

COUNCIL *on*
FOREIGN
RELATIONS

Public Opinion on Global Issues

A Web-based Digest of Polling from Around the World

www.cfr.org/public_opinion

November 2009

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders, and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries. Founded in 1921, CFR carries out its mission by maintaining a diverse membership, with special programs to promote interest and develop expertise in the next generation of foreign policy leaders; convening meetings at its headquarters in New York and in Washington, DC, and other cities where senior government officials, members of Congress, global leaders, and prominent thinkers come together with CFR members to discuss and debate major international issues; supporting a Studies Program that fosters independent research, enabling CFR scholars to produce articles, reports, and books and hold roundtables that analyze foreign policy issues and make concrete policy recommendations; publishing *Foreign Affairs*, the preeminent journal on international affairs and U.S. foreign policy; sponsoring Independent Task Forces that produce reports with both findings and policy prescriptions on the most important foreign policy topics; and providing up-to-date information and analysis about world events and American foreign policy on its website, CFR.org.

The Council on Foreign Relations takes no institutional position on policy issues and has no affiliation with the U.S. government. All statements of fact and expressions of opinion contained in its publications are the sole responsibility of the author or authors.

For further information about CFR or this paper, please write to the Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10065, or call the Director of Communications at 212.434.9400. Visit CFR's website, www.cfr.org.

Copyright © 2009 by the Council on Foreign Relations®, Inc.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

This paper may not be reproduced in whole or in part, in any form beyond the reproduction permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law Act (17 U.S.C. Sections 107 and 108) and excerpts by reviewers for the public press, without express written permission from the Council on Foreign Relations. For information, write to the Publications Office, Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10065.

ABOUT THE PROJECT

The international community confronts a daunting array of transnational threats and challenges that no country can hope to resolve alone. As political leaders in the United States and abroad grapple with this global agenda and seek to forge international partnerships in addressing it, for a variety of reasons they must consider the opinions of those from whom they represent. But what, precisely, do citizens in the United States and abroad think about such matters?

To answer this question, the International Institutions and Global Governance program has produced *Public Opinion on Global Issues*, a comprehensive digest of existing polling data on U.S. and global public attitudes on the world's most pressing challenges—and the institutions designed to address them. Developed in partnership with the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland, the digest consolidates global and U.S. public opinion across ten major issue areas: elements of world order, international institutions, violent conflict, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, climate change, energy security, the global economy, economic development, and human rights.

Until recently, global public opinion was essentially a black box. But in the last few years, large-scale polls have sampled countries from around the world. We can thus begin to see the outlines of world public opinion on a wide range of issues. This digest is the first effort to integrate all publicly available data into a coherent analysis.

The digest draws on hundreds of surveys from a wide array of polling sources. But it is organized for easy navigation between levels of detail. Under each topic, you will find a series of brief summaries on particular subtopics. With one click, you can read a full analysis of the findings. And with another click one can see the exact wording of each survey question and full country-by-country breakouts of the answers given. In each case, you can look at “World Opinion” or “U.S. Opinion.”

Why It Matters

Foreign policy analysts often discount the impact of public opinion—but doing so is a mistake. To be sustainable, national decisions must be informed by an accurate reading of what the public wants. Indeed, policymakers' assumptions about what citizens think frequently inform, constrain, or enable foreign policy choices. This is most obvious in established democracies, but is also true to some extent in more closed societies. Even authoritarian states require the acquiescence of its citizenry and when leaders depart from what the public believes is legitimate this creates a tension that is costly for the state.

This is not to suggest that public opinion is always right—or that it cannot be shaped by determined leadership. But it should not be ignored. The future of global governance is not viable if it is left only to foreign policy elites, disconnected from the aspirations and sentiments of the broader citizenry.

In practice, national leaders—and foreign policy elites—sometimes misperceive what their publics really believe. In the United States, for instance, politicians often portray the American people as innately isolationist (despite [evidence \(PDF\)](#) to the contrary). Such misperceptions can lead national leaders to believe that they are more politically constrained than they actually are.

In launching *Public Opinion on Global Issues*, we hope to shed greater light on how U.S. citizens and their counterparts around the world conceive of some of the central problems of world order, and how they think about the main institutions that have been created to advance global cooperation.

What We Found

The digest paints a striking portrait of global and American attitudes on international institutions and an array of global issues including nuclear proliferation, climate change, and human rights. The data suggest significant overlap between global and U.S. opinion, along with a few noteworthy differences. A few of the big-picture highlights:

Views on World Order: Publics around the world—including in the United States—are strongly internationalist in orientation. They believe that global challenges are simply too complex and daunting to be addressed by unilateral or even regional means. In every country polled, most people support a global system based on the rule of law, international treaties, and robust multilateral institutions. They believe their own government is obliged to abide by international law, even when doing so is at odds with its perceived national interest. Large majorities, including among Americans, reject a hegemonic role for the United States, but do want the United States to participate in multilateral efforts to address international issues.

The United Nations: Globally, national publics believe that the United Nations plays a positive international role, although they are often disappointed by the UN's actual performance and support its reform. Majorities in most countries—including the United States—regard the UN Security Council as the premier institution for conferring legitimacy on the use of armed force. Publics around the world believe the UN Security Council has not only the right but also the responsibility to prevent or end gross human rights abuses such as genocide. Majorities or pluralities in all nations polled want the UN to actively promote human rights—and they reject the argument that this would be improper interference in sovereign affairs. There is strong popular support for adding new permanent members to the Security Council and (even among publics of most permanent members) for giving the Council the power to override a veto by a permanent member.

Nuclear Proliferation: Large majorities around the world, including in countries with nuclear arms, favor an international agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons, with stringent inspection provisions. Publics worldwide also favor a new UN regime that would stop new countries from creating nuclear fuel, and instead supply them with the fuel they need for energy production. Publics in the United States and other countries polled support the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and most also favor the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force to prevent a country from acquiring nuclear weapons.

World Trade: International polls find strong support for globalization, tempered with anxiety that its pace is too fast. Majorities in most countries view international trade as positive for their nation, support the World Trade Organization, and believe their government should comply with adverse WTO decisions. At the same time, overwhelming majorities globally support including labor and environmental standards in trade agreements.

Global Finance: In the wake of the global recession, most publics around the world—with the exception of the United States—strongly support the idea of a global regulatory body to ensure that big financial institutions follow international standards. Assessments of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund are mildly positive in most (though not all) countries. Support for foreign aid is robust, and there is consensus in both developed and developing countries that wealthy nations are not doing enough to help poorer ones.

Climate Change: In every international poll, majorities in all countries, including the United States, say that global warming is a threat, that action needs to be taken, and that such an adjustment will entail lifestyle changes in their own country. Majorities in developing as well as developed countries think that developing countries have a responsibility to limit their emissions in an effort to deal with climate change. Among most countries—developed and developing—there is also a consensus that developed countries should provide aid to help developing countries limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.

American Exceptionalism?

Contrary to conventional wisdom, the digest suggests substantial consistency in the views of Americans and their counterparts abroad regarding the importance of international law, international institutions, and multilateral cooperation to address global challenges. Far from being insular or obsessed with sovereignty, Americans convey support for internationalist principles and a willingness to compromise for effective multilateral cooperation.

A few headlines are particularly striking. Most Americans favor a world order that is multipolar or led by the United Nations, rather than based on U.S. hegemony or a bipolar balance. They believe that all nations must abide by international law even when doing so is at odds with their national interest. A large majority of Americans express support for U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court, even after hearing past U.S. government objections. And most Americans believe that the United Nations plays a necessary role in the world, including in legitimating the use of armed force. They also favor giving the United Nations stronger powers to investigate human rights violations and to regulate the international arms trade (though not, significantly, to impose any taxes). At the same time, surveys show significant dissatisfaction with the UN's actual *performance* in fulfilling its missions, contributing to erratic overall evaluations of the UN as an institution.

A few distinctive differences in U.S. attitudes do emerge. Compared to many Europeans, for example, the U.S. public is slightly more inclined to countenance the use of military force and other coercive methods by the United Nations and multilateral alliances. Americans also show slightly greater skepticism than residents of other developed nations about international regulation, for instance in international finance or climate change, and they reveal relatively more trust in the private sector. And yet these differences tend to be shadings at the margin, rather than wholesale divergences.

Many of the results in the digest are surprising, and they challenge long-held stereotypes about attitudes toward world order and international cooperation, both in the United States and abroad.

A Few Caveats

Polling data should never be taken at face value—it needs to be interpreted, contextualized, and explained. We offer three caveats to bear in mind as you read through this digest.

1. Findings like these naturally raise questions about the intensity and resilience with which respondents feel their sentiments. Americans may express support for internationalist principles in polls, but it is always possible that they will back peddle if they begin to see real U.S. power diminish.
2. In every case, the digest draws on the most recent data available on global and U.S. public attitudes. In most instances, this means polling that has occurred in the last few years. Where such data is missing, or where we seek to document continuity (or, more rarely, discontinuity) in public attitudes, the digest relies on older survey findings, dating back 5-10 years.
3. Because the digest draws on multiple polling organizations, it necessarily relies on a diverse set of survey methodologies, rather than any single, consistent approach. But each of the original polls is provided for your review, so you can see for yourself how each term is being used in each case.

This digest represents a compilation, analysis, and synthesis of existing polling data, rather than new survey research. Its value added lies in its comprehensive coverage of major issue areas, as well as its juxtaposition of global and U.S. attitudes toward each area. Getting a clearer picture of what citizens in the United States and

abroad want is important for policymakers, because public attitudes will shape prospects for effective multilateral cooperation in the twenty-first century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WORLD OPINION ON GLOBAL ISSUES

Chapter 1: World Opinion on General Principles of World Order

International Law

Multilateralism and the International Order

Strengthening the United Nations

Multilateralism and the Use of Military Force

Intervention in Internal Affairs

UN Monitoring of Elections

When the United Nations Should Take the Lead

National and International Identity

International Cooperation

Chapter 2: World Opinion on International Institutions

The United Nations

Assessments of the United Nations as an Institution

Sources of Support for United Nations

UN Security Council Reform

Adding New Permanent Members to United Nations Security Council

EU Seat in the UN Security Council

Veto Override

Democratizing the UN

International Economic Institutions

Views of the World Bank, IMF and WTO

International Courts

International Courts

Regional Organizations: Europe

General Support for NATO

Members' Views of the European Union

International Views of the European Union's Role in the World

Regional Organizations: Southeast Asia

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

Regional Organizations: Latin America

Latin American Multilateral Institutions

Regional Organizations: Africa

African Union

Chapter 3: World Opinion on Preventing and Responding to Violent Conflict

The Use of Force

The UN Security Council and the Use of Force

UN Responsibility to Protect

UN Role in Peacekeeping

Participation in Military Operations to Prevent and Respond to Violent Conflict

War in Afghanistan

Intervention in Darfur

The Responsibility to Participate in NATO and EU Military Operations

Perceived Effectiveness of UN Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 4A: World Opinion on Countering Transnational Threats: Terrorism

Concern about Terrorism	Assessments of U.S. Efforts against Terrorism
Attitudes Toward al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden	Principles for Treatment of Terrorism Suspects
Support for Multilateral Action against Terrorism	U.S. Treatment of Terrorism Suspects
Regional Cooperation on Terrorism	Absence of Consensus over Who Was Behind 9/11 Attacks

Chapter 4B: World Opinion on Countering Transnational Threats: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction

Concerns about Nuclear Proliferation	Multilateral Control of Nuclear Fuel Production
Goal of Abolition of Nuclear Weapons	Dealing with Iran's Nuclear Program
UN Use of Force to Prevent Nuclear Proliferation	
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty	

Chapter 5A: World Opinion on the Environment

Perception of Climate Change as a Problem or Threat	Multilateral Efforts to Address Climate Change
Readiness to Take Action	Assessing Country's Government in Addressing Problem
Changing Energy Usage	Assessments of Leading Country's Role in Addressing Problem
Reducing Reliance on Oil and Coal	
Role of Developing Countries	

Chapter 5B: World Opinion on Energy Security

Concerns about Energy Security	Approaches to Energy Supply-- Fossil fuels
Multilateral Cooperation on Energy Security	Approaches to Energy Supply--Nuclear Energy
Approaches to Energy Supply--Renewable Energy	Dealing With Energy-Producing Countries
Approaches to Energy Supply--Conservation	

Chapter 6: World Opinion on Managing the Global Economy

General Views of Globalization and International Trade	Including Labor and Environmental Standards in Trade Agreements
International Regulation of Financial Institutions	Assessments of Countries' Fairness in Trade

Regional Trade Relations
The World Bank and IMF
The World Trade Organization

Global Corporations
Foreign Investment
Trade and Poverty Reduction

Chapter 7: World Opinion on Economic Development and Humanitarian Aid

Aid Levels and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

Role of Multilateral Institutions and Aid to Developing Countries

Linking Aid to Recipient Country Behavior

Chapter 8: World Opinion on Human Rights

The Role of the United Nations in Human Rights

Women's Rights

Freedom of Expression

Racial and Ethnic Equality

Media Freedom

Norms on Torture and Detention

Religious Freedom

Social and Economic Rights

U.S. OPINION ON GLOBAL ISSUES

Chapter 9: U.S. Opinion on General Principles of World Order

International Law

Intervention in Internal Affairs

International Treaties

UN Monitoring of Elections

International Criminal Court

When the United Nations Should Take the Lead

Multilateralism and the International Order

National and International Identity

Strengthening the United Nations

International Cooperation

Multilateralism and the Use of Military Force

Chapter 10: U.S. Opinion on International Institutions

The United Nations

Assessments of the United Nations as an Institution

Veto Override

Sources of Support for United Nations

Democratizing the United Nations

UN Security Council Reform

International Economic Institutions

Adding New Permanent Members to United Nations Security Council

Views of the World Bank, IMF and WTO

EU Seat in the UN Security Council

International Courts

International Court of Justice

International Criminal Court

Regional Organizations: Europe

New International Institutions

General Support for NATO

Creating New International Institutions

The European Union's Role in the World

Chapter 11: U.S. Opinion on Preventing and Responding to Violent Conflict

The Use of Force

War in Afghanistan

The UN Security Council and the Use of Force

Intervention in Darfur

UN Responsibility to Protect

Preference for Using U.S. Military Force as Part of UN Operation

UN Role in Peacekeeping

The Responsibility to Participate in NATO and EU Military Operations

Participation in Military Operations to Prevent and Respond to Violent Conflict

Chapter 12A: U.S. Opinion on Countering Transnational Threats: Terrorism

Concern about Terrorism

Principles for Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

Support for Multilateral Action against Terrorism

U.S. Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

Assessments of U.S. Efforts against Terrorism

Chapter 12B: U.S. Opinion on Countering Transnational Threats: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction

Concerns about Nuclear Proliferation

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Goal of Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

Multilateral Control of Nuclear Fuel Production

Use of Force by the United Nations to Prevent Nuclear Proliferation

Dealing with Iran's Nuclear Program

Chapter 13A: U.S. Opinion on Climate Change

Perception of Climate Change as a Problem or Threat

Role of Developing Countries

Readiness to Take Action

Multilateral Efforts to Address Climate Change

Changing Energy Usage

Assessments of Leading Country's Role in Addressing Problem

Reducing Reliance on Oil and Coal

Chapter 13B: U.S. Opinion on Energy Security

Concerns about Energy Security

Approaches to Energy Supply—Fossil Fuels

Approaches to Energy Supply—Renewable Energy

Approaches to Energy Supply—Nuclear Energy

Approaches to Energy Supply—Conservation

Dealing With Energy-Producing Countries

Chapter 14: U.S. Opinion on Managing the Global Economy

General Views of Globalization and International Trade	The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF)
International Regulation of Financial Institutions	The World Trade Organization (WTO)
Including Labor and Environmental Standards in Trade Agreements	Global Corporations
Regional Trade Relations	Foreign Investment
	Trade and Poverty Reduction

Chapter 15: U.S. Opinion on Development and Humanitarian Aid

Aid Levels and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)	Role of Multilateral Institutions and Aid to Developing Countries
	Linking Aid to Recipient Country Behavior

Chapter 16: U.S. Opinion on Human Rights

The Role of the United Nations in Human Rights	Racial and Ethnic Equality
Freedom of Expression	Norms on Torture and Detention
Media Freedom	“Ticking Bomb”
Religious Freedom	Justifiability of Torture
Women’s Rights	Social and Economic Rights

WORLD OPINION ON GLOBAL ISSUES

CHAPTER 1: WORLD OPINION ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF WORLD ORDER

International Law

Most people around the world support an international order based on international law and treaties. Majorities in most countries believe that international laws create normative obligations like domestic law, and believe that nations should feel obliged to abide by international law even when doing so is at odds with their national interest. However, people tend to underestimate how much their fellow citizens feel such an obligation. Europeans and Americans express readiness to contribute military force to uphold international law. Limited international data reveal strong support for participation in a variety of international treaties.

Most people around the world believe that their nation is obliged to abide by international law. A 2009 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll across twenty countries introduced the subject of international law, saying: “As you may know there are a number of international laws based on agreements between most nations, including our own. These govern a wide set of issues ranging from fishing rights to the use of military force.” They were then asked to choose between two positions on international law. Publics in sixteen nations chose the one that said: “Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.” Publics in only two nations chose the position, “If our government thinks it is not in our nation’s interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws,” while one was divided. On average, 57 percent believed that their nation should be bound by international laws, as opposed to 36 percent who believe that their country should not necessarily have to follow such laws.¹

The countries with the largest majorities in favor of adhering to international law were in China (74 percent), Germany (70 percent), and the United States (69 percent). The only two countries to take the contrary position were Pakistan (56 percent) and Mexico (53 percent). Turkey was divided.

People tend to underestimate how much their fellow citizens feel obliged to abide by international law. The same poll asked a follow-on question in seventeen publics on whether, as compared to the average citizen of their country, the individual polled considered him or herself “more supportive or less supportive of consistently abiding by international laws.” In each case, if the public as a whole perceived itself correctly, there would be a balance between those saying more and those saying less. But this did not prove to be the case. On average, by a nearly two-to-one ratio (48 percent to 28 percent) those saying that they were more supportive outweighed those saying that they were less supportive. This indicates a skew in the public’s perception, whereby individuals underestimate societal support for abiding by international law.

This skew obtained to varying extents in fifteen of the seventeen publics surveyed. The two exceptions were Iraq and the Palestinian Territories, where more respondents thought that they were less supportive than the public average. Interestingly, one of the countries with the greatest skew in respondents saying that they were more supportive than average was Mexico (71 percent more supportive, 14 percent less), which was also one of the only two countries where a majority did not feel obliged to abide by international law.²

Forcibly Upholding International Law

Majorities in Europe and the United States have expressed a general readiness to use military force to uphold international law. A 2002 Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA)/German Marshall Fund (GMF) survey asked publics in six European countries and the United States whether they would approve the use of their country’s military troops “to uphold international law.” Large majorities in all six European countries and the United States approved of using force for this purpose. Among Europeans, an average of 80 percent favored sending troops to uphold international law, and 16 percent were opposed. The Dutch (at 86 percent) were the most supportive, followed by the British, French, and Polish. Only the Germans, at 68 percent, offered below 80-percent support. Seventy-six percent of Americans also approved of using force for the same purpose.³

The results of this poll are striking because the question did not seek to elicit support for intervention based on any other value, such as defending a victim from an aggressor country or advancing some humanitarian goal. Respondents saw upholding international law alone as sufficient cause for putting their country's troops at risk.

International Treaties

While the polling is limited to a relatively small number of countries, the data reveal strong world public support for participation in a variety of international treaties.

One such treaty is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. In 2006, CCGA asked publics in the United States, China, India, and South Korea whether they favored their country participating in the treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide. Large majorities were supportive in every case, including 86 percent of Americans, 86 percent of South Koreans, 73 percent of Chinese, and 57 percent Indians.⁴

CCGA also asked the same countries if respondents believed their country should participate in an agreement under the Biological Weapons Convention that would allow for international inspections. Eighty-nine percent of Americans, 86 percent of South Koreans, 65 percent of Chinese, and 50 percent of Indians said their country should participate in such an agreement.⁵

The same poll surveyed people in the United States and South Korea on their feelings on becoming parties to the International Criminal Court. Eighty-seven percent of South Koreans and 71 percent of Americans said their country should take part.⁶

Americans and South Koreans were also asked if their country should participate in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming. Eighty-eight percent of South Koreans and 70 percent of Americans favored participation.⁷

Multilateralism and the International Order

International polling reveals a strong consensus that world order should be based on a multilateral system led by the United Nations or a group of regional powers, rather than a system based on hegemony or bipolarity. Large majorities in countries around the world reject a hegemonic role for the United States, but do want the United States to participate in multilateral efforts to address international issues.

People around the world strongly prefer a system of world order based on a multilateral approach over one based on hegemony or bipolarity. The Bertelsmann Foundation asked nine countries worldwide in 2005 to identify the best framework for ensuring peace and stability and offered four options. In each country, only a small minority chose "a system led by a single world power" (average 7 percent) or "a system led by two world powers" (average 5 percent). In five countries, the most popular model was "a system led by the United Nations" (Germany 68 percent, China 51 percent, Great Britain 47 percent, France 46 percent, and Japan 33 percent), with an overall average of 42 percent choosing this system. The second most popular was "a system led by a balance of regional powers," which was endorsed on average by 36 percent and was the most popular system in three countries (the United States 52 percent, Brazil 45 percent, India 37 percent, and Russia 33 percent).⁸

Large majorities in all countries reject a hegemonic role for the United States. In 2006, WPO and CCGA asked respondents in fifteen countries to choose the ideal role for the United States in world affairs. Presented three options, the least popular was, "As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems." On average, just 11 percent chose this option. Only in India did more than a quarter favor this idea (34 percent).

The position that "the United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems" also received low levels of support. On average, just 24 percent favored it, though in two nations it was a majority position: Argentina and the Palestinian Territories (both 55 percent).

By far the preferred option was a multilateral approach that said "the United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries." On average, 56 percent endorsed this position, which was the preferred position in thirteen of the fifteen nations, including the United States itself.⁹

The same poll asked nine countries whether the “United States has the responsibility to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur.” Majorities in eight of the nine countries said the United States does not have this responsibility, while a majority in one country (India, 53 percent) said it does. In the average of all nine countries, 65 percent of respondents said the United States does not have the responsibility to fight violations of international law, while 28 percent said it does.¹⁰

A 2003 GMF poll of seven European countries and the United States, at a time of great international controversy over the Iraq war, also found concern about the potential for U.S. unilateralism. Majorities or pluralities in all eight countries saw the United States going it alone as an “important threat.” Among European countries on average, 47 percent of respondents said it was an important threat, 31 percent said it was an extremely important threat, and 17 percent said it was not an important threat.¹¹

Strengthening the United Nations

Large majorities around the world have endorsed having a stronger United Nations. Large majorities also support giving the UN a variety of expanded powers, including having a standing peacekeeping force, the power to investigate human rights violations, and the power to regulate the international arms trade. National publics are more divided when it comes to giving the United Nations the capacity to impose a tax. Support for working through the United Nations is somewhat tempered, especially among smaller countries, when poll questions highlight the prospect of subordinating national policies to collective decision-making processes.

A number of international polls have found robust support for a stronger United Nations. A 2004 British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll asked people in twenty-three countries about the possibility of “the United Nations becoming significantly more powerful in world affairs.” Majorities or pluralities in all twenty-three countries replied that this development would be mainly positive. In the global average, 64 percent said the United Nations becoming more powerful would be mainly positive, and 19 percent said it would be mainly negative.¹² Publics were especially enthusiastic in Germany (87 percent), Spain (78 percent), Indonesia (77 percent), and the Philippines (77 percent). Six in ten Americans (59 percent) favored it, while 37 percent were opposed. The only two countries with a mere plurality in favor of a stronger United Nations were Turkey (40 percent to 24 percent) and Argentina (44 percent to 22 percent).

WPO asked this same question in January 2007 to Iranians and Americans. Seventy percent of Iranians and 66 percent of Americans expressed support for a stronger UN.¹³

Strengthening the UN is also rated as important. A 2006–2007 WPO/CCGA poll of eight countries asked respondents to rate the importance of a number of foreign policy goals. At least 79 percent in every country considered the goal of “strengthening the United Nations” important, with majorities in Australia (64 percent), Mexico (56 percent), and China (51 percent) considering it very important. Across the eight countries, only small numbers of respondents said strengthening the United Nations was “not important,” ranging from 4 percent in Thailand to 19 percent in the United States.¹⁴

Support for a stronger United Nations was bit lower—though remained a majority view—when respondents were presented the argument that strengthening the United Nations “would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies,” as well as with the argument that “because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems.” After hearing these arguments in a 2003 GMF poll, 70 percent of Americans and 74 percent of Europeans across seven countries said the United Nations “needs to be strengthened.” European support ranged from 61 percent in Poland to 81 percent in Portugal.¹⁵

Giving the United Nations Expanded Powers

Polling reveals strong support for giving the United Nations new powers. Between 2006 and 2008, WPO and CCGA polled twenty-two countries on four proposals for new powers for the United Nations. Three out of four received strong support and one received modest support.

On having a **standing UN peacekeeping force**, twenty-one countries favored the proposal, and one country was divided on it. Twenty countries had a majority of favorable views, and one had a plurality. In the average across all countries, 66 percent were in favor and 23 percent were opposed. Kenya (85 percent) had the highest level of support,

closely followed by Nigeria (84 percent) and Great Britain (79 percent), and with the United States registering 72-percent support. Egypt had the highest level of negative views, with 47 percent opposed.¹⁶

On giving the United Nations the authority to **go into countries to investigate violations of human rights**, eighteen countries had majorities supporting the proposal, two had pluralities, and two were divided on the idea. On average, 65 percent were in favor and 22 percent were opposed. France had the highest support, with 92 percent positive views, followed by Great Britain (86 percent) and Nigeria (83 percent). Egypt had the highest number of negative viewpoints (49 percent) along with the Philippines (46 percent) and Israel (31 percent).¹⁷

On giving the United Nations **the power to regulate the international arms trade**, majorities or pluralities in nineteen countries expressed support and three expressed opposition. On average, 58 percent favored UN regulation and 30 percent opposed it. The highest support was found in Kenya (85 percent) and Nigeria (84 percent), followed by France (77 percent), South Korea (75 percent), and Britain (69 percent). Support was also high in Israel (60 percent) and the United States (60 percent). Only three publics tended to reject the idea: Filipinos (58 percent negative, 32 percent positive), Argentines (42 percent negative, 36 percent positive) and Turks (39 percent negative, 34 percent positive).¹⁸

On giving the UN the power to **impose a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil**, fifteen countries were in favor, five were opposed, and two were divided. On average, 48 percent favored the proposal and 36 percent were opposed. Kenya had the highest level of support (74 percent), followed by France (70 percent) and Great Britain (61 percent). Egypt had the highest level of disapproval (61 percent), followed by the Philippines (56 percent), Peru (55 percent), and the United States (50 percent).¹⁹

Subordination to Collective Decision-Making

If the United Nations is going to play a stronger role in the world, nations may at times need to subordinate their preferences for the sake of collective decision-making. When poll questions highlight the prospect of subordinating national preferences, support for collective decision-making remains fairly strong, but becomes significantly lower than for the broad principle of having a stronger United Nations.

WPO asked respondents in twenty-three countries between 2006 and 2008 whether they agreed with the statement, “When dealing with international problems, [survey country] should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that [survey country] will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.” Majorities or pluralities in fifteen of the twenty-three nations agreed they should work through the United Nations more. These were led by China (78 percent), France (68 percent), Kenya (66 percent), the United States and Nigeria (both 60 percent), and Britain (58 percent). Interestingly, a majority of Israelis also agreed (54 percent). A majority or plurality disagreed in six states or territories, led by the Palestinian Territories (81 percent) and including Indonesia (50 percent), the Philippines (46 percent), and Russia (44 percent). South Korea and Ukraine were divided. In the global average, 46 percent favored making more decisions within the UN and 38 percent were opposed.²⁰

Notably, four out of five countries most supportive of greater collective decision-making are also permanent members of the UN Security Council with the power to veto actions. The exception was Russia. Those most resistant tended to be smaller countries.

Multilateralism and the Use of Military Force

In international polling, large majorities around the world favor the United Nations having the right to authorize the use of military force for a wide range of contingencies. The approval of the UN Security Council plays a powerful—and in many cases a necessary—role in conferring legitimacy on the use of military force. Among Europeans and Americans, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) does provide some legitimacy, but by much smaller margins than does the United Nations.

The UN Security Council’s Right to Authorize Military Force

The UN Charter’s Chapter 7 grants the UN Security Council the right to authorize military force in response to what it believes is a threat to international security. Consistent with this provision, publics around the world generally believe that the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force in response to a wide range of

contingencies. Between 2006 and 2008, WPO and CCGA polled eighteen nations on whether the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force for a variety of purposes. Support was quite robust in nearly all cases.

The largest majorities said that the UN Security Council “should” have the right to authorize military force **“to defend a country that has been attacked.”** Overall, 76 percent of all respondents felt the UNSC should have this right, and only 16 percent felt it should not. Majorities ranged from 66 percent in India to 89 percent in Nigeria. Opposition nowhere exceeded 23 percent.²¹

Majorities in all nations polled favored giving the UN Security Council the right to authorize the use of military force in order **“to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.”** Overall, 76 percent of respondents agreed that the UN Security Council should have this right, while only 16 percent disagreed. The largest majorities were in Kenya (90 percent), Nigeria (88 percent), and France (85 percent). In no country was support below 62 percent.²²

Majorities in all nations favored the UN having the right **“to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.”** On average, 73 percent said the UN Security Council should have the right to intervene, and just 19 percent said it should not. Support was highest in Nigeria (87 percent), Israel (85 percent), and France (84 percent), and lowest in India (60 percent), the Palestinian Territories (61 percent), and South Korea (61 percent).²³

Two options that did elicit some variance involved the UN Security Council authorizing force to prevent nuclear proliferation, a topic clearly relevant to ongoing concerns about Iran’s and North Korea’s nuclear programs. Asked whether the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force **“to prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them,”** majorities or pluralities in fourteen nations agreed that it should. Support was highest in Kenya (84 percent) and Nigeria (81 percent). Interestingly, Egyptians were among the strongest supporters, with 74 percent agreeing. Support was also strong in Russia (55 percent) and a plurality was in favor in China (47 percent to 40 percent), while the French were divided (50 percent to 48 percent). Americans were robustly in favor (62 percent). However, a majority of respondents in the Palestinian territories disagreed (59 percent), as in South Korea (55 percent). In the average of all nations polled, 59 percent favored the UN Security Council having such a right, while 31 percent were opposed. Majority support was solid in all Muslim nations except the Palestinian Territories.²⁴

Raising the bar even higher, respondents were asked about using force **“to stop a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons.”** Globally, support was only a bit lower—56 percent on average, 32 percent opposed. Responses followed the same pattern as described above, though support was a bit more subdued. Permanent members of the UN Security Council were largely supportive (United States 57 percent, Russia 53 percent, China 47 percent to 34 percent, France divided 50 percent to 48 percent). The Palestinian Territories and South Korea were the only dissenters (by 57 percent and 56 percent, respectively). Egyptian support, though, dropped to a divided position.²⁵

The lowest level of support was for the United Nations having the right to authorize military action **“to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.”** On average, 53 percent thought the UN Security Council should have this right; 35 percent did not. Out of sixteen nations polled, majorities in ten and pluralities in three publics believed the UN Security Council should have this right. In one country, a majority (South Korea, 65 percent) and in another a plurality (China, 45 percent) were opposed. The largest majorities in favor were in Kenya and Nigeria (both 76 percent), the Palestinian Territories (67 percent), and Egypt (64 percent). Interestingly, no public in any Islamic country opposed this principle: 51 percent supported it in Indonesia, as did pluralities in Azerbaijan (43 percent to 38 percent) and Turkey (43 percent to 32 percent).²⁶

United Nations Approval as Legitimizing Military Force

A variety of polls have found that UN Security Council approval provides powerful legitimacy for the use of military force. A 2005 GMF poll asked in Europe and the United States if respondents agreed that “the use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations approves it.” Majorities in the United States and all ten European countries agreed. In the average of ten European countries, 64 percent agreed and 30 percent disagreed. Interestingly, an even larger percentage of Americans (69 percent) also agreed. In Europe, agreement was especially strong in Portugal (78 percent), the United Kingdom (76 percent), and France (74 percent). Turkey was the only country to not have a robust majority agreeing (49 percent agreed, 37 percent disagreed).²⁷ A 2006 WPO poll asked the same question in Iran and the United States. Roughly seven in ten Iranians (69 percent) and Americans (72 percent) agreed.²⁸

In 2003, the GMF's transatlantic poll conducted an experiment in the United States and seven European countries to test the importance of multilateralism in decisions to use military force. In each of the eight countries polled, the sample was divided into small subgroups. All were asked a hypothetical question about contributing troops to attacking Iran or North Korea to get these countries to give up their weapons of mass destruction. The scenarios varied according to the actor authorizing and leading the response, ranging from unilateral action by the United States to a coalition of the United States and its allies, a NATO intervention, and a UN Security Council-authorized intervention. International support was the lowest when the United States was acting alone (31 percent against North Korea, 38 percent against Iran). Support rose by 4–6 points when the actor was “the United States and its allies,” by 10 points when it was NATO, and by 12 points when it was the UN Security Council.²⁹

Whether United Nations Approval is Necessary

A variety of polls reveal that not only does the United Nations provide greater legitimacy for military action, but in many instances UN approval is regarded as essential. A strikingly large number even say that UN approval is necessary to use military force to deal with international threats in general—something that goes well beyond the strictures of Article 51 of the UN Charter, which does allow for unilateral or collective self-defense without Security Council approval.

In 2004, Pew asked nine countries from around the world whether their country “should have UN approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat,” or whether “that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats.” Views were mixed. Majorities endorsed the view that UN approval was necessary in Germany (80 percent), Britain (64 percent), and France (63 percent), and pluralities did so in Jordan (47 percent to 38 percent) and Pakistan (38 percent to 34 percent). Pluralities said UN approval was unnecessary in both the United States (48 percent to 41 percent) and Russia (41 percent to 37 percent). Views were divided in Morocco and Turkey.³⁰

In 2004 the GMF asked a series of questions in Europe and the United States that explored this issue in some depth. The poll asked, “If a situation like Iraq arose in the future, do you think it is essential to secure the approval of the UN before using military force, or don't you think it is essential?” Large majorities in all ten European nations (on average 78 percent) said that it was essential. Fifty-eight percent of Americans agreed.³¹

The pollsters then developed a small experiment. First they asked, “If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [country's] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?” Majorities in nine of the ten European countries said that they would (Turkey was the exception). On average, 65 percent said they would, as did 78 percent of Americans.³² They also asked, “If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [country's] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?” Majorities in six of the ten European countries said they would favor it. On average, 55 percent said they would, as did 66 percent of Americans.³³

The pollsters then asked those who said they would favor use of troops under either of these circumstances if they would still support the use of their country's armed forces if the UN did not approve it. Support dropped precipitously among this subsample, with majorities in all ten European countries now disapproving of the use of force. In the United States, the subsample became divided on this question, but here too only a small number of the whole sample were ready to act without UN approval.³⁴

NATO Approval as Legitimizing Military Force

Polls of Europeans and Americans indicate that NATO approval also provides some legitimacy for the use of military force, but the percentages holding this view are substantially smaller than for UN approval.

In 2005, GMF asked publics in ten European countries and the United States if NATO approval makes military action legitimate. Americans leaned to the view that it does (53 percent to 39 percent). On average, 51 percent of the Europeans said that it did, while 41 percent said it did not. Countries varied widely, with majorities saying that it did in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Holland, Portugal, and Serbia; a majority of Italians disagreed. The Spanish were divided.³⁵

When asked about contributing troops to a NATO-approved operation, publics expressed fairly strong support, a bit lower than for UN-approved operations. The 2004 GMF poll found substantial readiness to contribute to a NATO-approved military action to prevent a terrorist attack (Europeans 61 percent, Americans 79 percent), or to establish peace in a civil war in Africa (Europeans 50 percent, Americans 60 percent). Support was generally about five points lower than when UN approval was specified.³⁶

Intervention in Internal Affairs

Robust majorities approve of the United Nations intervening in the internal affairs of states to investigate human rights abuses and to promote human rights in member states. Perhaps most dramatic, equally large majorities approve of the United Nations using military force to forcibly deliver urgent humanitarian aid if the government tries to block the aid, and to protect people from severe human rights abuses even against the will of the government.

While governments regularly invoke the principle of national sovereignty and resist UN intervention in their internal affairs, publics appear ready to give the United Nations such powers. This is a strong indication that people around the world believe that international norms should be applied in a global—not just national—context.

As discussed above, large majorities in nearly all nations polled approve of giving the United Nations the authority to go into countries to investigate violations of human rights. In a 2006–2008 WPO/CCGA poll, twenty out of twenty-two publics polled supported the idea, while two were divided on it. In the average of all twenty-two countries, 65 percent were in favor and 22 percent were opposed.³⁷

More generally, there is strong support for the United Nations taking an active role in promoting human rights in member states. Most people (on average 70 percent) in twenty-one countries polled by WPO in 2008 said that the United Nations should “actively promote human rights in member states,” rejecting the argument that “this is improper interference in a country’s internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country.”³⁸ Sixty-five percent on average favored the United Nations doing more than it does to “promote human rights principles.”³⁹ Likewise, sixty-seven percent said “the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women,” rejecting the argument that “this is improper interference in a country’s internal affairs.”⁴⁰

Forcible Humanitarian Intervention

Perhaps most dramatic, robust majorities approve of the United Nations using military force against the will of governments when their populations are at risk.

A 2008 WPO poll posed the question of whether the United Nations should forcibly deliver urgent humanitarian aid if a government refused to allow entry. The question was posed in terms of the recent events in Myanmar, as follows:

“In May 2008, Burma, [also known as Myanmar] had a major cyclone that left over a million people without food and water. Though the Burmese government was not effectively delivering aid, it refused to let in relief organizations. As a general rule, in such circumstances, should the UN bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government—OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of a country’s sovereignty?”

Publics in nineteen out of twenty-one nations and territories polled said that, as a general rule, the United Nations should bring in shipments of aid even against the will of the government, escorted by military protection if necessary. Support was especially high in Argentina (86 percent), Kenya (81 percent), Germany (74 percent), and France (70 percent). Two countries were divided: Russia and Egypt. And in two countries support was just a plurality: Jordan (46 percent to 37 percent), and Ukraine (42 percent to 29 percent). On average, 60 percent of respondents were in favor, while 28 percent said that this would too much of a violation of the country’s sovereignty. Interestingly, support for forcible intervention was also quite strong in China (59 percent). Support was even higher in Taiwan (78 percent).⁴¹

In 2009, a WPO poll of seven majority-Muslim nations and territories also found strong support for intervening in Sudan for humanitarian purposes against the will the Sudanese government. Respondents were told that in response to charges made by the International Criminal Court, Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir “has expelled humanitarian groups that have been providing food and other aid to the displaced civilians living in refugee camps.” They were then

asked, “If, as a result, many people in these camps start dying from hunger and exposure, do you think the UN should bring in food and other aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government or do you think this would be too much of a violation of Sudan’s sovereignty?” Large majorities approved of such an intervention in Kenya (82 percent), Nigeria (68 percent), Egypt (61 percent), the Palestinian Territories (60 percent), and Turkey (58 percent). A plurality of Iraqis also approved (46 percent to 29 percent). Only Pakistanis leaned against the idea (37 percent to 42 percent). On average across the seven publics, 59 percent approved.⁴²

Large majorities in most countries polled endorse the principle that the United Nations not only has the right but the responsibility to authorize military intervention “to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government.” In a 2006–2008 WPO poll of twenty nations, an average of 61 percent said that the UN has such a responsibility.⁴³

UN Monitoring of Elections

Publics in most nations say that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections, countries should be willing to have UN observers monitor the elections. Most countries polled, including developed democracies, say that their own country would benefit from such monitoring.

There is strong support for the idea of the United Nations monitoring elections. In 2009, WPO asked respondents in eighteen countries, “Do you think that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections, countries should or should not be willing to have international observers from the United Nations monitor their elections?” Publics in fifteen nations said countries should be willing to have international observers from the UN monitor elections in these cases, while a majority in only one nation said countries should not be willing to have international observers come in to monitor (two nations were divided). On average, 63 percent of respondents across all seventeen countries said countries should be willing to have UN international observers monitor their elections when there are concerns, as opposed to 31 percent who opposed this step.⁴⁴

Publics in Azerbaijan (83 percent), Kenya (82 percent), and Great Britain (81 percent) were the most supportive of international observers monitoring when there are election concerns. Indonesia was the one country with a majority (74 percent) unsupportive. Views were divided in Turkey and India.

Interestingly, respondents expressed surprisingly high levels of support for having such monitoring in their own countries. Asked whether they thought their own country would “benefit from having international observers monitor elections,” publics in eleven of the eighteen nations said that their country would benefit. A majority in five nations said that their country would not benefit, and two nations were divided. On average, 55 percent of respondents said that their countries would benefit from having international observers monitor their elections, as opposed to 36 percent who said that their countries would not.

Majorities in Kenya (85 percent), Nigeria (74 percent), and Azerbaijan (71 percent) were the most supportive of having international observers monitor their own country’s elections. The four nations with majorities unsupportive were Indonesia (62 percent), India (51 percent), Great Britain (51 percent), and the United States (51 percent). Interestingly, substantial numbers in advanced democracies were supportive of such monitoring, including in the United States (46 percent), France (45 percent), Germany (49 percent), and Britain (46 percent). Large majorities also liked the idea in Iraq (67 percent), Egypt (63 percent), Macau (66 percent), Chile (59 percent), and Taiwan (59 percent).⁴⁵

When the United Nations Should Take the Lead

Asked whether the United Nations, national governments, or regional organizations should take the lead in dealing with various issues, responses vary according to the issue. The most common view is that the United Nations should take the leading role in addressing aid for economic development, dealing with refugees, and international peacekeeping. The most common view is that national governments should take the leading role on protection of the environment. Views are more mixed on human rights, but most say either the United Nations or a regional organization should take the lead.

From 2005 to 2008, the World Values Survey asked a series of questions in forty-six countries on which entity would be best to make decisions on a variety of international issues. The options presented were: national governments, a regional organization, or the United Nations.

On **aid to developing countries**, an average of 48 percent identified the United Nations as best placed to lead, with 22 percent saying national governments, and 19 percent a regional organization. The United Nations was the most common response in forty countries while two nations were divided between the United Nations and a regional organization and another between the United Nations and national governments. In only two countries did respondents identify a regional organization as their predominant choice for leading on development aid, and only one public preferred national governments. Ethiopia (68 percent), Andorra (62 percent), Vietnam (61 percent), and Poland (61 percent) had the largest percent of respondents naming the United Nations, while Slovenia (45 percent), Malaysia (43 percent), and Bulgaria (40 percent) were the top supporters of a regional organization. Public support for national governments taking the lead on aid to developing countries was strongest in Thailand (65 percent), Canada (34 percent), South Korea (32 percent), and Australia (32 percent).⁴⁶

On **refugees**, an average of 43 percent of respondents across the forty-six countries identified the United Nations as the natural lead, with 29 percent identifying national governments, and another 17 percent a regional organization. The United Nations was the top choice of publics in thirty-one countries, while five countries were divided between the United Nations and national governments. Respondents in another nine countries preferred to look first to national governments, with opinion in one country favoring a regional organization. Rwanda (72 percent), Ghana (64 percent), and Zambia (62 percent) had the largest percentage of respondents choosing the United Nations, while Georgia (67 percent), Canada (46 percent), Poland (45 percent), and Thailand (45 percent) most frequently said national governments.⁴⁷

On **international peacekeeping**, an average of 45 percent of poll respondents identified the United Nations as the natural lead, 34 percent said national governments, and 11 percent said a regional organization. The United Nations was the leading choice in twenty-seven countries and national governments in another fourteen. In four countries, opinion was divided on whether the United Nations and national governments offered the more natural lead, and in one country, opinion was divided between the UN and regional organizations. Support for the United Nations carrying out this mission was most common in Indonesia (74 percent), Japan (72 percent), and Sweden (70 percent) while national governments received the largest support from Georgia (79 percent), Thailand (77 percent), and Malaysia (51 percent). While no national public identified a regional organization as its preferred leader, support for this option was strongest in Rwanda (41 percent).⁴⁸

On **protection of the environment**, 47 percent of poll respondents said that national governments should take the lead; 25 percent said regional organization; and 18 percent said the United Nations. In thirty-nine countries, the highest number of respondents preferred to look at national governments first, while in two countries respondents preferred the United Nations, and in another one, regional organizations. Respondents in the remaining four countries were divided. Support for a lead role for national governments was strongest in Indonesia (79 percent), Georgia (72 percent), and Ghana (62 percent). Spain (40 percent), Ethiopia (36 percent), and Mexico (32 percent) showed the highest public support for a lead UN role in this arena, while Malaysia (43 percent), Rwanda (43 percent), and Turkey (41 percent) showed highest support for a regional organization.⁴⁹

The area of **human rights** produced the most mixed responses. On average, 40 percent of respondents across all countries said national governments should have the lead, but a clear majority—on average 50 percent—chose a more multilateral approach, with 38 percent identifying the United Nations and 12 percent a regional organization as the preferred lead. Georgia (79 percent), Ghana (67 percent), and South Africa (60 percent) had the largest percentage of respondents select national governments, whereas the United Nations received its highest levels of support from Iran (75 percent), Sweden (72 percent), and Switzerland (63 percent). At 37 percent, a regional organization was preferred most frequently by respondents in Rwanda, followed by Cyprus (36 percent) and Slovenia (30 percent).⁵⁰

National and International Identity

Large majorities in publics around the world perceive themselves as citizens of the world as well as of their nation, but in all nations national identity is still stronger than global identity.

World Values Survey asked respondents in forty-six countries from 2005 to 2008 if they saw themselves as world citizens. Majorities in forty-three of the countries said they did. On average, 72 percent said they saw themselves as world citizens, compared to 21 percent who did not. The three exceptions—where less than a majority saw themselves as world citizens—were Bulgaria (42 percent), Georgia (44 percent), and Morocco (40 percent). The countries with the

largest numbers saying they felt *strongly* that they were world citizens were Rwanda (98 percent), Colombia (94 percent), and Mali (91 percent).⁵¹

However, when publics are asked which identity is stronger, the pull of national identity proves more powerful. A September 2008 WPO poll surveyed twenty-one nations on whether respondents consider themselves more of a citizen of their country, more a citizen of the world, or both equally. Majorities in seventeen nations considered themselves mostly a citizen of their own country. On average, 66 percent said they see themselves as mostly a citizen of their country, 10 percent said mostly a citizen of the world, and 20 percent said both equally. The most nationally identified were in Azerbaijan (89 percent), Kenya (88 percent), South Korea (83 percent), Ukraine (81 percent), Turkey (80 percent), and Jordan (80 percent).

There were, however, four exceptions. China had the lowest number who identified themselves nationally (35 percent), while half either said they were a citizen of the world (6 percent) or both equally (44 percent). France had a slight majority (51 percent) saying they were either a citizen of the world (14 percent) or both equally (37 percent). India had more saying they were citizens of the world (14 percent) or both equally (32 percent) than said they were primarily national citizens (40 percent), and Italy had nearly as many respondents (48 percent) identifying themselves as “world citizens” (21 percent) or both equally (27 percent). Fewer than half of respondents in Thailand described themselves foremost as “national citizens” (48 percent). Overall, the Taiwanese had the highest number (62 percent) saying they were citizens of the world (8 percent) or both equally (54 percent).⁵²

International Cooperation

Large majorities of Europeans and Americans alike believe that they have enough common values for transatlantic cooperation on international problems and that it is critical for their own nation to act together with its closest allies on national security issues. Europeans strongly favor cooperation over competition between the European Union and the United States. Internationally, more publics think their government should be more cooperative than it is than think that their government tends to be too ready to compromise.

The GMF in 2008 presented respondents in twelve European countries and the United States with two competing statements on cooperation between the United States and Europe. Eleven European countries and the United States agreed that there were enough common values for cooperation on international problems, while one country said the United States and European Union have such different values that cooperation was impossible. In the average of twelve European countries, 55 percent said cooperation was possible and 35 percent said it was not possible.⁵³

A 2007 GMF survey asked twelve European countries and the United States if they agreed with the following statement: “When our country acts on a national security issue, it is critical we do so together with our closest allies.” All twelve European countries and the United States agreed with the statement. In the European average, 80 percent were in agreement and 15 percent were in disagreement.⁵⁴

In 2005, GMF asked ten European countries if a more powerful European Union should compete or cooperate with the United States. Nine countries said the European Union should cooperate and not compete with the United States, while Turkey was divided. In the European average, 74 percent thought the European Union should cooperate and 17 percent thought it should compete.⁵⁵

Internationally, publics tend to think that their governments should be more cooperative than they are. A poll across twenty-one countries (WPO 2009) asked respondents whether their government “should be more ready to act cooperatively to achieve mutual gains when their country negotiates with other countries” or their government “tends to be too willing to compromise and is often taken advantage of.” Publics in fourteen nations said that their government should be more ready to act cooperatively, while publics in six nations said that their government tends to be too willing to compromise (one nation was divided). On average, 55 percent of respondents said their country’s government should be more ready to act cooperatively, as opposed to 39 percent who said their government tends to be too willing to compromise already.

Majorities in Turkey (81 percent), Egypt (76 percent), and Nigeria (73 percent) were the most supportive of their government acting cooperatively when negotiating with other countries. Fifty-four percent of Americans also thought their government should be more cooperative. Majorities in South Korea (71 percent), Great Britain (65 percent), and Mexico (63 percent) were the most adamant that their government tends to be too willing to compromise.⁵⁶

CHAPTER 2: WORLD OPINION ON INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

THE UNITED NATIONS

Assessments of the United Nations as an Institution

International polling reveals a majority of nations have a favorable view of the United Nations and think that it is having a positive influence in the world. On average, nearly six in ten respondents express such positive views. These majorities are smaller than those expressing support for the United Nations having a robust mission, suggesting that attitudes about the United Nations as an institution, while buoyed by support for its mission, may be mitigated by reservations about its performance. When asked about confidence in the United Nations as an organization views tilt to the negative.

Large majorities in most countries want the United Nations to play a more powerful role in the world and favor giving the United Nations much greater powers (see discussion in “World Order” section). However, these questions are primarily in a hypothetical domain. Questions that ask about the institution per se elicit largely positive responses but are decidedly less enthusiastic. They also fluctuate—presumably in response to UN actions. This implies that public attitudes of the UN as an institution are driven not only by views of its actual or potential mission but by perceptions of the institutions’ performance. Some respondents who favor an expansive role for the UN may be disappointed with its failure to live up to the high hopes they have for the institution, and be inclined to give it poor ratings accordingly.

The most extensive polling on views of the United Nations simply asked respondents whether they have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of it. In 2009, Pew asked this question in twenty-five nations and found that publics in twenty had a favorable view, four an unfavorable view and one was divided. On average, 56 percent of respondents expressed a favorable view, 31 percent unfavorable.

Publics with the most positive views of the UN are distributed across the globe. Countries with overwhelmingly positive views include Indonesia (79 percent), South Korea (79 percent), Kenya (76 percent), and France (74 percent).

The most negative views are expressed in some predominantly Muslim publics in the Middle East—the Palestinian Territories (67 percent), Jordan (57 percent), Turkey (57 percent)—as well as in Israel (65 percent). However, favorable views are also expressed in Lebanon (62 percent) and Egypt (56 percent), and outside the Middle East, the UN is seen in an overwhelmingly favorable light in a number of nations with large Muslim populations—notably Indonesia (79 percent) and Nigeria (71 percent).

Among the permanent members of the UN Security Council, the United Nations receives overall positive views in France (74 percent), Britain (67 percent), and the United States (61 percent), with more moderately positive views in Russia (56 percent) and China (55 percent). Among nations discussed as potential permanent members of the Security Council, majorities of the public are positively disposed to the UN in Germany (65 percent) and Brazil (52 percent) while pluralities are positive in India (43 percent to 30 percent), and Japan (45 percent to 40 percent).⁵⁷

Comparison with an identical poll conducted two years beforehand by Pew suggests that global attitudes toward the United Nations have improved somewhat since 2007. Of the twenty-five publics surveyed in both years, twelve became more positive, nine remained more or less the same, and four became more negative. Most notably, favorable U.S. views of the organization jumped significantly from 48 percent to 61 percent of respondents, as did favorable views in Egypt (44 percent to 56 percent) and Jordan (32 percent to 44 percent), while favorable views fell by large numbers only in Kenya (88 percent to 76 percent). On average, favorable opinions of the UN remained roughly the same (from 57 percent to 56 percent) and unfavorable opinions grew very slightly (28 percent to 31 percent).

Limited trendline data from earlier years show mostly negative trends in views of the UN. Data on views toward the United Nations from the 1990s onward exists for three countries: Russia, Germany, and (most extensively) the United States. In the United States, public ratings of the United Nations were quite positive from the 1990s through 2001, ranging from 62 to 77 percent favorable, but starting in 2004 they dropped to 55 percent and then to a low of 48 percent before rising again to 61 percent in 2009. In Russia, support dropped from 80 percent favorable in 1991 to 60 percent in 2004, 49 percent in 2007, and remains only moderately positive at 52 percent. Germany went from 83 percent in 1991, to 71 percent in 2004, to 64 percent in 2007, and stands at 65 percent in 2009. (It should be noted that 1991 was a high

point for the UN, as it played a prominent and successful role in organizing consensus against Iraq's occupation of Kuwait at the time of the Gulf War.)⁵⁸

The UN's Influence in the World

The United Nations is largely seen as having a positive influence in the world. A 2006 GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll for the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) World Service asked publics in thirty-two countries whether respondents thought the United Nations was having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world. Positive views were expressed in thirty countries by majorities (twenty-three) or pluralities (seven), while in one country a plurality offered a negative assessment and in another views were divided. On average, 59 percent of all respondents called the United Nations' influence "mainly positive," while just 16 percent called it "mainly negative."

The ratio of countries expressing positive views was higher than in the 2007 Pew poll mentioned above, perhaps because the question about the UN's influence in the world elicited a positive attitude toward the UN's *mission* as opposed to its performance. Few respondents (16 percent on average) said the United Nations is having a negative influence, but substantial numbers volunteered a qualified response (9 percent) or volunteered that its influence is neither positive nor negative (4 percent). The mean positive ratings were almost exactly the same as the mean favorable rating in the 2007 Pew poll (57 percent), but the UN's negative ratings were lower than the unfavorable ratings (28 percent) in the Pew poll.

Publics expressing the most positive views of the United Nations were found in the Philippines (87 percent), Germany (86 percent), and Indonesia (84 percent). A plurality offered a negative assessment in Iraq (40 percent), and views were divided in Argentina.

The poll results show a modest overall decline in positive views of UN influence from 2005, when the same question was asked in twenty-three countries. In some countries the drops were sharp—France dropped from 73 percent viewing it positively to 52 percent; South Africa from 73 percent to 48 percent; Great Britain from 76 percent to 66 percent; and the United States from 59 percent to 52 percent. But no countries slipped into a predominantly negative view. The one country where views of the United Nations improved substantially was Mexico—rising from 41 percent to 62 percent positive.⁵⁹

In 2006, WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) asked publics in the United States and Iran the same question about the positive versus negative influence of the United Nations. Majorities of both Americans (64 percent) and Iranians (58 percent) viewed the UN's influence positively. Between 2005 and 2006, positive evaluations of the United Nations by the Iranian public decreased by 5 points, while U.S. views increased by 12 points.⁶⁰

Confidence in the United Nations as an Organization

The least positive views of the United Nations have been found in response to a question that assessed confidence in the UN as an organization. A World Values Survey of fifty-two nations conducted from 2005 to 2008 presented publics with a list of "organizations" and asked respondents how much "confidence" they had in them. Majorities or pluralities in twenty-five nations said that they had "not very much" or no confidence at all in the United Nations, while publics in twenty nations said that they had "quite a lot" or "a great deal" of confidence in the organization (seven nations were divided). On average, 46 percent of respondents said that they lack confidence in the United Nations while 42 percent responded that they had at least some confidence in it.

Respondents in Sweden (77 percent), Ghana (70 percent), and Vietnam (68 percent) had the most confidence in the United Nations. Those in Iraq (74 percent), Thailand (71 percent), and Serbia (68 percent) had the least confidence.⁶¹

Feelings toward the United Nations

Distinct from how people assess the performance of the United Nations is the question of how warmly people feel toward the world body. Between 2006 and 2007, WPO and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) asked respondents in eight nations around the world to rate their feelings toward the United Nations on a thermometer scale.

This ranged from 0 for very cold and unfavorable to 100 for very warm and favorable, with 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold in equal measure.

Interestingly, all publics gave a mean temperature rating above 50 degrees. The mean for all countries polled was 66 degrees. Indeed, even Palestinians gave a mean rating of 58 degrees, at a time when 69 percent of them were also giving an unfavorable view of the United Nations in a separate Pew poll. This underlying warmth may well be related to positive views for the mission and vision of the United Nations, as distinct from its performance.

Mexican respondents had the most positive feelings toward the multilateral body; they gave the UN a temperature of 80 degrees. Chinese opinion was also very favorable at 75 degrees, followed by Armenia (72 degrees), Thailand (71 degrees), South Korea (70 degrees), India (63 degrees), and the United States (55 degrees).⁶²

Regional Polls

Europe

In addition to global polls, the German Marshall Fund (GMF) and Eurobarometer have both conducted detailed polling of attitudes toward the United Nations within European countries.

In 2006, the GMF polled twelve European countries on whether they had a favorable or unfavorable view of the UN. On average, 71 percent of respondents declared their views positive, with the most favorable views coming from Germany (81 percent) and the Netherlands (81 percent). The only country with less than two-thirds giving a favorable rating was Turkey (46 percent). Comparing trends going back to 2003, GMF has found remarkable stability in European views.⁶³

In 2005, the Eurobarometer asked publics in all twenty-five European Union member states whether they trusted the United Nations. In twenty-two of the twenty-five, majorities (seventeen) or pluralities (five) said they did. Publics in only two countries said they tended not to trust the UN, and one was divided. On average, across the twenty-five countries, 52 percent of respondents were inclined to trust the United Nations and 34 percent not inclined. Trust was highest in Scandinavia, with Sweden at 74 percent, Denmark at 73 percent, and Finland at 70 percent. The two countries where majorities expressed mistrust were Cyprus (66 percent) and Greece (62 percent). Spain was narrowly divided, with 43 percent expressing a lack of trust and 40 percent expressing trust.

What was striking was that, overall, respondents expressed more trust in the United Nations than for all other institutions presented, including national ones. On average, Europeans expressed lower trust in their country's legal system (50 percent), in the European Union (44 percent), in their country's parliament (35 percent), in their country's government (31 percent), and in their political parties (just 19 percent).⁶⁴

Latin America

In 2008, Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano (CIMA) polled seventeen Latin American nations about their views of a variety of international actors. In thirteen, publics responded positively to the United Nations, three responded negatively, and one was divided. Among those with positive responses, ten nations expressed this view in majorities, three in pluralities. (In the nations that responded negatively, all three expressed this view in pluralities). In the regional average, 55 percent of people responded positively to the United Nations, and 30 percent responded negatively. Mexico (70 percent), Honduras (72 percent), and Colombia (77 percent) had the highest percentage of positive views toward the UN, while Argentina (44 percent), Guatemala (47 percent), and Venezuela (50 percent) were the only nations that responded negatively.⁶⁵

Overall, the United Nations received the most positive ratings among all international institutions and actors mentioned in the poll. The 55 percent favorable response to the United Nations exceeded positive impressions of the European Union (52 percent), China (47 percent), The Organization of American States (48 percent), Mercosur (42 percent), the United States (41 percent), the Organization of Iberoamerican States (39 percent), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (41 percent), and the Andean Pact (36 percent).

These views are largely the same as when CIMA polled sixteen Latin American nations in 2005.⁶⁶

Africa

The 2002 Afrobarometer asked Africans from seven different nations to rate the performance of seven international organizations, including the United Nations, on a scale of zero to ten. Evaluations for the United Nations were mostly positive in all seven nations, with mean ratings ranging from 7.66 (Mozambique) to 5.54 (South Africa). Across all seven nations, the United Nations received an average rating of 6.82 among African publics.

The UN's rating was the highest among all of the international institutions rated, including the European Union, the African Union, the World Bank, the IMF, and the World Trade Organization (WTO).⁶⁷

Sources of Support for United Nations

Polling in Europe and the United States finds that support for the United Nations appears to be derived from a perceived need for collective action to deal with global problems and from a belief in the efficiencies of collective action. Reservations appear to be related to performance issues.

Between 2004 and 2005 the German Marshall Fund made some efforts to determine the underlying sources of attitudes about the United Nations. In 2004, respondents in the United States, France and Germany were divided according to whether they had a favorable or unfavorable view of the United Nations.

Those who had a favorable view were then asked, "Among the following reasons...which one best explains why you have a favorable opinion of the UN?" and given three options. The most popular response was "Many global problems can't be solved by any single country," which was chosen by a majority of this group in France (57 percent), and by pluralities in Germany (49 percent) and the United States (48 percent). The second most popular response among Americans (chosen by 33 percent) was, "We can't afford to pay the whole cost of international actions; we need others to share the cost," while smaller number of French (14 percent) and German (18 percent) respondents concurred. The second most popular response among the French (24 percent) and Germans (26 percent) was that "military actions are not legal unless the UN approves them"—a sentiment to which only 11 percent of Americans concurred.⁶⁸

Those who had an unfavorable view of the United Nations were also offered three explanations. Pluralities of this group in all three countries chose the following option to explain their attitude: "When we need international action, it has to be done quickly, but the UN slows things down" (United States 48 percent, France 40 percent, and Germany 40 percent). Roughly one-third of respondents in each country chose the explanation: "The UN is wasteful and inefficient with its money." The smallest numbers chose, "Other countries should not have a veto when" their country's "important interests are at stake" (United States 11 percent, France 22 percent, and Germany 15 percent). What is notable here is that the most common criticisms were related to UN performance, while concerns about encroachment on sovereignty were quite limited.⁶⁹

In 2005, the GMF also presented two affirmative statements about the United Nations in ten European countries and the United States. Large majorities of both Americans (66 percent) and Europeans (69 percent) agreed, "The United Nations enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries." Only in Turkey was this majority less than robust (52 percent).⁷⁰

Large majorities of Europeans (74 percent) and a more modest majority of Americans (56 percent) also agreed that the "UN can manage the world's problems better than any one single country." A substantially larger number of Americans (43 percent) than Europeans (22 percent) disagreed. In comparison to other Europeans, Turks were not as positive (53 percent agreed, 32 percent disagreed).⁷¹

UN SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM

Adding New Permanent Members to United Nations Security Council

International polls have found support in all countries polled for adding new countries as permanent members of the UN Security Council (UNSC). Specifically, majorities or pluralities in nearly all countries have favored including Germany, Japan, India, Brazil and South Africa. On average, majorities have supported the inclusion of Germany and Japan, while pluralities have favored adding India, Brazil, and South Africa.

As a general principle, there is strong international support for adding new permanent members to the UNSC. Responding to a January 2005 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll of twenty-three countries, majorities or pluralities in all

twenty-three countries polled—including the five existing permanent members—supported additional countries becoming permanent members. The global average was 69 percent in favor and 17 percent opposed.⁷²

Polls have also explored views of adding specific countries. Two polls—a 2005 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll and a 2006 CCGA survey—asked respondents a series of questions on specific countries as possible permanent members to the Security Council. The BBC poll was fielded in twenty-three countries worldwide and the CCGA poll included four countries: the United States, China, India, and South Korea. The BBC question was only asked of respondents who replied positively to the generalized question on UNSC expansion (percentages below are of the total sample).

All twenty-three countries in the BBC poll said Germany should be added to the UNSC, with an average of 56 percent favoring such an addition and 12 percent opposed. CCGA's results had all four countries in favor of the addition of Germany.⁷³

Japan's inclusion in the Security Council was favored by twenty-one out of twenty-three countries in the BBC poll, the average being 54 percent in favor and 14 percent opposed. China and South Korea were opposed to adding Japan as a permanent member. CCGA also found China and South Korea opposed, but the United States and India were in favor.⁷⁴

India's addition to the UNSC was favored by twenty-two out of twenty-three countries in the BBC poll, with an average of 47 percent in favor and 19 percent opposed. All four countries surveyed in the CCGA poll supported the addition of India.⁷⁵

Including Brazil as a permanent member was supported by twenty-one countries in the BBC survey, the average in favor being 47 percent and opposed being 18 percent. The four countries asked by CCGA favored Brazil's inclusion.⁷⁶

Adding South Africa was supported by eighteen countries in the BBC poll; 43 percent favored and 21 percent were opposed in the average of all countries. India, Turkey, and South Korea were divided. In the CCGA survey, China and India had slight pluralities in favor while the United States and South Korea were divided.⁷⁷

EU Seat in the UN Security Council

Most European nations favor having a single permanent seat on the UNSC even if it means replacing the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France. The British public, however, is opposed.

The GMF's 2005 Transatlantic Trends survey asked the United States and ten European countries whether they agreed with the idea of the European Union having a single permanent seat on the UNSC, even if it replaced the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France. Respondents in eight European countries (including France) agreed with the proposal; those in the United Kingdom and the United States disagreed, and those in one country (Turkey) were divided. Among the ten European countries, an average of 57 percent approved and 33 percent disapproved of the idea.⁷⁸

In 2003, Eurobarometer asked simply whether the European Union should have its own seat on the UNSC, in a poll of twenty-eight countries—including all EU members at the time plus thirteen countries who were currently up for accession. All twenty-eight countries supported the European Union being a permanent UNSC member, with an average of 63 percent of respondents in favor.⁷⁹

Veto Override

International polling has found robust support for giving the UN Security Council the power to override the veto of a permanent member if all other members are in favor of a resolution. This position is favored in the United States, Great Britain, and China, while views are divided in Russia and France.

The January 2005 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll also asked twenty-three countries about changing the UNSC rules so that a veto of a permanent member could be overridden by an otherwise unanimous vote of the other members. The exact wording of the question was:

As you may know, there are currently five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, and any one of them can veto (block) any resolution. Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member could veto the decision. Would you favor or oppose this change?

For publics of the five permanent members (China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States), the pollsters added an extra clause to the second sentence: “Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member, *not even* [survey country] could veto the decision.”

Majorities or pluralities in twenty-one countries favored the change. The exceptions were two permanent members of the UNSC: Russia and France. However, a majority in Britain and pluralities in China and the United States were in favor. The average of all countries showed 58 percent of respondents in favor and 24 percent opposed. The most enthusiastic were in Lebanon (84 percent), India (77 percent), Australia (75 percent), and Indonesia (73 percent).⁸⁰

Democratizing the UN

There is strong international support for various approaches for making the UN more democratically representative. Large majorities around the world favor direct elections of their country’s UN representative to the General Assembly, a new UN parliament with directly elected representatives, and giving non-governmental actors a formal role in the United Nations.

In 2005, GlobeScan asked a series of questions on making the UN more democratically representative. One idea was “Having your country’s official representative to the United Nations General Assembly be elected by the people of your country.” In all nineteen countries surveyed, majorities favored such direct elections. The largest majorities supporting the proposal were found in Germany (85 percent), India (85 percent), and Indonesia (83 percent). The only country to show less than majority support was Russia where a plurality of 42 percent was in favor (28 percent were opposed). In the average of all nineteen countries, 74 percent agreed with General Assembly representatives being elected and 16 percent disagreed.⁸¹

The pollsters also tested public attitudes on “creating a new UN Parliament, made up of representatives directly elected by citizens, having powers equal to the current UN General Assembly.” This idea was supported by majorities in all eighteen countries polled. The countries most in favor of the new body were Mexico (80 percent), Indonesia (73 percent), and Brazil (73 percent). Once again Russia was the lone country for which only a plurality (33 percent) expressed support, with 22 percent opposed and a large number not answering. In the global average, 63 percent were in favor and 20 percent opposed.⁸²

Yet another idea tested was “giving leaders of major environmental and social groups, trade unions, and business organizations a formal role in shaping United Nations policies and actions, rather than having only government leaders do this.” Majorities in all nineteen countries favored this idea. The largest majorities were found in Mexico (77 percent), the Philippines (72 percent), Indonesia (70 percent), and Brazil (70 percent). Here too, support in Russia attracted only a plurality, with 36 percent in favor and 19 percent opposed. Majorities in support were also relatively modest in Poland (52 percent) and the United States (52 percent). On average, 61 percent of respondents favored the proposed change and 23 percent opposed it.⁸³

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

Views of the World Bank, IMF and WTO

In general, majorities in most countries have expressed a positive view of the influence of international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While both get mildly positive ratings in nearly all countries, the World Bank is more popular than the IMF and a few countries, particularly Argentina and Brazil, have distinctly negative views of the IMF. Publics in many beneficiary countries tend to show high levels of enthusiasm, while those in donor countries are more modest in their support, though still predominantly positive. The WTO has a positive image in Europe and the United States and most countries polled, including the United States, say that their government should comply with adverse WTO decisions.

Pew Global Attitudes Project in 2002 asked publics in forty-three countries if international organizations like the World Bank, IMF, and WTO were having a good or bad influence on the way things were going in their country. In thirty-nine countries majorities (thirty-one) or pluralities (eight) said these organizations were having a positive influence, while four countries said they were having negative influence. On average across the forty-three countries, 60

percent of respondents said organizations like the World Bank, IMF, and WTO were having a good influence on their country and 22 percent said they were having a bad influence.⁸⁴

Attitudes varied by region. The most positive attitudes were found in Africa, led by Ivory Coast (87 percent) and Senegal (81 percent), but these institutions also registered high approval in Uzbekistan and Vietnam (both 85 percent). The only four predominantly negative attitudes were found in Latin America (Argentina 66 percent negative, and Brazil 48 percent) and in the Middle East (Jordan 63 percent, Turkey 57 percent).

More recently, a January 2006 BBC poll found similarly positive attitudes about the World Bank. Respondents in thirty-two countries were asked if they thought the World Bank was having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world. In thirty countries, majorities (in seventeen cases) or pluralities (in thirteen cases) said the World Bank was having a mainly positive influence. In only one country (Argentina), a plurality gave the Bank negative ratings, and one country (Turkey) was divided. On average, 55 percent said the Bank's influence was positive and 18 percent said negative.⁸⁵

Developing countries that have been recipients of World Bank loans, especially African countries, were quite positive. Major donor countries showed more moderate levels of enthusiasm. These include the United States (47 percent positive), Britain (45 percent), France (48 percent), and Germany (51 percent).

In the same poll, enthusiasm for the IMF was milder. On average, 47 percent globally said its influence was mainly positive, while 21 percent it said was mainly negative. The IMF elicited mainly negative views in two countries—Argentina (60 percent) and Brazil (57 percent)—while a plurality of Turks (49 percent) held this view. All other countries gave the IMF predominantly positive reviews, but in virtually every case by several points lower than for the World Bank.⁸⁶

A 2006 WPO/CCGA poll asked respondents in seven countries around the world to rate their feelings toward the World Bank on a scale from zero (unfavorable) to 100 (favorable). Five countries gave a mean ranking higher than 50 and two countries gave a ranking lower than 50. The average mean of all seven countries was 59.⁸⁷ Asked to rate the IMF, the mean rating by four countries was above 50, two countries gave less than 50, and one was at 50. The average of all seven means was 54.⁸⁸

Another international poll that explicitly offered respondents the option of saying that they had neutral feelings toward the World Bank produced more muted, but still predominantly positive findings. The 2005 Gallup International Voice of the People survey asked respondents in sixty-seven countries who said they had heard of the World Bank (72 percent of the total sample) whether they had a positive, neutral, or negative view of it. On average, 29 percent (of the whole sample) gave the World Bank a positive rating, 26 percent gave it a neutral rating, and just 11 percent gave it a negative rating. Publics in thirty-one countries had a predominantly positive opinion, twenty-seven had a neutral opinion, four had a negative opinion, and five were divided on the question.⁸⁹⁻⁹⁰

The Gallup International poll also asked those who said they had heard of the IMF (68 percent of the total sample) their opinion of it. Among the countries polled, publics in twenty-eight countries expressed a positive opinion of the Fund, twenty-five a neutral opinion, five a negative opinion, and nine were divided on the question. Across all sixty-seven countries, on average, 24 percent of respondents had a positive opinion about the IMF, 24 percent had a neutral opinion, and 13 percent had a negative opinion.⁹¹⁻⁹²

Latin American views of the IMF appear to be largely divided. In 2008, CIMA polled eighteen Latin American nations, offering respondents the option of saying they had a positive or negative view. Views were split, with ten nations viewing the IMF positively, seven nations responding negatively, and one nation divided. On average, 41 percent of people polled had positive views of the IMF and 37 percent had negative views. Paraguay had the highest percentage of positive viewpoints (63 percent), followed by Honduras (58 percent) and Guatemala (56 percent). At 59 percent, Argentina had the highest percentage of negative views about the IMF, with Panama (57 percent) and Uruguay (58 percent) close behind.⁹³

African countries, though, express more benign views of the World Bank. A January 2003 Afrobarometer poll of seven African countries asked respondents to rate how well these institutions were doing their jobs on a scale from zero to ten. The World Bank received a rating of 6.78 and the IMF received a 6.40.⁹⁴

Most Europeans and Americans have a favorable view of the World Trade Organization. In a 2006 GMF poll, publics in six European nations and the United States were polled on their views of the WTO, and in each case a majority (four nations) or a plurality (three nations) expressed favorable views. Majorities in Italy (68 percent) and the United Kingdom (56 percent) had the most favorable opinions. The lowest levels of favorable ratings were found in Slovakia (44 percent), Portugal (47 percent), and the United States (48 percent). The average of all seven publics polled showed that 52 percent had favorable views of the WTO while 29 percent had negative views.⁹⁵

Strengthening the IMF and World Bank

A 2002 GMF/ CCGA poll asked in six European countries and the United States whether the World Bank needs to be strengthened to deal with shared problems or if this would only create more bureaucracy. Germans were divided, but majorities ranging from 52 percent in Britain to 72 percent in Italy agreed that the World Bank needs to be strengthened, as did a 49-percent plurality of Americans.⁹⁶

The idea of strengthening the IMF met with similar but more modest agreement. The Germans even had a majority against the idea (53 percent) and U.S. support dropped to a 42 percent plurality.⁹⁷

Complying With Adverse WTO Rulings

A 2006 WPO/CCGA poll asked publics in nine countries if their government should comply with WTO decisions against their country. Majorities in six publics agreed that their country should, two were opposed, and one was divided. In the average of nine countries, 45 percent of respondents were in favor of compliance and 28 percent were opposed. The highest levels of support for compliance came from the largest countries: the United States (73 percent) and China (58 percent). The two countries that leaned against compliance were relatively small: South Korea (52 percent) and Armenia (35 percent to 26 percent).⁹⁸

INTERNATIONAL COURTS

International Courts

Publics in a majority of countries, especially in Europe and Africa, express confidence that the International Court of Justice would rule fairly and impartially in cases involving their country. However substantial numbers also express doubts. A poll of African and majority-Muslim countries found more support than opposition to the International Criminal Court indictment of Sudanese President Omar Bashir for his alleged role in displacing and killing civilians.

In a WPO poll of nineteen countries, respondents were told what the International Court of Justice was and asked, “If there were a case involving [your country], how confident are you the Court’s decision would be fair and impartial?” Publics in twelve nations said that they would be at least somewhat confident that the Court’s decision would be fair and impartial, while publics in six nations said that they would not be confident of the Court’s fairness and impartiality. One nation was divided. On average, 54 percent said that they would be at least somewhat confident in the fairness and impartiality of the World Court’s decision, as opposed to 36 percent who said that they would not be very confident in the decision.

Majorities in Kenya (79 percent), Germany (74 percent), and Poland (73 percent) were the most confident, while publics in South Korea (59 percent), Mexico (53 percent), and the Palestinian territories (52 percent) were the least confident. Overall, Europeans and Africans expressed the most confidence, while majority-Muslim nations were lukewarm, with the exception of Egypt. Russians had a plurality expressing low confidence.⁹⁹

In 2009, the International Criminal Court issued an indictment of Sudanese President Omar Bashir for war crimes and crimes against humanity for his alleged role in the displacing and killing of civilians in Darfur. Most governments in majority-Muslim and African countries strongly denounced the indictment. However, a WPO poll from 2009 of seven majority-Muslim and African countries and territories found more support than opposition to the indictment. Two African countries showed large majorities approving of the indictment: Kenya (77 percent) and Nigeria (71 percent). A slight majority in Turkey (51 percent) and plurality in Pakistan (39 percent to 32 percent) were also supportive. A large

majority of Palestinians (70 percent), and a slight majority of Egyptians disapproved. Iraqis were divided. On average across the seven countries, 49 percent approved and 37 percent disapproved of the ICC indictment.¹⁰⁰

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

EUROPE

General Support for NATO

Most Europeans and Americans agree that NATO is still essential, think that it needs to be strengthened, and do not want to cut spending for it. But Europeans and Americans also agree that Europe should have its own defense alliance, and Europeans overwhelmingly believe that decisions about European defense policy should be made by the European Union or national governments rather than by NATO. Large majorities of Europeans and Americans agree that their country should contribute troops to defend a NATO member that has been attacked.

Large majorities of Europeans and Americans agree that NATO members should contribute troops to defend a NATO ally. However, not all publics believe that their country should generally contribute troops or money if the NATO alliance decides to take military action.

Most Europeans and Americans agree that NATO is still a critical institution. In 2008, GMF polled twelve European countries and the United States on whether NATO was still essential to their country's security. A majority of respondents in all nations said that it was. In the average of twelve European countries, 57 percent said NATO was still essential and 30 percent said it was no longer essential. Fifty-nine percent of Americans agreed.¹⁰¹

The 2002 GMF/CCGA Worldviews poll asked respondents in six European countries and the United States whether they favored strengthening a series of international institutions, including NATO. Majorities in all six European countries and the United States said that NATO did need to be strengthened. In the European average, 63 percent favored strengthening NATO and 31 percent were opposed.¹⁰²

The GMF 2008 Transatlantic Trends poll asked publics in the United States and Turkey whether their respective governments were spending too much, too little, or about the right amount in support of the NATO alliance. Most respondents in Turkey said their government was spending about the right amount, while U.S. opinion was divided on the question. In the average of both countries, 33 percent said their government was spending about the right amount, 28 percent said too much, and 14 percent said too little.¹⁰³

The GMF in 2005 asked publics in ten European countries and the United States whether they agreed that NATO allows democratic countries to act together. In all ten European countries and the United States, respondents agreed with the statement. In the average of ten European countries, 71 percent agreed that NATO allows democratic countries to act together and 21 percent disagreed.¹⁰⁴

Eight European countries also agreed that NATO enables European countries to influence the United States when the latter is considering military action; respondents in one country disagreed, and those in one were divided. In the European average, 50 percent agreed and 41 percent disagreed. A majority in the United States agreed with the proposition that NATO can help the United States share its military burden.¹⁰⁵

On Europe Acting Separately

The 2005 GMF study posed another parallel question to ten European countries and the United States on the subject of a distinct European defense identity. All ten European countries agreed that NATO is dominated by the United States and that Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States. In the European average, 66 percent agreed and 27 percent disagreed with this proposition. A majority in the United States, meanwhile, agreed that the United States is stretched too thin and that Europe should have its own separate defense alliance.¹⁰⁶

Eurobarometer in November 2003 asked respondents in the then-fifteen European Union member states if decisions concerning European defense policy should be taken by national governments, by NATO, or by the European Union. Ten countries said the European Union should make these decisions, two countries said the national governments, and

three were divided. In the average of all fifteen countries, 45 percent of those polled said the European Union should make European defense policy decisions, 27 percent said that national governments should have this role, and 13 percent said it should be left to NATO.¹⁰⁷

Joining in Military Action

In 2004, GMF asked ten European countries and the United States if they approved of using their country's military forces to defend a NATO ally that has been attacked. All ten European countries and the United States agreed that their nation's troops should be used in such circumstances. In the average of ten European countries, 75 percent approved and 19 percent disapproved of this principle. In only one European country was this not a large majority (just 50 percent of Slovaks concurred). An overwhelming 87 percent of Americans agreed.¹⁰⁸

GMF in 2008 polled twelve European countries and the United States, asking respondents whether they agreed that all NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action. Majorities in eight European countries and the United States agreed, three countries disagreed, and one was divided. In the European average, 57 percent agreed that all member countries should contribute troops and 35 percent disagreed.¹⁰⁹

GMF also asked in 2008 if all NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops. Majorities in eight European countries and the United States agreed, three countries disagreed, and one was divided. In the European average, 58 percent agreed that all member countries should share in the costs and 34 percent disagreed.¹¹⁰

Members' Views of the European Union

European Union members' views of their membership in the European Union are quite varied and on the whole only moderately positive. But when it comes to decisions that have foreign policy implications, Europeans show very strong support for decisions being made not simply by their own national government, but jointly within the European Union. This includes fighting terrorism, defense and foreign affairs generally, and energy. Europeans tend to agree that European Union membership aids in dealing with the costs and benefits of globalization; but it is more often pluralities, rather than majorities, that hold this view.

Members' views of EU membership are quite varied, and on the whole only moderately positive. In Eurobarometer's November 2008 poll of the twenty-seven member countries, respondents were asked whether their country's EU membership was a good or bad thing—and also offered the option of making no judgment (“neither good nor bad”). Out of twenty-seven countries, publics in twenty-six countries were largely favorable to the European Union, and divided in one case (Britain). Looking at the full samples, majorities in fifteen countries and pluralities in two more said EU membership was a good thing. On average, 53 percent called their EU membership a good thing and 15 percent a bad thing (27 percent said neither good nor bad). The most positive attitude toward the European Union emerged in Luxembourg (71 percent), followed by Ireland (67 percent), and the least positive in the United Kingdom (32 percent).¹¹¹

When it comes to decisions that have foreign policy implications, Europeans show very strong support for decisions being made not simply by their own government but rather “jointly within the European Union.” Majorities in all twenty-seven countries said that when it comes to **fighting terrorism**, they prefer that decisions be made jointly within the European Union. On average, 70 percent of publics wanted joint decision-making, and only 18 percent disagreed. The largest majority in favor of collective decision-making was in the Netherlands (91 percent) and the smallest was in Spain (63 percent).¹¹²

Majorities in twenty-four countries said that decisions on **defense and foreign affairs** should be made jointly within the European Union. On average, 64 percent of European citizens wanted joint decision-making while 31 percent disagreed. The largest majority was in Slovakia (85 percent), followed by Luxembourg (79 percent), the Czech Republic (77 percent), and Germany (76 percent). The exceptions were Finland (80 percent of respondents preferred choices to be made nationally), Britain (51 percent), and Sweden (50 percent made nationally to 46 percent jointly).¹¹³

Majorities in twenty-three countries, plus a plurality in one other country, said that decisions on **energy** should be made jointly within the European Union. On average, 63 percent wanted joint decision-making while 33 percent disagreed. The largest majority in favor was in Cyprus (80 percent), followed by Latvia (76 percent), Germany, and Greece (both

75 percent). Majorities wanted decision-making on energy to be nationally focused in Austria (56 percent), Finland (53 percent) and the United Kingdom (51 percent).¹¹⁴

EU respondents were also asked about many other areas where some joint decision-making either exists or has been considered. Publics showed considerable discrimination—for example, supporting macroeconomic decision-making across Europe in fiscal and regulatory areas, but wanting to manage public services and the social safety net at the national level.

Support for joint decision-making is most popular in the field of scientific and technological research, with an average of 72 percent of Europeans across the twenty-seven countries supporting it. This was followed by “protecting the environment” (67 percent), “support for regions facing economic difficulties” (62 percent), immigration (60 percent), “fighting crime” (59 percent), competition policy (57 percent), “fighting inflation” (54 percent), and the economy (51 percent). Opinion was nearly divided about joint decision-making in the spheres of over agriculture and fisheries (50 percent yes, 45 percent no), as well as transports and consumer protection (both 48 percent yes, 48 percent no). Majorities preferred to keep decision-making on a national level when it came to “fighting unemployment” (57 percent), health (64 percent), educational systems (64 percent), social welfare (65 percent), taxation (66 percent), and pensions (72 percent).¹¹⁵

Dealing with Globalization

Europeans tend to agree that for dealing with the costs and benefits of globalization, it is preferable to be inside the European Union than remain outside it. But in most EU nations it is pluralities, rather than majorities, that hold this view. In twenty-two out of twenty-seven countries, majorities in eight and pluralities in fourteen agreed that “the European Union enables European citizens to better benefit from the positive effects of globalization,” while three countries disagreed (one by majority, two by plurality). Two other countries were divided. On average, 48 percent of EU respondents agreed and 31 percent disagreed with the proposition. The strongest agreement came in Denmark (73 percent), Sweden (66 percent), and the Netherlands (63 percent). The strongest disagreement was in Greece (57 percent) and in France (50 percent disagree, 35 percent agree).¹¹⁶

Europeans are a little more confident that EU membership helps them benefit from globalization than they are that it helps with the costs. In eighteen of twenty-seven countries, majorities in three nations and pluralities in fifteen agreed that “the European Union helps to protect us from the negative effects of globalization.” Five countries disagreed (three by majorities, two by pluralities). Four countries were divided. On average, 43 percent agreed with the proposition while 37 percent disagreed. The highest agreement was in the Netherlands (56 percent), Belgium (55 percent) and Slovakia (51 percent)—fairly modest majorities all. The highest disagreement, however, was about the same in magnitude: 60 percent in Greece, 57 percent in Latvia, and 56 percent in France.¹¹⁷

International Views of the European Union’s Role in the World

Polls from around the world show the European Union is widely perceived as playing a positive role in the world. EU members show far more enthusiasm for the European Union’s international influence than they do about the benefits of membership.

Most publics around the world perceive the European Union as having a positive international influence. In a 2009 Pew Global Attitudes poll, publics in eighteen nations said they had a favorable view of the European Union, six publics had an unfavorable view, and one was divided. The most negative opinions were from publics in predominantly Muslim nations in the Middle East, with publics in Jordan (72 percent), Turkey (59 percent), the Palestinian territories (57 percent), and Egypt (50 percent) expressing unfavorable views. Pakistanis also had a plurality negative opinion of the European Union (46 percent to 9 percent favorable). On average, 52 percent of the twenty-five nations polled said they had a favorable opinion of the European Union while 32 percent said unfavorable.¹¹⁸

Interestingly, in a 2009 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll, EU members show considerably more enthusiasm for the European Union’s international role than they do about the benefits of EU membership. Majorities in all EU members polled said the European Union is having a positive influence. This was true for Germany (81 percent), Spain (76 percent), Italy (72 percent), France (71 percent), and even the United Kingdom (55 percent). The only country in the

poll to have a predominantly negative view of the European Union's influence was Turkey. Seventy-one percent of the population in the EU member nations polled had a positive view while 15 percent had a negative view.¹¹⁹

A 2008 CIMA poll of eighteen Latin American nations also asked about the European Union. Seventeen of them had positive views on the European Union—nine majorities, seven pluralities, and one was divided. Just one nation had a mostly negative view—Argentina. In the regional average, 52 percent of respondents had positive views of the European Union and 27 percent had negative views. The nations with the most positive views were Nicaragua (73 percent), Colombia (66 percent), Honduras (64 percent) and Costa Rica (61 percent). Argentina was 27 percent positive, 33 percent negative and had an exceptionally high 40 percent not answering.¹²⁰

ASIA

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

Asian publics polled tend to express positive feelings toward ASEAN and favor the idea of the ASEAN countries entering into a free trade agreement. However, confidence in ASEAN is mixed. When asked who should decide policies on the environment, refugees, aid to developing countries, and peacekeeping, only small minorities say that it should be ASEAN together with Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum. Most say the UN or national governments should decide such policies.

ASEAN elicits quite favorable feelings in Asia. In 2006, CCGA asked respondents in China, India, and South Korea to rate their feelings on ASEAN on a thermometer scale ranging from 0 (cold, unfavorable) to 100 (warm, favorable). China gave ASEAN a warm mean ranking of 68 and South Korea gave it a 61; India gave it a 48.¹²¹

In 2008, CCGA polled China, Japan, and South Korea on whether ASEAN countries as a group should have a free trade agreement. Eighty-four percent of Chinese, 76 percent of South Koreans, and 64 percent of Japanese favored such an agreement.¹²²

Views were found to be quite mixed when respondents were asked whether they had confidence in ASEAN in a 2005-08 World Values Survey of four Asian nations. Majorities had a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in Vietnam (69 percent) and Indonesia (51 percent), both ASEAN members. But relatively small numbers expressed confidence in South Korea (35 percent), and Australia (31 percent).¹²³

A 2006 AsiaBarometer survey polled seven Asian publics on who should decide policies on five international issues. In the average of all seven publics, 32 percent favored a regional organization handling protection of the environment,¹²⁴ 18 percent favored a regional organization handling refugees,¹²⁵ 17 percent favored a regional organization handling aid to developing countries,¹²⁶ 14 percent favored a regional organization handling human rights (Vietnam was not asked this question),¹²⁷ and 12 percent favored a regional organization such as ASEAN or APEC handling peacekeeping issues.¹²⁸

LATIN AMERICA

Latin American Multilateral Institutions

Majorities or, more often, pluralities in most Latin American countries have positive views of Mercosur, the Andean Community, the Central American Parliament, the Central American Integration System, the Organization of Ibero-American States, and the Organization of American States.

Mercosur

Out of eighteen nations polled by CIMA about views on international actors, sixteen nations responded positively to Mercosur, with majorities in five nations and pluralities in another five having positive views while two others were divided. On average, 42 percent of respondents felt positively about Mercosur, while 23 percent felt negatively about it. (Notably, 35 percent of respondents either had no opinion about Mercosur or did not know of it). The nations with the most positive views were Bolivia with 56 percent of respondents replying positively, Uruguay with 57 percent, and Venezuela with 70 percent. The nations with the most negative views about Mercosur were Uruguay with 32 percent responding negatively, Ecuador with 33 percent, and Guatemala with 37 percent. Mexico, El Salvador, and the

Dominican Republic had the highest percentage of “don’t know” responses, with 57 percent of Mexicans, 68 percent of El Salvadorans, and 79 percent of Dominicans responding that way.¹²⁹

The Andean Community

Twelve nations polled in an eighteen-country survey in Latin America on international views of the Andean Community (CAN) had majorities (four) or pluralities (eight) of respondents answering positively, while five nations responded negatively (one was divided). On average, 36 percent of respondents regarded the body positively, 28 percent negatively. Colombia and Ecuador were tied for the most positive views with 60 percent each, and El Salvador was second with 59 percent. Inhabitants of the Dominican Republic held the most negative views of the Andean Community, with 78 percent of people responding negatively, followed by Panamanians (52 percent) and Guatemala (43 percent). Argentina (69 percent), Mexico (61 percent), and Uruguay (59 percent) had the highest percentages of those people who responded that they didn’t know enough to express an opinion.¹³⁰

Central American Parliament

In the fifteen Latin American countries polled about their feelings regarding the Central American Parliament (Parlacen), a plurality of 31 percent had positive views and 23 percent voiced negative views. Respondents in Nicaragua (60 percent) expressed the only majority positive view, while Costa Rica (44 percent), Honduras (42 percent), and Colombia (40 percent) expressed the largest pluralities. As for negative views, Panama (62 percent) was the only country in which a majority expressed a negative opinion, while Venezuela (48 percent) and Guatemala (21 percent) were the only two in which pluralities expressed this view. Four more countries were divided between positive and negative.¹³¹

Central American Integration System

Across the sixteen countries polled regarding their views of the Central American Integration System (SICA), a plurality of 33 percent of respondents had a positive view of SICA and 23 percent had a negative view. The countries with the most positive attitudes were Nicaragua (66 percent), Panama (52 percent), Honduras (46 percent), and Costa Rica (44 percent). The only two countries with negative views were the Dominican Republic (80 percent) and Guatemala (39 percent).¹³²

Organization of Ibero-American States

Fourteen of the eighteen countries polled on their views of the Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI) expressed positive opinions, with majorities in five countries and pluralities in nine holding this view. In three countries a plurality viewed the organization in a negative light, and the remaining country was divided. Among the entire sample, a plurality of respondents (39 percent) held positive views, in contrast to 24 percent with negative views. Nicaragua (63 percent), Panama (55 percent), Colombia (53 percent), and Honduras (53 percent) expressed the largest majority positive views, while negative views were highest in Guatemala (43 percent), Brazil (38 percent), and Argentina (25 percent).¹³³

Organization of American States

Across eighteen countries, publics were asked if they had a positive or negative view of the Organization of American States (OAS). Of the thirteen publics that voiced positive opinions of the OAS, eight were majorities and five pluralities, while all four of the countries with negative views were pluralities. Mexicans were evenly divided between positive and negative views of the organization. An average of 48 percent of all respondents viewed the OAS positively and 28 percent viewed the organization negatively. With a majority of 73 percent, Colombians were the most supportive of the OAS, closely followed by Costa Ricans and Nicaraguans, both at 71 percent. Guatemala was the most negative about the OAS, with 44 percent expressing unfavorable views, along with Brazil (42 percent), Ecuador (32 percent), and Argentina (31 percent).¹³⁴

AFRICAN INSTITUTIONS

African Union

Limited polling of African countries has shown modest levels of confidence in the African Union (AU).

Respondents in five African countries were asked how much confidence they had in the African Union in the 2005-08 World Values Survey. Majorities expressed a great deal or quite a lot of confidence in Mali (63 percent), Ghana (67 percent), and Burkina Faso (51 percent). Confidence was expressed by smaller numbers in South Africa (46 percent) and by only 35 percent of Ethiopians.¹³⁵

CHAPTER 3: WORLD OPINION ON PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO VIOLENT CONFLICT

The Use of Force

In international polls most, but not all, publics say that force is sometimes necessary to maintain order in the world. European publics tend to think that their countries should be emphasizing a non-military role in international affairs. However, they express willingness to contribute forces to a wide range of possible multilateral operations.

Pew Global Attitudes Project polled forty-seven nations in May 2007 on whether they agreed that “it is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.” Forty nations agreed that force is sometimes necessary, six disagreed, and one was divided. Among the countries with the largest majorities agreeing were India (90 percent), Bangladesh (87 percent), and Brazil (84 percent), while the nations with the strongest dissenting opinions were Egypt (59 percent), Germany (58 percent), Jordan (58 percent), and South Korea (53 percent). In the global average, sixty-four percent of polled respondents agreed and 31 percent disagreed.¹³⁶

In a 2006 German Marshall Fund (GMF) survey, respondents in twelve European countries were asked if the European Union should concentrate on its economic power and not rely on its military power when dealing with international problems outside Europe. Majorities in all twelve countries polled agreed with this statement, with an average of 79 percent agreeing. Germany (83 percent), Poland (83 percent), Bulgaria (82 percent), and Italy (82 percent) were the countries with the most respondents in agreement, while the largest minorities disagreeing were in Turkey (25 percent) and France (24 percent).¹³⁷

The UN Security Council and the Use of Force

International polls find that the UN Security Council (UNSC) is widely seen as having the right to authorize the use of force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies: to defend a country that has been attacked, to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide, to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups, and to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.

Publics around the world show strong support for the UNSC having the right to authorize military force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies, according to a World Public Opinion (WPO)/Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll conducted between 2006 and 2008.

The highest level of support was for the UNSC having the right to authorize military force in order “**to defend a country that has been attacked.**” Overall, 76 percent of respondents in sixteen nations felt the UNSC should have this right, and only 16 percent felt it should not. Majorities were highest in Nigeria (89 percent), Kenya (88 percent), France (84 percent), and the United States (83 percent) and lowest in Thailand (67 percent), India (66 percent), and Mexico (65 percent). Nowhere did opposition exceed twenty-three percent.¹³⁸

Similarly, high levels of support were found for the right to authorize the use of military force in order “**to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.**” Overall, 76 percent of respondents across all eighteen countries polled agreed that the UNSC “should” have this right, while only 16 percent replied that the UNSC “should not.” The largest majorities were in Kenya (90 percent), Nigeria (88 percent), and France (85 percent). No country’s support for giving the UNSC this right was below 62 percent, but the relatively less supportive countries were Thailand (62 percent support) and India (63 percent support).¹³⁹

Majorities in all nations favored the UN having the right “**to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.**” On average, 73 percent of respondents in sixteen publics said the UNSC should have the right to intervene in such cases and just 19 percent said it should not. Support for this proposition was highest in Nigeria (87 percent), Israel (85 percent), and France (84 percent), and lowest in India (60 percent), the Palestinian Territories (61 percent), and South Korea (61 percent).¹⁴⁰

Among several possible contingencies, respondents expressed the lowest level of support for the UN having the right to authorize the use of military force **“to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.”** On average 53 percent of all publics polled thought the UNSC should have this right; 35 percent did not. Out of sixteen nations asked this question, majorities in ten and pluralities in three believed the UNSC should have this right. In one country a majority (South Korea, 65 percent), and in another a plurality (China, 45 percent), were opposed. The largest majorities in favor were found in Kenya and Nigeria (both 76 percent), the Palestinian Territories (67 percent), and Egypt (64 percent). Interestingly, no public in any Islamic country polled opposed this principle: 51 percent supported it in Indonesia, as did pluralities in Azerbaijan (43 percent to 38 percent) and Turkey (43 percent to 32 percent).¹⁴¹

UN Responsibility to Protect

International polls find the UN Security Council is widely seen as having not only the right, but the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to prevent severe human rights violations.

WPO/CCGA asked respondents from twenty countries between 2006 and 2008 whether the UNSC has a responsibility to authorize military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide. Majorities or pluralities in all twenty countries agreed that the Security Council does have this responsibility, with an average of 61 percent agreeing and 21 percent disagreeing. Kenya (89 percent), Indonesia (82 percent), and Egypt (80 percent) had the most respondents saying the United Nations had such a responsibility, while the largest minorities dissenting were in France (39 percent), Russia (31 percent), and Israel (28 percent).¹⁴²

UN Role in Peacekeeping

In principle, large majorities around the world favor a standing peacekeeping force selected, trained, and commanded by the United Nations. Majorities in most countries want peacekeeping policy to be decided at the United Nations than decided either by national governments or by regional organizations.

WPO/CCGA polled twenty-two countries between 2006 and 2008, asking whether respondents favored or opposed having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained, and commanded by the United Nations. Majorities in twenty-one countries favored such a force, and no countries were opposed, while one country was divided. The countries most favorable toward a standing UN force were Kenya (85 percent), Nigeria (84 percent), and Great Britain (79 percent), while the largest minorities opposing such a force were Egypt (47 percent), the Philippines (44 percent), and Israel (31 percent). On average, 66 percent of respondents in the twenty-two countries polled favored a standing UN peacekeeping force and twenty-three percent were opposed.¹⁴³

In polling conducted between 2005 and 2008, the World Values Survey (WVS) asked respondents in forty-six countries whether they would like to see peacekeeping policy decided by the United Nations, national governments, or regional organizations. In twenty-eight countries, the greatest number preferred that policy on peacekeeping be decided at the United Nations (eighteen majorities, four pluralities; in six countries this was the most common answer). In eleven countries, the greatest number preferred that policy on peacekeeping be decided by national governments (five majorities, six pluralities, three most common answer). Four countries were divided on the question.¹⁴⁴

Participation in Military Operations to Prevent and Respond to Violent Conflict

Majorities in the United States, European countries, and to some extent elsewhere, approve of participating in peacekeeping missions in principle. As a general rule, support is strong for participation in post-conflict situations and less consistent when it comes to intervening in civil conflict. Publics in Europe and the United States have in recent years supported participation in peacekeeping operations in the Balkans and southern Lebanon. Among other countries, support for participation in the UN peacekeeping mission in southern Lebanon has been mixed.

When asked about the broader principle of contributing to peacekeeping missions support tends to be quite high.

In 2004, CCGA asked respondents in Mexico, South Korea, and the United States whether their country should participate in an international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world when asked by the United Nations. Large majorities in South Korea (83 percent) and the United States (78 percent) said their country should participate, as did a plurality (48 percent) in Mexico.¹⁴⁵

The GMF's 2007 Transatlantic Trends poll asked the United States and twelve European countries whether the European Union should commit more troops for peacekeeping missions as part of the European Union taking greater responsibility for dealing with international threats. Twelve majorities and a plurality agreed that the European Union should commit more troops for peacekeeping missions. The largest majorities were found in the United States (85 percent), Spain (82 percent), and France (80 percent), while the largest minorities disagreeing were in Italy (41 percent), Slovakia (40 percent), and Bulgaria (37 percent). Among the twelve European countries, an average of 66 percent agreed with committing more troops and 29 percent disagreed.¹⁴⁶

Support for Contributing to Types of Missions

A poll of ten European countries and the United States asked about contributing **peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended** (GMF 2004). Majorities in all ten European countries and the United States approved of using troops in this situation. On average, 77 percent of Europeans expressed approval and 17 percent expressed disapproval.¹⁴⁷

Deploying troops to provide **food and medical assistance to victims of war** was approved by majorities in all ten European Countries and the United States (GMF 2004). Among the European countries, an average of 89 percent approved and 8 eight percent disapproved. Eight in ten Americans approved as well.¹⁴⁸

When the action requires intervention in a conflict situation, support appears to be more mixed. A poll of ten European countries and the United States asked about contributing troops in the event of a civil war (GMF 2004). Questioned about contributing **"to stop the fighting in a civil war,"** respondents expressed strong support, but there were dissenters. Majorities in eight of the European countries approved, with the exception of Germans, who were opposed (41 percent to 54 percent). Poles were divided. A plurality in the United States was also opposed (38 percent approving to 49 percent opposing). On average, 62 percent of Europeans approved.¹⁴⁹

People in the United States favor, while Europeans have mixed views on, using their military forces to **remove a government that abuses human rights**. Asked about the use of troops to remove a government that abuses human rights, majorities or pluralities in eight European countries approved of the deployment of military forces for this purpose, while the public in one country (Germany) disapproved, and the public in another (Slovakia) was divided. In the ten European countries, 53 percent approved and 39 percent disapproved.¹⁵⁰

Support for Contributing to Specific Missions

In the 2007 GMF survey, respondents were asked about deploying troops to maintain peace and order in the **post-conflict Balkans**. Majorities in all twelve European countries and the United States (54 percent) approved of such a deployment. On average, in the twelve European countries surveyed, 65 percent of respondents approved and 29 percent disapproved.¹⁵¹

Similarly, a poll of twelve European countries and the United States asked about the deployment of a country's troops **to monitor and support a ceasefire in southern Lebanon** following the 2006 Lebanon War (GMF 2007). Majorities or pluralities in eleven European countries approved (56 percent on average), as did 55 percent of people in the United States, while one nation (Germany) was opposed.¹⁵²

However, outside of Europe and the United States, polling organizations found only mixed support for participating in a mission in southern Lebanon . In the immediate aftermath of the Israel-Hezbollah conflict, Gallup International asked respondents in thirty-three countries whether their country should or should not send troops to **be peacekeepers in southern Lebanon** if asked by the United Nations. Although majorities or pluralities in sixteen countries agreed with sending troops, those in another sixteen countries disagreed, and one was divided. In the average of all thirty-three countries, 46 percent of those polled agreed with sending troops to be peacekeepers in response to a UN request and 44 percent disagreed.¹⁵³

War in Afghanistan

Most people around the world think it would be bad if the Taliban were to regain power, but views are now divided on NATO's Afghanistan mission. A plurality favors ending the mission, but this appears to be based on a widespread belief that the Afghans want NATO to leave. Most Europeans oppose increasing combat troops

above current levels, but withdrawal does not get majority support. Among Americans, reducing troop levels does not get majority support, and withdrawal is likewise rejected.

Among twenty nations polled worldwide by WPO in mid-2009—including eight countries contributing troops to Afghanistan—a majority in eighteen think it would be a bad thing if the Taliban were to regain power over Afghanistan. On average, 61 percent say that it would be bad and just 21 percent say that it would be good. In the eight countries polled that contribute troops to NATO's International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission, seven majorities and one plurality thought the Taliban's return would be bad.¹⁵⁴

Worldwide, views are divided on approval of the NATO mission in Afghanistan. On average, 44 percent approved and 45 percent disapproved of the NATO mission in June 2009. Overall, nine nations approved and ten disapproved, with one divided. Among troop contributors, the United States, France, Britain, and Azerbaijan approved by majorities, while Poland, Ukraine, and Turkey disapproved; Germans leaned toward disapproval.¹⁵⁵

Publics in most nations believe that the Afghan people want NATO forces to leave now, and this belief is closely related to views on continuing or ending the operation. On average, 53 percent of respondents have this belief, while 30 percent assume that most Afghans want NATO forces to stay.¹⁵⁶ On average, 37 percent think that NATO forces should remain in Afghanistan, while 50 percent think the mission should be ended now.¹⁵⁷

At this stage in the Afghanistan mission, most Europeans oppose increasing their combat troops there. In the German Marshall Fund's 2009 poll, on average across twelve European countries, 77 percent disapproved of increasing their country's combat troops.¹⁵⁸

While Europeans want to reduce their troop levels in Afghanistan, the idea of withdrawing does not get majority support in most countries currently contributing troops to the Afghan mission. In mid-2009, GMF offered four alternatives—for the country to “increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, keep its troops at the current level, reduce the number of its troops or...withdraw all troops from Afghanistan.” In nine of twelve countries, support for withdrawal fell within a range of 28 percent to 41 percent (the exceptions were Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria).¹⁵⁹

Intervention in Darfur

Internationally, views have been mixed as to whether the United Nations has the responsibility, rather than simply the right, to intervene in Darfur. Approximately half of the countries polled expressed a readiness to contribute troops to an international force to stop the killing, and a large majority of Europeans polled expressed a readiness to contribute troops to a humanitarian operation in Darfur. Muslim countries polled expressed confidence that such an intervention could be effective. A poll of African countries expressed support for either the United Nations or the African Union intervening in a situation like Darfur.

Fourteen countries were asked about the role of the UN Security Council regarding the violence occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan (WPO/CCGA 2006-08). Respondents in seven countries said the UN has a responsibility to authorize an intervention, two countries said the UN has the right but not a responsibility, and five countries were divided on the question. On average, 35 percent of all respondents thought the UN has a responsibility, 27 percent thought it has the right but not a responsibility, and 15 percent thought it does not have the right.

Support for UN action in Darfur has been highest in France, where 84 percent say the UN Security Council has either the “responsibility” to authorize intervention in Darfur (55 percent) or the “right” (29 percent) to do so. Close behind is the United States, where 83 percent have said the UN Security Council has either the “responsibility” (48 percent) or the “right” (35 percent) to intervene. Israelis (77 percent) have been the next most likely to favor UN action, with 46 percent saying it has the responsibility to act and 31 percent saying it has the right to do so.

Majorities in India and China have also stated that the United Nations has the responsibility and/or right to act. About six in ten Indians (59 percent) have said the UN Security Council either can (30 percent) or should (29 percent) act to stop the violence in Darfur. About the same proportion of Chinese (58 percent) have agreed, with 38 percent saying it has the right and 20 percent saying it has the responsibility to do so.¹⁶⁰

Eleven countries in the same poll were asked whether they favored or opposed the use of their country's troops as part of an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur. Majorities in six countries favored contributing

troops, four countries were opposed, and one was divided. The average across all eleven countries was 55 percent in favor and 30 percent opposed.¹⁶¹

A 2009 WPO poll of seven majority-Muslim and African nations and territories also found strong support for intervening in Sudan for humanitarian purposes against the will of the government. Respondents were told that in response to charges made by the International Criminal Court, Sudanese President Omar Bashir “has expelled humanitarian groups that have been providing food and other aid to the displaced civilians living in refugee camps.” They were then asked, “If, as a result, many people in these camps start dying from hunger and exposure, do you think the United Nations should bring in food and other aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government or do you think this would be too much of a violation of Sudan’s sovereignty?” Large majorities approved of such an intervention in Kenya (82 percent), Nigeria (68 percent), Egypt (61 percent), the Palestinian Territories (60 percent), and Turkey (58 percent). A plurality of Iraqis also approved (46 percent to 29 percent). Only Pakistanis leaned against the idea (37 percent to 42 percent). On average across the seven nations, 59 percent approved.¹⁶²

GMF’s 2007 Transatlantic Trends survey included a question on **the deployment of a country’s troops to provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan**. Majorities or pluralities in all twelve European countries and the United States approved of such a deployment. The European average showed 76 percent approving and 18 percent disapproving.¹⁶³

The Arab American Institute (AAI) polled six countries with Muslim majorities in 2007 on options for dealing with the situation in Darfur. Five countries believed a UN peacekeeping force from non-Western and Muslim nations would be effective, while one country (United Arab Emirates) believed it would not be effective. On average, 66 percent responded it would be effective and 31 percent responded it would not. The strongest majorities in favor came from Saudi Arabia (87 percent) and Egypt (74 percent). A majority in the United Arab Emirates (55 percent) thought that a UN peacekeeping mission in Darfur would “not be effective.”¹⁶⁴

The 2004 GlobeScan poll of eight sub-Saharan countries asked respondents about their preferred military group to intervene in a conflict like Darfur. On average across all eight countries, 30 percent favored the United Nations, 22 percent favored the African Union, 7 percent favored all options, and 5 percent favored any rich country.¹⁶⁵

The Responsibility to Participate in NATO and EU Military Operations

When NATO decides to take a military action, U.S. and European publics think that all NATO members should contribute troops and if not, then they should at least contribute financially (though Eastern European countries are more mixed on both of these questions). Most EU publics do not think that an EU decision to take military action creates an imperative for a member country to participate.

People in twelve European countries and the United States were asked, “To what extent do you tend to agree that *all* NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action?” (GMF 2008). An overwhelming majority of Americans (82 percent) said all should. On average, 57 percent of Europeans agreed, although there was substantial variation. In most cases, Western European countries had fairly large majorities agreeing (United Kingdom 82 percent, Holland 82 percent, Portugal 68 percent, France 62 percent), though fewer agreed in some (Germany 56 percent, Italy 51 percent, Spain 56 percent). Eastern European countries were quite mixed. In some, a majority agreed (Poland 57 percent, Romania 63 percent), while only minorities agreed in Slovakia (37 percent) and Bulgaria (42 percent). In Turkey, only 28 percent agreed.¹⁶⁶

When asked whether they agreed that all NATO members “should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops,” responses were essentially the same as above except that German agreement rose 6 points to 62 percent.¹⁶⁷

A 2007 GMF poll asked Europeans what their country should do if the European Union decided to use military force but the decision was one that the respondent’s country disagreed with. The question asked respondents whether they agreed that “if the European Union should decide to use military force, [survey country] should abide by that decision even if [survey country] disagrees.” Large majorities disagreed in France (65 percent) and Germany (67 percent), as

well as solid majorities in several others. Smaller majorities agreed in Poland (51 percent), Portugal (51 percent), and Turkey (52 percent). On average, only 43 percent of European publics agreed while 54 percent disagreed.¹⁶⁸

Perceived Effectiveness of UN Peacekeeping Operations

On average, a slight majority of the publics of Cambodia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Abkhazia, Lebanon, Somalia, and Georgia said they found the peacekeeping operations in their countries in the 1990s to have been effective. Publics in the permanent members of the UN Security Council offered similar assessments.

In 1999, the International Committee of the Red Cross sponsored a study in six countries where UN peacekeeping forces had been active (Cambodia, Bosnia Herzegovina, Abkhazia, Lebanon, Somalia, and Georgia). Overall, a slim majority of respondents (51 percent) said that the UN made conditions better for them and their fellow citizens. Only 14 percent said the UN made things worse, while 27 percent said it made no difference at all.

This question was also posed to respondents residing in four nations that are permanent members of the UN Security Council (all but China). These responses were similar to those living in the countries receiving the forces: 54 percent of those in UNSC permanent member states felt the UN peacekeeping or observer presence made conditions better for people in the countries receiving the international forces. Eight percent of those living in the UNSC permanent-member nations say the UN made things worse, and 29 percent say it made no difference at all.¹⁶⁹⁻¹⁷⁰

CHAPTER 4A: WORLD OPINION ON COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS: TERRORISM

Concern about Terrorism

Concern about terrorism varies significantly around the world, with the highest levels found in the Middle East, South Asia, and Western Europe—all regions that have suffered significant terrorist attacks. Despite 9/11, Americans are only average in their level of concern.

Asked how big a problem terrorism is in their country (Pew 2007), in sixteen out of forty-seven nations a majority or plurality said it was a very big problem; in fifteen nations a majority or plurality said it was at least a moderately big problem; and in thirteen nations a majority or plurality said it was a small problem or not a problem at all. An average of 41 percent of respondents across all countries polled said that terrorism is a very big problem in their country, while 23 percent said it was a moderately big problem, 19 percent said it is a small problem, and 14 percent said it is not a problem at all.¹⁷¹

All of the countries that show the highest levels of concern are ones where there have been significant terrorist attacks. The highest levels of concern are found in the Middle East and South Asia, led by Morocco (81 percent calling it a very big problem), Bangladesh (77 percent), Lebanon (76 percent), Pakistan (76 percent), India (72 percent), and Turkey (72 percent). But concern is also strong in European countries that have experienced terrorist attacks over the years, including Italy (73 percent), Spain (66 percent), France (54 percent), and in other countries around the world with such experiences—for instance Peru (70 percent) and Japan (59 percent).

Despite September 11, though, Americans are only average in their level of concern, with 44 percent saying it is a very big problem and 38 percent saying it is a somewhat big problem.

In fourteen countries a majority or plurality said terrorism was only a small problem or not a problem at all. These include most of the African countries polled, some Eastern European countries, as well as several Asian countries (including China).

Attitudes Toward al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden

In most countries polled, a majority of the public has negative feelings about al-Qaeda, but in some countries (majority-Muslim, in most cases), these are only pluralities, and significant numbers have positive or mixed views of al-Qaeda. Worldwide, the numbers expressing positive views of Osama bin Laden have declined, but in some predominantly Muslim countries, one-fifth to one-third still express positive views toward him.

Views of al-Qaeda are largely negative worldwide. The British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) in September 2008 asked respondents in twenty-two countries whether they had positive, negative, or mixed feelings about al-Qaeda. Fifteen of the countries had a majority with negative feelings about al-Qaeda, with the most widespread majorities present in the European countries: Italy (87 percent), Germany (86 percent), and France (85 percent).

While negative views of al-Qaeda are most common in nearly all of the countries surveyed, this is not the case in Egypt and Pakistan—both pivotal nations in the conflict with al-Qaeda. In both of these countries, far more people have either mixed or positive feelings toward al-Qaeda (Egypt 20 percent positive, 40 percent mixed; Pakistan 19 percent positive, 22 percent mixed) than have negative feelings (Egypt 35 percent, Pakistan 19 percent).

In addition, there are several other countries where negative views are less than a majority position: China (48 percent), India (44 percent), Indonesia (35 percent), Nigeria (42 percent), and the Philippines (42 percent).¹⁷²

Osama bin Laden

Asked how much confidence they have in Osama bin Laden to “to do the right thing regarding world affairs” (Pew 2008), in not a single country out of twenty-three polled did a majority say that they had some confidence or a lot of

confidence, while in twenty-one countries a majority said they had no confidence or not too much confidence. An average of 77 percent of respondents across all twenty-three countries polled said they had not too much confidence or no confidence at all, and only 10 percent said they had a lot of confidence or some confidence. Large majorities said they have no confidence at all in bin Laden in France (95 percent), Germany (90 percent), and Australia (89 percent).

When Pew polled nine nations and territories with large Muslim populations in a more recent poll (2009), it found that a majority in seven and a plurality in one said that they did not have confidence in bin Laden. However a slight majority of the Palestinians (51 percent) said that they did have confidence in the al-Qaeda leader, as did significant numbers in Nigeria (32 percent), Jordan (28 percent), and Egypt (23 percent).¹⁷³

These findings are consistent with a 2008 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll, which asked respondents whether they had positive, negative or mixed feelings about bin Laden. A majority of Palestinian respondents (56 percent) expressed positive feelings toward Osama bin Laden, as did a significant number of Egyptians (44 percent), Jordanians (27 percent), and Pakistanis (25 percent). Of the populations polled, only in Turkey and Azerbaijan did large majorities express negative feelings toward bin Laden.¹⁷⁴

Support for Multilateral Action against Terrorism

Large majorities around the world think the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.

Respondents in sixteen countries around the world were asked whether “the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force ... to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups” (WPO 2006-2008). A majority in all countries polled said the UN Security Council should have this right; Nigeria (87 percent), Israel (85 percent), and France (84 percent) had the largest majorities. Respondents in South Korea (61 percent), the Palestinian Territories (61 percent), and India (60 percent) were the least supportive of the right to intervene, though majorities still supported it. Across the sixteen countries polled, 73 percent said the UN Security Council should have the right to intervene and just 19 percent said it should not have the right to intervene.¹⁷⁵

Regional Cooperation on Terrorism

In North America and Europe, publics mostly give poor marks to the quality of transatlantic cooperation against terrorism. In the European Union, publics on average also give the European Union’s performance against terrorism a lukewarm assessment, while a large majority thinks more decision-making on terrorism should take place at the European level.

A poll of seven European countries, Canada, and the United States (GlobeScan 2008) found poor ratings of transatlantic cooperation on fighting global terrorism. On average, just 35 percent gave positive ratings, while 43 percent give negative ratings. The most negative attitudes were in Turkey and Spain, which had majorities giving a negative assessment. The French were divided.¹⁷⁶

When Eurobarometer asked respondents in twenty-five countries in March 2006 whether “more decision-making should take place at a European level or whether less decision-making should take place at a European level” in the fight against terrorism, 80 percent of those polled favored more European decision-making, with Luxembourg (92 percent) as the highest result and the United Kingdom (63 percent) as the lowest result. Only 12 percent believed that there should be less European level decision-making on this issue.¹⁷⁷

A 2008 Eurobarometer poll of the twenty-seven EU member states also found that all countries polled believed that decisions related to fighting terrorism should be made jointly within the European Union rather than by national governments. In the European average, 79 percent favored the European Union making decisions and 18 percent favored national governments.¹⁷⁸

Assessments of U.S. Efforts against Terrorism

In the struggle between the United States and al-Qaeda, the predominant view among world publics is that neither side is winning and that the “war on terror” has not weakened al-Qaeda. In recent years most have also seen the war in Iraq as increasing the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world.

In no country out of twenty-three polled did a majority believe that either the United States or al-Qaeda is winning in their conflict (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2008). The most significant numbers that believe al-Qaeda is winning were found in Pakistan (21 percent), Nigeria (17 percent), and the United Arab Emirates (16 percent). The greatest numbers saying that the United States is winning were found in Kenya (45 percent), Philippines (39 percent), and Egypt (39 percent). On average, 47 percent of respondents around the world believed that neither side is winning; 22 percent that the United States is winning; and 10 percent that al-Qaeda is winning. The countries with the largest numbers thinking neither side is winning are in the United Kingdom (75 percent), France (73 percent), and Mexico (73 percent).¹⁷⁹

In the same poll, there was little consensus about whether the U.S.-led war on terror has made al-Qaeda stronger, weaker, or has had no effect either way. In two countries, a plurality believed the war on terror had made al-Qaeda stronger (France, 48 percent and Mexico, 48 percent), and significant numbers thought this in Italy (43 percent), Australia (41 percent), and the United Kingdom (40 percent). In one country—Kenya—a majority believed the war on terror had made al-Qaeda weaker (58 percent).

On average, 30 percent said the war on terror had made al-Qaeda stronger, 22 percent believed it had weakened al-Qaeda, while 29 percent believed it had had no effect.¹⁸⁰

However, in 2006, there was a consensus that the war in Iraq had increased the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world. A 2006 poll of thirty-five countries (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA) found that majorities or pluralities in thirty-one countries said the war in Iraq had increased the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world. The countries with the largest majorities holding this view included China (85 percent), South Korea (84 percent), Egypt (83 percent), Finland (82 percent), Italy (81 percent), and Germany (80 percent). Only in Nigeria (49 percent) did a plurality say the Iraq war has decreased the threat. A majority in Mexico (59 percent) said it had had no effect. On average, 60 percent believed it had increased the threat of terrorist attacks, 15 percent said it had had no effect, and 12 percent believed it had decreased this threat.¹⁸¹

Principles for Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

Majorities or pluralities in most nations reject the view that, when dealing with terrorism suspects, rules against torture and the secret holding of detainees should be relaxed. However, in several countries majorities favor making an exception when dealing with a terrorist suspect who may have information that may save innocent lives. Majorities in the United States, Britain, Germany, and Poland, and a plurality in India endorse provisions of the Geneva Conventions that forbid detainees being held in secret or without access by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

In a poll of twenty-one nations, respondents were asked whether the rule against the use of torture should be unequivocal, or whether there should be an exception when dealing with a terrorism suspect who may have information that may save innocent lives (WPO 2008). In sixteen nations, majorities or pluralities rejected the argument that “terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives,” in favor of the argument that “clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture.” The largest majorities were in Spain (82 percent), Great Britain (82 percent), and France (82 percent). On average, 57 percent favored unequivocal rules against torture while 35 percent opted for an exception when innocent lives were at stake.

Five publics favored an exception for using torture in the case of terrorists: India (59 percent), Kenya (58 percent), Nigeria (54 percent), Turkey (51 percent), and Thailand (44 percent). South Koreans were divided.¹⁸²

A poll conducted in five countries from around the world (WPO 2006) also found that only small minorities were persuaded that the challenge of terrorism made treaties prohibiting the secret holding of detainees too restrictive. Respondents were told that their government had signed “treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and require that the International Committee of the Red Cross have access to them.” They were then presented the argument that such treaties are “too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism” as well as the counter-argument that “such treaties are “important for making sure governments treat people humanely.” Majorities in the United States (73 percent), Britain (64 percent), Germany (72 percent), and Poland (60 percent), and also a plurality in India (42 percent) rejected the view that such treaties were too

restrictive in favor of abiding by the treaties. Across the five countries, an average of 62 percent believed the treaties are important for making sure governments treat people humanely while 25 percent believed them too restrictive.¹⁸³

U.S. Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

In 2006, majorities in Great Britain, Germany, and Poland (and a plurality in India) believed that U.S. detention policies in place at Guantanamo were illegal, whereas a slight majority of people in the United States believed they were legal. In none of the five countries—including the United States—did a majority or plurality think the United States seeks to enforce a policy against torture in interrogations. Only minorities supported allowing the United States to use their country’s airspace for rendition of a terrorist suspect to another country, if that country had a reputation for using torture.

In 2006, publics in five countries were asked whether then-current U.S. policies for detaining suspects at Guantanamo Bay were legal or illegal (WPO 2006). Majorities or pluralities in Germany (85 percent), Great Britain (65 percent), Poland (50 percent), and India (34 percent) believed U.S. detention policies in place at Guantanamo were illegal. Only in the United States did a slight majority (52 percent) think they were legal. Less than one-third of respondents in India (28 percent), Great Britain (22 percent), Poland (18 percent), and Germany (8 percent) believed the detention policies to be legal. On average, 54 percent said the policies were not legal and 26 percent said they were legal.¹⁸⁴

In the same 2006 poll, respondents were asked whether they believed that the U.S. government was “making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture” or whether it was “allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists.” Majorities in Germany (76 percent) and Great Britain (62 percent) said they believed the U.S. government was allowing torture, along with 49 percent in Poland and 33 percent in India. About a quarter of respondents from Great Britain (27 percent), Poland (24 percent), and India (23 percent), and just 14 percent in Germany believed efforts were being made to prevent torture. The U.S. public was divided on whether the government was making efforts to prevent torture by interrogators (45 percent) or allowing it (47 percent). Across the five countries, an average of 53 percent said they believed the U.S. government was allowing torture, while 27 percent said it was trying to prevent such torture.¹⁸⁵

There was also little support for cooperating with extraordinary renditions by the United States. Respondents in four countries were asked whether the United States should be allowed to use their nation’s airspace to transport a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture. Majorities in Great Britain (66 percent) and Germany (55 percent) said their country should not grant the United States such permission, as did a plurality in Poland (48 percent) and India (42 percent).¹⁸⁶ The Polish (36 percent) and Germans (35 percent) had the largest minorities in support of granting such permission, while India (28 percent) and Great Britain (26 percent) had smaller minorities supporting such permission. On average, 53 percent of all respondents said their countries should refuse permission, while 31 percent were in favor of granting permission.

Absence of Consensus over Who Was Behind 9/11 Attacks

In seventeen countries worldwide, majorities in only nine of those countries believe al-Qaeda was behind the September 11 terrorist attacks—though in none of the other countries does a majority agree on a different possible perpetrator. Even in European countries, the majorities that say al-Qaeda was behind September 11 are not large. Publics in the Middle East are especially likely to name a different perpetrator (Israel or the United States itself.)

In an open-ended question, a poll in nineteen nations asked respondents who they thought was behind the September 11 attacks on the United States (WPO 2008). In only eleven of the countries did a majority answer “al-Qaeda” or a related answer such as “Islamic extremists” or “bin Laden.” However, in no other country did a majority agree on a different possible perpetrator.

On average across the nineteen nations, a plurality of 47 percent of respondents said either al-Qaeda, bin Laden, or Islamic extremists were behind the attacks, while smaller percentages said the U.S. government (14 percent); Israel (7 percent); other Arabs, Saudis, or Egyptians (3 percent); or others (3 percent.)

Even in western European countries, the majorities saying al-Qaeda was behind 9/11 were not large, ranging from 56 percent in Italy to 64 percent in Germany. In Germany, a remarkable 23 percent cited the United States.

The countries most convinced that al-Qaeda was behind the attacks were Kenya (77 percent), Nigeria (71 percent), and Azerbaijan (69 percent).

The countries least convinced were all majority Muslim countries—Jordan (11 percent), Indonesia (23 percent), and Egypt (16 percent).

Publics in the Middle East were especially likely to name a different perpetrator (Israel or the United States itself). In Turkey, one-third of the public (36 percent) said the U.S. government was behind the attacks, while significant numbers in Mexico (30 percent) and the Palestinian territories (27 percent) also believed the U.S. government was to blame. Pluralities in Egypt (43 percent) and Jordan (31 percent) believed Israel was behind the September 11 attacks.

Throughout the world, large numbers said they did not know or declined to answer. These were majorities in China (56 percent), Thailand (56 percent), and Indonesia (57 percent).¹⁸⁷

CHAPTER 4B: WORLD OPINION ON COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS: PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Concerns about Nuclear Proliferation

International polls find a high level of concern among world publics about the possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers, and a widespread belief that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons should be an important foreign policy goal.

People around the world perceive nuclear proliferation as a critical threat. In a 2006 poll of nine countries conducted by WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO)/Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA), respondents were presented a list of possible threats and asked to evaluate them. Asked about the possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers, in all cases only small minorities said this was not an important threat. In six countries, majorities chose the highest level of concern—saying that it was a critical threat—with Mexico (75 percent), Israel (72 percent), and the United States (69 percent) leading the field. In two countries, South Korea (50 percent to 40 percent) and the Ukraine (45 percent to 31 percent), only pluralities considered it a critical threat. In China, meanwhile, a plurality (43 percent) considered the threat important but not critical, with just 27 percent seeing it as a critical threat. China had the largest percentage (17 percent) saying it was not important.¹⁸⁸

In eight of the countries, a majority said preventing the spread of nuclear weapons should be a very important foreign policy goal for their country, a view expressed by 82 percent of Australians and 74 percent of Americans. The smallest majority was in China (52 percent), where 33 percent called it somewhat important and 7 percent said it was not important.¹⁸⁹

Goal of Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

Large majorities in publics around the world, including in countries with nuclear arms, favor an international agreement for the elimination of all nuclear weapons that includes an intrusive international inspection regime.

Internationally, there is strong support for abolishing nuclear weapons, even when it is specified that this would require an intrusive inspection regime. In 2008, WPO asked respondents in twenty-one countries about the possibility of an agreement for eliminating nuclear weapons, in which all nuclear-armed countries would be required to disarm according to a timetable and all other states would be prohibited from developing nuclear weapons. The poll question specified that all countries, including the country of the respondent, would be monitored.

Majorities in twenty countries and a plurality in the remaining one favored the idea. Support was robust in all but one of the declared nuclear-weapon states polled, including the United States (77 percent), France (86 percent), Britain (81 percent), Russia (69 percent), China (83 percent), and India (62 percent). The one exception was Pakistan, where only a plurality favored the idea (46 percent to 41 percent). Among these states, the country where the largest numbers said they “strongly” supported this idea was China (60 percent), followed by France (58 percent). (North Korea, unsurprisingly, was not polled).

The one unofficial nuclear state—Israel—also showed robust support for global nuclear disarmament, with 67 percent in favor (42 percent strongly). This level of support is interesting, because the question spells out a gradual process of elimination with intrusive inspections—something that would presumably reveal Israel’s unofficial program, even before other nations had eliminated their nuclear programs.

On average across all twenty-one nations, 76 percent favored the idea of an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons (50 percent strongly) while 16 percent were opposed (7 percent strongly).¹⁹⁰

UN Use of Force to Prevent Nuclear Proliferation

Most countries polled internationally favor the UN Security Council having the right to authorize the use of military force to prevent a country from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Though the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) is something that states enter into voluntarily and have the right to withdraw from, most countries favor the UN Security Council having the power to authorize the use of military force to prevent a country from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Seventeen nations and territories were polled on whether the UN Security Council should have such a right (WPO/CCGA 2006-08). Majorities or pluralities in fourteen nations agreed the United Nations should have this authority, led by Kenya (84 percent), Nigeria (81 percent), and Egypt (74 percent). Two publics were opposed—the Palestinian Territories (59 percent) and South Korea (55 percent). South Korean opposition may be rooted in trepidation about the idea of the United Nations taking action against North Korea, which could lead to large-scale attacks against South Korea.

Interestingly, publics in the current nuclear-armed countries (which could arguably benefit from freezing the number of nuclear states) were not exceptionally supportive of the United Nations having such a right to forcibly prevent proliferation. Respondents in the United States were supportive at 62 percent, in Russia at 55 percent, in India at 53 percent, in China at 47 percent, and in Israel at 62 percent. Opinion in France was evenly divided (50 percent to 48 percent).

On average across all nations polled, 59 percent of respondents favored the UN Security Council having such a right and 31 percent were opposed.¹⁹¹

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

There is substantial support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in global public opinion, including in the United States.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty seeks to reduce the danger of nuclear proliferation by preventing nonnuclear nations from developing nuclear weapons and hindering nuclear nations from improving them. The U.S. failure to ratify the CTBT is often cited internationally as evidence that the United States is not living up to its commitments under the NPT to seek the elimination of nuclear weapons, but is instead determined to its own right to improve its weapons.

CCGA asked the publics in the United States, China, India, and South Korea in 2006 whether they favored their country participating in the treaty that would prohibit nuclear test explosions worldwide. Robust majorities in all countries were in favor, including 86 percent of Americans, 86 percent of South Koreans, 73 percent of Chinese, and 57 percent of Indians.¹⁹²

Multilateral Control of Nuclear Fuel Production

There is substantial international support for not allowing some countries to develop nuclear fuel out of concern that they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Publics worldwide would favor an international regime under the United Nations that would stop new countries from beginning production of nuclear fuel and instead supply them with the fuel they need for energy production. Most publics polled even favor giving the UN Security Council the right to authorize military force to prevent a country from developing nuclear fuel that could be used to develop nuclear weapons.

The NPT puts limits on nations developing nuclear weapons, but does not limit the production of nuclear fuel, provided that nations do so exclusively for the purpose of producing nuclear energy under the monitoring of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). With the controversy surrounding Iran's production of nuclear fuel, and its possible diversion into a nuclear weapons program, there have been calls for greater regulation of the production of nuclear fuel.

Several international polls show strong support for greater control over the production of nuclear fuel. WPO/CCGA asked the following question in 2006-07:

In the past, the international community has agreed that all countries have the right to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes. Now it has been proposed that certain countries not be allowed to develop nuclear fuel out of concern they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Do you think this proposal is a good idea or a bad idea?

Of the thirteen nations and territories that answered this question, majorities in nine countries and pluralities in three favored the idea. The highest support was in Israel (69 percent). There was also robust support in publics of UN Security Council permanent members, including the United States (66 percent), Russia (59 percent), China (57 percent), and France (56 percent). However, a majority of 57 percent disagreed in the Palestinian Territories.¹⁹³

A British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on Internal Policy Attitudes (PIPA) question in 2006 asked respondents to choose between two arguments:

All countries should be free to produce nuclear fuel under United Nations oversight, because they have the right to have nuclear energy and should not have to depend on other countries

OR

Because nuclear fuel can be developed for use in nuclear weapons, the United Nations should try to stop new countries from producing nuclear fuel but should provide them with the fuel they need

In twenty of twenty-five countries polled, majorities or pluralities favored the UN trying to prevent such production. These countries included the United States (56 percent), Great Britain (55 percent), and Russia (46 percent). Interestingly, public opinion in France and China was divided, though the publics in both cases had favored the idea of preventing countries from developing nuclear fuel in the question mentioned above. The difference between the questions is that the second calls for the United Nations to play a new and major role providing nuclear fuel.

Views were also divided in Indonesia, and respondents showed significant opposition in Turkey (51 percent) and Egypt (49 percent). In the global average, 52 percent supported the proposed UN program and 33 percent said all countries should have a right to produce fuel.¹⁹⁴

Curiously, some of the strongest support for multilateral control of the production of nuclear fuel was found in a WPO/CCGA poll (2006-2008) that asked whether the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize the use of force to stop a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons. Majorities or pluralities in thirteen of the sixteen nations polled favored the idea, including in the United States (57 percent), Russia (53 percent), and China (47 percent to 34 percent). The French were, once again, divided. Egyptians were also, once again, divided, and a majority of South Koreans were opposed (56 percent). On average, 56 percent supported the UN Security Council having this right and 32 percent were opposed.¹⁹⁵

Dealing with Iran's Nuclear Program

International polls reveal a widespread global perception that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons, rather than limiting itself to energy production, and there is substantial concern over this. While most publics want to put international pressure on Iran to stop it from producing nuclear fuel, publics to date have roundly rejected the option of military force, and respondents in most countries have also opposed economic sanctions, preferring diplomacy instead. Publics in a majority of nations polled support the idea of allowing Iran to produce nuclear fuel if it accepts intrusive UN inspections. Asked which institution would best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons, Europeans and Americans choose the United Nations by a large margin.

International polling conducted in 2006 found widespread perceptions that Iran is seeking to develop nuclear weapons. BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA surveyed twenty-five countries on whether "Iran is producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs or ... is also trying to develop nuclear weapons." Majorities or pluralities in all twenty-five countries said Iran was trying to develop nuclear weapons. In the global average, 60 percent of respondents believed Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons and 17 percent that it was producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs.¹⁹⁶

The same poll found majorities in every country polled saying they would be concerned "if Iran were to develop nuclear weapons." On average, 72 percent said they would be concerned and just 20 percent said they would not. In only two countries—Indonesia (40 percent) and Iraq (34 percent)—did the number saying that they were not concerned rise above one in three. However, only 43 percent of global respondents overall said they were "very concerned." Publics described themselves as "very concerned" only in nine countries the United States (72 percent), Great Britain (67 percent), Australia (67 percent), Italy (65 percent), Israel (64 percent), Canada (63 percent), Brazil (57 percent), Germany (57 percent), and Poland (53 percent).

Similarly, a 2006 GMF poll of twelve European countries and the United States found the prospect of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons a major threat. In the European average, 53 percent of respondents called it an extremely important threat (compared to 75 percent for Americans), 27 percent called it an important threat (versus 19 percent of Americans), and 10 percent called it not an important threat at all (5 percent for Americans). Only the Turks departed from the general European norm, with just 35 percent saying it would be an extremely important threat.¹⁹⁷

Europeans and Americans also believe that very serious, negative consequences are likely to occur if Iran acquires nuclear weapons. GMF surveyed twelve European countries and the United States in 2008 about the likelihood of five hypothetical scenarios if Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons. In the European average, 68 percent of respondents believed that with a nuclear-armed Iran, other Middle Eastern countries would likely decide to pursue nuclear weapons (a view held by 83 percent of Americans); 67 percent believed Iran would supply nuclear weapons to terrorists (compared to 83 percent of Americans); 61 percent believed Iran would attack other countries in the region (compared to 75 percent of Americans); and 54 percent believed Iran would threaten Europe with nuclear weapons (a view held by 66 percent of Americans).

At the same time, and somewhat contradictorily, 50 percent of Europeans thought that it was “likely” or “somewhat” likely that Iran would only use nuclear weapons for defensive purposes—whereas Americans tended to be more skeptical (with 43 percent thinking this outcome unlikely).¹⁹⁸

What Action to Take

While there is support for international pressure on Iran to stop producing nuclear fuel, in no country has there been significant support for military action against Iran—and most countries have not even favored employing economic sanctions. A December 2007 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked twenty-six countries about actions the UN Security Council should take if Iran continues to develop nuclear fuel. In only one country (Egypt) was the most common response that the Council should not pressure Iran. On average across twenty-six countries, just 14 percent took this position. On the other hand, only small percentages around the world favored military action—on average 7 percent. Only in Israel did a significant number (34 percent) favor such an approach.

By far the most favored positions were to use only diplomatic efforts (on average 42 percent in favor) or to impose economic sanctions (on average 26 percent). The only countries where economic sanctions were the most popular position were the United States (45 percent), Israel (37 percent), and South Korea (48 percent). Globally, an average of 57 percent supported “softer measures” (42 percent use only diplomatic efforts, 14 percent not pressure Iran) and 33 percent supported “tougher measures” (26 percent impose economic sanctions, 7 percent authorize military strikes).¹⁹⁹

A 2008 GMF poll of twelve European countries and the United States found similar results. Most respondents in eleven European countries favored increasing diplomatic pressure but ruling out the use of military force. U.S. poll respondents were divided between those favoring increased pressure while maintaining the option of using military force, on the one hand, and those supporting milder approaches, on the other. Most Turks favored accepting that Iran may develop nuclear weapons. In Europe, an average of 47 percent supported increasing diplomatic pressure but ruling out military force; 21 percent supported increasing pressure while keeping force as an option; 16 percent supported maintaining the present level of diplomatic pressure; and 6 percent supported accepting that Iran may develop nuclear weapons.²⁰⁰

Making a Deal

Publics in a majority of countries have said they would favor a deal by which Iran would have a limited capacity to produce nuclear fuel. A December 2007 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked, “If Iran were to allow UN inspectors permanent and full access throughout Iran to make sure it is not developing nuclear weapons, do you think Iran should or should not be allowed to produce nuclear fuel for producing electricity?”

In sixteen of the twenty-six countries polled, more people favored than oppose this idea, while seven publics were opposed and three were divided. Support for this position was fairly strong in some countries at the forefront of the drive to stop Iran's nuclear program, including the United States (55 percent), Great Britain (71 percent), and France (56 percent). On average, 47 percent of respondents in the poll were in favor while 36 percent were opposed.²⁰¹

Who Best to Handle Iran?

Europeans and Americans tend to think that the United Nations is the best institution to deal with Iran. GMF surveyed twelve European countries and the United States in 2006 on who could best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons. The most common response in eleven European countries and the United States was the United Nations (the exception was Turkey which preferred the European Union). In the European average, 43 percent supported the United Nations handling the issue, 19 percent supported the European Union, 15 percent supported NATO, and 8 percent favored the United States. Thirty-six percent of Americans said the United Nations was the best to handle the issue, 22 percent said the United States, 18 percent said NATO, and 13 percent said the European Union.²⁰²

CHAPTER 5A: WORLD OPINION ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Perception of Climate Change as a Problem or Threat

A majority in every country polled says that global warming is a problem or a threat and that governments should give it a high priority, while only small minorities say it is not a problem. Despite these numbers, people tend to underestimate how much other people are concerned about climate change. While the number of people concerned about climate change has been increasing for some years, recent polls indicate that it may be leveling out.

Large-scale polls conducted by Pew from 2007 to 2009 showed majorities in every country saying that “global warming” is a serious problem. In 2009, majorities in all twenty-five countries surveyed said that global warming is a serious problem, including fifteen countries where majorities said it is a “very serious” problem. In 2008, majorities in twenty-four countries surveyed said that global warming is a serious problem, including fourteen countries with majorities saying it is very serious. In 2007, majorities in thirty-seven countries rated it a serious problem, including twenty-five with majorities rating it a very serious problem.

On average in 2009, 85 percent of those polled globally said the problem was serious, with 56 percent saying it was very serious. The number of people saying that it is not a problem averaged just 3 percent and was always in the single digits, with the exception of the United States in 2009 when this figure reached 11 percent. (The average 2007 and 2008 numbers were almost exactly the same as those in 2009.)

In the two largest producers of greenhouse gasses—the United States and China—large majorities of the public said the problem of global warming was serious, but relatively lower numbers said that it was very serious. In 2009, 74 percent of U.S. respondents described the problem as serious and 44 percent described it as very serious. The respective figures for China were 84 percent and 30 percent.²⁰³

In all thirty countries polled by GlobeScan in 2006, “climate change or global warming, due to the Greenhouse Effect” was seen as a problem. In twenty-three of these countries, a majority said the problem was very serious. On average, 90 percent rated the problem as serious, with 65 percent rating it very serious.²⁰⁴

A 2009 World Public Opinion (WPO) poll asked respondents how high a priority their government should place on addressing climate change on a zero-to-ten scale, with ten being a very high priority. In sixteen out of eighteen nations, the mean response was above six with the average across all nations being 7.28. The highest mean levels were found in Mexico (9.09), China (8.86), Turkey (8.34), and Great Britain (8.20). Only three publics had means below six. The lowest of these was in the United States (4.71) followed by the Palestinian territories (4.91) and Iraq (5.14). On average across all nations polled, 73 percent said their government should give climate change a priority between 6 and 10, 13 percent thought this priority should be between 0 and 4, and 9 percent said it should be a 5.²⁰⁵

In a 2006 WPO/Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll of ten countries from around the world, majorities in all countries said that global warming would be a threat over the next ten years. In six of those ten countries, majorities called it a critical threat and in another three—including the United States (46 percent) and China (47 percent)—“critical” was the most common response. Only in Ukraine was the public divided about whether the threat was critical (33 percent) or “important but not critical” (33 percent).²⁰⁶

In a German Marshall Fund (GMF) poll from 2007, majorities in twelve European countries plus the United States thought it was likely they would “be personally affected by the effects of global warming.” On average across the twelve European countries, 85 percent said it was likely that they would be affected, and in no country did less than 77 percent say this. Support for this view was slightly lower in the United States (where 70 percent said it was likely).²⁰⁷

When asked in 2008 what the top priority should be for the next U.S. president and European leaders from a given list of eight issues, climate change was one of the top two rated issues for Europeans (GMF 2008). However, it was rated the fifth highest among people in the United States.²⁰⁸

Perceptions of Others’ Level of Concern

The 2009 WPO poll also found that, in most nations, people have a tendency to underestimate how much other people in their country want to prioritize climate change. Respondents were asked, "What is your guess on how high a priority the average person in [our country] thinks the government should place on addressing climate change?" Across all nations, there was an average perceived priority of 6.42 for climate change, though the average priority actually placed on climate change is a higher 7.28.

In all but three nations or territories, those rating themselves as "above average" outweighed those who said they were "below average." For all nations, the percentage saying that they were above average outweighed those saying that they were below average by a two to one ratio (42 percent to 19 percent). The nations with the largest percentages rating themselves above average were China (77 percent), South Korea (75 percent), Great Britain (66 percent), the United States (52 percent), and Germany (52 percent). In just one public, the Palestinian territories, did a majority (52 percent) perceive the average person as more concerned than they were.²⁰⁹

Trends in Level of Concern

GlobeScan surveys found increasing concern about climate change in polls conducted across sixteen countries in 2003 and 2006. The percentages of respondents calling it a "very serious" problem increased an average of sixteen points. In only one country (Mexico) was there a significant decline in the perceived severity of the problem of climate change.²¹⁰

However, this growth in concern may be topping out, as Pew did not find significant changes between 2007 and 2009.

Role of Human Activity

Publics around the world overwhelmingly reject the idea that global warming can be attributed to non-human factors. In a British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll from 2007, in twenty out of twenty-one countries polled two-thirds or more believed that "human activity, including industry and transportation, [is] a significant cause of climate change." On average, eight in ten held this view. In no country did more than one in three respondents disagree. The one outlier was India, where only a plurality (47 percent) attributed climate change to human activity, 21 percent disagreed, and 33 percent did not answer.²¹¹

Similarly robust majorities in all nineteen countries polled expressed concern that "the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems, including climate change" (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). Overall, an average of 81 percent expressed concern about this, with 47 percent saying they were very concerned.²¹²

Readiness to Take Action

Large majorities around the world support taking action to address the problem of climate change. More often than not, majorities favor taking major steps urgently. Most believe that it will be necessary for people to change their lifestyle in order to reduce their production of climate changing gasses. Support for taking action is higher among those who have more information about climate change.

Respondents in twenty-one countries were asked whether it is necessary to address climate change by taking: 1) "major steps starting very soon;" 2) "modest steps over the coming years;" or whether it was 3) "not necessary to take any steps" (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). In fifteen of the twenty-one countries, majorities favored taking major steps promptly, with the largest majorities found in Spain (91 percent), Italy (86 percent), and France (85 percent). A large majority also favored quick action in China (70 percent) as did a majority in the United States (59 percent). In no country did a majority say that no steps were necessary and, on average, fewer than one in ten selected this option.

Views were more mixed in six of the countries polled. Germans leaned in favor of major steps (50 percent) rather than more modest measures (45 percent), as did Nigerians (50 percent to 27 percent). Egyptians were divided (43 percent to 43 percent), as were Russians (44 percent modest to 43 percent major) and South Koreans (48 percent major to 45 percent modest). Indians—whose government opposes emissions caps—favored major steps over modest ones by 37 percent to 26 percent. Only 12 percent said no steps were necessary, though large numbers did not answer (26 percent). Overall, on average, 65 percent favored major steps, 25 percent favored modest steps and 6 percent favored no steps.²¹³

Another poll of thirteen countries offered three options but put greater emphasis on the potential costs (WPO/CCGA 2007). Support for the highest level commitment was not quite as strong but was still the most common response. The view that: “Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs” was the most common response in six countries, including France (78 percent), Australia (69 percent), Argentina (63 percent), Israel (54 percent), the United States (43 percent), and Armenia (37 percent). Another five countries tended to believe that, “The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost.” These countries were the Philippines (49 percent), Thailand (41 percent), Poland (39 percent), Ukraine (37 percent), and India (30 percent). In two countries, the public was evenly divided between those who favored less expensive measures and those wanted action even at significant cost: China (low cost 41 percent, significant costs 42 percent) and Russia (low cost 34 percent, significant costs 32 percent). In no country did more than one in four endorse the statement, “Until we are sure that global warming is really a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs.”²¹⁴

A poll of thirty European countries found that large majorities in every country felt that the European Union needed to deal with global warming; in twenty-two of them, majorities said the problem required very urgent action (Eurobarometer 2007). On average, 59 percent in all countries polled said climate change should be dealt with very urgently. In the same poll, large majorities agreed that “The European Union should urgently put new policies in place to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions by at least 20 percent by 2020.”²¹⁵

Similarly, in a 2006 CCGA poll, U.S. (70 percent) and South Korean (88 percent) respondents agreed that their country should participate in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming.²¹⁶

Need for Changes in Lifestyle

There is overwhelming international consensus that it will be necessary for individuals to “to make changes in their life style and behavior in order to reduce the amount of climate changing gases they produce.” In twenty-one countries polled (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007), large majorities agreed such changes are necessary. On average, 83 percent of respondents globally said this is necessary, with 46 percent saying it is “definitely” necessary. The countries with the largest percentages calling it definitely necessary were Spain (68 percent), Mexico (64 percent), Canada (63 percent), Italy (62 percent), and China (59 percent). The countries with the largest numbers saying that such lifestyle changes would not be necessary were Nigeria (33 percent), Egypt (29 percent), Kenya (25 percent), the United States (19 percent), and India (18 percent).²¹⁷

Effect of Greater Information

Not surprisingly, willingness to take action in regard to climate change rises with greater awareness of the problem.

Levels of information about climate change are highly varied. In a poll of twenty-one countries, majorities in sixteen, including many developing countries, said they had heard at least something about the issue (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). On average across all countries polled, seven in ten had heard a great deal (35 percent) or some (35 percent), with 22 percent saying not very much and 7 percent none at all. The numbers saying none at all were always low, though they were substantial in Kenya (22 percent) and Indonesia (18 percent).²¹⁸

Changing Energy Usage

To motivate changes in energy usage, majorities in most countries believe that it will be necessary to increase the cost of energy that causes climate change. The idea of raising taxes on such forms of energy meets with mixed responses. However, support becomes high if respondents are told that the revenues of such a tax will be explicitly earmarked to address the problem of climate change, or will be offset with tax reductions.

Large numbers of people believe that it is necessary to “increase the cost of the types of energy that most cause climate change, such as coal and oil, in order to encourage individuals and industry to use less” (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). In fourteen out of twenty-one countries, majorities said that it would be necessary to increase these costs (a plurality also did so in India, 49 percent to 28 percent). On average, 61 percent supported this idea. Interestingly, the survey found the highest level of support in China and Indonesia (both 83 percent), followed by Australia (81 percent), Chile (79 percent), Great Britain (76 percent), Canada (72 percent), Germany (71 percent), and the United States (65 percent). Four countries were divided and just two leaned against the idea: Nigeria (47 percent to 51 percent) and Russia (36

percent to 50 percent). There were no countries where a clear majority said price increases would not be necessary.²¹⁹

Reactions were more mixed to the question of whether taxes should be increased on the energy sources that contribute to climate change, in order to encourage people and industry to use less. In only nine of the twenty-one countries did a majority or plurality favor such an energy tax increase. Six countries were divided and six were opposed. On average in all countries polled, 50 percent favored raising taxes and 44 percent opposed it. China had the largest majority (85 percent) saying they would support raising taxes on the fuels that contribute most to climate change. The proportion of Chinese respondents favoring higher fuel taxes was 24 points greater than the next largest majorities in Australia and Chile (61 percent in both). Majorities were opposed to higher fuel taxes in Italy (62 percent), South Korea (59 percent), the Philippines (58 percent), Brazil (55 percent), Egypt (52 percent), and the United States (51 percent).²²⁰

However, attitudes shifted sharply under certain conditions. Half of those who did not initially support tax increases were asked whether they would do so if the revenues were “devoted only to increasing energy efficiency and developing energy sources that do not produce climate change.” Another half were asked if they would do so if “your other taxes were reduced by the same amount, keeping your total taxes at the current level.” Large numbers shifted their position under these conditions. Adding those who initially favored increases with those who favored them under these conditions, majorities in every country supported higher energy taxes to reduce consumption. In every country, this measure was supported by a ratio of at least two to one. On average, 77 percent favored the measure if revenues were earmarked and 76 percent if the increase were offset.²²¹

Pew (2009) asked respondents in twenty-five nations if they agreed that “people should be willing to pay higher prices in order to address global climate change.” The question did not specify what the prices would be for, where the revenues would go or how paying these higher prices would help in addressing climate change. Thus it would be expected to get relatively low levels of agreement. Majorities or pluralities in eleven nations agreed, eight disagreed, and six were divided. Overall, 48 percent of respondents in the twenty-five nations polled agreed with the statement, while 44 percent disagreed.²²²

Reducing Reliance on Oil and Coal

To reduce reliance on oil and coal, large majorities in countries around the world favor creating tax incentives to encourage alternative energy sources and requiring automakers to increase fuel efficiency. Views are more mixed on building new nuclear power plants.

Respondents in nineteen countries were asked whether they favored a number of methods for reducing reliance on oil and coal, without specifically mentioning the purpose (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). The most popular of the four proposed measures was “creating tax incentives that would encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.” Majorities in all nineteen countries (on average 80 percent) said they would support such incentives. In nine of the countries, majorities favored them strongly and on average in all the countries 50 percent favored them strongly.²²³

The next most popular measure was to require “automakers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.” This was supported by majorities in sixteen of the nineteen countries (overall average 67 percent). However, only Australians (59 percent) had a majority who supported this idea strongly. The next highest level of strong support was in the United States (50 percent). On average among all of those polled, 34 percent strongly supported this measure.²²⁴

Respondents were divided about “building new nuclear power plants to reduce reliance on oil and coal.” This proposal received majority support in just ten countries (on average 49 percent in favor, with 44 percent opposed).²²⁵

The least popular measure was “increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation,” which received majority support in just four countries (average support 37 percent, with 59 percent opposed).²²⁶

Role of Developing Countries

Majorities in developing as well as developed countries think that developing countries have a responsibility to limit their emissions in an effort to deal with climate change. Among most countries—both developed and developing—there is also a consensus that developed countries should provide developing countries aid as part of a commitment by developing countries to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.

A major controversy in regard to climate change is whether developing countries should be required to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions. A BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll in 2007 introduced respondents to this debate by presenting the two positions. The first position was one taken by the government of many developing countries: “Because countries that are less wealthy produce relatively low emissions per person, they should not be expected to limit their emissions of climate changing gases.” The second was one advocated by governments of some developed nations: “Because total emissions from less-wealthy countries are substantial and growing, these countries should limit their emissions of climate changing gases.”

In eighteen of the twenty-one countries polled, respondents agreed with the position that less-wealthy countries should limit emissions (overall average 59 percent). Publics in just three countries opted instead for the position that less wealthy countries should not be expected to limit emissions: Egypt (53 percent), Nigeria (50 percent), and Italy (49 percent). Those favoring limits on the emissions of less-wealthy countries included some publics whose governments have opposed such agreements, such as a resounding 68-percent majority in China and a plurality in India (33 percent to 24 percent), though many Indians (43 percent) do not have an opinion. Limiting the emissions of less-wealthy countries was also the dominant view in Mexico (75 percent), Kenya (64 percent), Brazil (63 percent), Indonesia (54 percent), the Philippines (49 percent), and Turkey (41 percent).²²⁷

At the same time, there is a consensus that developed countries should provide aid to developing countries as part of a deal whereby developing countries agree to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.

The same poll asked about a possible deal in which “wealthy countries agree to provide less-wealthy countries with financial assistance and technology, while less-wealthy countries agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy countries.” In nineteen countries, a majority favored this idea and in two a plurality did so. All of the wealthy countries polled endorsed the idea by large margins, ranging from 70 percent in the United States to 84 percent in Canada and Australia, as did majorities or pluralities in all of the developing countries polled, including China (90 percent). The two countries with the least enthusiasm were Nigeria (50 percent favor, 46 percent oppose) and India (47 percent favor, 19 percent oppose).²²⁸

Similarly, a WPO/CCGA poll from 2006 to 2007 asked publics in five developing countries: “If the developed countries are willing to provide substantial aid, do you think the less developed countries should make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions?” In all five, majorities or pluralities said they should. Most significantly, this included a large 79-percent majority of Chinese respondents and nearly half of those polled in India (48 percent agree, 29 percent disagree, 23 percent no answer). The survey also asked respondents in three developed countries whether developed countries should provide “substantial aid” to less developed countries that “make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.” Respondents in all three showed a high level of support, including among Americans (64 percent), Poles (84 percent), and Ukrainians (72 percent).²²⁹

Multilateral Efforts to Address Climate Change

Publics in the Muslim world showed mixed views on how helpful UN efforts have been in working to address the problem of climate change. Publics in Europe and the United States showed negative views of multilateral efforts to address climate change, giving poor ratings for European-North American cooperation on climate change. Europeans would like the European Union to play an active role in addressing climate change.

A poll of six predominantly Muslim nations and territories (WPO 2008) found mixed views on how well the United Nations has been dealing with climate change. Asked to rate UN efforts on “working to address the problem of climate change” on a scale with zero meaning not helpful, ten meaning helpful, and five meaning neither helpful nor unhelpful, 38 percent of people surveyed gave a rating below five, 32 percent gave a rating above five, and 13 percent gave a rating of five. The only publics to express strong feelings were in Egypt, where 54 percent said the United Nations was helpful, and in the Palestinian territories, where 70 percent said it was not helpful.²³⁰

A poll across seven European countries, the United States, and Canada found that publics gave poor ratings for European-North American cooperation on climate change (GlobeScan 2008). On average, 58 percent said that transatlantic cooperation was below average, with publics in Germany (71 percent), Spain (70 percent), the United Kingdom (66 percent), and Ireland (64 percent) responding most negatively. Only 19 percent said that the effectiveness of such cooperation was above average, with respondents in Turkey (27 percent), France (24 percent), and Poland (22

percent) answering most positively, while 16 percent said that cooperation between Europe and North America was average.²³¹

A poll of twenty-seven European nations found that large majorities (on average 83 percent) want the European Union to address the problem of climate change, as well the problems of globalization and demographic changes (Eurobarometer 2008). Among these three problems, climate change was assigned the highest priority in every country, with an average of 61 percent choosing this as the most important issue.²³²

Assessing Country's Government in Addressing Problem

Publics gave their governments highly varied ratings in terms of how high a priority they place on addressing climate change. Majorities in nearly all nations polled think that their government should give climate change a higher priority than it does.

In 2009, WPO asked respondents to rate how high a priority their government places on addressing climate change on a zero-to-ten scale with ten being a very high priority. Ratings were highly varied, with two nations standing out: China got a mean rating of 7.31 and Germany got a mean rating of 7.02. These were followed by Britain (5.92), Poland (5.89), and Indonesia (5.85). The publics that gave their government the lowest scores were those in Ukraine (2.18), Iraq (3.65), the United States (3.84), and the Palestinian territories (4.18).

The mean assessment of all governments was 5.06, with an average of 39 percent saying their government gives climate change a relatively high priority (6-10), 35 percent saying it gives climate change a relatively low priority (0-4), and 17 percent in between (responding with a 5).

Respondents were also asked to say how high a priority their government should give climate change (on the scale discussed above). Comparing the two measures, in fifteen out of nineteen nations, majorities indicated that their government should give higher priority to climate change than it does now and in no nation did more than one in three want their nation to give it a lower priority. On average across all nations polled, 60 percent wanted climate change to get a higher priority, 12 percent wanted a lower priority, and 18 percent thought the current priority is about right.

The largest majorities wanting a higher priority were in South Korea (81 percent), Mexico (79 percent), Britain (77 percent), Taiwan (77 percent), France (76 percent), Kenya (71 percent), and Nigeria (70 percent).

In all nations surveyed, no more than one in five people wanted their government to give climate change a lower priority, except in Germany where 27 percent wanted a lower priority. Most Germans (78 percent) believed that their country already put a high priority (6-10) on addressing climate change.

Among the four nations and territories that gave their government the lowest scores on how much they prioritize climate change, majorities favored their government giving it a higher priority in Ukraine (68 percent), and the United States (52 percent), while smaller numbers felt that way in Iraq (39 percent) and the Palestinian territories (29 percent).²³³

Assessments of Leading Country's Role in Addressing Problem

Global publics in recent years have largely disapproved of how the United States is handling the problem of climate change. In general, the United States has been most widely seen as the country having the most negative effect on the world's environment, followed by China, while Germany has received the best ratings.

Majorities or pluralities in nineteen out of twenty-five countries polled disapproved of how the United States is handling global warming or climate change, according to a 2006 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll. On average, 56 percent disapproved and only 27 percent approved. Four European allies of the United States (France 86 percent, Germany 84 percent, Great Britain 79 percent, and Portugal 79 percent) showed the highest level of disapproval, as did Argentina (79 percent). A majority of Americans also disapproved (54 percent). In only three countries did majorities approve of U.S. policies on climate change: Nigeria (67 percent), the Philippines (60 percent), and Kenya (56 percent).²³⁴

In general, the United States has been most widely seen as the country having the most negative effect on the world's environment, followed by China. In a 2008 Pew poll, when asked which country is "hurting the world's environment the

most,” the most common response was the United States. But people are increasingly pointing fingers at China as well. The view that China is most to blame has risen significantly in seventeen of the twenty-four countries where trends are available. China is blamed for environmental problems more often than any other country by people in Japan, South Korea, Australia, the United States, and Germany.²³⁵ In the 2007 Pew poll, in thirty-three of the thirty-seven countries the largest number of respondents named the United States, followed by China.²³⁶

Germany receives the most widespread confidence in its ability to do the right thing in protecting the environment. In the 2008 Pew poll, publics in twenty-four countries were asked which country they would “trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world’s environment.” In ten of the twenty-four countries surveyed, publics had the most confidence in Germany. The United States was cited in five countries—Nigeria, South Africa, Mexico, Tanzania, and not surprisingly, the United States.²³⁷

CHAPTER 5B: WORLD OPINION ON ENERGY SECURITY

Concerns about Energy Security

Publics around the world show high levels of concern about energy security. Large majorities believe that energy shortages and higher prices could lead to destabilization of the world economy, that competition for energy could lead to international conflict and even war, and that the way the world produces energy is causing environmental problems. Large majorities favor addressing energy security as a high foreign policy priority.

Around the world, people express concerns about a variety of possible scenarios involving energy security. In 2006, a British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll of nineteen countries presented three possibilities and asked respondents how concerned they were about them.

On the possibility that **energy shortages and prices will destabilize the world economy**, majorities or pluralities in all nineteen countries expressed concern. In the global average, 77 percent said they were concerned (39 percent very) and 19 percent said they were not concerned. Russians expressed the lowest levels of concern (48 percent), while Filipinos were the most concerned (95 percent, 60 percent very concerned).²³⁸

On the possibility that **competition for energy will lead to greater conflict and war between nations**, majorities in all nineteen countries expressed concern. In the global average, 72 percent said they were concerned (36 percent very) and 22 percent said they were not concerned. Filipinos were again the most concerned (88 percent), while Poles (52 percent) and Russians (56 percent) were the least concerned about energy competition causing these problems.²³⁹

On the possibility that **the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change**, majorities in all nineteen countries expressed concern. In the global average, 81 percent said they were concerned (47 percent very) and 16 percent said they were not concerned. Concern was particularly widespread among Australians (94 percent), Britons (93 percent), Canadians (91 percent), and Italians (91 percent). Publics in Poland (58 percent) and Russia (66 percent) demonstrated considerably less concern.²⁴⁰

The potential for a disruption in energy supply is seen as a critical threat by majorities in several countries. In a WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO)/Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll of eight countries, majorities or pluralities in seven said it was a critical threat, and one said it was an important but not critical. On average among all eight countries, 51 percent called it was a critical threat, 30 percent said it was important but not critical, and 11 percent said it was not an important threat at all.²⁴¹

Europeans and Americans expect that they will be personally affected by the threat of energy dependence in the next ten years. Large majorities in all twelve European countries polled by the German Marshall Fund (GMF) in 2008, as well as in the United States, thought this was likely. On average among the twelve European countries, 81 percent said energy dependence would likely affect them. This belief was most widespread among Germans (92 percent) and Spaniards (91 percent) and less widespread among Turks (59 percent).²⁴²

Majorities in seven countries say that securing adequate supplies of energy should be an important goal for their country (WPO/CCGA 2006), with an average of 65 percent regarding this goal as very important, 26 percent as a somewhat important goal, and 5 percent as not important at all.²⁴³

Multilateral Cooperation on Energy Security

Europeans show strong support for addressing the issue of energy multilaterally rather than through their national governments.

Among citizens of European countries, there is a widespread view that decisions on energy should be made jointly with the European Union, rather than by their government alone. Majorities or pluralities in twenty-four out of twenty-seven countries replied that energy decisions should be made jointly within the European Union, while three countries preferred their national governments making these decisions (Eurobarometer 2008). In the EU average, 63 percent favored joint EU decisions on energy and 33 percent favored national governments making such decisions.²⁴⁴

Approaches to Energy Supply—Renewable Energy

In international polls there is strong support for a variety of methods for addressing the problem of energy supply. These methods include putting greater emphasis on the development of alternative renewable sources such as solar and wind, requiring utilities to use more alternative renewable energy (even if this increases the cost), and providing tax incentives to encourage the development and use of such technologies. There is substantial optimism that investments in alternative energy will pay off economically in the long run.

Global publics widely favor putting greater emphasis on installing wind or solar energy systems. In a poll of twenty-four publics, a majority in twenty-three favored their country putting greater emphasis on installing solar and wind energy systems (WPO 2008). On average, 77 percent supported more emphasis, 8 percent supported less emphasis, and 7 percent supported the same emphasis. Only in Russia did less than a clear majority (50 percent) support a great emphasis on these alternative energies.²⁴⁵

Most also favor the government requiring utilities to use more alternative energy, such as wind and solar, even if this increases the cost of energy in the short run. In twenty-two out of twenty-four publics, a majority of respondents supported the proposal (WPO 2008). In Russia views were divided, and in Azerbaijan support was just a plurality—both of these nations are major oil producers. On average, 69 percent favored requiring utilities to use more alternative energy and 20 percent were opposed.²⁴⁶

There is also support globally for creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power. In a poll of nineteen countries, majorities in every one favored these incentives, with thirteen countries favoring it strongly (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the average of all nineteen countries, 80 percent favored the incentives (50 percent strongly).²⁴⁷

When presented with competing arguments for and against making a major shift to alternative energy sources based on costs, the public is largely in favor of making the shift. In all twenty-four publics polled, most sided with the argument that with the rising cost of energy, such a shift would save money in the long run (WPO 2008). On average, 66 percent of respondents said it would save money in the long run, while 21 percent said it cost so much that it would hurt the economy. Publics in South Korea (86 percent) and France (83 percent) were most convinced by the argument for the switch, while support was more lukewarm in Russia (45 percent), Azerbaijan (52 percent), and Ukraine (54 percent).²⁴⁸

In several questions on energy posed by Eurobarometer, respondents in all fifteen EU member states at the time supported initiatives aimed at developing energy within the European Union and believed alternative energy sources would prove the least expensive, most useful, and best for the environment (2002). Respondents were told that half of energy used in the European Union came from outside the European Union and were presented with five statements on the issue with the option to agree to multiple statements. In the EU average, 52 percent of respondents said more energy sources should be developed inside the European Union; 51 percent said more should be done to encourage energy saving in the European Union; 37 percent called it an urgent issue; 25 percent said energy imports should be reduced; and 12 percent said this was not an urgent issue.²⁴⁹

Respondents in the same poll, asked to look forward to the year 2050, saw alternative energy sources as the *most economical* path for the future. Choosing a maximum of two answers, 40 percent predicted that in 2050 solar power, wind, and biomass would be the least expensive forms of energy, 24 percent said hydroelectric, 21 percent said natural gas, 14 percent said nuclear fusion, 11 percent said coal and peat, 10 percent said nuclear fission, and 7 percent said oil.²⁵⁰ Asked to select what resources would provide the *greatest amount* of useful energy, 27 percent said wind, solar, and biomass would provide the most; 22 percent said nuclear fusion; 20 percent said natural gas; 17 percent said nuclear fission; 17 percent said hydroelectric; 14 percent said oil; and 4 percent said coal and peat.²⁵¹ Finally, asked what resource would be the *best for the environment*, with the option of choosing two, 67 percent chose solar, wind, and biomass; 38 percent chose hydroelectric; 10 percent chose natural gas; 5 percent chose nuclear fusion; 3 percent chose coal and peat; 3 percent chose nuclear fission; and 2 percent chose oil.²⁵²

In the same 2002 poll, Europeans also favored research into renewable energy sources over other types of energy-related research. Presented with seven energy-related research options and allowed multiple answers, an average of 69 percent favored research into renewable energy sources such as solar and wind power; 51 percent favored research into cleaner means of transport such as electric cars; 21 percent favored research into nuclear fusion; 13 percent favored

research into gas; 10 percent favored research into nuclear fission; 6 percent favored research into oil; and 5 percent favored research into coal.²⁵³

Approaches to Energy Supply—Conservation

In every major country polled, majorities favor putting greater emphasis on modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient. Most publics favor requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently, even if this might make some products more expensive. Over half of publics—and an average of just under half of people across countries—favor an extra charge for the purchase of models or appliances or cars that are not energy efficient. Fewer than half of publics support increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation, but support rises to a majority in most countries if the revenues are earmarked for developing alternative energy or if the tax is offset by other tax reductions. Large majorities in nearly all countries favor requiring auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

Publics around the world widely favor putting greater emphasis on modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient. Asked whether they supported more, less, or the same level of emphasis on modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient, all twenty-four publics polled favored greater emphasis (WPO 2008). In the average of all publics, 74 percent favored more emphasis, 11 percent favored less emphasis, and 8 percent favored the same emphasis. Support ranged from 54 percent in India and the Palestinian territories to 89 percent in Britain and France.²⁵⁴

Support is also widespread for requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently. Nineteen out of twenty-four publics polled favored mandatory energy efficiency standards for businesses, even if this might make some products more expensive, while three publics were opposed and two were divided (WPO 2008). Taiwan (80 percent), Great Britain (79 percent), and South Korea (74 percent) showed the highest levels of support for the measure. The five nations not in support of the idea—Azerbaijan (55 percent), Russia (43 percent), and Indonesia (47 percent)—as well as the two that were divided—Mexico and Nigeria—were all major oil producers.²⁵⁵

As an additional conservation measure, publics in fifteen out of twenty-four countries polled support adding an extra charge for the purchase of models or appliances or cars that are not energy efficient. Seven countries were opposed, and two were divided (WPO 2008). On average, 48 percent of respondents across the twenty-four countries declared themselves in favor and 39 percent were opposed. Support for such a charge was highest in Kenya (74 percent), Italy (69 percent), Indonesia (61 percent), and France (60 percent). The publics with a majority rejecting the idea included Thailand (64 percent), the Palestinian Territories (58 percent), Mexico (57 percent), Germany (54 percent), Jordan (52 percent), and the United States (52 percent).²⁵⁶

On the other hand, there is significant opposition to increasing taxes to encourage conservation. In fifteen out of nineteen countries asked, most publics rejected higher energy taxes, while just four countries were in favor (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the average of nineteen countries, 59 percent opposed increasing energy taxes for conservation and 37 percent favored such taxes. Among the four countries that favored higher energy taxes were India (52 percent)—an emerging economic power with rising energy needs—Australia (69 percent), Great Britain (62 percent), and Kenya (60 percent). Opposition to these measures was especially strong in Poland (87 percent), Brazil (86 percent), Ukraine (86 percent), and Russia (84 percent).²⁵⁷

Despite this general resistance to increased energy taxes, additional polling shows that those who initially oppose the idea are willing to change their minds in significant numbers if the resulting tax revenues are earmarked for research and development of alternative energy sources—or when the tax increases are offset by other tax cuts. When either of those caveats is included, support for energy taxes rises to a substantial majority.

Large majorities also favor mandating increased vehicle fuel efficiency, even if this means higher car prices. Among nineteen publics polled, seventeen favored higher fuel efficiency standards despite higher car prices; one country was opposed; and one country was divided (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the average of all nineteen countries, 67 percent favored higher standards and 26 percent opposed them. The most enthusiastic proponents were the Australians (88 percent in favor), Italians (85 percent), Ukrainians (81 percent), and Germans (80 percent). Respondents were least supportive in Egypt, where a slight majority (51 percent) opposed it (47 percent in favor); the Philippines, where views were divided (49 percent favor, 50 percent oppose); and Poland, where just a plurality favored it (48 percent favor, 34 percent oppose).²⁵⁸

Approaches to Energy Supply-- Fossil fuels

Publics are divided as to whether greater emphasis should be placed on building coal or oil-fired power plants. Expectations are high that the price of oil will rise dramatically over the next decade. All nations polled say that their government should plan on the assumption that oil is running out and that a major effort is necessary to replace it. Europeans are divided and Americans lean against the idea of their country using its military force to ensure the supply of oil.

Putting greater emphasis on building coal or oil-fired power plants is a divisive issue among global publics. When 24 publics were asked whether they would favor putting more emphasis on building coal or oil-fired power plants, 12 publics supported more emphasis, seven supported less emphasis, one public favored the same emphasis, and four were divided (WPO 2008). In the average of all nations, 40 percent wanted more emphasis on building coal or oil-fired power plants, 33 percent wanted less, and 17 percent wanted no change. The countries most positive about increasing emphasis on coal or oil-fired power were Kenya (69 percent), Jordan (63 percent), Argentina (60 percent), Nigeria (56 percent), and Turkey (52 percent). At the same time there was little support for putting less emphasis on coal and oil, with Germany the only country where a majority (62 percent) preferred this approach, although nearly half favored less emphasis in the United States (49 percent), France (46 percent), and Italy (46 percent).²⁵⁹

The belief that the price of oil will be significantly higher within the next decade is widespread. Out of sixteen nations polled on their view of what the cost of oil will be in ten years, publics in fifteen nations said the price of oil will be much higher and one national public said it will be somewhat higher (WPO 2008). In the global average, 55 percent of respondents predicted prices will be much higher, 24 percent said they would be somewhat higher, 8 percent said they would remain about the same, 5 percent said they would be somewhat lower, and 2 percent said they would be much lower. The publics with the greatest number of people who think prices will be much higher were France (81 percent), Indonesia (74 percent), and Egypt (67 percent), while the lowest percentages saying oil prices will be much higher were found in China (29 percent), Russia (35 percent), and Nigeria (42 percent).²⁶⁰

Majorities in all sixteen nations polled say their governments should be making plans based on the assumption that oil is running out and will need to be replaced as a primary source of energy. (WPO 2008). In the global average, 70 percent of respondents said governments should plan on oil running out, while 22 percent said governments should assume enough new oil would be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future. The largest majorities endorsing the thesis of future oil scarcity were found in South Korea (97 percent), France (91 percent), Mexico (83 percent), and China (80 percent). The smallest were in the energy-producing nations of Russia (53 percent) and Nigeria (45 percent), along with India (54 percent).²⁶¹

In a follow-on question, respondents were asked to describe the assumptions they believed were informing their government's actions. Respondents in twelve nations said their governments were operating under the assumption that oil was running out and must be replaced, three nations said their governments were thinking that enough new oil would be found, and one country was divided (WPO 2008). In the global average, 53 percent said their government was assuming oil was running out and 35 percent said their government was assuming enough oil would be found. The belief that the government is assuming oil will run out was particularly prevalent in South Korea (79 percent), China (70 percent), and Egypt (67 percent). A majority in the United States (57 percent)—the world's biggest consumer of oil—believed in 2008 that their government was acting on the assumption that oil can remain a primary source of energy. This was also true in Nigeria (63 percent). However, while most Americans believed their government's assumptions were incorrect, most Nigerians thought they were correct. Interestingly, in four of the five countries that are net oil exporters, the perception that their government is planning for oil to run out was below the average of 53 percent. These included Azerbaijan (31 percent), Nigeria (32 percent), Russia (34 percent), and Mexico (49 percent). The exception was Iran, which was well above the average, with 63 percent believing that their government was planning for oil to run out.²⁶²

The idea of a country using force to ensure the supply of oil is divisive among European nations, while the U.S. public leans against the idea. When publics in ten European countries and the United States were asked whether they approved of their country using its military force to ensure the supply of oil, five European countries and the United States disapproved of such a use of force, four countries approved, and one country was divided. In the average of ten European countries, 42 percent approved of using force to ensure the supply of oil and 51 percent disapproved. Disapproval was most widespread among Germans (61 percent) and Italians (56 percent), while half of Americans disapproved (50

percent). Turks most widely approved of using force to secure the oil supply (69 percent), followed by the Portuguese (57 percent).²⁶³

Approaches to Energy Supply—Nuclear Energy

Internationally, views are mixed as to whether greater emphasis should be placed on building nuclear power plants or if new power plants should be built. However, Europeans show fairly favorable views on nuclear energy.

Globally, building nuclear power plants is a less popular approach to securing energy needs than other strategies. Out of twenty-one publics asked whether they favored emphasizing building nuclear power plants, an average of 40 percent of global respondents wanted more emphasis on building nuclear power plants, 30 percent wanted less, and 17 percent wanted the emphasis to remain about the same (WPO 2008). The most enthusiastic support for nuclear power was found in China (63 percent), Jordan (58 percent), Kenya (57 percent), Nigeria (56 percent), Argentina (55 percent) and South Korea (55 percent). Jordan and Nigeria have each announced plans to build their first nuclear power plants. China, South Korea and Argentina all have significant nuclear power production now. Italy closed down its nuclear energy program in 1988—following a referendum held after the Chernobyl disaster—and has debated a resumption of the program.²⁶⁴

Support for building nuclear power plants to reduce reliance on coal and oil is lukewarm. Twelve out of nineteen countries polled said they favored new nuclear plants, five countries said they were opposed, and two countries were divided (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the global average, 49 percent favored new plants and 44 percent were opposed. Some of the highest support for this approach came from India (66 percent), though support was also quite high in Egypt (69 percent), Kenya (66 percent), and South Korea (65 percent). Ukraine showed the strongest opposition (67 percent), while opposition was also significant in Germany (62 percent), Russia (60 percent), and France (57 percent).²⁶⁵

An earlier GlobeScan poll also showed little support for building new nuclear energy sources, but many preferred using those already built. Out of eighteen countries asked about their support for nuclear power, seven countries supported using what was built without building new plants, four countries supported building more plants, four countries supported closing all plants, and three countries were divided (GlobeScan 2005). In the average of all eighteen countries, 34 percent of respondents favored using existing plants without building new ones, 28 percent favored building more plants, and 25 percent favored closing all plants. South Koreans (52 percent) and Americans (40 percent) had the largest numbers in favor of building additional plants; Japan (61 percent) and Hungary (55 percent) were most in favor of utilizing current nuclear sources; and Morocco (49 percent) and Jordan (41 percent) had the largest numbers favoring the closure of all nuclear plants.²⁶⁶

More recently, a large number of European publics agreed with the idea of using nuclear energy to enable European countries to diversify their energy sources. Out of the twenty-seven EU member states polled on whether they agreed or disagreed with using nuclear energy to enable European countries to diversify their energy sources, twenty-six agreed with using nuclear energy for this purpose and one country disagreed (Eurobarometer 2008). In the EU average, 64 percent agreed and 21 percent disagreed.²⁶⁷

Europeans also agree that their dependence on oil could be reduced if they used more nuclear energy. Among twenty-seven countries asked whether they agreed or disagreed that nuclear energy could be used to lessen this dependence, twenty-five agreed with the statement, one country disagreed, and one country was divided (Eurobarometer 2008).²⁶⁸

Attitudes about nuclear research among Europeans are somewhat favorable, with the goal of increasing safety as the most widely favored reason for funding research. In April 2002, Eurobarometer presented four possible reasons for funding nuclear research, allowing respondents to pick more than one. In the EU average, 48 percent favored research for increasing the safety of nuclear power stations in the European Union, 43 percent favored research for achieving a broadly accepted solution for the disposal of radioactive waste in the European Union, 41 percent favored research for improving safety and waste disposal in non-EU countries, and 23 percent favored research for reducing the cost of nuclear power.²⁶⁹

Dealing With Energy-Producing Countries

Europeans and Americans are divided about how best to deal with their dependence on energy-producing countries. There is significant concern about dependence on Russian energy. Views are divided as to whether Russia can be trusted to follow through on its commitment to deliver energy. Such confidence in other energy-providing countries is moderately low for Saudi Arabia, very low for Iran, quite low for Venezuela, and very high for Canada.

Europeans and Americans show little consensus on the best ways to ensure a stable energy supply when dealing with energy suppliers whose governments show authoritarian tendencies. Publics in twelve European countries and the United States were presented with three options for ensuring a stable supply of energy: increasing cooperation with energy-producing countries “even if their governments are undemocratic,” reducing energy dependence on other countries “even if energy prices would rise sharply,” or applying diplomatic pressure “even if this increases tensions with oil producing countries” (GMF 2008). Seven countries favored reducing energy dependence on other countries, five countries favored increasing cooperation with energy-producing countries, and one country was divided. In the average of twelve European countries, 35 percent favored increased cooperation, 35 percent favored reduced dependence, and 18 percent favored diplomatic pressure. Romanians (54 percent) and Poles (51 percent) were the most in favor of increasing cooperation, while Americans (48 percent) and Britons (47 percent) were the most in favor of reducing dependence.²⁷⁰

Russia as an Energy Provider

Concerns about dependence on Russia as an energy provider are widespread in some European countries. Among five countries, asked how concerned they were that their country had become too dependent on Russia for its energy resources, four expressed concern and one country was divided (Pew 2008). In the average of all five countries, 60 percent said they were concerned and 35 percent said they were not.²⁷¹

The same question on dependence on Russian energy was also put to five Eastern European countries, most recently in spring 2007, with publics showing similar concerns. Four countries expressed concern and one country was not concerned. In the average of all five countries, 57 percent said they were concerned and 38 percent said they were not.²⁷²

Additional findings from the German Marshall Fund demonstrate concern about Russia as an energy provider in European nations as well as the United States. When publics in twelve European countries and the United States were asked whether they were concerned or not concerned with Russia’s role as an energy provider, respondents in eleven European countries and the United States expressed concern and one country was divided (2008). In the average of twelve European countries, 62 percent said they were concerned with Russia’s role and 31 percent said they were not concerned. Poles (81 percent) and Germans (78 percent) showed the highest levels of concern.²⁷³

Overall, publics are divided on whether Russia can be trusted to fulfill its commitment to deliver energy to other countries (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). Out of nineteen countries globally asked whether they trusted Russia to follow through on their commitment to deliver energy to other countries, nine countries said they trusted Russia, seven countries said they did not, and three were divided. In the global average, 45 percent thought Russia could be trusted and 45 percent thought Russia could not be trusted. Among the most confident were Australians (62 percent) and Indians (61 percent). Interestingly, most Ukrainians (59 percent) also said they trust their much-larger neighbor as an energy supplier, despite past disputes with Russia’s state-controlled gas monopoly. A majority of Americans (54 percent) also expressed confidence in Russia, as did a slim majority of Canadians (52 percent). Majorities in six countries lacked confidence in Russia, especially Brazil (76 percent), South Korea (67 percent), and Poland (61 percent), a major Russian customer.²⁷⁴

Europeans see conflict between Russia and its neighbors (such as the recent conflict with Georgia) as capable of having an effect on the energy supply in the European Union. All twenty-seven EU member states polled said the conflict between Russia and Georgia that flared up earlier in 2008 could have an impact on the security of the energy supply in the European Union (Eurobarometer 2008). In the EU average, 60 percent thought conflict between Russia and Georgia could affect the European Union’s energy supply and 21 percent thought it could not.²⁷⁵

Other Energy-Providing Countries

Trust in other energy suppliers varies significantly, depending on the country. When nineteen countries were asked about their confidence that several energy-exporting countries would follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries, overall trust was moderately low for Saudi Arabia, very low for Iran, quite low for Venezuela, and very high for Canada (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).

There is some skepticism about Saudi Arabia's reliability on its commitments as an energy supplier. Among nineteen countries polled, twelve publics said it could not be trusted on energy delivery, five said it could, and two were divided. In the global average, 46 percent of respondents said they did not trust Saudi Arabia on energy delivery and 41 percent said they did. Five countries endorsed Saudi trustworthiness: Egypt (83 percent), the Philippines (63 percent), Australia (58 percent), Kenya (55 percent), and India (48 percent). Twelve countries did not, including Brazil (81 percent) and, not surprisingly, Israel (61 percent). Some of the least confident were major Saudi customers, such as Italy (57 percent), France (56 percent), and South Korea (55 percent). Also skeptical was Saudi Arabia's close ally, the United States (56 percent).²⁷⁶

Trust in Iran to deliver on its energy commitments is the lowest out of all suppliers evaluated. On Iran, seventeen countries said it could not be trusted on energy delivery and just two said that it could. In the global average, 62 percent said they did not trust Iran while 26 percent said they did. Only in Egypt and India did majorities say they trusted Iran as an energy supplier (73 percent and 51 percent, respectively). Germans (86 percent) were especially skeptical of Iran, followed by Brazilians (84 percent), Americans (83 percent), Italians (80 percent), and Israelis (80 percent).²⁷⁷

Confidence in Venezuela as an energy supplier is somewhat low. Out of the nineteen countries polled, ten countries said Venezuela could not be trusted, five said it could, and four were divided. In the global average, 43 percent said they did not trust Venezuela and 35 percent said they did. Publics in Australia (55 percent) and Mexico (53 percent) exhibited the greatest trust in Venezuela, followed by the United States (49 percent), despite the countries' shaky relations. Most Brazilians (77 percent) and Egyptians (53 percent) lacked trust in Venezuela.²⁷⁸

Canada is the energy supplier most widely trusted by other nations. Seventeen countries said Canada could be trusted on energy delivery and just two said it could not. In the global average, 60 percent said they trusted Canada and 24 percent said they did not trust it. Only majorities in Brazil (68 percent) and Egypt (53 percent) said they lacked confidence in Canada as an energy supplier.²⁷⁹

CHAPTER 6: WORLD OPINION ON MANAGING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

General Views of Globalization and International Trade

International polls find strong support for globalization, though views lean moderately toward the position that the pace of globalization is too fast. People generally see international trade as positive for their country, their self and family, consumers, and their nation's companies. However, views are more mixed about the impact of international trade on jobs and the environment. Polling conducted in the spring of 2009—during the depths of the global recession—found some softening of majority support for globalization in general with majorities in many nations favoring a temporary increase in protectionism in light of the recession.

Globalization

Several international polls have found robust support for globalization. Asked in a 2009 Pew Global Attitudes poll about “the growing trade and business ties between [survey country] and other countries,” large majorities in every one of the twenty-five nations polled responded that it was a good thing for their country. Publics in India (96 percent), China (93 percent), and South Korea (92 percent) were the most positive, while the lowest levels of enthusiasm were found in Argentina (65 percent), Turkey (64 percent), Jordan (60 percent), the United States (65 percent), and Egypt (67 percent). Overall, an average of 81 percent of respondents said that it was a good thing while 16 percent said globalization is bad.

When asked in the same poll if these growing ties were good or bad *for them and their families*, support was a bit lower, but majorities in all nations responded that it was a good thing, with the lowest being in Lebanon (55 percent), Jordan (57 percent), and Argentina (57 percent). Overall, 75 percent of respondents said that globalization was a good thing for them and their families, while 17 percent said it was bad.²⁸⁰

A WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll of twenty-five nations asked respondents if they believed “globalization, especially the increasing connections of their economy with others around the world” was mostly good or mostly bad for their country. Majorities or pluralities in all twenty-five nations responded that globalization was mostly good. On average, 63 percent said it was mostly good and 22 percent said it was mostly bad. The highest levels of enthusiasm were found in Kenya (89 percent), China (87 percent), and South Korea (86 percent), while the lowest levels of support were found in Mexico (41 percent), Russia (41 percent), and the Philippines (49 percent).²⁸¹

Defining globalization as “the increased trade between countries in goods, services, and investment,” people in nineteen countries were asked whether it is positive or negative for “you and your family's interests” (GlobeScan 2004). Majorities or pluralities in fifteen countries said globalization's effect was positive. In two countries, pluralities said it was negative (France and Uruguay), and in two countries respondents were divided (Argentina and Turkey). On average, 55 percent globally said globalization was positive and 25 percent said it was negative.²⁸² In the same year GlobeScan asked the same question in a separate poll of seven African countries. In all, a majority of respondents replied that globalization was positive (65 percent) and 17 percent said it was negative.²⁸³

At the same time, there seems to be substantial concern that globalization is occurring too quickly. A British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll in twenty-nine countries asked respondents whether they thought economic globalization, including trade and investment, was growing too quickly or too slowly. Majorities or pluralities in twenty countries said it was growing too quickly, in six countries majorities or pluralities said it was growing too slowly, and in three countries majorities or pluralities were divided. On average globally, 51 percent said economic globalization was growing too quickly and 36 percent said it was growing too slowly. Countries with the largest majorities saying it was growing too quickly were the United Arab Emirates (77 percent), Egypt (77 percent), Australia (73 percent), China (72 percent), and Spain (68 percent), while those with majorities saying it was growing too slowly were Turkey (71 percent), the Philippines (71 percent), Portugal (59 percent), and Indonesia (54 percent).²⁸⁴

In Europe, globalization appears to be associated heavily in public perceptions with the export of jobs. Eurobarometer polled thirty European countries in 2008 on what globalization brings to mind from a list of options. In the average of all thirty countries, 36 percent said that globalization brings to mind the relocation of some companies to countries

where labor is cheaper, 18 percent said it reminds them of opportunities for their country's companies in terms of new outlets, 16 percent said it brings to mind foreign investment in their country, and 12 percent said it reminds them of increased competition for their country's companies. In twenty-one countries, the relocation of companies was the most common answer and in four countries it was the answer of a majority (France, 63 percent; Germany, 59 percent; Luxembourg, 56 percent; and Finland, 55 percent).²⁸⁵

International Trade

International trade is generally seen in a positive light. Between 2006 and 2008, WPO/Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) asked respondents in twenty-one countries to rate the effect of international trade in a number of dimensions. People in nearly all countries said that the effect of trade was mostly good on the general economy, domestic companies, and themselves.

- On the effect of trade on **their country's economy**, twenty-one nations said it was good and one nation was divided. On average, 72 percent of surveyed respondents said trade was good for their economy and 21 percent said it was bad. The highest levels of enthusiasm for trade were found in Peru (92 percent), China (88 percent), Israel (88 percent), and Azerbaijan and Kenya (both 85 percent). The least enthusiasm for trade was found in Egypt (49 percent) and the United States (54 percent).²⁸⁶
- On the effect of trade on **companies in their country**, all twenty-one nations said it had a good effect. On average, 66 percent of respondents in all countries surveyed said that trade had a good effect and 25 percent said it had a bad effect.²⁸⁷
- On the effect of trade on their **standard of living**, people in twenty nations said trade was good and one nation said trade was bad. On average, 59 percent of respondents in all countries surveyed said it had a good effect and 25 percent said it had a bad effect.²⁸⁸
- On the effect of trade on **consumers such as themselves**, people in all twenty nations surveyed said trade was good. On average, 65 percent said it was good and 23 percent said it was bad.²⁸⁹

These findings were echoed by a Pew poll that asked whether growing trade and business ties between their country and other countries were a good thing for **themselves and their family**. Respondents in all twenty-five nations polled tended to see these trends as a good thing. In the average of all twenty-five countries, 75 percent of the public said growing trade and business ties were a good thing for themselves and their family and 17 percent said they were a bad thing.²⁹⁰

Only on the question of the effect of trade on jobs and the environment did WPO find a significant divergence from these results.

- While eighteen nations said trade had a good effect on **job creation** in their country, three said it had a bad effect. In the average of all twenty-one nations, 59 percent said it was good and 30 percent said it was bad.²⁹¹
- Although fourteen nations said trade had a good effect on **job security** for their country's workers, four nations said trade had a bad effect, and two nations were divided. On average across all countries surveyed, 50 percent said it was good and 35 percent said it was bad.²⁹²
- Finally, ten nations said trade had a positive impact on the **environment**, seven said trade was bad for the environment, and four nations were divided on the question. On average across all nations, 44 percent said it was good and 40 percent said it was bad.²⁹³

Response to 2009 Recession

WPO conducted a poll of twenty-one nations in the spring of 2009, during the depths of the recession.²⁹⁴ There were some modest signs of softening of support for globalization, as compared to a poll using the same question from late 2006 to early 2008. Of the seventeen nations polled during both periods, publics in eight nations became more negative on globalization, those in four nations more positive, and those in four nations did not have a significant change. On average, there was an 11 percent decrease in “mostly good” responses (63 percent to 52 percent) and a 5 percent increase in “mostly bad” responses (22 percent to 27 percent). Between 2006 and 2008 respondents in all seventeen nations said that globalization was mostly good, but in 2009 those in three nations shifted to a predominantly negative view.

Publics with the greatest increase in “mostly bad” responses were in the Palestinian territories (28 percent to 58 percent), Mexico (22 percent to 46 percent), and Indonesia (31 percent to 44 percent), shifting these countries to a predominantly negative viewpoint. Of the nations which became more positive about globalization, the publics with the greatest increases in “mostly good” responses were in Turkey (39 percent to 51 percent), Poland (52 percent to 59 percent), and South Korea (86 percent to 90 percent).

The 2009 WPO poll also found some support for a temporary increase in protectionism as a response to the recession. Respondents in nineteen countries were asked, “Do you think in the current economic crisis it is a good idea for our government to try to help [your country’s] companies by making it harder for foreign companies to sell products here or do you think that would be a bad idea because other countries will then do the same thing to our companies?” Publics in eleven nations said that it is a good idea, while majorities in seven nations said that it is a bad idea (one nation was divided). On average, 48 percent of all respondents said it is a good idea for their government to try to help companies in their nation this way, as opposed to 43 percent who said that it would be a bad idea. Majorities in Nigeria (70 percent), Egypt (69 percent), and Turkey (67 percent) had the most positive views of temporary protectionism, while majorities in Germany (68 percent), Great Britain (68 percent), and South Korea (68 percent) had the most negative views.²⁹⁵

International Regulation of Financial Institutions

Global publics show very strong support for the broad idea of having a global regulating body to ensure that big financial institutions follow international standards. However publics are divided on whether nations should be free to regulate their own banks that operate internationally. This suggests that some people have not thought through the implications of international regulation of financial institutions.

A 2009 WPO poll across nineteen countries found that publics are for the most part supportive of a global regulating body to monitor big financial institutions and make sure they follow international standards. Respondents were presented two statements:

- A. To prevent international economic instability, there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions to make sure they follow international standards.
- B. A global financial regulating body is a bad idea because it would interfere in our economy and could make it less productive.

Publics in seventeen nations favored a global regulating body—position A. Only one chose position B and one was divided. On average, 57 percent of respondents said that there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions as opposed to 32 percent who said that it would be a bad idea. Publics in China (79 percent), Nigeria (72 percent), and Germany (71 percent) had the most supportive views of such a regulating body. The one nation opposed was the United States (52 percent chose position B) and Russia was divided.²⁹⁶

However, when the same poll highlighted the potential loss of national control, publics in most countries showed less enthusiasm for such international regulation, and eight countries shifted their position. The question presented two statements:

- A. The world economy is so interconnected that nations should agree on standards to regulate banks that operate internationally.
- B. Each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own decisions about regulating its banks when they operate internationally.

Publics in eight nations favored setting international standards to regulate banks that operate internationally, publics in eight nations believed that each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own decisions about regulating its banks, and publics in three nations were divided. On average, 45 percent of respondents said that nations should agree on standards to regulate banks internationally, as opposed to 47 percent who said that each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own regulatory decisions.

Publics in Nigeria (58 percent), Germany (56 percent), and France (55 percent) had the most supportive views of international regulation, while publics in South Korea (66 percent), Mexico (60 percent), Pakistan (58 percent), and the United States (55 percent) had the strongest views in opposition to such regulation.²⁹⁷

Eight publics gave differing answers to the two questions on international regulation. Publics in four nations (Mexico, Egypt, South Korea, and Iraq) shifted from majority or plurality support in the more general question to opposition in the more specific one. Three moved from support to a divided position (Great Britain, Poland, and the Palestinian territories). Two moved from a divided response to opposition to setting international regulation (Russia and Turkey).

Including Labor and Environmental Standards in Trade Agreements

Consistent with concerns about the impact of international trade on jobs and the environment, overwhelming majorities around the world, including in developing countries, support including labor and environmental standards in trade agreements.

A major controversy in trade negotiations has been whether to include labor and environmental standards in trade agreements. Concerns about the effect of trade on jobs as well as the environment has prompted labor and environmental leaders in developed countries to insist that trade agreements include requirements for signatory countries to comply with international labor and environmental standards to prevent a “race to the bottom,” as companies move to countries with minimal protection to cut costs. On the other hand, the leaders of less developed nations have generally opposed such provisions as protectionist ones that would undermine their ability to compete in major markets such as Europe and the United States.

World public opinion clearly sides with proponents of such standards. WPO/CCGA asked two questions related to minimum standards in international trade agreements between 2006 and 2008:

- On requiring countries that are part of international trade agreements to maintain minimum standards for **working conditions**, all eighteen countries polled said such standards should be required. On average globally, 81 percent said they should be required and 10 percent said they should not be required.²⁹⁸
- On requiring countries that are part of international trade agreements to maintain minimum standards for **protection of the environment**, all seventeen countries polled said such standards should be required. On average across all countries polled, 84 percent said they should be required and 8 percent said they should not be required.²⁹⁹

It should be noted that this support included overwhelming majorities in developing countries, such as China, whose leaders oppose such provisions. It is possible that the requirement of higher standards is attractive to the general public because it generates outside pressure to improve working conditions in developing countries.

Assessments of Countries' Fairness in Trade

Inhabitants of developing countries generally see rich countries as not playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries. Africans perceive that they do not benefit from trade as much as rich countries do. Europeans have mixed views on whether U.S. trade practices are fair, but lean toward seeing Japan as fair.

Nineteen countries were asked whether they agreed that “rich countries are playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries” (GlobeScan 2004). Twelve countries disagreed with the statement, five agreed, and two were divided on it. On average, 56 percent disagreed and 31 percent agreed. Interestingly, those saying that rich countries are being fair did not include publics in the rich countries themselves, but developing countries such as Mexico (61 percent), Indonesia (59 percent), and India (55 percent).³⁰⁰

When seven African countries were asked the same question in a separate poll, respondents in six countries said rich countries were not playing fair and one was divided (GlobeScan 2004). On average across all seven countries, 60 percent said rich countries were not playing fair and 30 percent said they were playing fair.³⁰¹

The same poll also found that most disagreed with the statement that “poor countries benefit as much as rich countries from free trade and globalization.” Out of the six countries asked, only South Africa agreed (52 percent). Five countries disagreed, with Cote d’Ivoire (77 percent) and Zimbabwe (71 percent) disagreeing the most. In the average of all seven countries, 57 percent disagreed and 35 percent agreed.³⁰²

Europeans have mixed views on whether U.S. trade practices are fair, but lean toward seeing Japan as fair. In a poll of six European countries (CCGA/GMF 2002), a majority of Germans (58 percent) and a plurality of Dutch (46 percent) and Poles (39 percent) said that the United States is practicing fair trade with Europe, a majority of the French (74 percent) said it is practicing unfair trade, and Britons and Italians were divided. On average across all six countries, 44 percent said the United States is practicing unfair trade and 43 percent said it is practicing fair trade.³⁰³ In the same poll, majorities of Germans (63 percent) and Dutch (51 percent) and pluralities of Britons (48 percent) and Poles (43 percent) said Japan is practicing fair trade, while a plurality of the French (47 percent) said it is practicing unfair trade and Italians were divided. In the average of all six countries, 48 percent said Japan is practicing fair trade and 31 percent said it is practicing unfair trade.³⁰⁴

Regional Trade Relations

Pacific Rim nations place a high priority on economic relations with each other and generally favor creating free trade relations with each other, though Americans have more mixed views. China, Japan, and South Korea favor a free trade agreement with the Association of Southeast Nations (ASEAN). They also favor an East Asia free trade area, but differ on whether to include the United States in it. Views are divided as to whether growing economic relations increase or decrease the likelihood of military conflict. Europeans and Americans favor a new initiative to enhance transatlantic trade and investment ties.

A poll of five East Asian countries (China, Japan, South Korea, Indonesia, and Vietnam) and the United States found that respondents in all six countries place a high priority on their trade relations with each other (CCGA 2008). Asked how important on a scale from zero to ten (ten meaning extremely important) were economic relations such as trade and investment with each country, all countries received fairly high ratings, with the following means: United States 8.0,³⁰⁵ China 7.5,³⁰⁶ Japan 7.5,³⁰⁷ South Korea 6.5,³⁰⁸ and Indonesia 6.0.³⁰⁹ When asked about economic relations with the European Union as a whole, the mean response of the six countries polled was 7.3.³¹⁰

The same poll also found that publics in China, Japan, and South Korea generally favor “a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs” among themselves. Among the three Asian countries, an average of 74 percent of respondents favored a free trade agreement with the United States.³¹¹ Similarly, 71 percent of respondents in the United States, China, and South Korea favored a free trade agreement with Japan. On both questions, majorities in all polled countries favored the respective agreements.³¹²

There was some divergence by respondents from the United States, though, on the prospect of free trade with China and South Korea. A majority of U.S. respondents (54 percent) opposed a free trade agreement with China, even though South Koreans (67 percent) and Japanese (53 percent) favored it.³¹³ Likewise, people in the United States were divided on the idea of a free trade agreement with South Korea, while Chinese (82 percent) and Japanese (63 percent) were in favor.³¹⁴

Regarding regional trade initiatives, the notion of a free trade agreement with ASEAN countries won strong support in China (84 percent), South Korea (76 percent), and Japan (63 percent).³¹⁵ Similarly, majorities in China (84 percent), South Korea (86 percent), and Japan (70 percent) all favored an East Asia free trade area including all three countries.³¹⁶ However, the three countries were divided over whether to include the United States in such a free trade area. While the Chinese favored the idea (67 percent), majorities were opposed in Japan (57 percent) and South Korea (57 percent).³¹⁷

Finally, pollsters asked publics in China, Japan, and South Korea if greater trade and cultural contact between countries in East Asia in the past ten years has increased or decreased the possibility of military conflict in the region. The South Koreans (59 percent) responded that trade and cultural contact had decreased the possibility of conflict, while a majority

of Chinese (58 percent) responded that the possibility of conflict has actually been increased. The Japanese were divided.³¹⁸

Atlantic Trade Relations

Europeans and Americans express support for greater economic ties across the Atlantic. In a GMF poll of six European nations and the United States, respondents were told, “There has been talk recently of a new effort to deepen the economic ties between the European Union and the United States, by making transatlantic trade and investment easier,” and asked, “Would you support a transatlantic initiative like this?” All seven countries favored the new effort by significant majorities (2007). In the average of seven countries, 67 percent favored a transatlantic economic initiative and 24 percent were opposed to it. The highest majorities were in Italy (75 percent) and Britain (74 percent); the lowest was in Slovakia (57 percent).³¹⁹

The World Bank and IMF

In general, majorities in most countries express a positive view of the influence of international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While both get mildly positive ratings in nearly all countries, the World Bank is more popular than the IMF and a few countries, particularly Argentina and Brazil, have distinctly negative views of the IMF. Publics in many beneficiary countries show high levels of enthusiasm, while those in donor countries are more modest in their support, though still predominantly positive.

The World Trade Organization

The World Trade Organization has a positive international image and there is support for strengthening it. Most countries polled, including the United States, say that their government should comply with adverse WTO decisions.

Global Corporations

Views of the international role of global corporations are mixed. Generally speaking, people are inclined to believe they have a positive influence internationally, but also lean toward not trusting them to operate in the best interests of their society. Africans, especially, hold a very positive view of global corporations and trust them to operate in the best interests of their society.

In a global context, people are inclined to see global companies as having a positive influence. When respondents in thirty-two countries were asked whether global companies were having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world, respondents in twenty-two countries said they were having a mainly positive influence, eight countries said they were having a mainly negative influence, and two countries were divided (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). The countries where global corporations were viewed in the most positive light were Nigeria (67 percent positive), South Korea (61 percent), Brazil (60 percent), and the Philippines (60 percent). The most negative were Italy (51 percent negative), Australia (49 percent), and Britain (47 percent). On average across all thirty-two countries, 41 percent said global companies were having a positive influence and 26 percent said they were having a negative influence.³²⁰

However, when the question was placed in a domestic context, views of corporations became more negative. A poll of twenty countries asked whether respondents trusted global companies “to operate in the best interests of our society” (GlobeScan 2004). In eleven countries, most respondents said they had little or no trust, while those in nine countries said they trusted these companies. On average, 51 percent of people in the countries polled said they had little or no trust and 42 percent said they had at least some trust.³²¹

Individuals in African countries showed more trust in global corporations. When GlobeScan also asked seven African countries the same question, majorities or pluralities in six countries said they trusted these companies to operate in the best interests of their society. On average across all seven countries, 56 percent said they trusted global companies and 36 percent said they did not trust them.³²²

GlobeScan also asked publics in eight African countries whether they were in favor of large foreign companies coming to their country and setting up operations there. Publics in seven out of the eight countries approved, while just one (Egypt) was opposed. On average across all eight countries, 73 percent of the public favored foreign companies coming to their country and 23 percent were opposed.³²³

Foreign Investment**Publics in most countries have a negative view of foreigners buying companies in their country.**

A poll of twenty-four countries (Pew 2008) asked respondents whether, when foreigners buy companies in their country, it has a good or bad impact. Publics in twenty countries said this had a bad impact (eighteen majorities, two pluralities), those in three countries said it had a good impact (two majorities, one plurality), and one country was divided. In the average of all twenty-four countries, 59 percent of respondents said foreigners buying domestic companies had a bad impact, while 35 percent said it was good. Majorities seeing foreign purchases of local companies as bad were highest in Germany (78 percent), Turkey (76 percent), and Argentina (71 percent). The most favorable views of foreign companies playing this role were in India (59 percent), South Africa (52 percent), and Spain (50 percent).³²⁴

It should be noted that the question did not ask whether such investments should be prohibited, or whether there were positive effects from the respondents' country having a reciprocal right of foreign investment.

Trade and Poverty Reduction**Majorities in most developed and developing countries believe that, to reduce poverty, rich countries should allow more imports from developing countries.**

In a seventeen nation poll in 2004, GlobeScan introduced the potential for addressing poverty by allowing more imports, pointing to the trade-offs involved:

Rich countries could reduce poverty in developing countries by allowing them to sell more food and clothing products to rich countries. In rich countries this would lower prices for food and clothing but would also mean significant job losses in these industries.

They then asked:

Would you support or oppose rich countries allowing more food and clothing imports from developing countries even if it meant significant job losses in rich countries?

Publics in fifteen countries (thirteen majorities, two pluralities) supported allowing more imports, and two were opposed (one majority, one plurality). Support was understandably strongest in major developing countries—India (76 percent), China (75 percent), and Indonesia (72 percent), but was also high in Spain (72 percent). The two countries where publics were opposed were both developed countries: the United States (60 percent opposed) and Italy (47 percent opposed, 43 percent in favor). However, of the other eight developed countries in the poll, six were supportive (Spain 72 percent, Britain 59 percent, Germany 58 percent, Canada 51 percent, France 47 percent to 43 percent, and Russia 41 percent to 26 percent).³²⁵

CHAPTER 7: WORLD OPINION ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN AID

Publics in developed countries express support for giving development assistance to poor countries. Globally, there is a widespread consensus that developed countries have a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty. There is also a consensus that helping poor countries develop serves the long-term interests of wealthy countries, such as developing trade partners and achieving global stability. In addition, development aid is seen as furthering democracy and, for a more modest number of respondents, as a way to fight terrorism. Besides financial aid, large majorities of European and U.S. respondents express a willingness to contribute troops for humanitarian operations, including providing assistance to victims of war and famine.

People in Europe and the United States express a favorable view of development assistance. In 2007, the German Marshall Fund (GMF) asked six European countries and the United States whether they had a favorable or unfavorable view of “providing development assistance to poor countries.” All six European countries had a majority with a favorable view (on average 74 percent), including Germany (55 percent), Slovakia (63 percent), Poland (74 percent), United Kingdom (76 percent), France (85 percent), and Italy (93 percent). Sixty-six percent of respondents from the United States were also favorably inclined toward development aid. These views have been largely stable since 2005, except that views in Germany declined 14 points from 69 percent expressing favorable views.³²⁶

There seems to be a global consensus that developed countries have “a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty in poor countries.” In a poll of twenty developed and developing nations, over 80 percent in all developed nations said that they did have this responsibility (WPO 2008). This included the United States (81 percent), France (79 percent), Germany (87 percent), and Britain (81 percent). Publics in less developed nations had similarly high numbers, except that for three nations or territories this number was less than 80 percent; these were the Palestinian Territories (50 percent), Russia (54 percent), and India (72 percent). On average globally, 80 percent said developed countries did have a responsibility to work to reduce hunger and 15 percent said they did not.³²⁷

Majorities around the world also agree that “it is in rich countries' own economic self-interest to actively help poor countries develop.” GlobeScan presented this statement to respondents in nineteen countries, and majorities in all cases said they agreed with it in 2004. This included large majorities in developed countries, including the United States (83 percent), Germany (83 percent), France (87 percent), Great Britain (86 percent), Italy (87 percent), Spain (86 percent), and Canada (87 percent). The lowest levels of agreement out of all countries polled were found in Russia (52 percent) and Turkey (52 percent). On average, 74 percent agreed and 18 percent disagreed.³²⁸

Other polls that have asked respondents to assess a variety of motivations for giving aid find endorsement of a variety of motivations, including moral reasons and long-term self-interest.

When Europeans were asked to name the top two motivations for richer countries helping poor countries out of a list of seven provided, the two motivations most frequently cited among twenty-seven EU countries were “self-interest; for example, helping poor countries trade will enable them to buy more products from rich countries” and “contribute to global stability” (both cited by 28 percent) (Eurobarometer 2007). The other leading motivations were “to encourage democracy and good governance” (22 percent), to “avoid citizens of these countries emigrating to rich countries” (20 percent), to “prevent and avoid favorable conditions for terrorism” (19 percent), to “gain political allies” (15 percent), and to “have a clear conscience” (12 percent). Eleven percent also volunteered the answer of helping people in need.³²⁹

Asked by GMF in 2007 to choose the top three (out of nine) reasons for giving aid to poor countries, the most popular reason among respondents in six European countries and the United States was alleviating poverty—a rationale cited by 49 percent of U.S. respondents and an average of 59 percent of Europeans. This was the most widely cited reason in all countries polled, except Italy.

The next most commonly cited reason was “fighting health problems like AIDS,” although, again, more people in Europe chose this option (46 percent) than people in the United States (37 percent). Supporting economic growth was the next most popular reason, with Europe (38 percent) and the United States (36 percent) showing comparable support. Helping with natural disaster relief was also cited by similar numbers of respondents in Europe (29 percent) and the United States (32 percent).

There were also several differences between the United States and Europe. More people in the United States chose “contributing to global stability” (35 percent) as a top reason for development assistance than did Europeans (23 percent). U.S. respondents were also somewhat more likely than Europeans to identify “preventing breeding grounds for terrorism” as a top reason (31 percent compared to 26 percent). By contrast, Europeans cited “encouraging democracy” (31 percent) as a top reason more commonly than people in the United States (23 percent). Europeans were also much more likely to mention “helping poor countries trade” (31 percent) than their U.S. counterparts (17 percent). Among all countries, few publics considered “gaining political allies” (9 percent) to be a top reason, although more U.S. respondents cited this reason (13 percent) than European respondents (5 percent).³³⁰

Majorities of six European nations agreed that development assistance strengthened support for democratic institutions in developing countries. Support for this view ranged from 63 percent in Slovakia to 77 percent in Germany. Sixty-four percent of respondents in the United States also agreed (GMF 2007).³³¹

There is less of a consensus on whether development assistance is a good way to fight terrorism. Ten European countries and the United States were asked whether providing economic aid to raise living standards in countries where terrorists are recruited is the most appropriate way to fight terrorism (GMF 2004). Seven European countries were in agreement, two European countries disagreed, and one European country and the United States were divided on this point. In the European average, 49 percent agreed that economic aid was the best way to fight terrorism and 43 percent disagreed.³³²

Besides financial aid, large majorities of people in Europe and the United States express a willingness to contribute troops for humanitarian operations. In a 2002 poll conducted by the GMF and Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA), large majorities in six European countries (an average of 90 percent) approved of using their troops to assist a population struck by famine, as did 81 percent in the United States.³³³ Similar numbers of European and U.S. respondents approved using troops to provide food and medical assistance to victims of war (GMF 2005). The same poll also found strong transatlantic support for providing humanitarian assistance in Darfur and contributing to international reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.³³⁴

Aid Levels and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

There is a strong global consensus that wealthy nations are not doing enough to help poorer nations. Europeans strongly support the view that the European Union should spend more on development aid. At the same time, less than a majority of Europeans favor increasing their taxes to increase aid or say that their own national government should increase its spending. However, when increased spending is placed in the context of a multilateral effort—specifically the Millennium Development Goal of cutting hunger and severe poverty in half—large majorities in the OECD countries say that they would be willing to substantially increase their spending if others did the same. Globally, public awareness of the MDGs remains low.

A study of forty-seven nations found that in nearly all countries a majority thought “the wealthier nations of the world are not doing enough to help the poorer nations of the world with such problems as economic development, reducing poverty, and improving health” (Pew/Kaiser Foundation 2007). This view garnered majority support in major donor countries such as the United States (69 percent), France (81 percent), Germany (75 percent), Great Britain (77 percent), Italy (78 percent), and Japan (63 percent). Interestingly, the only dissenting publics were among the developing countries. Indonesia had a 54-percent majority saying the wealthier nations are doing enough; Tanzanians were divided; and in Bangladesh a large minority (46 percent) said the wealthier nations are doing enough.³³⁵

Europeans strongly support the view that the European Union should spend more money on aid for development as part of the European Union taking greater responsibility for dealing with international threats. Large majorities in all twelve European nations (on average 84 percent) favored the European Union spending more while only 13 percent disagreed (GMF 2007). Not surprisingly, people in the United States concurred that the European Union should spend more.³³⁶

However, when seven European countries and the United States were asked in 2002 and 2003 whether their own government was spending too much, too little, or the right amount on “economic aid to other nations,” relatively small numbers said their government was spending too little (GMF/CCGA). In 2002, only France had a majority saying their government was spending too little, and this dropped to 25 percent the following year. On average, just 29 percent said

their government was spending too little in 2002, and 19 percent said so in 2003. In no country did a majority think their country was spending too much; on average 24 percent felt this way in 2002 and 31 percent in 2003. The most common response was that their country was spending the right amount (2002 44 percent, 2003 37 percent).³³⁷

Looking more closely at the wording of these questions suggests why these responses were so different. The former question that received such robust majority support asked about the *European Union* providing aid, as opposed to the respondent's own government. It also asked about "aid for development," while the latter simply described "economic aid to other nations" without specifying a purpose. In addition, the first question had a preamble that talked about the European Union taking greater responsibility for dealing with international threats and placed the development aid in that context. Thus it appears that increased aid given multilaterally—and specifically to promote development in the context of addressing potential threats—garners far more support than increasing bilateral aid to another government for unspecified purposes.

Public opinion researchers have also used polling to explore whether telling respondents how much of their tax money actually goes to foreign aid affects their willingness to increase that amount. In 2005, World Values Survey (WVS) presented respondents in ten countries (most of them developed European countries) with the percentage of their country's national income spent on foreign aid and the amount per capita. They were then asked how they felt about the level of aid. In no country did more than one in five say it was too high. Views were generally mixed between saying it was too low or about right. On average, 46 percent said their country's foreign aid contribution level was about right, 35 percent said it was too low, and 9 percent said it was too high.³³⁸ In general, supplying such information tends to significantly reduce the number of respondents claiming that their government is spending too much, but only modestly increases the number saying that it is spending too little. Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) polls have found that U.S. respondents tend to be quite mistrustful when they are provided information in a poll that is contrary to their assumptions.

Publics also tend to resist paying higher taxes in order to increase aid to other countries. Asked whether they would be willing to pay higher taxes to increase their country's foreign aid to poor countries, respondents in seven of thirteen countries polled said they would not be willing, three said they would be willing, and three were divided on the question (WVS 2005). Across all thirteen countries, 52 percent of those polled were opposed and 39 percent were willing. It should be noted that, in general, when respondents are asked about raising taxes they often show resistance even when it is for things that they say they support. This may reflect the view that other funds should be redirected to aid purposes, as well as widespread resistance to taxes related to general lack of confidence in governments.³³⁹

Not surprisingly, people also put a higher priority on solving their own country's problems over reducing poverty in the world. When respondents in forty-one countries were asked to specify the proper balance of their country's priorities on a scale from one (top priority to help reducing poverty in the world) to ten (top priority to solve my own country's problems), the mean rating in all forty-one countries was over 5.0, giving priority to solving problems in respondents' country (WVS 2005). The average across all countries was 7.5.³⁴⁰

The Millennium Development Goals

The UN member states have established a series of goals for economic and social development called the Millennium Development Goals. One goal is to cut hunger and severe poverty in half by the year 2015.

Majorities in eight developed countries polled were willing to contribute the funds necessary to meet this goal (WPO 2008). Respondents were presented with the annual per capita contribution that would be necessary for meeting this goal (based on actual World Bank estimates), adjusted for national income. This ranged from \$10 for people in Turkey to \$56 for people in the United States. In every case, and in most cases by a large margin, majorities of respondents said they were willing to personally pay the amount necessary to meet the goal, provided that people in other countries did so as well. Across the eight countries, 77 percent were willing to contribute and 17 percent were not willing.³⁴¹

It should be noted that these large majorities in support of new spending toward meeting the goal of cutting hunger in half were substantially higher than in the above-mentioned questions about increasing foreign aid. It is likely that this higher support was due to its being placed in the context of a multilateral effort, with support being predicated on other countries doing their part as well.

Few people around the world, however, have heard of the Millennium Development Goals. Majorities or pluralities in forty-one out of forty-two countries said they had not heard of the MDGs (WVS 2005). Only a majority of Ethiopians said they had. In the average of forty-two countries, 76 percent said they had not heard of the MDGs and 20 percent said they had.³⁴²

Similarly, in all twenty-seven EU member states surveyed, majorities said they had never heard or read about the MDGs (Eurobarometer 2007). On average in Europe, 80 percent said they had not heard or read about the goals, 14 percent said they had but did not know what they are, and 4 percent said they had and did know what they are.³⁴³

Role of Multilateral Institutions and Aid to Developing Countries

There is strong support for multilateral institutions taking the lead in setting aid policies, delivering development assistance, and dealing with refugees.

When it comes to making policies on aid to developing countries, most people believe the responsibility should lie with multilateral institutions over regional organizations or national governments. Asked who should take the lead on decisions about “aid to developing countries,” in thirty-six out of forty-two countries polled, a majority thought the United Nations should make such decisions; in two cases, respondents thought regional organizations should; in one case, respondents thought national governments should; and three countries were divided (WVS 2005). On average globally, 48 percent favored the United Nations handling aid, 22 favored national governments, and 20 percent favored regional organizations.³⁴⁴

Similarly, people in six European countries and the United States were asked who should have the primary responsibility for delivering development assistance, the most common response in all cases was “international organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations” (GMF 2007). On average among the seven countries, 46 percent said international organizations should have the responsibility; 11 percent said charities, foundations, and nongovernmental organizations; 16 percent said the European Union; 7 percent said the U.S. government; 11 percent said individual European governments; 5 percent said private companies and businesses; and 3 percent said religious organizations.³⁴⁵

Polling shows a clear preference for UN leadership on problems related to refugees as well. Twenty-nine out of forty-two countries polled favored the United Nations making decisions on refugees, six favored national governments, one said regional organizations, and six were divided (WVS 2005). On average, 43 percent of respondents supported the United Nations handling refugee issues, 28 percent supported national governments, and 18 percent favored regional organizations.³⁴⁶

Publics of European countries newly admitted to the European Union agreed that development aid is used more efficiently when spent by the European Commission rather than by individual states. Respondents in all twelve new EU member countries said aid was more efficient when provided through the European Union, with an average of 61 percent holding this view, while only 16 percent thought that national governments were more efficient (Eurobarometer 2007).³⁴⁷

In 2007, Eurobarometer asked respondents in the twenty-seven EU member states to select the top two explanations (if any) for why it is better for the European Union to provide development aid, rather than individual country governments. On average, the top reasons provided were that: the European Union is active in cooperation programs covering practically all developing countries (28 percent); the European Union is the strongest and best recognized player on international stage (24 percent); coherence between the actions of the EU member states can be ensured (23 percent); and the European Union’s cultural diversity results in a more effective and neutral expression of solidarity with developing countries (22 percent). Only 5 percent on average suggested that the European Union does not add value, compared to national governments, when addressing poverty.³⁴⁸

Linking Aid to Recipient Country Behavior

Large majorities of Europeans and Americans favor linking the level of aid given to poor countries to a variety of conditions, including the recipient country’s efforts to fight poverty, corruption, and terrorism, and to

promote democracy. Large majorities favor giving aid to help poor countries reduce greenhouse gases as part of an agreement wherein they commit to limit the growth of their emissions.

Large majorities in European countries and the United States say it is important to link the level of aid to poor countries to their efforts to fight poverty. On average among seven countries polled, 88 percent of publics agreed with linking aid to antipoverty efforts and 8 percent disagreed (GMF 2007).³⁴⁹

Similarly, in the same poll, large majorities in all seven countries agreed that the level of aid to poor countries should be linked to efforts by that country to fight corruption. Across all seven countries, an average of 86 percent favored linking aid levels to efforts against corruption and 10 percent were opposed (GMF 2007).³⁵⁰

Majorities also agreed that the amount of development aid given to a country should be linked to efforts in that country to promote democracy, though these majorities were slightly smaller. On average, 78 percent supported tying aid to democracy promotion and 16 percent were opposed (GMF 2007).³⁵¹

All seven countries also supported linking aid to recipient countries' efforts to open their markets to international trade. In the seven-country average, 74 percent favored linking aid to trade openness and 21 percent were opposed (GMF 2007).³⁵²

Broad majorities in the seven countries polled all favored a link between aid and the recipient country's efforts to fight terrorism. On average among all seven countries, 78 percent agreed with such a link and 18 percent disagreed (GMF 2007).³⁵³

Finally, there is strong support for an agreement by which developing countries would limit greenhouse-gas emissions in exchange for technology and financial assistance for this purpose from developed countries. Among twenty-one countries, nineteen had majorities and two had pluralities in support of such an agreement (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). On average, 73 percent were in favor of such a plan and 18 percent were opposed.³⁵⁴

CHAPTER 8: WORLD OPINION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The Role of the United Nations in Human Rights

Majorities or pluralities in all nations polled express support for the United Nations (UN) playing an active role in promoting human rights and reject the argument that this would be improper interference in the internal affairs of a country. Publics in most countries favor the UN playing a larger role than it presently does to promote human rights and favor giving it greater power to go into countries to investigate human rights abuses. Large majorities in nearly every country say that the UN should try to further women's rights even when presented the argument that this would conflict with national sovereignty. When asked which should make the decision on matters related to human rights, more respondents prefer either the UN or regional organizations rather than national governments, though an average of four in ten respondents prefer national governments.

In a 2008 WorldPublicOpinion.org poll, respondents in twenty-one nations were told that “the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” They were then presented with the debate about whether the UN should actively promote such rights: “Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country.” They were then asked, “Do you think the UN should or should not actively promote human rights in member states?”

The dominant view in all twenty-four nations—by majorities in twenty-two and pluralities in two—was to favor the UN actively promoting human rights principles in member states. On average, 70 percent favored such efforts while 19 percent were opposed.

Countries with the highest levels of support were Kenya (94 percent), Germany and Argentina (91 percent), Azerbaijan (89 percent), Nigeria (87 percent), and Mexico (85 percent). Support was strong among the permanent members of the UN Security Council, with large majorities being supportive in France (76 percent), the United States (70 percent), Great Britain (68 percent), and China (62 percent), though the Russian majority was relatively modest (55 percent). Support for the UN playing an intrusive role was strikingly high in China (62 percent) given that the Chinese government has invoked the principle of national sovereignty in opposition to the UN playing an active role in regard to human rights. However, support was even higher in Taiwan (78 percent), Hong Kong (73 percent), and Macau (68 percent).

Support for the UN actively promoting human rights was lowest in Thailand, where it was nonetheless a clear plurality (44 percent to 25 percent). Muslim nations and territories included three of the four populations with the highest levels of opposition: Palestinian Territories (41 percent), Jordan (33 percent), and Egypt (33 percent), but these were still minorities in every case. South Korea was the one other country polled with significant minority opposition (35 percent).

355

Greater UN Role on Human Rights

In the same poll respondents were asked: “Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?” In twenty-two of the twenty-four publics, majorities wanted the United Nations to do more; in Russia a plurality was in favor, and in the Palestinian Territories views were mixed. On average across twenty-four publics, 65 percent of respondents said the United Nations should do more, 17 percent said it should do the same as it has been doing, and 8 percent said it should do less.

The largest majorities wanting the UN to do more to promote human rights were in Africa and Latin America. Ninety-one percent of Kenyans and 88 percent of Nigerians said the UN should do more, as did 88 percent of Mexicans and 85 percent of Argentines. Italians were also highly supportive (83 percent).

Palestinians, who were divided, were the least supportive among the twenty-four publics of a greater UN role on human rights: 48 percent wanted the UN to do more while 49 percent wanted it to do the same amount (26 percent) or less (23 percent). In Russia, a plurality of 45 percent wanted the UN to do more, while a total of 31 percent either wanted it to do the same (23 percent) or less (8 percent).

In China, a 51-percent majority of respondents wanted the UN to do more, much smaller proportions wanted it to do the same (15 percent) or less (5 percent), and 29 percent did not answer. (In both Hong Kong and Macau, a higher 65 percent wanted the UN to do more, as did 62 percent in Taiwan.)

While the Palestinians had the lowest level of support, and in general majority-Muslim countries tended to express lower than average support, majorities were still supportive of a greater UN role in Turkey (69 percent), Indonesia (66 percent), Jordan (62 percent), and Egypt (55 percent).

Interestingly, some of the more modest majorities for a strong UN role were found in Western countries long associated with promoting human rights: Germany (58 percent), the United States (59 percent), France (64 percent), and Great Britain (64 percent).³⁵⁶

Giving the UN New Investigative Powers

Majorities in polled countries also support giving the United Nations new powers to promote human rights. Broad majorities around the world support active UN investigations on human rights. Asked about possible steps for strengthening the UN, the possibility of “giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights” garnered support in twenty countries (eighteen majorities, two pluralities); two countries were divided, but none were opposed. On average, about two-thirds of all respondents (65 percent) were in favor, with just 22 percent opposed.

The largest majorities in favor of a robust UN role were in Europe and Africa: France had 92 percent in favor, Great Britain 86 percent, Nigeria 83 percent, and Kenya 81 percent. Clear majorities were also supportive in the United States (75 percent), Russia (64 percent), and China (57 percent).

A plurality of Turks was supportive (47 percent to 25 percent) as was a plurality of Argentines (46 percent to 29 percent). Two countries were divided: Egypt (51 percent to 49 percent) and the Philippines (46 percent to 46 percent).³⁵⁷

The UN Promoting Women’s Rights

Large majorities in nearly every nation said that the United Nations should try to further women’s rights even when presented the argument that this would conflict with national sovereignty. WPO asked, “Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country’s internal affairs?”

In eighteen out of the twenty publics polled, a majority of respondents favored such UN efforts. Overall on average, 66 percent approved of UN initiatives to further the rights of women, while 26 percent said this would be improper interference.

The largest majorities were in Kenya (91 percent), Mexico (88 percent), China (86 percent; Hong Kong, 67 percent), Argentina (78 percent), South Korea (78 percent), Indonesia (74 percent), France (74 percent), and Great Britain (70 percent).

The two exceptions were Egypt, where most of those polled (70 percent) thought the United Nations should not get involved in efforts to improve women’s rights, and the Palestinian Territories, where views were evenly divided. In the other predominantly Muslim countries, most respondents supported UN efforts on women’s rights, including in Indonesia (74 percent), Turkey (70 percent), Azerbaijan (66 percent), and Iran (52 percent). Support was also relatively modest in Russia (52 percent) and India (48 percent favor, 28 percent opposed, and 24 percent no answer).³⁵⁸

The Role of the UN, Regional Organizations and National Governments

The World Values Survey from 2005 to 2008 asked respondents in forty-two countries who should decide policies in the area of human rights, posing the following question:

“Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?”

In the area of “human rights,” on average 40 percent favored national governments while 50 percent favored a multilateral approach, with 37 percent favoring the United Nations and 13 percent a regional organization. Twenty-one countries had a majority (nine countries) or a plurality (twelve countries) favoring national governments, led by Ghana (67 percent), Vietnam (59 percent), South Africa (58 percent), and Ukraine (57 percent). Fifteen countries had a majority (nine countries) or plurality (six countries) favoring the United Nations, led by Sweden (73 percent), Andorra (62 percent), Switzerland (62 percent), and Australia (57 percent). In total, sixteen countries had a majority or a plurality favoring a multilateral approach, with only Rwandans favoring (37 percent) a regional organization over the United Nations. Mexico and Argentina were both evenly divided between national governments and the United Nations.³⁵⁹

In 2006, AsiaBarometer asked the same question to six Asian publics. On average, 48 percent said national governments, while 50 percent said the United Nations (36 percent) or regional organizations (14 percent). Three publics had a majority or plurality saying the United Nations should decide, while three said national governments should do this.³⁶⁰

Freedom of Expression

The principle that individuals have a right to freedom of expression—including criticism of government and religious leaders—appears to be nearly universally supported by people throughout the world. However, when asked whether government should have the right to limit expression of certain political and religious views, the consensus is not as strong. While majorities in most countries say the government should not have such a right, in several countries a majority (and in another few a large minority) says that it should have such a right. At the same time there is widespread consensus that individuals should have the right to demonstrate peacefully against the government.

In a 2008 WPO poll, majorities in all twenty-three nations polled said that it is important that people have the right “to express any opinion, including criticisms of the government or religious leaders.” In nineteen of the twenty-three nations, a majority said that this right is “very important.” On average across all nations polled, 66 percent judged this right to be “very important” and an additional 22 percent saw it as somewhat important; only 7 percent saw it as either not very important (5 percent) or not important at all (2 percent).³⁶¹

Five countries showed exceptionally high levels of support, with 80 percent or more of respondents saying that this right is very important—Mexico (87 percent), Nigeria (86 percent), Argentina (84 percent), Indonesia (82 percent), and Italy (80 percent). This opinion was notably lower in Russia (34 percent), Egypt (43 percent), and India (48 percent). But in all these countries a majority did say it is at least “somewhat important.”

A Pew Global Attitudes Project poll in 2007 asked people in thirty-five nations whether the ability to openly say what you think, or to criticize the state or government, is important. Majorities in every country felt that freedom of speech is important. On average, 87 percent of respondents felt that it was either “very important” (57 percent) or “somewhat important” (30 percent), and 11 percent felt that it was “not too important” or “not important at all.”³⁶²

Between 2005 and 2006, Afrobarometer surveyed eighteen African countries about whether the government should allow the expression of political views that are fundamentally different from the views of the majority. Majorities in every country except one believed that government should allow free speech. In the average of the eighteen countries, 71 percent believed that people should be able to speak their minds about politics free of government influence, no matter how unpopular their views may be, while 23 percent believed that government should restrict free speech when it is fundamentally different from the views of the majority. The one country that did not have a majority endorsing free speech was Tanzania, where views were divided (43 percent in favor of free speech, 44 percent against).³⁶³

Right of Governments to Prohibit Expression

The right to free expression can also be examined from the perspective of whether the government has the right to prohibit the discussion of certain views. Interestingly, while the dominant view is that governments should not have such a right, several countries had significant numbers, in some cases even majorities, saying that the government should have such a right.

A 2008 WPO poll asked people in twenty-three nations whether the government should “have the right to prohibit certain political or religious views from being discussed” majorities in thirteen nations and pluralities in three said that the government should not have such a right. On average only 36 percent of people polled worldwide said the government should have such a right, while 57 percent said that the government should not.

In three countries, a majority supported the government’s right to prohibit expression of certain views: Kenya (67 percent), Thailand (63 percent), and Indonesia (55 percent). Curiously, all three of these countries also have large majorities saying that it is very important for people to have the right to express any opinion. A common feature of these countries is that they have all recently had major political instability, with near-civil war in Kenya, a coup in Thailand, and ethnic conflict in Indonesia.

While all European countries polled had majorities saying that the government should not have the right to prohibit expression, in two these majorities were relatively small. In Great Britain, only 53 percent said that government should not have the right to prohibit the expression of certain political and religious views, whereas 39 percent said the government should have such a right. In Germany as well, a relatively small majority (56 percent) opposed the right of government to prohibit the discussion of certain views, while a substantial minority (41 percent) felt that government should be able to prohibit the expression of some views. In both Germany and Britain, the emergence of extremist Islamic groups has generated controversy over whether some of their language should be regarded as incitement. In addition, Germany has a tradition of regulating neo-Nazi activities.

Two countries—Egypt and India—had less than half of respondents saying that the government should not have the right to prohibit expression. They are also two of the three countries where publics place relatively low importance on freedom of expression, suggesting that the norm in favor of freedom of expression, while clearly extant, is relatively weak. In Egypt views were divided on whether the government should have the right to limit expression (49 percent to 49 percent), while just 43 percent said freedom of expression is very important. In India, a modest plurality said that the government should not have the right to limit expression (44 percent to 38 percent), while 48 percent said freedom of expression is very important.³⁶⁴

Right to Demonstrate Peacefully

WPO asked publics in twenty-two nations in 2008 if they favored the people’s right to peacefully demonstrate against the government or if “the government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations that it thinks would be politically destabilizing.” Majorities in all cases said people should have the right to demonstrate. On average across all nations, 75 percent felt that the people should have the right to demonstrate peacefully against the government, whereas 20 percent believe that the government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations that it thinks would be politically destabilizing.³⁶⁵

The only countries and territories where 30 percent or more of the public felt that the government has the right to ban peaceful demonstrations were Egypt (42 percent), Jordan (35 percent), the Palestinian Territories (33 percent), and South Korea (32 percent). However a majority in each case still endorsed the right of the people to demonstrate peacefully.

Media Freedom

Internationally there is robust support for the principle that the media should be free of government control and that citizens should even have access to material from hostile countries. With just a few exceptions, majorities say that the government should not have the right to limit access to the internet. But while most publics say the government should not have the right to prohibit publishing material it thinks will be politically destabilizing, in a significant minority of countries a majority of the respondents say that governments should have such a right.

The broad principle of media freedom gets robust support. In 2008, WPO polled twenty-one nations on how important it is “for the media to be free to publish news and ideas without government control.” All twenty-one nations said it is important that media be given this freedom. On average, 81 percent of respondents said it is “important,” with 53 percent saying it is “very important,” while only 11 percent considered it not important. In no country did more than 26 percent say that media freedom is “not very important” or “not important at all.”³⁶⁶

Pew Global Attitudes Project in 2007 surveyed publics in thirty-five nations on how important it is to live in a country where the media can report the news without state censorship. Majorities in every one said they felt it was important to live in a country without media censorship. In the global average, 84 percent thought it was important while only 13 percent did not believe it to be important.³⁶⁷

Citizens are also seen as having the right to read publications from hostile countries. WPO in 2008 asked whether people in their country should “have the right to read publications from all other countries including those that might be considered enemies.” Once again, majorities in all countries affirmed this right; on average by 80 percent.³⁶⁸

In 2008, WPO polled twenty-one nations asking if people in their country should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet, or if instead they thought the government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the internet. Majorities in all but two nations felt that people should have the right to read whatever is on the internet, while two said the government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things. In the average of twenty nations, 62 percent of respondents favored people having the right read whatever is on the internet and 30 percent favored the government having the right to prevent access to some things.³⁶⁹

In China, a country whose Internet censorship policies have received a great deal of international attention, 71 percent of the public said that “people should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet;” only 21 percent of Chinese endorsed their government’s right to limit access.

The only two publics not endorsing full access were Jordan and Iran. In Jordan, 63 percent supported government regulation of the Internet, as did 44 percent in Iran (32 percent favor unlimited access). There is also significant minority support for some government control of access to information on the Internet in France (44 percent), the Palestinian Territories (44 percent), Kenya (38 percent), India (36 percent), and Great Britain (35 percent).

Controlling Potentially Destabilizing Information

As is the case with freedom of expression, publics in a significant minority of countries are willing to accept government control of the media in the service of political stability.

WPO in 2008 presented respondents with a choice between an argument in favor of media freedom without government control, on the one hand, and the argument that “government should have the right to prevent the media from publishing things it thinks will be politically destabilizing” on the other. Majorities or pluralities in eighteen publics polled felt that that the risk of political instability does not justify government control.

However, in Russia and in six predominantly Muslim nations this scenario prompted considerable support for government control. Majorities in Jordan (66 percent), the Palestinian Territories (59 percent), and Indonesia (56 percent) supported government control of the media when the government thinks that publishing some things might be politically destabilizing. In Iran, a plurality (45 percent) supported government control under such circumstances (whereas 31 percent felt the media should be able to publish freely). Views were divided in Russia (45 percent to 44 percent), Egypt (49 percent to 52 percent), and Turkey (45 percent to 42 percent).

This does not, however, mean that any of these publics favor greater government regulation in general. Rather, in four of these cases, majorities favored greater media freedom—Egypt (64 percent), the Palestinian Territories (62 percent), Jordan (56 percent), and Indonesia (53 percent). Only minorities favored greater government control in Iran (9 percent), Turkey (30 percent), and Russia (17 percent).³⁷⁰

Similarly, in 2007, the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) asked publics in fourteen countries to choose between the following statements:

“Freedom of the press to report the news truthfully is very important to ensure we live in a fair society, even if it sometimes leads to unpleasant debates or social unrest.”

“While freedom of the press to report news truthfully is important, social harmony and peace are more important, which sometimes means controlling what is reported for the greater good.”

Majorities in eleven countries said that freedom of the press to report the news truthfully is very important, but in three countries a plurality chose the latter position in favor of social harmony. These included Russia, Singapore, and India.³⁷¹

Afrobarometer polled eighteen African countries from 2005 to 2006, asking if the government should close newspapers that print false stories or misinformation, or if the news media should be free to publish any story that they see fit without fear of being shut down. In thirteen countries majorities or pluralities said that the news media should be free to publish any story, but majorities in three countries (Benin 60 percent, Mali 55 percent, and Tanzania 54 percent) said that the government should close such newspapers. A plurality in Senegal agreed and views in Malawi were divided. In the average of eighteen countries, 55 percent said they supported the freedom of the news media and 37 percent supported the government’s right to close newspapers.³⁷²

Religious Freedom

Publics around the world believe it is important for people of different religions to be treated equally. Majorities in most, but not all, nations affirm that followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in their country. At the same time, discomfort with proselytizing—trying actively to convert others to one’s own religion—is quite widespread. Majorities in more than half of the countries polled do not favor extending religious freedom to a right to proselytize.

Support for the norm of equal treatment of adherents of different religions is quite robust. WPO in 2008 asked respondents in twenty-four nations, “How important do you think it is for people of different religions to be treated equally?” Majorities in every country said that it was somewhat or very important. This ranged from 74 percent in Egypt to 99 percent in Kenya. In twenty of twenty-four nations, majorities called it very important. On average, 89 percent said that it is important, 64 percent very important, and just 7 percent said it was “not very important” or “not important at all.”³⁷³

In no country did a large number say that equal treatment was not very important or not important at all. Egypt was the highest with 24 percent, followed by India (15 percent).

The numbers saying that equal treatment is very important were a bit higher than average among Christians (69 percent) and Buddhists (68 percent), and a bit lower than average for Hindus (58 percent). Muslims were not different from the full sample.

Pew Global Attitudes Project surveyed thirty-five nations in 2007 on whether it was important to live in a country where a person can practice their religion freely. Large majorities in all thirty-five countries said it was “very important” or “somewhat important.” In the average of thirty-five nations, 72 percent believed freedom to practice their religion was “very important,” 21 percent believed it was “somewhat important,” 4 percent believed it was “not too important,” and 1 percent believed it was “not important at all.”³⁷⁴

When respondents were asked to consider the right of *any* religion to be practiced, support was still high, but there were some countries where a majority backed away from endorsing such a right. WPO asked respondents to choose between two statements: “Followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in [our country],” or “there are some religions that people should not be allowed to practice in [our country].” The question wording intentionally offered a test, by evoking in respondents’ minds “some religion” that they might find specifically objectionable.

In nineteen out of twenty-three countries, majorities (in fifteen cases) or pluralities (in one case) said that followers of any religion in their country should be able to assemble and practice. However, in three countries, majorities said there were some religions that people should not be permitted to practice there. One country was divided on the question. On average across all publics, 61 percent endorsed the right to assemble and practice any religion, while 32 percent said some religions should be excluded.³⁷⁵

The highest majority supporting freedom to practice without exceptions was found in Turkey—a majority Muslim — country—at 80 percent. Other countries with high majorities were Poland and Nigeria (both 77 percent); Mexico (76 percent); Kenya (75 percent); France (72 percent); and Azerbaijan (71 percent). The United States was somewhat lower at 67 percent. Russia had a substantial plurality in support, 50 percent to 38 percent.

Three countries had majorities wanting to exclude some religions from the freedom to assemble and practice. The highest was Egypt at 67 percent, followed by Ukraine at 54 percent and Jordan at 51 percent. South Koreans were divided, with 50 percent wanting to disallow some religions and 48 percent saying there should be no exceptions.

Trying to Convert Others

A controversial issue is the right to try to convert others to one's religion. Indeed, more publics opposed such a right than favored it. It should be noted that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights does not explicitly establish such a right, though it does provide for the right to change one's religion.

WPO asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "In [our country], people of any religion should be free to try to convert members of other religions to join theirs." Fourteen nations had majorities or pluralities that disagreed (i.e. they were unwilling to give activities to convert others the status of a right). In eight countries majorities did agree and one country was divided. On average across all publics, a majority disagreed, 51 percent to 41 percent.³⁷⁶

Publics in European countries and in Muslim countries express the highest levels of discomfort about proselytizing activities. Indonesia had the largest majority disagreeing with the statement, at 72 percent, followed by Egypt (67 percent), France (64 percent), Russia (62 percent), Poland, and Jordan (both 60 percent).

The highest support for the freedom to seek to convert others came from two East Asian publics: Taiwan (83 percent) and South Korea (79 percent). In Africa, there were also large majorities in Nigeria (78 percent) and Kenya (74 percent). In the Americas, supportive majorities were more modest, at 58 percent in the United States and 56 percent in Mexico.

Women's Rights

Large majorities in all nations support the principle that women should have "full equality of rights" and most say it is very important. Large majorities believe their government has the responsibility to seek to prevent discrimination against women. Large majorities in nearly every country polled favor the United Nations playing an active role in this agenda.

An overwhelming majority of people around the world say that it is important for "women to have full equality of rights compared to men." Large majorities in all nations polled by WPO took this position, ranging from 60 percent in India to 98 percent in Mexico and Great Britain. On average, across the twenty nations polled, 86 percent said women's equality is important, with 59 percent saying it is very important. Ten percent responded that they were "not very important" or "not important at all."³⁷⁷

Attitudes vary about whether such equality is very important or somewhat important. Large majorities said it is very important in Mexico (89 percent), Great Britain (89 percent), Turkey (80 percent), the United States (77 percent), and China (76 percent). Smaller percentages said it is very important in Egypt (31 percent), Russia (35 percent), India (41 percent), South Korea (43 percent), Ukraine (44 percent), and Iran (44 percent).

Support for equal rights is also robust in all Muslim countries. Large majorities said it is important in Iran (78 percent), Jordan (83 percent), Azerbaijan (85 percent), Egypt (90 percent), Indonesia (91 percent), Turkey (91 percent), and the Palestinian Territories (83 percent).

Between 2005 and 2008, the World Values Survey asked forty-three nations whether women's equality was an essential characteristic of democracy. On a scale of one to ten, with one implying women's equality is not an essential characteristic of democracy and ten implying women's equality is an essential characteristic of democracy, every nation polled answered higher than five, with the global average being 8.53.³⁷⁸

Afrobarometer polled seventeen African countries in 2005 about whether women should have rights equal to those of men in each country. All but one nation had majorities or pluralities agreeing that women should have equal rights. On average, 71 percent said that women should receive the same treatment as men do, and 27 percent said that women have always been subject to traditional laws and customs, and should remain so.³⁷⁹

In 2005 and 2006, Afrobarometer also polled eighteen African countries about whether women should have the same chance of being elected to political office as men. Majorities or pluralities in every nation felt that women have the right to hold elected office. On average, 76 percent of people polled said that women should have the same chance of being elected to political office as men, whereas 23 percent said that men make better political leaders than women, and should be elected rather than women.³⁸⁰

Government Intervention

There is strong support for the government taking an active role to further women's rights. Majorities in all nations polled—with large majorities in nearly all cases said that “the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination against women.” Only small minorities endorsed the view that “the government should not be involved in this kind of thing.”

WPO polled twenty-two nations in 2008 about whether the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination against women, and a majority in every nation responded that it should. An average of 81 percent of those answering felt that the government should be involved, whereas only 15 percent felt that it should not.³⁸¹

Kenya and Mexico had the largest majorities (97 percent and 96 percent, respectively) endorsing such intervention. India was the only country without a large majority favoring government action (53 percent) and the one with the largest minority saying the government should not be involved (38 percent).

Racial and Ethnic Equality

Large majorities in all countries say people of different races and ethnicities should be treated equally. In nearly every country large majorities say that employers should not be allowed to discriminate based on race or ethnicity and that it is the government's responsibility to stop this from happening. In general, large majorities agree that governments should take action to prevent racial discrimination.

In a 2008 WPO poll, majorities in all twenty-two nations polled considered it important for “people of different races and ethnicities to be treated equally.” In seventeen countries, majorities said this is “very important.” On average, 91 percent said that treating people of different races and ethnicities equally is important, with 69 percent saying it is very important. No more than 13 percent in any country said it is not important.³⁸²

Overwhelming majorities said racial equality is very important in Mexico (94 percent), China (90 percent), and Great Britain (87 percent), along with large majorities in Kenya (80 percent), the United States (79 percent), Indonesia (75 percent), Jordan (73 percent), and Turkey (73 percent). Smaller numbers agreed in Russia (37 percent), Thailand (39 percent), India (44 percent), and Ukraine (50 percent).

Workplace Discrimination

Majorities in eighteen out of twenty nations agreed that employers should not have the right to discriminate. Asked whether employers should be allowed to “refuse to hire a qualified person because of the person's race or ethnicity,” on average 72 percent said employers should not be able to base hiring decisions on race, while just 21 percent believed they should.

Majorities against workplace discrimination were largest in France (94 percent), China (88 percent), the United States (86 percent), Indonesia (84 percent), Great Britain (83 percent), and Azerbaijan (82 percent).

Thailand and India stand apart from the other countries polled. Thais were divided on whether employers should be allowed to discriminate based on race or ethnicity (37 percent) or whether they should not (38 percent). In India, although a plurality opposed such discrimination, an unusually high 30 percent said that employers should be allowed to

reject jobseekers because of race or ethnicity. Relatively large minorities also agreed that employers should be free to discriminate in Nigeria (34 percent) and South Korea (41 percent), though in both cases, majorities were opposed (64 percent and 58 percent, respectively).³⁸³

Majorities in seventeen out of twenty nations believed that the government has the responsibility to stop employers from discriminating. On average, 58 percent of people polled globally believed that the government has the responsibility to take action against such practices, while just 14 percent believed it does not.

Indonesians (80 percent) and the Chinese (77 percent) believed overwhelmingly that the government should try to prevent discriminatory hiring practices, followed by Azerbaijanis (72 percent), the French (69 percent), and Americans (69 percent). More modest majorities agreed in Russia (58 percent), Egypt (56 percent), Nigeria (56 percent), the Palestinian Territories (53 percent), and South Korea (53 percent). Among Thais, 36 percent said the government has this responsibility, while 37 said companies should be allowed to discriminate, and 9 percent believed the government should not be involved.

Two countries differ: Turkey and India. Only 23 percent of Turks said that the government has the responsibility to take measures against workplace discrimination and 43 percent said it does not. Among Indians, just 27 percent said that government has this responsibility, while 20 percent said it does not.³⁸⁴

Wide Support for Government Action

Majorities in publics around the world agree that governments should act to ensure that racial and ethnic minorities are treated equally. On average, 80 percent agreed that the government “should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on a person’s race or ethnicity,” while just 11 percent felt that the government should not be involved.³⁸⁵

Support for government action was greatest in South Korea (96 percent), Kenya (95 percent), Mexico (94 percent), China (90 percent; Hong Kong, 78 percent), Nigeria (90 percent), Spain (89 percent), and Indonesia (88 percent). Large majorities also favored such efforts in Great Britain (85 percent), France (85 percent), the United States (83 percent), Argentina (82 percent), Turkey (79 percent), and Iran (76 percent).

Only in India did less than half of the public (46 percent) favor government action. Seventeen percent opposed such action while large numbers were uncertain.

Eurobarometer in March 2008 asked respondents in twenty-seven EU member states whether specific measures should be adopted to provide equal employment opportunities for people of different ethnic origins. Majorities in all twenty-seven countries favored measures such as special training schemes or adapted selection and recruitment processes. In the European average, 72 percent were in favor and 22 percent were opposed.³⁸⁶

Eurobarometer also asked in March 2008 if respondents in twenty-seven EU member states favored monitoring the composition of the workforce to evaluate the representation of people from ethnic minorities. Twenty-three countries favored such a step, while four were opposed. In the European average, 57 percent supported this monitoring and 33 percent were opposed.³⁸⁷

In the same poll, respondents in all twenty-seven countries favored monitoring of recruitment procedures to ensure candidates from ethnic minorities are not discriminated against, with a European average of 71 percent supportive and 21 percent were.³⁸⁸

Norms on Torture and Detention

Large majorities support having international rules against torture. However, significant minorities favor making an exception in the case of terrorists who have information that could save innocent lives. Limited polling has found that views are more mixed on prohibiting threatening torture or treating detainees in a humiliating or degrading manner. Commanders are generally seen as responsible if their subordinates carry out torture. All countries polled disapprove of allowing the United States to use their airspace to conduct extraordinary renditions.

In a July 2006 WPO poll in the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, and India, majorities in four countries approved a rule against physical torture. In the average of all five countries, 61 percent approved a rule against physical torture and 31 percent said this rule was too restrictive. Indians were divided (35 percent approve, 39 percent too restrictive).³⁸⁹

A 2008 WPO poll of twenty-two nations asked whether governments should generally be able to use torture. While, as discussed below, some thought an exception should be made for terrorism-related suspects, across all nations polled, in no case did more than one in five favor generally allowing governments to use torture. On average just 9 percent said there should be no rules against torture. China and Turkey had the largest percentages (18 percent in both) saying governments should generally be allowed to torture, followed by Nigeria (15 percent). France and Great Britain had the lowest (4 percent in both).³⁹⁰

Making Exceptions for Terrorism-Related Suspects

Since the 9/11 attacks there has been substantial discussion of the possibility of using torture when terrorists have information, representing a challenge to the norm against the use of torture established in various international treaties. A 2008 WPO poll sought to find out how much this argument in favor of an exception has gained credence with publics around the world.

Respondents were presented with an argument in favor of allowing the torture of potential terrorists who threaten civilians: "Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that would save innocent lives." They were also presented with the argument: "Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture."

In fifteen out of twenty-two nations, a majority or plurality opted for the unequivocal view in favor of fully maintaining the norm, five favored an exception, and one was divided. On average across all nations polled, 57 percent opted for unequivocal rules against torture. However, 35 percent favored an exception when innocent lives are at risk.

Support for the unequivocal position was highest in Spain (82 percent), Great Britain (82 percent), and France (82 percent), followed by Argentina (76 percent), Mexico (73 percent), and China (66 percent). In two countries it was only a plurality: Russia (49 percent) and Iran (43 percent). South Koreans were divided.

The five publics favoring an exception for terrorists when innocent lives are at risk included majorities in India (59 percent), Kenya (58 percent), Nigeria (54 percent), and Turkey (51 percent), and a plurality in Thailand (44 percent).³⁹¹

However, this support for an exception does not signify a readiness to abandon the norm against torture. As mentioned above, when respondents who favored making an exception were asked whether the government should generally be allowed to use torture, the numbers saying it should were quite small.

All of the nations or territories polled on this topic are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and parties to the Geneva Conventions forbidding torture and other forms of abuse. All but three have also ratified the 1987 UN Convention against Torture. India has signed but not ratified the convention, while Iran has not signed it. The Palestinian Territories are not eligible to be a party to the agreement.

A November 2005 Associated Press-Ipsos poll of nine countries from around the world also found some readiness to consider using torture with suspected terrorists. Respondents were asked, "How do you feel about the use of torture against suspected terrorists to obtain information about terrorism activities?" and then asked "Can that often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified." Eight countries said torture in such a case could "never" or "rarely" be justified, while one country (South Korea) had a modest majority (53 percent) saying it can "often" or "sometimes" be justified. In the average of all nine countries, 63 percent said torture can rarely or never be justified, but 32 percent said it could be justified.³⁹²

Trends on Views of Making an Exception for Terrorists

A June-July 2006 poll conducted for the BBC World Service by GlobeScan and the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) asked sixteen of the twenty-one nations polled in the aforementioned 2008 WPO poll the same question about making an exception to rules against torture in the case of terrorists. While there has been little change overall, there have been some dramatic shifts within specific countries.³⁹³

In 2006 only India had even a modest plurality favoring an exception. But in the 2008 survey, four countries (India, Kenya, Nigeria, and Turkey) had a majority supporting such exceptions, Thailand had a plurality, and South Korea was divided.

Five countries included in both surveys showed dramatic increases in support for allowing the torture of terrorists: India (from 32 percent to 59 percent), Kenya (38 percent to 58 percent), Nigeria (39 percent to 54 percent), Turkey (24 percent to 51 percent), and South Korea (31 percent to 51 percent). Substantial increases also occurred in Egypt (25 percent to 46 percent) and the United States (36 percent to 44 percent).

At the same time, there were equally dramatic increases among those favoring a complete ban on torture. Support grew substantially in Mexico (rising from 50 percent to 73 percent), Spain (65 percent to 82 percent), China (49 percent to 66 percent), Indonesia (51 percent to 61 percent), Great Britain (72 percent to 82 percent), and Russia (43 percent to 49 percent).

On average, support for an exception went up six points, while support for an unequivocal rule went down two points. Thus the net increase in favor of an exception was just four points.

Of the six countries with the largest increases in support for an unequivocal rule against torture, four (Spain, Great Britain, Indonesia, and Russia) suffered major terrorist attacks before the 2006 poll, but have not suffered major attacks since then. Thus it may be that after a terrorist attack the prohibition against using torture weakens, but then over time gradually reasserts itself.

Threatening Torture/Humiliating and Degrading Treatment

Views having a rule against threatening physical torture are more equivocal than views on torture. Majorities in the United States, Germany, and Poland approved such a rule, while Britons and Indians said this was too restrictive. In the average of all five countries, 52 percent favored a rule against threatening physical torture and 39 percent were opposed.

Similarly, on treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading, majorities in the United States, Germany, and Poland approved a rule against, while those in Great Britain and India said this was too restrictive. The average of all five countries, 53 percent approved a rule against and 38 percent said this was too restrictive.³⁹⁴

Responsibility of Commanders for Torture

The July 2006 WPO poll also asked respondents in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Poland, and India whether commanders of military personnel should be held responsible for torture by subordinates, even when they claim not to have been aware of it. All five countries said commanders should be held responsible. On average, 61 percent favored holding commanders responsible in such a case and 28 percent said commanders should not be held responsible.³⁹⁵

Extraordinary Rendition

The same poll also asked publics about whether their country should allow the United States to use their country's airspace to transport a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture (also known as extraordinary rendition). Majorities or pluralities in all four countries said their country should refuse the United States this permission, with an average of 53 percent of respondents opposing and 31 percent in favor of granting it.³⁹⁶

Social and Economic Rights

Large majorities in every country say their government should be responsible to take care of the poor and for ensuring that citizens can meet their basic needs for food, healthcare, and education. However, there are wide variations in how people perceive their governments to be fulfilling these responsibilities.

An October 2007 Pew Global Attitudes Project survey polled forty-seven countries on whether the government should be responsible for taking care of very poor people who cannot care for themselves. Majorities in all forty-seven countries agreed that this is the responsibility of the state. In the global average, 86 percent of respondents agreed and 12 percent disagreed.³⁹⁷

WPO in 2008 explored perceptions of government responsibility for ensuring citizens can meet their needs for food, healthcare, and education.

When asked whether their “government should be responsible for ensuring that its citizens can meet their basic need for food,” or whether “you think that is not the government’s responsibility,” majorities of 70–97 percent in all twenty-one countries said government should be responsible for this function. The average was 87 percent in support of this proposition.³⁹⁸

Even the lowest majorities saying the government is responsible in this case were well above half of all respondents, including Indians (70 percent), Americans (74 percent), and Russians (77 percent). The publics with significant numbers saying the government does *not* have the responsibility to ensure access to food included the United States (25 percent), the Palestinian Territories (17 percent), and France (13 percent).

When asked about government responsibility in regard to “the basic need for healthcare,” majorities of the same magnitude (70–97 percent) in all countries polled saw ensuring that people can meet this need as one of government’s responsibilities. The average majority was 92 percent, and in all but five countries support was greater than 90 percent.³⁹⁹

The only publics in which the public gave less than 90-percent support for the government having a responsibility to provide healthcare included in India (70 percent), the United States (77 percent), the Palestinian Territories (79 percent), Egypt (81 percent), and Thailand (88 percent). The publics with the highest numbers saying that the government did not have such a responsibility were Americans (21 percent), the Palestinians (19 percent), and Egyptians (14 percent).

On education, majorities ranging from 64 to 98 percent also saw the government as responsible for ensuring that people can meet their basic needs. The average majority in support of government providing education was 91 percent across the twenty-one countries, and in only six nations do majorities of less than 90 percent take this position. Egyptians had the largest minority saying the government is not responsible for education (19 percent), followed by Americans (16 percent).⁴⁰⁰

U.S. OPINION ON GLOBAL ISSUES

CHAPTER 9: U.S. OPINION ON GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF WORLD ORDER

International Law

Americans support an international order based on international law. A majority believes that international laws create normative obligations like domestic law and rejects the view that nations should not feel obliged to abide by international law when doing so is at odds with their national interest. However, U.S. respondents tend to underestimate the extent to which their fellow citizens feel such an obligation. They also express readiness to contribute military forces to uphold international law. Asked about specific international laws, a large majority endorses the international law prohibiting the use of military force except in self-defense or defense of an ally, and a substantial majority believes that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) should abide by the Geneva Conventions when questioning suspects who may have information about terrorist plots against the United States.

Americans believe that their nation is obliged to abide by international law. A 2009 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll introduced the subject of international law, saying: “As you may know there are a number of international laws based on agreements between most nations, including our own. These govern a wide set of issues ranging from fishing rights to the use of military force.” They were then asked to choose between two positions on international law. Sixty-nine percent chose the one that said: “Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.” Only 29 percent chose the position, “If our government thinks it is not in our nation’s interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws.”

Interestingly, the number of U.S. respondents who felt their country had an obligation to abide by international law was substantially higher than the average of twenty nations polled on the subject; on average, 57 percent of respondents across those countries believed that their nation should be bound by international laws and 36 percent believed that their country should not necessarily have to follow such laws. The United States was led only by China (74 percent) and Germany (70 percent).⁴⁰¹

U.S. respondents tended to underestimate the extent to which their fellow citizens feel obliged to abide by international law. The same poll asked respondents in the United States and eighteen other countries a follow-up question on whether, compared to the average citizen of their country, they are “more supportive or less supportive of consistently abiding by international laws.” If a public as a whole were to perceive itself correctly, one would predict a balance between those saying more and those saying less. But this did not prove to be the case, particularly in the United States. On average, by more than a two-to-one ratio (66 percent to 30 percent), those Americans saying that they were more supportive outweighed those saying that they were less supportive. This indicates that respondents underestimate other citizens’ support for abiding by international law. This misperception appeared in fifteen out of the twenty countries in the poll. The number of people believing they were more supportive than average was a bit higher in the United States than the average of seventeen countries asked (48 to 28 percent; Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan were not included in the global average).⁴⁰²

A 2006 WPO poll found 79 percent of Americans approved of “the international law that prohibits a nation from using military force against another nation except in self defense or to defend an ally.”⁴⁰³

A 2006 Gallup poll found that 57 percent of Americans thought that Central Intelligence Agency officers should be required to abide by the Geneva Conventions when questioning “suspects whom they believe have information about possible terror plots against the United States,” while 38 percent thought they should be able to use more forceful techniques.⁴⁰⁴

Forcibly Upholding International Law

A majority of U.S. respondents has expressed a general readiness to use military force to uphold international law. A 2002 Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA)/German Marshall Fund (GMF) survey asked Americans whether they

would approve the use of their country's military troops "to uphold international law." Seventy-six percent of respondents approved. Large majorities in six European countries polled at the same time also approved.⁴⁰⁵

The results of this poll are striking because the question did not seek to elicit support for intervention based on any other value, such as defending a victim from an aggressor country or advancing some humanitarian goal. Upholding international law alone was seen by respondents as sufficient cause for putting their country's troops at risk.

International Treaties

Large majorities of Americans support U.S. participation in a variety of international treaties. A large majority also favors having an international body, such as a court, judge compliance with treaties to which the United States is party.

Americans show strong support for U.S. participation in a variety of international treaties.

One such treaty is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In 2006, CCGA asked people in the United States whether they favor their country participating in "the treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide." A large majority (86 percent) favored the idea. People in South Korea, China, and India were also asked this question and majorities in each case concurred, with Americans at the upper end of the spectrum in terms of their level of approval.⁴⁰⁶ When CCGA again asked this question in 2008, 88 percent of Americans favored U.S. participation.⁴⁰⁷

CCGA also asked if respondents believed their country should participate in an agreement under the Biological Weapons Treaty that would allow for international inspections. Eighty-nine percent of U.S. respondents said that the United States should. Again, the United States had the highest public support of participation in the treaty compared to the other countries asked.⁴⁰⁸

The same poll surveyed people in the United States on their feelings regarding participating in the international agreement on the International Criminal Court. Seventy-one percent of Americans said their country should take part.⁴⁰⁹ In 2008, CCGA again asked this question and found 68 percent in favor.⁴¹⁰

Large majorities of Americans believe the United States should take part in a new international treaty to combat climate change. CCGA found that 76 percent of U.S. respondents favor U.S. participation in "a new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse-gas emissions" (CCGA 2008).⁴¹¹ In 2006, seven in ten Americans indicated that they believed their country should participate in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming.⁴¹²

In 2005, Pew asked whether the United States should sign "a treaty with other nations to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons, including our own." Seventy percent of Americans said that it should.⁴¹³

Eighty-six percent of Americans polled in 2006 approved of the United States being part of "treaties that establish standards for protecting the human rights of their citizens" (WPO 2006).⁴¹⁴

Finally, 82 percent of U.S. respondents that same year approved of the United States signing treaties that prohibit the use of torture (WPO 2006).⁴¹⁵

International Adjudication of Treaties

A 2006 WPO study asked Americans a series of questions about international adjudication of treaties. Asked broadly, "As a general rule, when the United States enters into international agreements, do you think there should or should not be an independent international body, such as a court, to judge whether the parties are complying with the agreement?" Seventy-six percent of respondents said there should be such a body, while 21 percent said that there should not be.⁴¹⁶

Support was also quite strong when U.S. respondents were asked about the possibility of adjudicating a wide range of specific types of disputes. In every case, a majority expressed support; in all but one case, a large majority did so. Americans expressed the highest support for adjudication of disputes over whether states are abiding by treaties governing human rights (79 percent) and disputes over borders (74 percent). Strong majorities also endorsed having international bodies adjudicate disputes over whether countries are enforcing their environmental laws (69 percent), which countries have the right to fish in certain waters (66 percent), whether countries are enforcing their labor laws

(64 percent), and what rights nations give foreigners who are arrested and charged with a crime (64 percent). The case with the least public support was one in which “a country can give preferential trade treatment to another country.” A bare majority of 51 percent supported adjudication in this instance, with 44 percent opposed.⁴¹⁷

To dig deeper into respondents’ views and to find out how solid they were, researchers presented them with a series of four arguments in support of and four in opposition to international adjudication and asked how convincing they found each one.

All four of the arguments in favor of international adjudication received overwhelming support. Eighty-five percent found the argument convincing (41 percent very convincing) that “it is much easier for the United States to pursue its interests if the world is a place where countries are resolving disputes peacefully in accordance with international law.” An equally large number (84 percent) found convincing (35 percent very convincing) the argument: “We cannot simply let countries decide if they are in compliance with an agreement. Otherwise they will find excuses for not really complying. We need an objective party to judge whether they are complying.”⁴¹⁸

Even when presented with the fact that the United States may “lose a case from time to time,” 78 percent of respondents concurred—33 percent found it very convincing—that it is nonetheless “better for the United States to generally use international courts to resolve its disputes with other countries than to allow some disputes to escalate to destructive levels.” An argument Americans found slightly less persuasive (69 percent convincing, 22 percent very convincing) was that the positive U.S. experience with the rule of law at home should be applied to the international sphere.⁴¹⁹

None of the arguments against international adjudication secured as much public support as the arguments in favor, but three out of four nonetheless appeared convincing to a majority of respondents. This suggests that most Americans acknowledge that there are costs and risks associated with international adjudication. But when asked to weigh these costs and risks against the benefits, most are in favor of international adjudication.

The most convincing argument against accepting international adjudication was, “Judges from other countries cannot be trusted to be impartial ... because there are so many people in the world who are looking for opportunities to try to undermine the United States.” Sixty-five percent of U.S. respondents found that argument convincing (20 percent very convincing). This concern may be enhanced by the perception that U.S. foreign policy is unpopular.⁴²⁰

Somewhat less successful was an argument based on sovereignty concerns: “Submitting to international courts would violate the United States’ sovereign right to protect its citizens and its interests.” Fifty-eight percent said this was convincing.⁴²¹

The weakest argument against adjudication argued from a realist point of view, “Because the United States is the most powerful country in the world, it has the means to get its way in international disputes,” and therefore, “it has nothing to gain from submitting to the jurisdiction of international courts.” Only 48 percent of Americans polled found this convincing, while 51 percent found it unconvincing.⁴²²

Much more persuasive was an argument based on responsibility and U.S. exceptionalism, rather than power alone: Sixty-two percent found convincing (23 percent very convincing) the argument that the United States “uses its power in the world to do the right thing” and therefore international courts should not be allowed to “tie America’s hands.”⁴²³

After evaluating these arguments for and against international adjudication, all respondents were asked (half for the second time) whether, “As a general rule, when the United States enters into international agreements, do you think there should or should not be an independent international body, such as a court, to judge whether the parties are complying with the agreement?”

Although they had been exposed to strong arguments against adjudication, most respondents nevertheless felt that the benefits of international adjudication outweighed the costs. Seventy-one percent said that when the United States entered into an international agreement, an independent body should judge compliance, down only 5 percent from when they were asked the same question before evaluating the pro and con arguments; 25 percent said no.⁴²⁴

Overall, it appears that Americans find some arguments against international adjudication persuasive, based primarily on themes that the United States should be viewed as exceptional. However, while these arguments may give them

pause, in the end the U.S. public comes down firmly in favor of international adjudication. This proved true both on the general question as well as on the eight specific types of disputes (all of which were presented *after* respondents had evaluated the pro and con arguments).

Consistent with these results, seven out of ten U.S. respondents rejected making a special exception for the United States in international treaties on human rights. Only 25 percent thought that as a general rule “U.S. compliance with the treaty” should never be “subject to the judgment of an international body.” Sixty-nine percent thought the United States should not claim a special exception.⁴²⁵

International Criminal Court

A large majority of Americans favor U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court even after hearing U.S. government objections.

CCGA has regularly asked Americans whether the United States should “participate in the International Criminal Court (ICC) that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won’t try them.” In 2008, 68 percent favored doing so. CCGA has asked this question regularly since 2002 and found support ranging from 68 to 77 percent.⁴²⁶

When presented with arguments for and against participating in the ICC, including the primary U.S. argument against the court, a majority, albeit a somewhat smaller one, still favors U.S. participation. A 2006 WPO poll presented the following statements: “Some say the United States should not support the Court because trumped up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation. Others say that the United States should support the court because the world needs a better way to prosecute war criminals, many of whom go unpunished today.” After hearing the arguments, 68 percent said the United States should support the ICC while 29 percent said it should not. When CCGA asked the same question in 2002, 65 percent favored U.S. participation in the ICC.⁴²⁷

Multilateralism and the International Order

Americans favor a world order either based on a balance of regional powers or led by the United Nations, rather than a system based on hegemony or bipolarity. Large majorities reject a hegemonic role for the United States, but do want the United States to participate in multilateral efforts to address international issues.

Americans prefer a system of world order based on a multilateral approach over one based on hegemony or bipolarity. The Bertelsmann Foundation asked nine countries worldwide in 2005 to identify the best framework for ensuring peace and stability, offering four options. In the United States, the most popular option was “a system led by a balance of regional powers,” which was endorsed by 52 percent of Americans, while a third of respondents chose “a system led by the United Nations.” For other nations, the more common position was a system based on the United Nations. Among Americans, as with all other respondents, small minorities favored “a system led by a single world power” (6 percent) or “a system led by two world powers” (4 percent).⁴²⁸

Large majorities of Americans reject a hegemonic role for the United States. In 2006, CCGA and WPO presented three options for the U.S. role in the international system. The least popular choice argued, “As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.” Just 10 percent chose this option. Likewise, the position, “The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems” also received low levels of support (12 percent). By far, the preferred option was a multilateral approach, which reasoned, “The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.” Seventy-five percent favored this position. Interestingly, Americans concur with publics of most other nations on this; in thirteen out of fifteen countries polled, majorities preferred that the United States adopt a multilateral approach to world affairs, with an average of 56 percent of respondents endorsing it.⁴²⁹

The same poll asked whether the “United States has the responsibility to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur.” Here again, three-quarters of Americans rejected this hegemonic idea. This was even higher than the average of the nine countries polled (65 percent) saying that the United States does not have this responsibility.⁴³⁰

Other, U.S.-only polls have also found widespread rejection of the United States playing a hegemonic role in the world. Fifty-six percent of U.S. respondents in 2003 agreed that the United States does not have “the ability to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur” (Time/CNN/Harris 2003).⁴³¹ Only 27 percent endorsed the view, “The United States has the responsibility to fight violations of law and aggression around the world even without the cooperation of its allies,” while 63 percent agreed that “the United States should work only in a coordinated effort with its allies to fight violations of international law and aggression around the world” (*Los Angeles Times*/Bloomberg 2006).⁴³²

Gallup has regularly asked about “the role the United States should play in trying to solve international problems.” Repeatedly, only small minorities have endorsed the option of the United States playing “the leading role,” most recently 23 percent in 2009. At the same time, few Americans support the idea of playing only a “minor role” (17 percent) or “no role” (6 percent). Consistently, the most popular option is for the United States to “take a major role, but not the leading one” (52 percent in 2009).⁴³³

Majorities also consistently reject the position that “the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, we should go our own way in international matters, not worrying too much about whether other countries agree with us or not.” In 2005, 63 percent rejected this position, while 32 percent endorsed it.⁴³⁴

Interestingly, in 2003, Americans agreed with Europeans that U.S. unilateralism poses a threat to the United States itself. The GMF poll asked respondents to rate the threat of “the United States going it alone.” Only 24 percent said it was not a threat at all, while two-thirds said it was an extremely important threat (21 percent) or an important threat (46 percent). On average in Europe, 47 percent said it was an important threat to Europe, 31 percent said it was an extremely important threat, and 17 percent said it was not an important threat.⁴³⁵

At the same time, a plurality of Americans does want to ensure that no other country becomes the global hegemon. Asked whether the United States should preserve its role as “the only military superpower” or whether it was “acceptable if China, another country, or the European Union became as militarily powerful as the United States,” 50 percent of respondents preferred the option of preserving U.S. superiority, though 35 percent said it would be acceptable for others to achieve equal power and 15 percent did not answer (Pew 2005).⁴³⁶

However, a follow-up question suggested that this commitment to maintaining U.S. supremacy is fairly soft. The 50 percent who had advocated that the United States should maintain superiority were asked, “Should U.S. policies try to keep it so America is the only military superpower even if it risks alienating our principal allies?” Responses were evenly divided, such that only 23 percent of the full sample expressed determination to maintain superiority if it would alienate U.S. allies.⁴³⁷

Strengthening the United Nations

Americans favor the broad principle of having a stronger United Nations and having the United Nations, rather than the United States, take the lead on a variety of international issues. Majorities favor giving the United Nations expanded powers, including having a standing peacekeeping force, investigating human rights violations, and regulating the international arms trade. However, a slight plurality opposes giving the United Nations the capacity to impose a tax.

A number of polls have found robust support among U.S. respondents for a stronger United Nations. A 2004 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked about the possibility of “the United Nations becoming significantly more powerful in world affairs.” While slightly below the global average (64 percent), a majority of Americans (59 percent) replied that this development would be mainly positive.⁴³⁸ And when WPO asked this same question in January 2007, support for a stronger United Nations rose to 66 percent among Americans.⁴³⁹

A large majority of Americans also favor strengthening the United Nations. In response to a 2006 CCGA poll, 79 percent of U.S. respondents considered the goal of “strengthening the United Nations” to be an important foreign policy goal, while 19 percent responded that this objective is “not important.” Equally high levels of support for this goal were found in seven other countries polled.⁴⁴⁰

Slightly fewer respondents endorsed a stronger United Nations, though it still garnered majority support, when they were presented with two countervailing arguments: that strengthening the United Nations “would only create bigger,

unwieldy bureaucracies,” and that “because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems.” After hearing both arguments in a 2003 GMF poll, 70 percent of Americans said the United Nations “needs to be strengthened.” This was in line with European support, which ranged from 61 to 81 percent.⁴⁴¹

U.S. support for a stronger United Nations has been consistent over the last three decades. CCGA has asked about this goal since 1974 and, in every year, approximately eight in ten U.S. respondents say that it should be a U.S. foreign policy goal. Most recently, the 2008 CCGA survey found that 79 percent of respondents believed it should be a very (39 percent) or somewhat (40 percent) important foreign policy goal, while 21 percent believed it was not important.

At the same time, respondents do not rank this goal high on the list of U.S. policy priorities. The percentage saying that strengthening the United Nations should be “very important” is generally under half. In a 2002 internet poll, an unusually high 55 percent endorsed it as a very important foreign policy goal, but by the 2008 poll, the figure had fallen to just 39 percent.⁴⁴²

Pew has also found consistently large U.S. majorities for making the goal of strengthening the United Nations a priority. Asked most recently in 2008, 78 percent of respondents classified strengthening the United Nations as a top priority (32 percent) or some priority (46 percent). Support was slightly higher in October 2005, when 83 percent either said that it should be a top priority (40 percent) or some priority (43 percent).⁴⁴³

A large majority of Americans also support the idea that the United Nations should become significantly more powerful. In December 2006, a WPO/Knowledge Networks poll asked respondents to evaluate a number of possible future trends, one of which was “the United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.” Fully two-thirds (66 percent) said they thought this outcome would be mostly positive, while just 32 percent said it would be mostly negative. This represents a tangible jump from November 2004, when the figures were 59 percent and 37 percent, respectively (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA).⁴⁴⁴

The U.S. public wants the United Nations to play a policymaking role, though not to dictate policy. In response to a Gallup poll in 2009 that presented three options, 26 percent opted for the United Nations to play “a leading role where all countries are required to follow UN policies.” The largest percentage (38 percent) preferred the United Nations playing “a major role, where the UN establishes policies, but where individual countries still act separately when they disagree with the UN.” Taken together, a total of 64 percent opted for the United Nations to play a policymaking role, though less than half favor giving it the power to dictate policy. In contrast, just 30 percent opted for the more limited third option of “the UN serving mostly as a forum for communication between nations, but with no policymaking role.”⁴⁴⁵

Giving the United Nations Expanded Powers

Polling reveals consistent U.S. support for giving the United Nations new powers. In 2006, CCGA polled people in the United States on four proposals for new powers for the United Nations. Five out of six received strong support.

On having a **standing UN peacekeeping force**, a strong majority of Americans were in favor (72 percent). This figure was a bit higher than the average of 66 percent among the twenty-two nations polled.⁴⁴⁶

On giving the United Nations the authority to **go into countries to investigate violations of human rights**, three-quarters of Americans were in favor (75 percent); again, this was higher than the global average of 65 percent.⁴⁴⁷

Taking this a step further in 2008, CCGA also asked about “creating an **international marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide**.” Seventy-one percent of Americans were in favor of this idea, while 27 percent were opposed (this question was only asked in the United States).⁴⁴⁸

On giving the United Nations **the power to regulate the international arms trade**, 60 percent of Americans were in favor, compared to 58 percent globally.⁴⁴⁹

CCGA also asked about having a “UN agency **control access to all nuclear fuel in the world to ensure that none is used for weapons production.**” Sixty-three percent of Americans favored the idea (the question was not asked globally).⁴⁵⁰

Opposition was stronger to giving the United Nations the power to **impose a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil**, with 45 percent in favor and 50 percent against. While U.S. support was just below the global average (48 percent), the United States had much higher levels of opposition (50 percent) than other nations polled (average 36 percent).⁴⁵¹

In November 2001—two months after 9/11—a large majority (71 percent) of Americans responded positively when asked, “In order to prepare for a possible future international terrorist attack do you think that the United Nations should be given broader powers that would **force member countries to work together to fight terrorism?**”⁴⁵²

Multilateralism and the Use of Military Force

Among U.S. respondents, large majorities favor the United Nations having the right to authorize the use of military force for a wide range of contingencies. U.S. responses indicated that approval of the UN Security Council is seen as playing a powerful and, in many cases, necessary role in conferring legitimacy on the use of military force. Approval by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) does provide some legitimacy for military action in the U.S. public’s eyes, but generally by smaller margins than does UN approval.

The UN Security Council’s Right to Authorize Military Force

Chapter 7 of the UN Charter grants the UN Security Council (UNSC) the right to authorize military force in response to what it believes is a threat to international security. Consistent with this provision, the U.S. public generally believes that the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force in response to a wide range of contingencies. Between 2006 and 2008, WPO and CCGA polled the U.S. public on whether the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize military force for a variety of purposes. U.S. support was quite robust in nearly all cases.

The largest majority of Americans said that the UNSC “should” have the right to authorize the use of military force in order “**to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.**” Eighty-three percent of respondents agreed that the UNSC should have this right, while only 13 percent disagreed. For all eighteen countries polled, the average was 76 percent agreeing.⁴⁵³

A majority of Americans polled similarly favored giving the UNSC the right to authorize military force in order “**to defend a country that has been attacked.**” Eighty-three percent of respondents felt the UNSC should have this right (higher than the average of 76 percent among the sixteen countries polled), and only 14 percent felt it should not.⁴⁵⁴

A majority of U.S. respondents also favored the United Nations having the right “**to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.**” Seventy-six percent said that the United Nations should have this right, while 20 percent said that it should not (as compared to an international average of 73 percent in favor).⁴⁵⁵

Asked whether the Security Council should have the right to authorize military force “**to prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them,**” a majority of Americans were in favor (62 percent), similar to the average of all countries polled (59 percent).⁴⁵⁶

Raising the bar even higher, the poll asked respondents about the United Nations using force “**to stop a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons.**” Support in this case was only a bit lower, with 57 percent in favor and 39 percent opposed (compared to the global average of 56 percent in favor and 32 percent opposed).⁴⁵⁷

Americans gave the same level of support for the United Nations having the right to authorize military action “**to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.**” Fifty-seven percent were in favor of the United Nations having this right (compared to the global average of 53 percent).⁴⁵⁸

United Nations Approval as Legitimizing Military Force

A variety of polls have found that, in the eyes of the U.S. public, UN Security Council approval provides powerful legitimacy for the use of military force. A 2005 GMF poll asked if respondents agreed that “the use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations approves it.” Interestingly, a larger majority of Americans (69 percent) agreed with this statement than agreed across the ten European countries polled.⁴⁵⁹ When a 2006 WPO poll asked the same question, once again, roughly seven in ten Americans (72 percent) agreed.⁴⁶⁰

In 2003, GMF’s transatlantic poll conducted an experiment in the United States to test the importance of multilateralism in decisions to use military force. Respondents were divided into several subgroups and asked a hypothetical question about contributing troops to attacking Iran or North Korea to force each of them to give up their weapons of mass destruction. The scenarios varied according to the actor authorizing and leading the response, including unilateral action by the United States, a coalition of the United States and its allies, a NATO intervention, and a UN Security Council-authorized intervention. Public support was lower for the scenario that envisioned the United States acting alone (with only 58 percent favoring it against North Korea and 67 percent against Iran), rather than through the United Nations (in which case support rose to 72 and 75 percent, respectively) or NATO (68 and 78 percent in the two scenarios).⁴⁶¹

Whether United Nations Approval is Necessary

A variety of polls reveal that Americans not only think that the United Nations provides greater legitimacy for military actions, but also that, in some instances, UN approval is essential. However, U.S. support for this view is more modest than in most other countries.

In 2004, GMF asked publics in the United States and ten Europe the following question: “If a situation like Iraq arose in the future, do you think it is essential to secure the approval of the United Nations before using military force, or don't you think it is essential?” Fifty-eight percent of Americans agreed that UN approval is essential. However, this was the lowest percentage of the eleven countries asked.⁴⁶²

The poll also asked about the United States contributing troops with UN approval in two different scenarios: “to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack” and “to establish peace in a civil war in an African country.” A majority of Americans (78 percent and 66 percent, respectively) said they would favor using U.S. armed forces in both scenarios, while 15 percent and 27 percent, respectively, said they would not.⁴⁶³⁻⁴⁶⁴ In both cases, U.S. respondents were among the most supportive, compared to Europeans who were asked whether they would endorse use of their own national troops in the event of UN authorization.

Those who said they would favor use of national troops under either of these circumstances were then asked if they would still support the use of their country’s armed forces if the United Nations did not approve it. In the United States, the subsample was divided on this question (49 percent in favor, 46 percent against) and Europeans were even less willing (only 27 percent in favor) than people in the United States to countenance the use of their troops in this scenario.⁴⁶⁵

Among Europeans, a strikingly large percentage of respondents regard UN approval as necessary before using military force to deal with international threats in general, a stance that goes well beyond the strictures of Article 51 of the UN Charter, which does allow for unilateral or collective self-defense without Security Council approval. U.S. respondents, in contrast, leaned away from this restrictive view of military power.

In 2004, Pew asked people in nine nations whether their country “should have UN approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat,” or whether “that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats.” A plurality of Americans (48 percent) believed that it would be too difficult to deal with international threats this way, while 41 percent responded that the United States should indeed have UN approval. Among the eight other countries polled, views were mixed, with Europeans (British 64 percent, French 63 percent, Germans 80 percent) the most likely to say approval was necessary and Russians the least likely (37 percent).⁴⁶⁶

NATO Approval as Legitimizing Military Force

The use of military force by NATO during the Kosovo War of 1999, without explicit UN Security Council endorsement, raises the question of whether NATO confers adequate legitimacy on military action when the UNSC does not approve. Polls indicate that a majority of Americans believe NATO approval provides some legitimacy for the use of military force, but substantially fewer people hold this view than those believing UN approval confers such legitimacy.

In 2005, GMF asked if NATO approval makes military action legitimate. A modest majority of Americans (53 percent) said that it does, while 39 percent said it does not. An average of 51 percent of Europeans from ten countries agreed that it does.⁴⁶⁷

When asked about contributing troops to a NATO-approved operation, Americans express fairly strong support for doing so, though in some cases support is a bit lower than for UN approved operations. The 2004 GMF poll first asked Americans about their readiness to contribute to a NATO approved military action to prevent a terrorist attack (79 percent in favor), or to establish peace in a civil war in Africa (60 percent in favor). In the terrorism scenario, support was about the same as in instances of UN approval (78 percent); in the African peacekeeping scenario, support for NATO approved operations was six points lower than for a UN-authorized mission.⁴⁶⁸

Overall, a large majority of Americans think that “initiating military force only when we have the support of our allies” is important. In a 2008 Public Agenda poll, 85 percent said that only taking military action with the backing of allies is “very important” (51 percent) or “somewhat important” (34 percent). Only 11 percent said it was “not very important” (6 percent) or “not at all important” (5 percent).⁴⁶⁹

Intervention in Internal Affairs

A robust majority of Americans approve of the United Nations intervening in the internal affairs of states to investigate human rights abuses and to promote human rights in member states. An equally large majority approves of the United Nations using military force to deliver urgent humanitarian aid if the government tries to block the aid and to protect people from severe human rights abuses, even against the will of the government. Majorities also support the idea that the UN has not only the right, but the “responsibility to protect” in the event of severe human rights violations.

While governments regularly invoke the principle of national sovereignty and resist UN intervention in their internal affairs, Americans are strikingly ready to give the United Nations such powers. This is a strong indication that Americans believe that norms should be applied in a global, not just a national, context.

As discussed above, a large U.S. majority approves of giving the United Nations the authority to go into countries to investigate violations of human rights. In a 2006 CCGA poll, 75 percent of Americans supported this idea (a higher figure than the global average of 65 percent).⁴⁷⁰

More generally, there is strong U.S. support for the United Nations taking an active role in promoting human rights in member states. A majority of U.S. respondents (70 percent, which was also the global average), said that the United Nations should “actively promote human rights in member states,” rejecting the argument that “this is improper interference in a country’s internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country.”⁴⁷¹ Fifty-nine percent favored the United Nations doing more than it does to “promote human rights principles” (a bit lower than the global average of 65 percent).⁴⁷² Fifty-nine percent said “the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women,” while 38 percent said that “this is improper interference in a country’s internal affairs.” Across the other nations polled, an average of 67 percent favored further UN action on advancing women’s rights, while only 26 percent were opposed (WPO 2008).⁴⁷³

Even when the counterargument of protecting national sovereignty is posed, U.S. respondents still strongly favored UN intervention to arrest human rights violators. Presented with two statements, only 18 percent endorsed the view that “even if human rights are seriously violated, the country’s sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene.” In contrast, 75 percent endorsed the view that “if a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene.”⁴⁷⁴

Forcible Humanitarian Intervention

Perhaps most dramatically, a majority of the U.S. public approves of the United Nations using military force against the will of a government when the population of a country is at risk.

A 2008 WPO poll posed the question of whether the United Nations should forcibly deliver urgent humanitarian aid if a government refuses to allow entry. The question was posed in terms of the recent events in Myanmar, as follows:

“In May 2008, Burma, [also known as Myanmar] had a major cyclone that left over a million people without food and water. Though the Burmese government was not effectively delivering aid, it refused to let in relief organizations. As a general rule, in such circumstances, should the UN bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government—OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of a country’s sovereignty?”

A modest majority of Americans (53 percent) said that, as a general rule, the United Nations should bring in shipments of aid even against the will of the government, escorted by military protection if necessary. U.S. support was below the global average of 60 percent.⁴⁷⁵

As discussed in more depth in the Violent Conflict component (see Chapter 3), large majorities in most countries endorse the principle that the United Nations not only has the right but also the responsibility to authorize military intervention “to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government.” In a 2006 CCGA poll, 74 percent of Americans said that the United Nations has such a responsibility, which is substantially higher than the global average of 61 percent.⁴⁷⁶

UN Monitoring of Elections

The U.S. public generally believes that when there are concerns about the fairness of an election, countries should be willing to have UN observers monitor it. Less than a majority of Americans, however, think the United States itself would benefit from such monitoring.

There is strong U.S. support for the United Nation’s role in monitoring elections. In 2009, respondents were asked by WPO, “Do you think that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections, countries should or should not be willing to have international observers from the United Nations monitor their elections?” Two-thirds of Americans responded that countries should be willing to have such international observers, just above the average of 63 percent of respondents from all eighteen nations polled.⁴⁷⁷

When it comes to having such monitoring in the United States, however, a slight majority of Americans resist the idea. Fifty-one percent said that the United States would not benefit from having international observers from the United Nations monitor elections, although a substantial 46 percent said that it would. In contrast, respondents globally expressed surprisingly high levels of support for having such monitoring in their own countries, with an average of 55 percent saying that their countries would benefit from having international observers monitor their elections and 36 percent saying that their countries would not.⁴⁷⁸

When the United Nations Should Take the Lead

Asked whether the United Nations, national governments, or regional organizations should take the lead in dealing with various issues, U.S. responses varied according to the issue. The most common view was that the United Nations should take the leading role in addressing aid for economic development and dealing with refugees and international peacekeeping, whereas national governments should take the lead on protection of the environment. U.S. views were more mixed on human rights, but most said either the United Nations or a regional organization should take the lead. Large majorities have said that the United Nations rather than the United States should take the lead in dealing with international conflicts in general, and specifically in dealing with Iran’s nuclear program and working toward a peace agreement after the 2006 Lebanon War. However, most balk at having the United Nations take the lead in combating climate change.

The World Values Survey asked a series of questions from 2005 to 2008 on which entity would be best to make decisions on a variety of international issues. The options presented were: national governments, a regional organization, or the United Nations.

On **aid to developing countries**, 41 percent of Americans identified the United Nations as best placed to lead, with 31 percent saying national governments, and 22 percent a regional organization. Globally, an average of 48 percent agreed that the United Nations was the best choice.⁴⁷⁹

On **refugees**, U.S. sentiment deviated somewhat from the global view. Americans were divided on which entity should take the lead, split between the national government (34 percent) and the United Nations (32 percent). On average, 43 percent of poll respondents across the globe identified the United Nations as the natural lead, while 29 percent identified national governments and 17 percent chose a regional organization.⁴⁸⁰

On **international peacekeeping**, more U.S. respondents identified the United Nations as a leader than the global average. Fifty percent of Americans said that the United Nations should take the lead on international peacekeeping, while 28 percent said the national government should and 16 percent identified a regional organization as the best leader. On average, 45 percent of poll respondents globally identified the United Nations as the natural leader, 34 percent said national governments, and 11 percent said a regional organization.⁴⁸¹

On **protection of the environment**, a plurality of Americans (42 percent) said that national governments should take the lead, 33 percent said a regional organization, and 18 percent said the United Nations. Global responses were similar, with 47 percent saying that national governments should take the lead, 25 percent saying regional organizations, and 18 percent stating that the United Nations should take the lead on environmental protection.⁴⁸²

In the area of **human rights**, the U.S. public also showed a preference for national leadership. Forty-two percent of U.S. respondents said that national governments should take the lead, 33 percent said the UN, and 18 percent said regional organizations. The global average, in contrast, saw respondents split over whether national governments (40 percent) or the UN (38 percent) were the better leaders on human rights, with only 12 percent in favor of a regional organization.⁴⁸³

In a separate CBS/*New York Times* poll from 2006, only 31 percent of Americans said the United States “should take the lead in **solving international crises and conflicts**,” while 59 percent said “the United States should let other countries and the United Nations take the lead” in this domain.⁴⁸⁴

In addition, Pew found in 2006 that 70 percent of Americans believed that the United Nations “should take the lead in **dealing with Iran’s nuclear program**,” while just 21 percent wanted the United States to take the lead.⁴⁸⁵

Following the 2006 conflict between Israel and Hezbollah, more than half (56 percent) of Americans favored the United Nations rather than the United States playing the leading role in **developing a peace agreement between Israel and Hezbollah**. Only 14 percent were in favor of the United States playing a leading role.⁴⁸⁶

Presented with the possibility of the United Nations being “**in charge of the worldwide effort to combat climate change**” with the United States “**report[ing]**” to the United Nations, 57 percent rejected it in favor of the position that the United States should be “allowed to make its own decisions” (Fox News 2009).⁴⁸⁷

National and International Identity

A large majority of Americans perceive themselves as citizens of the world as well as of their nation, but national identity is still stronger than global identity.

World Values Survey asked respondents in 2005 if they saw themselves as world citizens. A majority of U.S. respondents (65 percent) said that they either ‘agree’ or ‘agree strongly’ with the statement: “I see myself as a world citizen.” On average globally, 72 percent said they saw themselves as world citizens, compared to 21 percent who did not.⁴⁸⁸

However, when asked which identity is stronger, national identity proves more powerful. A September 2008 WPO poll asked whether respondents considered themselves more a citizen of their country, more a citizen of the world, or both equally. A strong majority of Americans (72 percent) said that they considered themselves more a citizen of the United States than of the world, while only 5 percent said the reverse. Twenty-two percent of Americans said that they considered themselves equally a citizen of their country and of the world.

U.S. respondents identified slightly more with their country than the global average. On average among twenty-one nations, 66 percent of respondents said they see themselves as mostly a citizen of their country, while 10 percent said mostly a citizen of the world and 20 percent said both equally.⁴⁸⁹

International Cooperation

As a general principle, a majority of Americans think the U.S. government should be more cooperative than it is. A large majority of the U.S. public believes that Americans have enough common values with Europeans for transatlantic cooperation on international problems, and an overwhelming majority thinks that it is critical for the United States to act together with its closest allies on national security issues.

Asked whether their government “should be more ready to act cooperatively to achieve mutual gains when their country negotiates with other countries” or, alternatively, whether their government “tends to be too willing to compromise and is often taken advantage of,” 54 percent of Americans agreed with the first proposition and 44 percent agreed with the latter (WPO 2009). This is almost exactly the same breakdown as the average of all the other twenty-one nations polled (with 55 percent saying their country’s government should be more ready to act cooperatively and 39 percent saying their government tends to be too willing to compromise).⁴⁹⁰

In 2008, GMF presented respondents in the United States with two competing statements on cooperation between the United States and Europe. Most Americans (67 percent) agreed that there were enough common values for cooperation on international problems, while some (23 percent) said the United States and the European Union have such different values that cooperation is impossible. In comparison, the average of the twelve European countries surveyed was not as optimistic, though still a majority (55 percent) said cooperation was possible (35 percent said it was not).⁴⁹¹

An overwhelming majority of Americans (89 percent) said that they ‘agree’ or ‘agree strongly’ with the proposition: “When our country acts on a national security issue, it is critical we do so together with our closest allies” (GMF 2007). In the European countries polled, 80 percent were in agreement with this statement.⁴⁹²

A large majority (78 percent) of Americans said that “closer cooperation with the European Union” would enhance U.S. security a great deal (28 percent) or somewhat (50 percent).⁴⁹³

CHAPTER 10: U.S. OPINION ON INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

THE UNITED NATIONS

Assessments of the United Nations as an Institution

A large majority of Americans believes that the United Nations (UN) plays a necessary role in the world and supports U.S. participation in the UN. Large majorities favor the United States working through the UN more than it does, even if this means the United States has to accept compromises. At the same time Americans have in recent years shown significant dissatisfaction with the UN's performance in fulfilling its mission. This mixture of strong support for the UN in principle and dissatisfaction with its actual performance seems to contribute to surprisingly erratic overall evaluations of the UN as an institution.

A majority of Americans believes that the UN plays a necessary and useful role in the world. In a February 2005 Gallup poll, 64 percent said that the "The United Nations plays a necessary role in the world", while 34 percent said it did not.⁴⁹⁴ A May 2005 German Marshall Fund (GMF) poll found that 56 percent agreed that the UN "can manage many of the world's most pressing problems better than any single country," and 66 percent agreed that the UN "enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries".⁴⁹⁵ A November 2003 Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll found 72 percent saying they would like to see the UN play "a greater role ... in dealing with world problems."⁴⁹⁶

Americans strongly support U.S. participation in the United Nations. A February 2005 Gallup poll found that only 13 percent favor the United States giving up its UN membership, while 85 percent were opposed.⁴⁹⁷ Sixty-nine percent said in a January 2006 Public Agenda poll that "U.S. support of the UN peacekeeping efforts" is "important and worthwhile," while only 24 percent said it was "a waste of resources."⁴⁹⁸

Support for the United Nations is sustained even when Americans are presented with the argument that international institutions are too bureaucratic and tend to oppose the United States. In an October 2006 PIPA poll, respondents were offered two arguments. Only 23 percent chose the one that said: "International institutions are slow and bureaucratic and often used as places for other countries to criticize and block the United States. It is better for the United States to try and solve problems like terrorism and the environment on our own instead." Sixty-nine percent chose the argument that said: "As the world becomes more interconnected, and problems such as terrorism and the environment are of a more international nature, it will be increasingly necessary for the United States to work through international institutions." Indeed, the number endorsing this second view has increased over recent years: in 1999 56 percent agreed and in 2004 64 percent agreed, while support for the disparaging view of working through international institutions dropped from 39 percent in 1999 and 30 percent in 2004.⁴⁹⁹

Americans find attractive the argument that the UN is a way for the United States to share the burden of maintaining world order. In the same October 2006 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll, two in three (68 percent) agreed with the statement, "For the United States to move away from its role as world policeman and reduce the burden of its large defense budget, the United States should invest in efforts to strengthen the UN's ability to deal with potential conflicts in the world." In November 1995, PIPA had found 73 percent agreement with this statement.⁵⁰⁰

The United States Working Through the United Nations

A majority of Americans favors the United States working through the UN more than it does, even when reminded that this might require forgoing optimal U.S. preferences. A 2009 WPO poll found that 60 percent agreed with the statement, "When dealing with international problems, the United States should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that the United States will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice." The Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) has asked this question three times from 2004 through 2008 and 52-66 percent of respondents agreed.⁵⁰¹

Several polls have found support for cooperating with the United Nations. A Public Agenda poll asked respondents in March 2008 how much they thought “closer cooperation with the UN” would “enhance our security,” and 80 percent said a great deal (35 percent) or somewhat (45 percent). Just 15 percent said not at all. These findings represent a slight increase from September 2006 (when 76 percent said a great deal or somewhat). Public Agenda found similar responses in January 2006 and June 2005.⁵⁰² Similarly, Pew found 57 percent agreeing in December 2006 that “the United States should cooperate fully with the United Nations,” consistent with opinion in recent years.⁵⁰³ Nearly a decade ago, in a September 2000 PIPA poll, 81 percent said it was extremely (41 percent) or somewhat (40 percent) important “for the United States to cooperate with other countries by working through the United Nations,” “now that the Cold War has ended.” Only 17 percent said it was “not so important” (7 percent) or “not at all important” (10 percent).⁵⁰⁴

When asked to weigh the pragmatic benefits of acting unilaterally against the legitimacy derived from working through the UN, Americans widely endorse the more multilateral course. Asked in a September 2005 CCGA/PIPA poll which was the better approach for the United States pursue in promoting democracy, 25 percent chose “acting on its own because the United States can act more decisively and effectively,” while 68 percent chose “working through the UN because such efforts will be seen as more legitimate.”⁵⁰⁵

Americans are responsive to the argument that participation in UN efforts ultimately serves U.S. interests. In the October 1999 PIPA poll a decade ago, an overwhelming 79 percent agreed with the argument that: “Because the world is so interconnected today, the United States should participate in UN efforts to maintain peace, protect human rights, and promote economic development. Such efforts serve U.S. interests because they help create a more stable world that is less apt to have wars and is better for the growth of trade and other U.S. goals.” By contrast, 39 percent agreed with a counterargument that: “...the world is so big and complex that such [UN] efforts only make a minimal difference with little benefit to the United States. Therefore it is not really in the U.S. interest to participate in them.”⁵⁰⁶

Varying Levels of Satisfaction with UN Performance

Although large majorities of Americans have consistently expressed support for the purpose and mission of the United Nations, satisfaction with the UN's performance has varied dramatically over the years. Since 1990, polling organizations have regularly asked U.S. citizens whether “the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face.” Answers to this question have gone through many swings. Since 2003, when the UN Security Council failed to come to a consensus on how to deal with Iraq, majorities have said the UN is doing a poor job—the view expressed by 65 percent in a February 2009 Gallup poll.⁵⁰⁷

Other recent polls suggest persistent dissatisfaction with UN performance since 2003. Fox News in September 2007 asked respondents whether they “approve or disapprove of the job the United Nations is doing.” Just 34 percent approved, while 48 percent disapproved and a large 18 percent said they did not know. These numbers are similar to findings in March 2005, when 32 percent expressed approval, 46 percent indicated disapproval and a 22 percent said they did not know.⁵⁰⁸ Two NBC News/Wall Street Journal polls in 2005 asked respondents how much confidence they had in the United Nations: in May, 67 percent said they had not very much confidence (47 percent) or not confidence at all (20 percent), while in September, 65 percent expressed took these positions (not very much 44 percent, no confidence 21 percent).⁵⁰⁹ A September 2006 World Values Survey poll of Americans revealed a similar lack of confidence, with 63 percent saying “not very much” (44 percent) or “none at all” (19 percent). In contrast, a broader World Values Survey survey of fifty-two nations from 2005 to 2008 found an average of 46 percent expressing lack of confidence in the UN.⁵¹⁰ Public Agenda found in June 2005 that 64 percent of Americans worried a lot (27 percent) or somewhat (37 percent) that “the UN may be ineffective.”⁵¹¹

Overall, vicissitudes in U.S. public approval of the UN's performance appear to track global events. The highest level of U.S. approval occurred in 1991, during the Gulf War, when the Security Council was acting in highly concerted fashion and the UN-authorized, U.S.-led coalition successfully reversed Iraqi aggression in Kuwait. In August 1993, as the UN peacekeeping operation in Somalia appeared to be going well, approval was also high. But when the Somalia operation encountered problems, followed by the UN Security Council failing to act effectively on Bosnia, U.S. public approval plunged sharply. By the late 1990s, U.S. public approval had recovered to a majority position and reached another high point after 9/11, when the UN Security Council rallied behind the United States and took concerted action in Afghanistan. In November 2001, as the war on terrorism got under way, the public's job approval rating of the United Nations rose to 63 percent, a level last seen in the early 1990s (CBS). Subsequently, however, the UN Security Council's

failure to find common ground on Iraq appears to have created a prolonged slump in U.S. evaluations of the UN's performance. Asked by PIPA in November 2003 about "how countries have been working together in the UN lately," 53 percent of respondents said they felt the results had been "unsatisfactory."⁵¹²

Net Evaluations of the UN: Mostly Positive But Erratic

When respondents are simply asked for their net evaluation of the UN as an institution, in recent years responses have been mostly on the positive side but also quite erratic, even when polls are taken fairly close in time. This presumably reflects ongoing tensions and complex interactions between positive aspirations for the UN, on the one hand, and the ups and downs of its perceived performance, on the other.

The clearest case is the question of whether respondents have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of the United Nations. Most recently in 2009, Pew found 61 percent of Americans giving it a favorable rating, compared to 56 percent in an average of twenty-five countries—a significant rise since 2007, when another Pew poll found a favorable rating of just 48 percent (and 39 percent unfavorable).⁵¹³

During the 1990s, views of the United Nations as an institution were quite stable, with the percentage giving a favorable rating ranging from the low-sixties to mid-seventies. After the failure of the UN Security Council to find consensus in the run-up to the Iraq war, ratings began to slip: in 2003 and 2004 the percentage giving favorable ratings bobbed between the high-fifties and mid-sixties. Then, in 2005, they oscillated between a low of 43 percent in February (Gallup 2005), up to 59 percent the next month (Pew 2005), even higher to 62 percent in May (GMF 2005), then back down to 48 percent in October (Pew 2005). In May 2006, they were 51 percent (Pew 2006), back up to 61 percent in June (GMF 2006), down to 53 percent in July (Pew 2006), and up to 57 percent in December 2006 (Pew 2006). Most recently in April 2007, Pew found the favorable rating had dropped down to 48 percent. However, throughout this fluctuation, the percentage of Americans giving an unfavorable rating remained fairly stable, in the 32-39 percent range. What varied more were the numbers declining to answer. Thus, reluctance to give a favorable judgment did not always mean an unfavorable judgment.⁵¹⁴

Lukewarm feelings have also been found in polls that ask U.S. respondents to rate their feelings toward the UN using a thermometer scale, ranging from a cold 0 degrees to a warm 100 degrees. CCGA found a mean of 54 degrees in July 2008 and 55 degrees in 2006.⁵¹⁵ The United States had the lowest mean of among eight nations polled between 2006 and 2008 (WPO/CCGA).⁵¹⁶

In a WPO/Knowledge Networks December 2006 poll, nearly two in three Americans (64 percent) said that the UN has a mainly positive influence, while 27 percent said it has a mainly negative influence. However, results were more lukewarm in a November 2005 British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/PIPA poll, with 52 percent saying it was mainly positive, 36 percent saying mainly negative, and 12 percent not answering either way.⁵¹⁷ Global views were more positive, with an average of 59 percent of respondents in thirty-two countries surveyed saying the UN had a positive influence and 16 percent saying a negative one.⁵¹⁸

In July 2005, Gallup International asked the 73 percent of U.S. respondents that had said they were familiar with the United Nations whether they had a positive, negative, or neutral view of the world body. Once again views were lukewarm. The largest number (38 percent) gave the UN a neutral rating, but more gave a positive rating (35 percent) than a negative rating (26 percent). In the larger sample of sixty-five countries polled, by contrast, an average of 83 percent had heard of the UN and of those, 48 percent had a positive view, 35 percent had a neutral view, and 13 percent had a negative view.⁵¹⁹

Sources of Support for United Nations

U.S. public support for the United Nations appears to be derived from a perceived need for collective action to deal with global problems and from a belief in the efficiencies of collective action. Reservations appear to be related to performance issues.

Between 2004 and 2005, GMF sought to determine the underlying sources of public attitudes about the United Nations. In 2004, respondents were divided according to whether they had a favorable or unfavorable view of the United Nations.

Those who had a favorable view were then asked, “Among the following reasons ... which one best explains why you have a favorable opinion of the UN?” and given three options. The most popular response, chosen by a plurality (48 percent) of Americans was, “Many global problems can’t be solved by any single country.” The second most popular response (chosen by 33 percent) was, “We can’t afford to pay the whole cost of international actions; we need others to share the cost.” The least popular response among Americans (11 percent) was, “Military actions are not legal unless the UN approves them.” This last response, however, was the second most popular response among the French (24 percent) and Germans (26 percent).⁵²⁰

Those respondents who had an unfavorable view of the United Nations were also offered three explanations. In the United States, a plurality of this group (48 percent) explained their attitude with the following option: “When we need international action, it has to be done quickly, but the UN slows things down.” Roughly one-third of U.S. respondents (27 percent) chose the explanation: “The UN is wasteful and inefficient with its money.” The smallest numbers chose, “Other countries should not have a veto when” their country’s “important interests are at stake” (11 percent). What is notable here is that the most common criticisms were related to UN performance, while concerns about encroachment on national sovereignty were relatively limited.⁵²¹

In 2005, the GMF also presented two affirmative statements about the United Nations. A large majority of Americans (66 percent) agreed that “the United Nations enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries,” only slightly lower than the European average of 69 percent.⁵²²

A majority of Americans (56 percent) also agreed with the statement that the “UN can manage the world’s problems better than any one single country.” A substantially larger number of Americans (43 percent) than Europeans (22 percent) disagreed, however.⁵²³

UN SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM

Adding New Permanent Members to United Nations Security Council

Polls have found U.S. public support for adding new countries as permanent members of the UN Security Council. Specifically, majorities of Americans support the inclusion of Germany, Japan, India, and Brazil, while they are divided on including South Africa.

As a general principle, there is strong U.S. support for adding new permanent members to the UN Security Council. Responding to a January 2005 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll, a majority of Americans (70 percent) said they supported additional countries becoming permanent members. This was equivalent to the global average (69 percent in favor and 17 percent opposed).⁵²⁴

Polls have also explored views of adding specific countries. Two polls, a 2005 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll and a 2006 CCGA survey, asked respondents in a number of countries, including the United States, a series of questions on specific countries as possible permanent members to the UN Security Council. (The BBC question was only asked of respondents who replied positively to the generalized question on UNSC expansion; percentages below are of the total sample). In each of the specific country cases, U.S. support for including additional nations in the UN Security Council was higher than the global average. More recently, in 2008, CCGA asked the same series of questions of Americans.

A majority (60 percent) of U.S. respondents in the BBC poll said Germany should be added to the UN Security Council, slightly higher than the global average of 56 percent favoring such an addition (12 percent opposed). A similar majority of Americans (62 percent) in the 2006 CCGA poll agreed on Germany’s inclusion, a higher percentage than in four other countries polled.⁵²⁵ The U.S. level of support for adding Germany increased to 66 percent in 2008 (CCGA).⁵²⁶

In both the BBC and 2006 CCGA polls, a majority of Americans also favored including Japan (62 percent and 66 percent, respectively). This compares with 54 percent of respondents globally in the BBC poll favoring Japan’s admission, with 14 percent opposed. (The 2006 CCGA poll indicated strong opposition to this step in China and South Korea.)⁵²⁷ In a 2008 CCGA poll, a similar majority of Americans (67 percent) favored Japan’s inclusion.⁵²⁸

A smaller majority of Americans favored India’s addition to the Security Council. In the BBC poll, 51 percent declared themselves in favor, 19 percent opposed (slightly above the global average of 47 percent to 19 percent). In the 2006 CCGA poll, U.S. support for India’s inclusion outweighed opposition more narrowly, 53 percent to 42 percent (global

figures were 53 percent to 30 percent).⁵²⁹ U.S. public support for India's addition remained unchanged in 2008 (CCGA) at 53 percent.⁵³⁰

Likewise, slightly more than half of Americans supported including Brazil as a permanent member (51 percent in the BBC poll, 52 percent in the 2006 CCGA poll (52 percent), but this was again higher than the global averages (47 percent in favor and 18 percent opposed in the BBC poll, 42 percent in favor and 32 percent opposed in the CCGA poll).⁵³¹ CCGA found roughly similar U.S. support for Brazil's inclusion in 2008 (53 percent).⁵³²

Adding South Africa was the only question on which Americans were divided. While a decisive plurality of Americans (48 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed) in the BBC poll were supportive, U.S. responses in the CCGA poll were split, with 48 percent opposed and 45 percent in favor of the nation's inclusion. (Among all global respondents, an average of 43 percent favored and 21 percent opposed South Africa's entry in the BBC poll, while 39 percent were in favor and 35 percent opposed in the CCGA poll).⁵³³ In the 2008 CCGA poll, 47 percent of Americans favored adding South Africa.⁵³⁴

EU Seat in the UN Security Council

While most European nations favor having a single permanent seat on the UN Security Council even if it means replacing the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France, the U.S. public is opposed.

GMF's 2005 Transatlantic Trends survey asked whether respondents agreed with the idea of the European Union having a single permanent seat on the UN Security Council, even if it replaced the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France. Overall, an average of the 57 percent of Europeans approved of this proposal and 33 percent disapproved of the idea, with only the British public in opposition. Yet despite a general European agreement on an EU seat, a majority of Americans (55 percent) opposed this prospect, while only 36 percent agreed. Interestingly, this was the same statistical response the British public gave to the question.⁵³⁵

Veto Override

There is robust support among Americans for giving the UN Security Council the power to override the veto of a permanent member if all other members are in favor of a resolution.

The January 2005 BBC poll also asked publics in a number of countries about changing the rules of the UN Security Council so that a veto of a permanent member could be overridden by an otherwise unanimous vote of the other members. The exact wording of the question was:

"As you may know, there are currently five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, and any one of them can veto (block) any resolution. Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member could veto the decision. Would you favor or oppose this change?"

For publics of the five permanent members (i.e., China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States), the pollsters added an extra clause to the second sentence: "Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member, *not even* [*survey country*] could veto the decision."

A majority of Americans (57 percent) favored the change while 34 percent were not in favor. The average of all countries showed that 58 percent of respondents were in favor while 24 percent were opposed. Among permanent members of the Security Council, majorities in the United States, United Kingdom, and China agreed, while publics in Russia and France were divided.⁵³⁶

Democratizing the United Nations

There is variable U.S. public support for several proposed approaches to make the UN more democratically representative. Large majorities of Americans favor direct elections of their country's UN representative to the General Assembly, as well as a new UN parliament with directly elected representatives, while a more modest majority favors giving non-governmental actors a formal role in the United Nations. Additionally, global support for these proposals is consistently stronger than U.S. support.

In 2005, GlobeScan asked a series of questions on making the United Nations more democratically representative. One idea was "having your country's official representative to the United Nations General Assembly be elected by the people

of your country.” The U.S. public favored this idea 64 percent to 32 percent, though support was lower than in the average of the nineteen countries surveyed, where the comparable figures were 74 percent and 16 percent.⁵³⁷

The pollsters also tested public attitudes on “creating a new UN Parliament, made up of representatives directly elected by citizens, having powers equal to the current UN General Assembly.” Among Americans, 55 percent supported the idea, 35 percent opposed it. (Global averages were 63 percent and 20 percent).⁵³⁸

Americans were also more lukewarm than their counterparts abroad about a third proposal: “giving leaders of major environmental and social groups, trade unions, and business organizations a formal role in shaping United Nations policies and actions, rather than having only government leaders do this.” A modest majority of Americans (52 percent) supported the idea (43 percent opposed), compared with 61 percent of respondents abroad who favored the proposed change and 23 percent who opposed it.⁵³⁹

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

Views of the World Bank, IMF and WTO

In general, Americans express a positive view of the influence of international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). While both get mildly positive ratings, the World Bank is more popular than the IMF. The World Trade Organization (WTO) has a fairly positive image among Americans, who support strengthening it. Respondents in the United States, as in most other nations, say that their government should comply with adverse WTO decisions.

The Pew Global Attitudes Project in 2002 asked respondents in forty-three nations if international organizations like the World Bank, IMF, and WTO were having a good or bad influence on the way things were going in their country. Six in ten Americans thought that the organizations are having a good influence, while 26 percent said they are having a bad influence. This mirrored the average of all countries polled.⁵⁴⁰

More recently, a January 2006 BBC poll found more muted attitudes about the World Bank specifically. Slightly less than half of Americans (47 percent) responded that the World Bank was having a mainly positive influence in the world, while 28 percent said it had a predominantly negative one. This favorability rating was somewhat lower than the global average of 55 percent (in thirty-two countries) saying that the Bank’s influence was positive and 18 percent saying negative.⁵⁴¹

In the same poll, enthusiasm for the IMF was even more tepid. A plurality of Americans (37 percent) said that the IMF’s influence was mainly positive, while 26 percent said mostly negative, compared to comparable global figures of 47 percent and 21 percent.⁵⁴²

U.S. attitudes to the World Bank and the IMF appear more negative when pollsters ask respondents to rank both institutions on a thermometer scale. In a 2006 CCGA poll that asked respondents to rate their feelings toward the World Bank on a scale from 0 degrees (cold) to 100 degrees (warm), Americans gave a mean of 46 degrees, well below the average mean of the seven countries polled of 59 degrees (WPO/CCGA).⁵⁴³ When CCGA asked Americans to rate the World Bank again in 2008, the mean response had barely increased to 48 degrees.⁵⁴⁴

When asked to rate the IMF in 2006 (CCGA), the U.S. mean was even lower, at 44 degrees, well below the global average of 54 degrees (WPO/CCGA). The average U.S. response remained at 44 degrees in 2008.⁵⁴⁵

Another international poll that explicitly offered respondents the option of saying that they had neutral feelings toward the World Bank produced more muted findings. The 2005 Gallup International Voice of the People survey asked respondents who said they had heard of the World Bank whether they had a positive, neutral, or negative view of it. Of the total sample of Americans, a plurality (30 percent) had a neutral view of the organization, while 13 percent had a positive view and 12 percent a negative view. This was a decidedly more neutral stance than the global average of sixty-seven countries, which showed 29 percent of respondents giving the World Bank a positive rating, 26 percent a neutral rating, and just 11 percent a negative rating.⁵⁴⁶⁻⁵⁴⁷

The Gallup International poll also asked those who said they had heard of the IMF their opinion of it. Among Americans, 23 percent had a neutral view, 9 percent had a positive view, and 8 percent a negative view. This was decidedly less positive than the average of sixty-seven countries polled, which showed 24 percent positive views, 24 percent neutral, and 13 percent negative.⁵⁴⁸⁻⁵⁴⁹

Strengthening the IMF and World Bank

A 2002 GMF/CCGA poll asked whether the World Bank needs to be strengthened to deal with shared problems or if this would only create more bureaucracy. A plurality of Americans (49 percent) agreed that the World Bank needs to be strengthened, a similar figure to the average of European nations polled.⁵⁵⁰

The idea of strengthening the IMF met with more modest agreement, with a 42-percent plurality of Americans in favor, with 38 percent opposed. Among the six European countries polled, support was higher, with 53 percent in favor and 35 percent opposed.⁵⁵¹

World Trade Organization

Americans express a fairly positive opinion of the WTO. When asked by GMF in September 2006, a plurality of 48 percent said their opinion of the institution was “very favorable” (8 percent) or “somewhat favorable” (40 percent), while 32 percent said they had a “very unfavorable” (12 percent) or “somewhat unfavorable” (20 percent) view. In response to the same question, publics in six European nations on average offered a slightly more favorable view.⁵⁵²

Another 2006 poll asked respondents if their country should comply with WTO decisions against their nation. A majority of respondents in the United States (73 percent) supported such compliance. This was the largest show of support among nine countries polled (WPO/CCGA).⁵⁵³ When CCGA re-asked the question in 2008, 72 percent of Americans once again said the United States should comply.⁵⁵⁴

INTERNATIONAL COURTS

International Court of Justice

A majority of Americans express confidence that the International Court of Justice would rule fairly and impartially in cases involving their country. A majority favors the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the court.

In a 2009 WPO poll of twenty countries, respondents were told what the International Court of Justice (World Court) was and asked, “If there were a case involving [country], how confident are you the Court’s decision would be fair and impartial?” A majority of Americans (57 percent) were confident that the decision would be a fair one, while 42 percent responded that they would not be very confident in an impartial decision by the Court. On average, 54 percent of the nineteen countries polled said that they would be at least somewhat confident in the fairness and impartiality of the Court’s decision, as opposed to 36 percent who said that they would not be very confident in the decision.⁵⁵⁵

In June 2004, the Chicago Council found a majority of Americans favored granting compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court. The question read as follows:

“The World Court is part of the United Nations. It makes rulings on disputes between countries based on treaties the countries have signed. There is a debate about whether countries should give the World Court more power by making a general commitment to accept the decisions of the World Court or restrict the power of the Court by deciding on a case-by-case basis whether they will accept the Court’s decisions. Do you think the United States should or should not make the general commitment to accept the decisions of the World Court?”

Fifty-seven percent of Americans said that it should, while 35 percent said that it should not. PIPA asked a similar question in 1999 and found 53-percent support.⁵⁵⁶

International Criminal Court

Large majorities of Americans favor U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court (ICC), even when presented with the U.S. government argument against it, and large majorities favor trying terror suspects in the ICC. A modest majority favors sharing intelligence with the ICC.

A large majority of Americans supports the United States participating in the ICC. Most recently, when asked in 2008 by CCGA if the United States should take part in “the agreement on the [ICC] that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won’t try them,” 68 percent were in favor and 30 percent opposed. CCGA has consistently found large majority support for some years now.⁵⁵⁷

In 2002, CCGA also presented a separate sample question containing both the pro and con arguments for ICC participation, including the U.S. government position that “trumped up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation.” Despite the inclusion of this viewpoint, 65 percent of Americans nonetheless supported U.S. participation, only slightly less than in the sample that did not hear the arguments.⁵⁵⁸

Large majorities of Americans consistently support the trial of suspected terrorists in the ICC. In polling done between 1998 and 2008, CCGA has found roughly 80 percent favored trying terror suspects in the ICC. The most recent 2008 finding had 79 percent in favor and 19 percent opposed.⁵⁵⁹

A Greenberg Quinlan Rosner poll presented competing arguments on the United States sharing intelligence with the ICC in December 2006. Respondents were told:

“Some people believe that the United States should help the International Criminal Court by sharing intelligence about genocide that would build its case against the government of Sudan's leaders, who are accused of planning and implementing the genocide. Others believe that the United States should not help the International Criminal Court because there is some chance that, in the future, its prosecutors might try to prosecute the U.S. military personnel for their actions in Iraq or in other military missions around the world.”

Fifty-three percent believed the United States should help the ICC and 38 percent believed it should not.⁵⁶⁰

Nonetheless, Americans have a tepid feeling about the ICC as an institution. CCGA in June 2008 asked respondents for their feelings toward the ICC on a thermometer scale from 0 degrees (unfavorable) to 100 degrees (favorable). The average response was 52 degrees.⁵⁶¹

NEW INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Creating New International Institutions

A majority of Americans favor creating new international institutions to monitor compliance with climate change treaties, to monitor global financial markets, to monitor the energy market, and to provide information about migration.

In 2008, CCGA polled Americans about their views on creating four new proposed international institutions. In all cases clear majorities favored establishing them. The highest support was 69 percent, for creating an organization to “monitor the worldwide energy market and predict potential shortages.” Respondents expressed a similar level of support (68 percent) for a proposed body that would “monitor whether countries are meeting their treaty obligations to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions that contribute to climate change.” Another 59 percent favored the creation of an institution to “monitor financial markets worldwide and report on potential crises.” Finally, more than half of Americans (57 percent) also favored founding an institution to “provide information and assistance to countries dealing with problems resulting from large-scale migration of people across borders.”⁵⁶²

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

EUROPE

General Support for NATO

Most Americans agree that NATO is still essential, think that it needs to be strengthened, and do not want to cut spending for it. Most also agree that Europe should have its own defense alliance. Large majorities agree that the United States should contribute troops to defend a NATO member that has been attacked.

Large majorities of Americans agree that NATO members should contribute troops to defend a NATO ally.

Americans agree along with Europeans that NATO is still a critical institution. In 2008, GMF polled the United States and a number of NATO allies on whether the alliance was still essential to their country's security. A majority of Americans (59 percent) said that it was, while 32 percent said that it was not. This was quite similar to the twelve European countries polled, where an average of 57 percent said NATO was still essential and 30 percent said it was not.

⁵⁶³

The 2002 GMF/CCGA poll asked respondents in the United States and Europe whether they favored strengthening a series of international institutions, including NATO. A majority of Americans (61 percent) were in favor, while 29 percent were opposed—once again, similar to the European average (63 percent in favor, 31 percent opposed).⁵⁶⁴

The GMF's 2008 Transatlantic Trends poll asked publics in the United States and Turkey whether their respective governments were spending too much, too little, or about the right amount in support of the NATO alliance. U.S. opinion was divided on the question (35 percent saying about the right amount, 32 percent saying too much) while most respondents in Turkey said their government was spending about the right amount.⁵⁶⁵

The GMF in 2005 asked whether respondents agreed that NATO allows democratic countries to act together. A majority of Americans were in agreement (73 percent) and 16 percent disagreed. In the average of ten European countries, 71 percent also agreed, while 21 percent disagreed.⁵⁶⁶

A majority in the United States (75 percent) agreed with the proposition that NATO can help the United States share its military burden while 18 percent disagreed.⁵⁶⁷ In a June 2004 *Los Angeles Times* poll, 56 percent of respondents favored giving NATO the principal role in the security of Iraq, while 31 percent were opposed.⁵⁶⁸

Overall, Americans have a mostly warm feeling toward NATO. Given a thermometer scale from 0 degrees (unfavorable) to 100 degrees (favorable), respondents rated NATO at 57 degrees in a June 2008 CCGA poll.⁵⁶⁹

On Europe Acting Separately

The 2005 GMF study also asked whether Americans agreed with the statement, "The United States is stretched too thin" and therefore "Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States". Two-thirds of Americans (66 percent) agreed with this proposition, while 27 percent disagreed.⁵⁷⁰

Joining in Military Action

In 2004, GMF asked respondents if they approved of using their country's military forces to defend a NATO ally that has been attacked. An overwhelming 87 percent of Americans agreed, well above the average of 75 percent of the ten European countries polled (in which 19 percent disapproved).⁵⁷¹

GMF in 2008 asked respondents in NATO nations whether they agreed that all alliance members should contribute troops if the alliance decides to take military action. A large majority of Americans (82 percent) agreed, while only 12 percent disagreed. In the European average meanwhile, 57 percent agreed that all member countries should contribute troops and 36 percent disagreed.⁵⁷²

GMF also asked in 2008 if all NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops. Once again, an overwhelming proportion of Americans (82 percent) agreed with this principle (only 13 percent disagreed). Europeans were far more divided on this question, with an average of 58 percent agreeing and 34 percent disagreeing.⁵⁷³

The European Union's Role in the World

Americans perceive the European Union as playing a positive role in the world.

Americans lean toward favoring the European Union becoming more powerful, though they do not favor it becoming as powerful as the United States.

Most Americans perceive the European Union as having a positive international influence. Asked in a 2009 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll whether the European Union is having a positive or negative influence in the world, a majority of Americans (62 percent) judge its influence as mainly positive, 19 percent mainly negative. This is a slightly higher percentage than the average of all twenty-one countries polled (in which 54 percent of respondents regarded the European Union as having a positive influence, 20 percent a negative one).⁵⁷⁴

Americans generally believe a stronger European Union would be positive for their country. At the same time, they are apprehensive of it becoming as powerful as the United States itself. An October 2005 Pew survey found that a plurality (47 percent) of Americans believed that a stronger European Union would be a good thing for the United States (with 28 percent saying it did not matter, and only 12 percent saying it would be a bad thing).⁵⁷⁵ Asked by GMF in 2005 whether a more powerful European Union would compete or cooperate with the United States, respondents were split, with a slight plurality of Americans (45 percent) saying that a more powerful European Union would cooperate rather than compete (41 percent) with it.⁵⁷⁶ However, in a February 2004 poll, 50 percent of Americans said the European Union becoming as powerful as the United States would be a bad thing, while 33 percent said it would be a good thing.⁵⁷⁷

CHAPTER 11: U.S. OPINION ON PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO VIOLENT CONFLICT

The Use of Force

In international polls, most Americans agree that military force is sometimes necessary to maintain order in the world.

In May 2007, Pew Global Attitudes Project polled people in the United States on whether they agreed that “it is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.” A large majority agreed (77 percent), which was significantly higher than the global average. Among all forty-seven nations polled, 64 percent of respondents agreed and 31 percent disagreed.⁵⁷⁸

The UN Security Council and the Use of Force

International polls find that publics around the world, including in the United States, believe that the UN Security Council has the right to authorize the use of force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies. These include: to defend a country that has been attacked, to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide, to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups, and to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown. More broadly, Americans say the idea that national sovereignty precludes intervention in the internal affairs of countries is outdated.

In a Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll from 2006, Americans showed strong support for the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies. Responses were similar to the average response to the same questions in a poll of eighteen nations conducted by WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) and CCGA from 2006 to 2008.

The highest level of U.S. support was for the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force in order “**to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.**” A large majority of Americans (83 percent) were in favor of this principle, while only 13 percent were not. Overall, 76 percent of respondents in eighteen nations polled agreed that the UN Security Council should have this right, while 16 percent replied that the Security Council should not.⁵⁷⁹

The U.S. public expresses similarly high levels of support for the UN Security Council’s right to authorize the use of military force “**to defend a country that has been attacked.**” Eighty-three percent of U.S. respondents endorsed this view, while 14 percent were opposed. This number was slightly higher than the 76 percent of respondents globally who felt the UN Security Council should have this right.⁵⁸⁰

A slightly smaller, though still significant, majority of U.S. respondents favored the UN Security Council having the right “**to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.**” Seventy-six percent of Americans were in favor, while 20 percent were not. This is approximately the same level of support expressed across all nations polled (73 percent of respondents in favor, 19 percent opposed).⁵⁸¹

Among the scenarios outlined, Americans expressed the lowest level of support for the United Nations having the right to authorize the use of military action “**to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.**” A modest majority (57 percent) was in favor, while 38 percent were opposed to giving the Security Council this right. On average, 53 percent of all publics polled thought the Council should have this right as opposed to 35 percent who did not.⁵⁸²

More broadly, the U.S. public appears to believe that the principle of nonintervention based on national sovereignty is an outdated idea. As early as 1999, Harris found that 68 percent agreed with the idea, “The old idea of national sovereignty which did not allow foreign interference in the domestic affairs of any country, even if it killed many of its own people, is no longer acceptable and must change.”⁵⁸³

UN Responsibility to Protect

Polls further find that the UN Security Council is seen as having not only the right, but the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to prevent severe human rights violations.

CCGA asked Americans in 2006 whether the UN Security Council has a responsibility to authorize military force to protect people from severe human rights violations, such as genocide. A large majority (74 percent) said that the UN does have this responsibility. Interestingly, the global average was quite a bit lower, with 61 percent agreeing.⁵⁸⁴ When CCGA asked this question again in 2008, a slightly smaller 67 percent affirmed that the Security Council has such a responsibility.⁵⁸⁵

Americans perceive this responsibility as applying to other Western powers as well. Sixty-nine percent of Americans agreed in 2005 that “the United States and other Western powers have a moral obligation to use military force if necessary, to prevent one group of people from committing genocide against another” (Pew 2005).⁵⁸⁶

UN Role in Peacekeeping

In principle, most Americans favor the United Nations having a standing peacekeeping force that it selects, trains, and commands. A majority also wants peacekeeping policy to be decided at the United Nations rather than by national governments or regional organizations. Americans favor providing financial support to the United Nations for peacekeeping.

CCGA asked Americans whether they favored or opposed having a standing peacekeeping force selected, trained, and commanded by the United Nations. A large majority of Americans (72 percent) favored this idea, while 24 percent were opposed. This is slightly higher than the average level of support for this proposition among publics in all twenty-two countries polled (66 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed) (WPO/CCGA).⁵⁸⁷

Americans also tend to favor having the United Nations take the lead in peacekeeping. In polling conducted by the World Values Survey, U.S. respondents were offered three options for structuring international peacekeeping efforts. A large plurality (50 percent) of respondents said that policies regarding peacekeeping efforts should be made at the level of the United Nations, while smaller percentages of respondents were split between policymaking by regional organizations or national governments. This was in line with global attitudes, as publics in twenty-eight of the forty-three countries polled also indicated that the United Nations should decide policies regarding international peacekeeping efforts (2005-2008).⁵⁸⁸

The U.S. public also believes that U.S. financial support to the United Nations for its peacekeeping efforts is important. More than two-thirds of respondents (69 percent) said it was “important and worthwhile,” while 24 percent said it was “a waste of resources” (Public Agenda 2006).⁵⁸⁹ Only 32 percent of respondents said that the United States spends “too much” on international peacekeeping efforts, while six in ten said the United States spends not enough (25 percent) or about the right amount (35 percent) (Kaiser 2004).⁵⁹⁰

Americans have continued to express confidence in the effectiveness of the United Nations in peacekeeping, even when U.S.-UN relations hit a low point over the Iraq War. In April 2003, a poll by the *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News asked Americans, “Based on its role in the recent Iraq conflict, do you think that the United Nations can effectively function as an international peacekeeping force?” Fifty percent of those polled said that the United Nations “can function effectively” and 42 percent said that the United Nations “cannot function effectively.”⁵⁹¹ This is surprisingly strong support, given the timing of the poll and the unfavorable ratings the United Nations was receiving during this same period.

In 1999, the International Committee of the Red Cross sponsored a study asking respondents residing in four permanent members of the UN Security Council (United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France) whether UN peacekeeping operations were making things better, worse, or not making a difference. A slight majority of Americans (52 percent) believed that operations were making things better, 28 percent said that they made no difference, and 15 percent said that peacekeeping operations were making things worse. The level of positive responses was close to the average among all of the permanent members polled (54 percent), and also similar to public perceptions in the countries receiving peacekeeping forces (51 percent).⁵⁹²⁻⁵⁹³

Participation in Military Operations to Prevent and Respond to Violent Conflict

A large majority in the United States approves in principle of participating in peacekeeping. As a general rule, support is strong for participation in post-conflict situations, but less consistent when it comes to intervening in civil conflict. In the recent past, Americans have expressed support for contributing U.S. troops to military

operations in the Balkans, southern Lebanon, Haiti, and Liberia, and to enforce peace agreements between Israel and the Palestinians. A slight majority has also favored contributing to a UN operation to keep peace between India and Pakistan.

When Americans are asked about the broader principle of contributing to peacekeeping missions, support tends to be quite high. A large majority (78 percent) believes that the United States should participate, if asked by the United Nations, in a UN international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world. Only 19 percent of respondents say it should not (CCGA 2004).⁵⁹⁴

The modest polling evidence available suggests that, if anything, the U.S. public prefers the United Nations over the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a vehicle for using U.S. military force. In July 2000, the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) asked, "As a general rule, when it is necessary for the United States to use military force, do you think it is best for the United States to act as part of a United Nations operation, act as part of a NATO operation, or act on its own?" A 49-percent plurality preferred the United States to act as part of a UN operation, 26 percent preferred NATO, and only 17 percent preferred unilateral action.⁵⁹⁵

Support for Types of Missions

A 2004 German Marshall Fund (GMF) poll asked several countries about contributing **peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended**. A majority of U.S. respondents (66 percent) approved of this use of military forces, while 29 percent disapproved. European support was quite a bit higher, with an average of 77 percent expressing approval and 17 percent expressing disapproval.⁵⁹⁶

Asked about deploying troops to provide **food and medical assistance to victims of war**, a large majority of Americans (81 percent) approved, while 16 percent disapproved. While U.S. support was high, it was still less than the average level of European approval (89 percent).⁵⁹⁷

When the proposed military action requires intervention in a situation of ongoing violence, public support is much lower, both in the United States and Europe. When questioned about contributing **"to stop the fighting in a civil war"** (GMF 2004), a plurality of Americans (49 percent) opposed sending the U.S. military to stop civil war violence, while 38 percent approved. In contrast, Europeans expressed modest support, with an average of 62 percent of respondents approving the use of European forces.⁵⁹⁸

Americans do favor, on the other hand, using their military forces **to remove a government that abuses human rights**. Asked about this scenario, a majority of Americans (57 percent) approved, while 36 percent disapproved. European attitudes were often mixed across countries, but an average of 53 percent approved and 39 percent disapproved.⁵⁹⁹

Similarly, a 2008 CCGA poll found 69 percent of Americans favored contributing U.S. troops to **"stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people."**⁶⁰⁰

Support for Specific Missions

In the 2007 GMF survey, respondents were asked about deploying troops to maintain peace and order in the **post-conflict Balkans**. A modest majority of Americans (54 percent) were in favor, while 38 percent were opposed. Support was higher in the twelve European nations polled (where an average of 65 percent approved and 29 percent disapproved).⁶⁰¹

Similarly, a 2007 GMF international poll asked about the deployment of a country's troops **to monitor and support a ceasefire in southern Lebanon** following the 2006 Lebanon War. A majority of U.S. respondents were also in favor of such a deployment (55 percent), which was in line with the European average (58 percent).⁶⁰² Another 2006 CNN poll found 51-percent support for having U.S. troops be part of an international peacekeeping force on the border between Israel and Lebanon.⁶⁰³ However, when asked about sending in a peacekeeping force *"to end the fighting between Israel and the Hezbollah militants in Lebanon"* (emphasis added) only 32 percent favored sending U.S. troops for this purpose, though six in ten favored sending UN troops (CBS/*New York Times* 2006).⁶⁰⁴

In 2004, Americans were asked whether it was necessary for the United States to have sent peacekeeping forces to Haiti. A modest majority (52 percent) said it was and 28 percent said it was not (Fox 2004).⁶⁰⁵

In 2003, a large majority (61 percent) of Americans polled favored the participation of U.S. troops in an international peacekeeping force in Liberia, while 33 percent were opposed (CNN/*USA Today*).⁶⁰⁶ An NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll also found that 58 percent of U.S. respondents approved of "sending a thousand American soldiers to Liberia as part of a UN peacekeeping force."⁶⁰⁷

In 2008, a modest majority of Americans (52 percent) favored contributing U.S. troops to "enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians" (CCGA 2008).⁶⁰⁸

Finally, in 2004, 51 percent of Americans favored contributing U.S. troops to a "UN-sponsored force to keep the peace between India and Pakistan." Two years later, when the reference to the United Nations was removed, support dropped to 40 percent.⁶⁰⁹

War in Afghanistan

The Afghanistan war began with high majority support among the U.S. public, even though a majority expected it to last several years or longer. As of October 2009, about one-third of the public thinks the military action was a mistake, but six in ten disagree. A majority believes the war is going badly, and approval of the administration's handling of Afghanistan has declined. However, a majority continues to reject the idea of withdrawal and substantially fewer than half even favor troop reductions. A majority approved of the troop increase in February 2009; however, there is not majority support for a second increase. Reasons Americans cite for maintaining the operation are to weaken terrorists' ability to stage attacks and to keep the Taliban from regaining power.

The United States, together with NATO allies, first began military action in Afghanistan in late October 2001. Early in the war, 87 percent approved of "the military attacks led by the United States against targets in Afghanistan,"⁶¹⁰ even though 62 percent expected that "a campaign will be long and will last for several years or longer."⁶¹¹

Since then, there has been some decline in support, which remains, however, at clear majority levels as of early autumn 2009. Gallup has asked over the years: "Thinking now about the U.S. military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?" In November 2001, 89 percent said the Afghanistan intervention was not a mistake. As of September 2009, this view was at 61 percent, with 37 percent calling it a mistake.⁶¹²

Respondents in September 2009 widely agreed that the situation in Afghanistan had deteriorated rapidly in the last several months. Interestingly, though, while a majority of the public also thought the war is going badly for the United States, this majority view has been very stable since summer 2008. Most recently (September 19-23), 53 percent said the war is going somewhat (38 percent) or very (15 percent) badly for the United States. In March 2009, 57 percent said the war was going somewhat (36 percent) or very (21 percent) badly; and in August 2008, 58 percent said the war was going badly. Earlier, in 2006, the public was not sanguine, but divided (49 percent going well, 46 percent badly). One has to go back to early 2003 to find large majorities thinking the war was going well (from mid-2003 through 2005, this question was not asked).⁶¹³

Approval of the Obama administration's handling of Afghanistan has declined. In the AP-GfK poll, those approving "of the way Barack Obama is handling...the situation in Afghanistan" has gone from a 60 percent majority in April 2009 (26 percent disapproving) to a 46 percent plurality in October 2009 (41 percent disapproving).⁶¹⁴

Since public support for military action is typically related to perceptions that the action is multilateral, it is noteworthy that the public feels that robust multilateral participation is lacking in Afghanistan. In April 2009, CNN found a very large 78 percent thought "other countries that are allies of the United States" are "not doing enough to help the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan."⁶¹⁵

A clear majority of Americans rejected the idea of withdrawing from Afghanistan in September 2009. When asked by NBC/*Wall Street Journal* whether “we should have an immediate and orderly withdrawal of all troops from Afghanistan,” 55 percent said no (yes: 38 percent).⁶¹⁶ Similarly, in June 2009, 66 percent said “the NATO mission in Afghanistan should be continued” while 30 percent said “it should be ended” (WPO).⁶¹⁷ Substantially fewer than half even favored reducing troop levels, much less withdrawing: when asked whether the United States should reduce, maintain, or increase troop levels, CBS/*New York Times* found 38 percent wanting to reduce them in October 2009.⁶¹⁸

The Obama administration’s February 2009 decision to increase troop levels in Afghanistan had the approval of about two-thirds of the public, 67 percent, in the June 2009 WPO poll.⁶¹⁹ However, even at that time, there was reluctance to support a further round of troop increases. In April, CNN found 68 percent favoring Obama’s decision,⁶²⁰ and then asked the full sample how they would react if Obama “announced a plan to send even more U.S. troops.” Fifty-two percent said they would oppose it, while 45 percent said they would support it.⁶²¹ These levels have remained fairly stable: for example, the NBC/*Wall Street Journal* September poll found 51 percent opposing and 44 percent supporting another increase.⁶²² In mid-October 2009, ABC/*Washington Post* said “U.S. commanders have requested...40,000 more U.S. troops” and found the public divided (47 percent for, 49 percent against).⁶²³

When asked about reasons for keeping a military presence in Afghanistan, four-fifths of respondents cited degrading the capacity of international terrorists to target the United States as a critical reason. In a *USA Today*/Gallup poll in October 2009, 80 percent said that “to weaken terrorists’ ability to stage attacks against the United States” is “an important reason to keep U.S. troops” there. Further, a 55 percent majority thought that on this specific goal, the United States is making progress (37 percent disagreed).⁶²⁴

Another important reason the public cites is to keep the Taliban out of power. In the same poll, 69 percent of respondents said that an important reason to keep U.S. troops in the country is “to keep the Taliban from taking control of Afghanistan.” A bare majority (51 percent) thought the United States was making progress on this goal.⁶²⁵ The June 2009 WPO poll found 94 percent saying that it would be a bad thing if the Taliban were to regain power.⁶²⁶

Intervention in Darfur

Many Americans feel that the United Nations has the responsibility, rather than simply the right, to intervene in Darfur. Approximately three out of four Americans has expressed a readiness to contribute U.S. troops to an international force to stop the killing and support a humanitarian operation in Darfur.

A plurality of U.S. respondents (48 percent) said that the UN Security Council has a responsibility to intervene to stop the killing in Darfur, 35 percent said it has a right, but not a responsibility, while 11 percent said that it does not have a right to authorize intervention (CCGA 2006). Overall, the sense of moral obligation to intervene appears stronger in the United States than in other countries polled. On average across fifteen countries, 35 percent of respondents thought the UN had a responsibility to intervene, 27 percent thought it had the right but not a responsibility, and 15 percent thought it did not have the right (WPO/CCGA).⁶²⁷

In the same 2006 CCGA poll, Americans were asked whether they favored or opposed contributing U.S. troops as part of an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur. A majority of the U.S. public (65 percent) favored contributing troops, while 28 percent were opposed. The average across all eleven countries polled on the question was 55 percent in favor and 30 percent opposed (WPO/CCGA).⁶²⁸ When CCGA asked the question again in 2008, 62 percent of Americans favored contributing U.S. troops.⁶²⁹

Other polling has found similar results. In a 2007 CNN poll, 61 percent of U.S. respondents favored sending U.S. ground troops as part of an international peacekeeping force in Darfur (32 percent were opposed).⁶³⁰ A GMF survey the same year also found 75 percent of Americans support the deployment of U.S. troops to provide humanitarian assistance in Darfur. Europeans expressed nearly identical support (76 percent) for sending their respective country’s troops as part of an international relief mission.⁶³¹

Preference for Using U.S. Military Force as Part of UN Operation

Americans show significant resistance to using U.S. military force without UN approval except in self-defense or when vital interests are at stake. Even when it comes to defending other countries from aggression, Americans show reluctance to do so except as part of a UN operation. Support is quite strong for contributing U.S. troops to UN peacekeeping operations.

Americans show much greater readiness to use military force when it is part of a UN-sponsored operation, rather than acting alone. In recent years, CCGA has asked specifically about using U.S. troops in the event that North Korea invades South Korea, both under the auspices of a "UN-sponsored effort to reverse the aggression" and, alternatively, without mentioning the United Nations. In July 2006, the Chicago Council found that 65 percent of U.S. respondents were in favor of the United States "contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN-sponsored effort to reverse the aggression" if North Korea invaded South Korea (30 percent were opposed). In comparison, only 45 percent favored the use of U.S. troops "if North Korea invaded South Korea" (without mention of the UN or an international effort) while 49 percent were opposed. This finding—majority support for a UN-sponsored international effort and a more divided response when the scenario makes no mention of the United Nations—was similar in 2004 and 2002.⁶³²

The clear preference for the use of force within the context of an international effort also extends to other scenarios. In 2002, CCGA asked whether U.S. troops should be used if Iraq were to invade Saudi Arabia. While 77 percent favored the United States contributing troops to a "UN-sponsored effort" together with other countries (18 percent opposed), only 48 percent favored using U.S. troops when the United Nations was not mentioned (46 percent were opposed).⁶³³

Majorities have also consistently rejected the use of U.S. troops in other scenarios where a United Nations or international effort is not mentioned, including if China were to invade Taiwan and if "Arab forces" were to invade Israel (except in the scenario that Iran were to invade Israel, in which case 53 percent would favor the use of U.S. troops) (CCGA 2006).⁶³⁴

Earlier polls also found a strong preference for the United States to use military force through the United Nations over acting alone. When presented with a series of arguments in an April 1995 PIPA poll (when the UN operation in Bosnia was not going well), 89 percent agreed with the position, "When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is generally best for the U.S. to address the problem together with other nations working through the UN, rather than going it alone."

This attitude was sustained even in the face of a strong counterargument that the United States would be more successful acting on its own, with 29 percent of U.S. respondents agreeing with and 66 percent rejecting the argument, "When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is better for the United States to act on its own rather than working through the UN because the United States can move more quickly and probably more successfully."⁶³⁵

The Responsibility to Participate in NATO and EU Military Operations

When NATO decides to take a military action, the U.S. public believes that all NATO members should contribute troops and, if not, at least contribute financially. U.S. support for such a shared contribution is exceptionally higher than that expressed in other NATO member countries.

Respondents were asked, "To what extent do you tend to agree that *all* NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action?" (GMF 2008). An overwhelming majority (82 percent) of Americans said all should, while on average, only 57 percent of Europeans agreed.⁶³⁶ When publics in the United States and other NATO countries were asked whether they agreed that all NATO members "should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops," responses were essentially the same.⁶³⁷

CHAPTER 12A: U.S. OPINION ON COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS: TERRORISM

Concern about Terrorism

Despite the attacks of September 11, 2001, the U.S. public is only slightly above the global average in its level of concern about terrorism, with less than half of respondents saying it is a very big problem. However, a large majority says that international terrorism poses a critical threat and that combating international terrorism is a very important foreign policy goal.

Asked how big of a problem terrorism poses to the United States, fewer than half of Americans (44 percent) said it was a very big problem, 38 percent said it was at least a moderately big problem, and 18 percent said it was a small problem or not a problem at all (Pew 2007). Despite September 11, U.S. levels of concern are only slightly above the global average: across forty-seven countries, an average of 41 percent said that terrorism is a very big problem in their country, while 23 percent said it is a moderately big problem, and 33 percent said it is a small problem or not a problem at all.⁶³⁸

Asked in 2008 by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) about the extent to which international terrorism is a threat to the United States, 70 percent of U.S. respondents said it is a critical threat, 26 percent said it is important but not critical, and 3 percent said it is not important. The number saying it is critical represents a significant decline from a high of 91 percent in 2002.⁶³⁹

Asked how important of a foreign policy goal it should be for the United States to combat international terrorism, two-thirds (67 percent) of Americans said that it is very important (CCGA 2008), compared to 29 percent who felt it was somewhat important and only 4 percent who thought it was not important. This number has also been declining from a high of 91 percent in 2002.⁶⁴⁰

Support for Multilateral Action Against Terrorism

In general, a large majority of Americans favor having the United Nations play a greater role in the fight against terrorism. Large majorities of U.S. respondents supported the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups and favored combating terrorism through strengthening the role of international law and enhancing intelligence cooperation. A majority also supports empowering the UN Security Council to require UN member countries to allow UN-sponsored police forces to enter and conduct investigations, as well as provide intelligence on, arrest, and freeze the assets of suspected terrorist groups. Furthermore, a majority of U.S. respondents supports the UN Security Council sending an international military force to capture suspected terrorists if their host country refuses to take action. Finally, a strong majority favors using international judicial bodies for trying terrorists.

While Americans see the United Nations as playing an important role in the fight against global terrorism, they would like to see it play larger role.

When WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) asked whether “the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force ... to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups,” a large majority of respondents in the United States (76 percent) said the UN Security Council should have the right to intervene, while just 20 percent said it should not have this right (WPO 2006-08). These numbers are comparable with the global average; across the sixteen countries polled, 73 percent said the UN Security Council should have the right to intervene and just 19 percent said it should not have this right.⁶⁴¹

A 2008 CCGA poll asked people in the United States about eight different measures for combating international terrorism. The one that received the highest level of support (84 percent) was, “Working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members enforce them.” (This had also been the preferred choice in previous polls, winning 87-percent support in 2004 and 88 percent in 2002).⁶⁴² The U.S. public prefers operating through the United Nations over other military approaches, including air strikes against terrorist camps (79 percent), attacks by U.S. ground troops against terrorist camps (72 percent), and assassination of individual terrorist leaders (68 percent).⁶⁴³

A September 2003 Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll found 76 percent of Americans favor putting a high priority on "setting up a UN database of terrorists to which all countries would contribute."⁶⁴⁴

Shortly after September 11, 2001, a series of polls in the United States found overwhelming support for the United Nations playing a role in the global campaign against terrorism. In a September 2001 Associated Press poll, 90 percent of respondents said that the United Nations should "play a major role in pulling countries together to fight against terrorism." In November 2001, 90 percent said that they favored (71 percent strongly) "working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members cooperate in enforcing them" (PIPA 2001).⁶⁴⁵

Perhaps most strikingly, strong majorities of Americans in November 2001 favored the UN Security Council having extensive powers to make demands on member states or to intervene in their territory in the effort to track down terrorist groups (PIPA 2001). Responses ranged from 70 percent believing a country should be required "to allow a UN-sponsored police force to enter the country and conduct investigations," to an overwhelming 88 percent believing that the Security Council should be able "to require a country to provide intelligence on a suspected terrorist group." While the UN Charter has language that gives the UN Security Council broad powers, in practice, exercising the powers that were overwhelmingly supported by the U.S. public would certainly break new ground.⁶⁴⁶

Similarly, Harris found (also in November 2001) that a strong majority (71 percent) of Americans thought, "In order to prepare for a possible future international terrorist attack ... the United Nations should be given broader powers that would force member countries to work together to fight terrorism."⁶⁴⁷

Trying Terrorists Before International Judicial Bodies

Support has also been quite strong for using international judicial bodies to try terrorists. In the 2008 CCGA poll that asked about eight different measures for combating terrorism, the second most popular approach—favored by 79 percent—was "trial of suspected terrorists in an International Criminal Court." In a July 2004 survey, 82 percent of Americans favored this idea.⁶⁴⁸

Polls taken immediately after September 11, 2001, also showed support for this idea. In an NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll taken on September 12, 2001, respondents were asked to evaluate a list of possible responses by the United States to the September 11 attacks. Seventy-five percent favored (62 percent strongly) "build[ing] a case against the people who are specifically responsible and seek[ing] justice in the world court."⁶⁴⁹

Perhaps most dramatically, given that the September 11 attacks occurred on U.S. soil, a 49-percent plurality of Americans would favor trying Osama Bin Laden, if captured, in an international criminal tribunal, compared to 44 percent who would prefer to try him in a federal court in New York (PIPA 2001).⁶⁵⁰

Regional Cooperation on Terrorism

The U.S. public mostly gives poor marks to the quality of transatlantic cooperation in fighting terrorism.

Respondents in the United States have generally expressed negative opinions of transatlantic cooperation on terrorism. Just 38 percent in January 2008 said the United States and Europe are working together effectively to fight global terrorism, 19 percent said they are doing an average job, and 42 percent said they are doing a below average job of working together (GlobeScan 2008). U.S. responses on this question are comparable with the average across nine European and North American countries: just 35 percent gave positive ratings, while 43 percent gave negative ratings.⁶⁵¹

However, Americans were fairly optimistic about the European Union's role in the war terror, with 41 percent of Americans saying that the European Union tends to play a positive role and only 18 percent saying it plays a negative role (Gallup 2004).⁶⁵² A majority (52 percent) also perceived European countries as willing to do their fair share in the war on terrorism, though 43 percent disagreed.⁶⁵³

Assessments of U.S. Efforts against Terrorism

In assessing the struggle between the United States and al-Qaeda, the predominant public view in the United States has been that neither side is winning. Americans have also been divided as to whether the “war on terror” has weakened or strengthened al-Qaeda. Furthermore, a modest majority of Americans believes that the war in Iraq has increased the threat of terrorist attacks globally.

Asked whether the United States or al-Qaeda is winning in the war on terror, a substantial majority (56 percent) of U.S. respondents said that neither side is winning, while 31 percent said the United States is winning and 8 percent said that al-Qaeda is winning. These opinions are similar to the global average of the twenty-three countries polled by the British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/PIPA in 2008, with 47 percent of respondents believing that neither side is winning, 22 percent saying that the United States is winning, and 10 percent saying that al-Qaeda is winning.⁶⁵⁴ A CNN poll found similar results in 2007, with a 46-percent plurality saying neither side is winning, 32 percent saying the United States is winning, and 21 percent saying the terrorists are winning.⁶⁵⁵

When asked whether the war on terror has made al-Qaeda stronger or weaker, just 34 percent of Americans said that it had made al-Qaeda weaker, while essentially the same number (33 percent) believed it had strengthened al-Qaeda, and 26 percent believed it had no effect (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2008). International respondents leaned more toward the view that the war on terrorism has made al-Qaeda stronger: among twenty-three countries polled, an average of 30 percent said the war on terror had made al-Qaeda stronger, 22 percent believed it had weakened al-Qaeda, and 29 percent believed it had had no effect.⁶⁵⁶

In 2006 most Americans believed that the war in Iraq has increased the risk of terrorist attacks. A 2006 poll (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA) found that 55 percent of Americans said the war in Iraq had increased the threat of terrorist attacks, 21 percent said that it had no effect, and 21 percent believed that it had decreased the threat. Across all thirty-five countries polled, 60 percent believed that it had increased the threat, while only 12 percent thought it had decreased the threat.⁶⁵⁷

Principles for Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

A majority in the United States rejects the view that, when dealing with terrorism suspects, rules against torture and the secret holding of detainees should be relaxed. A large majority also rejects the view that treaties preventing secret holding of detainees are too restrictive in the context of dealing with the threat of terrorism.

Americans were asked whether the rules against the use of torture should be unequivocally maintained, or whether there should be an exception when dealing with a terrorism suspect who may have information that would save innocent lives (WPO 2008). A moderate majority (53 percent) favored the statement, “Clear rules against torture should be maintained,” while 44 percent said, “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives.” Across twenty-one nations polled worldwide, average support for unequivocal rules was a bit higher (57 percent).⁶⁵⁸

A large majority of Americans disagrees with the argument that treaties preventing the secret holding of detainees are too restrictive in the context of dealing with the threat of terrorism. Respondents were told that their government had signed “treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and require that the International Committee of the Red Cross have access to them.” They were then presented the argument that such treaties are “too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism,” as well as the counterargument that such treaties are “important for making sure governments treat people humanely.” Only 23 percent of U.S. respondents took the position that the treaties were too restrictive, while a large majority (73 percent) took the position that the treaties were important to ensure that governments treat people humanely. Comparatively, across the five countries surveyed, an average of 62 percent believed the treaties were “important for making sure governments treat people humanely” while 25 percent believed that they are too restrictive (WPO 2006).⁶⁵⁹

U.S. Treatment of Terrorism Suspects

A slight majority of Americans in 2006 believed that the U.S. detention policies in place at that time at Guantanamo were legal. However, they were divided on whether the United States seeks to enforce a policy against torture in investigations of detained terrorist suspects. A majority perceived that U.S. detention of

terror suspects has damaged the U.S. image in the world, but most Americans in 2009 opposed closing Guantanamo prison and moving detainees to the United States.

In 2006, Americans were asked whether then-current U.S. policies for detaining suspects at Guantanamo Bay were legal or illegal (WPO 2006). A slight majority of Americans (52 percent) thought they were legal while 38 percent said the policies were illegal. Among five countries polled, endorsement of U.S. detention policies was much lower: on average 54 percent said the policies were illegal and 26 percent said they were legal.⁶⁶⁰

In the same 2006 poll, respondents were asked whether they believed that the U.S. government was “making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture” or whether it was “allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists.” Americans were divided on whether their government was making efforts to prevent torture by interrogators (45 percent) or allowing it (47 percent). Across the five countries polled, an average of 53 percent said they believed the U.S. government was allowing torture, while 27 percent said the U.S. government was trying to prevent such torture.⁶⁶¹

A majority of Americans in 2006 perceived that “U.S. detainment of suspected terrorists at Guantanamo Bay has damaged the United States’ image with the rest of the world.” Fifty-four percent had this perception, though only 23 percent said it had damaged the U.S. image a lot. Thirty-nine percent said it had not damaged the U.S. image.⁶⁶²

Americans have shown little support for the idea of closing the Guantanamo Bay prison. A June 2009 NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll found that 52 percent of respondents opposed U.S. President Barack Obama “ordering closure of the Guantanamo Bay prison for terror suspects.”⁶⁶³ In May of the same year, Gallup found that 65 percent of respondents thought that the United States should not close the prison and move people “suspected of being terrorists ... to U.S. prisons.”⁶⁶⁴ (It should be noted that the questions did not highlight the public diplomacy dimension of the proposal, but one of them did highlight the concern about having suspected terrorists in local prisons.)

CHAPTER 12B: U.S. OPINION ON COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL THREATS: PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Concerns about Nuclear Proliferation

A large majority of Americans are concerned about the possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers and believe that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is an important foreign policy goal for the United States.

Overwhelmingly, Americans perceive nuclear proliferation as a critical threat. According to a 2006 Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll, more than two-thirds of U.S. respondents (69 percent) believe that the possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers is a critical threat, compared to 27 percent who believe it is important but not critical, and only 3 percent who believe it is not important. This is a higher level of concern than expressed in the nine other nations polled by WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) and CCGA in 2006: on average, 58 percent of respondents in these countries regard the possible acquisition of nuclear weapons by unfriendly countries as a critical threat, 28 percent as important but not critical, and 8 percent as unimportant (WPO/CCGA 2006).⁶⁶⁵ When CCGA asked this question again in 2008, U.S. responses were similar (67 percent critical, 30 percent important, and 3 percent not important).⁶⁶⁶

A large majority of U.S. respondents (74 percent) said that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is a very important foreign policy goal, with another 22 percent saying that it is an important goal, and just 2 percent saying it is not an important goal (CCGA 2006). This level of concern is a bit higher than the average across all eight countries polled, in which 63 percent of international respondents indicated that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is a very important goal, 25 percent that it is an important goal, and 7 percent that it is unimportant.⁶⁶⁷ In 2008, CCGA and Public Agenda both asked the same question of Americans and got similar results.⁶⁶⁸

Goal of Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

A large majority of Americans favor an international agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons, even when this would include an intrusive international inspection regime.

In a 2008 WPO poll, respondents in twenty-one nations were asked about the possibility of an agreement for eliminating nuclear weapons, in which all nuclear-armed countries would be required to disarm according to a timetable and all other states would be prohibited from developing nuclear weapons. The question specified that all countries, including the country of the respondent, would be monitored. A majority of Americans (77 percent) favored the idea of such an agreement (39 percent strongly), while only 20 percent were opposed (7 percent strongly). On average across all twenty-one nations polled, 76 percent favored the idea of an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons (50 percent strongly) while 16 percent were opposed (7 percent strongly).⁶⁶⁹

In 2005, Pew also found that 70 percent of Americans favor the United States “signing a treaty with other nations to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons, including our own.”⁶⁷⁰ Interestingly, support was a little lower than in the 2008 WPO poll discussed above, which mentioned an international inspections regime.

Use of Force by the United Nations to Prevent Nuclear Proliferation

Americans favor the UN Security Council having the power to authorize the use of military force to prevent a country from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Though the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) is something that states enter into voluntarily and from which they have the right to withdraw, Americans favor the UN Security Council having the power to authorize the use of military force to prevent a country from acquiring nuclear weapons. A large majority of Americans (62 percent) favored giving the UN Security Council this authority in a 2006 CCGA poll (33 percent were opposed). This was slightly higher than the average of the seventeen nations polled, where 59 percent of respondents favored the Security Council having such a right and 31 percent were opposed (WPO/CCGA 2006-08).⁶⁷¹

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

An overwhelming majority of Americans support U.S. participation in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) seeks to reduce the danger of nuclear proliferation by preventing nonnuclear nations from developing nuclear weapons and hindering nuclear nations from improving them. The idea of such a treaty, which the United States has not ratified, enjoys strong U.S. public support. When asked in a 2006 CCGA poll, 86 percent of Americans said the United States should participate in a treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide. Among all of the four countries asked, the average was a bit lower, with 76 percent saying their country should participate in such a treaty and 18 percent saying their country should not participate. In 2008, CCGA asked the same question and 88 percent of Americans favored U.S. participation in the CTBT.⁶⁷²

Multilateral Control of Nuclear Fuel Production

There is substantial U.S. public support for prohibiting some countries from developing nuclear fuel out of concern that they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Americans would also favor an international regime under the United Nations that would stop new countries from beginning production of nuclear fuel and instead supply them with the fuel they need for energy production. Americans even favor giving the UN Security Council the right to authorize military force to prevent a country from developing nuclear fuel that could be used to develop nuclear weapons.

The NPT puts limits on the development of nuclear weapons, but does not limit the production of nuclear fuel—provided that nations only do so to produce nuclear energy and submit to monitoring from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). To prevent diversion into weapons programs, there have been calls for greater international regulation of nuclear fuel production. Several polls show strong U.S. support for greater control over the production of nuclear fuel. CCGA asked the following question in 2006: “In the past, the international community has agreed that all countries have the right to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes. Now it has been proposed that certain countries not be allowed to develop nuclear fuel out of concern they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Do you think this proposal is a good idea or a bad idea?”

A large majority of U.S. respondents (66 percent) said the proposal is a good idea, while 31 percent said it is a bad idea. This was somewhat higher than the average of the thirteen countries that participated in the poll: 56 percent of respondents in these nations said the proposal is a good idea and 29 percent said it is a bad idea (WPO/CCGA 2006-07).⁶⁷³

A British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll in 2006 asked respondents to choose between two arguments about new countries developing nuclear fuel: “All countries should be free to produce nuclear fuel under United Nations oversight, because they have the right to have nuclear energy and should not have to depend on other countries” OR “Because nuclear fuel can be developed for use in nuclear weapons, the United Nations should try to stop new countries from producing nuclear fuel, but should provide them with the fuel they need.”

A majority of Americans (56 percent) endorsed the statement that the United Nations should try to stop countries from producing nuclear fuel, while 29 percent said that all countries should have a right to produce fuel. U.S. support for UN action to prevent new countries from developing nuclear fuel was slightly higher than the average (52 percent) of twenty-five countries polled. Thirty-three percent of respondents in these nations said that all countries should have a right to produce fuel.⁶⁷⁴

Some of the strongest U.S. public support for multilateral control of the production of nuclear fuel emerged in a 2006 CCGA poll that asked whether the UN Security Council should have the right to authorize the use of force to stop a country that did not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce such weapons. Fifty-seven percent of Americans supported granting the UN Security Council such authority, with 39 percent opposed. This is almost exactly the same as the average of sixteen countries polled (56 percent to 32 percent) (WPO/CCGA 2006-08).⁶⁷⁵

In 2008, CCGA also asked about an idea, similar to one proposed by then-IAEA Director Mohamed ElBaradei, that called for “having a UN agency control access to all nuclear fuel in the world to ensure that none is used for weapons production.” Sixty-three percent of Americans favored the idea.⁶⁷⁶

Dealing with Iran's Nuclear Program

A large majority of Americans perceive Iran as pursuing nuclear weapons, rather than limiting itself to energy production, and there is substantial concern over this. Most want to put international pressure on Iran to stop it from producing nuclear fuel, but to date they have rejected the option of military force. Americans support the idea of allowing Iran to produce nuclear fuel if it accepts intrusive UN inspections. Asked which institution would best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons, Americans are divided, though a plurality chooses the United Nations.

International polling conducted in 2006 found a widespread perception in the United States that Iran is seeking to develop nuclear weapons. BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA surveyed twenty-five countries, including the United States, on whether “Iran is producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs or ... is also trying to develop nuclear weapons.” An overwhelming majority of U.S. respondents (83 percent) believed Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons, while only 5 percent believed that it was producing nuclear fuel solely for its energy needs. Globally, a much lower 60 percent of respondents believed Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons and 17 percent that it was producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs.⁶⁷⁷

In December 2007, however, CNN found that a somewhat smaller majority of Americans (61 percent) said that Iran was trying to develop nuclear weapons. This was on the heels of the National Intelligence Estimate report saying that Iran had abandoned its nuclear weapons program.⁶⁷⁸

The 2006 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll also found that almost all U.S. respondents would be concerned “if Iran were to develop nuclear weapons.” An overwhelming 92 percent of U.S. respondents said they would be concerned (72 percent very concerned) if Iran were to develop nuclear weapons, while just 7 percent said they would not be concerned. Comparable global averages were 72 percent and 20 percent, respectively.⁶⁷⁹

Similarly, a 2006 German Marshall Fund (GMF) poll found that the prospect of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons was considered an extremely important threat by three-quarters of Americans. Nineteen percent called it an important threat, and 5 percent said it was not an important threat at all. This indicates a greater level of concern than the average of respondents polled in Europe, where 53 percent called it an extremely important threat, 27 percent called it an important threat, and 10 percent said it was not a threat.⁶⁸⁰

In 2009, a Pew poll found that a large majority (69 percent) of Americans believe that Iran’s nuclear program poses “a major threat,” and Gallup found a modest majority (54 percent) saying they are very concerned about it (moderately concerned 29 percent).⁶⁸¹

Many more Americans than Europeans also believe that very serious consequences are likely to arise if Iran acquires nuclear weapons. In 2008, GMF polled people in Europe and the United States about the likelihood of five hypothetical scenarios if Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons. In the United States, 83 percent of respondents believed that with a nuclear-armed Iran, other Middle Eastern countries would likely decide to pursue nuclear weapons (a view held by 68 percent of Europeans); 83 percent believed Iran would supply nuclear weapons to terrorists (compared to 66 percent of Europeans); 75 percent believed Iran would attack other countries in the region (58 percent in Europe); and 66 percent believed Iran would threaten Europe with nuclear weapons (a view held by 54 percent of Europeans).

At the same time, 43 percent of Americans thought that it was “likely” or “somewhat” likely that Iran would only use nuclear weapons for defensive purposes, whereas more Europeans (50 percent) believed that this outcome was likely.⁶⁸²

What Action to Take

Americans have favored talking with Iranian leaders and establishing diplomatic relations. Sixty-two percent said in November 2008 that President-elect Obama should “personally negotiate with the leaders of Iran to limit their nuclear program” (Quinnipiac University 2008).⁶⁸³ In a different poll in 2008, a more modest majority (53 percent) said that the United States should “establish diplomatic relations with Iran while Iran has a nuclear program” (CBS/*New York Times* 2009).⁶⁸⁴

If Iran persists in developing nuclear weapons, polls suggest, most Americans do not favor military action against Iran, but they do favor a more assertive approach than publics in most other countries.

A December 2007 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked about actions the UN Security Council should take if Iran continues to develop nuclear fuel. Among Americans, only 15 percent favored authorizing military strikes, while the largest number favored economic sanctions (45 percent) and 35 percent favored softer approaches (31 percent diplomacy, 4 percent no pressure). In contrast, on average among the twenty-six countries polled, 56 percent favored softer approaches (42 percent use only diplomatic efforts, 14 percent not pressure Iran) and just 33 percent supported “tougher measures” (26 percent impose economic sanctions, 8 percent authorize military strikes).⁶⁸⁵

A 2008 CCGA poll showed similar views. When asked what the UN Security Council should do if Iran continues to enrich uranium, only 20 percent of Americans chose the approach of authorizing “a military strike against Iran’s nuclear energy facilities.” The most popular approach (endorsed by 48 percent) was to impose economic sanctions, followed by simply continuing diplomatic efforts (27 percent). Just 3 percent favored applying no pressure.⁶⁸⁶

A 2008 GMF poll presented a different set of policy options for dealing with Iran. Americans were divided between those in favor of increasing pressure while maintaining the option of using military force (49 percent), and those in support of taking a range of milder approaches, including: accepting that Iran may develop nuclear weapons (6 percent); maintaining the level of diplomatic pressure on Iran (13 percent); and increasing diplomatic pressure while ruling out use of military force (27 percent). On average among Europeans, only 21 percent supported increasing pressure while keeping force as an option, whereas 47 percent supported increasing diplomatic pressure but ruling out military force. Sixteen percent of European supported maintaining the present level of diplomatic pressure and 6 percent supported accepting that Iran may develop nuclear weapons.⁶⁸⁷

When Americans are given only the two options of taking military action or not taking military action, their responses vary from a slight plurality opposing military action to a slight plurality favoring it.⁶⁸⁸ (It should also be noted that the question did not specify whether the military action would be unilateral or multilateral).

Even when nonmilitary options are not successful, a majority of Americans tend to reject military options. In 2007, Gallup initially asked what the United States “should do to get Iran to shut down its nuclear program,” providing two options: “Take military action” and “Rely on economic/diplomatic efforts.” Only 18 percent of respondents opted for military action, while 73 percent favored relying on economic and diplomatic efforts. Of these 73 percent, 55 percent still rejected the idea of military action when asked the question, “Suppose U.S. economic and diplomatic efforts do not work ... [should the United States] take military action?” Thirty-four percent said that the United States should take military action if economic and diplomatic efforts do not work.⁶⁸⁹

Making a Deal

A December 2007 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked, “If Iran were to allow UN inspectors permanent and full access throughout Iran to make sure it is not developing nuclear weapons, do you think Iran should or should not be allowed to produce nuclear fuel for producing electricity?” A majority of respondents in the United States (55 percent) favored granting Iran permission to produce nuclear fuel for energy (while 38 percent were opposed). Interestingly, this was somewhat higher than the average of 47 percent across all twenty-six countries polled who favored the idea (36 percent were opposed).⁶⁹⁰

CCGA asked this same question in 2008 and 56 percent of U.S. respondents favored the idea, while 41 percent were opposed.⁶⁹¹

Who Best to Handle Iran?

In polls, a plurality of Americans as well as Europeans favor having the United Nations take the lead in dealing with Iran. In 2006, GMF asked who could best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons. A plurality of Americans (36 percent) said the United Nations was the best to handle the issue, 22 percent said the United States, 18 percent said the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and 13 percent said the European Union. Comparatively, in Europe, an average of 43 percent supported the United Nations handling the issue, 19 percent supported the European Union, 15 percent supported NATO, and 8 percent favored the United States.⁶⁹²

When Americans are not offered the option of the United Nations, a slight majority prefers the European Union taking the lead on Iran rather than the United States. In 2006, Pew asked “Who should take the lead in dealing with Iran’s nuclear program—the United States or countries in the European Union?” Fifty-one percent said the European Union, while 30 percent said the United States.⁶⁹³

CHAPTER 13A: U.S. OPINION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Perception of Climate Change as a Problem or Threat

Most Americans say that global warming is a problem or a threat. Only small minorities say it is not a problem. Concern about climate change, while increasing for some years, may be leveling out. Large majorities believe that human activity plays a role in climate change.

In a 2009 Pew poll, 74 percent of U.S. respondents described the problem of global warming as serious, with 44 percent specifically saying it is very serious. Just 11 percent said it is not a problem. These numbers are consistent with the 2008 poll in which 72 percent said it was a serious problem.

This strong U.S. concern was nonetheless lower than in most other countries. On average, 85 percent of those polled across twenty-five countries said the problem was serious, with 56 percent saying it was very serious. In China—the largest producer of greenhouse gasses—an average of 84 percent said that climate change was serious, with 30 percent saying it was very serious (Pew 2009).⁶⁹⁴

In a Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CGA) poll conducted in 2006, 85 percent of Americans said that global warming would be a threat over the next ten years, with 46 percent saying that it would be a critical threat and 39 percent saying it would be an important, but not critical threat. Just 13 percent said it would not be an important threat. In the average of all ten countries surveyed by WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) and CCGA from 2006 to 2008, a similar 81 percent said global warming would be a threat; however a larger percentage (54 percent) identified it as a critical threat.⁶⁹⁵

In 2008, 81 percent of Americans said that global warming would be a threat over the next ten years, with 44 percent saying that it would be a critical threat and 37 percent said it would be important, but not critical (CCGA 2008). Just 18 percent said it would not be important. A separate sample asked the question using the term “climate change” instead and found no significant differences.⁶⁹⁶

When asked by the German Marshall Fund (GMF) in 2007, a majority (70 percent) of Americans thought it was likely they would “be personally affected by the effects of global warming.” However, concern was even higher among twelve European countries polled: on average 85 percent of respondents said it was likely, and in no European country did less than 77 percent take this view.⁶⁹⁷

GlobeScan surveys conducted in 2003 and 2006 documented increasing levels of concern about climate change, both in the United States and abroad. The percentage of U.S. respondents calling it a “very serious” problem increased 18 points, while globally this percentage increased an average of 16 points.⁶⁹⁸ However, this growth in concern may be topping out, as Pew did not find significant changes in U.S. views between 2007 and 2009.⁶⁹⁹

Role of Human Activity

The U.S. public, similar to publics around the world, appears to overwhelmingly reject the idea that global warming can simply be attributed to nonhuman factors. In a 2007 poll conducted by the British Broadcasting Company (BBC), GlobeScan, and the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA), a large majority of respondents in the United States (71 percent) believed that “human activity, including industry and transportation, [is] a significant cause of climate change,” while only 24 percent believed that it is not a significant cause of climate change. On average, 79 percent of respondents in twenty-one countries said that human activity is to blame, while 14 percent said it is not.⁷⁰⁰

A similarly robust majority of Americans (82 percent) expressed concern that “the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems, including climate change,” with 53 percent saying they are very concerned (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). Just 18 percent said that they are not concerned. Globally, an average of 81 percent of those polled across nineteen countries expressed concern, with 47 percent saying they were very concerned.⁷⁰¹

Readiness to Take Action

A large majority of Americans support taking action to address the problem of climate change. More often than not majorities favor taking major steps, urgently. A modest majority thinks that the U.S. government should do

more than it is currently doing to address climate change. Americans tend to underestimate how ready other Americans are to support taking action, however. There is strong support for participation in an international treaty to limit climate change. Most Americans believe that it will be necessary for people to change their lifestyle in order to reduce their production of climate-changing gasses. Readiness to take action is highly related to levels of information regarding climate change and the perception that there is scientific consensus on the reality of climate change.

Support for taking action to address climate change is quite robust. Respondents were asked whether it was necessary to address climate change by taking: 1) “major steps starting very soon;” 2) “modest steps over the coming years;” or whether it was 3) “not necessary to take any steps” (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). A large majority of Americans (59 percent) favored quick action, while 33 percent preferred modest steps and 6 percent said no action is necessary at all. Overall, among the twenty-one nations polled, on average 65 percent favored major steps, 25 percent modest steps, and 6 percent no steps.⁷⁰²

Another poll offered three options for responding to climate change, but put greater emphasis on the potential costs of each (CCGA 2006). In this case the highest level of commitment failed to garner majority support, but it remained the most common response. A plurality of Americans (43 percent) took the view that: “Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs.” A slightly lower number (37 percent) said that while the problem of global warming should be addressed, “its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost.” Yet another 17 percent of Americans responded, “Until we are sure that global warming really is a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs.” A similar pattern emerged among all thirteen publics polled (WPO/CCGA 2006-08): on average, 42 percent said that steps should be taken now despite the costs, 33 percent said that modest steps should be taken, and 12 percent said that steps which would have negative economic effects should not be taken yet to combat global warming.⁷⁰³

A 2009 WPO poll asked Americans how high a priority the government should place on addressing climate change, using a scale of zero to ten (with zero being no priority at all). Overall, U.S. respondents placed only moderate urgency on this goal, giving a mean response of 4.71. This was the lowest of twenty nations polled and well below the global average of 7.28.⁷⁰⁴

Similarly, GMF asked Americans and Europeans in 2008 what the top priority should be for the next U.S. president and European leaders. Given a list of eight issues, Americans rated climate change as the fifth most pressing issue, while Europeans rated it as one of the top two (GMF 2008).⁷⁰⁵

However, a majority of Americans do think that their government should place a higher priority on climate change than it does. When WPO asked how high a priority their government places on addressing climate change, using the same zero-to-ten scale, the mean estimate from U.S. respondents was 3.84—one of the lowest of all nations polled (average 5.06). A modest majority of Americans (52 percent) argued that their government should make combating climate change a higher level priority, whereas 24 percent approved of the current level and 21 percent favored a lower level. Across the twenty-two countries, an average of 60 percent called for their government to give climate change a higher priority.⁷⁰⁶

Americans tend to underestimate the level of concern among their fellow Americans about climate change. Asked to estimate how high a priority the average American thinks the government should place on climate change, respondents offered the mean response of 3.71—substantially lower than the 4.71 they reported for themselves.⁷⁰⁷ Overall, 52 percent of U.S. respondents reported placing a higher priority on climate change than what they estimated the average American does, while 22 percent perceived placing the same priority, and 24 percent a lower priority, than the average of their fellow citizens.

Participation in Climate Change Treaty

Large majorities of Americans believe the United States should take part in an international treaty to combat climate change. CCGA found that 76 percent favoring favored the United States participating in “a new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse-gas emissions” (CCGA 2008).⁷⁰⁸ Americans were asked previously in 2006 if their country should participate specifically in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming. Seven out of ten Americans said that it should.⁷⁰⁹

Poll questions that presented the arguments for and against the Kyoto treaty elicited a similar response in an April 2001 ABC News poll, which presented both sides of the argument with the following question: “An international treaty calls on the United States and other industrialized nations to cut back on their emissions from power plants and cars in order to reduce global warming, also known as the greenhouse effect. Some people say this would hurt the U.S. economy and is based on uncertain science. Others say this is needed to protect the environment and could create new business opportunities. What's your view: do you think the United States should or should not join this treaty requiring less emissions from U.S. power plants and cars?”

A majority of 61percent expressed support for joining the treaty. In June 2002, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs asked the same question again and found 70-percent support for joining the treaty.⁷¹⁰

Need for Changes in Lifestyle

There is overwhelming consensus among Americans that it will be necessary for individuals “to make changes in their lifestyle and behavior in order to reduce the amount of climate changing gases they produce.” In a 2007 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll, a large majority of Americans (79 percent) agreed that such changes are necessary, with 48 percent saying they would definitely be necessary and 31 percent saying they would probably be necessary. Just 19 percent said such changes would not be necessary. In the global average of twenty-one countries polled, 83 percent said lifestyle changes are necessary (with 46 percent saying “definitely”), and 13 percent said they are unnecessary.⁷¹¹

Effect of Greater Information

Not surprisingly, willingness to take action in regard to climate change rises with greater awareness.

Levels of information about climate change are highly varied (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). Among Americans, 89 percent said that they have heard at least something about climate change, while 10 percent said they have not heard much or anything. On average across all countries polled, seven in ten had heard a great deal (35 percent) or some (35 percent), with 22 percent saying not very much and 7 percent none at all.⁷¹²

Effect of Perceived Scientific Consensus

Most Americans do not perceive that there is a scientific consensus on the reality of climate change. When asked, “Do you think most scientists agree with one another about how much of a threat global warming poses, or is there a lot of disagreement among scientists about that?” (ABC/Stanford July 2008) 62 percent said there is a lot of disagreement while just one in three said that most scientists agree.⁷¹³

A June 2005 PIPA poll found a slight majority of 52 percent saying “there is a consensus among the great majority of scientists that global warming exists and could do significant damage,” while 39 percent said that scientists are divided on the existence of global warming and its impact.⁷¹⁴

In June 2005, PIPA found that while 76 percent favored taking some steps to address global warming, only 34 percent favored taking steps with significant costs. PIPA also followed this question by asking respondents to assume that an overwhelming majority of scientists “have concluded that global warming is occurring and poses a significant threat,” and asked what position they would then favor. Under these circumstances, those willing to take steps with significant costs rose 22 points to 56 percent. At the same time those unwilling to take any steps declined from 21 percent to 6 percent.⁷¹⁵

Changing Energy Usage

To motivate changes in energy usage, most Americans believe that it will be necessary to increase the cost of energy that causes climate change. The idea of raising taxes on such forms of energy meets with mixed responses. But if the revenues of such a tax are earmarked to address the problem of climate change or are offset with tax reductions, support becomes much higher. Also, a large majority of Americans say that in order to address climate change they would be willing to pay more for renewable energy.

A large number of Americans (65 percent) believe that it is necessary to “increase the cost of the types of energy that

most cause climate change, such as coal and oil, in order to encourage individuals and industry to use less” (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007). Thirty-two percent believe this is not necessary. Globally, an average of 61 percent of respondents in nations polled supported this proposition, while 34 percent disagreed, making U.S. support just slightly higher than the global average.⁷¹⁶

U.S. support plummeted, however, when pollsters asked whether taxes should be increased on the energy sources that contribute to climate change, so as to encourage people and industry to use less. Just 46 percent supported such taxes while 51 percent were opposed. In the global average, however, 50 percent favored raising taxes and 44 percent opposed it (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007).⁷¹⁷

Nevertheless, U.S. attitudes shifted sharply under certain conditions. Half of those who did not initially support tax increases were asked whether they would do so if the revenues were “devoted only to increasing energy efficiency and developing energy sources that do not produce climate change.” Another half were asked if they would do so if “your other taxes were reduced by the same amount, keeping your total taxes at the current level.” Under the first condition (earmarked revenues), 28 percent responded that they would support such taxes, while 23 percent opposed. Under the second condition (tax offsets), however, U.S. attitudes did not change as much, with 31 percent saying that they would not support such taxes while 17 percent said that they would. When those who initially favored tax increases are added to those who favored them under these conditions, a majority of Americans would favor energy taxes with earmarks (74 percent) or with tax offsets (63 percent). Globally, an average of 77 percent would favor the measure if revenues were earmarked and 76 percent if the increase were offset (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2007).⁷¹⁸

It may be that using the term “taxes” diminishes support for adjusting cost structures to encourage more renewable energy. A CBS/*New York Times* poll in 2007 simply asked, “In order to help reduce global warming, would you be willing or not willing to pay more for electricity if it were generated by renewable sources like solar or wind energy?” In this case, 75 percent of Americans said they would be willing, while just 20 percent said they would not.⁷¹⁹

Pew asked Americans in 2009 whether they agreed that “people should be willing to pay higher prices in order to address global climate change.” The question did not specify what the prices would be for, where the revenues would go, or how paying these higher prices would help in addressing climate change. Only 41 percent agreed and 55 percent disagreed.⁷²⁰

Reducing Reliance on Oil and Coal

To reduce reliance on oil and coal, a large majority of Americans favor creating tax incentives to encourage alternative energy sources, requiring automakers to increase fuel efficiency, and building new nuclear power plants.

Respondents were asked whether they favored a number of methods for reducing reliance on oil and coal, without specifically mentioning the purpose (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). The most popular of the four proposed measures proved to be “creating tax incentives that would encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.” A majority of Americans (85 percent) supported this measure while 12 percent opposed. Across all nineteen countries an average of 80 percent of respondents said they would support such incentives.⁷²¹

The next most popular measure was to require “auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.” Seventy-seven percent of Americans (and 67 percent of respondents globally) supported this measure, while 21 percent of Americans (and 26 percent of those globally) opposed it.⁷²²

A majority of Americans (63 percent) also supported “building new nuclear power plants, to reduce reliance on oil and coal.” Global support was far weaker, with 49 percent endorsing and 44 percent opposing the proposal.⁷²³

The least popular measure was “increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation.” A bare majority of Americans (51 percent) opposed the measure, while 47 percent were in support of it. On average, 59 percent of global respondents opposed the tax increase, while 37 percent supported it.⁷²⁴

Role of Developing Countries

A majority of Americans—along with most people in developing and developed countries alike—think that developing countries have a responsibility to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions in an effort to deal with

climate change. There is also a consensus that developed countries should provide aid as part of a deal to help developing countries commit to limiting their emissions. If developing countries refuse to limit their emissions, most Americans think the United States should nonetheless proceed to limit its own emissions.

A major controversy in addressing climate change is whether developing countries should be required to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions. A BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll (2007) introduced respondents to this debate by presenting the two positions. The first position was one taken by the government of many developing countries: “Because countries that are less wealthy produce relatively low emissions per person, they should not be expected to limit their emissions of climate changing gases.” The second was one advocated by governments of some developed nations: “Because total emissions from less-wealthy countries are substantial and growing, these countries should limit their emissions of climate changing gases.”

Seventy-five percent of U.S. respondents agreed with the second position saying that developing countries should limit their emissions. A smaller 18 percent of Americans disagreed, saying that they should not be expected to limit emissions. On average among the twenty-one countries polled, 59 percent said that these countries should be expected to lower emissions, while 29 percent said that they should not.⁷²⁵

At the same time, there is a consensus in the United States that developed countries should provide aid to developing countries as part of a deal whereby developing countries agree to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.

The same poll asked about a possible bargain in which “wealthy countries agree to provide less-wealthy countries with financial assistance and technology, while less-wealthy countries agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy countries.” A majority of Americans (70 percent) supported this idea. However, this was the lowest show of support by a developed nation. On average across both developed and developing nations, 73 percent of respondents were in favor of the idea while 18 percent were opposed.⁷²⁶

Similarly, a CCGA poll from 2006 asked whether developed countries should provide “substantial aid” to less developed countries that “make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions.” A majority of respondents in the United States (64 percent) agreed with this idea, while 32 percent disagreed.⁷²⁷

However, when a more recent CCGA poll asked specifically about providing technological and financial aid to China and India, views were almost evenly divided, with 48 percent in favor and 52 percent opposed.⁷²⁸

Americans also say that U.S. action on climate change should not be contingent on the actions of developing countries. Given three options, only 20 percent said that the United States “should take action on global warming only if other major industrial countries such as China and India agree to do equally effective things.” Fifty-nine percent said the United States “should take action even if these other countries do less.” Eighteen percent said the United States should not take action at all (ABC News/Stanford 2009).⁷²⁹

Multilateral Efforts to Address Climate Change

Americans say that multilateral cooperation on climate change is very important, but give the United States a mediocre rating in advancing this objective. A large majority believes there should be a new international institution to monitor compliance with climate treaty obligations.

Asked how important it is for the United States to cooperate with other countries on reducing global warming, 87 percent of Americans said it was important, with 61 percent saying it was very important (Public Agenda 2008). However, when the same poll asked respondents to give the United States a grade for how well it is working with other countries to reduce global warming, the average grade was a C minus. Just 30 percent gave the United States an A or B, while 25 percent gave a C and 33 percent gave a D or F.⁷³⁰

A GlobeScan poll in 2008 found that Americans gave poor ratings for cooperation between Europe and North America on climate change. A majority of Americans (58 percent) said that transatlantic cooperation was below average, while only 19 percent and 17 percent said that cooperation was average and above average, respectively. Among the other nine nations (composed of European nations and Canada) polled, an average of 58 percent of respondents said that transatlantic cooperation was below average, only 19 percent said it was above average, and 16 percent said it was average.⁷³¹

A large majority (68 percent) of Americans said that there should be a “new international institution or agency” to “monitor whether countries are meeting their treaty obligations to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions that contribute to climate change.” (CCGA 2008)⁷³²

Assessments of Leading Country’s Role in Addressing Problem

A majority of Americans disapprove of how the United States has handled the problem of climate change. Most Americans regarded China as the worst offender in harming the global environment, while most other nations blame the United States. Americans retain a large amount of trust in their own country to protect the environment, while Germany has the best ratings globally.

When it comes to how the United States is handling global warming or climate change, opinion polls suggest that most Americans share the same negative view as the rest of the world. According to a 2006 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll, 54 percent of Americans disapprove of how their own nation has handled the problem, while 39 percent approve. In the average of all twenty-five nations polled, 56 percent disapproved and only 27 percent approved of U.S. handling of climate change.⁷³³

While most Americans see China as having the most negative effect on the world’s environment, global opinions put more of the blame on the United States. In a 2008 Pew poll, when asked which country is “hurting the world’s environment the most,” 40 percent of Americans said “China”, while 22 percent indicated their own country.⁷³⁴ This is a notable change from a Pew poll conducted a year earlier in 2007, when most Americans (33 percent) said that the United States was hurting the environment the most, and only 22 percent indicated that China was.⁷³⁵

In the 2008 Pew poll, respondents were also asked which country they would “trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world’s environment.” A majority of Americans (57 percent) said that they trust their own country the most, while 15 percent said Germany. The largest number of respondents (24 percent on average) in the twenty-four countries surveyed, however, said that they trusted Germany the most, while 15 percent indicated their trust in the United States.⁷³⁶

CHAPTER 13B: U.S. OPINION ON ENERGY SECURITY

Concerns about Energy Security

Americans show high levels of concern about energy security. A large majority of the U.S. public believes that energy shortages and higher prices could lead to destabilization of the world economy, that competition for energy could lead to international conflict (and even war), and that the way the world produces energy is causing environmental problems. A large majority favors creating a new international institution to monitor the worldwide energy market.

Many Americans express concerns about a variety of possible scenarios involving energy security. A 2006 British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll presented three possibilities and asked respondents how concerned they were about each.

On the possibility that **energy shortages and prices will destabilize the world economy**, a majority of U.S. respondents (82 percent) expressed concern, with 44 percent saying that they were very concerned. This level of concern was slightly higher than the global average, where 77 percent of respondents said they were concerned (39 percent very concerned) and 19 percent said they were not concerned.⁷³⁷

Regarding the possibility that **competition for energy will lead to greater conflict and war between nations**, once again an overwhelming majority of U.S. respondents (79 percent) expressed concern (41 said they were very concerned), while 19 percent said that they were not concerned. The global average was quite similar, with 72 percent concerned (36 percent very) and 22 percent not concerned.⁷³⁸

On the possibility that **the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change**, most Americans (82 percent) replied that they are concerned (53 percent very concerned), while 18 percent said that they are not. Globally, 81 percent of respondents were concerned (47 percent very) and 16 percent not concerned.⁷³⁹

The U.S. public is also deeply concerned about the potential for disruption in the energy supply. WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) found that nearly three in five Americans (59 percent) regarded this threat as a critical one. Another 37 percent regarded it as important but not critical, while only 3 percent believe it is not important. On average among all eight countries polled on this question, 51 percent of respondents have called it a critical threat, 30 percent said it was important but not critical, and 11 percent said it was not an important threat at all (WPO/CCGA 2006-08).⁷⁴⁰

People in both the United States and Europe expect that they will be personally affected by “energy dependence” in the next ten years, according to a 2008 poll from the German Marshall Fund (GMF). A large majority of Americans (87 percent) said that they would likely be affected, while 11 percent said that it was not likely. U.S. responses were only slightly higher than the average of twelve European countries polled, where 81 percent said energy dependence would likely affect them and 15 percent said it is not likely that it would affect them.⁷⁴¹

Americans also overwhelmingly agree that securing adequate supplies of energy should be an important goal for their country (CCGA 2006), with 72 percent regarding this goal as very important, 25 percent as important, and only 2 percent as not important. On average, 65 percent of respondents in seven countries polled said that this goal is very important, 26 percent said it is somewhat important, and 5 percent said it is not important at all.⁷⁴²

A large majority (69 percent) of Americans favor creating a new international institution to “monitor the worldwide energy market and predict potential shortages.” Thirty percent of U.S. respondents opposed the idea (CCGA 2008).⁷⁴³

Approaches to Energy Supply—Renewable Energy

There is strong U.S. support for a variety of methods to address the problem of energy supply. Americans are in favor of putting greater emphasis on the development of alternative renewable sources such as solar and wind, requiring utilities to use more alternative renewable energy (even if this increases the cost), and providing tax incentives to encourage the development and use of such technologies. There is substantial optimism that

investments in alternative energy will pay off economically in the long run. Americans also strongly agree that investing in renewable energy is important for the United States to remain competitive in the global economy.

The U.S. public widely favors putting greater emphasis on installing new wind or solar systems to help meet energy needs. In a 2008 WPO poll, 87 percent of U.S. respondents said that their country should emphasize these systems more than they are now. That number is somewhat higher than the average (77 percent) in twenty-one of the populations polled globally.⁷⁴⁴

Most Americans also favor the U.S. government requiring utilities to use more alternative energy, such as wind and solar, even if this increases the cost of energy in the short run. Two-thirds (66 percent) of the U.S. public supported this idea, while 28 percent opposed it. On the whole, an average of 69 percent of respondents in twenty-one publics globally favored requiring utilities to use more alternative energy, while 20 percent were opposed (WPO 2008).⁷⁴⁵ In an April 2007 poll, 75 percent of Americans agreed they “would be willing to pay more for electricity if it were generated by renewable sources like solar and energy” in order to reduce global warming (CBS News/*New York Times*).⁷⁴⁶

There is also broad U.S. public support for creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power. A large majority (85 percent) of Americans favored such tax incentives (59 percent strongly), while 12 percent were opposed (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the average of all nineteen countries polled, 80 percent favored tax incentives (50 percent strongly) while 14 percent were opposed.⁷⁴⁷

A large majority of Americans (77 percent) favored the government increasing the “financial support and incentives it gives for producing energy from alternative sources such as wind and solar” (Gallup 2009). Only 8 percent said such support should be decreased, while 13 percent said there should be no change.⁷⁴⁸ In a related question, 63 percent said the government “should offer tax breaks for companies to develop alternative energy sources” compared to 32 percent who said it should “leave it to the marketplace” (ABC News 2008).⁷⁴⁹

When presented with competing arguments about the costs of making a major shift to alternative energy sources such as wind and solar, the U.S. public favors making such a shift. Most U.S. respondents (79 percent) sided with the argument that, with the rising cost of energy, making a major shift to alternative energy sources would save money in the long run (WPO 2008). On average among the twenty-one publics surveyed, a lower 66 percent of all respondents said it would save money in the long run.⁷⁵⁰

In addition, an overwhelming 93 percent of Americans believe “investing in renewable energy” is important for the United States to remain competitive with other countries in the global economy, with 74 percent considering this very important (CCGA 2008).⁷⁵¹

Approaches to Energy Supply—Conservation

In general, the U.S. public strongly favors conservation. Specifically, it favors putting greater emphasis on modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient as well as requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently, even if this might make some products more expensive. Americans do not, however, favor an extra charge for the purchase of models of appliances or cars that are not energy efficient, and they are opposed to increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation. Nevertheless, a majority supports higher taxes if the revenues are earmarked for developing alternative energy or if the tax is offset by other tax reductions. Additionally, Americans are in favor of requiring automakers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

Americans generally support conservation as a means to reduce U.S. energy dependence. In an August 2008 George Washington University survey, an overwhelming majority (92 percent) favored “promoting energy conservation practices.”⁷⁵²

To this end, the U.S. public favors putting greater emphasis on modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient. Asked whether they thought there should be more, less, or the same level of emphasis on modifying buildings for this purpose, 83 percent favored more emphasis, 11 percent wanted no change, and 4 percent desired less emphasis (WPO 2008). U.S. responses were slightly more “green” than the global average, where 74 percent favored more emphasis, 11 percent favored less emphasis, and 8 percent favored the same emphasis.⁷⁵³

There is also widespread U.S. support for requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently. A majority of Americans (61 percent) favored mandatory energy efficiency standards for businesses, even if this might make some products more expensive (34 percent were opposed) (WPO 2008). Among the twenty-one publics polled, an average of 58 percent of respondents were in favor, while 31 percent were opposed.⁷⁵⁴

More than two-thirds of Americans (69 percent) support the government creating tax incentives to encourage conservation, while only 23 percent are opposed (Pew 2008).⁷⁵⁵

However, when asked about the possible conservation measure of adding an extra charge for the purchase of models of appliances or cars that are not energy-efficient, a majority of Americans (52 percent) opposed the measure, while 43 percent were in favor. Across twenty-one publics polled, 48 percent of respondents were in favor of this measure and 39 percent were opposed.⁷⁵⁶

Americans are divided on whether they support taxes to encourage conservation. In 2006, BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA found that a slight majority of U.S. respondents (51 percent) oppose such a tax increase, while 47 percent were in favor. On average in the nineteen countries polled, there was more opposition, with 59 percent opposing an increase in energy taxes for conservation and 37 percent favoring such taxes.⁷⁵⁷ In the United States, the public is particularly resistant to the prospect of increased gasoline taxes. In an April 2009 poll, Pew found that 74 percent of Americans opposed “increasing taxes on gasoline to encourage carpooling and conservation.”⁷⁵⁸ Similarly, 83 percent were against “increasing the federal tax on gasoline” and 63 percent were against “rationing gasoline and oil” in a June 2008 Fox News poll.⁷⁵⁹

However, when Americans were asked if they would be willing to “pay higher taxes on gasoline and other fuels if the money was used for research into renewable sources like solar and wind energy,” nearly two-thirds (64 percent) of Americans were willing, while one-third (33 percent) was not.⁷⁶⁰ In contrast, when a potential increase in the federal tax on gasoline was described more vaguely as a step to “cut down on energy consumption and reduce global warming,” only 38 percent of U.S. respondents were in favor (CBS News/*New York Times* 2007).⁷⁶¹

A large majority of the U.S. public favors mandating increased vehicle fuel efficiency, even if this means higher car prices. Seventy-seven percent of U.S. respondents were in favor of this idea, while 21 percent were opposed (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). This support is somewhat higher than the average of all nineteen countries surveyed on this question, where 67 percent favored higher standards and 26 percent opposed them.⁷⁶²

When Americans were asked to evaluate the merits of conservation as compared to increased production of fossil-fuel-based energy, they consistently preferred conservation. An April 2007 CBS News/*New York Times* poll found that 68 percent were in favor of “encouraging conservation,” compared to 21 percent who favored “increasing production of petroleum, coal and natural gas.”⁷⁶³ Repeatedly, Gallup has found consistent majority support for placing emphasis on “more conservation by consumers of existing energy sources” rather than “production of more oil, gas, and coal supplies.” Most recently in March 2008, 61 percent sided with conservation over production.⁷⁶⁴ When asked in a CBS News/*New York Times* poll in 2007, 68 percent of Americans favored “encouraging people to conserve energy” over “increasing the production of petroleum, coal, and natural gas”—this was an increase of 19 percentage points from 2005.⁷⁶⁵

However, when improving conservation was juxtaposed with the alternative of “finding new energy sources” in July 2008, 64 percent put a higher priority on the latter, while 33 percent considered conservation to be more important. (ABC News).⁷⁶⁶

Approaches to Energy Supply—Fossil Fuels

Americans oppose putting greater emphasis on building coal or oil-fired power plants. Expectations are high that the price of oil will rise dramatically over the next decade and most Americans say that their government should plan under the assumption that oil is running out and that a major effort is necessary to replace it. Americans lean against the idea of using military force to ensure the supply of oil.

Putting greater emphasis on building coal or oil-fired power plants does not win much support among the U.S. public. In a 2008 WPO poll, 49 percent of Americans responded that there should be less emphasis put on building such plants,

while 25 percent wanted to emphasize it more, and 22 percent wanted no change. Globally, support for building new coal or oil-fired power plants was much higher, with an average of 40 percent of respondents across twenty-one nations wanting to emphasize this step more, 33 percent wanting to emphasize it less, and 17 percent wanting no change.⁷⁶⁷

An overwhelming majority (85 percent) of U.S. respondents considered “decreas[ing] American dependence on oil imported from the Middle East” as important, with 67 percent saying it was very important (Pew 2006).⁷⁶⁸

A large majority of Americans (88 percent) think that the price of oil will be higher within the next decade (63 percent “much higher”) and only 6 percent think the price will be lower (WPO 2008). On average in the sixteen nations polled, 79 percent predicted oil prices would be higher (55 percent much higher).⁷⁶⁹

Three out of four U.S. respondents say that their governments should be making plans based on the assumption that oil is running out and will need to be replaced as a primary source of energy (WPO 2008). Only 23 percent agreed with the argument that “enough new oil will be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future.” Globally, an average of 70 percent of respondents said governments should plan on oil running out, while 22 percent said that governments should assume enough new oil would be found.⁷⁷⁰

In a follow-up question, respondents were asked to describe the assumptions they believed were informing their government’s actions. Most U.S. respondents (57 percent) said that the government was operating under the assumption that enough new oil would be found so that it could remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future, while 41 percent said the government was assuming that oil was running out (WPO 2008). In other words, there was a widespread perception among Americans that their government was failing to respond to the depletion of oil reserves.

However, on average globally, 53 percent said their government was assuming oil was running out and would need to be replaced, consistent with the majority assumption among the public.⁷⁷¹

The U.S. public leans against the idea of their country using force to ensure the supply of oil. When asked whether they approved of this, 50 percent of Americans said no, while 44 percent approved (GMF 2004). In ten European countries polled, an average of 42 percent approved of using force to ensure the supply of oil and 51 percent disapproved.⁷⁷²

Approaches to Energy Supply—Nuclear Energy

Fewer than half of Americans want to put a greater emphasis on building nuclear power plants. However, most Americans do not want to abandon nuclear energy, and when building nuclear plants is part of an effort to reduce reliance on oil and coal, a majority supports it.

Americans are not enthusiastic about nuclear energy. In a 2008 WPO poll, only 42 percent wanted the United States to put more emphasis on building nuclear power plants than it already does, a result similar to the 40 percent average support for this idea among the twenty-one nations polled.⁷⁷³

Similarly, an ABC News poll in 2008 found that 53 percent of Americans were opposed to “building more nuclear power plants”⁷⁷⁴ and a 2005 GlobeScan poll found that just 40 percent of Americans favored building new nuclear plants, slightly more than the average of 28 percent among all eighteen countries polled.⁷⁷⁵

At the same time, most Americans do not want to abandon nuclear energy altogether. In the 2008 WPO poll, only 31 percent of respondents thought there should be less emphasis on building nuclear power plants (similar to the global average of 30 percent), and in the 2005 GlobeScan poll, just 20 percent supported closing all nuclear power plants.

A 2009 Gallup poll also found that 59 percent of Americans favor “the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity for the United States.” This number is up from a low of 46 percent in 2001.⁷⁷⁶

Furthermore, when poll questions place the building of nuclear power plants in the context of an effort to reduce reliance on oil and coal, a majority of Americans favor doing so. Apparently, in the eyes of U.S. respondents, nuclear energy is not an attractive option, but it is not as unattractive as oil and coal. When asked in 2006 about “building new nuclear power plants, to reduce reliance on oil and coal,” a large majority (63 percent) favored the idea

(BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006), as did an average of 49 percent of respondents in nineteen countries.⁷⁷⁷ In 2008, Fox News also found a more modest majority of 51 percent that endorsed building more nuclear power plants as a way “to reduce the country’s dependence on foreign oil and make the United States more energy-independent.”⁷⁷⁸ Similarly, in an August 2006 *Los Angeles Times*/Bloomberg poll, 61 percent supported “the increased use of nuclear power as a source of energy in order to prevent global warming.”⁷⁷⁹

Dealing With Energy-Producing Countries

Americans express strong support for reducing reliance on undemocratic countries in general and on Middle East countries in particular. While Americans are very concerned about dependence on Russian energy, they continue to have some faith in that nation as an energy supplier. When it comes to other energy-providing countries, such confidence is moderately low for Saudi Arabia, quite low for Venezuela, very low for Iran, and very high for Canada.

In a 2008 GMF poll, respondents were presented with three options for ensuring a stable supply of energy: increasing cooperation with energy-producing countries “even if their governments are undemocratic,” reducing energy dependence on other countries “even if energy prices would rise sharply,” or applying diplomatic pressure “even if this increases tensions with oil producing countries.” A plurality of Americans (48 percent) said that dependence on those countries should be reduced, even with sharp economic costs, 23 percent favored increased cooperation with energy suppliers, and 15 percent wanted to apply diplomatic pressure. Global attitudes were more split, and on average among twelve European countries polled, 35 percent favored increased cooperation, 35 percent favored reduced dependence, and 18 percent favored diplomatic pressure.⁷⁸⁰

Americans also place great importance on reducing U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern countries as oil suppliers. An August 2006 Pew poll found 85 percent saying “decreas[ing] U.S. dependence on oil imported from the Middle East” was “very important” (67 percent) or “fairly important” (18 percent), compared to 10 percent saying it was “not at all important” (5 percent) or “not too important” (5 percent).⁷⁸¹

Russia as an Energy Provider

Findings from a 2008 GMF poll reveal worries both in the United States and Europe about reliance on Russia as provider of energy. When asked about the extent to which they were concerned with Russia’s role as an energy provider, 61 percent of Americans said they were concerned (24 percent very concerned), while 33 percent said they were not concerned. On average in twelve European countries surveyed, 62 percent said they were concerned with Russia’s role and 31 percent said they were not concerned.⁷⁸²

Overall, publics are divided on whether Russia can be trusted to fulfill its commitment to deliver energy to other countries. A slight majority (54 percent) of Americans said that they have a lot of trust (5 percent) or some trust (49 percent) in Russia to follow through on their commitment to deliver energy, while 43 percent said that they do not (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). U.S. faith in Russia was higher than international trust in that nation: in the global average, 45 percent of respondents thought Russia could be trusted while 45 percent thought Russia could not be trusted.⁷⁸³

Other Energy-Providing Countries

Trust in other energy suppliers varies significantly, depending on the country. When publics in nineteen countries were asked about their confidence that several energy-exporting nations would follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries, overall trust was moderately low for Saudi Arabia, very low for Iran, quite low for Venezuela, and very high for Canada (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).

There is some skepticism in the United States about Saudi Arabia’s reliability to meet its commitments as an energy supplier. Fifty-six percent of Americans said they do not trust Saudi Arabia to deliver on its energy commitments, while 41 percent said they do. Globally, an average of 46 percent of respondents said they do not trust Saudi Arabia on energy delivery, and 42 percent said they do (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).⁷⁸⁴

While confidence in Venezuela as an energy supplier is somewhat low, most Americans still trust the South American nation. A plurality of U.S. respondents (49 percent) said that they trust Venezuela to fulfill its energy commitments,

while 42 percent said that they do not. A plurality (43 percent) of respondents globally, however, lack trust in the nation, while 35 percent have trust in it (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).⁷⁸⁵

Trust in Iran to deliver on its energy commitments is the lowest out of all suppliers evaluated. Eighty-three percent of Americans lack faith in the Islamic Republic, while only 14 percent said they trust Iran to fulfill its commitments. Globally, 62 percent said they do not trust Iran while 26 percent said they do (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).⁷⁸⁶

Canada is the energy supplier most widely trusted by the United States, as well as by other nations. Eighty-nine percent of Americans trust Canada to fulfill its energy commitments, while only 9 percent do not. On average globally, 60 percent said they trusted Canada as an energy supplier and 25 percent said they did not (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006).

⁷⁸⁷

CHAPTER 14: U.S. OPINION ON MANAGING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

General Views of Globalization and International Trade

Americans clearly support globalization, though they also lean toward the position that the pace of globalization is too fast. Americans generally view international trade as positive for the United States, themselves, their families, consumers, and the nation's companies; however views are more negative about the impact of international trade on jobs and the environment.

Globalization

Several international polls have found robust U.S. support for globalization. Asked whether “the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries” is good or bad for their country, 65 percent of Americans said it was good while 30 percent said it was bad (Pew 2009). This was lower, however, than the average of 81 percent expressing a positive view across twenty-five nations polled. The same poll asked whether these growing ties are good or bad for “for you and your family.” Sixty-three percent of Americans said they were good, a bit lower than the average of 75 percent among twenty-five publics polled.⁷⁸⁸

When the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) asked if they believed that “globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world,” was mostly good or mostly bad for their country, 60 percent of U.S. respondents said “mostly good” while 35 percent said “mostly bad” for the United States. Globally, of the twenty-five publics polled by CCGA and WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO), an average of 63 percent of respondents said it was mostly good and 22 percent said it was mostly bad for their country.⁷⁸⁹ When CCGA asked the question again in 2008, 58 percent of Americans said globalization was mostly good.⁷⁹⁰

Defining globalization as “the increased trade between countries in goods, services, and investment,” respondents were asked whether the phenomenon was positive or negative for “you and your family's interests.” In this case, 65 percent of Americans said it was positive (8 percent said very positive) and 31 percent said negative (8 percent said very negative). This was somewhat higher than the average of 55 percent across nineteen countries polled (25 percent said it was negative) (GlobeScan 2004).⁷⁹¹

At the same time there seems to be substantial concern that globalization is occurring too quickly. A British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) poll from 2008 asked respondents whether they thought economic globalization, including trade and investment, was growing too quickly or too slowly. A modest majority of Americans (54 percent) said that it was growing too quickly (19 percent said “much too quickly”) and 37 percent said it was growing too slowly (9 percent said “much too slowly”). This suggests a bit more concern among the U.S. public than expressed in the average of twenty-nine countries polled: globally, 51 percent of respondents said it was growing too quickly and 36 percent said it was growing too slowly.⁷⁹² When CCGA asked the same question later in 2008, the percentage of Americans saying that globalization is going too quickly had dropped to just 40 percent, though this was still far more than the number saying it was going too slowly (18 percent) and about the same as those saying it was going at the right pace (39 percent).⁷⁹³

International Trade

Americans generally see international trade in a positive light. In a 2008 CCGA poll, nine out of ten respondents said that “promoting international trade” is a very (34 percent) or somewhat (57 percent) important foreign policy goal for the United States.⁷⁹⁴ Asked in the same poll about various factors that might determine whether the United States remained competitive with other countries in the global economy, 81 percent of Americans said that it was important (32 percent said very important) to support “open trade around the world.”⁷⁹⁵

CCGA also asked Americans to rate the effect of international trade in a number of dimensions. Most Americans said that the effect of trade was mostly good on the general economy, domestic companies, and themselves. However, these levels of support tended to be somewhat lower than in the average of twenty to twenty-two national publics WPO and CCGA polled between 2006 and 2008.

- On the effect of trade on **their country’s economy**, most Americans agree that it has a positive effect. Fifty-four percent of U.S. respondents said that the effect was good, while 42 percent said it was bad. In the global average of all twenty-two publics, on the other hand, 72 percent said trade was good for their economy and 21 percent said it was bad. The United States had the lowest number saying that trade was good.⁷⁹⁶
- On the effect of trade on **companies in their country**, 52 percent of Americans stated that it had a good effect, while 45 percent said trade had a bad effect. In the average of all twenty-one publics, 66 percent said it had a good effect and 25 percent said bad.⁷⁹⁷
- On the effect of trade on their **standard of living**, more Americans responded positively; 64 percent said that trade had a good effect, while 31 percent said it had a bad effect. In the average of all twenty-one publics, 59 percent said it had a good effect and 25 percent said a bad effect.⁷⁹⁸
- On the effect of trade on **consumers such as themselves**, Americans offered their most positive assessment. A large majority of Americans (70 percent) said trade had a good effect, and 26 percent said it had a bad effect. In the average of all twenty publics, 65 percent said it was good and 23 percent said it was bad.⁷⁹⁹
- These findings were echoed by a spring 2009 Pew poll that asked respondents whether growing trade and business ties between their country and other countries were a good thing for **themselves and their family**. A majority of Americans (63 percent) tended to see these trends as a good thing (11 percent “very good”), while 28 percent saw it as a bad thing (7 percent “very bad”). The global average was quite a bit higher among twenty-five publics polled: 75 percent of respondents said growing trade and business ties were a good thing for themselves and their family and 17 percent said they were a bad thing.⁸⁰⁰
- Only on the question of the effect of trade on jobs and the environment did CCGA find significant negative responses among Americans, which highlighted the different public attitudes between the United States and other countries.
- When asked about **job creation** in their country, 60 percent of Americans said trade had a bad effect and 37 percent said it had a good effect. In the average of all twenty-one publics globally, 59 percent said it was good and 30 percent said it was bad.⁸⁰¹
- On **job security** for their country’s workers, 67 percent of U.S. respondents said that trade had a bad effect, while 30 percent said it had a good effect. In the global average of all twenty publics, 50 percent said it was good and 35 percent said it was bad.⁸⁰²
- Finally, when asked about trade’s impact on the **environment**, 49 percent of Americans said trade had a bad effect while 45 percent said it had a good effect. In the average of all twenty-one publics, 44 percent said it was good and 40 percent said it was bad.⁸⁰³

Closely related to concerns about the impact of trade on jobs is the perception that low-wage countries have a competitive advantage in the global economy. In a 2008 CCGA poll, 87 percent said that economic competition from low-wage countries poses an important (49 percent) or critical (38 percent) threat to the United States.⁸⁰⁴

Response to 2009 Recession

A spring 2009 poll—taken by WPO during the depths of the recession—found some modest signs of softening of support for globalization as compared to responses to same question in mid-2006 and mid-2008 (CCGA). While in 2006, 60 percent said that globalization was mostly good, this declined to 58 percent in 2008 and then to 53 percent in 2009.

Between 2006 and 2009, the share of Americans saying globalization is mostly bad increased from 35 percent to 44 percent.⁸⁰⁵

This was consistent with the average of seventeen publics polled between 2006 and 2008, and then again in 2009 by WPO. On average, there was an 8 percent decrease globally in “mostly good” responses (62 percent to 54 percent) and a 5 percent increase in “mostly bad” responses (23 percent to 28 percent).⁸⁰⁶

The 2009 WPO poll also found some support for a temporary increase in protectionism as a response to the recession. Respondents were asked: “Do you think in the current economic crisis it is a good idea for our government to try to help [country] companies by making it harder for foreign companies to sell products here or do you think that would be a bad idea because other countries will then do the same thing to our companies?”

Most Americans (55 percent) said it was a bad idea, while 42 percent said it was a good idea. Across twenty-two publics polled, 48 percent said it is a good idea for their government to try to help companies in their nation this way, as opposed to 43 percent who said that such temporary protectionism would be a bad idea.⁸⁰⁷

It should be noted that while Americans seemed to show increased nervousness about globalization—defined as “the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world”—and some support for temporary protectionism, even during this period there was some increase in support for “growing trade and business ties between the United States and other countries” (59 percent in spring 2007 to 65 percent in spring 2009, Pew).⁸⁰⁸

While Americans may feel that greater economic integration may have played a role in the economic recession that deepened in 2009, most do not feel that the United States can climb out of it separately from the rest of the world. In an April 2009 CNN poll, only 43 percent thought that “the United States can recover from the recession on its own.” Fifty-seven percent said “the United States will recover from the recession only if the economy also improves in other parts of the world.”⁸⁰⁹

International Regulation of Financial Institutions

A clear majority of Americans favor the idea of having a new international institution to monitor global financial markets. At the same time, a modest majority of Americans worries that a global regulating body might interfere with the U.S. economy and make it less productive. A modest majority of Americans also resists the idea of international regulation of U.S. banks.

A clear majority of Americans (59 percent) favors the idea of having a new international institution to “monitor financial markets worldwide and report on financial crises” (CCGA 2008).⁸¹⁰

However this support is somewhat tenuous. A 2009 WPO poll asked respondents to choose between two statements: “A. To prevent international economic instability, there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions to make sure they follow international standards; B. A global financial regulating body is a bad idea because it would interfere in our economy and could make it less productive.”

Most Americans (52 percent) agreed with statement B, saying that a global financial regulating body is a bad idea, while 44 percent of Americans endorsed the global regulating body.

This goes against how most publics internationally responded. On average, 57 percent of twenty-two publics polled said that there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions as opposed to 32 percent who said that it would be a bad idea.⁸¹¹

When the same poll asked whether an international body should be able to regulate their nation’s banks and highlighted national autonomy in setting standards, U.S. support was even lower. The question presented two statements: “A. The world economy is so interconnected that nations should agree on standards to regulate banks that operate internationally; B. Each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own decisions about regulating its banks when they operate internationally.”

Fifty-five percent of U.S. respondents agreed with statement B, saying that each nation should maintain this freedom, while 43 percent agreed with statement A, calling for international standards. Among the twenty-two nations polled on this question, views were divided (45 percent in favor of statement A, 47 percent in favor of statement B).⁸¹²

Including Labor and Environmental Standards in Trade Agreements

Consistent with concerns about the impact of international trade on jobs and the environment, an overwhelming majority of Americans support including labor and environmental standards in trade agreements.

A major controversy in trade negotiations has been whether to include labor and environmental standards in trade agreements. Concerns about the effect of trade on jobs as well as the environment has prompted labor and environmental leaders in developed countries to insist that trade agreements include requirements for signatory countries to comply with international labor and environmental standards to prevent a “race to the bottom,” as companies move to countries with minimal protection to cut costs. On the other hand, the leaders of less developed nations have generally opposed such provisions as protectionist ones that would undermine their ability to compete in major markets such as Europe and the United States.

U.S. attitudes, as well as world public opinion, clearly side with proponents of such standards. CCGA asked two questions related to minimum standards in international trade agreements in 2006.

- On requiring countries that are part of international trade agreements to maintain minimum standards for **working conditions**, an overwhelming 93 percent of Americans say they should be required, while only 5 percent say they should not. In the average of eighteen countries (WPO/CCGA 2006-08), a strong 81 percent said they should be required and 10 percent said they should not be required.⁸¹³
- On requiring countries that are part of international trade agreements to maintain minimum standards for **protection of the environment**, a large majority of U.S. respondents (91 percent) agreed that they should be required while only 5 percent said they should not. In the average of seventeen countries, 84 percent said they should be required and 8 percent said they should not be required.⁸¹⁴

Consistent with this support, 63 percent of Americans agreed with the statement that “freer trade puts the United States at a disadvantage because of our high labor and environmental standards” (GMF 2006). On average across six European countries, 56 percent agreed as well.⁸¹⁵

Assessments of Countries’ Fairness in Trade

Americans perceive rich countries as not playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries.

When asked whether they agreed that “rich countries are playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries” (GlobeScan 2004), 62 percent of Americans said that rich countries are not playing fair (28 percent believed this strongly) and 25 percent said that rich countries are playing fair (5 percent believed this strongly). In the global average, 56 percent of respondents also said that rich countries are not playing fairly.⁸¹⁶

Regional Trade Relations

Americans generally place a high priority on economic relations with Pacific Rim nations, though they only favor creating a free trade agreement with one East Asian nation: Japan. Most Americans favor a new initiative to enhance transatlantic trade and investment ties.

A 2008 CCGA poll found that U.S. respondents place a high priority on their trade relations with East Asian nations. Asked to rate the importance of economic relations such as trade and investment with three major East Asian countries, (on a scale from zero to ten with ten meaning extremely important), U.S. respondents gave all fairly high ratings, with the following means: China 6.5,⁸¹⁷ Japan 7.2,⁸¹⁸ and South Korea 5.1.⁸¹⁹ This was only slightly less than the U.S. public’s rating of the importance of economic relations with the European Union as a whole (7.0).⁸²⁰

The same poll also asked about “a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs” with several specific East Asian nations. The only Asian nation with whom most Americans thought a free trade agreement should be made was Japan; 59 percent were in favor of such an agreement and 36 percent were opposed.⁸²¹ A modest majority (54

percent) opposed a free trade agreement with China,⁸²² and Americans were divided on the idea of a free trade agreement with South Korea.⁸²³

Americans, as well as their European counterparts, express support for greater economic ties across the Atlantic. In a 2007 GMF poll of the United States and six European nations, respondents were told, “There has been talk recently of a new effort to deepen the economic ties between the European Union and the United States, by making transatlantic trade and investment easier,” and asked, “Would you support a transatlantic initiative like this?” Most Americans (64 percent) favored a transatlantic economic initiative while 25 percent were opposed. In the average of all the six European countries polled, 67 percent favored such an initiative and 24 percent were opposed.⁸²⁴

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF)

In general, Americans express a positive view of the influence of international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the IMF. While both get mildly positive ratings, the World Bank is more popular than the IMF.

The World Trade Organization (WTO)

The WTO has a positive image among Americans and there is support for strengthening it. Respondents in the United States, as in most other nations, say that their government should comply with adverse WTO decisions.

Global Corporations

Americans lean slightly to the view that global corporations have a positive influence in the world and on U.S. society.

Most Americans are inclined to see global companies as having a positive influence. When respondents were asked whether global companies were having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world, 44 percent of U.S. respondents said “mainly positive,” while 38 percent said “mainly negative” (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2006). In the average of all thirty-two countries polled on the question, 41 percent said global companies were having a positive influence and 26 percent said they were having a negative influence.⁸²⁵

When the question is placed in a domestic context, U.S. views of corporations become more slightly more negative, but are still higher than the global average. A 2004 GlobeScan poll asked whether respondents trusted global companies “to operate in the best interests of our society.” Fifty-one percent of Americans said that they have trust in such corporations while 41 percent say that they do not trust them. In the global average, 51 percent of people said they had little or no trust and 42 percent said they had at least some trust.⁸²⁶

Foreign Investment

A large majority of Americans endorses foreigners investing in U.S. companies and projects. However, large majorities also have a negative view of foreigners *buying* U.S. companies, and express concern that sovereign wealth funds investing in U.S. companies may give them too much control.

When CCGA asked respondents to evaluate a number of possible factors for ensuring the United States remains competitive in the global economy, 80 percent said that it was important (40 percent very important) to encourage “foreign investors to invest in U.S. companies and projects” (CCGA 2008).⁸²⁷

However, this support is tenuous and highly responsive to any suggestion that foreign investment could lead to a loss of national control over corporations. A 2008 Pew poll asked respondents about the impact of foreigners *buying* U.S. companies. A large majority (67 percent) of Americans said that this has a bad impact while 25 percent said it has a good impact. (In the average of all twenty-four countries polled, 59 percent of respondents said foreigners buying domestic companies had a bad impact, while 35 percent said it was good.)⁸²⁸

The 2008 CCGA poll also found concerns about sovereign wealth funds, or investment vehicles controlled by governments of countries with large capital reserves. Respondents were presented with the following question: “Recently some foreign government-owned funds have made major investments in U.S. companies and financial institutions. Some observers say that as their role is purely economic, we should welcome such investment. Others say the risk of losing control of U.S. companies and their technologies to foreign governments is too great. Are you in favor or not in favor of allowing foreign government investors to invest in U.S. companies and banks?”

Sixty eight percent said they were not in favor of allowing such investments.⁸²⁹

Trade and Poverty Reduction

While majorities of the public in most developed and developing countries believe that, to reduce poverty, rich countries should allow more imports from developing countries, Americans disagree.

In 2004, GlobeScan introduced in a multi-country poll the potential for addressing poverty by allowing more imports, pointing to the tradeoffs involved: “Rich countries could reduce poverty in developing countries by allowing them to sell more food and clothing products to rich countries. In rich countries this would lower prices for food and clothing but would also mean significant job losses in these industries.”

GlobeScan then asked: “Would you support or oppose rich countries allowing more food and clothing imports from developing countries even if it meant significant job losses in rich countries?”

A large majority of Americans (60 percent) opposed the idea (25 percent strongly opposed the idea,) while 35 percent supported it (6 percent strongly supported it.) This is strikingly at odds with how most nations responded. In the global average of all seventeen publics asked, 58 percent supported the idea while 30 percent were opposed. The United States was the nation most opposed to the idea of allowing more imports from developing nations to reduce poverty.⁸³⁰

CHAPTER 15: U.S. OPINION ON DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN AID

The U.S. public, like publics in most other developed nations, expresses support for giving development assistance to poor countries. There is a widespread consensus in the United States that developed countries have a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty and that helping poor countries develop serves the long-term interests of wealthy countries, including by developing trade partners and enhancing global stability. In addition, Americans perceive development aid as furthering democracy and, for a more modest number of respondents, as a way to fight terrorism. Besides financial aid, large majorities of Americans express a willingness to contribute troops for humanitarian operations, including providing assistance to victims of war and famine.

Americans are generally view development aid favorably. When asked whether they had a favorable or unfavorable view of “providing development assistance to poor countries,” 66 percent of Americans expressed a favorable view while 30 percent had an unfavorable view. The average of six European nations polled on the question (75 percent in favor) was slightly higher. These views have been largely stable since 2005, except for declining support in Germany.⁸³¹

There is a broad U.S. consensus that developed countries have “a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty in poor countries.” In a 2008 WPO poll, a large majority of U.S. respondents (81 percent) said that developed countries have such an obligation. On average among nineteen countries polled, including both developed and developing nations, a similar 80 percent said developed countries have such a responsibility.⁸³²

A majority of Americans also agree that “it is in rich countries' own economic self-interest to actively help poor countries develop.” In a 2004 GlobeScan poll, a large majority of Americans (83 percent) agreed with this statement, a slightly higher number than the 74 percent average of all nineteen publics polled. Among the seven European countries, an average of 76 percent agreed.⁸³³

When asked by the German Marshall Fund (GMF) in 2007 to choose the top three (out of nine) reasons for giving aid to poor countries, the most popular reason among U.S. respondents was “alleviating poverty,” a rationale cited by 49 percent of Americans and an average of 59 percent of Europeans across six nations polled.

The next most commonly cited reason was “fighting health problems like AIDS,” although, again, fewer Americans (37 percent) chose this option than Europeans (46 percent). “Supporting economic growth” was the next most popular reason, with Americans (36 percent) and Europeans (38 percent) showing comparable support. “Helping with natural disaster relief” was also cited by similar numbers of Americans (32 percent) and Europeans (29 percent).

There were some areas, however, where the U.S. public differed from European publics in its justifications for providing development assistance. More Americans chose “contributing to global stability” (35 percent) as a top reason than did Europeans (23 percent). Americans were also somewhat more likely than Europeans to identify “preventing breeding grounds for terrorism” as a top reason for development aid (31 percent, compared to the European average of 26 percent). By contrast, Europeans cited “encouraging democracy” (31 percent) as a top reason more commonly than did Americans (23 percent). Americans were also much less likely (17 percent) than Europeans (31 percent) to mention “helping poor countries trade.” Among all countries, few publics considered “gaining political allies” to be a top reason, although more Americans cited this reason (13 percent) than Europeans (5 percent).⁸³⁴

A majority of Americans (64 percent) further agreed that development assistance strengthens support for democratic institutions in developing countries, although an even greater percentage (71 percent) of Europeans also adhered to this belief (GMF 2007).⁸³⁵

There is less of a consensus among Americans, as well as Europeans, on whether development assistance is a good way to fight terrorism. Publics in the United States, along with ten European countries, were asked whether providing economic aid to raise living standards in countries where terrorists are recruited is the most appropriate way to fight terrorism (GMF 2004). Americans were divided on the questions (49 percent to 46 percent). On average in Europe, 49 percent agreed that economic aid was the most appropriate way to fight terrorism and 43 percent disagreed.⁸³⁶

Aside from financial aid, a large majority of Americans express a willingness to contribute troops for humanitarian operations. In a poll conducted by GMF and the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) in 2002, 81 percent of respondents in the United States approved of using their troops to assist a population struck by famine, as did an average of 88 percent of Europeans in six nations.⁸³⁷ Similar numbers of Americans (81 percent) and Europeans (90 percent) approved of using their troops to provide food and medical assistance to victims of war (GMF 2005). The same poll also found strong U.S. support for providing humanitarian assistance in Darfur (75 percent) and contributing to international reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan (64 percent). On average in twelve European countries, similar majorities supported using their troops for these efforts in Darfur (73 percent) and Afghanistan (64 percent).⁸³⁸

Aid Levels and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

There is a strong consensus among Americans that wealthy nations are not doing enough to help poorer nations. At the same time, less than a majority of U.S. respondents favored increased government spending on aid, or higher taxes to pay for more foreign aid. However, these attitudes are based on extremely exaggerated estimates of how much aid the U.S. government is giving.

In addition, when increased spending is placed in the context of a multilateral effort—specifically the Millennium Development Goal of cutting hunger and severe poverty in half—a large majority of Americans said they would support increasing their spending to the necessary amount to meet the goal, provided other countries do the same. However, public awareness of the MDGs remains low.

A 2007 study found that a majority of Americans thought “the wealthier nations of the world are not doing enough to help the poorer nations of the world with such problems as economic development, reducing poverty, and improving health” (Pew/Kaiser Foundation). Sixty-nine percent of Americans agreed with this statement, while 25 percent thought wealthier nations are doing enough. This view garnered majority support in other major donor countries as well, including in France (81 percent), Germany (75 percent), Great Britain (77 percent), Italy (78 percent), and Japan (63 percent). Interestingly, the only place with a majority that believed the wealthier nations are doing enough was in Indonesia (54 percent), a developing country. On average among all forty-seven nations polled 72 percent of respondents thought wealthier nations are not doing enough.⁸³⁹

Predictably, when asked whether “the European Union can take greater responsibility for dealing with international threats” by “spend[ing] more money on aid for development,” 84 percent of Americans agreed that the European Union should spend more. Europeans strongly support this view as well, with an identical 84 percent taking this position (GMF 2007).⁸⁴⁰

However, when respondents were asked in 2002 and 2003 whether their own government is spending too much, too little, or the right amount on “economic aid to other nations,” relatively low numbers of Americans said their government is spending too little (GMF/CCGA). In 2003, only 8 percent of U.S. respondents said their government is spending too little, while 59 percent said that the government is spending “too much,” and 26 percent said that the spending is “about right.” On average, across seven European countries in 2002, just 29 percent said their government is spending too little, and 19 percent said so in 2003. In contrast to U.S. public opinion, however, in no European country did a majority think that their country is spending too much. The most common European response was that their country is spending the right amount (44 percent in 2002, 37 percent in 2003).⁸⁴¹

These attitudes, however, appear to rest on extreme overestimates of how much the United States is spending. In 2002, CCGA asked respondents what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid, and then what they thought would be an appropriate percentage. (Both questions were asked open-ended; respondents were not prompted with ranges of possible replies.) The average response was that 31 percent of the federal budget goes to foreign aid, but that 17 percent would be appropriate, more than ten times the actual level.⁸⁴²

Public opinion researchers have also used polling to explore whether telling respondents how much of their tax money actually goes to foreign aid affects their willingness to increase that amount. World Values Survey (WVS) presented respondents with the percentage of their country’s national income spent on foreign aid and the amount per capita (WVS 2005). They were then asked how they felt about the level of aid. In this case, only 20 percent of Americans said that it is too high, 51 percent said that this spending is about right, and 25 percent said it is too low. Globally, views were also generally mixed between saying it is too low or about right. On average, 46 percent across ten developed

countries said their country's foreign aid contribution level was about right, 35 percent said it was too low, and 9 percent said it was too high.¹³ In general, supplying such information tends to significantly reduce the number of respondents claiming that their government is spending too much, but only modestly increases the number saying that it is spending too little.⁸⁴³ Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) polls have found that U.S. respondents tend to be quite mistrustful when they are provided information in a poll that is contrary to their assumptions and may not believe what they are told about the actual levels of foreign aid spending.⁸⁴⁴

The U.S. public also tends to resist paying higher taxes in order to increase aid to other countries. Asked whether they would be willing to pay higher taxes to increase their country's foreign aid to poor countries, most respondents said they would not be willing (WVS 2005). Seventy-three percent of Americans were opposed (the largest opposition of all nations polled) and 23 percent were in favor. On average in thirteen countries, 52 percent of those polled were opposed and 39 percent were willing. It should be noted that, in general, when respondents are asked about raising taxes they often show resistance even when it is for things that they say they support. This may reflect the view that other funds should be redirected to aid purposes, as well as widespread resistance to taxes related to general lack of confidence in governments.⁸⁴⁵

Not surprisingly, Americans also put a higher priority on solving their own country's problems over reducing poverty in the world. When respondents were asked to specify the proper balance of their country's priorities on a scale from 1 (top priority to help reducing poverty in the world) to 10 (top priority to solve my own country's problems), Americans gave a rating of 7.6, while the mean rating in all forty-one countries was 7.5 (WVS 2005).⁸⁴⁶

This does not mean, however, that Americans do not think that a significant amount of funds should go to addressing poverty abroad. In June 1996, PIPA asked respondents to specify how much of their tax money that goes to the poor should go to the poor at home and how much to the poor abroad. On average, U.S. respondents proposed that 78 percent should go to the poor at home and 22 percent should go to the poor abroad. (At the time, the actual ratio was 97 percent to the poor at home and 3 percent to the poor abroad.)⁸⁴⁷

The Millennium Development Goals

The UN member states have established a series of goals for economic and social development called the Millennium Development Goals. One goal is to cut hunger and severe poverty in half by the year 2015.

Majorities in all eight developed countries polled were willing to contribute the funds necessary to meet this goal (WPO 2008). Respondents were presented the annual per capita contribution that would be necessary for meeting this goal (based on actual World Bank estimates), adjusted for national income. This ranged from ten dollars for people in Turkey to fifty-six dollars for people in the United States. Seventy-five percent of Americans said that they were willing to contribute this amount, while 22 percent were unwilling. In every case, and in most cases by a large margin, majorities of respondents said they were willing to personally pay the amount necessary to meet the goal, provided that people in other countries did so as well. In the average of the eight countries polled, 77 percent were willing to contribute and 17 percent were not willing.⁸⁴⁸

It should be noted that these large majorities in support of new spending toward meeting the goal of cutting hunger in half were substantially higher than in the above-mentioned questions about increasing foreign aid. It is likely that this higher support was due to its being placed in the context of a multilateral effort, with support being predicated on other countries doing their part as well.

Despite their support, few people around the world, including Americans, have heard of the Millennium Development Goals. In 2005, an overwhelming majority of Americans (92 percent) said they had not heard of the MDGs while only 5 percent had (WVS 2005). On average in forty-two countries, 76 percent of respondents said they had not heard of the MDGs and 20 percent said they had heard of them.⁸⁴⁹

Role of Multilateral Institutions and Aid to Developing Countries

There is strong U.S. support for multilateral institutions taking the lead in setting aid policies and delivering development assistance, but not in dealing with refugees.

When it comes to making policies on aid to developing countries, a majority of people in the United States believe the responsibility should lie with multilateral institutions over regional organizations or national governments (WVS 2005). When asked who should take the lead on decisions about “aid to developing countries,” 41 percent of Americans thought the United Nations should make such decisions, 30 percent said that national governments should take the lead, and 23 percent said regional organizations. On average among forty-two countries polled, 48 percent favored the United Nations deciding policies on aid, 22 percent favored national governments, and 20 percent favored regional organizations.⁸⁵⁰ (The World Bank was not offered as an option in this case).

Similarly, when asked who should have the primary responsibility for delivering development assistance, the most common public response was “international organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations” (GMF 2007). A plurality of U.S. respondents (37 percent) were in favor of international organizations delivering development assistance, while the rest were divided between NGOs (18 percent), the U.S. government (17 percent), and private companies (8 percent). On average among the six European countries polled, 46 percent said international organizations should have the responsibility of delivering assistance; 20 percent said the European Union; 12 percent said individual European governments; nine percent said charities, foundations, and nongovernmental organizations; five percent said the U.S. government; two percent said private companies and businesses; and two percent said religious organizations.⁸⁵¹

When it comes to policies related to refugees, however, the U.S. public is divided. Thirty-four percent of respondents said that national governments should decide refugee policy, while 33 percent said that the United Nations should have this responsibility and 27 percent said regional organizations (WVS 2005). On the other hand, publics globally express a preference for UN leadership on refugee issues. On average among forty-two countries polled, 43 percent of respondents support the United Nations setting policies on refugee issues, 28 percent picked national governments, and 18 percent favored regional organizations.⁸⁵²

Linking Aid to Recipient Country Behavior

Majorities of Americans favor linking the level of aid given to poor countries with a variety of conditions, including the recipient country’s efforts to promote democracy and fight poverty, corruption, and terrorism, though U.S. public support is consistently lower than global support for insisting on these conditions. A large majority also favors giving aid to help poor countries reduce greenhouse gases as part of an agreement wherein they commit to limit the growth of their emissions.

A majority in the United States say it is important to link the level of aid to poor countries with their efforts to fight poverty. Eighty-three percent say that this should be the case, while 9 percent disagree. On average among the six European countries polled (GMF 2007), 89 percent of respondents agreed with linking aid to anti-poverty efforts and 8 percent disagreed.⁸⁵³

Similarly, in the same poll, a large majority agreed that the level of aid to poor countries should be linked with efforts by that country to fight corruption. Eighty percent of U.S. respondents agreed with this while 13 percent disagreed. Among the six European countries, 87 percent favored linking aid levels to efforts against corruption and 10 percent were opposed (GMF 2007).⁸⁵⁴

A more modest majority of Americans (61 percent) support linking the amount of development aid given to a country with efforts in that country to promote democracy. Among Europeans, a much larger average of 81 percent supported tying aid to democracy promotion (GMF 2007).⁸⁵⁵

Americans, as well as publics in other countries, also agreed with linking aid to efforts that recipient countries make to open their markets to international trade. Again, U.S. support is the lowest among countries polled, with 68 percent agreeing and 24 percent disagreeing. Among the six European countries, an average of 75 percent of respondents favored linking aid to openness to international trade (GMF 2007).⁸⁵⁶

Curiously, U.S. public support is also the lowest when Americans are asked if respondents favor a link between aid and the recipient country’s efforts to fight terrorism. Sixty-nine percent of Americans were in favor, while 23 percent were opposed. In all six European countries, an average of 79 percent agreed with such a link and 18 percent disagreed (GMF 2007).⁸⁵⁷

Finally, there is strong U.S. support for an agreement by which developing countries would limit greenhouse-gas emissions in exchange for technology and financial assistance for this purpose from developed countries. When polled about such an agreement in a 2007 British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan/PIPA survey, a majority of U.S. respondents (70 percent) were in favor, and 21 percent were opposed. In the global average of all twenty-one nations asked, 73 percent of respondents were in favor of such a plan and 18 percent were opposed.⁸⁵⁸

CHAPTER 16: U.S. OPINION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The Role of the United Nations in Human Rights

Americans express support for the United Nations playing an active role in promoting human rights and reject the argument that this would be improper interference in the internal affairs of a country. A large majority favors the UN playing a larger role than it presently does to promote human rights and favor giving it greater power to go into countries to investigate human rights abuses. A substantial majority of Americans believe that the UN should try to further women's rights even when presented with the argument that this would conflict with the principle of national sovereignty. When asked which entity should make decision on matters related to human rights, more Americans prefer the giving this role to the UN or regional organizations than to national governments.

In a 2008 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll, respondents were told that “the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” They were then presented with the debate about whether the United Nations should actively promote such rights: “Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country.”

They were then asked, “Do you think the UN should or should not actively promote human rights in member states?” Seventy percent of U.S. respondents favored the UN actively promoting human rights while 25 percent were opposed to such efforts. The dominant view in all twenty-four nations polled—by majorities in twenty-two, pluralities in two—was to favor an active UN role. Overall, the global average was identical to the U.S. average: 70 percent.⁸⁵⁹

The General Social Survey in 2004 asked Americans to choose between two positions on UN intervention to protect human rights. Three-quarters endorsed the view, “If a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene,” while just 18 percent endorsed the view that, “Even if human rights are seriously violated, the country's sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene.”⁸⁶⁰

A WPO poll in 2008 asked respondents: “Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?” A substantial majority of Americans (59 percent) said they would like to see the UN do more; 28 percent said it should do the same; and 7 percent said it should do less. Across all twenty-four nations polled, comparable figures were 65 percent, 17 percent, and 8 percent (WPO 2008), suggesting global as well as U.S. support for a vigorous UN role in promoting human rights.⁸⁶¹

Giving the UN New Investigative Powers

When the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) asked about possible steps for strengthening the United Nations, 75 percent of Americans endorsed “giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights,” while 22 percent of respondents were opposed. On average, out of the twenty-two countries polled, about two-thirds of all respondents (65 percent) were in favor, with just 22 percent opposed (WPO/CCGA).⁸⁶²

The UN Promoting Women's Rights

A 2008 WPO poll asked, “Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?”

In the United States, 59 percent of respondents thought the United Nations should make such efforts while 38 percent said this would be improper interference. Across the twenty countries polled, an even higher average of 66 percent approved of UN initiatives to further the rights of women, while 26 percent said this would be improper interference.⁸⁶³

The Role of the UN, Regional Organizations and National Governments

The World Values Survey from 2005 to 2008 asked respondents who should decide policies in the area of human rights, posing the following question: “Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the

United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?"

In the United States, 44 percent of respondents said they favored giving this human rights role to national governments, while 51 percent favored a multilateral approach, with 33 percent favoring the UN and 18 percent favoring a regional organization. Similarly, across forty-two countries polled, on average, 40 percent favored national governments, 37 percent favored the UN, and 13 percent a regional organization.⁸⁶⁴

Freedom of Expression

Americans nearly unanimously support the principle that individuals have a right to freedom of expression, including the right to criticize government and religious leaders. An overwhelming majority of Americans also believe that the government should not have the right to prohibit discussion of certain political or religious views and that people should have the right to demonstrate peacefully against their government.

A 2008 WPO poll asked respondents how important it is for "people to have the right to express any opinion, including criticisms of the government or religious leaders." Asked in the United States, an overwhelming majority (98 percent) said that it is important to have freedom of expression, with 76 percent saying it is very important; just 2 percent said it is not important. On average across twenty-three nations polled, 88 percent judged this right to be important with 66 percent saying it is "very important." Only 7 percent saw it as either not very important (5 percent) or not important at all (2 percent).⁸⁶⁵

Right of Governments to Prohibit Expression

The right to free expression can also be examined from the perspective of whether the government should have the right to prohibit discussion of particular beliefs or attitudes. A 2008 WPO poll asked whether the government should "have the right to prohibit certain political or religious views from being discussed". In the United States, only 13 percent of respondents said that the government should have the right to prohibit certain views from being discussed, while an overwhelming majority (85 percent) said that the government should not have the right. On average across the twenty-two nations polled, only 36 percent of people said the government should have such a right, while 57 percent said that the government should not.⁸⁶⁶

Right to Demonstrate Peacefully

A 2008 WPO poll asked respondents if they favored the people's right to peacefully demonstrate against the government or if "the government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations that it thinks would be politically destabilizing." U.S. respondents overwhelmingly (94 percent) supported the right to peacefully demonstrate against the government, while only 5 percent accepted that the government could ban peaceful demonstrations on the grounds of political stability. On average across all twenty-two publics polled, average support for unqualified right to demonstrate peacefully was somewhat lower but still overwhelming (75 percent); only one-fifth of respondents (20 percent) believed the government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations it thinks would be politically destabilizing.⁸⁶⁷

Media Freedom

There is robust support in the United States for the principle that the media should be free of government control and that citizens should even have access to material from hostile countries. A majority of U.S. respondents also say that the government should not have the right to limit access to the internet and believe that the government should not have the right to prohibit publishing material it thinks will be politically destabilizing.

The broad principle of media freedom gets robust support in the United States. In 2008, a WPO poll asked how important it is "for the media to be free to publish news and ideas without government control." Among Americans polled, 88 percent of respondents said it is important for the media to be free to provide the public with news and ideas without government control, while 11 percent said it was not important. Comparatively, on average across twenty-two nations polled, 81 percent said it is important, while only 11 percent considered it not important.⁸⁶⁸

Both Americans and publics around the globe also believe that citizens have the right to read publications from hostile countries. WPO in 2008 asked whether people in their country should “have the right to read publications from all other countries including those that might be considered enemies.” In the United States, 92 percent of respondents affirmed this right, while only 7 percent said this right was not important. Comparatively, on average across twenty-one publics, 80 percent of respondents endorsed this right, while just 13 percent disagreed.⁸⁶⁹

In 2008, WPO asked respondents whether people in their country should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet, or if instead they thought the government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the Internet. A large majority of U.S. respondents (75 percent) said that people should have a right to read whatever is on the Internet, while 24 percent said the government could prevent access to some things. Globally, an average of 62 percent of respondents in twenty-one nations agreed that people should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet and 30 percent favored the government having the right to prevent access to some things.⁸⁷⁰

Controlling Potentially Destabilizing Information

In 2007, a British Broadcasting Company (BBC)/GlobeScan poll asked publics to choose between the following statements: “Freedom of the press to report the news truthfully is very important to ensure we live in a fair society, even if it sometimes leads to unpleasant debates or social unrest” and “While freedom of the press to report news truthfully is important, social harmony and peace are more important, which sometimes means controlling what is reported for the greater good.”

A large majority (70 percent) of U.S. respondents support freedom of the press, while 28 percent believe that social harmony and peace are more important. On average across the fourteen countries surveyed, 56 percent said that freedom of the press is most important, while 40 percent said that controlling the press for the greater good is more important.⁸⁷¹

Religious Freedom

Americans believe it is important for people of different religions to be treated equally and majorities affirm that followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in the United States. Additionally, a substantial majority of U.S. respondents believe that people of any religion should be allowed to try to actively to convert others to their religion, which differs from the global average.

Support for the norm of equal treatment of adherents of different religions is quite robust. WPO in 2008 asked respondents, “How important do you think it is for people of different religions to be treated equally?” A large majority of U.S. respondents (77 percent) said that treating people of different religions is very important, 18 percent said it was important, 3 percent said it was not very important, and just 1 percent said it was not important at all. On average across the twenty-four nations polled, 89 percent said that it is important. Just 7 percent said it was “not very important” or “not important at all.”⁸⁷²

When respondents were asked to consider the right of *any* religion to be practiced, support in the United States and globally was still high, but there were some countries where a majority backed away from endorsing such a right. WPO asked respondents to choose between two statements: “Followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in [our country],” or “there are some religions that people should not be allowed to practice in [our country].” The wording of the question intentionally offered a test, by evoking in respondents’ minds “some religion” that they might find specifically objectionable.

In the United States, 67 percent of respondents said that followers of any religion should have the right to assemble and practice, while 28 percent said that some religions should be excluded. Comparatively, on average across all publics in the twenty-three countries surveyed, 61 percent endorsed the right to assemble and practice any religion, while 32 percent said some religions should be excluded.⁸⁷³

Trying to Convert Others

The right to try to convert others to one's religion remains a controversial issue. Indeed, more publics oppose such a right than favor it. It should be noted that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights does not explicitly establish such a right, though it does provide for the right to change one's religion.

WPO asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "In [our country], people of any religion should be free to try to convert members of other religions to join theirs." In the United States, 58 percent of respondents agree that people of any religion should be free to try to convert members of other religions to join theirs, while 38 percent of respondents disagree. Opinion is even more divided globally. On average across all publics in twenty-three populations, a majority disagree, 51 percent to 41 percent.⁸⁷⁴

Women's Rights

A large majority in the United States supports the principle that women should have "full equality of rights," and believe their government has the responsibility to seek to prevent discrimination against women.

Asked in the United States whether women should "have full equality of rights compared to men," 77 percent of respondents believe that this right is very important, 20 percent said that it is somewhat important, 2 percent said it is not very important, and only 1 percent said women's rights are not important at all. Comparatively, on average across the twenty-one publics polled, 59 percent said it is very and 27 percent somewhat important. Ten percent responded that they were "not very important" or "not important at all."⁸⁷⁵

Between 2005 and 2008, World Values Survey asked whether women's equality was an essential characteristic of democracy. On a scale of one to ten, with one implying it is not an essential characteristic and ten implying it is, U.S. respondents had a mean score of nine, which is equal to the global average across forty-two nations.⁸⁷⁶

Government Intervention

The U.S. public, like publics around the world, strongly supports the government taking an active role to further women's rights. A WPO poll in 2008 about whether the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination against women found that U.S. respondents overwhelmingly supported government efforts to prevent discrimination (82 percent) while only 17 percent said the government should not intervene. An average across the twenty-two publics polled globally found that 81 percent of those answering felt that the government should be involved, whereas only 15 percent felt that it should not.⁸⁷⁷

Racial and Ethnic Equality

Large majorities in the United States say people of different races and ethnicities should be treated equally, and an overwhelming majority says that employers should not be allowed to discriminate based on race or ethnicity and that it is the government's responsibility to stop this from happening. In general, large majorities in the United States agree that governments should take action to prevent racial discrimination.

A 2008 WPO poll asked whether respondents considered it important for "people of different races and ethnicities to be treated equally." In the United States, 96 percent said it is important, with 79 percent saying it is very important. On average across twenty-two publics globally, 91 percent said this principle is important, with 69 percent saying it is very important.⁸⁷⁸

Workplace Discrimination

Asked whether employers should be allowed to "refuse to hire a qualified person because of the person's race or ethnicity," on average 86 percent of U.S. respondents said that employers should not be able to base hiring decisions on race, while just 13 percent said they should. In polling across twenty nations, an average of 72 percent said employers should not be able to base hiring decisions on race, while just 21 percent believed they should.⁸⁷⁹

Additionally, a large majority of Americans (69 percent) said that the government has the responsibility to take action against employer discrimination, while 17 percent said it should not be involved. On average across twenty publics, 58 percent of people polled globally believed that the government has the responsibility to take action against such practices, while just 14 percent believed it does not.⁸⁸⁰

Wide Support for Government Action

Respondents in the United States agree that governments should act to ensure that racial and ethnic minorities are treated equally. Eighty-three percent believe that the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on race while just 17 percent believe the government should not be involved. On average, 80 percent of global respondents agreed that the government “should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on a person’s race or ethnicity,” while just 11 percent felt that the government should not be involved.⁸⁸¹

Norms on Torture and Detention

A large majority of Americans support having international rules against torture, threatening torture, or treating detainees in a humiliating or degrading manner. However, a significant minority favors making an exception in the case of terrorists who have information that could save innocent lives. A large majority rejects the idea of making an exception to rules on detention for terrorism-related suspects. Commanders are generally seen as responsible if their subordinates carry out torture.

Three-quarters of Americans support the general principle of having “treaties establishing international laws governing how a country, in the context of armed conflict, must treat an individual it has detained” (WPO 2009).⁸⁸²

The same number of Americans (75 percent) also approved of having a rule against physical torture, while just 21 percent of respondents said the rule was too restrictive. In the average of all five countries polled, 61 percent approved a rule against physical torture and 31 percent said this rule was too restrictive (WPO 2006).⁸⁸³

In another U.S.-only poll, 59 percent supported the principle that “governments should never use physical torture.” Though 39 percent said at first this was too restrictive, when asked if they meant the international convention on the subject should be changed, only 21 percent of the full sample thought it should (WPO 2009).⁸⁸⁴

A large majority (60 percent) in the 2006 WPO poll also favored a rule against *threatening* physical torture, while 37 percent thought the rule was too restrictive. In the average of all five countries polled, 52 percent favored a rule against threatening physical torture and 39 percent were opposed.

Similarly, on treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading, 61 percent of U.S. respondents approved a rule against humiliating or degrading treatment of detainees, while 36 percent said this rule was too restrictive. In the average of all five countries, 53 percent approved a rule against such treatment and 38 percent said this was too restrictive.⁸⁸⁵

Making an Exception on Torture to Gain Information about Terrorist Attacks

Since the 9/11 attacks there has been substantial discussion of the possibility of using torture when terrorists have information, representing a challenge to the norm against the use of torture established in various international treaties.

“Ticking Bomb”

One mode of testing the limits for the public’s rejection of torture is to ask questions that pose a “ticking bomb scenario.” In such a scenario, it is assumed that a new terrorist attack is imminent, and that a suspect in custody has knowledge about the attack that could help authorities prevent the attack and save innocent lives. It should be noted that, in terms of the methodology of polling, most of these questions are unbalanced in that they give a compelling reason to engage in torture but not a balancing argument that would remind respondents of the legal or humanitarian considerations or the potential consequences to America’s reputation or to U.S. soldiers should the norm against torture be eroded. Thus they are tests to see if it is possible to persuade Americans to accept torture rather than being a reflection on whether there should be a norm against torture.

CNN/*USA Today* asked: “If the government thought it were necessary to combat terrorism,” would respondents “be willing ... to have the U.S. government ... torture known terrorists if they know details about future terrorist attacks in the United States?” Between 2001 and 2005, support for torture in this ticking-bomb scenario declined from 45 percent (2001) to 39 percent (2005). Those opposed rose from 53 percent to 59 percent. It should be noted that this question even made the strong assertion that “the government thought it would be necessary.”⁸⁸⁶

WPO posed such a scenario in 2009, but did not ask about torture abstractly. Instead, WPO asked about specific coercive techniques. Respondents were told that a detainee is likely to have “information about a possible terrorist attack on the United States that may prove critical to stopping the attack,” and asked to consider using a number of techniques. Majorities opposed forcing the detainee to take stressful positions (50 percent), using threatening dogs (60 percent), exposing the detainee to extreme heat and cold (61 percent), making the detainee go naked (70 percent), holding the detainee’s head under water (77 percent), punching or kicking the detainee (82 percent), and applying electric shocks (79 percent). However, views were divided on bombarding the detainee with loud music and two methods—sleep deprivation and keeping a hood over detainee’s head for long periods of time—received modest majority support (53 percent and 54 percent, respectively).⁸⁸⁷

In another survey, Fox News asked in 2003, “Do you favor or oppose allowing the government to use any means necessary, including physical torture, or obtain information from prisoners that might protect the United States from terrorist attacks?” Forty-four percent favored and 42 percent opposed this proposition. Those opposed were then asked the question: “If there were a possibility that a member of your own family could be saved, then would you favor or oppose allowing the government to use physical torture to obtain information from terrorist prisoners?” Ten percent of the full sample switched their position, netting 54 percent in support of torture if it would save a family member. Fox ran a similar first question again in January 2009, with the same family-member follow-up; the first question found 48 percent opposed and 43 percent in favor; then 5 percent of the full sample switched position, giving 43 percent opposed and 48 percent in favor..⁸⁸⁸

The ticking bomb scenario that was found most persuasive by respondents was put forward by *Newsweek* in 2005. It asked, “Would you support the use of torture by U.S. (United States) military or intelligence personnel if it might lead to the prevention of a major terrorist attack, or not?” An unusually high 58 percent said yes and 35 percent said no.”⁸⁸⁹ But respondents were then asked a subsequent question: “What if the use of torture by the United States makes it more likely that Americans will be tortured by our enemies?” In this case support then reversed, with 36 percent saying yes and 57 percent saying no.⁸⁹⁰

In another poll presenting the arguments for and against torture, ABC/*Washington Post* in 2004 offered opposing arguments on the subject, as follows: “Some people say it's acceptable to torture people suspected of terrorism, in cases where other methods have failed and the authorities believe the suspect has information that could prevent terrorist attacks and save lives,” whereas “Other people say the use of torture is never acceptable because it's cruel, it may violate international law, it may not work, and it could be used unnecessarily or by mistake on innocent people.” Respondents were then asked, “What's your view—do you think it's acceptable to torture people suspected of terrorism in some cases, or do you think the use of torture is never acceptable?” In this case a much larger majority (63 percent) said torture was never acceptable while 35 percent said it was in some cases.⁸⁹¹

In a 2008 WPO poll, respondents were presented with an argument in favor of allowing the torture of potential terrorists who threaten civilians: “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that would save innocent lives.” They were also presented with the counterargument: “Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture.” In this case, a modest majority (53 percent) of U.S. respondents indicated a preference that clear rules against torture should be maintained, but 44 percent said that an exception is acceptable when innocent lives are at risk. On average across all twenty-two nations polled, 57 percent opted for unequivocal rules against torture. Thirty-five percent favored an exception when innocent lives are at risk.⁸⁹²

A June-July 2006 BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA poll asked the same question about making an exception to rules against torture in the case of terrorist. In this case, a somewhat higher proportion (58 percent) of U.S. respondents said they supported an unequivocal rule against torture while 36 percent favored an exception in the case of terrorists. On average across all twenty-five nations polled, support for an exception was 29 percent, while support for an unequivocal rule was 59 percent.⁸⁹³

Justifiability of Torture

Another mode of testing the limits for the public’s rejection of torture is to ask whether torture *can be justified*—as in this question, asked at least eight times by Pew between July 2004 and June 2009: “Do you think the use of torture against

suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?”

This wording is problematic, however, since it conflates the question of whether torture is justified under some circumstances with the quite different question of whether a credible argument can be made for it—that it “*can* be justified” in the sense of adducing reasons for it. This makes it difficult to ascertain whether respondents are voicing one view or the other if they respond affirmatively to this question. The “rarely/never justified” response has fluctuated between 47 percent and 60 percent, and the “often/sometimes” response has fluctuated between 38 percent and 49 percent (the fluctuations are seemingly random and defy efforts to discern a trend over time). On average, 52 percent have said torture can rarely or never be justified while 45 percent have said it can often or sometimes be justified.⁸⁹⁴

A November 2005 Associated Press-Ipsos poll used essentially the same question, asking whether torture of “suspected terrorists to obtain information about terrorism activities” *can* be justified. An even larger population (59 percent) said torture can rarely or never be justified while 38 percent said it can often or sometime be justified. In the average of all nine countries polled, 63 percent said torture could not be justified and 32 percent said it could be justified.⁸⁹⁵

An apparently similar CBS/*New York Times* question from 2006 serves as a useful test. It asked [italics added]: “Do you think it *is* sometimes justified to use torture to get information from a suspected terrorist, or *is* torture never justified?” The difference between “*is* justified” and “*can be* justified” turns out to be significant: only 35 percent said torture is sometimes justified while 56 percent said it is never justified. Note too that this 56 percent took an unambiguous position that torture is “never” justified and rejected the equivocal position that it is “sometimes” justified.⁸⁹⁶

Making Exceptions to Rules on Detention for Terrorism Suspects

A large majority of Americans reject the argument that treaties preventing secret holding of detainees are too restrictive in the context of dealing with the threat of terrorism. In a 2006 WPO poll, respondents were told that their government had signed “treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and require that the International Committee of the Red Cross have access to them.” They were then presented the argument that such treaties are “too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism” as well as the counterargument that such treaties are “important for making sure governments treat people humanely.”

Within the United States, only 23 percent of respondents took the position that the treaties were too restrictive, while a large majority (73 percent) took the position that the treaties are important to ensure governments treat people humanely. Comparatively, across the five countries, an average 62 percent believed the treaties are “important for making sure governments treat people humanely” while 25 percent believed them “too restrictive.” (WPO 2006)⁸⁹⁷

When asked whether prisoners who are “suspected terrorists ... should receive all the same legal rights as prisoners of war” (NBC/*Wall Street Journal* 2006)—a position that neither the Bush administration nor the Obama administration has endorsed—a majority said suspected terrorists should be treated under the same rules as prisoners of war, 52 percent to 42 percent.⁸⁹⁸ A much larger majority (81 percent) approved one aspect of prisoner-of-war rules, which says “detainees have a right to a hearing in which the government makes its case for why the detainee should be held and the detainee can challenge the government’s right to hold him or her” (WPO 2009).⁸⁹⁹

However, in questions that ask whether it is acceptable to detain terrorism-related suspects in ways that are contrary to existing norms, but without clarification that those norms exist, slight majorities may say that it is acceptable. But even in this context, Americans pull back when it seems that such measures are being taken to an extreme.

A 2006 *Time* poll found that 53 percent of Americans favored “allow[ing] the federal government to jail anyone, without a hearing, who is not a U.S. citizen and is suspected of aiding terrorists,” with 43 percent opposed.⁹⁰⁰

However, in the same poll, 59 percent opposed “allow[ing] law enforcement officials to hold people suspected of links to terrorist organizations in jail without bail for an unlimited amount of time” (37 percent in favor).⁹⁰¹

A bare 51 percent approved a “special trial system ... for suspected terrorists” who “would get a military judge and jury” but “not have the right to hear classified evidence against them” (43 percent opposed).⁹⁰²

On the other hand, 51 percent opposed this system in another question (NBC/*Wall Street Journal* 2006), which said that “[terrorist suspects] and their lawyers would not be allowed to view any evidence that has been classified for security reasons that is brought against them, and in some cases the suspects would not be allowed to be present at their court hearings.” In this case, only 41 percent of Americans endorsed this approach.⁹⁰³

Responsibility of Commanders

The July 2006 WPO poll also asked respondents whether commanders of military personnel should be held responsible for torture by subordinates, even when the commanders claim not to have been aware of it. A substantial majority (58 percent) of U.S. respondents said commanders of military personnel should be held responsible for torture by subordinates while 37 percent said commanders should not be held responsible. On average across the five countries surveyed, 61 percent favored holding commanders responsible in such a case and 28 percent said commanders should not be held responsible.⁹⁰⁴

Social and Economic Rights

Large majorities in the United States say their government should be responsible for taking care of the poor and for ensuring that citizens can meet their basic needs for food, healthcare, and education.

An October 2007 Pew Global Attitudes Project survey asked whether the government should be responsible for taking care of very poor people who cannot care of themselves. A large majority (70 percent) of U.S. respondents said this is the responsibility of the state, while 28 percent said the government is not responsible for taking care of the poor. In the global average of forty-seven publics, 86 percent of respondents agreed and 12 percent disagreed.⁹⁰⁵

In 2008, WPO explored perceptions of government responsibility for ensuring citizens can meet their needs for food, healthcare, and education.

When asked whether their “government should be responsible for ensuring that its citizens can meet their basic need for food,” or whether “that is not the government’s responsibility,” a very large majority (74 percent) of U.S. respondents supported this proposition, while 25 percent said the government should not be responsible. The average across twenty-four publics was 87 percent in support of this proposition and just 8 percent opposed.⁹⁰⁶

When asked about government responsibility in regard to “the basic need for healthcare,” a very large majority of Americans (77 percent) said the government should be responsible, while 21 percent said the government should not be responsible. On average across twenty-four publics polled globally, 92 percent supported this proposition, while just 5 percent disagreed.⁹⁰⁷

On education, an overwhelming majority (83 percent) of respondents in the United States saw the government as responsible for ensuring that people can meet their basic needs, while 16 percent said the government was not responsible. The average percentage of global respondents in support of the government providing education was ninety-one across the twenty-four publics polled, with only 5 percent of respondents disagreeing.⁹⁰⁸

¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

As you may know there are a number of international laws based on agreements between most nations, including our own. These govern a wide set of issues ranging from fishing rights to the use of military force. Which of these two views is closer to yours?

	A. Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.	B. If our government thinks it is not in our nation's interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws.	DK/NR
Chile	58	27	15
Mexico	44	53	3
United States	69	29	2
France	61	35	4
Germany	70	26	4
Great Britain	54	43	3
Poland	62	29	10
Russia	54	34	13
Ukraine	67	19	14
Azerbaijan	60	31	10
Egypt	63	37	0
Iraq	46	31	24
Pakistan	38	56	6
Palestinian Territories	50	46	4
Turkey	46	46	8
Kenya	65	34	1
Nigeria	65	34	2
China	74	18	8
Hong Kong*	47	38	15
Macao	51	37	12
India	49	42	9
Indonesia	53	34	13
South Korea	56	44	1
Taiwan*	68	24	8
Average	57	36	7

*Not included in the Global average

² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

As compared to the average [Country citizen] would you say you are more supportive or less supportive of consistently abiding by international laws?

	More supportive	Less supportive	About the same (vol.)	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Chile	45	21	11	5	18
Mexico	71	14	5	5	5
United States	66	30	-	-	4
France	64	21	4	5	6
Great Britain	57	29	5	1	8
Poland	55	17	17	3	7
Russia	28	15	29	11	18
Ukraine	47	12	16	8	17
Egypt	49	38	7	6	
Iraq	21	41	19	9	11
Palestinian Territories	18	62	11	7	1

Turkey	43	27	14	6	11
Kenya	62	26	8	3	1
Nigeria	57	38	1	4	
Hong Kong*	70	5	10	7	8
Macao*	73	5	1	2	18
India	35	27	14	14	10
Indonesia	54	29	6	5	6
Taiwan*	83	8	0	4	5
	49	28	11	6	8

*Not included in Global Average

³ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002

For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of (own country) military troops?

To uphold international law

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/Other
Great Britain	84	12	4
France	84	13	3
Germany	68	26	7
The Netherlands	86	12	2
Italy	83	14	2
Poland	84	11	6
European Average	80	16	4
United States	76	21	3

⁴ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	86	10	4
China	73	17	10
India	57	31	12
South Korea	86	13	2

⁵ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

An agreement under the treaty banning biological weapons that would allow international inspectors to examine biological research laboratories to ensure that countries are not producing biological weapons

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	89	8	3
China	65	19	16
India	50	32	19

South Korea	86	12	2
--------------------	----	----	---

⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	71	25	5
South Korea	87	11	2

⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	70	23	7
South Korea	88	11	2

⁸ **Bertelsmann Foundation of Germany 2005**

What is the best framework for ensuring peace and stability?

	A System Led by the United Nations	A System Led by a Balance of Regional Powers	A System Led by a Single World Power	A System Led by Two World Powers	DK/NR
Brazil	36	45	9	6	4
China	51	36	6	3	4
France	46	34	5	4	11
Germany	68	21	4	3	4
Great Britain	47	40	3	2	8
India	33	37	16	12	2
Japan	33	29	1	1	36
Russia	28	33	15	10	14
United States	33	52	6	4	5
Average	42	36	7	5	10

⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007**

Which statement comes closest to your position?

	As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.	The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.	The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems.	Not sure/ Decline
United States	10	75	12	3
Argentina	1	34	55	10
Armenia	7	58	27	8
China	9	68	14	9
France	3	75	21	1
India	34	42	10	13
Israel	24	62	10	5
Mexico	12	59	22	8
Palestine	5	36	55	4
Peru	10	61	22	7
Philippines	20	55	16	9
Russia	8	42	38	12
South Korea	14	79	6	0
Thailand	8	47	18	27
Ukraine	3	52	34	11
Average	11	56	24	8

¹⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Do you think that the United States has the responsibility to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur?

	Yes	No	Not sure/ Decline
United States	22	75	3
Armenia	21	70	9
Australia	27	70	3
China	30	61	9
India	53	35	13
Indonesia	20	69	11
Palestine	20	76	4
South Korea	39	60	1
Ukraine	17	69	14
Average	28	65	8

¹¹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003

I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to Europe (“to the United States” in the United States) in the next 10 years. Please tell me if you think each one on the list is an extremely important threat, an important threat, or not an important threat at all.

U.S. unilateralism (If needed: The tendency of the United States to “go it alone”)

	Extremely important threat	Important threat	Not important threat	DK/NR
Great Britain	25	43	26	6
France	34	54	11	1
Germany	40	48	11	1
The Netherlands	24	53	19	4
Italy	29	46	21	4
Poland	24	43	18	15
Portugal	28	44	17	11
European Average	31	47	17	5
United States	21	46	24	9

¹² BBC December 2004

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative...The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	44	22	4	30
Australia	74	17	4	5
Brazil	61	22	6	12
Canada	72	22	1	5
China	54	17	5	23
Chile	69	18	5	8
France	54	37	1	8
Germany	87	7	3	3
Great Britain	75	20	1	4
India	55	23	9	13
Indonesia	77	9	8	6
Italy	58	33	3	7
Japan	65	3	0	32
Lebanon	58	18	10	13
Mexico	71	5	12	12
Russia	57	11	10	22
Philippines	77	18	3	3
Poland	61	11	3	25
South Africa	64	26	2	8
South Korea	56	38	4	3
Spain	78	10	2	10
Turkey	40	24	17	19
United States	59	37	1	3
Average	64	19	5	12

¹³ WorldPublicOpinion.org January 2007

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative...

The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Refused/DK
Iran	70	14	16
United States	66	32	3

¹⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Strengthening the United Nations

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline	Total
United States	40	39	19	2	100
Armenia	41	39	12	8	100
Australia	64	27	9	1	101
China	51	35	8	6	100
India	49	35	10	7	101
Mexico	56	26	14	4	100
South Korea	32	58	9	1	100
Thailand	45	34	4	17	100

¹⁵ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends-Jun2003

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies.

For the United Nations, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	DK/Refusal
Great Britain	78	18	4
France	71	25	4
Germany	80	18	2
The Netherlands	69	26	5
Italy	72	22	6
Poland	61	23	16
Portugal	81	14	5
European Average	74	21	5
United States	70	26	4

¹⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	48	30	22

Peru	77	19	4
United States	72	24	5
Armenia	75	15	10
France	74	25	1
Great Britain	79	17	4
Poland	63	11	26
Russia	58	22	20
Ukraine	54	19	28
Azerbaijan	64	21	14
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	62	13	25
Israel	64	31	6
Turkey	51	24	25
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	84	15	1
China	62	25	13
India	58	30	12
Indonesia	74	14	12
Philippines	46	44	9
South Korea	68	30	1
Thailand	73	12	15
Average	66	23	12

¹⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22

Average	65	22	13
----------------	----	----	----

¹⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to regulate the international arms trade

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	36	42	22
Peru	52	43	5
United States	60	34	6
Armenia	58	27	15
France	77	22	1
Great Britain	69	26	5
Poland	44	28	28
Russia	55	28	17
Ukraine	57	22	21
Azerbaijan	63	27	10
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	59	16	26
Israel	60	34	6
Turkey	34	39	27
Kenya	85	13	2
Nigeria	84	15	2
China	59	28	13
India	57	31	12
Indonesia	64	22	15
Philippines	32	58	10
South Korea	75	23	2
Thailand	44	37	19
Average	58	30	12

¹⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to fund its activities by imposing a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	32	42	27
Peru	38	55	7
United States	45	50	5
Armenia	46	28	26
France	70	30	1
Great Britain	61	33	6
Poland	40	27	33
Russia	39	36	25
Ukraine	44	20	36
Azerbaijan	47	30	24

Egypt	39	61	0
Iran	39	31	30
Israel	52	39	9
Turkey	33	36	31
Kenya	74	23	3
Nigeria	65	31	5
China	55	27	17
India	47	37	17
Indonesia	50	33	17
Philippines	33	56	11
South Korea	53	44	3
Thailand	48	29	23
Average	48	36	16

²⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Please select whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. When dealing with international problems, [survey country] should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that [survey country] will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.

	Agree	Disagree	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	41	32	27
Mexico	46	27	27
Peru	50	42	8
United States	60	37	4
Armenia	36	45	19
France	68	29	3
Great Britain	58	32	10
Poland	35	31	34
Russia	33	44	23
Ukraine	30	32	38
Azerbaijan	36	44	20
Egypt	57	43	0
Indonesia	33	50	17
Israel	54	38	8
Palestinian Territories	15	81	4
Turkey	39	29	32
Kenya	66	31	4
Nigeria	60	37	3
China	78	12	10
India	44	35	21
Philippines	26	46	28
South Korea	48	49	3
Thailand	48	25	27
Average	46	38	16

²¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	65	21	13
United States	83	14	4
France	84	13	3
Russia	70	14	17
Azerbaijan	82	11	7
Egypt	78	22	0
Israel	77	17	6
Palestinian Territories	81	17	2
Turkey	68	15	18
Kenya	88	11	1
Nigeria	89	10	1
China	70	18	11
India	66	22	12
Indonesia	71	15	14
South Korea	76	23	1
Thailand	67	14	19
Average	76	16	8

²² WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	73	17	9
United States	83	13	4
France	85	14	1
Russia	64	20	17
Ukraine	69	11	21
Azerbaijan	79	10	11
Egypt	83	17	0
Iran	69	20	12
Israel	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	78	20	2
Turkey	64	16	20
Kenya	90	10	1
Nigeria	88	10	2
China	72	18	9
India	63	28	9
Indonesia	83	7	10
South Korea	74	25	1
Thailand	62	23	15
Average	76	16	8

²³ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10
Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian Territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13
South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

²⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: preventing a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	70	21	10
United States	62	33	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	55	27	19
Ukraine	51	22	26
Azerbaijan	59	26	16
Egypt	74	26	0
Israel	62	33	5
Palestinian Territories	38	59	3
Turkey	58	23	19
Kenya	84	15	1
Nigeria	81	17	2
China	47	40	14
India	53	34	13
Indonesia	68	19	14
South Korea	43	55	1
Thailand	52	31	18
Average	59	31	10

²⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
United States	57	39	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	53	22	25
Ukraine	52	20	27
Azerbaijan	59	20	21
Egypt	51	49	0
Israel	54	39	7
Palestinian Territories	39	57	4
Turkey	58	20	23
Kenya	84	15	2
Nigeria	75	21	4
China	47	34	19
India	50	32	18
Indonesia	62	25	14
South Korea	42	56	2
Thailand	59	21	20
Average	56	32	12

²⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	54	30	15
United States	57	38	5
France	52	45	3
Russia	35	37	28
Azerbaijan	43	38	19
Egypt	64	36	0
Israel	58	34	7
Palestinian Territories	67	30	3
Turkey	43	32	26
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	76	22	3
China	37	45	18
India	51	34	16
Indonesia	51	28	21
South Korea	32	65	2
Thailand	46	29	25
Average	53	35	12

²⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
European Average	28	36	17	13	6

United States	35	34	34	15	2
France	34	40	40	11	1
Germany	23	37	37	15	2
United Kingdom	41	35	35	7	5
Italy	23	38	38	15	3
Netherlands	31	43	43	8	1
Poland	18	39	39	9	16
Portugal	45	33	8	8	7
Spain	24	43	15	11	7
Slovakia	31	36	13	10	10
Turkey	24	25	18	19	14

²⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org December 2006**

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following: The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
Iran	31	38	16	6	9
United States	26	46	16	11	2

²⁹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States government has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	37	57	6
France	41	53	6
Germany	20	76	4
The Netherlands	33	61	6
Italy	24	70	6
Poland	37	52	11
Portugal	25	72	3
EU Average	31	63	6
United States	58	31	11

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	55	41	4
France	47	48	5
Germany	34	64	2
The Netherlands	44	51	5
Italy	32	63	5
Poland	38	55	7
Portugal	39	56	5
EU Average	41	54	5

United States 68 24 8

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	56	37	7
France	45	50	5
Germany	33	66	1
The Netherlands	52	46	2
Italy	37	59	4
Poland	31	58	11
Portugal	44	54	2
EU Average	43	53	5
United States	72	24	4

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	49	48	3
France	43	49	8
Germany	30	63	7
The Netherlands	40	56	4
Italy	24	71	5
Poland	41	47	12
Portugal	34	61	5
EU Average	37	56	6
United States	53	38	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	66	31	3
France	54	44	2
Germany	29	67	4
The Netherlands	54	43	3
Italy	34	62	4
Poland	51	40	9
Portugal	47	49	4
EU Average	48	48	4
United States	78	17	5

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	DK / Refused
United Kingdom	51	43	6
France	44	52	4
Germany	32	66	2

The Netherlands	45	49	6
Italy	26	68	6
Poland	38	49	13
Portugal	28	66	6
EU Average	38	56	6
United States	67	23	10

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	70	27	3
France	56	39	5
Germany	46	51	3
The Netherlands	48	46	6
Italy	44	52	4
Poland	38	45	17
Portugal	48	50	2
EU Average	50	44	6
United States	75	16	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	58	40	2
France	47	49	4
Germany	33	63	4
The Netherlands	40	55	5
Italy	38	60	2
Poland	40	47	13
Portugal	38	54	8
EU Average	42	53	5
United States	73	20	7

³⁰ Pew Global Attitudes Project 2004

Now a question about using military force, do you think (survey country) should have U.N. approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat or do you think that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats?

	U.N. approval	Too difficult	Don't know/Refused
United States	41	48	10
Great Britain	64	30	6
France	63	35	2
Germany	80	15	6
Russia	37	41	21
Turkey	45	44	11
Pakistan	38	34	28
Jordan	47	38	15
Morocco	42	42	16

³¹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If a situation like Iraq arose in the future, do you think it is essential to secure the approval of the UN before using military force, or don't you think it is essential?

	Essential	Not essential	DK/Refusal
European Average	78	15	7
United States	58	38	4
France	86	10	5
Germany	78	18	5
United Kingdom	83	15	3
Italy	87	10	3
Netherlands	85	13	1
Poland	73	12	15
Portugal	69	16	15
Spain	86	9	5
Slovakia	78	11	11
Turkey	59	26	15

³² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	65	29	6
United States	78	15	7
France	82	16	2
Germany	56	42	2
United Kingdom	77	18	6
Italy	77	20	3
Netherlands	76	21	2
Poland	53	36	11
Portugal	57	30	14
Spain	77	18	5
Slovakia	61	24	15
Turkey	30	52	18

³³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	55	38	7
United States	66	27	6
France	70	25	5
Germany	40	55	5
United Kingdom	65	25	9
Italy	68	27	4
Netherlands	67	29	5

Poland	27	64	9
Portugal	52	28	20
Spain	68	24	8
Slovakia	26	57	17
Turkey	4	48	8

³⁴ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Would you still support the use of the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces if the UN does not approve it?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	27	68	5
United States	49	46	5
France	29	67	4
Germany	16	83	1
United Kingdom	31	66	3
Italy	25	69	6
Netherlands	26	71	3
Poland	24	63	13
Portugal	37	56	7
Spain	28	67	6
Slovakia	24	66	10
Turkey	41	53	6

³⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them:
NATO approval makes military action legitimate

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
European Average	15	36	25	16	7
United States	18	35	22	17	9
France	15	41	25	14	5
Germany	15	40	29	15	2
United Kingdom	20	39	21	11	9
Italy	8	32	30	26	4
Netherlands	14	48	23	12	3
Poland	11	36	23	10	20
Portugal	26	37	14	9	14
Spain	13	31	27	19	10
Slovakia	21	38	14	16	11
Turkey	23	25	20	18	13

³⁶ **GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004**

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	61	32	7
United States	79	16	5
France	76	21	3
Germany	51	47	2
United Kingdom	74	20	7
Italy	65	29	6
Netherlands	78	21	1
Poland	56	29	15
Portugal	58	30	12
Spain	76	20	4
Slovakia	50	31	19
Turkey	34	52	14

GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	50	42	8
United States	60	34	6
France	58	35	7
Germany	34	63	4
United Kingdom	64	28	7
Italy	64	29	7
Netherlands	63	34	3
Poland	26	64	10
Portugal	54	29	17
Spain	61	29	10
Slovakia	19	59	23
Turkey	42	45	13

³⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21

Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

³⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

As you may know, the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country. Do you think the UN SHOULD or SHOULD NOT actively promote human rights in member states?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	91	4	5
Mexico	85	12	3
United States	70	25	5
France	76	20	4
Germany	91	8	2
Britain	68	24	8
Italy	81	14	5
Russia	55	29	16
Ukraine	73	9	18
Azerbaijan	89	8	4
Egypt	64	33	3
Jordan	50	33	17
Palestinian Territories	54	41	5
Turkey	60	19	20
Kenya	94	4	2
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	62	16	22
Hong Kong*	73	16	12
Macau*	68	15	17
India	55	26	19
Indonesia	70	13	17
South Korea	62	35	4
Taiwan*	78	12	10
Thailand	44	25	31
Average	70	19	10

³⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?

	Do more	Do less	Do about the same as it has been doing	DK / NS
Argentina	85	2	8	5
Mexico	88	2	8	2
United States	59	7	28	5
France	64	6	26	4
Germany	58	7	34	2
Britain	64	6	22	8
Italy	83	6	8	3
Russia	45	8	23	24
Ukraine	57	4	18	22
Azerbaijan	58	9	29	4
Egypt	55	22	22	1
Jordan	62	17	8	13
Palestinian Territories	48	23	26	3
Turkey	69	7	8	16
Kenya	91	5	3	1
Nigeria	88	7	4	1
China	51	5	15	29
Hong Kong*	65	2	26	7
Macau*	65	1	22	12
India	54	14	16	17
Indonesia	66	6	12	17
South Korea	69	3	25	3
Taiwan*	62	2	25	11
Thailand	60	7	13	20
Average	65	8	17	10

⁴⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?

	Make efforts to further the rights of women	Improper interference in a country's internal affairs	DK / NS
Argentina	78	18	4
Mexico	88	9	3
United States	59	38	2
France	74	19	7
Britain	70	26	5
Russia	52	30	18
Ukraine	69	16	16

Azerbaijan	66	23	11
Egypt	30	70	
Iran	52	36	12
Palestinian Territories	49	48	3
Turkey	70	20	11
Kenya	91	8	1
Nigeria	66	32	2
China	86	10	4
Hong Kong*	67	23	10
India	48	28	24
Indonesia	74	16	10
South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	64	21	15
Average	67	26	8

⁴¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

In May 2008, Burma, [if you feel it is necessary, Add: “also known as Myanmar”] had a major cyclone that left over a million people without food and water. Though the Burmese government was not effectively delivering aid, it refused to let in relief organizations. As a general rule, in such circumstances, should the UN bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of a country’s sovereignty?

	UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary	This would be too much of a violation of a country’s sovereignty	DK / NS
Argentina	86	8	7
Mexico	69	27	4
United States	53	43	5
France	70	26	4
Germany	74	23	3
Great Britain	68	26	7
Italy	66	24	10
Russia	40	40	20
Ukraine	42	29	29
Azerbaijan	55	38	7
Egypt	48	48	4
Jordan	46	37	17
Palestinian Territories	65	31	4
Turkey	61	19	20
Kenya	81	14	5
Nigeria	57	32	10
China	59	28	12
Hong Kong	63	28	9
Macau	63	26	11
India	51	24	26
Indonesia	55	17	28
South Korea	58	37	4
Taiwan	78	15	6
Thailand	52	14	33
Average	60	28	12

⁴² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

In response to the charges made by the International Criminal Court, President Bashir has expelled humanitarian groups that have been providing food and other aid to the displaced civilians living in refugee camps. If, as a result, many people in these camps start dying from hunger and exposure, do you think the UN should bring in food and other aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of Sudan's sovereignty?

	UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary	This would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty	DK / Ref
Egypt	61	38	1
Iraq	46	29	24
Pakistan	37	42	21
Palestinian Territories	60	38	2
Turkey	58	17	25
Kenya	82	16	2
Nigeria	68	27	5
Average	59	30	11

⁴³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	Has this responsibility	Does not have this responsibility	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	48	27	25
United States	74	22	4
Armenia	66	19	16
France	54	39	7
Great Britain	70	22	8
Poland	54	15	31
Russia	48	31	21
Ukraine	40	16	44
Azerbaijan	42	23	35
Egypt	80	20	0
Iran	59	25	16
Israel	64	28	8
Palestinian Territories	69	27	4
Turkey	39	20	40
Kenya	89	8	3
Nigeria	78	18	5
China	76	13	11
India	51	25	25
Indonesia	82	5	14
Thailand	44	22	33
Average	61	21	18

⁴⁴ **World PublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections countries should or should not be willing to have international observers from the United Nations monitor their elections?

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Chile	63	14	23
Mexico	68	30	3
United States	67	31	2
France	71	25	4
Germany	78	18	4
Great Britain	81	15	4
Russia	45	40	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	83	8	9
Egypt	61	39	0
Iraq	65	23	12
Pakistan	55	38	7
Palestinian Territories	57	41	2
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	82	17	1
Nigeria	78	22	1
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	9
China – Macau*	63	23	14
India	45	48	7
Indonesia	20	74	6
Taiwan*	61	33	6
Average	63	31	7

* Not included in Global Average

⁴⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

Do you think that [Country] would or would not benefit from having international observers monitor elections here?

	Would	Would not	DK/NR
Chile	59	16	25
Mexico	66	30	4
United States	46	51	3
France	45	50	6
Germany	49	36	14
Great Britain	46	51	3
Russia	43	42	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	71	16	14
Egypt	63	37	0
Iraq	67	21	12
Pakistan	49	43	8
Palestinian Territories	57	40	3
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	74	24	3
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	10
China – Macau*	66	23	11
India	38	51	11
Indonesia	25	62	14
Taiwan*	59	32	10
Average	55	36	9

*Not included in the Global Average

⁴⁶ World Values Survey 2005-2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Aid to developing countries

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A	Margin of Error
Italy	19	19	56	0	0	5	1	0	
Spain	15	18	54	0	0	13	1	0	
United States	31	22	41	0	0	3	3	0	
Canada	34	9	51	0	0	6	0	0	
Japan	14	14	42	0	17	0	8	0	
Mexico	23	11	58	6	0	1	0	0	
South Africa	29	17	47	0	0	0	8	0	
Australia	32	14	49	0	0	0	5	0	
Sweden	14	31	51	0	0	4	0	0	
Argentina	18	7	50	0	0	23	1	0	
Finland	26	15	55	0	0	2	1	0	
South Korea	32	11	56	0	0	0	0	0	
Poland	21	16	61	0	0	3	0	0	
Switzerland	28	16	52	0	0	3	1	0	
Brazil	26	15	50	0	0	6	3	0	2.6
Chile	23	12	54	0	0	9	1	0	2.2
India	23	12	24	0	0	40	0	0	
Slovenia	10	45	33	0	0	10	2	0	3.1
Bulgaria	7	40	40	0	0	12	0	0	3.2
Romania	19	26	36	0	0	17	2	0	2.2
China	17	6	29	0	0	47	1	0	
Taiwan	22	31	44	0	0	3	0	0	
Turkey	31	16	44	0	0	8	1	0	
Ukraine	19	17	50	0	0	11	3	0	
Ghana	24	16	55	0	0	4	2	0	
Moldova	20	36	39	0	0	4	0	0	
Georgia	22	12	58	0	0	8	0	0	
Thailand	65	25	9	0	0	0	1	0	
Indonesia	13	25	51	0	0	8	2	1	3.2
Vietnam	13	15	61	0	0	9	1	0	
Serbia	20	18	52	0	0	8	2	0	
New Zealand	17	0	23	48	0	7	5	0	
Egypt	26	21	50	0	0	4	0	0	
Morocco	19	13	42	0	0	0	26	0	
Iran	19	20	56	0	0	4	1	0	1.9
Jordan	16	17	54	0	0	12	0	0	
Cyprus	24	39	37	0	0	0	0	0	3.1
Trinidad and Tobago	20	20	57	0	0	3	1	0	

Andorra	25	11	62	0	0	2	1	0	
Malaysia	18	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	
Burkina Faso	12	11	59	0	0	13	3	2	
Ethiopia	11	11	68	0	0	5	4	1	
Mali	21	12	55	0	0	7	5	1	
Rwanda	17	19	61	0	0	3	0	0	
Zambia	15	29	48	0	0	4	3	0	
Germany	23	26	46	0	0	4	1	0	
Average	22	19	48	1	0	7	2	0	--

⁴⁷ World Values Survey 2005-2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Refugees

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	32	22	37	0	0	8	1	0
Spain	13	20	54	0	0	14	0	0
United States	34	27	32	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	46	11	33	0	0	9	1	0
Japan	17	15	46	0	15	0	7	0
Mexico	36	14	42	8	0	2	0	0
South Africa	31	15	45	0	0	0	10	0
Australia	38	14	43	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	33	23	41	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	48	0	0	24	2	0
Finland	42	17	37	0	0	3	1	0
South Korea	31	9	60	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	45	15	36	0	0	4	0	0
Switzerland	32	16	48	0	0	4	1	0
Brazil	30	15	45	0	0	7	3	0
Chile	29	9	51	0	0	10	1	0
India	30	16	12	0	0	43	0	0
Slovenia	20	44	24	0	0	11	1	0
Bulgaria	15	27	44	0	0	14	0	0
Romania	31	19	28	0	0	19	2	0
China	22	6	27	0	0	45	1	0
Taiwan	24	23	50	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	37	19	35	0	0	9	1	0
Ukraine	29	18	39	0	0	11	3	0
Ghana	18	13	64	0	0	3	2	0
Moldova	39	29	26	0	0	6	0	0
Georgia	67	8	21	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	45	25	29	0	0	0	1	0
Indonesia	42	9	40	0	0	7	2	0
Vietnam	22	15	52	0	0	10	1	0

Serbia	36	16	38	0	0	8	2	0
New Zealand	25	0	20	41	0	9	5	0
Egypt	30	23	43	0	0	4	0	0
Morocco	14	17	44	0	0	0	26	0
Iran	22	15	58	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	15	16	57	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	42	20	38	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	31	16	48	0	0	5	1	0
Andorra	30	12	55	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	25	36	39	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	15	13	51	0	0	15	3	3
Ethiopia	13	13	61	0	0	7	6	2
Mali	27	13	41	0	0	11	7	2
Rwanda	10	17	72	0	0	2	0	0
Zambia	13	20	62	0	0	3	2	0
Germany	25	25	45	0	0	5	1	0
Average	29	17	43	1	0	8	2	0

⁴⁸ **World Values Survey 2005–2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? International peacekeeping

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	22	12	60	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	12	0	0
United States	28	16	50	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	7	0
Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	3	0	0

Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	12	53	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	26	8	64	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	47	6	34	0	0	9	2	2
Ethiopia	41	10	40	0	0	5	3	1
Mali	46	5	38	0	0	6	3	1
Rwanda	50	41	8	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	29	19	47	0	0	4	1	0
Germany	20	20	54	0	0	6	1	0
Average	34	11	45	1	0	7	2	0

⁴⁹ World Values Survey 2005–2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Protection of the environment

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	45	29	19	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	28	20	40	0	0	13	0	0
United States	42	33	18	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	52	23	20	0	0	4	0	0
Japan	17	26	31	0	16	0	7	0
Mexico	41	19	32	6	0	1	0	0
South Africa	48	32	15	0	0	0	6	0
Australia	46	29	20	0	0	0	6	0
Sweden	39	34	25	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	40	11	30	0	0	18	1	0
Finland	40	40	18	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	54	27	20	0	0	0	*	0
Poland	59	21	18	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	46	19	32	0	0	3	1	0

Brazil	51	25	18	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	21	19	0	0	7	1	0
India	37	21	8	0	0	33	0	0
Slovenia	39	36	13	0	0	10	2	0
Bulgaria	48	28	14	0	0	10	0	0
Romania	51	24	8	0	0	15	2	0
China	34	9	16	0	0	40	1	0
Taiwan	66	17	15	0	0	2	0	0
Turkey	33	41	18	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	49	30	9	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	62	28	7	0	0	2	1	0
Moldova	51	37	7	0	0	4	0	0
Georgia	72	15	9	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	61	33	6	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	79	4	5	0	0	5	2	6
Vietnam	48	20	24	0	0	7	1	0
Serbia	41	34	16	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	43	0	8	37	0	7	5	0
Egypt	57	17	24	0	0	2	0	0
Morocco	36	22	22	0	0	0	20	0
Iran	39	35	22	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	44	19	26	0	0	12	0	0
Cyprus	46	40	15	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	62	19	18	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	54	22	22	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	45	43	12	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	50	16	19	0	0	10	3	2
Ethiopia	36	18	36	0	0	6	3	1
Mali	49	28	12	0	0	6	4	1
Rwanda	48	43	7	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	55	26	13	0	0	5	2	0
Germany	36	29	31	0	0	4	1	0
Average	47	25	18	1	0	6	2	0

⁵⁰ World Values Survey 2005–2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Human Rights

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	27	15	51	0	0	6	2	0
Spain	16	14	56	0	0	13	1	0
United States	42	18	33	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	45	10	40	0	0	4	1	0
Japan	27	11	47	0	9	0	7	0

Mexico	41	9	41	0	0	7	2	0
South Africa	60	16	20	0	0	0	5	0
Australia	30	9	56	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	17	9	72	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	39	4	38	0	0	19	1	0
Finland	33	8	56	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	49	9	41	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	49	7	41	0	0	3	0	0
Switzerland	26	8	63	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	44	11	39	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	7	32	0	0	9	1	0
India	36	10	13	0	0	41	0	0
Slovenia	39	30	20	0	0	9	1	0
Bulgaria	34	26	30	0	0	10	0	0
Romania	43	10	30	0	0	15	2	0
China	32	4	17	0	0	48	1	0
Taiwan	56	10	31	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	40	12	39	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	57	13	20	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	67	9	22	0	0	1	1	0
Moldova	55	17	24	0	0	4	0	0
Georgia	79	7	11	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	50	24	26	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	55	3	34	0	0	6	2	1
Vietnam	59	5	27	0	0	7	1	0
Serbia	50	8	34	0	0	6	2	0
New Zealand	25	0	19	43	0	8	5	0
Egypt	45	15	37	0	0	2	*	0
Morocco	34	6	42	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	16	5	75	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	21	16	50	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	29	36	35	0	0	0	1	0
Trinidad and Tobago	45	11	41	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	28	8	61	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	38	29	34	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	32	6	45	0	0	12	3	3
Ethiopia	20	12	54	0	0	7	6	2
Mali	35	7	44	0	0	7	5	2
Rwanda	29	37	32	0	0	2	1	0
Zambia	54	13	26	0	0	3	3	0
Germany	20	19	55	0	0	4	1	0
Average	40	12	38	1	0	7	2	0

⁵¹ World Values Survey 2005–2008

People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you see yourself? ((Read out and code one answer for each statement): I see myself as a world citizen

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	No answer
Italy	20	40	29	8	2	1
Spain	20	48	14	4	13	1
United States	20	45	24	5	2	4
Canada	29	55	12	2	2	1
Japan	11	61	4	1	22	-
Mexico	35	55	7	2	1	0
South Africa	42	41	10	3	4	-
Australia	21	56	18	1	-	3
Sweden	18	65	15	1	2	-
Argentina	15	48	24	5	7	1
Finland	18	45	28	7	2	0
South Korea	14	66	16	3	-	-
Poland	21	48	20	4	7	0
Switzerland	32	46	18	5	0	-
Brazil	27	51	19	2	1	0
Chile	26	41	19	9	5	0
India	27	31	13	3	25	0
Slovenia	17	52	17	7	6	1
Bulgaria	17	25	30	20	8	-
Romania	15	33	26	14	11	2
China	10	51	10	1	27	1
Turkey	37	43	11	3	5	1
Ukraine	25	29	23	13	8	2
Ghana	45	39	12	1	1	1
Moldova	26	36	28	6	3	0
Georgia	22	22	32	16	9	1
Thailand	33	63	4	0	-	0
Indonesia	29	58	7	1	3	1
Vietnam	31	52	6	-	8	3
Colombia	40	54	3	1	2	-
Serbia	30	44	17	4	3	2
Egypt	28	28	24	19	1	0
Morocco	14	26	26	20	-	14
Iran	30	51	16	2	0	0
Jordan	34	33	14	13	6	-
Cyprus	28	45	23	3	-	1
Trinidad and Tobago	25	47	24	3	1	1
Andorra	25	62	11	2	0	0
Malaysia	41	49	9	1	-	0
Burkina Faso	42	37	10	3	6	2

Ethiopia	41	49	7	1	2	1
Mali	59	32	4	1	2	2
Rwanda	43	55	1	1	1	0
Zambia	32	37	21	5	4	1
Germany	16	32	28	15	7	1
Average	27	45	16	5	6	1

⁵² WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

Do you consider yourself more a citizen of [country], more a citizen of the world, or both equally?

	Citizen of [country]	Citizen of the world	Both equally	Neither/None of the above	DK/NS
Argentina	64	10	24	0	1
Mexico	56	9	35	1	0
United States	72	5	22		1
France	48	14	37	2	0
Germany	59	19	18	3	1
Great Britain	59	9	29	2	1
Italy	51	21	27		1
Russia	79	5	13	2	1
Ukraine	81	6	10	2	1
Azerbaijan	89	4	5	1	1
Egypt	73	13	13	1	0
Jordan	80	8	7	2	3
Palestinian Territories	70	14	13	2	1
Turkey	80	9	10	1	0
Kenya	88	9	3		0
Nigeria	69	11	19	0	1
China - Mainland	35	6	44		15
China - Hong Kong	62	5	29	2	2
China - Macao	61	6	27	2	4
India	40	14	32	6	9
Indonesia	68	2	27	0	4
South Korea	83	5	11	1	0
Taiwan	36	8	54	1	2
Thailand	48	15	23	3	11
Average	66	10	20	1	3

⁵³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

Some people say that the United States and the European Union have enough common values to be able to cooperate on international problems. Other say that the United States and the European Union have such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible. Which view is closer to your own?

	Enough common values to cooperate on international problems	Such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible	DK/Refusal
European Average	55	35	10

United States	67	23	10
France	60	38	2
Germany	54	43	3
United Kingdom	52	41	7
Italy	63	35	3
Netherlands	59	37	4
Poland	56	28	16
Portugal	57	36	8
Spain	59	36	4
Slovakia	59	25	16
Turkey	27	33	39
Bulgaria	57	24	19
Romania	72	12	15

⁵⁴ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following.

When our country acts on a national security issue, it is critical that we do so together with our closest allies

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal	Agree	Disagree
European Average	42	38	8	7	4	80	15
United States	61	28	5	5	2	89	9
France	52	38	5	4	1	90	9
Germany	48	37	8	6	1	86	14
United Kingdom	50	35	8	4	3	85	12
Italy	35	46	12	7	1	81	19
Netherlands	60	31	4	4	1	91	8
Poland	40	45	7	3	6	85	9
Portugal	45	31	9	9	7	76	17
Spain	41	47	7	4	2	88	11
Slovakia	32	39	12	5	12	71	17
Turkey	21	26	12	23	18	47	35
Bulgaria	35	43	7	4	10	78	11
Romania	37	39	7	5	12	76	12

⁵⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

[Europe] Do you think a more powerful European Union *should* compete or cooperate with the United States?

[United States] Do you think a more powerful European Union *would* compete or cooperate with the United States?

	Compete with the United States	Cooperate with the United States	Both - Spontaneous	Neither - Spontaneous	DK/Refusal
European Average	17	74	4	3	3
United States	41	45	7	1	6
France	16	81	1	1	1

Germany	13	84	2	1	1
United Kingdom	17	72	2	5	5
Italy	12	80	6	1	1
Netherlands	9	87	2	1	1
Poland	7	85	3	2	3
Portugal	27	62	4	2	5
Spain	12	80	3	4	2
Slovakia	17	67	8	4	4
Turkey	37	35	10	8	10

⁵⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

In general, when [Country] government negotiates with other countries do you think that the government:

	A. Should be more ready to act cooperatively to achieve mutual gains	B. Tends to be too willing to compromise and is often taken advantage of.	DK/NR
Chile	60	26	15
Mexico	35	63	2
United States	54	44	2
France	43	48	9
Germany	47	46	8
Great Britain	31	65	4
Poland	34	53	14
Russia	54	34	12
Ukraine	49	35	16
Azerbaijan	67	29	4
Egypt	76	23	1
Iraq	60	24	16
Pakistan	42	54	5
Palestinian Territories	69	29	2
Turkey	81	14	5
Kenya	71	28	1
Nigeria	73	26	1
China	63	30	7
China – Hong Kong	72	18	10
China - Macao	60	29	11
India	59	34	7
Indonesia	52	40	8
South Korea	28	71	1
Taiwan	42	49	9
Average	55	39	7

⁵⁷ Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the United Nations?

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/R
United States	18	43	16	13	10
Canada	19	51	14	6	10
Britain	17	50	15	7	12

France	9	65	20	6	0
Germany	6	59	23	4	7
Spain	8	53	20	4	14
Poland	10	62	10	2	16
Russia	10	46	17	6	21
Turkey	3	15	11	46	26
Egypt	15	41	23	21	0
Jordan	13	31	23	34	0
Lebanon	30	32	18	20	0
Palestinian Territories	4	26	24	43	3
Israel	5	27	34	31	3
China	10	45	25	7	13
India	11	32	18	12	27
Indonesia	24	55	8	1	12
Japan	5	40	33	7	15
Pakistan	5	23	16	15	42
South Korea	9	70	10	1	10
Argentina	4	26	17	8	45
Brazil	3	49	24	5	20
Mexico	20	38	15	5	23
Kenya	48	28	6	4	14
Nigeria	39	32	15	8	6
Average	14	42	18	13	17

⁵⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2007**

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of the United Nations?

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Ref
United States	9	39	23	16	13
Canada	15	49	19	8	8
Argentina	2	22	21	20	35
Bolivia	7	36	23	10	24
Brazil	2	43	35	9	10
Chile	13	44	18	4	20
Mexico	17	40	19	10	15
Peru	15	43	14	7	22
Venezuela	8	47	23	15	8
Britain	11	47	23	8	10
France	9	57	26	7	0
Germany	8	56	27	4	5
Italy	13	54	19	4	11
Spain	10	53	18	9	10
Sweden	32	47	13	2	6
Bulgaria	23	52	6	2	17
Czech Republic	10	57	23	4	6
Poland	15	53	16	5	11
Russia	12	46	19	5	18
Slovakia	11	60	19	2	8
Ukraine	15	48	14	8	15
Turkey	3	20	18	39	20

Egypt	8	36	30	25	1
Jordan	10	22	31	35	2
Kuwait	12	29	19	23	17
Lebanon	32	30	24	13	2
Morocco	3	17	14	24	42
Palestinian Territories	4	23	23	46	4
Israel	7	31	34	24	5
Pakistan	4	13	18	19	46
Bangladesh	50	30	5	2	13
Indonesia	25	56	10	1	8
Malaysia	5	50	19	7	19
China	6	46	29	4	15
India	12	35	21	13	19
Japan	5	36	33	7	19
South Korea	9	65	11	2	13
Ethiopia	28	44	19	4	4
Ghana	49	36	4	2	8
Ivory Coast	28	42	17	12	0
Kenya	51	37	6	3	3
Mali	42	34	11	7	6
Nigeria	37	36	14	6	8
Senegal	39	40	8	4	9
South Africa	23	40	14	9	14
Tanzania	49	26	5	4	17
Uganda	40	22	5	5	28
Average	17	40	18	10	13

Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2006

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of the United Nations

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Very unfavorable	Somewhat unfavorable	DK/Ref
United States	15	36	19	19	11
October 2005	9	39	15	24	13
March 2004	14	41	15	20	10
Early Sept., 2001	23	54	6	12	5
Aug., 1999	19	57	5	14	5
June 1999	19	51	7	16	7
Early Sept., 1998	14	55	7	16	8
Sept., 1997	11	53	9	19	8
Feb., 1996	19	46	9	20	6
June 1995	14	53	8	20	5
Feb., 1995	13	49	8	18	12
July 1994	21	55	5	14	5
May 1993	21	52	4	13	10
May 1990	15	55	6	13	11
Great Britain (GP)	16	49	8	15	11
March 2004	22	52	4	14	7
France	10	62	8	20	*
March 2004	10	57	6	24	3
Germany	13	55	4	21	7
March 2004	21	50	3	20	6

1991	21	62	3	7	7
Spain	11	49	8	22	10
Russia	11	38	9	20	22
March 2004	13	47	5	13	21
1991	21	59	1	3	16
Egypt	11	38	24	27	*
Turkey	5	24	32	19	20
March 2004	13	38	19	16	14
Indonesia	30	48	2	16	4
India	9	30	19	16	26
Pakistan	18	24	11	11	36
March 2004	9	26	17	10	38
Jordan	6	24	36	33	1
March 2004	6	15	47	26	6
Nigeria (GP)	24	44	7	19	7
Nigeria (Christians)	33	49	4	6	8
Nigeria (Muslims)	14	39	10	34	4
China	8	45	3	22	22
Japan	8	48	5	31	7

⁵⁹ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world:

The United Nations

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA
Afghanistan	79	8	6	8
Argentina	34	31	4	31
Australia	61	26	5	9
Brazil	46	36	5	13
Canada	65	20	3	12
Congo	55	16	15	15
Finland	77	8	6	9
France	52	33	7	8
Germany	80	6	8	5
Ghana	74	8	8	9
Great Britain	66	24	2	8
India	44	12	16	29
Indonesia	80	8	9	3
Iran	63	21	10	6
Iraq	34	40	22	4
Italy	56	19	6	19
Kenya	74	3	7	16
Mexico	62	17	6	15
Nigeria	75	8	8	9
Philippines	74	13	4	9
Poland	72	7	4	17
Russia	38	14	16	32
Saudi Arabia	41	20	25	14
Senegal	60	8	11	21
South Africa	48	9	15	29

South Korea	76	19	0	4
Spain	61	17	9	13
Sri Lanka	36	7	5	52
Tanzania	69	10	14	8
Turkey	32	18	25	25
United States	52	36	3	9
Zimbabwe	57	5	20	18
Average	59	16	9	15

BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA
Argentina	43	20	6	31
Australia	67	19	4	10
Brazil	64	18	5	13
Canada	77	15	2	6
Chile	67	9	5	20
China	77	9	6	8
France	73	18	2	8
Germany	86	8	3	4
Great Britain	76	16	1	7
India	57	20	10	13
Indonesia	84	6	6	3
Italy	73	15	4	8
Japan	44	4	0	52
Lebanon	57	23	10	10
Mexico	41	18	17	24
Russia	54	8	11	27
Philippines	87	9	2	2
Poland	74	5	3	19
South Africa	73	17	2	8
South Korea	73	22	3	2
Spain	77	7	3	13
Turkey	45	25	14	16
United States	59	31	2	8
Average	66	15	5	

⁶⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org December 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol.)	Neither (vol.)	DK/NR (vol.)
Iran					
Dec 2006	58	24	9	1	8
Dec 2005	63	21	10	4	2
United States					
Dec 2006	64	27	N/A	N/A	9
Dec 2005	52	36	3	4	5

⁶¹ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? United Nations

	A great deal	Quite a lot	Not very much	None at all	Don't know	No answer	N/A
France	10	45	29	15	2	0	0
Great Britain	8	31	34	14	12	1	0
Italy	9	47	31	8	5	1	0
Netherlands	2	33	40	17	7	1	0
Spain	6	51	31	7	5	1	0
United States	4	28	44	19	2	2	0
Canada	11	43	28	9	8	1	0
Japan	5	47	24	5	19	0	0
Mexico	15	36	27	18	3	1	0
South Africa	15	32	23	9	21	0	0
Australia	6	38	43	11	0	2	0
Sweden	13	64	18	3	1	0	0
Argentina	2	17	36	31	13	1	0
Finland	8	55	32	4	1	0	0
South Korea	6	49	36	8	0	1	0
Poland	6	34	33	9	17	0	0
Switzerland	6	42	38	10	3	1	0
Brazil	14	32	27	20	5	2	0
Chile	7	31	31	20	11	0	0
India	13	13	10	5	57	3	0
Slovenia	5	25	49	12	8	2	0
Bulgaria	11	41	23	11	14	0	0
Romania	10	44	20	9	15	1	0
China	5	22	11	3	59	1	0
Taiwan	3	26	43	23	5	0	0
Turkey	6	22	27	35	10	1	0
Ukraine	5	30	21	19	21	4	0
Russian Federation	7	27	24	17	22	2	0
Peru	8	20	38	21	0	14	0
Ghana	34	36	19	4	5	3	0
Moldova	12	33	34	14	7	0	0
Georgia	7	37	29	13	14	1	0
Thailand	7	23	49	22	0	0	0
Indonesia	12	35	34	10	8	2	0
Vietnam	37	31	11	1	19	1	0
Colombia	14	33	26	21	6	0	0
Serbia	3	22	39	29	5	2	0
New Zealand	5	37	30	11	13	4	0
Egypt	7	26	25	35	8	0	0
Morocco	3	13	29	28	0	28	0
Iran	14	23	49	9	4	1	0
Jordan	18	15	20	31	17	0	0
Cyprus	11	30	35	24	0	0	0
Iraq	5	6	12	62	12	2	0
Trinidad and Tobago	10	29	41	13	6	0	0
Andorra	3	37	41	17	2	0	0
Malaysia	8	41	35	16	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	20	28	16	10	18	4	4

Ethiopia	5	30	35	20	5	4	0
Mali	32	29	19	9	6	4	2
Rwanda	9	28	31	10	21	1	0
Zambia	25	29	28	14	3	2	0
Germany	5	31	40	16	8	1	0
Average	10	32	30	16	10	2	0

⁶² **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The United Nations

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees
United States	55°	60°	24	22	16	5	20
Armenia	72°	80°	51	14	19	2	10
China	75°	80°	52	29	8	2	2
India	63°	70°	40	15	12	4	20
Mexico	80°	80°	60	14	10	1	3
Palestinian Territories	58°	60°	39	11	20	2	25
South Korea	70°	70°	39	39	18	2	2
Thailand	71°	--	38	8	22	1	6

⁶³ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006**

Would you say your overall opinion of the United Nations (UN) is favorable or unfavorable?

	Favorable	Unfavorable	DK
United States	61	35	3
France	72	26	1
Germany	81	17	2
United Kingdom	74	22	3
Italy	71	27	1
Netherlands	81	16	2
Poland	70	15	13
Portugal	75	17	6
Spain	67	29	3
Slovakia	71	17	9
Turkey	46	32	19
Bulgaria	69	13	16
Romania	76	8	14
European Average	71	22	6

⁶⁴ Eurobarometer June 2005

I would like to ask you a question about how much trust you have in certain institutions. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust:

The United Nations

	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
European Average	52	34	14
Belgium	60	36	4
Czech Republic	59	27	14
Denmark	73	17	10
Germany	49	40	11
Estonia	57	21	23
Greece	30	62	8
Spain	40	43	17
France	50	37	14
Ireland	56	22	22
Italy	50	39	12
Cyprus	25	66	9
Latvia	51	21	28
Lithuania	46	21	33
Luxembourg	61	25	14
Hungary	55	28	17
Malta	60	18	22
Netherlands	60	32	7
Austria	60	29	11
Poland	55	24	21
Portugal	57	27	16
Slovenia	52	39	9
Slovakia	50	31	20
Finland	70	25	5
Sweden	74	19	7
United Kingdom	54	29	17
Bulgaria	51	24	25
Croatia	36	48	16
Romania	66	18	16
Turkey	35	50	15
Cyprus (Turkish)	40	49	11

[Survey Country's] Legal Systems

Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
--------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

European Average	50	45	6
Belgium	48	49	3
Czech Republic	32	61	6
Denmark	83	14	3
Germany	58	39	3
Estonia	49	42	9
Greece	53	46	1
Spain	47	46	7
France	53	43	4
Ireland	52	39	9
Italy	43	49	8
Cyprus	64	30	6
Latvia	37	47	16
Lithuania	30	58	12
Luxembourg	65	26	9
Hungary	50	43	7
Malta	45	46	10
Netherlands	65	33	2
Austria	74	21	5
Poland	23	69	8
Portugal	41	53	6
Slovenia	34	61	4
Slovakia	27	67	6
Finland	78	21	1
Sweden	64	32	4
United Kingdom	54	38	8
Bulgaria	20	70	10
Croatia	24	67	8
Romania	35	56	9
Turkey	69	26	4
Cyprus (Turkish)	60	36	4

The European Union

	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
European Average	44	43	13
Belgium	58	39	3
Czech Republic	52	38	10
Denmark	43	48	9
Germany	39	51	10
Estonia	52	33	15
Greece	57	38	5

Spain	46	40	15
France	39	50	11
Ireland	48	29	23
Italy	56	33	11
Cyprus	54	34	12
Latvia	48	33	19
Lithuania	56	25	19
Luxembourg	54	36	10
Hungary	58	30	11
Malta	53	31	16
Netherlands	42	52	7
Austria	42	48	10
Poland	52	31	17
Portugal	57	29	13
Slovenia	55	37	8
Slovakia	55	31	14
Finland	41	53	6
Sweden	32	58	10
United Kingdom	27	53	20
Bulgaria	56	25	19
Croatia	28	58	14
Romania	68	19	13
Turkey	41	50	10
Cyprus (Turkish)	51	42	7

[Survey Country's] Parliament

	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
European Average	35	57	9
Belgium	49	47	4
Czech Republic	17	79	4
Denmark	74	22	3
Germany	35	59	6
Estonia	41	51	8
Greece	47	51	2
Spain	37	50	13
France	33	55	11
Ireland	40	50	11
Italy	35	55	9
Cyprus	54	37	9
Latvia	27	62	10
Lithuania	15	77	8

Luxembourg	64	24	12
Hungary	29	63	9
Malta	38	48	15
Netherlands	53	43	3
Austria	52	38	10
Poland	8	88	4
Portugal	40	52	8
Slovenia	39	58	3
Slovakia	23	70	7
Finland	67	31	2
Sweden	46	47	7
United Kingdom	36	51	13
Bulgaria	11	81	8
Croatia	20	73	7
Romania	35	57	8
Turkey	73	22	4
Cyprus (Turkish)	57	34	8

[Survey Country's] Government

	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
European Average	31	64	6
Belgium	44	53	3
Czech Republic	23	73	4
Denmark	55	42	3
Germany	27	69	4
Estonia	44	49	8
Greece	40	57	3
Spain	40	51	10
France	24	71	5
Ireland	40	52	8
Italy	29	64	8
Cyprus	60	32	7
Latvia	35	56	10
Lithuania	25	66	8
Luxembourg	68	25	7
Hungary	32	59	9
Malta	40	50	10
Netherlands	40	58	2
Austria	49	45	6
Poland	11	84	5
Portugal	33	60	7

Slovenia	40	57	3
Slovakia	22	73	5
Finland	68	30	2
Sweden	33	62	5
United Kingdom	34	60	6
Bulgaria	20	70	4
Croatia	22	71	7
Romania	43	49	8
Turkey	76	21	3
Cyprus (Turkish)	62	32	6

[Survey Country's] Political Parties

	Tend to trust	Tend not to trust	DK
European Average	19	75	6
Belgium	30	66	4
Czech Republic	11	85	4
Denmark	51	43	6
Germany	18	78	4
Estonia	17	72	11
Greece	23	76	2
Spain	24	69	8
France	14	81	6
Ireland	24	66	10
Italy	19	75	6
Cyprus	21	72	7
Latvia	10	82	8
Lithuania	10	81	10
Luxembourg	46	43	11
Hungary	16	75	9
Malta	29	58	14
Netherlands	35	61	4
Austria	31	63	6
Poland	5	91	5
Portugal	19	75	6
Slovenia	23	74	4
Slovakia	11	83	5
Finland	37	59	4
Sweden	22	73	5
United Kingdom	22	70	7
Bulgaria	11	83	6
Croatia	11	84	6

Romania	22	69	9
Turkey	28	65	7
Cyprus (Turkish)	40	52	7

⁶⁵ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?

The United Nations

	Positive	Negative	DK/ NR
Argentina	22	44	34
Bolivia	52	30	18
Brazil	55	28	17
Chile	49	33	18
Colombia	77	14	9
Costa Rica	68	18	14
Ecuador	52	33	15
Guatemala	39	47	14
Honduras	72	17	11
Mexico	70	17	13
Nicaragua	63	26	11
Panama	67	33	
Paraguay	67	22	11
Peru	47	25	28
Dominican Republic	46	24	30
Uruguay	43	43	15
Venezuela	41	50	9
Average	55	30	17

⁶⁶ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, 2005**

Do you have positive or negative view of the following international actors?

The United Nations

	Positive	Negative	DK/NR
Argentina	27	49	24
Bolivia	40	33	27
Brazil	29	60	11
Chile	68	27	5
Colombia	66	22	12
Costa Rica	68	25	7
Guatemala	48	40	12
México	53	29	18
Panamá	65	24	11
Paraguay	61	22	17
Peru	63	22	15

Portugal	65	15	20
Puerto Rico	74	14	12
Dominican Republic	68	29	3
Uruguay	45	35	20
Venezuela	46	36	18

⁶⁷ Afrobarometer October 2002

Giving marks out of ten, where 0 is very badly and 10 is very well, how well do you think the following institutions do their jobs? Or haven't you heard enough about the institutions to have an opinion?

United Nations

	Average
Mozambique	7.66
Cape Verde	7.38
Uganda	7.25
Ghana	7.2
Mali	6.72
Senegal	5.98
South Africa	5.54

⁸ German Marshall Fund December 2004

Among the following reasons that could explain why you have a favorable opinion of the UN, which one best explains why you have a favorable opinion of the UN? [ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO SAID "FAVORABLE" TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]

	Military actions are not legal unless the UN approves them	Many global problems can't be solved by any single country	We can't afford to pay the whole cost of international actions; we need others to share the cost	All of the above (vol.)	None of the above(vol.)	DK/NR
United States	11	48	33	6	2	1
France	24	57	14	3	1	2
Germany	26	49	18	6	0	1

⁹ German Marshall Fund December 2004

Among the following reasons that could explain why you have an unfavorable opinion of the UN, which one best explains why you have an unfavorable opinion of the UN? [ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO SAID "UNFAVORABLE" TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]

	Other countries should not have a veto when [survey country's] important interests are at stake	The UN is wasteful and inefficient with its money	When we need international action, it has to be done quickly, but the UN slows things down	All of the above (vol.)	None of the above (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	11	27	48	9	5	1
France	22	29	40	2	3	5
Germany	15	35	40	3	4	3

¹⁰ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The United Nations (UN) enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	25	41	16	14	4
France	25	50	14	6	5
Germany	21	50	20	6	3
United Kingdom	33	44	11	6	6
Italy	19	49	18	6	8
Netherlands	31	50	11	4	4
Poland	13	47	12	3	24
Portugal	42	36	8	3	10
Spain	22	51	12	5	11
Slovakia	27	41	14	4	13
Turkey	27	25	18	15	16
European Average	24	45	15	7	9

¹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The United Nations (UN) can manage many of the world's most pressing problems better than any single country

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	25	31	18	25	2
France	31	45	16	7	1
Germany	43	41	12	4	0
United Kingdom	32	35	18	11	4
Italy	33	44	14	7	2
Netherlands	34	45	13	7	2
Poland	29	42	13	3	13
Portugal	54	31	6	3	6
Spain	35	48	8	4	4
Slovakia	31	41	14	5	7
Turkey	26	27	16	16	15
European Average	34	40	14	8	5

⁷² BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

The five permanent members of the Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose additional countries becoming permanent members

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	63	8	1	28
Australia	81	13	3	3

Brazil	73	12	2	14
Canada	84	12	1	3
Chile	55	21	4	20
China	54	33	5	8
France	67	25	1	8
Germany	81	16	1	1
Great Britain	74	21	2	4
India	87	6	1	6
Indonesia	69	21	3	6
Italy	86	9	2	4
Japan	59	5	0	36
Lebanon	72	7	16	5
Mexico	52	14	11	22
Russia	44	28	1	27
Philippines	73	25	1	1
Poland	67	9	2	22
South Africa	76	16	1	7
South Korea	56	40	1	3
Spain	80	7	2	12
Turkey	59	21	3	17
United States	70	23	3	4
Average	69	17	3	11

⁷³ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

Germany

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	48	17	1	27	8
Australia	69	9	1	8	13
Brazil	56	15	2	15	12
Canada	72	13	0	4	12
Chile	49	6	3	21	21
China	42	15	3	8	33
France	65	6	0	4	25
Germany	79	3	0	1	16
Great Britain	63	12	1	4	21
India	45	20	10	19	6
Indonesia	55	15	4	6	21
Italy	72	14	1	4	9
Japan	50	4	0	41	5
Lebanon	64	15	9	6	7
Mexico	35	13	9	28	14
Russia	45	7	3	18	28
Philippines	59	13	1	2	25

Poland	54	13	1	23	9
South Africa	60	15	1	7	16
South Korea	43	14	1	2	40
Spain	66	8	2	16	7
Turkey	41	12	7	20	21
United States	60	13	0	4	23
Average	56	12	3	12	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Germany

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	62	32	4	2
China	41	27	21	11
India	40	22	25	13
South Korea	54	31	14	2

⁷⁴ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

Japan

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	48	17	1	26	8
Australia	67	10	1	9	13
Brazil	61	10	3	14	12
Canada	72	12	0	3	12
Chile	50	6	2	22	21
China	10	51	2	5	33
France	58	11	0	6	25
Germany	64	16	1	2	16
Great Britain	61	15	1	3	20
India	53	15	8	18	6
Indonesia	61	9	3	5	21
Italy	66	20	1	4	9
Japan	64	3	0	29	5
Lebanon	63	15	8	7	7
Mexico	46	10	5	25	14
Russia	41	10	3	18	28
Philippines	68	5	1	1	25
Poland	52	12	1	26	9
South Africa	57	18	1	8	16
South Korea	26	32	0	2	40

Spain	58	15	3	18	7
Turkey	42	10	7	20	21
United States	62	11	0	4	23
Average	54	14	2	12	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Japan

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	66	29	3	2
China	10	75	8	6
India	46	29	16	9
South Korea	18	72	8	1

⁷⁵ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

India

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	51	11	1	29	8
Australia	60	16	2	10	13
Brazil	51	20	1	15	12
Canada	61	20	0	7	12
Chile	44	5	3	26	21
China	31	24	3	9	33
France	45	22	1	8	25
Germany	44	36	1	3	16
Great Britain	62	13	1	4	21
India	88	1	0	4	6
Indonesia	48	19	4	7	21
Italy	61	22	1	7	9
Japan	31	13	0	52	5
Lebanon	48	32	5	9	7
Mexico	38	10	7	30	14
Russia	37	10	4	21	28
Philippines	45	25	2	2	25
Poland	38	20	1	31	9
South Africa	49	24	1	9	16
South Korea	31	26	1	2	40
Spain	52	17	3	20	7
Turkey	24	23	9	23	21
United States	51	19	0	6	23
Average	47	19	2	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

India

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	53	42	4	2
China	37	32	20	11
India	75	11	7	8
South Korea	46	34	18	2

⁷⁶ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

Brazil

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	58	9	1	25	8
Australia	50	22	1	15	13
Brazil	70	6	1	11	12
Canada	61	20	0	7	12
Chile	56	2	2	19	21
China	36	16	4	11	33
France	50	18	1	8	25
Germany	45	33	1	4	16
Great Britain	50	21	2	6	21
India	27	35	10	21	6
Indonesia	43	21	7	8	21
Italy	64	19	1	7	9
Japan	29	12	0	55	5
Lebanon	52	26	8	7	7
Mexico	59	6	5	16	14
Russia	32	13	4	22	28
Philippines	54	15	2	3	25
Poland	43	16	1	31	9
South Africa	47	25	1	10	16
South Korea	30	27	1	3	40
Spain	54	16	4	19	7
Turkey	27	20	9	23	21
United States	51	18	1	8	23
Average	47	18	3	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Brazil

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	52	42	5	2
China	39	25	23	13
India	36	23	25	17
South Korea	41	37	19	3

⁷⁷ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

South Africa

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	53	11	1	28	8
Australia	49	27	2	10	13
Brazil	56	15	2	15	12
Canada	56	25	0	7	12
Chile	43	5	4	27	21
China	39	16	3	10	33
France	44	24	1	7	25
Germany	47	33	1	3	16
Great Britain	49	25	1	4	21
India	34	31	10	19	6
Indonesia	39	24	6	10	21
Italy	59	24	1	6	9
Japan	28	12	0	55	5
Lebanon	50	26	7	10	7
Mexico	24	22	11	28	14
Russia	24	19	4	25	28
Philippines	47	24	2	2	25
Poland	35	24	1	31	9
South Africa	72	6	1	5	16
South Korea	26	30	1	3	40
Spain	50	20	3	20	7
Turkey	25	23	9	22	21
United States	48	23	0	6	23
Average	43	21	3	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

South Africa

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	45	48	5	2

China	38	27	20	15
India	35	25	22	18
South Korea	38	40	19	3

⁷⁸ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

Some say that in order for the European Union to assume a greater international role it needs to do certain things. To what extent do you agree with the following: The European Union should have a single permanent seat on the United Nations (UN) Security Council, even if it replaces the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	13	23	21	34	9
France	20	42	19	15	3
Germany	21	43	21	12	4
United Kingdom	16	21	23	32	8
Italy	25	37	20	8	11
Netherlands	33	32	18	13	4
Poland	21	37	15	7	19
Portugal	39	27	13	7	14
Spain	26	49	11	4	10
Slovakia	25	36	15	7	17
Turkey	18	19	17	21	26
European Average	22	35	18	15	11

⁷⁹ **Eurobarometer 2003**

The European Union already has a Common Security and Foreign Policy and a European Security and Defense Policy. There is now a debate about how much further these should be developed. Do you tend to agree or tend to disagree with each of the following statements?

The European Union should have its own seat on the UN Security Council

	Agree
European Average	63
Belgium	69
Denmark	54
Germany	66
Greece	77
Italy	71
Spain	66
France	67
Ireland	71
Luxemburg	77
Netherlands	75
Portugal	63
United Kingdom	48
Finland	66
Sweden	49
Austria	67

Bulgaria	65
Cyprus	81
Czech Republic	59
Estonia	66
Hungary	68
Latvia	69
Lithuania	67
Malta	66
Poland	68
Romania	60
Slovakia	65
Slovenia	67
Turkey	53

⁸⁰ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

As you may know, there are currently five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, and any one of them can veto (block) any resolution. Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member [if Permanent 5 member (i.e., China, France, Russia, Britain, or United States) add "not even [COUNTRY,]" could veto the decision. Would you favor or oppose this change?

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	48	17	3	32
Australia	75	20	2	3
Brazil	62	19	2	18
Canada	68	26	1	5
Chile	47	22	3	28
China	48	36	5	12
France	44	43	1	12
Germany	70	25	2	3
Great Britain	56	35	3	6
India	77	13	3	7
Indonesia	73	14	4	9
Italy	67	25	2	6
Japan	46	13	0	42
Lebanon	84	9	2	5
Mexico	39	15	16	30
Russia	25	29	10	36
Philippines	58	35	4	3
Poland	52	23	2	24
South Africa	61	29	2	9
South Korea	52	40	5	4
Spain	71	13	2	14
Turkey	53	24	4	18
United States	57	34	2	7
Average	58	24	3	14

⁸¹ **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Having your country's official representative to the United Nations General Assembly be elected by the people of your country.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	81	3	1	1	14
Australia	66	30	1	1	2
Brazil	77	9	1	1	12
Canada	77	19	-	1	3
Chile	80	6	1	2	10
China	79	13	3	1	4
France	74	20	1	2	4
Germany	85	11	1	1	1
Britain	77	19	1	1	2
India	85	6	1	1	7
Indonesia	83	9	5	1	2
Italy	76	18	1	2	3
Mexico	78	6	7	1	8
Philippines	66	29	2	1	2
Poland	75	7	1	6	12
Russia	42	28	5	9	16
South					
Korea	59	37	2	-	2
Turkey	74	8	5	-	12
United States	64	32	1	-	3
Average	74	16	2	2	6

⁸² **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Creating a new UN Parliament, made up of representatives directly elected by citizens, having powers equal to the current UN General Assembly that is controlled by national governments.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	66	6	2	1	26
Australia	56	35	3	1	6
Brazil	73	10	2	-	15
Canada	65	28	1	1	6
Chile	64	7	4	4	21
China	68	20	4	1	7
Germany	66	24	3	1	5
Britain	64	28	1	1	6
India	56	22	10	3	10
Indonesia	73	13	7	2	5
Italy	70	20	1	2	7
Mexico	80	5	8	-	7
Philippines	65	29	2	-	4
Poland	59	9	1	7	23
Russia	33	22	5	10	29
South					
Korea	62	33	1	-	3
Turkey	55	18	10	1	17

United States	55	35	1	-	9
Average	63	20	4	2	11

⁸³ **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Giving leaders of major environmental and social groups, trade unions, and business organizations a formal role in shaping United Nations policies and actions, rather than having only government leaders do this.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	60	11	3	1	25
Australia	61	32	3	-	3
Brazil	70	15	2	-	14
Canada	64	30	1	1	4
Chile	61	8	4	4	22
China	61	28	4	-	8
France	57	31	1	2	8
Germany	57	37	3	1	2
Britain	65	30	1	1	3
India	55	20	8	5	11
Indonesia	70	12	9	2	6
Italy	68	22	2	2	7
Mexico	77	6	10	-	7
Philippines	72	21	3	1	3
Poland	52	16	2	6	24
Russia	36	19	5	9	31
South Korea	61	35	2	-	3
Turkey	56	16	9	1	18
United States	52	43	1	-	3
Average	61	23	4	2	11

⁸⁴ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2002**

Here is a list of groups, organizations. For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of international organizations like the World Bank, IMF, and the World Trade Organization very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in (survey country)?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	DK/R
United States	10	50	18	8	14
Canada	11	53	15	7	15
Argentina	3	13	24	42	18
Bolivia	17	47	19	6	11
Brazil	2	28	34	14	22
Guatemala	27	46	12	6	10
Honduras	22	47	13	3	16
Mexico	16	43	15	5	21
Peru	16	39	12	8	25
Venezuela	28	40	19	9	4
Great Britain	12	55	19	4	10

France	8	58	22	6	7
Italy	12	46	18	5	19
Germany	9	57	24	3	7
Bulgaria	10	38	17	6	29
Czech Republic	8	62	19	2	9
Poland	4	46	18	3	29
Russia	3	39	17	10	31
Slovakia	8	66	15	3	8
Ukraine	18	44	14	10	14
Angola	26	48	7	4	15
Ghana	32	40	11	2	14
Ivory Coast	39	48	9	4	0
Kenya	40	31	13	10	6
Mali	25	44	8	6	18
Nigeria	34	45	7	4	11
Senegal	37	44	9	5	5
South Africa	30	38	7	6	19
Tanzania	18	35	12	4	32
Uganda	32	31	6	3	27
Bangladesh	16	26	9	8	41
China	20	50	5	1	25
India	29	21	4	5	41
Indonesia	13	35	22	8	22
Japan	9	48	17	1	25
Philippines	26	55	9	2	7
South Korea	5	53	21	5	16
Vietnam	52	33	2	1	12
Jordan	7	25	29	34	5
Lebanon	15	29	20	14	23
Pakistan	9	14	8	10	59
Turkey	8	16	17	40	20
Uzbekistan	40	45	4	1	10
Average	19	41	14	8	18

⁸⁵ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2006

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world:

The World Bank.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/ No difference	DK/NA (vol)
Afghanistan	79	7	5	2	7
Argentina	26	47	4	1	23
Australia	42	34	5	4	16
Brazil	48	34	3	2	12
Canada	43	28	3	4	22
Congo	75	6	11	2	6
Finland	59	21	8	2	11
France	48	28	5	1	17
Germany	51	20	9	5	15
Ghana	76	6	9	0	8

Great Britain	45	37	2	4	13
India	51	9	19	4	17
Indonesia	80	12	6	0	2
Iran	42	21	13	12	11
Iraq	44	18	29	2	6
Italy	37	27	6	7	24
Kenya	81	5	6	1	7
Mexico	44	22	14	8	13
Nigeria	83	6	5	2	4
Philippines	69	16	6	1	8
Poland	60	7	4	2	26
Russia	41	10	13	6	30
Saudi Arabia	55	12	20	3	10
Senegal	74	6	7	2	12
South Africa	58	5	7	4	27
South Korea	66	29	1	1	4
Spain	55	22	10	2	12
Sri Lanka	44	8	6	1	41
Tanzania	79	8	8	2	3
Turkey	30	28	20	6	15
United States	47	28	4	5	17
Zimbabwe	43	19	18	5	15
Average	55	18	9	3	14

⁸⁶ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world

The International Monetary Fund.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/No difference (vol.)	DK/NA/ (vol)
Afghanistan	36	13	20	6	24
Argentina	19	60	3	1	18
Australia	35	30	5	4	27
Brazil	27	57	3	2	12
Canada	38	25	3	4	30
Congo	66	10	13	1	10
Finland	53	17	6	3	21
France	42	31	6	1	21
Germany	49	16	10	6	19
Ghana	66	9	13	2	11
Great Britain	44	30	2	4	21
India	39	10	21	10	21
Indonesia	64	24	8	1	3
Iran	38	24	15	11	12
Iraq	39	22	30	3	6
Italy	38	25	5	7	25

Kenya	73	8	7	1	11
Mexico	47	21	15	5	12
Nigeria	67	16	6	2	9
Philippines	62	19	5	1	14
Poland	57	6	5	3	29
Russia	36	14	13	6	31
Saudi Arabia	52	9	23	4	11
Senegal	67	6	9	2	16
South Africa	39	7	10	4	39
South Korea	64	33	1	1	1
Spain	53	24	9	1	13
Sri Lanka	38	7	5	1	48
Tanzania	66	14	13	3	4
Turkey	15	49	19	5	12
United States	37	26	3	6	29
Zimbabwe	38	23	21	6	13
Average	47	21	10	6	18

⁸⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The World Bank

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar / Decline
United States	46°	50°	8	14	27	6	20	25
Armenia	63°	60°	35	16	24	4	14	7
China	74°	75°	40	28	9	2	2	19
India	60°	70°	35	18	11	5	21	10
Palestinian Territories	40°	50°	13	11	23	3	35	15
South Korea	61°	60°	19	39	33	4	5	0
Thailand	67°	--	30	7	26	1	7	29
Average	59°	63°	26	19	22	4	15	15

⁸⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF)

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees (percent)	75-51 degrees (percent)	50 degrees (percent)	49-31 degrees (percent)	30-0 degrees (percent)	Not familiar / Decline (percent)
United States	44°	50°	6	13	24	6	20	30
Armenia	50°	50°	15	13	24	7	21	19
China	70°	70°	27	28	11	2	2	31
India	55°	60°	24	22	15	7	20	12
Palestinian Territories	38°	50°	10	11	24	3	34	19
South Korea	59°	60°	19	35	31	7	7	0
Thailand	65°	--	29	8	25	2	9	28
Average	54°	58°	19	19	22	5	16	20

⁸⁹ Gallup International Voice of the People 2005

Which, if any, of the following global institutions have you heard of?

World Bank

	Not mentioned	Mentioned	Total
Austria	53	48	100
Denmark	10	90	100
Finland	13	87	100
France	32	68	100
Germany	15	85	100
Greece	42	58	100
Ireland	15	85	100
Italy	28	73	100
Netherlands	33	67	100
Norway	18	82	100
Portugal	22	78	100
Spain	54	46	100
Switzerland	14	86	100
United Kingdom	27	73	100
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	95	100
Bulgaria	28	72	100
Croatia	9	91	100
Czech Republic	21	79	100
Kosovo	32	69	100
Lithuania	43	58	100
Macedonia	19	81	100
Moldova	23	77	100
Poland	25	75	100
Romania	22	78	100
Russia	32	68	100
Serbia	10	90	100
Ukraine	35	65	100
Egypt	20	80	100
Israel	13	87	100
Turkey	21	79	100
Argentina	32	68	100

Bolivia	25	75	100
Canada	26	74	100
Colombia	30	70	100
Costa Rica	28	72	100
Ecuador	35	65	100
Guatemala	45	55	100
Mexico	32	68	100
Nicaragua	22	78	100
Panama	37	63	100
Dominican Republic	23	77	100
Peru	31	69	100
Uruguay	17	83	100
United States	43	58	100
Venezuela	59	41	100
Hong Kong	35	65	100
Indonesia	42	58	100
India	24	76	100
South Korea	29	71	100
Malaysia	25	75	100
Pakistan	34	66	100
Philippines	31	69	100
Singapore	34	67	100
Taiwan	53	47	100
Thailand	32	68	100
Vietnam	50	50	100
Cameroon	5	95	100
Kenya	24	76	100
Nigeria	12	88	100
South Africa	47	53	100
Ghana	9	91	100
Senegal	26	74	100
Togo	18	82	100
Ethiopia	22	78	100
Paraguay	22	78	100
Iceland	17	83	100
Japan	57	43	100
Total	28	72	100

⁹⁰ Gallup International Voice of the People 2005

And is your overall opinion of the World Bank positive, neutral or negative?

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	DK/NA	Total
Austria	10	9	22	7	48
Denmark	29	49	10	2	90
Finland	16	52	13	7	87
France	22	30	10	5	68
Germany	11	50	21	4	85
Greece	17	25	15	1	58
Ireland	20	34	25	6	85
Italy	25	28	15	5	73

Netherlands	15	43	4	5	67
Norway	13	42	17	10	82
Portugal	46	18	7	7	78
Spain	16	21	6	3	46
Switzerland	21	40	17	8	86
United Kingdom	16	35	16	5	73
Bosnia and Herzegovina	43	36	12	4	95
Bulgaria	33	26	5	8	72
Croatia	28	38	21	4	91
Czech Republic	23	41	9	6	79
Kosovo	47	16	1	4	69
Lithuania	33	18	3	4	58
Macedonia	35	28	14	5	81
Moldova	47	22	2	6	77
Poland	28	39	5	3	75
Romania	40	22	8	7	78
Russia	23	39	6	0	68
Serbia	25	38	20	7	90
Ukraine	27	26	5	6	65
Egypt	39	18	9	14	80
Israel	42	33	8	4	87
Turkey	22	18	32	8	79
Argentina	8	18	32	9	68
Bolivia	30	17	26	2	75
Canada	18	35	15	6	74
Colombia	28	22	14	6	70
Costa Rica	30	16	18	9	72
Ecuador	16	22	25	2	65
Guatemala	20	24	8	3	55
Mexico	26	27	13	2	68
Nicaragua	60	10	6	2	78
Panama	31	15	13	4	63
Dominican Republic	49	11	12	5	77
Peru	30	23	12	4	69
Uruguay	17	23	30	14	83
United States	13	30	12	3	58
Venezuela	20	14	5	1	41
Hong Kong	20	34	5	5	65
Indonesia	23	27	7	1	58
India	51	12	3	9	76
South Korea	22	39	4	5	71
Malaysia	33	24	6	11	75
Pakistan	22	22	10	13	66
Philippines	50	10	8	1	69
Singapore	23	33	5	6	67

Taiwan	13	25	3	6	47
Thailand	24	35	5	4	68
Vietnam	30	16	2	2	50
Cameroon	48	23	14	10	95
Kenya	48	16	8	4	76
Nigeria	55	23	9	0	88
South Africa	24	20	5	4	53
Ghana	63	19	6	4	91
Senegal	52	7	5	9	74
Togo	57	9	8	8	82
Ethiopia	49	18	10	1	78
Paraguay	36	24	12	6	78
Iceland	26	45	6	6	83
Japan	10	30	1	1	43
Total	29	26	11	5	71

⁹¹ **Gallup International Voice of the People 2005**

Which, if any, of the following global institutions have you heard of?

International Monetary Fund

	Not mentioned	Mentioned	Total
Austria	56	44	100
Denmark	60	40	100
Finland	19	81	100
France	25	75	100
Germany	14	86	100
Greece	23	77	100
Ireland	25	75	100
Italy	17	83	100
Netherlands	33	67	100
Norway	39	61	100
Portugal	25	75	100
Spain	54	46	100
Switzerland	14	86	100
United Kingdom	23	77	100
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6	94	100
Bulgaria	18	82	100
Croatia	4	96	100
Czech Republic	20	80	100
Kosovo	46	54	100
Lithuania	50	50	100
Macedonia	20	80	100
Moldova	38	62	100

Poland	43	57	100
Romania	19	81	100
Russia	34	66	100
Serbia	9	91	100
Ukraine	32	68	100
Egypt	29	71	100
Israel	23	77	100
Turkey	18	82	100
Argentina	17	83	100
Bolivia	39	61	100
Canada	38	62	100
Colombia	26	74	100
Costa Rica	25	75	100
Ecuador	30	70	100
Guatemala	54	46	100
Mexico	38	62	100
Nicaragua	28	72	100
Panama	40	60	100
Dominican Republic	11	89	100
Peru	35	65	100
Uruguay	8	92	100
United States	57	43	100
Venezuela	59	41	100
Hong Kong	13	87	100
Indonesia	28	72	100
India	67	33	100
South Korea	6	94	100
Malaysia	42	58	100
Pakistan	42	58	100
Philippines	50	50	100
Singapore	36	64	100
Taiwan	44	56	100
Thailand	21	79	100
Vietnam	58	42	100
Cameroon	8	92	100
Kenya	37	63	100
Nigeria	25	75	100
South Africa	69	31	100
Ghana	30	70	100
Senegal	34	66	100
Togo	26	74	100
Ethiopia	46	54	100
Paraguay	24	76	100
Iceland	25	75	100
Japan	47	53	100

Total	32	68	100
--------------	----	----	-----

⁹² Gallup International Voice of the People 2005

And is your overall opinion of the International Monetary Fund positive, neutral or negative?

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	DK/NA	Total
Austria	8	9	21	7	44
Denmark	11	24	3	2	40
Finland	12	53	10	7	81
France	22	34	13	6	75
Germany	15	47	21	3	86
Greece	23	36	17	1	77
Ireland	22	31	18	4	75
Italy	28	34	16	4	83
Netherlands	16	41	5	5	67
Norway	6	32	12	11	61
Portugal	33	25	8	8	75
Spain	21	15	6	4	46
Switzerland	22	43	11	9	86
United Kingdom	18	39	14	6	77
Bosnia and Herzegovina	40	39	12	4	94
Bulgaria	32	28	12	10	82
Croatia	30	38	26	3	96
Czech Republic	21	40	12	7	80
Kosovo	36	12	1	4	54
Lithuania	26	19	1	4	50
Macedonia	30	26	19	5	80
Moldova	35	18	3	6	62
Poland	16	34	4	3	57
Romania	37	22	14	7	81
Russia	20	38	8	0	66
Serbia	25	38	20	8	91
Ukraine	29	26	7	7	68
Egypt	28	17	12	14	71
Israel	38	28	6	6	77
Turkey	13	14	49	7	82
Argentina	7	17	50	9	83
Bolivia	21	15	23	2	61
Canada	16	28	14	4	62
Colombia	26	23	18	7	74
Costa Rica	28	16	20	10	75
Ecuador	13	22	32	3	70
Guatemala	17	19	6	3	46
Mexico	23	26	11	1	62

Nicaragua	50	12	8	2	72
Panama	29	14	13	4	60
Dominican Republic	47	13	25	4	89
Peru	24	23	15	3	65
Uruguay	18	21	43	10	92
United States	9	23	8	3	43
Venezuela	22	11	6	1	41
Hong Kong	28	46	6	7	87
Indonesia	33	25	13	1	72
India	17	9	3	5	33
South Korea	32	42	16	4	94
Malaysia	24	18	8	8	58
Pakistan	19	17	9	11	58
Philippines	33	9	8	1	50
Singapore	22	29	7	6	64
Taiwan	18	26	5	7	56
Thailand	21	34	20	4	79
Vietnam	24	15	1	3	42
Cameroon	46	21	14	11	92
Kenya	36	14	10	3	63
Nigeria	44	18	13	1	75
South Africa	13	13	3	2	31
Ghana	44	16	6	4	70
Senegal	42	9	4	11	66
Togo	46	11	7	9	74
Ethiopia	28	16	8	2	54
Paraguay	34	24	14	4	76
Iceland	23	41	4	7	75
Japan	13	37	2	1	53
Total	24	24	13	5	67

⁹³ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Country	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	14	59	27
Bolivia	34	42	24
Brazil	31	47	22
Chile	37	25	38
Colombia	53	23	24
Costa Rica	53	29	18
Ecuador	26	52	22
Guatemala	56	34	10
Honduras	58	25	17
Mexico	45	23	32

Nicaragua	51	33	16
Panama	43	57	
Paraguay	63	25	12
Peru	35	29	36
Dominican Republic	41	26	33
El Salvador	35	36	29
Uruguay	28	58	14
Venezuela	32	45	23
Average	41	37	23

⁹⁴ **Afrobarometer January 2003**

Giving marks out of ten, where 0 is very badly and 10 is very well, how well do you think the following institutions do their jobs? Or haven't you heard enough about the institution to have an opinion?

United Nations.

	World Bank	IMF
Average of 7 African Countries	6.78	6.4

⁹⁵ **German Marshall Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey 2006**

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of:

The WTO, the World Trade Organization

	Favorable	Unfavorable	DK/NR
Denmark	52	30	18
France	51	44	5
Italy	68	19	13
Portugal	47	14	39
Slovakia	44	31	26
United Kingdom	56	22	22
United States	48	32	20
Average	52	29	19

⁹⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002**

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

The World Bank.

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	52	38	10
France	53	39	8
Germany	47	44	8
The Netherlands	57	33	10
Italy	72	26	12

Poland	54	24	21
European Average	53	36	11
United States	49	39	12

⁹⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002**

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

The IMF

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	50	38	12
France	59	30	11
Germany	41	53	6
The Netherlands	55	35	10
Italy	70	19	11
Poland	49	25	26
European Average	53	35	12
United States	42	38	20

⁹⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

The World Trade Organization was established to rule on disputes over trade treaties. If another country files a complaint with the World Trade Organization and it rules against [survey country], as a general rule, should [survey country] comply with that decision or not?

	Yes	No	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	73	22	3	1
Armenia	26	35	24	14
China	58	19	16	8
India	37	29	21	14
Mexico	53	21	18	8
Philippines	48	49	n/a	3
South Korea	37	52	10	1
Thailand	34	17	25	24
Ukraine	40	12	29	19
Average	45	28	18	10

⁹⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

As you may know when there is a dispute about whether a country is abiding by international law, the case is tried in front of the International Court of Justice, also called the World Court. It is comprised of fifteen justices from around the world. If there were a case involving [country], how confident are you the Court's decision would be fair and impartial? Would you say that you are:

	Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not very confident	Not at all confident	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Mexico	14	28	38	15	2	3

United States	8	49	31	11	-	1
France	15	54	19	6	2	4
Germany	29	45	17	4	2	3
Great Britain	13	55	23	7	1	2
Poland	24	49	13	3	7	4
Russia	5	20	35	14	10	17
Ukraine	11	33	20	9	11	16
Egypt	22	45	18	9	6	0
Iraq	15	24	23	17	3	19
Pakistan	14	33	20	23	2	7
Palestinian Territories	6	40	38	14	1	1
Turkey	10	23	25	26	3	13
Kenya	40	39	15	2	2	2
Nigeria	30	36	22	9	1	2
China	17	45	22	4	5	7
Macau	20	45	14	4	5	12
India	20	33	18	14	11	4
Indonesia	5	31	48	3	3	10
South Korea	3	37	52	7	0	1
Taiwan	10	44	31	8	-	7
Average	16	38	26	10	4	6

*Macau, Taiwan not included in average

¹⁰⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

As you may know the International Criminal Court has charged the President of Sudan, Omar Bashir with war crimes and crimes against humanity for his role in displacing and killing civilians. Do you approve or disapprove of the International Criminal Court taking this action?

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/Ref
Egypt	47	52	2
Iraq	35	37	28
Pakistan	39	32	29
Palestinian Territories	25	70	5
Turkey	51	22	27
Kenya	77	19	4
Nigeria	71	24	5
Average	49	37	14

¹⁰¹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

Some people say that NATO is still essential to our country's security. Others say it is no longer essential. Which of these views is closer to your own?

	Still essential	No longer essential	DK/R
European Average	57	30	10
United States	59	32	9
France	62	34	4
Germany	62	36	2
United Kingdom	68	25	7

Italy	55	41	4
Netherlands	70	26	4
Poland	51	32	18
Portugal	60	30	10
Spain	60	35	5
Slovakia	47	27	26
Turkey	38	32	31
Bulgaria	54	25	21
Romania	57	19	24

¹⁰² Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

NATO

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	66	28	6
France	62	33	5
Germany	62	34	4
The Netherlands	62	36	3
Italy	61	34	5
Poland	68	19	12
European Average	63	31	6
United States	61	29	10

¹⁰³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

Overall, do you think the [NATIONALITY] government is spending too much, too little, or about the right amount in support of the NATO alliance?

	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/R
United States	32	17	35	16
Turkey	23	11	31	35

¹⁰⁴ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

NATO allows democratic countries to act together.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European Average	24	47	14	7	8
United States	30	43	10	6	11
France	20	54	15	7	4
Germany	24	54	15	5	4
United Kingdom	33	45	9	5	9
Italy	15	49	20	11	6

Netherlands	35	50	8	4	3
Poland	18	47	13	3	19
Portugal	40	35	9	3	13
Spain	24	51	10	6	9
Slovakia	20	44	14	11	10
Turkey	27	30	16	13	14

¹⁰⁵ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

[EUROPE] NATO enables European countries to influence the United States when it is considering military action
 [UNITED STATES] NATO can help the United States share its military burden

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European Average	16	34	25	16	9
United States	34	41	10	8	8
France	16	35	26	20	4
Germany	18	35	29	15	3
United Kingdom	23	36	17	14	9
Italy	10	31	30	23	6
Netherlands	24	42	21	11	3
Poland	10	38	24	9	19
Portugal	24	30	18	15	13
Spain	13	30	29	17	11
Slovakia	14	35	20	17	14
Turkey	21	27	19	15	17

¹⁰⁶ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

[EUROPE] NATO is dominated by the United States, Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States
 [UNITED STATES] The United States is stretched too thin, Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European Average	30	36	18	9	7
United States	34	32	16	11	7
France	32	29	20	5	3
Germany	32	34	23	9	2
United Kingdom	32	31	18	12	7
Italy	29	45	16	7	4
Netherlands	30	39	18	10	3
Poland	26	34	19	6	16
Portugal	36	27	16	10	12
Spain	29	39	17	7	9
Slovakia	32	32	15	8	13
Turkey	29	27	14	13	17

¹⁰⁷ Eurobarometer November 2003

In your opinion, should decisions concerning European defense policy be taken by national governments, by NATO or by the European Union?

	National governments	NATO	The European Union	Other (vol.)	Don't Know
Belgium	17	19	49	1	14
Denmark	32	29	29	1	9
Germany	24	15	44	1	16
Greece	25	1	66	0	8
Spain	23	13	46	2	15
France	22	9	49	1	19
Ireland	34	9	34	1	23
Italy	11	12	66	1	10
Luxembourg	16	16	53	3	12
Netherlands	21	26	43	1	10
Austria	36	9	40	2	13
Portugal	32	7	46	2	14
Finland	46	3	42	1	8
Sweden	37	7	40	1	15
United Kingdom	32	24	23	1	21
European Average	24	15	45	1	15

¹⁰⁸ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To defend a NATO ally that has been attacked

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/NR
European Average	75	19	6
France	79	16	5
Germany	74	22	4
United Kingdom	85	10	5
Italy	67	27	5
Netherlands	86	11	3
Poland	73	19	8
Portugal	70	13	17
Spain	69	23	9
Slovakia	50	28	22
Turkey	60	27	13
United States	87	9	4

¹⁰⁹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent do you tend to agree or disagree that all NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action? [If respondent asks: "NATO is the Alliance among the United States, Canada, and many European states".]

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NR	Agree	Disagree
European Average	24	33	20	16	8	57	35
France	19	43	21	15	2	62	36

Germany	22	33	27	15	2	56	43
United Kingdom	50	32	9	6	3	82	15
Italy	17	34	26	22	2	51	48
Netherlands	53	28	8	8	2	82	16
Poland	19	38	21	10	12	57	31
Portugal	31	38	12	14	6	68	26
Spain	24	32	19	22	3	56	41
Slovakia	9	28	33	15	14	37	49
Turkey	11	18	14	23	35	28	37
Belgium	17	25	24	23	11	42	47
Romania	25	39	19	7	12	63	25
United States	54	28	7	5	6	82	12

¹¹⁰ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent do you agree or disagree that all NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NR	Agree	Disagree
European Average	28	30	18	16	8	58	34
France	24	38	19	17	2	62	36
Germany	32	30	20	16	1	62	36
United Kingdom	56	24	9	8	3	80	17
Italy	18	33	25	22	3	50	47
Netherlands	59	23	8	8	2	82	17
Poland	20	37	22	10	11	57	32
Portugal	29	35	15	15	7	64	29
Spain	28	32	17	20	2	60	37
Slovakia	9	28	32	20	11	37	52
Turkey	9	18	14	23	37	27	36
Belgium	16	25	22	25	13	41	47
Romania	26	42	16	6	11	67	21
United States	60	22	7	6	5	82	13

¹¹¹ Eurobarometer November 2008

Generally speaking, do you think that (OUR COUNTRY)'s membership of the European Union is a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good nor bad?

	Good	Bad	Neither	DK/R
Belgium	65	12	22	1
Bulgaria	48	7	37	8
Czech Republic	46	12	40	2
Denmark	64	16	19	1
Germany	64	11	22	3
Estonia	61	6	32	1
Greece	45	12	43	0
Spain	62	11	17	10
France	49	21	27	3
Ireland	67	9	16	6
Italy	40	15	37	8
Cyprus	40	21	37	2
Lithuania	55	10	29	6
Latvia	27	21	49	3
Luxembourg	71	10	17	2

Hungary	31	21	45	3
Malta	46	14	36	4
The Netherlands	80	7	12	1
Austria	39	21	38	2
Poland	65	7	25	3
Portugal	50	17	24	9
Romania	66	7	22	5
Slovenia	59	11	29	1
Slovakia	62	5	31	2
Finland	48	18	33	1
Sweden	59	17	23	1
United Kingdom	32	30	31	7
Average	53	15	27	5

¹¹² Eurobarometer November 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the (NATIONALITY) Government, or made jointly within the European Union?

Fighting Terrorism

	Government	Within EU	DK/R
Belgium	14	85	1
Bulgaria	9	84	7
Czech Republic	11	88	1
Denmark	9	90	1
Germany	12	87	2
Estonia	9	88	3
Greece	23	77	0
Spain	33	63	4
France	15	82	3
Ireland	22	72	6
Italy	23	70	7
Cyprus	18	79	3
Lithuania	11	85	4
Latvia	8	89	3
Luxembourg	9	89	2
Hungary	9	90	1
Malta	12	85	3
The Netherlands	8	91	1
Austria	22	76	2
Poland	11	85	4
Portugal	17	77	6
Romania	14	80	6
Slovenia	16	82	2
Slovakia	7	92	1
Finland	13	86	1
Sweden	8	90	2
United Kingdom	29	67	4
Average	18	70	3

¹¹³ Eurobarometer November 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the (NATIONALITY) Government, or made jointly within the European Union?

Defense and Foreign Affairs

Government	Within EU	DK/R
------------	-----------	------

Belgium	31	64	5
Bulgaria	24	74	2
Czech Republic	22	77	1
Denmark	38	59	3
Germany	22	76	2
Estonia	23	73	4
Greece	41	59	0
Spain	38	56	6
France	22	74	4
Ireland	34	59	7
Italy	22	70	8
Cyprus	25	72	3
Lithuania	21	73	6
Latvia	22	74	4
Luxembourg	18	79	3
Hungary	20	77	3
Malta	19	73	8
The Netherlands	39	59	2
Austria	38	60	2
Poland	28	65	7
Portugal	25	66	9
Romania	28	65	7
Slovenia	29	69	2
Slovakia	13	85	2
Finland	80	18	2
Sweden	50	46	4
United Kingdom	51	43	6
Average	31	64	5

¹¹⁴ Eurobarometer November 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the (NATIONALITY) Government, or made jointly within the European Union?

Energy	Government	Within EU	DK/R
Belgium	33	63	4
Bulgaria	35	56	9
Czech Republic	42	57	1
Denmark	30	68	2
Germany	24	75	1
Estonia	35	62	3
Greece	25	75	0
Spain	44	50	6
France	26	71	3
Ireland	37	57	6
Italy	28	65	7
Cyprus	16	80	4
Lithuania	25	70	5
Latvia	21	76	3
Luxembourg	33	66	1
Hungary	29	69	2
Malta	32	64	4
The Netherlands	29	69	2
Austria	56	41	3
Poland	28	65	7
Portugal	27	64	9
Romania	36	58	6
Slovenia	32	66	2
Slovakia	36	63	1

Finland	53	45	2
Sweden	36	62	2
United Kingdom	51	46	3
Average	33	63	4

¹¹⁵ **Eurobarometer November 2008**

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the [Nationality] Government or made jointly with the European Union?

Science and technological research

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	20	78	2
Bulgaria	17	73	10
Czech Republic	21	78	1
Denmark	23	74	3
Germany	26	73	1
Estonia	17	79	4
Greece	14	86	0
Spain	33	60	7
France	19	78	3
Ireland	20	73	7
Italy	24	69	7
Cyprus	9	88	3
Latvia	15	81	4
Lithuania	18	76	6
Luxembourg	12	86	2
Hungary	18	80	2
Malta	12	81	7
Netherlands	22	77	1
Austria	32	65	3
Poland	18	76	6
Portugal	19	72	9
Romania	30	63	7
Slovenia	24	74	2
Slovakia	13	86	1
Finland	33	65	2
Sweden	21	77	2
United Kingdom	29	65	0
European Average	24	72	4

Protecting the environment

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	29	70	1
Bulgaria	37	55	8
Czech Republic	34	65	1
Denmark	31	68	1

Germany	18	81	1
Estonia	40	57	3
Greece	25	75	0
Spain	36	59	5
France	24	74	2
Ireland	44	51	5
Italy	32	60	8
Cyprus	21	76	3
Latvia	40	57	3
Lithuania	40	55	5
Luxembourg	29	70	1
Hungary	27	72	1
Malta	42	56	2
Netherlands	17	82	1
Austria	43	56	1
Poland	30	65	5
Portugal	26	67	7
Romania	39	55	6
Slovenia	36	63	1
Slovakia	31	68	1
Finland	49	50	1
Sweden	23	76	1
United Kingdom	39	57	4
European Average	30	67	3

Support for regions facing economic difficulties

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	32	65	3
Bulgaria	20	71	9
Czech Republic	45	54	1
Denmark	40	57	3
Germany	29	70	1
Estonia	28	68	4
Greece	23	77	0
Spain	39	55	6
France	45	52	3
Ireland	21	72	7
Italy	42	50	8
Cyprus	13	83	4
Latvia	25	71	4
Lithuania	17	81	2
Luxembourg	26	71	3
Hungary	12	81	7
Malta	11	87	2
Netherlands	43	55	2
Austria	43	55	2
Poland	27	67	6
Portugal	21	71	8
Romania	25	68	7
Slovenia	34	64	2

Slovakia	26	73	1
Finland	38	69	2
Sweden	23	74	3
United Kingdom	42	53	5
European Average	34	62	4
Immigration			
		Jointly with the European Union	DK
	Government		
Belgium	30	69	1
Bulgaria	26	64	10
Czech Republic	41	57	2
Denmark	55	44	1
Germany	34	64	2
Estonia	52	44	4
Greece	51	49	0
Spain	35	61	4
France	27	69	4
Ireland	42	53	5
Italy	25	68	7
Cyprus	31	65	4
Latvia	29	66	5
Lithuania	30	64	6
Luxembourg	45	53	2
Hungary	34	63	3
Malta	22	76	2
Netherlands	38	61	1
Austria	62	37	1
Poland	27	64	9
Portugal	29	64	7
Romania	22	71	7
Slovenia	31	66	3
Slovakia	29	70	1
Finland	82	17	1
Sweden	51	48	1
United Kingdom	54	43	3
European Average	36	60	4

Fighting Crime

		Jointly with the European Union	DK
	Government		
Belgium	34	66	0
Bulgaria	33	60	7
Czech Republic	25	74	1
Denmark	35	64	1
Germany	23	77	0
Estonia	34	63	3
Greece	50	50	0

Spain	54	43	3
France	42	55	3
Ireland	54	41	5
Italy	33	60	7
Cyprus	32	65	3
Latvia	25	72	3
Lithuania	33	63	4
Luxembourg	31	68	1
Hungary	22	77	1
Malta	47	50	3
Netherlands	36	63	1
Austria	41	57	2
Poland	39	66	4
Portugal	21	73	6
Romania	32	62	6
Slovenia	27	71	2
Slovakia	21	78	1
Finland	34	65	1
Sweden	42	57	1
United Kingdom	63	34	3
European Average	38	59	3

Competition

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	28	69	3
Bulgaria	37	50	13
Czech Republic	48	49	3
Denmark	33	61	6
Germany	26	69	5
Estonia	39	52	9
Greece	43	57	0
Spain	41	44	15
France	31	63	6
Ireland	35	57	8
Italy	34	57	9
Cyprus	28	67	5
Latvia	34	58	8
Lithuania	33	55	12
Luxembourg	26	67	5
Hungary	39	62	8
Malta	37	59	13
Netherlands	25	71	4
Austria	44	50	6
Poland	34	53	13
Portugal	33	55	12
Romania	41	59	9
Slovenia	34	62	4
Slovakia	31	66	3
Finland	47	47	6

Sweden	31	63	6
United Kingdom	45	44	11
European Average	35	57	8

Fighting inflation

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	31	67	2
Bulgaria	48	43	9
Czech Republic	52	46	2
Denmark	37	60	3
Germany	27	71	2
Estonia	43	54	3
Greece	43	55	0
Spain	52	43	5
France	39	57	4
Ireland	52	42	6
Italy	36	56	8
Cyprus	31	66	3
Latvia	41	55	4
Lithuania	32	63	5
Luxembourg	35	63	2
Hungary	52	46	2
Malta	49	46	5
Netherlands	25	73	2
Austria	46	52	2
Poland	45	48	7
Portugal	29	63	8
Romania	50	44	6
Slovenia	41	57	2
Slovakia	33	65	2
Finland	45	54	1
Sweden	47	47	6
United Kingdom	57	39	4
European Average	42	54	4

Economy

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	35	63	2
Bulgaria	36	55	9
Czech Republic	55	43	2
Denmark	66	31	3
Germany	39	60	1
Estonia	42	54	4
Greece	52	48	0
Spain	49	45	6
France	43	54	3

Ireland	58	36	6
Italy	33	60	7
Cyprus	30	68	2
Latvia	34	62	4
Lithuania	27	69	4
Luxembourg	40	57	3
Hungary	44	54	2
Malta	48	47	5
Netherlands	32	65	3
Austria	47	51	2
Poland	41	53	6
Portugal	28	63	9
Romania	47	48	5
Slovenia	46	52	2
Slovakia	35	63	2
Finland	76	22	2
Sweden	67	31	2
United Kingdom	63	34	3
European Average	45	51	4

Agriculture and fishery

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	32	67	1
Bulgaria	45	47	8
Czech Republic	61	38	1
Denmark	38	60	2
Germany	32	66	2
Estonia	52	45	3
Greece	54	46	0
Spain	49	42	9
France	43	52	5
Ireland	44	50	6
Italy	43	48	9
Cyprus	25	71	4
Latvia	50	47	3
Lithuania	41	54	5
Luxembourg	38	59	3
Hungary	50	48	2
Malta	47	48	5
Netherlands	31	67	2
Austria	57	41	2
Poland	41	51	8
Portugal	35	58	7
Romania	61	35	4
Slovenia	44	54	2
Slovakia	45	54	1
Finland	85	14	1
Sweden	42	56	2
United Kingdom	54	40	6

European Average	45	50	5
Transportation			
	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	31	67	2
Bulgaria	50	41	9
Czech Republic	57	47	1
Denmark	44	53	3
Germany	37	61	2
Estonia	55	41	4
Greece	69	31	0
Spain	56	38	6
France	49	48	3
Ireland	54	39	7
Italy	38	55	7
Cyprus	31	64	5
Latvia	42	55	3
Lithuania	45	49	6
Luxembourg	42	56	2
Hungary	58	49	2
Malta	69	26	5
Netherlands	50	49	1
Austria	58	39	3
Poland	30	63	7
Portugal	45	47	8
Romania	53	41	6
Slovenia	35	62	3
Slovakia	49	49	2
Finland	77	22	1
Sweden	27	71	2
United Kingdom	71	25	3
European Average	48	48	4

Consumer protection

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	43	56	1
Bulgaria	36	55	9
Czech Republic	42	57	1
Denmark	51	46	3
Germany	37	61	2
Estonia	60	36	4
Greece	49	51	0
Spain	55	41	4
France	50	48	2
Ireland	38	56	6
Italy	44	48	8

Cyprus	26	72	2
Latvia	44	51	5
Lithuania	39	53	8
Luxembourg	49	49	2
Hungary	50	48	2
Malta	57	39	4
Netherlands	45	53	2
Austria	63	35	2
Poland	38	55	7
Portugal	35	57	8
Romania	59	36	5
Slovenia	44	54	2
Slovakia	35	75	1
Finland	68	30	2
Sweden	52	45	3
United Kingdom	61	34	5
European Average	48	48	4

Fighting unemployment

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	57	42	1
Bulgaria	61	32	7
Czech Republic	55	43	2
Denmark	72	27	1
Germany	55	44	1
Estonia	54	42	4
Greece	51	49	0
Spain	58	39	3
France	63	35	2
Ireland	61	34	5
Italy	47	46	7
Cyprus	46	51	3
Latvia	46	48	4
Lithuania	46	50	4
Luxembourg	64	35	1
Hungary	57	42	1
Malta	35	42	3
Netherlands	64	35	1
Austria	62	35	3
Poland	50	45	5
Portugal	36	58	6
Romania	60	34	6
Slovenia	49	49	2
Slovakia	40	59	1
Finland	78	21	1
Sweden	58	41	1
United Kingdom	69	27	4
European Average	57	40	3

Health

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	66	33	1
Bulgaria	61	32	7
Czech Republic	58	41	1
Denmark	73	26	1
Germany	65	33	2
Estonia	53	44	3
Greece	64	36	0
Spain	67	30	3
France	69	30	1
Ireland	74	21	5
Italy	50	44	6
Cyprus	25	72	3
Latvia	48	48	4
Lithuania	49	47	4
Luxembourg	67	32	1
Hungary	70	28	2
Malta	66	31	3
Netherlands	69	30	1
Austria	80	18	2
Poland	53	42	5
Portugal	41	52	7
Romania	63	34	3
Slovenia	56	43	1
Slovakia	63	36	1
Finland	92	7	1
Sweden	76	23	1
United Kingdom	74	24	2
European Average	64	33	3

The educational system

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	70	29	1
Bulgaria	65	27	8
Czech Republic	59	48	1
Denmark	75	24	1
Germany	54	45	1
Estonia	65	32	3
Greece	63	37	0
Spain	65	32	3
France	72	26	2
Ireland	74	21	5
Italy	51	42	7
Cyprus	59	45	5
Latvia	52	45	3
Lithuania	55	49	5

Luxembourg	79	20	1
Hungary	71	27	2
Malta	69	28	3
Netherlands	78	21	1
Austria	70	28	2
Poland	65	30	5
Portugal	44	49	7
Romania	62	33	5
Slovenia	48	50	2
Slovakia	57	42	1
Finland	91	8	1
Sweden	73	25	2
United Kingdom	77	20	3
European Average	64	33	3

Social welfare

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	74	25	1
Bulgaria	51	41	8
Czech Republic	61	38	1
Denmark	86	12	2
Germany	66	32	2
Estonia	61	36	3
Greece	54	46	0
Spain	69	28	3
France	79	19	2
Ireland	76	19	5
Italy	50	43	7
Cyprus	33	61	6
Latvia	56	41	3
Lithuania	50	46	4
Luxembourg	72	27	1
Hungary	54	44	2
Malta	77	20	3
Netherlands	76	23	1
Austria	80	19	1
Poland	51	45	4
Portugal	41	51	8
Romania	60	37	3
Slovenia	55	43	2
Slovakia	59	40	1
Finland	93	6	1
Sweden	88	11	1
United Kingdom	71	25	4
European Average	65	32	3

Taxation

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	70	28	2
Bulgaria	66	26	9
Czech Republic	65	32	3
Denmark	88	11	1
Germany	65	33	2
Estonia	75	21	4
Greece	66	34	0
Spain	67	28	5
France	70	16	4
Ireland	73	21	6
Italy	51	41	8
Cyprus	51	41	8
Latvia	58	37	5
Lithuania	54	40	6
Luxembourg	85	14	1
Hungary	67	30	3
Malta	74	22	4
Netherlands	76	22	2
Austria	77	21	2
Poland	59	33	8
Portugal	46	46	8
Romania	63	31	6
Slovenia	56	41	3
Slovakia	65	33	2
Finland	89	10	1
Sweden	85	12	3
United Kingdom	78	18	4
European Average	66	29	5

Pensions

	Government	Jointly with the European Union	DK
Belgium	75	25	0
Bulgaria	72	24	4
Czech Republic	69	29	2
Denmark	91	7	2
Germany	81	17	2
Estonia	64	33	3
Greece	76	24	0
Spain	64	33	3
France	81	17	2
Ireland	66	29	5
Italy	63	30	7
Cyprus	48	48	4
Latvia	59	38	3
Lithuania	60	35	5
Luxembourg	88	10	2
Hungary	75	24	1
Malta	74	24	2
Netherlands	89	10	1
Austria	82	15	3
Poland	53	43	4
Portugal	51	42	7
Romania	69	27	4
Slovenia	64	34	2
Slovakia	71	28	1
Finland	94	5	1
Sweden	90	8	2
United Kingdom	78	18	4
European Average	72	25	3

¹¹⁶ Eurobarometer September 2008

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:

The European Union enables European citizens to better benefit from the positive effects of globalization.

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ R
Belgium	54	40	6
Bulgaria	47	16	37
Czech Republic	48	36	16
Denmark	73	17	10
Germany	50	38	12
Estonia	49	22	29

Greece	41	57	2
Spain	41	24	35
France	35	50	15
Ireland	50	14	36
Italy	48	32	20
Cyprus	42	28	30
Lithuania	48	17	35
Latvia	37	39	24
Luxembourg	47	37	16
Hungary	47	32	21
Malta	56	13	31
Netherlands	63	23	14
Austria	46	44	10
Poland	54	17	29
Portugal	44	24	32
Romania	41	19	40
Slovenia	40	44	16
Slovakia	59	23	18
Finland	62	28	10
Sweden	66	15	19
United Kingdom	50	24	26
Average	48	31	21

¹¹⁷ Eurobarometer September 2008

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:

The European Union helps to protect us from the negative effects of globalization.

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ R
Belgium	55	10	5
Bulgaria	44	17	39
Czech Republic	46	39	16
Denmark	48	41	11
Germany	47	41	12
Estonia	45	36	19
Greece	39	60	1
Spain	41	23	36
France	36	56	8
Ireland	38	26	36
Italy	46	32	22
Cyprus	50	26	24
Lithuania	37	29	34
Latvia	26	57	17
Luxembourg	40	43	17
Hungary	40	40	20
Malta	30	40	30
Netherlands	56	32	12
Austria	45	44	11
Poland	49	24	27
Portugal	43	25	32
Romania	43	25	32
Slovenia	41	48	11

Slovakia	51	29	20
Finland	49	40	11
Sweden	46	35	19
United Kingdom	36	39	25
Average	43	37	20

¹¹⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of:

The European Union

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Favorable	Unfavorable	DK/R
United States	14	42	15	8	56	23	22
Canada	15	56	9	3	71	12	17
Britain	8	42	21	18	50	39	10
France	12	50	28	9	62	37	0
Germany	8	57	26	6	65	32	3
Spain	15	62	14	2	77	16	6
Poland	15	62	12	3	77	15	7
Russia	16	53	13	4	69	17	15
Turkey	4	18	9	50	22	59	20
Egypt	14	32	26	24	46	50	5
Jordan	10	16	37	35	26	72	3
Lebanon	20	46	18	16	66	34	1
Palestinian Territories	6	31	24	33	37	57	6
Israel	14	42	26	14	56	40	5
China	4	35	34	10	39	44	16
India	8	26	21	16	34	37	30
Indonesia	8	42	17	6	50	23	27
Japan	7	58	19	2	65	21	13
Pakistan	1	8	10	36	9	46	46
South Korea	4	70	13	1	74	14	13
Argentina	8	35	15	5	43	20	38
Brazil	3	47	24	4	50	28	21
Mexico	10	31	16	8	41	24	35
Kenya	36	26	12	6	62	18	21
Nigeria	27	34	15	13	61	28	11
Average	11	41	19	13	52	32	16

¹¹⁹ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2009**

Is your view of the European Union's influence mainly positive or mainly negative?

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative
Canada	73	9
United States	62	19
Chile	64	13
Central America	56	20
Mexico	37	15

Germany	81	5
Spain	76	11
Italy	72	12
France	71	17
United Kingdom	55	28
Russia	31	23
Egypt	39	35
Turkey	34	44
Ghana	70	7
Nigeria	58	26
Australia	65	16
Philippines	65	21
China	57	28
Japan	39	3
Indonesia	37	25
India	36	11
Average	54	20
EU Average	71	15

¹²⁰ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?

European Union

Country	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	27	33	40
Bolivia	55	26	19
Brazil	45	30	25
Chile	46	27	27
Colombia	66	18	16
Costa Rica	61	19	20
Ecuador	42	41	17
Guatemala	51	39	10
Honduras	64	12	24
Mexico	56	21	23
Nicaragua	73	17	10
Panama	58	42	
Paraguay	47	34	19
Peru	39	23	38
Dominican Republic	49	21	30
El Salvador	49	23	28
Uruguay	55	25	20
Venezuela	45	39	16
Average	52	27	22

¹²¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward these organizations.

ASEAN

Mean	Median	100-75 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar/ Decline
------	--------	-------------------	------------------	---------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------

China	68	70	22	26	9	1	3	39
India	48	50	17	15	13	6	29	20
South Korea	61	60	18	40	33	5	4	0

¹²² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power Survey 2008**

Do you think [survey country] should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

	Should have	Should not have	Not sure/ Decline
China	83.8	9.9	6.3
Japan	63.6	25.9	11.5
South Korea	76	20	4

¹²³ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Association of South East Asian Nations – ASEAN

	A great deal	Quite a lot	Not very much	None at all	Don't know	NR
Australia	2	29	49	8	0	12
South Korea	1	34	49	16	0	*
Indonesia	10	41	34	5	8	2
Vietnam	37	32	9	1	20	1
Average	13	34	35	7	7	5

¹²⁴ **AsiaBarometer Survey 2006**

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Protection of the Environment

	National government	Regional organization	United Nations	Don't know
Vietnam	48.2	32.3	15	4.5
Taiwan	47.9	40.1	8.9	3.1
Singapore	59.4	24.9	11.8	3.9
Korea	49.8	26.5	19.4	4.3
Japan	35.8	31.5	25.1	7.6
Hong Kong	48	38.5	13.5	0
China	48.1	30.6	20.3	1
Average	48	32	16	3

¹²⁵ **AsiaBarometer Survey 2006**

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Refugees

	National government	Regional organization	United Nations	Don't know
Vietnam	22.4	16.3	51.2	10.1
Taiwan	19.8	21.8	55.4	
Singapore	23.2	17.6	53.7	5.6
Korea	12.9	20.8	60.4	5.9
Japan	18	18.4	55.3	8.3
Hong Kong	33.1	12.6	53.8	0.5
China	23.6	21.6	53.7	1.1
Average	22	18	55	5

¹²⁶ AsiaBarometer Survey 2006

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Aid to developing countries

	National government	Regional organization	United Nations	Don't know
Vietnam	16.6	14.5	62.2	6.7
Taiwan	20.3	16.7	59.1	3.9
Singapore	35.4	17.4	43	4.2
Korea	16.6	31.6	45.1	6.6
Japan	24.5	19.1	47.8	8.6
Hong Kong	35.1	8.4	55.9	0.6
China	23.2	11.4	64.3	1.1
Average	25	17	54	5

¹²⁷ AsiaBarometer Survey 2006

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Human rights

	National government	Regional organization	United Nations	Don't know
Taiwan	53.6	12.4	31.6	2.4
Singapore	35.2	11.6	46.6	6.6
Korea	25.3	18.2	50.9	5.6
Japan	35.4	15.7	40.7	8.3
Hong Kong	51.3	11.8	35.9	1
China	71.7	14.5	12.7	1.1
Average	45	14	36	4

¹²⁸ AsiaBarometer Survey 2006

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Peacekeeping

	National government	Regional organization	United Nations	Don't know
--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------

Vietnam	46.8	8.3	41.3	3.6
Taiwan	45.4	10.4	41.2	3
Singapore	48.9	12.6	33.6	4.9
Korea	21.8	12.4	60.5	5.3
Japan	27.4	10.3	53.6	8.7
Hong Kong	39.9	19.1	40.7	0.3
China	34.2	7.6	57.2	1
Average	38	12	47	4

¹²⁹ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
Mercosur

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	46	22	32
Bolivia	56	22	22
Brazil	53	28	19
Chile	52	23	25
Colombia	49	18	33
Costa Rica	31	26	43
Ecuador	43	33	24
Guatemala	44	37	19
Honduras	37	18	45
Mexico	28	15	57
Nicaragua	46	25	29
Panama	42	28	
Paraguay	50	28	22
Peru	30	19	51
Dominican Republic	11	10	79
El Salvador	16	16	68
Uruguay	57	32	11
Venezuela	70	15	15
Average	42	23	35

¹³⁰ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
Andean Community (CAN)

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	10	21	69
Bolivia	58	20	22
Brazil	15	29	56
Chile	28	17	55
Colombia	60	17	23
Costa Rica	25	26	49
Ecuador	60	22	18
Guatemala	25	43	32
Honduras	38	18	44
Mexico	23	16	61
Nicaragua	48	24	28

Panama	48	52	
Paraguay	27	22	51
Peru	47	19	34
Dominican Republic	10	78	12
El Salvador	59	28	13
Uruguay	27	14	59
Venezuela	48	34	18
Average	36	28	38

¹³¹ Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
PARLACEN

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	-	-	-
Bolivia	28	24	48
Brazil	-	-	-
Chile	-	-	-
Colombia	40	16	44
Costa Rica	44	17	39
Ecuador	28	26	46
Guatemala	12	21	37
Honduras	42	21	37
Mexico	17	16	67
Nicaragua	60	22	18
Panama	38	62	
Paraguay	26	10	64
Peru	16	18	66
Dominican Republic	11	10	79
El Salvador	37	22	41
Uruguay	22	10	69
Venezuela	42	48	10
Average	31	23	48

¹³² Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
Central American Integration System (SICA)

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina			
Bolivia	29	21	50
Brazil			
Chile	21	12	67
Colombia	39	14	47
Costa Rica	44	16	40
Ecuador	28	26	46
Guatemala	31	39	30
Honduras	46	12	42
Mexico	26	15	59
Nicaragua	66	18	16

Panama	52	48	
Paraguay	28	6	66
Peru	14	15	71
Dominican Republic	10	80	10
El Salvador	34	17	49
Uruguay	17	11	72
Venezuela	42	11	47
Average	33	23	47

¹³³ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI)

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	16	25	59
Bolivia	38	22	30
Brazil	26	38	38
Chile	34	18	48
Colombia	53	14	33
Costa Rica	52	17	31
Ecuador	42	31	27
Guatemala	26	43	31
Honduras	53	12	34
Mexico	36	16	48
Nicaragua	63	18	19
Panama	55	45	
Paraguay	29	31	40
Peru	29	18	53
Dominican Republic	25	15	60
El Salvador	36	19	45
Uruguay	40	20	40
Venezuela	50	21	29
Average	39	24	39

¹³⁴ **Cima Barómetro Iberoamericano, Spring 2008**

Do you have a positive or negative view of the following international actors?
Organization of American States (OAS)

	Positive	Negative	DK/R
Argentina	20	31	49
Bolivia	53	27	20
Brazil	30	42	28
Chile	47	25	28
Colombia	73	16	11
Costa Rica	71	14	15
Ecuador	21	32	17
Guatemala	32	44	24
Honduras	62	16	22
Mexico	39	39	32
Nicaragua	71	20	9
Panama	58	42	

Paraguay	66	9	25
Peru	43	25	32
Dominican Republic	36	20	44
El Salvador	47	25	28
Uruguay	52	29	19
Venezuela	49	43	10
Average	48	28	24

¹³⁵ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Organization for African Unity-OAU

Weight [with split ups]	A great deal	Quite a lot	Not very much	None at all	Don't know	No answer	Not applicable
South Africa	12.10%	34.40%	22.70%	9.70%	21.20%	0	0
Ghana	29.50%	37.20%	20.90%	4.20%	5.00%	3.10%	0.10%
Burkina Faso	20.10%	30.80%	16.90%	8.00%	16.80%	3.30%	4.00%
Ethiopia	6.00%	29.10%	36.10%	19.70%	5.20%	3.50%	0.40%
Mali	33.10%	30.30%	19.00%	6.30%	5.80%	3.80%	1.60%
AVERAGE	20.16%	32.36%	23.12%	9.58%	10.80%	2.74%	1.22%

¹³⁶ **Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2007**

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with it:

It is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.

	Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	DK/NR
United States	35	42	14	6	3
Canada	26	45	17	10	2
Argentina	17	35	18	22	8
Bolivia	23	39	22	10	5
Brazil	42	42	10	5	1
Chile	24	36	23	12	5
Mexico	20	52	20	5	3
Peru	26	39	18	9	7
Venezuela	21	51	19	8	0
Britain	19	48	19	9	5
France	26	41	18	15	0
Germany	11	30	29	29	1
Italy	25	48	15	7	6
Spain	11	54	18	9	9
Sweden	37	38	11	10	4
Bulgaria	13	21	26	25	15
Czech Republic	23	39	22	14	1
Poland	16	40	26	11	7
Russia	21	40	21	10	8

Slovakia	16	31	28	23	2
Ukraine	16	36	27	17	6
Turkey	36	38	13	6	6
Egypt	14	26	30	29	2
Jordan	12	25	29	29	5
Kuwait	58	22	6	10	5
Lebanon	21	37	23	15	5
Morocco	24	23	9	12	33
Palestinian Territories	28	31	15	19	7
Israel	39	37	18	4	2
Pakistan	46	26	11	3	14
Bangladesh	57	30	7	4	2
Indonesia	23	51	16	7	3
Malaysia	15	46	20	12	6
China	16	50	22	6	6
India	58	32	7	3	1
Japan	10	50	26	8	6
South Korea	5	38	40	13	4
Ethiopia	24	24	32	18	2
Ghana	26	44	18	11	1
Ivory Coast	44	34	14	8	0
Kenya	41	34	14	10	1
Mali	49	27	17	7	0
Nigeria	40	34	14	9	2
Senegal	36	36	17	9	1
South Africa	31	41	14	8	5
Tanzania	39	22	10	24	4
Uganda	25	29	21	19	6
Average	27	37	19	12	5

¹³⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006

Some say that in order for the European Union to assume a greater international role it needs to do certain things. To what extent do you agree with the following? The European Union should concentrate on its economic power and not rely on its military power when dealing with international problems outside Europe.

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	DK/NR
European Average	40	39	11	5	6
France	40	45	17	7	2
Germany	41	42	11	5	2
Great Britain	35	38	14	7	6
Italy	30	52	12	4	2
Netherlands	42	40	12	4	3
Poland	37	46	7	1	9
Portugal	39	37	12	6	8
Spain	42	49	10	6	4
Slovakia	37	37	13	4	8
Turkey	33	24	13	12	18
Bulgaria	52	30	4	3	11
Romania	48	31	6	3	12

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Some say that in order for the European Union to assume a greater international role it needs to do certain things. To what extent do you agree with the following: The European Union should concentrate on economic power, even if this means it will not be able to act independently on military issues

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly	DK/NR
European Average	35	41	12	6	6
France	40	45	17	7	2
Germany	41	42	11	5	2
Great Britain	35	38	14	7	6
Italy	40	52	12	4	2
Netherlands	42	40	12	4	3
Poland	37	46	7	1	9
Portugal	39	37	12	6	8
Spain	32	49	10	6	4
Slovakia	37	37	13	4	8
Turkey	33	24	13	12	18
Bulgaria	52	30	4	3	11
Romania	48	31	6	3	12

Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund World Views 2002

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: It makes sense for Europe and the United States to specialize in their role in the world. Because the United States has the strongest military, the United States should take the lead responsibility and supply most of the forces when it comes to military conflict. Europe should instead emphasize things like assisting poor countries to develop their economies and trying to help reconstruct societies after a war.

	Agree	Disagree	DK/NR
Great Britain	51	46	3
France	43	55	3
Germany	57	36	7
The Netherlands	56	41	4
Italy	53	42	4
Poland	56	28	16
European Average	53	42	6
United States	39	56	5

¹³⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	Should	Should not	DK/ NR
Mexico	65	21	13
United States	83	14	4
France	84	13	3
Russia	70	14	17
Azerbaijan	82	11	7
Egypt	78	22	0
Israel	77	17	6
Palestinian Territories	81	17	2
Turkey	68	15	18
Kenya	88	11	1
Nigeria	89	10	1

China	70	18	11
India	66	22	12
Indonesia	71	15	14
South Korea	76	23	1
Thailand	67	14	19
Average	76	16	8

¹³⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	73	17	9
United States	83	13	4
France	85	14	1
Russia	64	20	17
Ukraine	69	11	21
Azerbaijan	79	10	11
Egypt	83	17	0
Iran	69	20	12
Israel	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	78	20	2
Turkey	64	16	20
Kenya	90	10	1
Nigeria	88	10	2
China	72	18	9
India	63	28	9
Indonesia	83	7	10
South Korea	74	25	1
Thailand	62	23	15
Average	76	16	8

¹⁴⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10
Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian Territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13

South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

¹⁴¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	54	30	15
U.S.	57	38	5
France	52	45	3
Russia	35	37	28
Azerbaijan	43	38	19
Egypt	64	36	0
Israel	58	34	7
Palestinian Territories	67	30	3
Turkey	43	32	26
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	76	22	3
China	37	45	18
India	51	34	16
Indonesia	51	28	21
South Korea	32	65	2
Thailand	46	29	25
Average	53	35	12

¹⁴² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	Has this responsibility	Does not have this responsibility	DK/NR
Argentina	48	27	25
United States	74	22	4
Armenia	66	19	16
France	54	39	7
Great Britain	70	22	8
Poland	54	15	31
Russia	48	31	21
Ukraine	40	16	44
Azerbaijan	42	23	35
Egypt	80	20	0
Iran	59	25	16
Israel	64	28	8
Palestinian Territories	69	27	4
Turkey	39	20	40
Kenya	89	8	3
Nigeria	78	18	5
China	76	13	11
India	51	25	25
Indonesia	82	5	14

Thailand	44	22	33
Average	61	21	18

¹⁴³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NR
Argentina	48	30	22
Peru	77	19	4
U.S.	72	24	5
Armenia	75	15	10
France	74	25	1
Great Britain	79	17	4
Poland	63	11	26
Russia	58	22	20
Ukraine	54	19	28
Azerbaijan	64	21	14
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	62	13	25
Israel	64	31	6
Turkey	51	24	25
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	84	15	1
China	62	25	13
India	58	30	12
Indonesia	74	14	12
Philippines	46	44	9
South Korea	68	30	1
Thailand	73	12	15
Average	66	23	12

¹⁴⁴ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? International peacekeeping

	National governments	Regional orgs	UN	National governments with UN coordination	Non profit / Nongovernmental orgs	Commercial enterprise	DK	No answer	NA
Italy	22	12	58	0	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	0	12	0	6
United States	28	16	50	0	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	0	7	0

Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	12	53	0	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	26	8	64	0	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	47	6	34	0	0	0	9	2	0
Ethiopia	41	10	40	0	0	0	5	3	2
Mali	46	5	38	0	0	0	6	3	1
Rwanda	50	41	8	0	0	0	1	0	1
Zambia	29	19	47	0	0	0	4	1	0
Germany	20	20	54	0	0	0	6	1	0
Average	34	11	45	1	0	0	7	2	0

¹⁴⁵ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004

In general, when South Korea/the United States is asked to be part of a united Nations international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world, do you think we should take part, or should we leave this job to other countries? (South Korea, United States)

And now, please tell me, if the United Nations asks member countries to participate in a military or police peacekeeping force being sent to some part of the world, what do you think Mexico should do, participate in the peacekeeping force or leave this type of activity to other countries? (Mexico)

	Should take part	Should not take part	DK/NR
South Korea	83	17	n/a
United States	78	19	3
Mexico	48	36	6

¹⁴⁶ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007

The European Union can take greater responsibility for dealing with international threats in a number of different ways. For each of the following, please tell me if you agree or disagree that it is something that the European Union should undertake: Commit more troops for peacekeeping missions.

	Agree	Disagree	DK/NR
European Average	66	29	5
United States	85	13	2
France	80	18	2
Germany	63	36	1
Great Britain	76	22	2
Italy	57	41	2
Netherlands	71	27	2
Poland	54	38	7
Portugal	78	18	3
Spain	82	17	1
Slovakia	44	40	16
Turkey	73	19	7
Bulgaria	54	37	8
Romania	60	30	10

¹⁴⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces: To provide peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/NR
European Average	77	17	6
United States	66	29	5
France	84	14	2
Germany	84	15	2
Great Britain	81	16	3
Italy	77	21	2
Netherlands	88	11	1
Poland	61	31	8
Portugal	76	12	12
Spain	85	13	3
Slovakia	58	26	16
Turkey	77	14	8

¹⁴⁸ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces: To provide food and medical assistance to victims of war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	89	8	3
United States	81	16	3
France	92	7	1
Germany	94	5	1
Great Britain	83	5	3
Italy	85	14	1
Netherlands	98	2	1
Poland	86	12	3
Portugal	85	7	8
Spain	95	5	1
Slovakia	84	11	5
Turkey	87	9	4

¹⁴⁹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces: To stop the fighting in a civil war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	62	31	7
United States	38	49	13
France	68	27	5
Germany	41	54	5
Great Britain	57	35	8
Italy	56	38	5
Netherlands	56	40	4
Poland	45	47	8
Portugal	63	25	12
Spain	70	23	7
Slovakia	83	11	6
Turkey	81	14	5

¹⁵⁰ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces: To remove a government that abuses human rights

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	53	39	8
United States	57	36	7
France	53	43	4
Germany	36	60	4
Great Britain	59	33	8
Italy	54	41	5
Netherlands	53	43	4
Poland	48	41	11
Portugal	63	24	13

Spain	55	38	7
Slovakia	40	43	17
Turkey	64	25	11

¹⁵¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations: To maintain peace and order in post-conflict Balkans.

	Approve	Disapprove	(Don't know about topic)	NR
European Average	65	29	4	2
United States	54	38	5	4
France	70	24	2	4
Germany	60	38	1	1
Great Britain	66	27	2	5
Italy	73	25	1	1
Netherlands	74	24	1	1
Poland	58	33	7	2
Portugal	77	18	3	2
Spain	76	23	0	1
Slovakia	62	31	4	3
Turkey	53	33	14	0
Bulgaria	55	39	3	3
Romania	58	30	8	4

¹⁵² **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations: To monitor and support a ceasefire in Southern Lebanon.

	Approve	Disapprove	(Don't know about topic)	NR
European Average	56	35	6	3
United States	55	39	2	4
France	73	23	1	2
Germany	45	52	1	1
Great Britain	65	30	2	4
Italy	66	32	1	1
Netherlands	70	28	1	1
Poland	47	39	10	5
Portugal	63	32	3	2
Spain	69	30	1	1
Slovakia	45	38	10	7
Turkey	46	38	16	1
Bulgaria	35	40	18	7
Romania	47	37	12	5

¹⁵³ **Gallup International, August 2006**

If the United Nations asked our country's Government to send troops to be peacekeepers in the region, we should send them?" [Southern Lebanon after recent Israeli-Hezbollah conflict]

	Disagree (Don't send)	Agree (Send)	Can't say
Croatia	70	22	8
Georgia	70	18	12
Russia	63	25	12
Germany	62	37	1
Romania	62	31	7
Austria	61	30	9
Korea	60	37	3
Vietnam	57	38	5
Switzerland	56	40	4
Portugal	55	35	10
United States	54	30	16
Greece	54	44	2
Argentina	53	26	21
Australia	51	44	5
United Kingdom	51	42	7
Moldova	51	20	29
Cameroon	46	50	4
Canada	46	44	10
Luxembourg	43	54	3
Indonesia	39	56	5
South Africa	38	46	16
India	36	51	13
Senegal	35	63	2
Finland	34	47	19
New Zealand	32	57	11
Iceland	32	49	19
Sweden	27	67	6
Norway	25	67	8
Ireland	22	66	12
Lebanon	19	78	3
Pakistan	16	70	14
Morocco	15	76	9
Kosovo	12	60	28
Average	44	46	10

¹⁵⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009

If the Taliban were to regain power in Afghanistan do you think this would be very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Neither good nor bad (vol.)	DK/NR
Mexico	4	16	24	42	4	9
United States	0	4	17	77	0	2
France	1	4	26	62	1	7
Germany	0	1	15	78	2	4
Great Britain	0	3	19	72	2	4
Poland	0	6	33	32	20	8
Russia	1	7	23	17	10	42
Ukraine	1	5	18	16	12	48
Azerbaijan	3	3	17	50	12	15
Egypt	17	45	12	19	7	2

Iraq	5	11	16	40	6	22
Palestinian Territories	20	48	24	4	3	1
Turkey	3	12	26	35	3	21
Kenya	15	21	16	42	2	5
Nigeria	16	23	21	30	2	8
China	3	13	28	25	8	23
Hong Kong*	1	10	33	29	6	22
Macau*	3	11	28	31	2	25
Taiwan*	1	12	25	37	1	25
India	18	19	13	41	3	5
Indonesia	4	16	38	8	7	27
Pakistan	7	17	7	54	10	5
South Korea	3	21	41	32	1	2
Average	6	15	22	39	6	13

* Publics marked with asterisk are excluded from the average.

¹⁵⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009

As you may know the UN has authorized a NATO mission in Afghanistan, manned by forces from the United States and other countries. This mission is meant to stabilize Afghanistan and help the government defend itself from Taliban insurgents. Do you approve or disapprove of this mission?

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/NR
Mexico	35	57	8
United States	72	26	2
France	58	34	8
Germany	45	49	6
Great Britain	57	36	7
Poland	33	57	10
Russia	20	53	27
Ukraine	15	57	29
Azerbaijan	53	27	20
Egypt	44	56	0
Iraq	41	34	25
Palestinian Territories	23	74	3
Turkey	28	58	15
Kenya	74	20	6
Nigeria	64	31	5
China	20	65	15
Hong Kong*	45	34	21
Macau*	43	35	22
Taiwan*	55	26	19

India	65	26	9
Indonesia	38	38	25
Pakistan	18	72	10
South Korea	73	25	2
Average	44	45	12

* Publics marked with asterisk are excluded from the average.

¹⁵⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009

Do you think that most people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to remain for now, or do you think most want the NATO forces to leave now?

	Most want NATO forces to remain for now	Most want NATO forces to leave now	DK/NR
Mexico	13	76	11
United States	56	39	5
France	29	46	25
Germany	33	55	11
Great Britain	35	47	18
Poland	19	59	23
Russia	8	63	29
Ukraine	8	52	40
Azerbaijan	44	36	19
Egypt	30	67	3
Iraq	28	40	32
Palestinian Territories	22	74	4
Turkey	21	59	21
Kenya	52	38	10
Nigeria	53	36	11
Hong Kong*	29	44	27
Macau*	20	51	28
Taiwan*	26	49	25
India	57	30	14
Indonesia	16	48	36
Pakistan	9	86	5
Average	30	53	18

* Publics marked with asterisk are excluded from the average.

¹⁵⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009

Do you think the NATO mission in Afghanistan should be continued or do you think it should be ended now?

	NATO mission should be continued	NATO mission should be ended now	DK/NR
--	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------

Mexico	27	64	9
United States	66	30	4
France	53	38	10
Germany	42	52	7
Great Britain	47	47	6
Poland	27	65	9
Russia	14	59	28
Ukraine	12	57	31
Azerbaijan	52	31	18
Egypt	37	60	3
Iraq	43	35	23
Palestinian Territories	21	75	4
Turkey	30	55	14
Kenya	65	29	6
Nigeria	59	34	7
China	14	69	17
Hong Kong*	39	44	18
Macau*	31	48	21
Taiwan*	44	35	21
India	63	25	12
Indonesia	29	43	27
Pakistan	13	79	8
Average	37	50	13

* Publics marked with asterisk are excluded from the average.

¹⁵⁸ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2009

As you may know, President Barack Obama has asked European countries to increase their contribution in the effort to stabilize Afghanistan. Would you approve or disapprove of the following... Increasing [country's] combat troops in Afghanistan

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	DK/REFUSAL
France	4	11	43	41	1
Germany	4	9	47	39	1
United Kingdom	9	13	32	42	2
Italy	5	16	21	57	1
Netherlands	5	15	32	46	2
Poland	3	11	33	47	6
Portugal	5	26	28	37	3
Spain	6	19	29	43	2
Slovakia	2	9	32	47	11
Turkey	13	14	17	39	16
Bulgaria	1	5	19	65	9
Romania	3	6	27	57	7
Average	6	13	32	45	4

¹⁵⁹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2009

As you may know, [country] currently has troops stationed in Afghanistan. In your view, should [country] increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, keep its troops at its current level, reduce the number of its troops or should it withdraw all troops from Afghanistan?

	Increase	Keep at current level	Reduce	Withdraw all troops	DK/REFUSAL
United States	30	32	11	19	8
France	4	41	17	34	3
Germany	7	35	16	41	1
United Kingdom	11	27	19	41	3
Italy	6	38	21	34	1
Netherlands	4	43	22	28	3
Poland	5	22	17	51	6
Portugal	4	40	14	38	4
Spain	7	37	17	37	2
Slovakia	2	31	31	30	6
Turkey	14	21	20	30	14
Bulgaria	2	14	22	50	12
Romania	5	16	23	48	8
European Average	7	32	19	38	4

¹⁶⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that in regard to the violence that is occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan the UN Security Council:

	Does not have the right to authorize intervention	Has the right, but not a responsibility, to authorize intervention	Has a responsibility to authorize intervention	DK/ NR
Argentina	19	15	22	43
United States	11	35	48	7
Armenia	9	15	29	46
France	8	29	55	8
Great Britain	8	24	57	11
Poland	8	23	23	47
Ukraine	16	22	10	52
Egypt	32	21	47	0
Israel	7	31	46	16
Kenya	25	37	35	4
Nigeria	17	34	45	4
China	12	38	20	30
India	20	30	29	21
Thailand	12	17	17	54
Average	15	27	35	25

¹⁶¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Would you favor or oppose the use of [country] troops to participate in an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/ NR
United States	65	28	7
Armenia	27	45	28
France	84	3	14

Great Britain	71	18	11
Poland	28	42	31
Ukraine	13	56	32
Egypt	78	23	0
Israel	39	52	9
Kenya	84	16	1
Nigeria	81	16	3
Thailand	35	37	28
Average	55	30	15

¹⁶² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

In response to the charges made by the International Criminal Court, President Bashir has expelled humanitarian groups that have been providing food and other aid to the displaced civilians living in refugee camps. If, as a result, many people in these camps start dying from hunger and exposure, do you think the UN should bring in food and other aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of Sudan's sovereignty?

	UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary	This would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty	DK / Ref
Egypt	61	38	1
Iraq	46	29	24
Pakistan	37	42	21
Palestinian Territories	60	38	2
Turkey	58	17	25
Kenya	82	16	2
Nigeria	68	27	5
Average	59	30	11

¹⁶³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations: To provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan.

	Approve	Disapprove	(I don't know anything about this topic)	DK/ NR
European Average	76	18	5	1
United States	75	21	2	2
France	88	10	1	2
Germany	73	25	1	1
Great Britain	80	16	1	3
Italy	86	13	1	0
Netherlands	82	17	1	1
Poland	71	17	11	1
Portugal	84	12	3	1
Spain	90	9	0	1
Slovakia	62	24	8	5
Turkey	58	26	16	0
Bulgaria	44	28	20	8
Romania	57	24	15	5

¹⁶⁴ Arab American Institute, 2007

There are several options that the international community is considering regarding the situation in Darfur. How would you rate these options—very effective, somewhat effective, not very effective, or not at all effective:

U.N. Peacekeeping (non-Western and Muslim Nations)

	Effective	Not Effective	DK/ NR
United Arab Emirates	40	55	5
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	87	12	<1
Egypt	74	26	<1
Morocco	56	44	1
Turkey	71	22	7
Malaysia	70	26	5
Average	66	31	5

¹⁶⁵ **GlobeScan, 2004**

Preferred Military Group to Intervene in Conflict like Darfur

	United Nations	African Union	No Foreign Military	Rich Country	All	None	DK/ NR
Average of 8 African Countries	30	22	11	5	7	2	24

¹⁶⁶ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

To what extent do you tend to agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decided to take military action?

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	57	34	9
United States	82	12	6
France	62	36	2
Germany	56	43	2
Great Britain	82	15	3
Italy	51	48	2
Netherlands	82	16	2
Poland	57	21	12
Portugal	68	26	6
Spain	56	41	3
Slovakia	37	49	14
Turkey	28	37	35
Bulgaria	42	47	11
Romania	63	25	12

¹⁶⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

To what extent do you agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops?

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ NR
European Average	58	34	8
United States	82	13	5
France	62	36	2
Germany	62	36	1
Great Britain	80	17	3
Italy	50	47	3

Netherlands	82	17	2
Poland	57	32	11
Portugal	64	29	7
Spain	60	37	2
Slovakia	37	52	11
Turkey	27	36	37
Bulgaria	41	47	13
Romania	67	21	11

¹⁶⁸ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007

Some people say that in order for the European Union to take greater responsibility for dealing with international threats, it needs to do certain things. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

If the European Union should decide to use military force, [country] should abide by that decision, even if [country] disagrees.

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ NR
European Average	43	54	3
France	34	65	1
Germany	33	67	1
Great Britain	44	52	4
Italy	47	52	2
Netherlands	45	54	1
Poland	51	41	8
Portugal	51	43	5
Spain	44	55	1
Slovakia	36	55	9
Turkey	52	34	14
Bulgaria	49	43	7
Romania	67	25	8

¹⁶⁹ International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999

Is the [international force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	Better	Worse	No Difference	DK/ NR
Georgia	9	9	52	8
Abkhazia	2	2	15	2
Cambodia	2	2	9	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	13	13	40	7
Lebanon	8	8	44	8
Somalia	27	27	10	17
Average	51	14	27	7

¹⁷⁰ International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999

Is the [peacekeeping force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	Better	Worse	No Difference	DK/ NR
Total Security Counsel	54	8	29	8
Great Britain	58	4	31	7
United States	52	15	28	5
France	52	9	27	12
Russia	54	4	31	11

Total War Torn	51	14	27	7
Georgia	31	9	52	8
Abkhazia	81	2	15	2
Cambodia	88	2	9	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	41	13	40	7
Lebanon	41	8	44	8
Somalia	46	27	10	17

¹⁷¹ **Pew Global Attitudes Project, Spring 2007**

Now I'm going to read you a list of things that may be problems in our country. As I read each one, please tell me if you think it is a very big problem, a moderately big problem, a small problem, or not a problem at all:

Terrorism

	Very big problem	Moderately big problem	Small problem	Not a problem at all	DK/Refused
United States	44	38	15	3	1
Canada	24	32	31	12	2
Argentina	42	24	15	14	6
Bolivia	42	29	16	10	2
Brazil	44	28	15	12	1
Chile	46	19	17	16	2
Mexico	50	26	15	7	2
Peru	70	21	7	1	1
Venezuela	41	34	16	8	0
United Kingdom	30	41	23	4	2
France	54	29	15	1	0
Germany	31	43	18	7	1
Italy	73	20	6	1	0
Spain	66	26	5	1	1
Sweden	3	10	48	34	4
Bulgaria	24	18	31	21	7
Czech Republic	16	26	40	16	2
Poland	35	30	22	10	3
Russia	48	36	13	2	1
Slovakia	17	17	42	23	2
Ukraine	23	22	26	26	3
Turkey	72	17	6	2	3
Egypt	53	30	13	3	1
Jordan	42	23	17	18	0
Kuwait	37	12	14	32	5
Lebanon	76	17	5	1	0
Morocco	81	10	2	1	5
Palestinian Territories	51	20	8	15	6
Israel	70	21	7	2	1
Pakistan	76	18	3	1	2
Bangladesh	77	16	5	1	2
Indonesia	48	37	13	1	1
Malaysia	10	18	32	32	8
China	11	26	36	19	8
India	72	22	5	1	1

Japan	59	29	9	2	1
South Korea	12	34	36	13	5
Ethiopia	23	23	33	19	1
Ghana	20	21	31	26	3
Ivory Coast	57	19	14	10	0
Kenya	24	26	33	15	2
Mali	15	11	20	51	2
Nigeria	40	18	22	20	1
Senegal	22	12	14	49	2
South Africa	20	21	26	27	6
Tanzania	19	11	18	44	8
Uganda	34	15	19	21	12
Average	41	23	19	14	3

¹⁷² **BBC September 2008**

Overall, would you say your feelings about al-Qaeda are positive, negative, or mixed?

	Positive	Mixed	Negative	Never heard of al Qaeda/ DK/NS
United States	2	9	84	5
Canada	1	19	71	9
Panama	7	16	57	20
Costa Rica	6	13	68	13
Mexico	4	26	61	9
United Kingdom	4	22	67	7
Russia	2	10	60	28
Germany	1	9	86	4
France	1	10	85	4
Italy	1	8	87	4
Egypt	20	40	35	5
Lebanon	7	14	72	7
Turkey	2	8	82	8
Nigeria	25	12	42	21
Kenya	14	15	67	4
Pakistan	19	22	19	40
Indonesia	16	23	35	26
Philippines	15	33	42	10
India	11	13	44	32
China	5	26	48	21
Australia	2	16	76	6

¹⁷³ **Pew Global Attitudes Project, Spring 2008**

For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs- a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all.

Osama bin Laden

	A lot of confidence	Some confidence	Not too much confidence	No confidence at all	DK/Refused
Great Britain	0	1	5	86	7
France	0	1	4	95	0
Germany	2	2	4	90	2
Spain	0	1	6	91	3
Poland	0	3	9	83	4
Russia	7	7	16	52	18
Turkey	1	2	3	77	18
Egypt	2	16	31	38	13
Jordan	3	16	33	41	8
Lebanon	0	1	11	87	1
Australia	1	2	4	89	4
China	2	11	22	31	34
India	2	6	4	72	16
Indonesia	4	32	23	17	24
Japan	0	3	13	76	8
Pakistan	15	19	9	19	38
South Korea	1	4	21	65	10
Argentina	1	3	6	74	15
Brazil	0	2	4	88	5
Mexico	0	2	8	72	18
Nigeria	21	12	13	40	14
South Africa	4	7	8	56	25
Tanzania	4	7	7	73	8
Average	3	7	11	66	13

Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009

For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs:

Osama bin Laden

	A lot of confidence	Some confidence	Not too much confidence	No confidence at all	DK/R
Turkey	1	2	9	68	22
Egypt	4	19	31	37	9
Jordan	8	20	32	29	12
Lebanon	1	1	9	89	1
Palestinian Territories	17	34	18	29	2
Israel	1	2	23	72	2
Indonesia	3	21	32	21	23
Pakistan	4	14	13	34	35
Nigeria	17	15	16	44	8
Average	6	14	20	47	13

¹⁷⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Overall, would you say your feelings toward Osama bin Laden are very positive, somewhat positive, mixed, somewhat negative, or very negative?

Very positive	Somewhat positive	Mixed	Somewhat negative	Very negative	DK/NS
---------------	-------------------	-------	-------------------	---------------	-------

Egypt	20	24	25	7	10	14
Indonesia	5	9	21	16	10	39
Pakistan	10	15	26	9	6	34
Azerbaijan	1	3	6	49	33	8
Jordan	13	14	27	7	13	26
Palestinian Territories	24	32	22	10	10	2
Turkey	4	5	9	13	55	14

¹⁷⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10
Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian Territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13
South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

¹⁷⁶ GlobeScan, January 2008

How effectively do you think Europe and North America are working together in the following area?

Fighting global terrorism

	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Refused	DK/NA
United Kingdom	39	15	43	3	-
United States	38	19	42	2	-
Canada	36	16	44	-	4
France	45	18	25	-	12
Germany	26	24	44	5	1
Spain	28	17	52	3	-
Ireland	40	17	41	1	1
Turkey	18	12	58	-	12

Poland	41	17	37	-	5
Average	35	17	43	2	4

¹⁷⁷ Eurobarometer March 2006

For each of the following areas, please tell me if you believe that more decision-making should take place at a European level or on the contrary that less decision-making should take place at a European level.

The fight against terrorism

	More decision making at a European level	Less decision making at a European level	No change is needed (vol.)	DK/NR
European Average	80	12	4	4
Belgium	88	7	4	1
Czech Republic	91	6	1	1
Denmark	89	7	2	2
Germany	85	9	5	1
Estonia	81	11	1	7
Greece	74	19	7	0
Spain	71	11	7	11
France	88	7	1	3
Ireland	74	12	6	8
Italy	76	14	6	4
Cyprus	89	8	1	2
Latvia	81	9	3	7
Lithuania	71	17	2	10
Luxemburg	92	3	3	2
Hungary	79	7	8	6
Malta	86	7	3	4
Netherlands	90	3	5	1
Austria	73	20	4	3
Poland	91	6	0	3
Portugal	79	10	3	8
Slovenia	81	11	4	4
Slovakia	84	9	4	3
Finland	85	11	3	1
Sweden	90	7	1	2
United Kingdom	63	26	6	6

¹⁷⁸ Eurobarometer November 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the (national) government, or made jointly within the European Union?

Fighting terrorism

	(National) Government	Jointly within the European Union	DK
Belgium	18	79	3
Bulgaria	9	84	7
Czech Republic	11	88	1
Denmark	9	90	1
Germany	12	87	1

Estonia	9	88	3
Greece	23	77	0
Spain	33	63	4
France	15	82	3
Ireland	22	72	6
Italy	23	70	7
Cyprus	18	79	3
Latvia	8	89	3
Lithuania	11	85	4
Luxemburg	9	89	2
Hungary	9	90	1
Malta	12	85	3
Netherlands	8	91	1
Austria	22	76	2
Poland	11	85	4
Portugal	17	77	6
Romania	14	80	6
Slovenia	16	82	2
Slovak Republic	7	92	1
Finland	13	86	1
Sweden	8	90	2
United Kingdom	29	67	4
European Average	18	79	3

¹⁷⁹ BBC, September 2008

In the conflict between al-Qaeda and the United States do you think al-Qaeda is winning, the United States is winning, or neither side is winning?

	Al Qaeda is winning	Neither side is winning	United States is winning	Never heard of al Qaeda/ DK/ NA/ Other
United States	8	56	31	7
Canada	7	70	13	10
Brazil	12	52	10	26
Costa Rica	12	56	18	14
Panama	11	47	16	26
Mexico	8	73	9	10
Italy	11	71	10	8
France	9	73	7	11
Russia	8	33	12	47

Germany	6	38	35	21
United Kingdom	5	75	11	9
United Arab Emirates	16	29	16	39
Lebanon	12	44	26	18
Turkey	11	29	38	22
Egypt	10	40	39	11
Nigeria	17	25	34	24
Kenya	12	33	45	21
Pakistan	21	24	11	44
Indonesia	14	36	18	32
India	10	21	21	48
Australia	8	70	14	8
China	5	45	22	28
Philippines	2	39	39	20
Average	10	47	22	22

¹⁸⁰ BBC, September 2008

Do you think what U.S. leaders refer to as the “war on terror” has made al-Qaeda stronger, weaker, or has had no effect either way?

	Made al-Qaeda stronger	Had no effect	Made al-Qaeda weaker	Never heard of al-Qaeda/ DK/ NA
United States	33	26	34	7
Canada	32	38	15	15
Brazil	34	28	9	29
Costa Rica	27	36	22	15
Panama	28	26	21	25
Mexico	48	33	8	11
Italy	43	36	13	8
France	48	33	7	12
Russia	12	31	16	41
Germany	31	24	34	11
United Kingdom	40	36	13	11
United Arab Emirates	27	23	17	33
Lebanon	39	32	18	11
Turkey	31	18	32	19
Egypt	21	31	44	4
Nigeria	22	18	37	23
Kenya	16	15	58	11
Pakistan	24	30	13	33

Indonesia	24	33	12	31
India	16	19	27	38
Australia	41	31	17	11
China	23	29	25	23
Philippines	19	40	21	20
Average	30	29	22	19

¹⁸¹ BBC, January 2006

Do you think that the war in Iraq has increased, decreased, or had no effect on the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world?

	Increased	Decreased	Has had no effect	Other/DK/NA (vol)
Afghanistan	39	29	20	12
Argentina	76	3	11	11
Australia	73	4	19	3
Brazil	56	15	27	3
Canada	69	5	22	5
Chile	47	16	23	14
China	85	5	6	5
Congo	44	16	21	20
Egypt	83	1	6	10
Finland	82	4	11	3
France	67	3	27	4
Germany	80	4	14	2
Ghana	42	30	5	23
Great Britain	77	3	17	3
India	44	18	19	20
Indonesia	72	7	10	11
Iran	77	12	8	3
Iraq	75	12	11	2
Italy	81	1	15	3
Kenya	41	34	10	15
Mexico	10	12	59	19
Nigeria	29	49	6	16
Philippines	61	13	8	18
Poland	76	6	12	5
Russia	58	5	26	12
Saudi Arabia	49	2	9	40
Senegal	61	17	11	11
South Africa	42	18	10	30
South Korea	84	4	12	0
Spain	79	4	12	5
Sri Lanka	31	6	10	53
Tanzania	49	37	7	7
Turkey	64	6	14	17
United States	55	21	21	3
Zimbabwe	44	16	8	32
Average	60	12	15	13

¹⁸² WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2008

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	DK / NS
Argentina	18	76	6
Mexico	24	73	3
United States	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7
Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22
Palestinian Territories	28	66	6
Turkey	51	36	13
Kenya	58	41	2
Nigeria	54	41	5
China	28	66	6
Hong Kong	22	67	12
India	59	28	13
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	51	48	1
Thailand	44	36	19
Average	35	57	8

[Asked only to those who answered “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat...”]

What about cases that have nothing to do with terrorism? Do you think that there should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases or that in general governments should be allowed to use torture to try to get information?

	Clear rules should be maintained	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS on 1st question
Argentina	76	13	5	6
Mexico	73	17	7	3
United States	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palest Territories	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Kenya	41	44	14	2
Nigeria	41	39	15	5

China	66	10	18	6
Hong Kong	67	9	13	12
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
South Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

¹⁸³ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

As you may know, [country] has signed treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and that require that the International Committee of the Red Cross to have access to them. Do you think that these treaties are:

	Important for making sure governments treat people humanely (percent)	Too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
United States	73	23	4
Great Britain	64	32	4
Germany	72	22	6
Poland	60	24	16
India	42	26	32
Average	62	25	12

¹⁸⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

Is it your impression that current U.S. policies for detaining people it has captured and is holding in Guantanamo Bay are or are not legal, according to international treaties on the treatment of detainees?

	Are legal (percent)	Are not legal (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
United States	52	38	9
Great Britain	22	65	14
Germany	8	85	7
Poland	18	50	32
India	28	34	38
Average	26	54	20

¹⁸⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

Is it your impression that the U.S. government is:

	Currently allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists (percent)	Making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
United States	47	45	8
Great Britain	62	27	12
Germany	76	14	10
Poland	49	24	27
India	33	23	44
Average	53	27	20

¹⁸⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

If the United States requests permission to fly through [country's] airspace when it is transporting a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture, do you think [country] should allow the United States to do this or do you think that it should refuse permission?

	Should allow U.S. to fly through airspace (percent)	Should refuse permission (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
Great Britain	26	66	7
Germany	35	55	10
Poland	36	48	16
India	28	42	30
Average	31	53	16

¹⁸⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2008

As you know, on September 11, 2001 the United States was attacked. Who do you think was behind the 9/11 attacks? [OPEN ENDED RESPONSES]

	Al-Qaeda/Bin Laden/Islamic extremists	The U.S. government	Israel	Other Arabs/Saudis/ Egyptians	Other	DK/NS
Mexico	33	30	1	5	13	19
France	63	8	0	3	4	23
Germany	64	23	1	0	2	9
Great Britain	57	5	1	2	10	26
Italy	56	15	1	3	4	21
Russia	57	15	2	4	2	19
Ukraine	42	15	1	3	2	39
Azerbaijan	69	5	6	6	1	13
Egypt	16	12	43	2	9	18
Jordan	11	17	31	2	2	36
Palestinian Territories	42	27	19	7	2	3
Turkey	39	36	3	1	0	21
Kenya	77	4	3	3	0	12
Nigeria	71	7	2	4	2	14
China	32	9	0	1	2	56
Hong Kong	54	7	0	2	2	35
Macau	51	7	0	1	2	40
India	62	6	7	6	6	12
Indonesia	23	14	5	1	0	57
South Korea	51	17	1	5	4	22
Taiwan	53	4	0	5	5	34
Thailand	35	5	2	3	0	56
Average	47	14	7	3	3	25

¹⁸⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

The possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
United States	69	27	3	1
Armenia	62	21	7	10
Australia	68	25	6	1
China	27	43	17	12
India	54	27	12	7
Israel	72	17	7	4
Mexico	75	17	4	3
South Korea	50	40	9	0
Ukraine	45	31	7	17

¹⁸⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that [survey country] might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of [survey country], a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
United States	74	22	2	2
Armenia	58	24	12	6
Australia	82	14	4	0
China	52	33	7	8
India	56	25	9	10
Mexico	65	23	8	3
South Korea	56	38	6	1
Thailand	57	20	7	17

¹⁹⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

I would like you to consider a possible international agreement for eliminating all nuclear weapons. All countries with nuclear weapons would be required to eliminate them according to a timetable. All other countries would be required not to develop them. All countries, including [country], would be monitored to make sure they are following the agreement. Would you favor or oppose such an agreement?

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	85	8	2	2	3
Mexico	70	17	7	3	3
United States	39	38	13	7	2
France	58	28	7	5	3
Britain	55	26	9	8	2
Russia	38	31	8	6	16
Ukraine	53	27	5	2	14
Azerbaijan	48	22	8	14	8
Egypt	39	44	7	10	0
Iran	50	18	8	5	19
Israel	42	25	13	12	8
Pakistan	20	26	21	20	13
Palestinian Territories	33	37	14	8	9
Turkey	55	10	5	5	24

Kenya	68	28	2	1	1
Nigeria	55	31	8	4	2
China	60	23	9	5	3
India	31	31	11	9	18
Indonesia	60	21	6	5	9
South Korea	53	33	11	4	1
Thailand	45	22	4	4	25
Average	50	26	9	7	9

¹⁹¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	70	21	10
United States	62	33	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	55	27	19
Ukraine	51	22	26
Azerbaijan	59	26	16
Egypt	74	26	0
Israel	62	33	5
Palestinian Territories	38	59	3
Turkey	58	23	19
Kenya	84	15	1
Nigeria	81	17	2
China	47	40	14
India	53	34	13
Indonesia	68	19	14
South Korea	43	55	1
Thailand	52	31	18
Average	59	31	10

¹⁹² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Do you think that [survey country] should or should not participate in the treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide?

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
United States	86	10	4
China	73	17	10
India	57	31	12
South Korea	86	13	2

¹⁹³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

In the past, the international community has agreed that all countries have the right to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes. Now it has been proposed that certain countries not be allowed to develop nuclear fuel out of concern they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Do you think this proposal is a good idea or a bad idea?

	Good Idea	Bad Idea	Not sure/ Decline
United States	66	31	3
Argentina	48	29	23
Armenia	61	22	18
China	57	23	20
France	56	40	4
India	49	36	15
Israel	69	27	3
Palestinian Territories	40	57	3
Peru	56	42	2
Poland	61	19	20
Russia	59	23	19
Thailand	41	33	26
Ukraine	60	17	24

¹⁹⁴ BBC July 2006

Which of the following positions about new countries developing nuclear fuel is closer to your own?

	All countries should be free to produce nuclear fuel under United Nations oversight, because they have the right to have nuclear energy and should not have to depend on other countries	Because nuclear fuel can be developed for use in nuclear weapons, the United Nations should try to stop new countries from producing nuclear fuel but should provide them with the fuel they need	Neither/ Depends	DK / NA
Australia	32	60	6	2
Brazil	28	60	8	5
Canada	31	59	6	3
Chile	26	55	9	11
China	44	42	8	5
Egypt	49	39	6	5
France	44	46	6	4
Germany	28	63	6	2
India	25	29	22	24
Indonesia	46	45	3	5
Iraq	42	51	-	3
Israel	30	59	3	8
Italy	29	57	12	2
Kenya	35	51	5	9
Mexico	33	60	8	-
Nigeria	38	48	4	10
Philippines	32	56	8	4
Poland	32	49	6	14
South Korea	22	76	1	1
Russia	26	46	14	13
Spain	14	61	13	12
Turkey	51	29	8	12

Ukraine	26	50	11	13
Great Britain	36	55	6	3
United States	29	56	7	7
Average	33	52	7	7

¹⁹⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
United States	57	39	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	53	22	25
Ukraine	52	20	27
Azerbaijan	59	20	21
Egypt	51	49	0
Israel	54	39	7
Palestinian Territories	39	57	4
Turkey	58	20	23
Kenya	84	15	2
Nigeria	75	21	4
China	47	34	19
India	50	32	18
Indonesia	62	25	14
South Korea	42	56	2
Thailand	59	21	20
Average	56	32	12

¹⁹⁶ **BBC July 2006**

Do you think that Iran is producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs or do you think it is also trying to develop nuclear weapons?

	Iran is producing nuclear strictly for energy needs	Iran is also trying to develop nuclear weapons	Neither / Depends	DK / NA
Australia	21	65	5	10
Brazil	10	72	6	13
Canada	10	68	5	16
Chile	13	58	4	25
China	18	58	11	13
Egypt	38	54	4	4
France	10	66	7	16
Germany	15	65	10	9
India	18	32	19	31
Indonesia	35	47	6	11
Iraq	38	60	-	1
Israel	9	83	1	7
Italy	10	74	4	13

Kenya	13	63	5	20
Mexico	20	41	4	35
Nigeria	26	46	4	23
Philippines	26	59	6	8
Poland	7	67	3	23
South Korea	11	76	2	11
Russia	12	48	13	27
Spain	11	58	8	23
Turkey	15	59	10	17
Ukraine	17	39	11	33
Great Britain	19	57	6	19
United States	5	83	3	9
Average	17	60	6	17

How concerned would you be if Iran were to develop nuclear weapons? Would you be...?

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	Depends	DK / NA
Australia	67	24	4	4	0	1
Brazil	57	17	10	12	0	4
Canada	63	24	6	5	1	1
Chile	49	25	12	6	1	7
China	23	45	22	7	1	1
Egypt	37	37	17	7	1	1
France	46	39	11	3	1	1
Germany	57	27	11	2	2	0
India	29	28	9	11	8	16
Indonesia	16	37	31	9	3	4
Iraq	25	40	20	14		0
Israel	64	18	7	9	0	3
Italy	65	25	6	3	0	0
Kenya	48	21	11	12	1	6
Mexico	34	21	15	8	5	17
Nigeria	31	24	16	16	2	11
Philippines	36	30	18	10	2	4
Poland	53	27	10	3	2	7
South Korea	30	52	14	2	0	0
Russia	25	33	21	7	4	10
Spain	42	33	9	7	2	6
Turkey	28	29	24	7	8	4
Ukraine	21	36	16	7	8	12
Great Britain	67	23	5	4	0	0
United States	72	20	5	2	0	0
Average	43	29	13	7	2	5

¹⁹⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006

I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to [Europe/the United States] in the next 10 years. Please tell me if you think each one on the list is an extremely important threat, an important threat, or not an important threat at all.

Iran acquiring nuclear weapons

	Extremely important threat	Important threat	Not an important threat at all	DK/ Refused
United States	75	19	5	1
France	53	37	9	1
Germany	67	26	7	1
United Kingdom	56	30	10	4
Italy	62	29	7	1
Netherlands	62	27	9	1
Poland	64	31	3	3
Portugal	69	17	10	4
Spain	68	25	7	-
Slovakia	5	11	24	60
Turkey	35	30	21	13
Bulgaria	43	36	9	12
Romania	57	28	8	8
European Average	53	27	10	10

¹⁹⁸ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

If Iran obtains nuclear weapons, how likely or not do you think it is that the following will happen? Just give us your best guess.

Iran will attack other countries in the region

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/ Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	44	31	16	7	3	75	22
France	20	35	31	10	4	55	41
Germany	33	35	23	7	3	68	29
United Kingdom	28	34	23	9	5	62	33
Italy	10	46	26	6	3	65	32
Netherlands	20	34	32	12	3	53	44
Poland	16	47	19	3	14	64	22
Portugal	39	36	17	7	11	65	24
Spain	30	38	21	9	3	68	30
Slovakia	10	35	31	7	18	44	38
Turkey	17	32	18	15	18	49	33
Bulgaria	16	34	20	9	21	50	29
Romania	23	29	21	9	18	52	30
European Average	24	37	23	9	7	61	32

Other countries in the Middle East will decide that, like Iran, they should have nuclear weapons as well

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/ Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	50	33	8	6	3	83	13
France	28	39	20	10	3	67	30

Germany	37	34	16	10	3	71	20
United Kingdom	37	41	13	7	3	77	20
Italy	21	50	21	5	3	71	27
Netherlands	32	39	19	9	1	71	28
Poland	20	47	15	4	15	67	18
Portugal	35	36	13	7	9	71	20
Spain	32	40	15	11	2	72	26
Slovakia	15	43	20	6	16	58	26
Turkey	18	40	12	7	23	58	19
Bulgaria	20	44	11	4	21	64	16
Romania	25	33	16	6	21	58	22
European Average	28	40	16	8	8	68	24

Iran will supply nuclear weapons to terrorists

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	56	27	10	5	3	82	15
France	26	39	23	7	5	65	30
Germany	40	34	17	6	2	75	23
United Kingdom	34	34	17	8	6	69	25
Italy	30	47	16	4	3	77	20
Netherlands	30	36	23	8	4	65	31
Poland	25	49	12	3	13	73	14
Portugal	34	38	18	8	3	72	26
Spain	33	38	20	6	18	56	26
Slovakia	18	38	20	6	18	56	26
Turkey	21	27	13	16	23	47	30
Bulgaria	22	33	15	7	23	55	22
Romania	29	28	16	7	19	57	24
European Average	30	37	17	8	8	68	24

Iran will threaten Europe with nuclear weapons

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	36	30	20	9	5	67	29
France	16	26	41	14	3	42	55
Germany	23	32	31	12	2	56	43
United Kingdom	23	30	29	14	4	54	42
Italy	17	37	33	10	2	55	43
Netherlands	14	27	40	18	2	40	58
Poland	22	48	17	4	10	70	20
Portugal	22	33	23	13	10	54	36
Spain	24	31	29	15	2	54	44
Slovakia	13	30	31	10	16	43	41
Turkey	25	34	11	9	21	59	20
Bulgaria	18	34	10	9	20	52	27
Romania	22	28	21	10	10	50	31
European Average	21	33	28	11	7	54	39

Iran will only use nuclear weapons for defensive purposes (if attacked themselves)

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	19	24	25	27	5	43	52
France	23	35	28	11	4	58	38
Germany	29	22	27	20	2	52	47
United Kingdom	24	33	25	12	6	57	37
Italy	10	36	36	15	3	45	52
Netherlands	22	30	29	16	3	52	45
Poland	13	37	26	7	18	50	32
Portugal	21	27	27	16	10	47	43
Spain	21	34	25	17	3	55	42
Slovakia	10	27	29	13	22	37	42
Turkey	30	26	12	11	21	56	22
Bulgaria	13	29	21	11	27	42	32
Romania	18	27	20	14	22	45	33
European Average	22	31	26	14	8	52	39

¹⁹⁹ BBC December 2007

What action should the UN Security Council take if Iran continues to produce nuclear fuel?

	Not pressure Iran	Use only diplomatic efforts	Impose economic sanctions	Authorize military strike
Canada	6	42	35	10
United States	4	31	45	15
Central America	26	30	17	3
Argentina	16	31	12	1
Mexico	15	65	10	6
Chile	13	39	23	4
Germany	17	44	34	3
Russia	12	38	24	3
Portugal	10	46	32	4
Spain	9	45	28	8
France	8	46	24	7
Great Britain	7	50	29	5
Italy	4	52	29	7
Egypt	56	29	13	3
Turkey	21	33	28	5
Israel	6	15	37	34
Nigeria	25	41	17	12
Ghana	18	43	17	8
Kenya	16	56	16	9
Indonesia	19	53	16	2
India	17	26	20	6

Philippines	13	63	16	3
China	13	42	27	13
Australia	7	47	35	7
South Korea	7	37	48	5
Japan	4	53	37	2
Average	14	42	26	7

²⁰⁰ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

Diplomatic efforts are underway to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Should these efforts fail, which of the following strategies would you most favor?

	Accept that Iran may develop nuclear weapons	Maintain the present level of diplomatic pressure on Iran	Increase diplomatic pressure on Iran but rule out the use of military force	Increase diplomatic pressure on Iran and maintain the option of using military force	DK/Refused
United States	6	13	27	49	6
France	2	19	54	22	2
Germany	4	11	56	27	2
United Kingdom	8	20	38	28	5
Italy	3	14	59	23	2
Netherlands	7	14	45	31	4
Poland	5	19	47	14	15
Portugal	3	13	62	15	8
Spain	4	18	53	20	5
Slovakia	4	18	56	8	14
Turkey	23	17	12	12	35
Bulgaria	4	20	47	12	17
Romania	3	17	46	8	26
European Average	6	16	47	21	9

²⁰¹ **BBC December 2007**

If UN inspectors are given access, should Iran be allowed to produce nuclear fuel for electricity?

	Should be allowed	Should not be allowed
Canada	58	36
United States	55	38
Mexico	79	6
Chile	36	36
Central America	30	38
Argentina	26	24
Great Britain	71	22
Portugal	59	26

Italy	58	30
France	56	24
Spain	49	36
Germany	38	50
Russia	33	24
Egypt	86	14
Turkey	30	54
Israel	28	62
Kenya	56	39
Nigeria	46	40
Ghana	45	39
Australia	64	31
Indonesia	56	31
China	51	40
South Korea	38	51
Philippines	27	60
India	24	25
Japan	23	54
Average	47	36

²⁰² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006

And who do you think can best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons?

	The United Nations	The NATO alliance	The United States	The European Union	DK/ Refused
United States	36	18	22	13	10
France	49	22	8	17	5
Germany	47	12	8	25	9
United Kingdom	56	17	6	13	8
Italy	52	13	9	17	9
Netherlands	55	21	9	9	6
Poland	28	13	18	15	26
Portugal	45	14	10	18	13
Spain	44	14	8	25	9
Slovakia	50	20	6	8	16
Turkey	21	14	5	25	34
Bulgaria	34	15	10	10	30
Romania	36	21	8	10	26
European Average	43	15	8	19	14

²⁰³ Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009

In your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem?

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Serious	Not Serious	DK/R
United States	44	30	14	11	74	25	2

Canada	47	37	7	8	84	15	1
Britain	50	34	10	5	84	15	2
France	68	28	3	1	96	4	0
Germany	60	30	6	2	90	8	1
Spain	61	29	4	2	90	6	3
Poland	36	47	10	2	83	12	5
Russia	44	34	14	4	78	18	4
Turkey	65	19	4	3	84	7	9
Egypt	54	23	11	6	77	17	6
Jordan	54	24	11	5	78	16	6
Lebanon	53	30	14	1	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	59	29	5	5	88	10	2
Israel	48	41	6	3	89	9	2
China	30	54	12	1	84	13	3
India	67	26	2	0	93	2	5
Indonesia	46	35	9	2	81	11	7
Japan	65	25	7	2	90	9	0
Pakistan	50	16	3	2	66	5	29
South Korea	68	29	2	0	97	2	1
Argentina	69	25	3	1	94	4	2
Brazil	90	4	2	1	94	3	3
Mexico	65	25	3	1	90	4	7
Kenya	48	30	9	4	78	13	10
Nigeria	57	29	6	3	86	9	5
Average	56	29	7	3	85	10	5

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/Refused
United States	42	30	13	11	3
Britain	56	28	10	5	1
France	72	24	3	1	0
Germany	61	29	7	2	1
Spain	67	28	2	2	1
Poland	51	35	8	1	4
Russia	49	25	14	7	4
Turkey	82	7	3	2	5
Egypt	38	38	16	6	3
Jordan	41	35	20	4	1
Lebanon	43	35	19	2	1
Australia	62	27	6	3	1
China	24	51	17	1	7
India	66	22	5	1	5
Indonesia	46	32	9	3	10
Japan	73	22	4	1	0
Pakistan	48	12	5	3	31
South Korea	68	29	3	1	0
Argentina	70	24	3	1	3
Brazil	92	4	1	1	1
Mexico	70	18	6	1	4
Nigeria	45	25	11	6	13
South Africa	47	19	10	4	20
Tanzania	75	14	6	3	2

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2007

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/Refused
United States	47	28	13	9	2
Canada	58	29	8	4	2
Argentina	69	21	2	1	7
Bolivia	68	24	4	1	3
Brazil	88	8	1	2	2
Chile	75	17	2	1	5
Mexico	57	24	10	2	7
Peru	66	20	4	1	9
Venezuela	78	17	1	2	1
Britain	45	37	10	5	3
France	68	27	4	1	0
Germany	60	26	8	4	2
Italy	57	35	2	1	6
Spain	70	25	2	0	3
Sweden	64	25	5	2	4
Bulgaria	66	19	5	1	8
Czech Republic	61	29	8	3	0
Poland	40	47	8	2	4
Russia	40	33	19	6	3
Slovakia	65	28	5	1	1
Ukraine	59	30	7	1	2
Turkey	70	18	3	1	8
Egypt	32	37	18	8	6
Jordan	32	32	25	8	3
Kuwait	69	19	6	6	1
Lebanon	41	42	15	2	1
Morocco	69	13	6	3	10
Palestinian Territories	59	22	5	7	7
Israel	48	37	11	2	2
Pakistan	41	21	5	3	30
Bangladesh	85	12	2	0	1
Indonesia	43	32	9	3	12
Malaysia	46	32	10	2	10
China	42	46	7	1	4
India	57	28	4	1	10
Japan	78	19	2	1	1
South Korea	75	22	2	0	0

²⁰⁴ **GlobeScan January 2006**

How serious a problem do you consider each of the following issues to be? Is it a very serious problem, somewhat serious problem, not very serious problem or not a serious problem at all? What about [...]?

Climate change or global warming, due to the Greenhouse Effect

Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not very serious	Not at all serious
--------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------

Argentina	80	14	2	*
Brazil	78	15	4	1
Canada	57	33	6	3
Chile	86	10	2	*
China	39	41	15	2
Costa Rica	84	11	4	1
El Salvador	81	16	3	*
Finland	59	30	8	1
France	70	24	3	1
Germany	73	20	5	1
Great Britain	70	21	6	2
Guatemala	83	12	3	1
Honduras	58	23	10	4
India	65	25	8	1
Indonesia	44	37	14	2
Italy	68	26	4	1
Japan	75	23	2	*
Kenya	44	21	13	6
Mexico	67	21	4	4
Nicaragua	90	9	*	*
Nigeria	47	33	13	3
Panama	73	22	5	*
Philippines	46	40	12	1
Poland	66	26	3	1
Russia	59	29	7	1
Saudi Arabia	63	33	3	-
South Africa	44	28	9	5
South Korea	63	31	4	*
Turkey	64	34	2	*
United States	49	27	12	9
Average	65	25	3	2

²⁰⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

Using the same scale, how high a priority do you think the government SHOULD place on addressing climate change?

	0 - 4 (Low priority)	5	6 - 10 (High Priority)	DK/ refused	Mean	Median
Mexico	2	4	90	4	9.09	10
United States	42	13	44	1	4.71	5
France	3	6	89	3	8.03	8
Germany	5	12	83	0	7.57	8
Great Britain	4	6	89	1	8.20	8
Poland	8	9	77	6	7.88	8
Russia	8	12	65	15	7.39	8
Ukraine	7	6	72	16	7.95	8
Egypt	12	6	82	0	7.18	8
Iraq	37	9	35	19	5.14	5
Palestinian Territories	43	14	34	9	4.91	5
Turkey	5	5	83	8	8.34	9
Kenya	20	15	63	2	6.48	6
Nigeria	3	6	89	2	7.81	8

China	1	3	94	2	8.86	9
Macau	8	14	60	18	7.00	7
India	16	14	59	11	6.73	7
Indonesia	7	6	75	12	7.38	7
South Korea	6	12	82	0	7.42	8
Taiwan	5	9	82	4	7.52	8
Average	13	9	73	6	7.28	7.50

²⁰⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all:

Global Warming

	Critical	Important but not Critical	Not Important	DK/NS
United States	46	39	13	2
Armenia	47	26	16	11
Australia	69	26	5	0
China	47	33	12	8
India	51	27	10	12
Iran	61	16	9	14
Israel	52	25	15	7
Mexico	70	18	7	5
South Korea	67	29	4	0
Ukraine	33	33	11	23

²⁰⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

And in the next 10 years, please tell me how likely you are to be personally affected by each of the following threats:

The effects of global warming

	Likely	Not Likely	DK/R
European Average	85	13	3
United States	70	28	2
France	89	10	1
Germany	82	17	*
United Kingdom	80	20	1
Italy	87	12	1
Netherlands	77	23	1
Poland	83	13	3
Portugal	91	6	4
Spain	93	7	1
Slovakia	77	18	5
Turkey	84	7	9
Bulgaria	79	12	9

Romania 81 10 9

²⁰⁸ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trend 2008**

Which among these should be the top priority for the next American president and European leaders?

	Climate change	Int'l terrorism	Int'l economic problems	Managing relations with Russia	Spread of nuclear weapons	Stabilizing Afghanistan	Managing relations with china	Easing tensions in the Middle East
European Average	24	25	19	3	6	4	3	15
United States	8	26	21	1	9	7	5	18
France	30	18	19	*	6	2	4	17
Germany	42	13	12	4	7	4	4	18
United Kingdom	21	22	16	2	7	9	5	19
Italy	25	25	19	2	7	2	3	14
Netherlands	28	21	14	2	6	5	3	19
Poland	9	25	23	10	9	6	2	12
Portugal	29	17	19	2	7	5	3	13
Spain	30	28	21	1	3	2	1	13
Slovakia	9	33	29	6	9	2	1	10
Turkey	8	47	22	2	5	1	*	9
Bulgaria	7	38	33	4	8	1	*	14
Romania	9	35	27	7	7	4	1	13

²⁰⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

What is your guess on how high a priority the average person in [Country] thinks the government should place on addressing climate change?

	0 - 4 (Low priority)	5	6 - 10 (High Priority)	DK/refused	Mean	Median
Mexico	8	11	76	5	7.98	9
United States	67	14	18	0	3.71	3
France	9	16	66	9	6.77	7
Germany	10	24	66	0	6.47	6
Great Britain	10	23	65	3	6.52	7
Poland	22	18	51	10	6.25	6
Russia	7	11	59	23	7.22	8
Ukraine	8	7	64	21	7.76	8
Egypt	19	10	71	1	6.65	7
Iraq	32	15	32	22	5.05	5
Palestinian Territories	19	12	60	9	6.21	6
Turkey	13	15	60	12	6.98	7
Kenya	23	13	61	3	6.31	6
Nigeria	8	8	82	3	7.49	8

China	23	23	52	2	6.05	6
Macau	13	17	53	17	6.57	7
India	18	11	61	11	6.76	8
Indonesia	11	14	62	14	6.34	6
South Korea	36	31	32	1	4.98	5
Taiwan	10	16	67	6	6.88	7
Average	19	15	58	8	6.42	6.56

Does individual perceive themselves differently from the public on how high a priority climate change should be?

	Individuals think they have a higher priority	Has the same priority as the public	Individuals think they have a lower priority	DK/Ref
Chile	42	29	11	19
Mexico	38	45	12	6
United States	52	22	24	1
France	49	29	13	9
Germany	52	38	10	0
Great Britain	66	18	13	3
Poland	49	27	14	10
Russia	22	35	16	26
Ukraine	15	50	12	22
Egypt	37	39	23	1
Iraq	28	20	29	22
Palestinian Territories	18	15	52	15
Turkey	40	37	10	13
Kenya	40	19	39	3
Nigeria	36	30	30	3
China	77	16	5	3
Hong Kong*	38	40	14	8
Macau*	26	36	14	24
Taiwan*	35	47	18	0
India	23	29	33	16
Indonesia	47	27	12	14
South Korea	75	16	8	1
Average	42	28	19	10

²¹⁰ **GlobeScan 2006**

How serious a problem do you consider each of the following issues to be? Is it a very serious problem, somewhat serious problem, not very serious problem or not a serious problem at all? What about [...]?

Climate change or global warming, due to the Greenhouse Effect

**Very
serious**

**Somewhat
serious**

**Not very
serious**

**Not at all
serious**

	2006	2003	2006	2003	2006	2003	2006	2003
Argentina	80	64	14	21	2	7	*	1
Brazil	78	74	15	18	4	5	1	2
Canada	57	40	33	41	6	11	3	5
China	39	37	41	42	15	17	2	1
France	70	46	24	43	3	8	1	1
Germany	73	54	20	33	5	10	1	2
Great Britain	70	50	21	35	6	9	2	3
India	65	67	25	24	8	5	1	1
Indonesia	44	36	37	43	14	16	2	1
Italy	68	63	26	30	4	5	1	1
Mexico	67	71	21	23	4	3	4	1
Nigeria	47	35	33	32	13	18	3	8
Russia	59	43	29	34	7	15	1	1
South Africa	44	30	28	32	9	18	5	6
Turkey	64	37	34	40	2	16	*	1
United States	49	31	27	40	12	13	9	11
Average	65	49	25	33	3	11	2	3

²¹¹ BBC July 2007

As you may know there has been an increase in the temperature of the earth, do you believe that human activity, including industry and transportation, is or is not a significant cause of climate change?

	Human activity IS a significant cause	Human activity IS NOT a significant cause	DK / NA
Australia	81	16	3
Brazil	88	8	4
Canada	77	21	2
Chile	85	9	6
China	87	11	2
Egypt	66	33	1
France	89	8	4
Germany	87	11	2
Britain	78	17	5
India	47	21	33
Indonesia	71	17	11
Italy	92	7	1
Kenya	72	20	8
Mexico	94	4	2
Nigeria	72	18	9
Philippines	76	20	4
Russia	79	12	9
South Korea	91	7	2
Spain	93	5	1
Turkey	70	14	16
United States	71	24	5
Average	79	14	6

²¹² BBC July 2006

Please tell me if you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned or not at all concerned about each of the following possibilities related to energy issues:

That the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	69	25	5	1	*
Brazil	61	20	10	8	1
Canada	62	29	4	4	1
Chile	50	28	10	6	6
Egypt	41	36	15	7	1
France	45	45	7	3	1
Germany	43	40	13	3	1
Britain	66	27	4	2	1
India	41	20	13	8	18
Israel	42	33	12	10	2
Italy	60	31	7	2	1
Kenya	55	24	11	5	5
Mexico	35	39	18	5	3
Philippines	47	41	8	2	2
Poland	17	41	23	8	12
Russia	20	46	20	4	9
South Korea	43	47	7	1	2
Ukraine	35	38	14	3	10
United States	53	29	10	8	1
Average	47	34	11	5	4

²¹³ BBC July 2007

As you may know there is some discussion these days about whether it is necessary to take steps to reduce the impact of human activities that are thought to cause global warming or climate change. Would you say that you believe that:

	It is not necessary to take any steps	It is necessary to take modest steps over the coming years	It is necessary to take major steps starting very soon	DK / NA
Australia	3	25	70	1
Brazil	4	16	76	4
Canada	7	20	72	2
Chile	2	16	78	5
China	4	25	70	2
Egypt	14	43	43	*
France	1	13	85	1
Germany	4	45	50	1
Britain	3	25	70	2
India	12	26	37	26
Indonesia	4	22	64	10
Italy	1	13	86	*
Kenya	12	31	53	4
Mexico	1	13	83	3
Nigeria	16	27	50	7

Philippines	7	19	70	4
Russia	6	44	43	8
South Korea	5	45	48	2
Spain	2	6	91	1
Turkey	11	19	59	11
United States	6	33	59	2
Average	6	25	65	5

²¹⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

There is a controversy over what the countries of the world, including [survey country], should do about the problem of global warming. Here are three statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own point of view.

	Until we are sure that global warming really is a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs	The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost	Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs	DK/NS
United States	17	37	43	3
Argentina	3	19	63	16
Armenia	19	32	37	12
Australia	8	23	69	0
China	8	41	42	9
France	2	20	78	*
India	24	30	19	26
Israel	10	29	54	7
Philippines	18	49	27	7
Poland	11	39	30	20
Russia	22	34	32	12
Thailand	7	41	27	24
Ukraine	14	37	30	19

²¹⁵ Eurobarometer May 2007

Overall, thinking about global warming, do you think that it is a matter that should be dealt with by the European Union urgently or not? It should be dealt with by the European Union...

	Very urgently	Fairly Urgently	Not really urgently	Not at all urgently	DK/Refused
Austria	54	35	7	1	3
Belgium	62	27	8	1	2
Bulgaria	50	31	5	1	13
Croatia	75	17	3	1	4
Cyprus	87	9	2	0	2
Cyprus (Turk)	71	16	6	2	5
Czech Republic	54	37	6	1	2
Denmark	59	27	9	3	2
Estonia	35	38	14	4	9
Finland	53	36	9	1	1
France	70	23	4	1	2
Germany	65	26	5	1	3
Greece	87	10	2	1	0

Hungary	66	26	4	1	3
Ireland	57	31	3	1	8
Italy	50	34	8	2	6
Latvia	41	36	10	2	11
Lithuania	43	36	12	3	6
Luxembourg	69	21	7	2	1
Malta	61	23	6	2	8
Poland	41	40	10	1	8
Portugal	53	32	5	1	9
Romania	50	30	6	2	12
Slovakia	49	39	7	1	4
Slovenia	69	26	4	0	1
Spain	54	37	2	1	6
Sweden	76	17	4	1	2
The Netherlands	58	28	9	2	3
Turkey	66	10	4	2	18
United Kingdom	51	33	7	3	6
Average	59	28	6	2	5

More precisely, please tell me to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement about climate change: The European Union should urgently put new policies in place to reduce greenhouse-gas emission by at least 20% by 2020.

	Agree	Disagree	DK
EU 27 Average	89	5	6
Austria	89	7	4
Belgium	92	6	2
Bulgaria	87	3	10
Croatia	92	2	6
Cyprus	94	1	5
Cyprus (Turk)	82	9	9
Czech Republic	93	5	2
Denmark	90	8	2
Estonia	83	7	10
Finland	89	9	2
France	94	3	3
Germany	92	6	2
Greece	98	2	0
Hungary	93	4	3
Ireland	86	3	11
Italy	85	9	6
Latvia	86	6	8
Lithuania	82	6	12
Luxembourg	90	8	2
Malta	91	2	7
Poland	84	6	10
Portugal	88	5	7
Romania	86	4	10
Slovakia	90	5	5

Slovenia	95	4	1
Spain	87	3	10
Sweden	95	3	2
The Netherlands	89	8	3
Turkey	70	5	25
United Kingdom	86	8	6

²¹⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming

	Should Participate	Should not participate	NS/Decline
United States	70	23	7
South Korea	88	11	2

²¹⁷ **BBC July 2007**

Please tell me how necessary it is: For individuals in [country] to make changes in their life style and behavior in order to reduce the amount of climate changing gases they produce.

	Will definitely be necessary	Probably be necessary	Necessary	Probably not be necessary	Definitely not be necessary	Not necessary	DK / NA
Australia	55	32	87	7	5	11	2
Brazil	50	38	89	5	2	7	4
Canada	63	28	91	4	3	7	1
Chile	49	41	90	5	1	5	5
China	59	28	86	6	5	12	2
Egypt	31	41	71	16	12	29	0
France	49	42	91	5	3	8	1
Germany	36	52	87	10	2	12	1
Britain	53	33	87	9	3	12	1
India	34	27	61	12	6	18	21
Indonesia	46	38	84	8	2	10	6
Italy	62	31	93	5	2	6	1
Kenya	36	34	70	16	9	25	5
Mexico	64	28	92	3	4	7	1
Nigeria	30	35	65	22	11	33	2
Philippines	46	41	87	8	3	11	2
Russia	27	49	76	10	3	13	11
South Korea	28	58	86	13	1	13	1
Spain	68	24	93	4	2	7	1
Turkey	22	55	77	9	2	11	12
United States	48	31	79	10	9	19	2
Average	46	37	83	9	4	13	4

²¹⁸ BBC July 2007

How much have you heard or read about global warming or climate change?

	A great deal	Some	Not very much	Nothing at all	DK/NA
Australia	54	36	9	2	*
Brazil	43	35	13	10	-
Canada	56	33	8	2	*
Chile	23	39	27	8	2
China	30	42	24	3	*
Egypt	17	41	25	16	-
France	62	30	5	3	*
Germany	28	48	22	2	*
Britain	61	29	6	3	1
India	15	33	33	3	16
Indonesia	8	20	47	18	7
Italy	51	36	11	1	*
Kenya	15	29	31	22	4
Mexico	43	30	23	4	-
Nigeria	20	30	38	10	2
Philippines	38	25	31	5	1
Russia	5	30	55	9	1
South Korea	43	51	4	1	1
Spain	32	45	19	3	-
Turkey	22	50	17	9	2
United States	59	30	8	2	*
Average	35	35	22	7	2

²¹⁹ BBC July 2007

Please tell me how necessary you think it is:

To increase the cost of the types of energy that most cause climate change, such as coal and oil/petrol, in order to encourage individuals and industry to use less.

	Will definitely be necessary	Probably be necessary	Necessary	Probably not be necessary	Definitely not be necessary	Not Necessary	DK / NA
Australia	42	38	80	10	7	17	2
Brazil	28	36	64	14	18	32	4
Canada	39	33	72	12	12	24	3
Chile	38	41	79	8	4	12	9
China	57	26	83	10	4	14	3
Egypt	24	37	61	25	13	38	1
France	25	36	61	20	16	36	4
Germany	19	52	71	20	8	28	2
Britain	35	41	76	11	9	20	3
India	25	24	49	18	10	28	23
Indonesia	36	47	83	8	2	10	8
Italy	24	23	47	26	24	50	3
Kenya	25	28	53	23	19	42	4

Mexico	31	30	61	10	23	33	6
Nigeria	17	30	47	28	23	51	1
Philippines	16	32	48	29	21	50	3
Russia	12	24	36	30	20	50	15
South Korea	5	44	49	37	12	49	2
Spain	33	19	52	29	13	42	4
Turkey	13	28	41	30	14	44	15
United States	29	36	65	17	15	32	3
Average	27	34	61	20	14	34	6

²¹⁹ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: People should be willing to pay higher prices in order to address global climate change?

	Agree	Disagree	DK/R
United States	41	55	4
Canada	54	44	3
Britain	53	43	4
France	51	49	0
Germany	54	43	3
Spain	49	48	4
Poland	44	45	11
Russia	32	52	16
Turkey	61	23	16
Egypt	18	69	13
Jordan	15	73	13
Lebanon	46	45	9
Palestinian Territories	44	49	7
Israel	58	33	9
China	88	8	4
India	85	11	5
Indonesia	33	64	3
Japan	68	28	4
Pakistan	36	35	29
South Korea	69	26	5
Argentina	34	54	13
Brazil	48	41	11
Mexico	28	61	11
Kenya	45	48	7
Nigeria	42	54	4
Average	48	44	9

²²³ **BBC July 2006**

Creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	74	18	5	2	1
Brazil	65	22	4	6	3
Canada	66	25	4	4	1
Chile	31	31	13	12	13

Egypt	32	34	24	8	2
France	63	28	4	3	2
Germany	50	35	9	4	2
Britain	62	24	5	6	2
India	49	19	14	5	13
Israel	59	25	7	4	6
Italy	75	20	2	2	1
Kenya	48	29	11	8	5
Mexico	32	35	13	11	9
Philippines	31	39	19	8	2
Poland	55	31	4	3	7
Russia	30	44	9	4	13
South Korea	31	51	14	3	2
Ukraine	42	36	9	4	9
United States	59	26	6	6	2
Average	50	30	9	5	5

²²⁴ BBC July 2006

Requiring auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	59	29	6	5	1
Brazil	35	23	16	23	3
Canada	47	30	10	10	2
Chile	24	34	17	10	15
Egypt	20	27	26	25	2
France	24	31	18	23	4
Germany	38	42	14	4	2
Great Britain	45	29	12	11	3
India	36	19	7	13	24
Israel	35	30	15	13	7
Italy	47	38	7	4	3
Kenya	33	28	18	13	7
Mexico	25	44	11	13	8
Philippines	20	29	29	21	1
Poland	18	30	21	13	18
Russia	36	41	11	1	11
South Korea	23	51	20	3	3
Ukraine	38	43	8	2	10
United States	50	27	10	11	1
Average	34	33	15	11	7

²²⁵ BBC July 2006

Building new nuclear power plants to reduce reliance on oil and coal

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	19	34	20	24	3
Brazil	23	24	15	35	3

Canada	22	30	18	25	6
Chile	18	24	20	24	15
Egypt	30	39	21	9	1
France	10	28	23	34	5
Germany	9	26	26	36	3
Britain	21	29	17	26	7
India	36	30	11	10	13
Israel	20	29	18	23	10
Italy	26	27	18	25	5
Kenya	36	30	12	15	8
Mexico	19	35	20	13	13
Philippines	27	33	20	18	2
Poland	13	18	26	30	14
Russia	5	23	36	24	12
South Korea	15	50	27	4	4
Ukraine	6	18	31	36	9
United States	29	34	15	18	4
Average	20	29	21	23	7

²²⁶ BBC July 2006

Increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know / No answer
Australia	30	39	18	12	1
Brazil	6	7	13	73	*
Canada	18	29	21	30	2
Chile	14	27	23	25	13
Egypt	20	26	23	28	2
France	7	23	24	41	5
Germany	12	35	26	26	1
Britain	31	31	16	18	4
India	25	27	14	22	13
Israel	14	22	26	31	6
Italy	5	17	34	42	2
Kenya	32	28	18	17	5
Mexico	7	19	27	43	3
Philippines	20	18	22	38	1
Poland	2	5	34	53	5
Russia	2	11	39	45	4
South Korea	6	35	45	12	1
Ukraine	3	9	31	55	2
United States	19	28	22	29	2
Average	14	23	25	34	4

²²⁷ BBC July 2007

Which of the following points of view is closer to your own?

	Because countries that are less wealthy produce relatively low emissions per person they SHOULD NOT be expected to limit their emissions of climate change gases along with wealthy countries.	Because total emissions from less wealthy countries are substantial and growing, these countries SHOULD limit their emissions of climate change gases along with wealthy countries.	DK / NA
Australia	23	71	5
Brazil	26	63	11
Canada	27	68	5
Chile	19	63	18
China	27	68	4
Egypt	53	47	*
France	31	61	8
Germany	34	61	5
Britain	25	70	5
India	24	33	43
Indonesia	24	54	22
Italy	49	42	9
Kenya	31	64	5
Mexico	14	75	11
Nigeria	50	42	8
Philippines	37	49	14
Russia	20	58	22
South Korea	39	56	5
Spain	20	72	8
Turkey	23	41	36
United States	18	75	7
Average	29	59	12

²²⁸ BBC July 2007

Would you support or oppose the following deal:

Wealthy countries agree to provide less wealthy countries with financial assistance and technology, while less wealthy countries agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy countries.

	Support	Oppose	DK / NA
Australia	84	12	5
Brazil	73	17	10
Canada	84	12	4
Chile	68	16	16
China	90	7	3
Egypt	77	23	
France	78	14	8
Germany	75	22	3
Britain	81	13	5
India	47	19	34
Indonesia	78	12	10
Italy	77	18	5
Kenya	76	19	5
Mexico	57	29	14

Nigeria	50	46	4
Philippines	71	17	12
Russia	77	6	18
South Korea	72	23	5
Spain	76	17	7
Turkey	65	12	23
United States	70	21	9
Average	73	18	10

²²⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

If the less developed countries make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions, do you think the developed countries should provide substantial aid to help them?

	Yes, should help less developed countries	No, should not provide aid	NS/DK/Depends
United States	64	32	4
Poland	84	1	14
Ukraine	72	4	24

If the developed countries are willing to provide substantial aid, do you think the less developed countries should make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions?

	Yes, should make a commitment	No, should not make a commitment	NS/Decline
Argentina	68	7	25
Armenia	63	21	16
China	79	8	13
India	48	29	23
Thailand	49	9	43

²³⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Please tell me how helpful UN efforts have been in the following areas. Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10 with 0 being not at all helpful and 10 being extremely helpful: Working to address the problem of climate change

	(0-4) - Not helpful	5 - Neither helpful nor not helpful	(6-10) - Helpful	DK / NS
Azerbaijan	25	17	42	17
Egypt	30	13	54	3
Jordan	48	10	21	20
Palestinian Territories	70	8	20	2
Turkey	45	13	19	23
Indonesia	11	16	36	38
Average	38	13	32	17

²³¹ GlobeScan 2008

Effectiveness of current cooperation between Europe and North America in combating climate change, rated on 0 to 100 scale: Above average (6-10), average (5), below average (0-4)

	Above average	Average	Below average	DK/NR
Average	19	16	58	7
United Kingdom	16	15	66	4
United States	17	19	58	6
Canada	17	16	60	6
France	24	20	44	11
Germany	12	14	71	3
Spain	15	11	70	4
Ireland	17	16	64	3
Turkey	27	15	38	20
Poland	22	19	52	7

²³² Eurobarometer February 2008

Do you think that in the future EU Regional Policy should address issues such as globalization, climate change and demographic change?

	Yes	No	DK/NA
Belgium	84	10	6
Bulgaria	81	10	10
Czech Republic	58	30	12
Denmark	78	18	5
Germany	88	9	2
Estonia	79	14	8
Greece	85	11	3
Spain	85	10	5
France	85	12	3
Ireland	93	6	1
Italy	88	7	5
Cyprus	66	22	11
Latvia	79	10	11
Lithuania	84	8	8
Luxembourg	83	12	5
Hungary	90	7	3
Malta	85	4	11
Netherlands	76	17	7
Austria	88	8	4
Poland	70	19	11
Portugal	82	9	9
Romania	66	15	19
Slovenia	91	7	2
Slovakia	80	10	10
Finland	90	7	4
Sweden	94	4	2
Britain	86	12	1
Average	83	11	5

Eurobarometer February 2008

	Globalization (%)	Climate Change (%)	Demographic Change (%)	DK/NA (%)
Belgium	17	68	13	3

Bulgaria	19	41	36	3
Czech Republic	30	51	14	5
Denmark	17	64	15	4
Germany	16	61	20	3
Estonia	24	47	24	6
Greece	15	68	15	2
Spain	12	75	12	2
France	16	60	21	2
Ireland	25	60	13	2
Italy	18	62	17	2
Cyprus	36	47	14	4
Latvia	17	43	37	4
Lithuania	29	44	20	7
Luxembourg	21	63	14	3
Hungary	21	50	24	5
Malta	23	62	10	6
Netherlands	16	61	19	4
Austria	19	31	16	4
Poland	24	56	17	4
Portugal	23	60	12	5
Romania	26	57	12	6
Slovenia	13	70	13	3
Slovakia	33	47	16	4
Finland	8	72	18	2
Sweden	14	76	7	3
Britain	21	61	16	2
Average	18	61	17	3

²³³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

How high a priority does the government place on addressing climate change? Please answer on a scale of 0-10 with 0 meaning “not a priority at all” and 10 meaning a “very high priority”.

	Mean	Median	0 - 4	5	6 - 10	DK/ refused
Chile	5.07	5	34	15	34	17
Mexico	5.51	5	25	26	45	5
United States	3.84	4	61	17	21	1
France	5.42	5	27	27	44	2
Germany	7.02	7	9	13	78	0
Great Britain	5.92	6	20	21	58	1
Poland	5.89	5	25	21	44	10
Russia	4.57	5	35	18	26	20
Ukraine	2.18	2	65	6	7	21
Egypt	5.23	5	41	18	40	2
Iraq	3.65	4	50	13	17	19
Palestinian Territories	4.18	4	44	10	17	29
Turkey	4.69	5	40	15	33	11
Kenya	4.29	4	56	16	26	3
Nigeria	5.43	6	37	11	49	3
China	7.31	8	8	13	78	2
Hong Kong*	4.67	5	39	28	29	4
Macau*	4.60	5	37	22	28	13

India	5.41	5	32	15	43	10
Indonesia	5.85	6	16	18	50	15
South Korea	4.61	5	46	24	30	1
Taiwan	4.80	5	37	25	34	4
Average	5.06	5	35	17	39	9

Should your government place a higher priority on addressing climate change than it does?

	Should have a higher priority	Has placed the right priority	Should have lower priority	DK/Ref
Chile	62	13	8	18
Mexico	79	13	3	5
United States	52	24	21	2
France	76	18	4	3
Germany	46	27	27	0
Great Britain	77	14	8	1
Poland	54	25	10	10
Russia	56	16	4	23
Ukraine	68	5	2	24
Egypt	60	27	13	2
Iraq	39	23	17	20
Palestinian Territories	29	17	20	34
Turkey	65	16	8	11
Kenya	71	8	19	3
Nigeria	70	10	16	4
China	62	30	6	2
Hong Kong*	67	21	5	6
Macau*	52	20	6	23
Taiwan*	77	16	7	0
India	43	24	18	16
Indonesia	53	23	8	16
South Korea	81	13	6	1
Average	60	18	12	10

²³⁴ BBC December 2006

Thinking about the last year, please tell me if you approve or disapprove of how the United States government has dealt with each of the following:

The U.S. handling of global warming or climate change.

	Approve	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Disapprove	Somewhat disapprove	Strongly Disapprove	DK
Argentina	6	2	4	79	6	73	16
Australia	25	7	18	68	23	45	7
Brazil	17	5	12	73	17	56	10
Chile	17	5	12	63	16	47	20

China	39	13	26	35	14	21	26
Egypt	9	1	8	59	23	36	32
France	8	2	6	86	12	74	6
Germany	10	3	7	84	18	66	7
Great Britain	15	5	10	79	18	61	6
Hungary	17	4	13	53	19	34	31
India	48	25	23	23	13	10	30
Indonesia	38	15	23	52	25	27	10
Italy	13	3	11	74	18	56	13
Kenya	56	38	18	21	9	12	22
Lebanon	19	11	8	68	12	56	14
Mexico	10	1	9	67	40	27	24
Nigeria	67	35	32	25	17	8	9
Philippines	60	25	35	22	9	13	19
Poland	20	5	15	31	16	15	49
Portugal	14	5	9	79	14	65	8
Russia	27	3	24	36	20	16	38
South Korea	50	8	42	45	28	17	5
Turkey	11	3	8	65	20	45	24
United Arab Emirates	30	11	19	55	18	37	15
United States	39	12	27	54	17	37	7
Average	27	10	17	56	18	38	18

²³⁵ **Pew Global Attitudes Project March 2008**

Which one of the following, if any, is hurting the world's environment the most?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	None (vol.)	Other (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	4	0	40	3	5	22	7	0	1	18
Britain	4	3	40	2	2	36	4	1	0	10
France	10	1	34	3	3	35	12	0	0	0
Germany	6	1	39	3	2	34	9	0	0	6
Spain	4	2	17	2	3	51	7	0	1	13
Poland	2	3	23	2	2	26	25	0	1	17
Russia	6	1	18	3	4	28	16	0	2	18
Turkey	3	1	6	1	1	46	5	0	3	34
Egypt	6	5	20	9	18	22	13	0	4	4
Jordan	7	7	19	8	15	24	15	0	6	1
Lebanon	18	4	18	4	3	36	8	0	8	1
Australia	9	1	46	4	3	24	4	0	1	8
China	11	5	9	4	9	26	4	0	1	31
India	19	6	21	4	7	21	4	0	2	15
Indonesia	7	3	11	1	5	42	11	0	1	19
Japan	2	1	67	1	3	17	2	0	1	7
Pakistan	23	1	1	0	0	51	2	0	1	19
South Korea	4	0	64	1	2	19	1	0	2	6
Argentina	1	2	7	4	5	54	4	0	5	15
Brazil	5	3	11	14	6	44	5	0	0	13
Mexico	2	4	13	3	6	38	7	0	4	24
Nigeria	6	5	11	2	7	24	8	0	6	31
South Africa	7	4	16	2	6	11	6	0	2	44

Tanzania 11 3 5 2 8 27 9 0 1 32

²³⁶ **Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2007**

Which one of the following, if any, is hurting the world's environment the most?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	Other	DK/ Refused
United States	5	0	22	2	3	33	10	4	22
Canada	6	1	31	1	2	36	4	2	16
Argentina	1	1	3	3	4	49	1	4	35
Bolivia	2	3	10	1	7	47	5	1	23
Brazil	3	1	6	16	3	49	4	1	16
Chile	3	2	9	2	6	42	10	2	24
Mexico	5	6	11	3	5	39	6	2	22
Peru	4	3	8	1	7	46	10	2	20
Venezuela	6	1	9	1	5	55	8	2	12
Britain	5	1	31	3	1	41	4	3	13
France	9	1	23	1	2	53	9	0	2
Germany	4	1	33	1	1	45	8	1	8
Italy	4	1	22	1	4	31	4	1	32
Spain	7	0	7	2	4	56	2	0	22
Sweden	2	1	18	1	2	42	16	3	15
Bulgaria	1	0	3	2	1	41	4	1	48
Czech Rep.	4	3	19	2	1	48	12	0	11
Poland	3	4	11	2	3	29	19	0	29
Russia	2	2	14	2	3	26	16	2	33
Slovakia	4	2	13	3	2	55	8	1	12
Ukraine	1	0	6	1	4	37	8	4	38
Turkey	2	1	3	0	2	61	4	2	25
Egypt	6	8	19	6	19	27	6	3	7
Jordan	5	6	19	6	19	22	6	2	14
Kuwait	8	3	5	1	4	29	5	5	40
Lebanon	5	5	19	5	7	37	7	7	9
Morocco	4	3	7	2	2	31	2	2	47
Palestinian Territories	3	3	11	3	4	41	4	2	28
Israel	13	5	21	5	6	20	9	1	20
Pakistan	24	0	1	0	0	41	1	1	31
Bangladesh	13	2	3	1	4	61	3	0	14
Indonesia	3	2	6	1	4	52	4	2	27
Malaysia	6	1	3	0	1	38	2	4	44
China	7	1	11	2	9	38	2	3	29
India	29	4	10	5	4	25	3	2	17
Japan	1	1	34	0	7	36	1	1	18
South Korea	1	0	56	1	2	30	0	1	9

²³⁷ **Pew Global Attitudes Project March 2008**

Which of the following countries would you trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world's environment?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	None (vol.)	Other (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	3	15	2	4	7	57	1	0	2	9
Britain	3	45	4	3	8	12	1	6	0	19
France	3	71	2	6	6	6	3	0	2	1
Germany	2	80	1	2	2	3	2	0	1	6
Spain	7	36	4	5	7	9	1	5	3	20
Poland	1	25	2	6	16	24	1	0	3	21
Russia	3	26	3	3	19	5	15	0	2	20
Turkey	3	19	2	1	10	4	1	2	6	51
Egypt	7	14	13	5	18	7	2	17	8	9
Jordan	7	12	14	6	15	8	4	20	8	6
Lebanon	2	25	6	8	9	7	4	16	15	7
Australia	1	43	2	5	7	21	1	0	5	14
China	2	8	42	2	6	7	2	0	1	29
India	54	3	3	3	7	16	3	0	1	10
Indonesia	3	8	10	5	32	16	2	0	3	22
Japan	5	36	2	2	34	4	2	0	4	13
Pakistan	4	2	44	1	7	7	0	0	10	26
South Korea	3	33	1	5	23	13	1	0	6	16
Argentina	3	18	6	8	13	9	2	7	2	33
Brazil	3	11	5	43	12	14	0	1	0	10
Mexico	7	11	13	5	9	19	5	0	4	28
Nigeria	2	6	22	2	4	48	2	0	1	12
South Africa	4	12	8	6	5	26	2	0	4	32
Tanzania	5	11	7	11	6	18	4	0	7	32

²³⁸ BBC July 2006

Please tell me if you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned or not at all concerned about each of the following possibilities related to energy issues.

That energy shortages and prices will destabilize the world economy.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	43	42	11	4	1
Brazil	51	24	13	10	1
Canada	45	40	9	4	2
Chile	40	33	12	7	8
Egypt	47	32	13	7	1
France	29	50	13	5	2
Germany	31	42	20	7	1
Great Britain	49	35	9	4	3
India	42	26	11	10	12
Israel	29	38	14	16	3
Italy	40	44	10	4	1
Kenya	54	28	11	3	5
Mexico	46	37	11	4	2
Philippines	60	35	3	1	1

Poland	20	43	21	7	9
Russia	10	38	32	9	10
South Korea	43	50	6	*	1
Ukraine	26	39	21	5	9
United States	44	38	12	4	2
Average	39	38	13	6	4

²³⁹ BBC July 2006

That competition for energy will lead to greater conflict and war between nations.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	40	42	11	6	1
Brazil	47	26	14	12	1
Canada	42	40	11	6	1
Chile	39	32	14	7	8
Egypt	41	38	17	4	*
France	28	43	17	9	3
Germany	37	38	18	6	1
Great Britain	46	37	9	6	2
India	35	24	16	9	15
Israel	29	33	16	18	4
Italy	42	35	16	5	2
Kenya	49	27	11	6	7
Mexico	33	27	23	14	4
Philippines	50	38	8	2	2
Poland	16	36	25	11	12
Russia	14	42	27	7	11
South Korea	34	56	9	1	1
Ukraine	31	40	17	4	9
United States	41	38	12	7	1
Average	36	36	15	7	4

²⁴⁰ BBC July 2006

That the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	69	25	5	1	*
Brazil	61	20	10	8	1
Canada	62	29	4	4	1
Chile	50	28	10	6	6
Egypt	41	36	15	7	1
France	45	45	7	3	1
Germany	43	40	13	3	1
Great Britain	66	27	4	2	1
India	41	20	13	8	18
Israel	42	33	12	10	2
Italy	60	31	7	2	1
Kenya	55	24	11	5	5
Mexico	35	39	18	5	3
Philippines	47	41	8	2	2

Poland	17	41	23	8	12
Russia	20	46	20	4	9
South Korea	43	47	7	1	2
Ukraine	35	38	14	3	10
United States	53	29	10	8	1
Average	47	34	11	5	4

²⁴¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

Disruption in energy supply

	Critical	Important but not Critical	Not Important	NS/Decline
United States	59	37	3	1
Armenia	58	23	8	10
Australia	52	40	8	0
China	53	29	9	8
India	43	32	13	11
Iran	47	12	27	14
Israel	33	37	19	10
South Korea	64	31	4	0
Average	51	30	11	7

²⁴² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

And in the next 10 years, please tell me how likely you are to be personally affected by each of the following threats.

Energy dependence

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not likely at all	DK/ Refused	Likely	Not likely
United States	63	24	6	5	2	87	11
France	47	37	12	3	1	84	15
Germany	69	23	5	2	1	92	7
Great Britain	49	32	11	6	3	80	17
Italy	48	41	8	2	1	89	11
Netherlands	33	41	18	6	3	73	24
Poland	34	49	10	2	5	83	12
Portugal	45	34	10	5	6	79	15
Spain	60	31	5	3	1	91	8
Slovakia	30	46	15	4	6	75	18
Turkey	36	24	13	9	19	59	22
Bulgaria	43	37	7	4	9	81	11
Romania	29	44	14	5	6	73	20
European Average	44	37	11	4	5	81	15

²⁴³ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that [survey country] might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of [survey country], a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Securing adequate supplies of energy

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	NS/Decline
United States	72	25	2	2
Armenia	73	19	4	4
Australia	72	23	4	1
China	61	29	5	5
India	52	28	12	8
South Korea	63	33	3	
Thailand	59	23	3	15
Average	65	26	5	6

²⁴⁴ Eurobarometer Nov 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the [NATIONALITY] Government, or made jointly within the European Union?

Energy

	(NATIONALITY) Government	Jointly within the European Union	DK
Belgium	30	69	1
Bulgaria	35	56	9
Czech Republic	42	57	1
Denmark	30	68	2
Germany	24	76	1
Estonia	35	62	3
Greece	25	74	0
Spain	44	50	6
France	26	71	3
Ireland	37	57	6
Italy	28	65	7
Republic of Cyprus	16	80	4
Latvia	21	76	3
Lithuania	25	70	5
Luxembourg	33	66	1
Hungary	29	69	2
Malta	32	64	4
The Netherlands	29	69	2
Austria	56	41	3
Poland	28	65	7
Portugal	27	64	9
Romania	36	58	6
Slovenia	32	66	2
Slovakia	36	63	1
Finland	53	45	2
Sweden	36	62	2
United Kingdom	51	46	3
Average	33	63	4

²⁴⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Installing solar or wind energy systems

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	82	4	6	8
Mexico	86	4	6	3
United States	87	5	6	3
France	88	3	9	0
Germany	82	5	12	2
Great Britain	81	6	10	4
Italy	88	7	4	2
Poland	85	7	1	7
Russia	50	4	12	35
Ukraine	67	6	7	20
Azerbaijan	64	10	13	14
Jordan	76	11	3	10
Palestinian Territories	59	30	8	4
Turkey	84	4	3	9
Kenya	88	11	0	1
Nigeria	77	17	4	3
China	84	4	4	8
Hong Kong	59	16	18	8
Macau	64	9	15	12
India	62	13	16	10
Indonesia	64	16	8	13
South Korea	89	2	9	1
Taiwan	82	2	10	5
Thailand	75	7	5	13
Average	77	8	7	8

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁴⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Requiring utilities to use more alternative energy, such as wind and solar, even if this increases the cost of energy in the short run

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	70	17	13
Mexico	58	38	5
United States	66	28	6
France	88	10	3
Germany	62	36	2
Great Britain	75	19	6
Italy	67	29	4
Poland	66	15	19
Russia	36	36	28
Ukraine	56	11	33
Azerbaijan	48	43	8
Jordan	77	13	10
Palestinian Territories	71	27	2

Turkey	71	12	17
Kenya	87	13	1
Nigeria	71	26	4
China	75	11	14
Hong Kong	78	15	7
Macau	76	13	11
India	63	20	17
Indonesia	65	13	22
South Korea	96	4	1
Taiwan	88	9	3
Thailand	73	9	17
Average	69	20	11

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁴⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	74	18	5	2	1
Brazil	65	22	4	6	3
Canada	66	25	4	4	1
Chile	31	31	13	12	13
Egypt	32	34	24	8	2
France	63	28	4	3	2
Germany	50	35	9	4	2
Great Britain	62	24	5	6	2
India	49	19	14	5	13
Israel	59	25	7	4	6
Italy	75	20	2	2	1
Kenya	48	29	11	8	5
Mexico	32	35	13	11	9
Philippines	31	39	19	8	2
Poland	55	31	4	3	7
Russia	30	44	9	4	13
South Korea	31	51	14	3	2
Ukraine	42	36	9	4	9
United States	59	26	6	6	2
Average	50	30	9	5	5

²⁴⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

As you may know there is some controversy about the possibility of making a major shift to alternative energy sources, such as wind and solar. Which view is closer to yours?

	This would cost so much money that it would hurt the economy	With the rising cost of energy, it would save money in the long run	DK / NS
Argentina	21	66	13
Mexico	18	73	10
United States	18	79	3

France	12	83	5
Germany	31	65	4
Great Britain	13	79	8
Italy	18	74	8
Poland	6	77	17
Russia	27	45	29
Ukraine	14	54	33
Azerbaijan	33	52	15
Jordan	21	61	18
Palestinian Territories	40	55	4
Turkey	19	57	24
Kenya	34	64	2
Nigeria	32	63	6
China	8	78	14
Hong Kong	10	83	7
Macau	9	79	12
India	29	51	19
Indonesia	15	59	27
South Korea	12	86	2
Taiwan	7	84	9
Thailand	13	59	28
Average	21	66	14

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁴⁹ Eurobarometer April 2002

50 percent of the energy used in the European Union comes from outside the European Union. This dependency is expected to increase in the future. With which of the following statements, if any, do you agree?

1. It is an urgent issue
2. Energy imports (of coal, oil, gas, uranium, etc.) from outside the European Union should be reduced
3. More energy sources should be developed within the European Union
4. More should be done to encourage energy saving in the European Union
5. There are issues which are more urgent
6. None of these (spontaneous)
7. DK

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Belgium	38	25	57	50	13	1	7
Denmark	24	23	58	65	20	1	5
Germany	41	27	58	57	10	1	4
Greece	31	20	51	37	8	1	14
Spain	33	21	40	34	14	1	12
France	40	23	49	49	15	2	5
Ireland	29	21	42	43	12	1	14
Italy	35	24	57	49	9	1	6
Luxembourg	39	25	57	55	15	1	6
The Netherlands	27	26	60	64	11	1	6
Austria	40	31	40	53	6	3	7
Poland	42	16	34	34	11	1	12
Finland	30	27	66	59	10	1	6
Sweden	49	47	72	73	12	0	3
United Kingdom	34	26	45	54	15	1	11

Average	37	25	52	51	12	1	7
----------------	----	----	----	----	----	---	---

²⁵⁰ Eurobarometer April 2002

Let's think forward about fifty years, to 2050. Which of the following energy resources do you think will be least expensive? (Max. 2 answers)

1. Solid fuels (coal, peat, etc.)
2. Oil
3. Natural gas
4. Nuclear fission
5. Nuclear fusion
6. Hydroelectric power (dams, etc.)
7. Other renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind, biomass, etc.)
8. None of these (spontaneous)
9. DK

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Belgium	15	6	26	7	9	25	44	1	15
Denmark	8	8	19	15	23	25	59	0	4
Germany	12	7	19	14	16	26	38	3	15
Greece	5	12	47	4	4	22	34	1	17
Spain	11	5	16	2	4	15	39	2	26
France	13	8	22	15	17	22	39	2	13
Ireland	14	5	21	6	6	18	35	2	22
Italy	15	7	27	5	9	24	40	2	15
Luxembourg	9	9	21	12	14	18	49	1	13
The Netherlands	6	5	15	12	25	34	57	1	10
Austria	15	7	11	13	13	35	41	3	17
Poland	3	5	28	2	3	24	21	2	33
Finland	7	6	18	18	29	14	45	0	10
Sweden	9	4	23	14	28	37	59	0	5
United Kingdom	9	4	16	10	16	26	42	1	17
Average	11	7	21	10	14	24	40	2	16

²⁵¹ Eurobarometer April 2002

And which do you think will provide the greatest amount of useful energy? (Max. 2 answers)

1. Solid fuels (coal, peat, etc.)
2. Oil
3. Natural gas
4. Nuclear fission
5. Nuclear fusion
6. Hydroelectric power (dams, etc.)
7. Other renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind, biomass, etc.)
8. None of these (spontaneous)
9. DK

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Belgium	3	6	28	9	15	24	42	0	15
Denmark	7	19	26	17	27	9	40	0	6
Germany	6	17	22	22	24	13	27	2	16
Greece	3	16	40	6	6	19	27	1	23
Spain	2	14	17	6	12	16	25	0	29

France	3	11	18	22	29	19	27	2	16
Ireland	8	12	21	9	11	13	23	1	27
Italy	4	25	22	17	23	14	18	0	20
Luxembourg	4	6	16	17	23	17	37	2	17
The Netherlands	4	9	21	18	37	18	41	0	11
Austria	5	12	14	16	15	35	35	1	22
Poland	2	5	22	3	5	25	18	1	37
Finland	5	6	10	20	32	11	33	1	13
Sweden	7	12	16	22	36	29	37	0	8
United Kingdom	5	6	15	15	22	18	29	1	21
Average	4	14	20	17	22	17	27	1	19

²⁵² Eurobarometer April 2002

And which do you think will be best for the environment? (Max. 2 answers)

1. Solid fuels (coal, peat, etc.)
2. Oil
3. Natural gas
4. Nuclear fission
5. Nuclear fusion
6. Hydroelectric power (dams, etc.)
7. Other renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind, biomass, etc.)
8. None of these (spontaneous)
9. DK

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Belgium	3	0	15	1	4	42	71	1	9
Denmark	1	1	8	4	8	46	79	0	3
Germany	4	2	7	3	6	50	71	2	9
Greece	1	2	35	1	1	33	53	1	15
Spain	2	1	6	1	2	20	70	3	15
France	5	2	10	5	5	32	64	3	13
Ireland	3	3	10	2	2	24	54	2	23
Italy	4	1	16	2	4	39	69	1	11
Luxembourg	3	2	10	2	5	35	73	2	10
The Netherlands	1	1	5	2	11	55	84	0	3
Austria	3	2	8	2	3	57	71	1	11
Poland	1	1	20	1	1	28	39	1	30
Finland	3	1	8	5	11	22	69	0	7
Sweden	3	0	15	6	18	47	73	0	5
United Kingdom	2	2	7	3	6	32	63	1	14
Average	3	2	10	3	5	38	67	2	12

²⁵³ Eurobarometer April 2002

In which of the following areas would you like to see more energy-related research in the European Union? (Multiple answers possible)

1. Coal
2. Oil
3. Gas
4. Renewable energy sources, such as solar power, wind
5. Nuclear fission, the splitting of heavy atoms
6. Nuclear fusion, the merging of light atoms

7. Cleaner means of transport such as electric cars
 8. Other (spontaneous)
 9. I would not like to see more energy-related research in the European Union (spontaneous)
 10. DK

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Belgium	5	7	18	73	11	17	58	2	3	7
Denmark	2	4	8	79	11	21	58	0	1	5
Germany	5	6	13	74	10	27	52	2	1	9
Greece	9	18	36	59	9	10	38	0	2	11
Spain	4	8	12	60	6	10	37	1	5	20
France	6	7	15	68	11	21	58	0	2	6
Ireland	6	7	20	58	10	10	30	1	3	17
Italy	4	4	12	74	8	16	57	1	0	7
Luxembourg	3	4	12	77	9	14	53	1	2	5
The Netherlands	3	4	7	77	18	36	61	2	1	7
Austria	6	8	12	70	5	12	46	2	3	9
Poland	3	6	22	46	7	10	32	1	2	27
Finland	4	4	13	75	19	32	50	1	0	7
Sweden	3	4	13	80	14	42	67	1	0	5
United Kingdom	5	6	11	64	13	20	50	0	3	14
Average	5	6	13	69	10	21	51	1	2	10

²⁵⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	80	4	8	8
Mexico	83	7	7	3
United States	83	4	11	2
France	89	2	9	1
Germany	85	6	7	1
Great Britain	89	2	8	2
Italy	88	8	3	1
Poland	83	9	1	7
Russia	58	8	14	20
Ukraine	66	6	7	21
Azerbaijan	60	17	17	6
Jordan	69	16	6	10
Palestinian Territories	54	31	10	4
Turkey	83	6	2	9
Kenya	75	23	2	1
Nigeria	55	28	12	5
China	80	6	4	10
Hong Kong	51	16	23	11
Macau	56	10	18	15
India	54	17	19	11
Indonesia	55	24	8	12
South Korea	85	3	10	2
Taiwan	73	4	16	8

Thailand	73	8	6	13
Average	74	11	8	7

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁵⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently, even if this might make some products more expensive

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	63	24	13
Mexico	47	49	4
United States	61	34	5
France	72	25	3
Germany	57	40	3
Great Britain	79	17	5
Italy	69	27	4
Poland	50	26	24
Russia	28	43	29
Ukraine	46	17	38
Azerbaijan	38	55	7
Jordan	62	27	11
Palestinian Territories	53	44	2
Turkey	63	18	19
Kenya	71	28	1
Nigeria	49	46	5
China	66	16	18
Hong Kong	71	18	10
Macau	71	18	12
India	62	25	14
Indonesia	37	47	16
South Korea	74	24	3
Taiwan	80	15	5
Thailand	65	17	18
Average	58	31	11

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁵⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Having an extra charge for the purchase of models of appliances and cars that are NOT energy efficient

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	62	25	13
Mexico	39	57	4
United States	43	52	5
France	60	38	2
Germany	43	54	3
Britain	59	36	5
Italy	69	28	3
Poland	37	36	26
Russia	37	33	30
Ukraine	32	22	47

Azerbaijan	43	47	10
Jordan	37	52	11
Palestinian Territories	38	58	4
Turkey	56	26	19
Kenya	74	25	2
Nigeria	44	46	11
China	48	33	19
Hong Kong	55	36	9
Macau	53	35	12
India	47	27	26
Indonesia	61	21	18
South Korea	53	43	4
Taiwan	55	40	5
Thailand	19	64	17
Average	48	39	13

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁵⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	30	39	18	12	1
Brazil	6	7	13	73	*
Canada	18	29	21	30	2
Chile	14	27	23	25	13
Egypt	20	26	23	28	2
France	7	23	24	41	5
Germany	12	35	26	26	1
Great Britain	31	31	16	18	4
India	25	27	14	22	13
Israel	14	22	26	31	6
Italy	5	17	34	42	2
Kenya	32	28	18	17	5
Mexico	7	19	27	43	3
Philippines	20	18	22	38	1
Poland	2	5	34	53	5
Russia	2	11	39	45	4
South Korea	6	35	45	12	1
Ukraine	3	9	31	55	2
United States	19	28	22	29	2
Average	14	23	25	34	4

²⁵⁸ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Requiring auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	----------------

Australia	59	29	6	5	1
Brazil	35	23	16	23	3
Canada	47	30	10	10	2
Chile	24	34	17	10	15
Egypt	20	27	26	25	2
France	24	31	18	23	4
Germany	38	42	14	4	2
Great Britain	45	29	12	11	3
India	36	19	7	13	24
Israel	35	30	15	13	7
Italy	47	38	7	4	3
Kenya	33	28	18	13	7
Mexico	25	44	11	13	8
Philippines	20	29	29	21	1
Poland	18	30	21	13	18
Russia	36	41	11	1	11
South Korea	23	51	20	3	3
Ukraine	38	43	8	2	10
United States	50	27	10	11	1
Average	34	33	15	11	7

²⁵⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Building coal or oil-fired power plants

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	60	14	14	13
Mexico	46	39	12	5
United States	25	49	22	4
France	28	46	21	4
Germany	9	62	27	2
Great Britain	28	40	24	8
Italy	38	46	11	5
Poland	27	28	28	17
Russia	19	38	23	21
Ukraine	30	27	22	22
Azerbaijan	45	31	15	9
Jordan	63	19	7	11
Palestinian Territories	46	35	14	5
Turkey	52	26	11	11
Kenya	69	23	5	4
Nigeria	56	28	11	6
China	42	36	11	11
Hong Kong	23	30	34	12
Macau	30	28	25	16
India	36	27	24	13
Indonesia	50	24	10	15
South Korea	31	33	32	4
Taiwan	29	34	27	10

Thailand	41	19	13	28
Average	40	33	17	10

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁶⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Do you think that ten years from now, the cost of oil will be higher, lower or about the same as it is now?

	Much Higher	Somewhat Higher	About the same as it is now	Somewhat lower	Much lower	DK / NS
Mexico	54	29	7	5	1	4
United States	63	25	6	4	2	0
France	81	5	9	2	2	1
Great Britain	58	27	7	3	2	3
Russia	35	26	12	5	2	20
Ukraine	55	23	6	2	0	13
Azerbaijan	45	25	12	6	1	12
Egypt	67	28	5	1	0	-
Iran	55	20	5	3	1	17
Palestinian Territories	46	26	14	6	3	6
Turkey	58	20	5	4	3	11
Nigeria	42	22	12	14	7	4
China	29	46	11	6	1	7
India	54	20	10	7	4	4
Indonesia	74	22	1	2	0	1
South Korea	56	31	7	5	2	0
Average	55	24	8	5	2	7

²⁶¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Do you think that governments should make long-term plans based on the assumption that:

	Enough new oil will be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future	Oil is running out and it is necessary to make a major effort to replace oil as a primary source of energy	DK / NS
Mexico	13	83	5
United States	23	76	2
France	8	91	1
Great Britain	13	85	3
Russia	27	53	20
Ukraine	18	63	19
Azerbaijan	29	58	12
Egypt	21	79	-
Iran	9	68	23
Palestinian Territories	29	68	4
Turkey	28	57	16
Nigeria	53	45	2
China	16	80	4
India	28	54	18

Indonesia	37	59	4
South Korea	4	97	-
Average	22	70	8

²⁶² WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Which assumption do you think the [Survey country] government is acting on now:

	Enough new oil will be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future	Oil is running out and it is necessary to make a major effort to replace oil as a primary source of energy	DK / NS
Mexico	41	49	10
United States	57	41	3
France	36	55	10
Great Britain	34	56	10
Russia	37	34	29
Ukraine	28	44	28
Azerbaijan	50	31	18
Egypt	33	67	-
Iran	12	63	26
Palestinian Territories	30	61	9
Turkey	28	53	18
Nigeria	63	32	6
China	21	70	9
India	30	48	23
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	20	79	1
Average	35	53	13

²⁶³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military force?

To ensure the supply of oil

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Ref
United States	44	50	6
France	50	45	5
Germany	37	61	3
Great Britain	52	41	7
Italy	38	56	6
Netherlands	48	47	4
Poland	33	53	14
Portugal	57	27	16
Spain	43	49	8
Slovakia	30	43	27
Turkey	69	21	11
European Average	42	51	7

²⁶⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Building nuclear energy power plants

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	55	21	12	12
Mexico	32	50	12	7
United States	42	31	24	3
France	26	41	32	1
Germany	14	63	22	1
Great Britain	41	29	22	8
Italy	52	33	8	6
Poland	32	12	37	18
Russia	27	33	22	18
Ukraine	9	49	20	22
Azerbaijan	36	32	16	17
Jordan	58	21	9	12
Palestinian Territories	41	34	18	7
Turkey	48	26	12	14
Kenya	57	29	8	6
Nigeria	56	25	9	11
China	63	10	6	20
Hong Kong	22	35	32	11
Macau	23	44	17	15
India	51	16	17	17
Indonesia	23	40	10	27
South Korea	55	13	28	5
Taiwan	40	21	30	9
Thailand	22	31	10	37
Average	40	30	17	13

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

²⁶⁵ BBC July 2006

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Building new nuclear power plants, to reduce reliance on oil and coal.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK/NA
Australia	19	34	20	24	3
Brazil	23	24	15	35	3
Canada	22	30	18	25	6
Chile	18	24	20	24	15
Egypt	30	39	21	9	1
France	10	28	23	34	5
Germany	9	26	26	36	3
Great Britain	21	29	17	26	7
India	36	30	11	10	13
Israel	20	29	18	23	10
Italy	26	27	18	25	5
Kenya	36	30	12	15	8

Mexico	19	35	20	13	13
Philippines	27	33	20	18	2
Poland	13	18	26	30	14
Russia	5	23	36	24	12
South Korea	15	50	27	4	4
Ukraine	6	18	31	36	9
United States	29	34	15	18	4
Average	20	29	21	23	7

²⁶⁶ **GlobeScan July 2005**

Support for Nuclear Power

	Nuclear is safe; build more plants	Use what's there; don't build new	Nuclear dangerous; close all plants	DK/NA
South Korea	52	34	12	2
United States	40	29	20	11
Jordan	35	18	41	6
Australia	34	37	23	6
Canada	34	35	22	9
Indonesia	33	31	28	8
Great Britain	33	37	23	7
India	33	23	22	22
Mexico	32	28	23	17
France	25	50	16	9
Germany	22	47	26	5
Russia	22	41	20	17
Cameroon	21	21	27	31
Japan	21	61	15	3
Hungary	19	55	19	7
Saudi Arabia	16	25	36	23
Argentina	14	32	23	31
Morocco	13	4	49	34
Average	28	34	25	13

²⁶⁷ **Eurobarometer March 2008**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you totally agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree with it.

The use of nuclear energy enables European countries to diversity their energy sources

	Agree	Disagree	DK
Belgium	73	22	5
Bulgaria	72	7	21
Czech Republic	79	15	6
Denmark	72	21	7
Germany	64	27	9
Estonia	75	16	9
Greece	63	32	5
Spain	50	19	31
France	70	19	11
Ireland	58	16	26

Italy	63	23	14
Cyprus	48	17	35
Latvia	63	23	14
Lithuania	78	10	12
Luxembourg	57	29	14
Hungary	81	14	5
Malta	39	23	38
The Netherlands	78	16	6
Austria	38	54	8
Poland	70	14	16
Portugal	46	29	25
Romania	62	11	27
Slovenia	66	24	10
Slovakia	80	14	6
Finland	66	29	5
Sweden	65	21	14
United Kingdom	58	18	24
Average	64	21	15

²⁶⁸ Eurobarometer March 2008

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you totally agree, tend to disagree or totally disagree with it.

We could reduce our dependence on oil if we use more nuclear energy

	Agree	Disagree	DK
Belgium	65	30	5
Bulgaria	65	11	24
Czech Republic	69	22	9
Denmark	78	17	5
Germany	64	30	6
Estonia	63	25	12
Greece	57	41	2
Spain	51	20	29
France	60	26	14
Ireland	61	16	23
Italy	63	25	12
Cyprus	43	27	30
Latvia	52	34	14
Lithuania	69	17	14
Luxembourg	44	44	12
Hungary	74	18	8
Malta	46	24	30
The Netherlands	75	19	6
Austria	39	54	7
Poland	66	18	16
Portugal	46	29	25
Romania	56	13	31
Slovenia	63	28	9
Slovakia	73	18	9
Finland	73	23	4
Sweden	83	12	5
United Kingdom	70	16	14

Average 63 23 14

²⁶⁹ **Eurobarometer April 2002**

For which of the following reasons do you think the European Union should continue to fund nuclear research? (Multiple answers possible)

1. To reduce the cost of nuclear power
2. To increase the safety of nuclear power stations in the European Union
3. To achieve a broadly accepted solution for the disposal of radioactive waste in the European Union
4. To improve nuclear safety and waste disposal in non-European Union countries
5. For other reasons (spontaneous)
6. The European Union should not continue to fund nuclear research
7. DK

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Belgium	29	50	52	39	2	9	10
Denmark	8	52	45	47	1	22	6
Germany	21	53	45	40	2	20	10
Greece	20	40	38	38	2	14	18
Spain	24	37	37	26	1	15	21
France	33	52	52	47	1	7	5
Ireland	15	47	39	35	2	11	18
Italy	20	45	38	34	3	13	13
Luxembourg	19	50	49	46	3	15	7
The Netherlands	16	48	50	50	3	12	9
Austria	17	41	38	31	2	27	8
Poland	20	29	32	27	3	5	34
Finland	16	54	51	61	5	3	6
Sweden	16	71	46	74	1	4	5
United Kingdom	25	49	38	48	3	6	16
Average	23	48	43	41	2	13	12

²⁷⁰ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

As you may know, we depend on other countries for much of our energy needs. Which of the following approaches do you favor the most for ensuring a stable supply of energy?

	We should increase cooperation with energy producing countries even if their governments are undemocratic	We should reduce our energy dependence on other countries, even if energy prices would rise sharply at home as a result	We should apply diplomatic pressure, even if this increases tensions with energy producing countries	None of the above	DK/ Refused
United States	23	48	15	9	5
France	33	39	22	5	2
Germany	38	35	22	2	2
United Kingdom	25	47	20	3	6
Italy	35	43	13	7	2
Netherlands	36	43	16	3	3

Poland	51	16	15	5	12
Portugal	41	26	16	8	10
Spain	30	40	22	5	3
Slovakia	42	23	12	12	10
Turkey	20	32	12	7	20
Bulgaria	48	12	14	12	14
Romania	54	21	7	8	11
European Average	35	35	18	5	7

²⁷¹ **Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008**

On a different subject, how concerned are you, if at all, that (survey country) has become too dependent on Russia for its energy resources? Are you very concerned, fairly concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

	Very concerned	Fairly concerned	Not too concerned	Not at all concerned	DK/Refused
Great Britain	26	41	23	6	4
France	19	39	29	13	0
Germany	24	38	30	7	2
Spain	9	37	20	18	7
Poland	21	45	24	5	7
Average	20	40	25	10	4

²⁷² **Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2007**

How concerned are you, if at all, that (survey country) has become too dependent on Russia for its energy resources? Are you very concerned, fairly concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

	Very concerned	Fairly concerned	Not too concerned	Not at all concerned	DK/Refused
Bulgaria	10	27	27	26	9
Czech Republic	10	47	31	10	2
Poland	22	53	17	3	5
Slovakia	13	40	31	14	2
Ukraine	26	37	20	14	3
Average	16	41	25	13	4

²⁷³ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

As you may know, some people are concerned about recent developments in Russia. Those who are concerned give a number of reasons. To what extent are you concerned or not about each of the following items:

Russia's role as an energy provider

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not concerned at all	DK/Refused	Concerned	Not concerned
United States	24	37	19	14	6	61	33
France	17	37	32	12	1	55	44
Germany	36	42	15	6	1	78	21
United Kingdom	35	37	16	8	4	72	24
Italy	27	47	19	5	2	74	24
Netherlands	19	46	25	8	3	65	33
Poland	30	51	11	2	6	81	13
Portugal	25	35	18	11	11	60	30
Spain	15	36	33	12	4	51	45

Slovakia	16	44	27	7	6	60	34
Turkey	14	21	13	13	40	35	26
Bulgaria	13	31	22	24	10	44	46
Romania	30	38	16	8	8	69	23
European Average	23	39	21	10	8	62	30

²⁷⁴ **BBC July 2006**

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Russia

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK / NA
Australia	10	52	25	10	3
Brazil	3	11	21	55	11
Canada	8	44	21	19	8
Chile	9	33	20	12	26
Egypt	22	28	21	24	5
France	5	30	33	22	11
Germany	11	36	37	13	2
Great Britain	5	37	31	22	5
India	32	29	8	5	25
Israel	11	31	21	29	8
Italy	6	39	37	11	8
Kenya	17	26	21	16	19
Mexico	17	20	24	31	8
Philippines	9	34	28	17	11
Poland	2	25	32	29	12
Russia	40	39	10	2	9
South Korea	1	17	62	5	15
Ukraine	24	35	21	13	7
United States	5	49	23	20	3
Average	13	32	26	19	10

²⁷⁵ **Eurobarometer Nov 2008**

Do you think this conflict could have an impact on the security of energy supply in the European Union?

2008 South Ossetia Conflict between Russia and Georgia

	Yes	No	DK
Belgium	70	22	8
Bulgaria	47	19	34
Czech Republic	77	14	9
Denmark	60	29	11
Germany	61	32	7
Estonia	60	27	13
Greece	81	15	4
Spain	46	10	44
France	58	25	17
Ireland	58	13	29

Italy	51	23	26
Cyprus	77	6	17
Latvia	63	29	8
Lithuania	66	19	15
Luxembourg	58	27	15
Hungary	62	21	17
Malta	51	10	39
The Netherlands	63	30	7
Austria	66	24	10
Poland	76	11	13
Portugal	39	25	36
Romania	51	19	30
Slovenia	74	17	9
Slovakia	74	14	12
Finland	54	32	14
Sweden	66	20	14
United Kingdom	64	15	21
Average	60	21	19

²⁷⁶ BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Saudi Arabia

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	11	47	26	14	2
Brazil	1	7	20	61	10
Canada	6	36	24	27	7
Chile	7	27	25	14	26
Egypt	56	27	10	7	1
France	5	29	28	28	10
Germany	13	35	34	15	3
Great Britain	8	38	30	20	5
India	19	29	22	12	19
Israel	12	20	16	45	7
Italy	6	30	38	19	7
Kenya	24	31	18	14	13
Mexico	20	24	27	22	7
Philippines	27	36	21	11	5
Poland	6	34	24	13	23
Russia	5	19	29	13	34
South Korea	3	34	51	4	8
Ukraine	2	20	24	21	33
United States	5	36	26	30	3
Average	12	29	26	20	12

²⁷⁷ BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Iran

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK / NA
Australia	4	30	38	26	2
Brazil	1	5	16	68	10
Canada	3	20	29	42	6
Chile	5	21	30	19	25
Egypt	40	33	18	8	2
France	1	16	27	45	11
Germany	2	11	41	45	1
Great Britain	3	24	32	36	5
India	22	29	16	12	20
Israel	7	7	11	69	6
Italy	2	11	43	37	8
Kenya	18	20	24	26	12
Mexico	18	22	25	25	10
Philippines	11	27	32	22	8
Poland	2	20	29	26	23
Russia	2	12	33	23	30
South Korea	1	16	61	9	13
Ukraine	2	12	30	27	29
United States	2	12	27	56	2
Average	8	18	29	33	12

²⁷⁸ BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Venezuela

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK / NA
Australia	7	48	22	7	17
Brazil	1	12	18	59	10
Canada	7	41	22	14	16
Chile	7	32	26	13	23
Egypt	10	26	29	24	10
France	3	36	23	15	24
Germany	7	35	38	11	10
Great Britain	5	37	27	15	16
India	9	21	16	22	33
Israel	10	26	19	23	22
Italy	5	29	38	9	19
Kenya	10	23	21	15	30
Mexico	22	31	31	11	5
Philippines	6	29	33	17	16
Poland	5	30	18	9	37

Russia	2	15	25	13	44
South Korea	1	14	39	5	42
Ukraine	2	14	23	19	43
United States	5	44	19	23	9
Average	7	28	26	17	22

²⁷⁹ **BBC July 2006**

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Canada

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK / NA
Australia	54	40	3	1	2
Brazil	7	16	19	49	11
Canada	45	41	7	5	2
Chile	15	37	15	8	26
Egypt	14	25	27	26	8
France	20	55	7	5	14
Germany	41	44	8	3	4
Great Britain	32	47	11	4	5
India	18	23	13	16	31
Israel	37	32	9	10	11
Italy	24	43	14	5	13
Kenya	21	28	14	13	23
Mexico	24	32	32	7	6
Philippines	27	40	16	9	8
Poland	20	36	10	5	29
Russia	7	30	19	12	32
South Korea	3	41	28	2	25
Ukraine	8	30	17	17	29
United States	47	42	5	4	1
Average	24	36	14	10	15

²⁸⁰ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad thing for our country?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	16	49	20	10	65	30	5
Canada	32	53	8	3	85	11	5
Britain	29	53	11	3	82	14	4
France	28	55	13	4	83	17	0
Germany	32	53	12	2	85	14	1
Spain	35	54	6	2	89	8	3
Poland	22	59	10	2	81	12	6
Russia	24	56	11	2	80	13	7
Turkey	30	34	13	9	64	22	15

Egypt	24	43	26	8	67	34	1
Jordan	21	39	28	11	60	39	2
Lebanon	46	44	9	0	90	9	1
Palestinian Territories	44	36	12	6	80	18	1
Israel	47	41	6	3	88	9	2
China	26	67	3	0	93	3	3
India	48	48	3	1	96	4	1
Indonesia	21	58	14	1	79	15	5
Japan	20	53	17	4	73	21	6
Pakistan	47	32	9	2	79	11	10
South Korea	24	68	4	0	92	4	4
Argentina	16	49	18	6	65	24	11
Brazil	20	67	8	1	87	9	4
Mexico	27	52	12	4	79	16	6
Kenya	38	42	11	6	80	17	3
Nigeria	52	38	7	2	90	9	1
Average	31	50	12	4	81	16	4

Now thinking about you and your family – do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad for you and your family?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	11	52	21	7	63	28	8
Canada	25	60	7	2	85	9	6
Britain	20	60	10	3	80	13	8
France	20	62	14	4	82	18	0
Germany	18	64	13	1	82	14	4
Spain	25	60	6	1	85	7	7
Poland	18	64	9	1	82	10	8
Russia	15	50	11	2	65	13	22
Turkey	22	40	12	8	62	20	18
Egypt	18	42	28	11	60	39	1
Jordan	16	41	27	14	57	41	2
Lebanon	21	34	28	15	55	43	2
Palestinian Territories	38	44	10	5	82	15	2
Israel	31	53	6	2	84	8	8
China	16	66	5	0	82	5	12
India	39	55	4	1	94	5	1
Indonesia	13	58	21	2	71	23	6
Japan	16	57	15	2	73	17	10
Pakistan	34	40	7	2	74	9	18
South Korea	17	70	5	0	87	5	8
Argentina	11	46	17	6	57	23	19
Brazil	12	71	11	1	83	12	6
Mexico	22	52	13	3	74	16	9
Kenya	27	44	17	8	71	25	4
Nigeria	42	45	9	3	87	12	2
Average	22	53	13	4	75	17	8

Do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for [country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	DK
United States	60	35	5
Argentina	55	22	23
Mexico	41	22	37
Peru	70	27	3
Armenia	65	18	17
France	51	42	7
Great Britain	53	30	17
Poland	52	21	27
Russia	41	24	34
Ukraine	55	11	34
Azerbaijan	63	16	20
Egypt	79	21	0
Iran	63	31	6
Israel	82	10	7
Palestinian Territories	58	28	15
Turkey	39	28	33
Nigeria	78	18	4
Kenya	89	9	2
Australia	65	27	8
China	87	6	7
India	54	30	16
Indonesia	61	31	8
Philippines	49	32	20
South Korea	86	12	2
Thailand	75	8	17
Average	63	22	15

²⁸² **GlobeScan June 2004**

As you may know, there are both positive and negative impacts from increasing globalization occurring in the world. By globalization, I mean the increased trade between countries in goods, services and investment. Thinking of you and your family's interests, do you think the overall effect of globalization is very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?

	Positive	Negative	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Neutral/Other	DK/NA
Argentina	32	30	5	26	17	13	23	15
Brazil	72	22	17	55	15	7	4	2
Canada	67	30	10	57	23	8	1	2
Chile	54	22	12	42	18	4	20	4
China	60	13	9	51	12	1	21	6
France	35	45	1	34	36	9	15	5
Germany	55	38	5	51	34	4	5	1
Great Britain	67	28	9	59	23	5	2	3
India	73	18	31	42	10	8	7	2
Indonesia	61	22	14	47	19	3	16	1
Italy	53	31	6	46	25	6	14	3
Mexico	67	19	15	52	15	4	8	7

Nigeria	70	15	31	39	9	6	13	2
Russia	28	16	5	23	10	5	46	10
South Africa	71	19	26	45	12	7	6	4
Spain	55	19	15	40	13	6	18	8
Turkey	30	31	4	27	26	5	22	16
Uruguay	28	32	3	25	20	12	27	13
United States	65	31	8	57	24	8	1	2
Average	55	25	12	43	19	6	15	6

²⁸³ **GlobeScan June 2004**

As you may know, there are both positive and negative impacts from increasing globalization occurring in the world. By globalization, I mean the increased trade between countries in goods, services and investment. Thinking of you and your family's interests, do you think the overall effect of globalization is very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?

	Positive	Negative	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Depends/ Neither	DK/ NA
South Africa	71	19	26	45	12	7	6	4
Zimbabwe	35	28	18	17	17	11	22	14
Tanzania	53	26	18	35	16	10	11	9
Kenya	79	8	45	34	5	2	7	6
Nigeria	70	15	31	39	9	6	13	2
Ghana	82	9	39	43	6	3	5	5
Cote d'Ivoire	70	19	29	41	15	5	8	2
Average	65	17	29	36	11	6	11	6

²⁸⁴ **BBC February 2008**

Overall do you think economic globalization, including trade and investment, is growing much too quickly, a bit too quickly, a bit too slowly, or much too slowly?

	Growing much too quickly	Growing a bit too quickly	About Right/ Depends/DK/NA	Growing a bit too slowly	Growing much too slowly
Canada	19	42	7	25	7
United States	19	35	9	28	9
Chile	22	30	14	22	12
Central America	18	27	7	30	18
Argentina	12	31	32	20	5
Brazil	10	26	13	21	30
Mexico	9	14	31	19	27
Spain	39	29	11	16	5
France	30	34	16	15	5
Italy	30	29	11	17	13
Great Britain	15	40	10	28	7
Germany	17	35	21	23	4
Portugal	13	23	5	35	24

Russia	10	13	52	16	9
United Arab Emirates	43	34	6	13	4
Egypt	24	53	1	16	6
Lebanon	32	27	6	21	14
Israel	17	30	19	21	13
Turkey	3	12	14	43	28
Ghana	21	34	7	28	10
Nigeria	15	39	10	25	11
Kenya	14	31	8	34	13
Australia	20	53	6	18	3
China	23	49	11	13	4
India	23	27	31	13	6
Japan	14	36	36	11	3
South Korea	12	38	11	32	7
Indonesia	11	29	6	39	15
Philippines	5	19	5	47	24
Global average	19	32	14	24	12

²⁸⁵ Eurobarometer Spring 2008

There are multiple consequences of the globalization of trade. When you hear the word “globalization”, what comes first to mind?

	Opportunities for (nationality) companies in terms of new outlets	Foreign investments in (our country)	Relocation of some companies to countries where labor is cheaper	Increased competition for (nationality) companies	Other	DK
Belgium	13	20	48	16	1	2
Bulgaria	16	19	26	16	1	22
Czech Republic	18	21	35	16	1	9
Denmark	35	6	36	18	1	4
Germany	20	8	59	8	2	3
Estonia	25	15	24	21	1	14
Greece	9	23	50	17	1	0
Spain	16	15	30	13	4	22
France	10	8	63	12	2	5
Ireland	15	11	39	13	1	21
Italy	17	21	31	15	3	13
Cyprus	8	27	21	35	1	8
Latvia	12	18	24	30	1	15
Lithuania	20	18	20	14	3	25

Luxemburg	8	9	56	19	1	7
Hungary	12	26	38	16	1	7
Malta	18	22	24	23	1	12
Netherlands	35	6	38	13	3	5
Austria	12	15	50	16	2	5
Poland	19	25	23	14	2	17
Portugal	12	24	35	17	0	12
Romania	16	23	24	12	1	24
Slovenia	14	17	40	20	2	7
Slovak Republic	15	26	36	15	1	7
Finland	15	10	55	13	4	3
Sweden	30	7	40	16	3	4
United Kingdom	11	16	38	15	2	18
Croatia	8	31	31	19	1	10
Turkey	12	19	19	8	1	41
Macedonia	21	30	23	11	1	14
European Average	16	18	36	16	2	12

²⁸⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: The [survey country] economy:

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	54	42	4
Argentina	65	20	15
Mexico	59	27	15
Peru	92	7	2
Armenia	75	15	9
France	64	34	2
Great Britain	67	24	9
Poland	76	11	13
Russia	66	20	13
Ukraine	78	9	13
Azerbaijan	85	7	8
Egypt	49	51	0
Israel	88	6	6
Palestinian Territories	70	25	5
Turkey	72	10	18
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	62	36	2
China	88	8	4
India	64	27	9
Indonesia	60	35	6
South Korea	79	20	1
Thailand	79	10	11

Average	72	21	8
----------------	----	----	---

²⁸⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: [survey country] companies

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	52	45	3
Argentina	61	22	16
Mexico	66	23	11
Armenia	64	21	15
France	55	43	2
Great Britain	65	26	10
Poland	77	9	14
Russia	51	34	15
Ukraine	69	10	21
Azerbaijan	80	8	13
Egypt	52	48	0
Israel	86	8	6
Palestinian Territories	67	25	8
Turkey	70	12	19
Kenya	76	23	2
Nigeria	54	44	3
China	78	12	9
India	59	31	10
Indonesia	49	39	13
South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	70	13	17
Average	66	25	10

²⁸⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Your own standard of living

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	64	31	5
Argentina	42	30	28
Mexico	53	29	18
Armenia	60	19	21
France	50	44	6
Great Britain	73	17	10
Poland	59	12	29
Russia	45	19	36
Ukraine	53	10	37
Azerbaijan	65	5	30
Egypt	44	56	0
Israel	74	10	15
Palestinian Territories	62	26	12
Turkey	61	16	23
Kenya	82	17	2
Nigeria	63	35	2

China	73	15	12
India	54	30	15
Indonesia	51	33	16
South Korea	56	38	6
Thailand	59	23	18
Average	59	25	16

²⁸⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006–2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Consumers like you

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	70	26	4
Argentina	46	31	23
Armenia	56	28	16
France	61	38	1
Great Britain	75	17	8
Poland	70	12	18
Russia	59	22	19
Ukraine	66	10	24
Azerbaijan	67	10	23
Egypt	54	46	0
Israel	77	12	11
Palestinian Territories	57	30	13
Turkey	62	17	22
Nigeria	77	21	2
Kenya	79	20	2
China	69	17	14
India	61	28	11
Indonesia	59	32	9
South Korea	68	29	3
Thailand	65	19	16
Average	65	23	12

²⁹⁰ Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2009

Now thinking about you and your family—do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad for you and your family?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	11	52	21	7	63	28	8
Canada	25	60	7	2	85	9	6
Britain	20	60	10	3	80	13	8
France	20	62	14	4	82	18	0
Germany	18	64	13	1	82	14	4
Spain	25	60	6	1	85	7	7
Poland	18	64	9	1	82	10	8
Russia	15	50	11	2	65	13	22
Turkey	22	40	12	8	62	20	18
Egypt	18	42	28	11	60	39	1
Jordan	16	41	27	14	57	41	2
Lebanon	21	34	28	15	55	43	2

Palestinian Territories	38	44	10	5	82	15	2
Israel	31	53	6	2	84	8	8
China	16	66	5	0	82	5	12
India	39	55	4	1	94	5	1
Indonesia	13	58	21	2	71	23	6
Japan	16	57	15	2	73	17	10
Pakistan	34	40	7	2	74	9	18
South Korea	17	70	5	0	87	5	8
Argentina	11	46	17	6	57	23	19
Brazil	12	71	11	1	83	12	6
Mexico	22	52	13	3	74	16	9
Kenya	27	44	17	8	71	25	4
Nigeria	42	45	9	3	87	12	2
Average	22	53	13	4	75	17	8

²⁹¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Creating jobs in [survey country]

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	37	60	3
Argentina	53	30	17
Mexico	74	15	11
Armenia	61	26	13
France	26	73	2
Great Britain	52	37	11
Poland	71	14	15
Russia	52	27	21
Ukraine	66	14	20
Azerbaijan	77	9	14
Egypt	36	64	0
Israel	74	19	8
Palestinian Territories	62	26	11
Turkey	66	15	19
Kenya	70	27	2
Nigeria	50	46	4
China	73	17	10
India	56	32	11
Indonesia	55	37	9
South Korea	60	38	2
Thailand	74	13	13
Average	59	30	10

²⁹² WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Job security for [survey country] workers

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	30	67	3
Argentina	38	39	23
Armenia	52	24	25

France	19	80	2
Great Britain	45	46	9
Poland	53	21	26
Russia	43	32	25
Ukraine	50	16	34
Azerbaijan	57	11	32
Egypt	35	65	0
Israel	63	25	12
Palestinian Territories	57	29	14
Turkey	62	16	22
Kenya	70	24	5
Nigeria	45	50	5
China	65	22	13
India	49	37	14
Indonesia	47	37	16
South Korea	51	47	2
Thailand	64	20	16
Average	50	35	15

²⁹³ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: The environment

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	45	49	6
Argentina	27	46	27
Mexico	41	41	19
Armenia	37	36	27
France	29	66	5
Great Britain	39	47	14
Poland	49	25	26
Russia	25	44	31
Ukraine	40	25	36
Azerbaijan	42	33	25
Egypt	37	63	0
Israel	56	23	21
Palestinian Territories	53	32	14
Turkey	58	19	23
Kenya	62	35	3
Nigeria	49	48	3
China	57	29	13
India	51	34	15
Indonesia	27	56	18
South Korea	47	49	4
Thailand	45	35	20
Average	44	40	17

²⁹⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for [country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	DK
United States	60	35	5
Argentina	55	22	23
Mexico	41	22	37
Peru	70	27	3
Armenia	65	18	17
France	51	42	7
Great Britain	53	30	17
Poland	52	21	27
Russia	41	24	34
Ukraine	55	11	34
Azerbaijan	63	16	20
Egypt	79	21	0
Iran	63	31	6
Israel	82	10	7
Palestinian Territories	58	28	15
Turkey	39	28	33
Nigeria	78	18	4
Kenya	89	9	2
Australia	65	27	8
China	87	6	7
India	54	30	16
Indonesia	61	31	8
Philippines	49	32	20
South Korea	86	12	2
Thailand	75	8	17
Aggregate average	63	22	15

WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

First of all, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for [Country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	Neither good nor bad (vol.)	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Chile	52	13	17	3	16
Mexico	38	46	8	3	5
United States	53	44	0	0	3
France	47	38	6	4	5
Germany	46	35	7	10	3
Great Britain	49	38	8	1	5
Poland	59	24	12	2	4
Russia	32	26	14	13	15
Ukraine	53	13	14	0	21
Azerbaijan	63	16	5	4	12
Egypt	41	26	23	10	0
Iraq	30	20	18	3	29

Palestinian Territories	22	58	17	2	0
Turkey	51	26	6	2	16
Kenya	67	24	6	2	1
Nigeria	74	19	3	3	1
China	85	4	3	3	6
Hong Kong	81	11	4	2	2
Macau	71	11	6	2	10
Taiwan	81	4	4	2	10
India	56	19	13	7	5
Indonesia	39	44	3	5	10
Pakistan	55	17	13	14	2
South Korea	90	9	1	0	0
Average	52	27	9	4	7

²⁹⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think in the current economic crisis it is a good idea for our government to try to help [country] companies by making it harder for foreign companies to sell products here or do you think that would be a bad idea because other countries will then do the same thing to our companies?

	Good idea	Bad idea	DK/NR
Mexico	61	39	0
United States	42	55	3
France	36	57	7
Germany	25	68	7
Great Britain	29	68	3
Poland	35	53	12
Russia	55	27	18
Ukraine	53	18	30
Egypt	69	31	1
Iraq	47	24	30
Pakistan	46	47	7
Palestinian Territories	48	37	15
Turkey	67	24	9
Kenya	59	40	1
Nigeria	70	28	2
China	31	63	6
Hong Kong	28	65	7
Macau	43	36	21
India	49	41	10
Indonesia	55	33	12
South Korea	30	68	2
Taiwan	32	50	18
Average	48	43	9

²⁹⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Which of these two positions is closer to yours?

	A. To prevent international economic instability, there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions to make sure they follow international standards.	B. A global financial regulating body is a bad idea because it would interfere in our economy and could make it less productive.	DK/NR
Mexico	61	33	5
United States	44	52	4
France	70	24	6
Germany	71	24	5
Great Britain	60	36	5
Poland	48	25	27
Russia	39	36	25
Ukraine	42	29	29
Egypt	62	37	1
Iraq	42	31	27
Pakistan	59	37	3
Palestinian Territories	56	41	3
Turkey	41	36	23
Kenya	68	30	2
Nigeria	72	27	2
China	79	13	8
Hong Kong	65	31	4
Macau	66	21	14
India	51	40	10
Indonesia	51	23	27
South Korea	62	36	2
Taiwan	67	23	10
Average	57	32	11

²⁹⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

Which of these two positions is closer to yours?

	A. The world economy is so interconnected that nations should agree on standards to regulate banks that operate internationally	B. Each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own decisions about regulating its banks when they operate internationally.	DK/NR
Mexico	37	60	3
United States	43	55	2
France	55	41	4
Germany	56	41	4
Great Britain	48	48	4
Poland	45	42	14
Russia	38	47	15
Ukraine	40	36	24
Egypt	47	53	0
Iraq	35	39	26
Pakistan	39	58	4
Palestinian Territories	48	49	3
Turkey	33	50	17
Kenya	51	47	2
Nigeria	58	41	1
China	51	41	8

Hong Kong	49	49	2
Macau	49	43	8
India	49	42	10
Indonesia	39	34	27
South Korea	33	66	1
Taiwan	49	44	7
Average	45	47	9

²⁹⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that countries that are part of international trade agreements should or should not be required to maintain minimum standards for working conditions?

	Should be required	Should not be required	DK
United States	93	5	2
Argentina	89	1	10
Mexico	67	22	11
Armenia	79	9	11
Great Britain	95	3	2
Poland	88	2	10
Ukraine	85	2	12
Azerbaijan	80	12	8
Egypt	77	23	0
Iran	75	7	18
Israel	91	5	3
Turkey	76	6	19
Kenya	96	4	0
Nigeria	87	13	1
China	84	8	7
India	56	25	19
Indonesia	82	5	13
Philippines	55	30	15
Average	81	10	9

²⁹⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that countries that are part of international trade agreements should or should not be required to maintain minimum standards for protection of the environment?

	Should be required	Should not be required	DK
United States	91	5	4
Argentina	90	1	9
Mexico	76	13	11
Armenia	82	9	9
Great Britain	96	2	2
Poland	90	2	8
Ukraine	88	2	10
Azerbaijan	83	6	10
Egypt	93	7	0
Israel	93	4	2
Turkey	75	6	19
Nigeria	87	12	1
Kenya	95	5	0
China	85	8	7

India	60	28	12
Indonesia	79	8	13
Thailand	69	10	21
Average	84	8	8

³⁰⁰ **GlobeScan June 2004**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

Rich countries are playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/NA
<i>Argentina</i>	34	37	16	18	14	24	1	28
Brazil	20	76	7	13	24	52	2	2
Canada	23	72	6	16	31	40	*	6
Chile	42	37	12	30	24	13	5	17
China	48	36	11	37	28	8	9	7
France	16	76	5	11	32	44	1	8
Germany	34	63	20	14	33	30	1	2
Great Britain	23	68	7	16	33	35	2	8
India	55	37	20	35	23	14	2	7
Indonesia	59	36	29	30	30	6	2	3
Italy	14	77	3	11	31	46	3	7
Mexico	61	34	33	28	17	16	*	5
Nigeria	45	46	19	27	22	24	1	7
Russia	8	72	2	7	38	34	3	16
South Africa	37	50	18	19	23	27	4	9
Spain	19	75	6	13	40	35	2	4
Turkey	14	51	4	10	33	18	4	32
Uruguay	15	65	4	10	18	47	3	18
United States	25	62	5	20	34	28	2	10
Average	31	56	12	19	28	28	2	10

³⁰¹ **GlobeScan June 2004**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

Rich countries are playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/ NA
South Africa	37	50	18	19	23	27	4	9
Zimbabwe	12	72	4	8	28	44	4	13
Tanzania	36	49	14	22	24	25	6	9
Kenya	40	55	19	21	24	32	1	4
Nigeria	45	46	19	27	22	24	1	7
Ghana	34	62	14	20	22	40	1	3
Cote d'Ivoire	10	88	3	6	37	51	*	2
Average	30	60	13	17	26	35	2	7

³⁰² **GlobeScan June 2004**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

Poor countries benefit as much as rich countries from free trade and globalization

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/ NA
South Africa	52	42	31	21	19	23	2	4
Zimbabwe	13	71	4	9	37	34	4	12
Tanzania	33	56	12	20	22	33	5	7
Kenya	39	56	21	19	21	34	2	3
Ghana	45	52	21	24	20	32	1	2
Cote d'Ivoire	21	77	7	14	42	35	*	2
Average	35	57	16	19	26	31	2	5

³⁰³ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund World Views 2002**

In general, do you think that the following countries practice fair trade or unfair trade with Europe?

The United States

	Fair trade	Unfair trade	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	45	45	11
France	20	74	6
Germany	58	31	11
The Netherlands	46	38	17
Italy	44	41	16
Poland	39	26	34
European Average	43	44	14

³⁰⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund World Views 2002**

In general, do you think that the following countries practice fair trade or unfair trade with Europe?

Japan

	Fair trade	Unfair trade	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	48	32	20
France	37	47	15
Germany	63	23	15
The Netherlands	51	24	25
Italy	40	37	24
Poland	43	18	40
European Average	48	31	21

³⁰⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

United States

	Average
United States	n/a
China	7.6
Japan	8.0
South Korea	8.5
Indonesia	7.7
Vietnam	8.0
Average	8.0

³⁰⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

China

	Average
United States	6.5
China	n/a
Japan	7.4
South Korea	8.3
Indonesia	7.7
Vietnam	7.5
Average	7.5

³⁰⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

Japan

	Average
United States	7.2
China	6.7
Japan	n/a
South Korea	7.8
Indonesia	8.1
Vietnam	7.8
Average	7.5

³⁰⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

South Korea

	Average
United States	5.1
China	6.8
Japan	6.6
South Korea	n/a
Indonesia	7.0
Vietnam	6.8
Average	6.5

309 Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

Indonesia

	Average
United States	n/a
China	5.8
Japan	5.9
South Korea	6.3
Indonesia	n/a
Vietnam	n/a
Average	6.0

310 Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

European Union

	Average
United States	7
China	7.6
Japan	7.1
South Korea	7.4
Indonesia	7.5
Vietnam	7.1
Average	7.3

311 Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

United States

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	84.4	11.1	4.5
Japan	63.2	28.8	8
South Korea	75.4	22.3	2.3
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	74	21	5

312 Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

Japan

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	59.0	35.8	5.2
China	78.9	16	5.2

Japan	n/a	n/a	n/a
South Korea	73.6	24.0	2.4
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	71	25	4

³¹³ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

China

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	41	54.3	4.6
China	n/a	n/a	n/a
Japan	53.4	39.0	7.7
South Korea	66.7	30.6	2.7
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	54	41	5

³¹⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

South Korea

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	48.6	45.6	5.8
China	82.1	12.2	5.7
Japan	63.4	28.9	7.7
South Korea	n/a	n/a	n/a
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	65	29	6

³¹⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

ASEAN countries

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	83.8	9.9	6.3
Japan	62.6	25.9	11.5
South Korea	76.0	20.0	4.0
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	74	19	7

³¹⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Should or shouldn't there be an East Asia free trade area including China, Japan, and South Korea?

	There should be (percent)	There shouldn't be (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	83.6	13.6	2.8
Japan	70.0	22.6	7.4
South Korea	86.0	8.0	6.0
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	80	15	5

³¹⁷ Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008

Do you think this free trade area should or shouldn't include the United States?

	Yes, it should (percent)	No, it shouldn't (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	66.5	31.1	2.4
Japan	39.6	57.4	3.0
South Korea	41.3	57.2	1.5
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	49	49	2

³¹⁸ Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008

Do you think greater trade and cultural contact between countries in East Asia in the past ten years has increased or decreased the possibility of military conflict in the region?

	Very much increased (percent)	Somewhat increased (percent)	Somewhat decreased (percent)	Very much decreased (percent)	Has no effect (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
China	29.3	28.9	16.5	17.1	1.5	6.8
Japan	8.3	35.7	34.0	6.5	6.3	9.2
South Korea	2.9	29.3	47.3	12.3	4.6	3.5
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Average	14	31	33	12	4	7

³¹⁹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey October 2007

There has been talk recently of a new effort to deepen the economic ties between the European Union and the United States, by making transatlantic trade and investment easier. Would you support a transatlantic initiative like this?

	Yes	No	DK/ Refused
Germany	66	27	7
France	64	35	1
Italy	75	17	5
Poland	68	14	19
Slovakia	57	29	14
United Kingdom	74	17	9
United States	64	25	11
European Average	67	24	9
Average w/United States	67	23	9

³²⁰ **BBC January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world.

Global companies

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/ No difference (vol.)	DK/NA/ (vol)
Afghanistan	49	16	18	5	12
Argentina	26	40	6	1	28
Australia	30	49	8	4	9
Brazil	60	27	5	1	6
Canada	39	39	6	4	11
Congo	43	14	23	5	14
Finland	32	45	12	2	9
France	37	44	11	1	7
Germany	42	32	15	6	5
Ghana	46	13	23	5	12
Great Britain	36	47	4	3	10
India	41	14	21	6	18
Indonesia	53	24	17	1	4
Iran	49	42	2	4	3
Iraq	32	26	34	3	4
Italy	21	51	8	7	12
Kenya	50	11	18	6	15
Mexico	23	33	21	8	15
Nigeria	67	11	12	3	7
Philippines	60	17	10	1	12
Poland	49	13	9	5	23
Russia	27	18	16	6	33
Saudi Arabia	31	10	40	8	11
Senegal	51	8	18	3	20
South Africa	50	7	15	5	23
South Korea	61	32	2	1	4
Spain	36	36	13	3	12
Sri Lanka	22	12	8	2	56
Tanzania	50	13	26	6	5
Turkey	21	27	30	7	16
United States	44	38	4	4	10
Zimbabwe	30	11	30	10	18
Average	41	26	15	4	14

³²¹ **GlobeScan June 2004**

Please tell me how much you trust each of the following institutions to operate in the best interests of our society. Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all?

Global companies operating in [COUNTRY]

	Trust	No trust	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK/NA
Argentina	23	69	5	18	31	38	8
Australia	40	57	3	37	37	20	4
Brazil	39	60	8	31	30	30	1
Canada	53	40	3	50	27	13	6
Chile	33	64	7	27	37	26	3
China	69	21	13	56	19	2	8
France	22	72	1	20	43	30	6
Germany	41	56	7	34	43	13	2
Great Britain	45	50	3	42	33	17	5
India	59	39	20	39	23	16	2
Indonesia	62	35	11	51	32	2	3
Italy	23	71	2	21	43	28	7
Mexico	51	47	11	41	29	18	2
Nigeria	52	40	15	36	24	15	5
Russia	19	72	2	18	35	37	8
Spain	52	46	10	42	34	12	2
South Africa	63	29	18	44	19	9	6
Turkey	32	50	5	27	40	10	16
Uruguay	21	69	3	18	29	40	10
United States	51	41	3	47	28	13	8
Average	42	51	8	35	32	20	6

³²² GlobeScan June 2004

Please tell me how much you trust each of the following institutions to operate in the best interest of our society. Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Global companies operating in [COUNTRY]

	Trust	Do not trust	A lot	Some	Not much	No trust at all	DK/NA
South Africa	63	29	18	44	19	9	8
Zimbabwe	28	60	4	24	32	28	112
Tanzania	46	42	16	30	25	17	12
Kenya	67	27	25	42	20	7	6
Nigeria	52	40	15	36	24	15	9
Ghana	79	17	34	46	12	5	4
Cote d'Ivoire	54	40	13	41	31	9	6
Average	56	36	18	38	23	13	9

³²³ GlobeScan June 2004

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

I am in favor of large foreign companies coming to my country and setting up their operations here.

Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/Neither	DK/NA
-------	----------	----------------	----------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-------

South Africa	71	20	41	30	9	11	5	4
Zimbabwe	80	11	48	32	4	6	3	6
Tanzania	50	42	22	29	25	18	4	3
Kenya	80	17	55	24	8	9	2	1
Nigeria	84	15	51	33	9	6	1	1
Egypt	39	58	25	14	4	54	*	3
Ghana	89	10	61	28	6	4	*	*
Cote d'Ivoire	89	10	59	30	7	3	1	*
Average	73	23	45	27	9	14	2	2

³²⁴ **Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008**

When foreigners buy (survey country) companies, do you think this has a very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad impact on our country?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	DK/Refused
United States	3	22	33	34	7
Great Britain	6	37	34	15	9
France	3	30	42	25	0
Germany	2	18	58	20	3
Spain	7	43	31	8	12
Poland	4	33	36	20	7
Russia	7	22	33	32	5
Turkey	5	11	15	61	8
Egypt	5	22	32	38	3
Jordan	10	23	35	28	3
Lebanon	13	26	31	25	5
Australia	4	26	46	21	3
China	3	28	42	16	11
India	18	41	21	17	3
Indonesia	4	24	39	27	5
Japan	2	25	52	17	4
Pakistan	13	24	17	26	20
South Korea	3	35	50	9	4
Argentina	2	19	37	34	9
Brazil	4	36	43	13	4
Mexico	15	33	27	20	5
Nigeria	17	25	16	38	3
South Africa	26	26	16	26	5
Tanzania	13	19	28	39	2
Average	8	27	34	25	6

³²⁵ **GlobeScan June 2004**

Rich countries could reduce poverty in developing countries by allowing them to sell more food and clothing products to rich countries. In rich countries this would lower prices for food and clothing but would also mean significant job losses in these industries.

Would you support or oppose rich countries allowing more food and clothing imports from developing countries even if it meant significant job losses in rich countries?

	Support	Oppose	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK/NA
Argentina	53	20	15	39	17	3	26
Brazil	63	34	24	39	18	16	3
Canada	51	43	13	38	27	16	6
Chile	54	22	14	40	17	5	23
China	75	18	16	59	16	2	8
France	47	43	8	39	29	14	11
Germany	58	39	10	48	31	7	3
Great Britain	59	35	20	39	24	11	6
India	76	22	35	40	12	10	2
Indonesia	72	21	24	48	17	4	7
Italy	43	47	10	32	34	12	11
Mexico	70	20	42	28	13	7	10
Russia	41	26	11	30	18	8	33
Spain	72	16	19	52	10	6	12
Turkey	65	30	19	47	19	11	5
Uruguay	52	18	17	35	14	4	29
United States	35	60	6	28	35	25	6
Average	58	30	18	40	21	10	12

³²⁶ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

Please tell me if you have a favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of:

Providing development assistance to poor countries

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Favorable	Unfavorable
Germany	18	37	34	8	3	55	42
France	44	41	9	5		85	15
Italy	53	40	5	2		93	7
Poland	20	53	15	3	8	74	18
Slovakia	14	48	26	6	6	63	31
United Kingdom	39	36	10	10	4	76	21
United States	28	38	17	13	4	66	30
European Average	34	41	17	6	3	75	23

³²⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Do you think the developed countries do or do not have a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty in poor countries?

	Do	Do not	DK / NS
Argentina	85	10	5
Mexico	90	8	1
United States	81	17	2
France	79	19	2
Germany	87	12	1
Great Britain	81	14	5
Italy	89	10	2

Russia	54	29	17
Ukraine	87	6	7
Egypt	71	27	3
Jordan	81	11	8
Palestinian Territories	50	49	1
Turkey	81	15	4
Kenya	92	8	1
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	83	5	12
India	72	14	13
Indonesia	87	4	8
South Korea	90	10	1
Taiwan	91	5	4
Average	80	15	5

* Taiwan not included in average

³²⁸ GlobeScan June 2004

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

It is in rich countries' own economic self-interest to actively help poor countries develop

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/ NA
Argentina	54	26	29	25	14	12	2	18
Brazil	67	31	45	22	14	17	1	1
Canada	87	11	44	43	7	5	-	2
Chile	68	25	37	31	18	7	2	5
China	73	17	21	52	14	2	5	5
France	87	10	52	35	7	3	1	2
Germany	83	15	53	30	11	4	1	1
Great Britain	86	12	50	36	9	3	-	2
India	89	9	57	32	7	1	1	1
Indonesia	55	38	14	41	30	8	2	5
Italy	87	11	53	34	6	5	1	1
Mexico	88	8	56	32	4	4	-	3
Nigeria	73	23	39	34	15	8	2	2
Russia	52	27	16	36	18	9	5	16
South Africa	83	12	58	25	6	6	3	3
Spain	86	12	45	41	8	4	-	2
Turkey	52	15	20	33	13	2	5	28
Uruguay	56	26	23	32	11	15	2	16
United States	83	14	37	46	9	5	-	2
Average	74	18	39	35	12	6	2	6

³²⁹ Eurobarometer June 2007

What in your opinion are the two main motivations for richer countries to provide development aid to poor countries?

Self-interest for example helping poor countries trade will enable them to buy more products from rich countries

European Average

28

Contribute to global stability	28
Encourage democracy and good governance	22
Avoid citizens of these countries emigrating to rich countries	20
Prevent and avoid favorable conditions for terrorism	19
Gain political allies	15
Have a clear conscience	12
To help people who are in need (spontaneous)	11
None of these (spontaneous)	2
Other (spontaneous)	1
Don't know	9

³³⁰ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

From the following list of possibilities, please select the top three most important reasons, in your opinion, for giving aid to poor countries. Most important reason? Second most important reason? Third most important reason?

	Germany	France	Italy	Poland	Slovakia	United Kingdom	United States	European Average
Alleviating poverty	65	58	43	60	65	65	49	59
Helping poor countries trade	23	33	40	25	31	38	17	31
Preventing breeding grounds for terrorism	21	29	28	29	20	29	31	26
Contributing to global stability	24	21	20	26	14	25	35	23
Encouraging democracy	35	38	37	16	26	22	23	31
Gaining political allies	5	3	5	7	10	5	13	5
Helping with natural disaster relief	28	31	22	46	45	22	32	29
Fighting health problems like AIDS	49	57	45	36	40	41	37	46
Supporting economic growth	40	27	49	35	36	38	36	38
None of these (spontaneous)	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	1
DK/ Refused	1	-	-	3	3	4	4	2

³³¹ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

Which of the following two positions comes closest to your view?

	Development assistance strengthens support for democratic institutions in developing countries	Development assistance weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries	Development assistance neither strengthens nor weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused
Germany	77	13	4	6
France	76	18	3	3
Italy	74	9	13	5
Poland	64	10	12	14
Slovakia	63	13	8	15
United Kingdom	72	18	2	8
United States	64	11	16	9
European Average	71	14	7	9

³³² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following:

Providing economic aid to raise living standards in countries where terrorists are recruited is the most appropriate way to fight terrorism.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/ Refused
United States	19	30	26	20	5
France	17	30	23	28	3
Germany	20	33	25	19	2
United Kingdom	24	31	22	15	8
Italy	21	35	25	19	3
The Netherlands	18	35	25	19	3
Poland	18	30	25	14	13
Portugal	23	26	15	23	13
Spain	17	25	15	23	13
Slovakia	17	25	29	23	7
Turkey	28	17	15	28	13
European Average	20	29	22	21	8

³³³ German Marshall Fund/Chicago Council on Global Affairs World Views 2002

To assist a population struck by famine

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	90	9	1
France	89	10	1
Germany	83	14	3
The Netherlands	93	6	1
Italy	91	8	1
Poland	92	5	3
United States	81	16	3
European Average	90	9	2

³³⁴ German Marshall Fund/Chicago Council on Global Affairs World Views 2002

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide food and medical assistance to victims of war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Refused
United States	81	16	3
France	92	7	1
Germany	94	5	1
United Kingdom	93	5	3
Italy	85	14	1
The Netherlands	98	2	1
Poland	86	12	3
Portugal	85	7	8
Spain	95	5	1
Slovakia	84	11	5
Turkey	87	9	4
European Average	90	8	3

As you may know, some countries have troops engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [Nationality] troops for the following operations?

To provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	I don't know anything about this topic	DK/ Refused	Approve	Disapprove
United States	43	32	11	10	2	2	75	21
France	61	26	5	5	1	2	88	10
Germany	34	39	15	11	1	1	73	25
United Kingdom	51	29	9	7	1	3	80	16
Italy	55	31	7	7	1	-	86	13
Netherlands	55	27	8	9	1	1	82	17
Poland	30	41	10	7	11	1	71	17
Portugal	52	32	5	7	3	1	84	12
Spain	47	43	4	5		1	90	9
Slovakia	22	41	14	10	8	5	62	24
Turkey	37	21	8	18	16	-	58	26
Bulgaria	17	27	11	17	20	8	44	28
Romania	24	32	11	13	15	5	57	24
European Average	40	32	9	10	7	3	73	18

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [Nationality] troops for the following operations?

To contribute to international reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	I don't know anything about this topic	DK/ Refused	Approve	Disapprove
United States	26	38	15	18	1	3	64	33
France	33	38	14	12	1	2	71	25
Germany	20	38	14	12	1	2	71	25
United Kingdom	29	41	14	13	1	4	69	27
Italy	30	40	16	12	1	1	70	28
Netherlands	40	35	9	15		1	75	24
Poland	17	37	23	14	5	4	54	37
Portugal	35	38	10	13	3	2	73	22
Spain	32	49	10	8		1	81	18
Slovakia	11	33	22	18	8	8	44	40
Turkey	28	22	12	22	16		50	34
Bulgaria	11	28	22	25	7	6	39	48
Romania	26	36	11	15	8	5	61	25
European Average	27	37	16	15	3	2	64	30

³³⁵ **Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey May 2007**

Do you think the wealthier nations of the world are doing enough or not doing enough to help the poorer nations of the world with problems such as economic development, reducing poverty, and improving health?

	Doing enough	Not doing enough	DK/ Refused
United States	25	69	6
Canada	20	77	3
Argentina	5	85	11
Bolivia	16	76	8
Brazil	7	91	2
Chile	10	86	4
Mexico	14	78	8
Peru	14	78	8
Venezuela	17	81	2
France	19	81	0
Germany	21	75	3
Great Britain	20	77	4
Italy	12	78	10
Spain	5	91	4
Sweden	15	82	4
Bulgaria	6	84	10
Czech Republic	24	74	2
Poland	7	88	5
Russia	10	74	16
Slovakia	27	69	4
Ukraine	5	85	10
Egypt	12	84	5
Israel	16	77	7
Jordan	17	76	7
Kuwait	23	70	6
Lebanon	12	85	2
Morocco	18	58	24
Palestinian Territories	8	80	12
Turkey	5	77	18
Bangladesh	46	52	2
China	11	83	6
India	33	56	11
Indonesia	54	38	8
Japan	26	63	11
Malaysia	13	73	14
Pakistan	13	56	31
South Korea	17	76	7
Ethiopia	29	67	3
Ghana	37	56	7
Ivory Coast	39	61	0
Kenya	36	62	2
Mali	42	57	1
Nigeria	34	60	6
Senegal	28	71	1
South Africa	22	71	8

Tanzania	45	48	7
Uganda	39	53	8

³³⁶ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

The European Union can take greater responsibility for dealing with international threats in a number of different ways. For each of the following, please tell me if you agree or disagree that it is something that the European Union should undertake.

Spend more money on aid for development

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ Refused
United States	84	13	4
France	86	13	1
Germany	71	27	2
Great Britain	89	10	1
Italy	86	14	1
The Netherlands	63	35	2
Poland	93	5	2
Portugal	88	9	2
Spain	96	4	
Slovakia	73	15	12
Turkey	83	12	5
Bulgaria	87	8	5
Romania	90	6	4
European Average	84	13	3

³³⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

Now I am going to read a list of government programs. Is the government spending too much, too little, or about the right on:

Economic aid to other nations

	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/ Refused
2003				
United Kingdom	33	25	32	10
France	30	25	39	6
Germany	40	12	42	6
The Netherlands	26	18	48	8
Italy	18	29	41	12
Poland	25	13	33	29
Portugal	43	14	25	19
United States	59	8	26	7
European Average	31	19	37	13

	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/ Refused
2002				
United Kingdom	31	22	45	2
France	2	58	35	4
Germany	29	20	48	3
The Netherlands	21	18	58	2
Italy	15	45	38	2

Poland	44	12	39	6
Portugal	-	-	-	-
United States	48	14	35	3
European Average	24	29	44	3

³³⁸ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

In 2003, this country's government allocated [a tenth of one percent]* of the national income to foreign aid—that is, [SUS 38.05]** per person. Do you think this amount is too low, too high, or about right?

	Too low	About right	Too high	DK/NA
Spain	40	33	5	22
United States	25	51	20	4
Japan	15	34	16	36
Australia	42	47	9	2
Sweden	46	46	4	4
Finland	35	58	6	2
Switzerland	45	48	2	4
Thailand	24	61	14	1
Andorra	70	25	1	4
Germany	26	49	10	15
Average	35	46	9	10

* Official development aid as percentage of OECD donor's Gross National Income

	2003	In words, express this as
Australia	0.05	Less than a tenth of one percent
Austria	0.07	A tenth of one percent
Belgium	0.35	A third of one percent
Canada	0.07	A tenth of one percent
Denmark	0.32	A third of one percent
Finland	0.11	A tenth of one percent
France	0.17	A fifth of one percent
Germany	0.1	A tenth of one percent
Greece	0.03	Less than a tenth of one percent
Ireland	0.21	A fifth of one percent
Italy	0.08	A tenth of one percent
Japan	0.04	Less than a tenth of one percent
Luxembourg	0.27	A quarter of one percent
Netherlands	0.16	A quarter of one percent
New Zealand	0.06	A tenth of one percent
Norway	0.36	A third of one percent
Portugal	0.14	A tenth of one percent
Spain	0.04	Less than a tenth of one percent
Sweden	0.27	A quarter of one percent
Switzerland	0.12	A tenth of one percent
United Kingdom	0.12	A tenth of one percent
United States	0.04	Less than a tenth of one percent

** Official Development Aid to LDCs

	2003 Aid in U.S. millions	Population in 2000	Amount in U.S. dollars per person
Australia	259	19.195	13.49
Austria	169	8.098	20.87
Belgium	1088	10.252	106.12
Canada	634	30.735	20.63
Denmark	673	5.34	126.03
Finland	183	5.18	35.33
France	2965	58.85	50.38
Germany	2508	82.15	30.53
Greece	55	10.56	5.21
Ireland	266	3.794	70.11
Italy	1104	57.679	19.14
Japan	1922	126.77	15.16
Luxembourg	65	0.438	148.4
Netherlands	1286	15.919	80.78
New Zealand	45	3.831	11.75
Norway	801	4.492	178.32
Portugal	205	10.01	20.48
Spain	342	39.45	8.67
Sweden	822	8.869	92.68
Switzerland	405	7.18	56.41
United Kingdom	2273	59.739	38.05
United States	4474	281.55	15.89

³³⁹ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Would you be willing to pay higher taxes in order to increase your country's foreign aid to poor countries?

	Yes	No	DK/NA
Italy	43	42	15
Spain	36	51	13
United States	23	73	4
Japan	18	58	25
South Africa	28	54	18
Australia	32	64	3
Sweden	49	48	4
Finland	36	60	4
Switzerland	47	46	7
Turkey	65	30	6
Thailand	68	32	0
Andorra	56	41	3
Germany	23	69	8

Average 39 52 9

³⁴⁰ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Should your country's leaders give top priority to help reducing poverty in the world or should they give top priority to solve your own country's problems? Use a scale of one to ten, where one means "top priority to help reducing poverty in the world" and ten means "top priority to solve my own country's problems".

	Mean
Italy	6.75
Spain	6.38
United States	7.61
Japan	7
Mexico	6.73
South Africa	7.99
Australia	7.03
Sweden	5.99
Argentina	8.26
Finland	6.95
South Korea	8.33
Poland	7.63
Switzerland	6.67
Brazil	7.18
Chile	8.18
India	6.15
Slovenia	8.49
Bulgaria	7.27
Romania	7.58
China	6.61
Turkey	7.97
Ukraine	7.48
Ghana	7.73
Moldova	7.31
Thailand	7.16
Indonesia	8.16
Vietnam	8.21
Serbia	8.05
Egypt	9.01
Morocco	7.86
Jordan	9.13
Cyprus	8.17
Trinidad and Tobago	8.79
Andorra	7.77
Malaysia	7.01
Burkina Faso	6.2
Ethiopia	7.97
Mali	5.76
Rwanda	7.37
Zambia	7.29
Germany	7.43
Average	7.5

³⁴¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

As you may know, [country] is a member of the OECD, a group that includes most industrialized countries. These countries have agreed to a set of goals, called the Millennium Development Goals. A key goal has been to cut hunger by half throughout the world and reduce severe poverty by the year 2015. If the cost of achieving these goals were shared among these countries, the cost for [citizens] would be [enter country amount - see chart] per person per year. Assuming the people in the other countries were willing to pay their share, would you be willing to pay [enter country amount - see chart*] a year to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty?

	Would be willing	Would not be willing	DK / NS
United States	75	22	3
France	86	14	1
Germany	76	20	4
Great Britain	79	15	6
Italy	84	12	4
Russia	54	24	23
Turkey	78	11	10
South Korea	80	18	1
Average	77	17	7

*Per person, per year cost to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty in respondent's currency:

	Amount in USD	Amount in Respondent's Currency
France	\$45	29 EUROS
Italy	\$39	25 EUROS
Great Britain	\$49	25 POUNDS
South Korea	\$23	24,000 WON
Turkey	\$10	12 LIRAS
United States	\$56	\$56
Germany	\$43	27 EUROS
Russia	\$11	257 RUBLES

³⁴² World Values Survey 2005-2008

Have you ever heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

	Yes	No	DK/NR
Italy	17	82	1
Spain	17	81	2
United States	5	92	3
Japan	11	86	3
Mexico	16	83	1
South Africa	13	87	0
Australia	13	85	2
Sweden	30	67	3
Argentina	9	89	2
Finland	20	79	1
South Korea	21	78	0
Poland	7	92	0
Switzerland	23	74	3
Brazil	21	79	1
Chile	28	70	2
India	21	79	0
Slovenia	16	73	12
Bulgaria	9	90	1

Romania	7	89	4
China	5	73	22
Turkey	6	94	0
Ukraine	11	89	0
Peru	14	83	3
Ghana	38	57	5
Moldova	20	81	0
Thailand	40	60	0
Indonesia	20	71	9
Vietnam	33	67	0
Serbia	18	77	6
Egypt	8	90	2
Morocco	19	59	23
Jordan	9	81	10
Cyprus	18	82	0
Trinidad and Tobago	18	81	1
Andorra	13	87	0
Malaysia	22	78	0
Burkina Faso	27	65	8
Ethiopia	64	33	2
Mali	43	49	8
Rwanda	25	74	2
Zambia	41	52	7
Germany	25	71	4
Average	20	76	4

³⁴³ Eurobarometer June 2007

Have you ever heard or read about the Millennium Development Goals?

	Yes and you know what it is	Yes but you don't really know what it is	No
Belgium	6	24	70
Bulgaria	4	11	82
Czech Republic	4	15	80
Denmark	8	25	66
Germany	4	15	78
Estonia	2	15	79
Greece	3	11	85
Spain	4	8	87
France	3	9	88
Italy	4	14	77
Ireland	4	15	85
Cyprus	1	5	88
Latvia	2	17	80
Lithuania	4	16	78
Luxembourg	3	11	84
Hungary	5	21	73
Malta	4	10	84

Netherlands	8	30	61
Austria	4	23	71
Poland	4	13	81
Portugal	7	17	76
Romania	4	16	72
Slovenia	7	27	65
Slovakia	6	21	71
Finland	5	24	70
Sweden	7	34	58
United Kingdom	4	10	86
European Average	4	14	80

³⁴⁴ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Should policies regarding aid to developing countries be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

	National governments	Regional Organization	United Nations	DK/NA
Italy	19	19	56	6
Spain	15	18	54	13
United States	30	23	41	5
Japan	14	14	42	30
Mexico	23	11	58	8
South Africa	28	17	49	6
Australia	31	15	49	5
Sweden	14	31	51	4
Argentina	19	9	51	22
Finland	27	15	55	4
South Korea	32	12	56	0
Poland	21	16	61	3
Switzerland	27	16	52	5
Brazil	26	16	50	8
Chile	22	12	58	8
India	23	12	24	40
Slovenia	10	45	33	12
Bulgaria	8	40	40	13
Romania	19	26	36	20
China	17	6	29	48
Taiwan	22	31	43	4
Turkey	31	16	44	8
Ukraine	20	17	50	13
Ghana	24	16	55	6
Moldova	20	36	39	5
Thailand	65	25	9	1
Indonesia	13	26	51	10
Vietnam	13	15	61	10
Serbia	20	18	52	10
Egypt	26	21	49	4
Morocco	19	13	42	26
Jordan	16	17	54	13

Cyprus	28	33	39	0
Trinidad and Tobago	20	20	57	4
Andorra	24	11	63	3
Malaysia	18	43	38	0
Burkina Faso	13	11	61	16
Ethiopia	11	11	68	9
Mali	21	12	55	12
Rwanda	17	19	61	4
Zambia	15	29	48	7
Germany	24	25	46	5
Average	22	20	48	11

³⁴⁴³⁴⁵ GMF Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

Please tell me who, in your opinion, should have the primary responsibility for delivering development assistance

	Germany	France	Italy	Poland	Slovakia	United Kingdom	United States	European Average
The U.S. government	5	4	4	7	11	3	17	5
The European Union	19	24	20	24	13	12	2	20
Individual European governments	5	13	18	14	14	13	2	12
International organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations	54	40	48	36	42	46	37	46
Charities, foundations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	8	12	3	7	12	14	18	9
Religious organizations	3	1	2	2	2	2	6	2
Private companies and businesses	2	4	1	1	1	3	8	2
None of these (spontaneous)	2	1	2	2	1		5	1
DK/ Refused	3	1	7	7	4	7	6	4

³⁴⁶ World Values Survey 2005-2008

Should policies regarding refugees be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

	National governments	Regional Organization	United Nations	DK/NA
Italy	32	22	37	9
Spain	13	20	54	14
United States	34	27	33	6
Japan	17	15	46	23
Mexico	36	14	42	9
South Africa	29	16	47	8
Australia	38	14	44	5
Sweden	34	23	40	3
Argentina	22	5	50	23
Finland	42	17	37	4
South Korea	29	8	62	1
Poland	45	15	37	4
Switzerland	32	17	45	6
Brazil	30	15	45	10
Chile	29	10	52	9
India	30	16	12	43

Slovenia	20	44	24	12
Bulgaria	15	26	44	15
Romania	31	19	28	22
China	22	6	27	45
Taiwan	22	24	51	4
Turkey	37	19	35	10
Ukraine	30	18	39	13
Ghana	18	13	64	5
Moldova	39	29	26	6
Thailand	45	25	29	1
Indonesia	43	9	40	9
Vietnam	22	15	52	11
Serbia	36	16	38	10
Egypt	30	23	42	5
Morocco	14	17	44	26
Jordan	15	15	57	13
Cyprus	43	20	36	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	15	47	6
Andorra	30	13	54	3
Malaysia	25	36	39	0
Burkina Faso	16	13	53	18
Ethiopia	13	13	62	13
Mali	28	13	42	18
Rwanda	10	17	72	2
Zambia	13	20	63	5
Germany	25	25	45	6
Average	28	18	43	11

³⁴⁷ Eurobarometer September 2007

Would you say that development aid is more efficient if provided by each Member State separately or if it is provided by the European Union through the European Commission?

	More efficient if provided by each Member State separately	More efficient if provided by the European Union through the European Commission	DK
Bulgaria	15	45	40
Czech Republic	21	64	15
Estonia	16	62	22
Cyprus	20	67	13
Latvia	14	68	18
Lithuania	17	60	23
Hungary	15	68	17
Malta	21	64	15
Poland	13	68	19
Romania	17	46	37
Slovenia	24	65	11
Slovakia	23	63	14
Average	16	61	23

348 Eurobarometer March 2007

In your opinion, which two of the following, if any, best explain the added value of the European Union, compared to the [Nationality] Government, when it comes to providing development aid to developing countries in order to eradicate poverty?

	The EU is active in cooperation programs covering practically all developing countries	Coherence between the actions of the EU Member States can be ensured	The EU's cultural diversity results in a more effective and neutral expression of solidarity with developing countries	The EU is the strongest and best recognized player on the international stage	The EU does not add value compared to the [Nationality] Government when it comes to combating poverty (Spontaneous)	Other (Spontaneous)
Belgium	40	40	27	23	4	1
Bulgaria	39	23	11	20	1	0
Czech Republic	35	24	20	21	2	0
Denmark	39	49	23	28	4	0
Germany	22	24	30	30	7	0
Estonia	36	34	20	20	1	0
Greece	46	36	27	32	5	
Spain	18	12	16	18	5	0
France	29	26	27	22	5	1
Ireland	30	26	26	23	5	1
Italy	24	21	18	23	3	
Cyprus	50	35	25	20	1	
Latvia	29	27	13	20	4	
Lithuania	31	19	15	15	2	
Luxembourg	39	26	22	24	4	0
Hungary	28	30	19	28	9	1
Malta	33	16	20	18	3	0
Netherlands	39	29	19	20	9	1
Austria	36	18	31	24	9	0
Poland	31	20	18	31	4	0
Portugal	35	23	20	23	3	0
Romania	38	26	12	21	6	1
Slovenia	34	24	26	39	1	1
Slovakia	48	22	26	26	1	0
Finland	35	26	18	33	9	1
Sweden	27	31	22	22	6	0
United Kingdom	23	17	22	29	3	0
European Average	28	23	22	24	5	0

348

349 German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight poverty

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	60	34	5	1	-	-	93	6
France	49	42	7	3	-	-	90	9
Italy	47	46	5	2	-	-	92	7
Poland	42	46	6	2	2	2	88	7
Slovakia	46	39	7	1	3	4	84	9
United Kingdom	53	35	8	4	-	1	87	11
United States	49	34	7	3	4	3	83	9
European Average	50	40	6	2	3	2	89	8

³⁵⁰ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight corruption.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	60	30	6	2	-	1	91	8
France	51	39	6	4	-	-	90	9
Italy	49	43	5	2	1	1	92	7
Poland	37	47	8	2	3	3	84	10
Slovakia	35	40	12	3	4	6	75	15
United Kingdom	59	29	7	4	-	2	87	11
United States	50	30	9	4	5	3	80	13
European Average	49	38	7	3	3	3	87	10

³⁵¹ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to promote democratic government

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	46	39	10	3	-	2	85	13
France	47	42	8	3	-	1	89	11
Italy	48	44	5	2	1	1	91	7
Poland	24	50	10	3	5	7	74	14
Slovakia	29	42	15	3	4	7	71	18
United Kingdom	39	39	13	4	1	3	78	18
United States	24	36	21	10	5	4	61	31
European Average	39	43	10	3	3	4	81	14

³⁵² German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to open their markets to international trade.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	27	46	21	4	-	2	73	25
France	24	49	20	6	-	-	73	26
Italy	28	54	12	4	1	1	82	16
Poland	25	51	10	3	4	7	76	13
Slovakia	23	47	14	3	5	7	71	17
United Kingdom	29	44	16	7	1	3	73	23
United States	25	43	15	9	5	3	68	24
European Average	26	49	16	5	3	4	75	20

³⁵³ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight terrorism

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	49	30	15	5	-	1	79	20
France	40	37	15	8	-	-	77	22
Italy	47	41	7	3	1	1	88	10
Poland	36	45	10	4	4	3	80	13
Slovakia	44	35	10	3	4	5	79	13
United Kingdom	44	28	16	10	1	1	72	26
United States	40	30	14	9	5	3	69	23
European Average	43	36	12	6	3	2	79	17

³⁵⁴ BBC July 2007

Would you support or oppose the following deal: Wealthy COs agree to provide less-wealthy COs with financial assistance and technology, while less-wealthy COs agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy COs.

	Support	Oppose	Don't know / No answer
Australia	84	12	5
Brazil	73	17	10
Canada	84	12	4
Chile	68	16	16
China	90	7	3
Egypt	77	23	-
France	78	14	8
Germany	75	22	3
Great Britain	81	13	5

India	47	19	34
Indonesia	78	12	10
Italy	77	18	5
Kenya	76	19	5
Mexico	57	29	14
Nigeria	50	46	4
Philippines	71	17	12
Russia	77	6	18
South Korea	72	23	5
Spain	76	17	7
Turkey	65	12	23
United States	70	21	9
Average	73	18	10

³⁵⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

As you may know, the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country. Do you think the UN SHOULD or SHOULD NOT actively promote human rights in member states?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	91	4	5
Mexico	85	12	3
United States	70	25	5
France	76	20	4
Germany	91	8	2
Great Britain	68	24	8
Italy	81	14	5
Russia	55	29	16
Ukraine	73	9	18
Azerbaijan	89	8	4
Egypt	64	33	3
Jordan	50	33	17
Palestinian Territories	54	41	5
Turkey	60	19	20
Kenya	94	4	2
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	62	16	22
Hong Kong	73	16	12
Macau	68	15	17
India	55	26	19
Indonesia	70	13	17
South Korea	62	35	4
Taiwan	78	12	10
Thailand	44	25	31

Average	70	19	10
----------------	----	----	----

³⁵⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?

	Do more	Do less	Do about the same as it has been doing	DK / NS
Argentina	85	2	8	5
Mexico	88	2	8	2
United States	59	7	28	5
France	64	6	26	4
Germany	58	7	34	2
Great Britain	64	6	22	8
Italy	83	6	8	3
Russia	45	8	23	24
Ukraine	57	4	18	22
Azerbaijan	58	9	29	4
Egypt	55	22	22	1
Jordan	62	17	8	13
Palestinian Territories	48	23	26	3
Turkey	69	7	8	16
Kenya	91	5	3	1
Nigeria	88	7	4	1
China	51	5	15	29
Hong Kong	65	2	26	7
Macau	65	1	22	12
India	54	14	16	17
Indonesia	66	6	12	17
South Korea	69	3	25	3
Taiwan	62	2	25	11
Thailand	60	7	13	20
Average	65	8	17	10

³⁵⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, would favor or oppose...giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NS
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1

Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

³⁵⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?

	Make efforts to further the rights of women	Improper interference in a country's internal affairs	DK / NS
Argentina	78	18	4
Mexico	88	9	3
United States	59	38	2
France	74	19	7
Great Britain	70	26	5
Russia	52	30	18
Ukraine	69	16	16
Azerbaijan	66	23	11
Egypt	30	70	
Iran	52	36	12
Palestinian Territories	49	48	3
Turkey	70	20	11
Kenya	91	8	1
Nigeria	66	32	2
China	86	10	4
Hong Kong	67	23	10
India	48	28	24
Indonesia	74	16	10

South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	64	21	15
Average	66	26	8

³⁵⁹ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

Human Rights

	National governments	Regional Organization	United Nations	DK/NR
Italy	27	15	51	8
Spain	16	14	56	13
United States	44	18	33	5
Japan	27	11	47	16
Mexico	41	9	41	8
South Africa	58	15	23	4
Australia	29	9	57	5
Sweden	16	9	73	2
Argentina	39	4	39	18
Finland	33	8	56	3
South Korea	49	10	40	0
Poland	49	7	41	3
Switzerland	25	8	62	4
Brazil	44	11	39	7
Chile	52	7	34	8
India	36	10	13	41
Slovenia	39	30	20	10
Bulgaria	34	26	30	11
Romania	43	10	30	17
China	32	4	17	48
Taiwan	54	10	32	4
Turkey	41	12	39	8
Ukraine	57	14	19	10
Ghana	67	9	22	3
Moldova	55	17	24	4
Thailand	50	24	26	0
Indonesia	55	3	35	8
Vietnam	59	5	27	8
Serbia	50	8	34	9
Egypt	45	15	37	3
Morocco	34	6	42	18
Jordan	21	15	50	13
Cyprus	33	29	37	1
Trinidad & Tobago	45	11	40	3
Andorra	27	8	62	3
Malaysia	38	29	34	0
Burkina Faso	33	6	46	15
Ethiopia	20	12	55	13

Mali	36	8	45	12
Rwanda	29	37	32	3
Zambia	54	13	26	6
Germany	21	19	55	5
Average	40	13	37	10

³⁶⁰ **AsiaBarometer 2006**

I'm going to mention some issues. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations (such as ASEAN [Association of South East Asian Nations] and APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation]), or by the United Nations?

Human rights

	National Government	Regional Organization	United Nations
Taiwan	53.6	12.4	31.6
Singapore	35.2	11.6	46.6
Korea	25.3	18.2	50.9
Japan	53.4	15.7	40.7
Hong Kong	51.3	11.8	35.9
China	71.7	14.5	12.7

³⁶¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

How important is it for people to have the right to express any opinion, including criticisms of the government or religious leaders? Is that very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	84	10	3	1	0	1
Mexico	87	8	2	1	0	1
United States	76	22	1	1	0	1
France	68	28	3	1	0	0
Germany	75	20	3	0	1	0
Great Britain	79	18	2	0	1	1
Italy	80	15	3	1	1	1
Russia	34	42	13	2	4	4
Ukraine	52	35	6	1	3	3
Azerbaijan	50	25	10	3	8	5
Egypt	43	37	18	2	2	0
Jordan	65	21	6	3	0	5
Palestinian Territories	67	27	3	2	0	2
Turkey	67	18	6	3	2	5
Kenya	74	20	4	2	1	0
Nigeria	86	9	2	3	0	0
Hong Kong	44	45	7	1	2	2
Macau	47	35	7	1	3	8
India	48	21	5	13	9	4

Indonesia	82	12	1	0	0	4
South Korea	56	38	5	0	1	1
Taiwan	53	38	5	1	1	2
Thailand	58	18	2	3	15	5
Average	66	22	5	2	2	2

³⁶² **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2007**

As I read a list of things that you can and cannot do in some countries, please tell me how important each is to you. How important is it to you to live in a country where? Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

Where you can openly say what you think and can criticize the (state or government)

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	DK/ Refused
Argentina	65	30	3	1	2
Bolivia	47	41	9	2	1
Brazil	63	30	6	2	0
Chile	71	23	4	0	2
Mexico	48	43	7	1	2
Peru	65	27	5	2	2
Venezuela	57	38	4	1	0
Bulgaria	48	35	11	1	5
Czech Republic	45	32	16	6	1
Poland	43	49	6	0	1
Russia	34	46	15	3	2
Slovakia	48	30	17	4	1
Ukraine	38	46	11	4	1
Turkey	61	25	9	1	4
Egypt	80	5	14	1	1
Jordan	62	29	7	2	1
Kuwait	37	28	13	19	4
Lebanon	86	11	3	0	0
Morocco	63	18	4	1	15
Palestinian Territories	57	27	8	4	5
Pakistan	58	24	4	1	13
Bangladesh	61	29	8	1	1
Indonesia	47	39	12	1	1
Malaysia	33	42	19	5	1
India	54	36	7	2	1
Ethiopia	67	30	2	0	1
Ghana	50	37	9	4	0
Ivory Coast	64	28	6	3	0
Kenya	68	23	8	2	0
Mali	61	27	7	4	0
Nigeria	70	26	3	1	1
Senegal	59	29	8	4	0
South Africa	47	36	11	5	1
Tanzania	73	16	7	3	1
Uganda	55	31	9	3	2

³⁶³ **Afrobarometer 2005-2006**

Which of the following statements is closest to your view?

	Government should not allow the expression of political views that are fundamentally different from the views of the majority.	People should be able to speak their minds about politics free of government influence, no matter how unpopular their view may be.	Do not agree with either.	DK
Benin	25	73	1	2
Botswana	16	82	1	1
Cape Verde	14	72	4	10
Ghana	18	79	1	2
Kenya	20	76	2	2
Lesotho	16	83	1	0
Madagascar	14	73	2	10
Malawi	29	69	1	2
Mali	38	60	1	1
Mozambique	34	55	3	8
Namibia	34	63	2	1
Nigeria	25	73	2	1
Senegal	23	70	2	5
South Africa	20	73	3	4
Tanzania	44	43	4	8
Uganda	25	73	2	0
Zambia	15	81	3	1
Zimbabwe	11	87	1	0
Average	23	71	2	3

³⁶⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government should or should not have the right to prohibit certain political or religious views from being discussed?

	Should have the right	Should not have the right	DK / NS
Argentina	29	69	2
Mexico	20	76	3
United States	13	85	2
France	27	71	2
Germany	41	56	3
Great Britain	39	53	7
Italy	30	63	7
Russia	29	55	16
Ukraine	29	63	9
Azerbaijan	32	64	4
Egypt	49	49	3
Jordan	41	47	12
Palestinian Territories	33	64	3

Turkey	25	64	11
Kenya	67	33	0
Nigeria	47	51	1
Hong Kong	16	78	6
India	38	44	18
Indonesia	55	32	12
South Korea	14	85	2
Taiwan*	15	81	5
Thailand	63	16	21
Average	36	57	7

³⁶⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think that:

	A. People should have the right to demonstrate peacefully to protest against the government	B. The government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations that it thinks would be politically destabilizing	DK / NS
Mexico	84	11	4
United States	94	5	2
France	91	7	2
Germany	84	15	1
Great Britain	87	11	2
Italy	87	10	3
Russia	76	17	7
Ukraine	82	11	7
Azerbaijan	72	28	1
Egypt	55	42	3
Jordan	53	35	12
Palestinian Territories	65	33	2
Turkey	67	21	12
Kenya	72	28	0
Nigeria	83	17	1
Hong Kong	82	11	8
Macau	72	16	12
India	68	20	12
Indonesia	83	10	8
South Korea	66	32	3
Taiwan	78	13	9
Thailand	55	29	17
Average	75	20	5

³⁶⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important is it for the media to be free to publish news and ideas without government control?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol)	DK / NS
Argentina	70	24	4	1	0	0
Mexico	79	15	4	0	1	1
Peru	65	31	3	0	0	1
United States	56	32	10	1	0	1
France	54	26	11	5	3	1
Britain	65	23	7	4	1	1
Russia	23	41	21	5	5	6
Ukraine	39	35	13	5	3	6
Azerbaijan	52	34	5	5	3	1
Egypt	64	33	2	0	0	0
Iran	29	36	9	8	3	16
Jordan	50	28	12	7	0	4
Palestinian Territories	52	30	12	5	0	1
Turkey	56	18	9	9	3	5
Kenya	70	21	7	2	0	0
Nigeria	54	37	6	1	1	1
China	58	27	10	1	2	2
Hong Kong*	56	29	4	0	8	3
India	34	18	8	6	33	2
Indonesia	42	31	13	3	2	8
South Korea	64	29	6	1	0	0
Thailand	45	28	6	1	16	5
Average	53	28	8	3	4	3

³⁶⁷ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2007**

As I read a list of things that you can and cannot do in some countries, please tell me how important each is to you. How important is it to you to live in a country where (see below)? Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

The media can report the news without (state or government) censorship

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	DK/Refused
Argentina	65	29	3	1	3
Bolivia	36	44	13	3	3
Brazil	58	31	8	2	1
Chile	71	23	4	1	2
Mexico	51	36	9	2	3
Peru	71	23	2	1	2
Venezuela	57	28	5	0	0
Bulgaria	66	25	4	1	4
Czech Republic	69	20	8	2	1

Poland	51	36	9	1	3
Russia	40	41	13	3	3
Slovakia	65	20	10	4	2
Ukraine	58	32	7	1	2
Turkey	50	27	12	3	7
Egypt	75	11	5	8	2
Jordan	45	48	1	5	1
Kuwait	53	23	7	13	4
Lebanon	72	16	8	4	1
Morocco	62	24	5	1	9
Palestinian Territories	49	25	12	6	8
Pakistan	50	24	7	3	16
Bangladesh	43	30	10	4	13
Indonesia	33	44	18	5	1
Malaysia	32	43	20	3	1
India	51	36	8	3	2
Ethiopia	73	22	3	2	1
Ghana	46	37	12	3	1
Ivory Coast	38	33	18	11	0
Kenya	72	22	5	1	0
Mali	55	30	10	4	0
Nigeria	69	25	4	1	1
Senegal	46	29	16	9	0
South Africa	47	34	12	5	3
Tanzania	55	13	9	20	2
Uganda	58	30	7	2	3

³⁶⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think people in [country] should or should not have the right to read publications from all other countries, including those that might be considered enemies?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	92	7	1
Mexico	95	3	2
United States	92	7	1
France	82	15	4
Great Britain	89	7	4
Poland	84	7	9
Russia	71	15	14
Ukraine	82	8	10
Azerbaijan	73	14	13
Egypt	74	26	
Iran	79	6	16
Palestine	72	23	5
Turkey	74	18	9
Kenya	84	15	0
Nigeria	91	8	1
China	78	17	5

Hong Kong*	86	8	6
India	56	33	11
Indonesia	84	7	9
South Korea	73	26	1
Thailand	79	7	13
Average	80	13	6

³⁶⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think people in [country] should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet or do you think the government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the internet?

	People should have the right to read whatever is on the internet	Government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the Internet	DK / NS
Argentina	84	13	3
Mexico	67	28	5
United States	75	24	1
France	52	44	4
Great Britain	61	35	5
Russia	57	27	17
Ukraine	64	21	16
Azerbaijan	79	12	10
Egypt	65	35	
Iran	32	44	24
Jordan	29	63	9
Palestinian Territories	52	44	4
Turkey	60	30	10
Kenya	59	38	2
Nigeria	72	23	5
China	71	21	8
Hong Kong	80	9	12
India	52	36	12
Indonesia	65	24	12
South Korea	69	31	0
Thailand	75	11	13
Average	62	30	8

³⁷⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Which view is closer to yours? Do you think:

	The media should have the right to publish news and ideas without government control.	The government should have the right to prevent the media from publishing things that it thinks will be politically destabilizing.	DK / NS
Argentina	80	16	4
Mexico	77	17	6
Peru	83	12	5
United States	72	27	1
France	70	26	4
Great Britain	69	28	3
Poland	78	13	9
Russia	45	44	12
Ukraine	59	31	10
Azerbaijan	55	34	11
Egypt	49	52	
Iran	31	45	24
Jordan	26	66	8
Palestinian Territories	36	59	6
Turkey	45	42	13
Kenya	67	33	
Nigeria	71	28	1
China	53	42	5
Hong Kong	76	18	6
India	42	33	25
Indonesia	35	56	9
South Korea	72	26	1
Thailand	48	37	15
Average	57	35	8

³⁷¹ BBC November 2007

Which of the following statements on the freedom of the press is closest to your own view?

	Freedom of the press to report the news truthfully is very important to ensure we live in a fair society, even if it sometimes leads to unpleasant debates or social unrest.	While freedom of the press to report news truthfully is important, social harmony and peace are more important which sometimes means controlling what is reported for the greater good.	DK/NA
United States	70	28	2
Venezuela	64	36	
Brazil	52	48	
Mexico	51	46	3

Great Britain	67	29	4
Germany	67	26	7
Russia	39	47	14
Egypt	55	45	
United Arab Emirates	51	48	1
South Africa	63	34	3
Kenya	62	37	1
Nigeria	56	43	1
Singapore	43	48	9
India	41	48	11

³⁷² Afrobarometer 2005-2006

Which of the following statements is closest to your view?

	Government should close newspapers that print false stories or information.	The news media should be free to publish any story that they see fit without fear of being shut down.	Do not agree with either.	DK
Benin	60	34	1	5
Botswana	25	71	3	1
Cape Verde	21	60	8	11
Ghana	36	55	2	6
Kenya	38	50	6	5
Lesotho	36	62	1	1
Madagascar	35	51	3	11
Malawi	47	50	1	2
Mali	55	41	2	2
Mozambique	20	67	3	10
Namibia	42	52	3	2
Nigeria	35	61	3	2
Senegal	49	37	7	6
South Africa	28	62	5	5
Tanzania	54	31	5	10
Uganda	41	56	2	1
Zambia	29	63	6	2
Zimbabwe	20	78	2	1
Average	37	55	4	5

³⁷³ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important do you think it is for people of different religions to be treated equally? Would you say it is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
----------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------	---------

Argentina	90	7	1	0	0	1
Mexico	83	11	3	1	0	1
United States	77	18	3	1		1
France	66	28	3	2	1	0
Germany	67	26	4	1	2	0
Great Britain	70	22	2	3	2	1
Italy	66	25	4	2	2	1
Poland	40	46	8	3		4
Russia	34	44	8	3	6	5
Ukraine	44	40	6	2	4	4
Azerbaijan	57	31	4	3	3	1
Egypt	29	45	18	6	2	1
Jordan	59	26	6	5		5
Palestinian Territories	52	36	10	1		2
Turkey	75	15	4	2	2	2
Kenya	83	16	1	0		
Nigeria	83	11	4	1	0	0
Hong Kong	54	38	4	1	1	1
Macau	56	29	5	1	2	7
India	56	20	2	13	6	4
Indonesia	82	13	2	0	1	2
South Korea	67	26	6	0	0	1
Taiwan	67	23	5	1	1	3
Thailand	61	16	6	3	8	6
Average	64	25	5	2	2	2

³⁷⁴ **Pew Global Attitudes Project October 2007**

As I read a list of things that you can and cannot do in some countries, please tell me how important each is to you. How important is it to you to live in a country where (see below)? Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

You can practice your religion freely

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	DK/Refused
Argentina	65	30	3	0	1
Bolivia	48	41	8	1	2
Brazil	77	20	2	1	0
Chile	76	19	3	1	2
Mexico	52	34	9	3	2
Peru	72	23	3	1	1
Venezuela	54	41	4	0	0
Bulgaria	49	30	12	4	5
Czech Republic	48	27	16	9	0
Poland	62	33	4	0	1
Russia	45	37	11	5	3
Slovakia	64	21	11	4	0

Ukraine	54	31	8	3	3
Turkey	70	18	7	1	3
Egypt	90	2	7	1	1
Jordan	73	24	0	4	0
Kuwait	90	6	1	1	1
Lebanon	85	8	6	1	0
Morocco	71	18	1	0	9
Palestinian Territories	74	15	4	3	4
Pakistan	68	18	4	1	9
Bangladesh	75	20	4	1	1
Indonesia	80	19	1	0	0
Malaysia	60	32	6	1	1
India	64	29	5	1	1
Ethiopia	92	8	0	0	1
Ghana	71	25	4	1	0
Ivory Coast	88	11	1	0	0
Kenya	83	14	2	0	0
Mali	86	12	1	0	0
Nigeria	86	12	1	1	0
Senegal	95	5	0	0	0
South Africa	68	27	3	1	1
Tanzania	92	6	1	1	1
Uganda	78	18	2	1	1

³⁷⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think:

	A. Followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in [country].	There are some religions that people should not be allowed to practice in [country].	DK / NS
Mexico	76	19	5
United States	67	28	5
France	72	26	2
Germany	61	36	3
Great Britain	59	33	9
Italy	64	30	6
Poland	77	16	7
Russia	50	38	12
Ukraine	30	54	16
Azerbaijan	71	26	3
Egypt	31	67	3
Jordan	39	51	9
Palestinian Territories	56	43	2
Turkey	80	12	8
Kenya	75	25	0
Nigeria	77	22	1
Hong Kong	65	25	10

Macau	51	33	16
India	63	18	18
Indonesia	65	28	7
South Korea	48	50	2
Taiwan	75	14	12
Thailand	63	13	24
Average	61	32	7

³⁷⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: “In [country], people of any religion should be free to try to convert members of other religions to join theirs.”

	Agree	Disagree	DK/NS
Mexico	56	40	4
United States	58	38	4
France	33	64	3
Germany	49	46	6
Great Britain	37	57	7
Italy	44	53	3
Poland	27	60	14
Russia	23	62	15
Ukraine	30	48	22
Azerbaijan	32	63	5
Egypt	30	67	3
Jordan	34	60	7
Palestinian Territories	18	78	4
Turkey	34	55	10
Kenya	74	25	0
Nigeria	78	20	2
Hong Kong	63	30	8
Macau	58	31	11
India	33	52	15
Indonesia	17	72	12
South Korea	79	20	1
Taiwan	83	11	6
Thailand	36	45	18
Average	41	51	8

³⁷⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

How important do you think it is for women to have full equality of rights compared to men? Would you say that is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	71	24	3	0	1	1
Mexico	89	9	2	0	0	0
United States	77	20	2	1	0	1
France	75	22	2	2	0	0
Great Britain	89	9	1	0	1	0
Russia	35	41	17	3	1	3
Ukraine	44	35	15	3	1	2
Azerbaijan	55	30	11	3	1	1
Egypt	31	59	9	1	0	0
Iran	44	34	5	3	2	12
Jordan	55	28	10	5	0	2
Palestinian Territories	54	29	9	7	0	1
Turkey	80	11	3	3	2	1
Kenya	66	24	8	1	0	0
Nigeria	44	32	15	9	1	0
China	76	19	2	1	0	1
Hong Kong	41	42	5	1	9	1
India	41	19	6	6	26	1
Indonesia	71	20	4	1	1	3
South Korea	43	43	13	2	0	0
Thailand	49	35	3	1	10	3
Average	59	27	7	3	2	2

³⁷⁸ World Values Survey 2005-2008

Many things may be desirable, but not all of them are essential characteristics of democracy. Please tell me for each of the following things how essential you think it is as a characteristic of democracy. Use this scale where 1 means “not at all an essential characteristic of democracy” and 10 means it definitely is “an essential characteristic of democracy.”

Women have the same rights as men.

Spain	8.91
United States	8.58
Japan	8.27
Mexico	8.23
South Africa	8.09
Australia	9.21
Sweden	9.84
Argentina	9.47
Finland	9.17
South Korea	8.27
Poland	9.02
Poland	9.02
Switzerland	9.27
Brazil	8.44

Chile	8.54
India	8.21
Slovenia	8.89
Bulgaria	8.69
Romania	9.35
China	9.04
Taiwan	9.05
Turkey	8.77
Ukraine	8.35
Peru	8.93
Ghana	8.49
Moldova	8.7
Thailand	7.58
Indonesia	8.09
Vietnam	9.32
Serbia	8.61
Egypt	7.85
Morocco	7.61
Jordan	7.71
Cyprus	8.82
Trinidad and Tobago	8.85
Andorra	9.6
Malaysia	6.73
Burkina Faso	8.34
Ethiopia	9.05
Mali	7.88
Rwanda	7.8
Zambia	7.72
Germany	9.13
Average	8.53

³⁷⁹ Afrobarameter 2005-2006

Which of the following statements is closest to your view? Choose Statement A or Statement B.

A: In our country, women should have equal rights and receive the same treatment as men do.

B: Women have always been subject to traditional laws and customs, and should remain so.

	Agree very strongly with A	Agree with A	Agree with B	Agree very strongly with B	Agree with neither	Don't know
Benin	71	8	7	13	0	
Botswana	42	25	11	19	3	1
Cape Verde	62	17	10	7	2	2
Ghana	56	26	10	8	0	0
Kenya	50	19	15	14	2	0
Lesotho	30	10	10	48	1	0
Madagascar	35	43	17	5	0	0
Malawi	53	4	3	39	1	1
Mali	27	28	21	23	1	0
Mozambique	55	26	9	5	2	2
Namibia	44	35	14	6	1	0
Nigeria	36	28	18	16	2	0
Senegal	32	24	22	19	2	1
South Africa	49	34	8	5	2	2

Tanzania	76	12	5	5	1	1
Uganda	47	22	14	16	1	0
Zambia	47	29	10	10	4	0
Average	47	24	12	15	2	1

³⁸⁰ **Afrobarometer 2005-2006**

Which of the following statements is closest to your view? Choose Statement A or Statement B.

A: Women should have the same chance of being elected to political office as men.

B: Men make better political leaders than women, and should be elected rather than women.

	Agree very strongly with A	Agree with A	Agree with B	Agree very strongly with B	Agree with neither	Don't know
Benin	75	10	7	8	0	
Botswana	55	28	9	7	2	1
Cape Verde	64	19	6	9	1	2
Ghana	58	26	9	7	0	0
Kenya	57	24	10	7	2	0
Lesotho	37	14	11	36	2	0
Madagascar	34	47	13	4	0	1
Malawi	76	4	3	16	0	1
Mali	33	30	16	20	1	1
Mozambique	54	27	8	5	3	3
Namibia	41	26	20	12	1	0
Nigeria	33	25	19	20	1	0
Senegal	42	30	15	12	1	1
South Africa	47	33	9	7	3	1
Tanzania	77	13	3	6	1	0
Uganda	54	25	11	10	1	0
Zambia	43	27	13	14	2	1
Zimbabwe	43	24	10	21	3	0
Average	51	25	11	12	1	1

³⁸¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Do you think the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination against women or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Should make an effort	Should not be involved	DK / NR
Argentina	74	24	2
Mexico	96	3	1
United States	82	17	1
France	88	11	2
Great Britain	88	11	1
Russia	74	14	12
Spain	89	9	3
Ukraine	77	14	9
Azerbaijan	77	15	9
Egypt	77	23	0
Iran	70	18	12

Jordan	71	22	7
Palestinian Territories	77	17	6
Turkey	85	11	4
Kenya	97	3	
Nigeria	76	23	1
China	86	11	3
Hong Kong	70	24	6
India	53	38	9
Indonesia	93	6	2
South Korea	87	12	1
Thailand	83	9	8
Average	81	15	4

³⁸² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important is it for people of different races and ethnicities to be treated equally?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol)	DK / NS
Argentina	72	24	3	1	1	0
Mexico	94	5	1	0	0	0
Peru	70	28	2	0	0	1
United States	79	17	2	1	0	1
France	69	25	2	2	1	1
Great Britain	87	10	1	0	0	1
Russia	37	46	10	3	1	3
Ukraine	50	37	8	2	1	3
Azerbaijan	68	21	8	2	1	1
Egypt	71	26	3	0	0	0
Iran	62	20	2	1	0	14
Jordan	73	17	5	2	0	2
Palestinian Territories	70	23	5	2	0	1
Turkey	73	15	5	3	2	2
Kenya	80	17	3	0	0	0
Nigeria	71	25	3	1	1	0
China	90	8	1	0	0	1
Hong Kong	47	41	4	1	6	1
India	44	15	5	5	30	2
Indonesia	75	14	5	1	2	3
South Korea	71	23	5	1	0	0
Thailand	39	36	6	2	13	4

Average	69	22	4	1	2	2
----------------	----	----	---	---	---	---

³⁸³ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think that employers should or should not be allowed to refuse to hire a qualified person because of the person's race or ethnicity?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	23	73	4
Mexico	24	72	3
United States	13	86	1
France	6	94	1
Great Britain	16	83	1
Russia	18	72	10
Ukraine	15	77	9
Azerbaijan	8	82	10
Egypt	25	75	0
Iran	12	72	16
Palestinian Territories	23	74	3
Turkey	18	72	10
Kenya	28	72	1
Nigeria	34	64	1
China	10	88	3
Hong Kong	6	88	6
India	30	43	27
Indonesia	13	84	3
South Korea	41	58	1
Thailand	37	38	25
Average	21	72	7

³⁸⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government has the responsibility to try to prevent employers from refusing to hire someone because of a person's race or ethnicity or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Has responsibility	Should not be involved	Should be allowed not to hire	DK / NS
Argentina	60	16	23	2
Mexico	64	9	24	2
United States	69	17	13	1
France	69	23	6	3
Great Britain	69	13	16	2
Russia	58	13	18	11
Ukraine	65	10	15	10
Azerbaijan	72	9	8	10

Egypt	56	19	25	0
Iran	61	5	12	22
Palestinian Territories	53	19	23	4
Turkey	23	43	18	16
Kenya	63	9	28	0
Nigeria	56	8	35	1
China	77	11	10	3
Hong Kong	66	22	6	6
India	27	20	30	24
Indonesia	80	3	13	4
South Korea	53	6	41	0
Thailand	36	9	37	18
Average	58	14	21	7

³⁸⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on a person's race or ethnicity or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Should make an effort	Should not be involved	Government does too much (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	82	14	2	3
Mexico	94	5	1	1
United States	83	17	0	0
France	85	12	1	3
Great Britain	85	13	0	2
Russia	71	11	4	14
Spain	89	8	0	3
Ukraine	71	16	3	10
Azerbaijan	70	11	12	7
Egypt	73	27	1	0
Iran	76	10	0	14
Palestinian Territories	64	15	17	4
Turkey	79	8	4	9
Kenya	95	5	0	0
Nigeria	90	8	2	0
China	90	8	0	2
Hong Kong	78	17	1	5
India	46	17	6	31
Indonesia	88	8	2	2
South Korea	96	4	0	0
Thailand	64	10	10	16

Average	80	11	3	6
----------------	----	----	---	---

³⁸⁶ Eurobarometer March 2008

Would you be in favor of or opposed to specific measures being adopted to provide equal opportunities for everyone in the field of employment? Measures such as for example special training schemes or adapted recruitment processes, for people depending on their...

Ethnic origin

	In favor	Opposed	DK
Belgium	65	35	
Bulgaria	76	13	11
Czech Republic	65	29	6
Denmark	69	29	2
German	69	26	5
Estonia	83	13	4
Greece	76	24	
Spain	85	9	6
France	73	22	5
Ireland	74	15	11
Italy	61	31	8
Republic of Cyprus	72	25	3
Latvia	66	25	9
Lithuania	77	14	9
Luxembourg	79	14	7
Hungary	77	19	4
Malta	68	23	9
The Netherlands	69	30	1
Austria	54	36	10
Poland	75	15	10
Portugal	74	19	7
Romania	71	17	12
Slovenia	75	23	2
Slovakia	78	17	5
Finland	72	26	2
Sweden	69	27	4
United Kingdom	78	18	4
Average	72	22	6

³⁸⁷ Eurobarometer March 2008

To what extent do you oppose the following in the workplace?

Monitoring the composition of the work-force to evaluate the representation of people from ethnic minorities

	Support	Opposed	DK
Belgium	61	37	2
Bulgaria	61	18	21
Czech Republic	54	38	8
Denmark	71	26	3
German	40	54	6
Estonia	53	35	12

Greece	77	22	1
Spain	65	18	17
France	55	36	9
Ireland	71	17	12
Italy	59	30	11
Republic of Cyprus	78	13	9
Latvia	41	45	14
Lithuania	59	24	17
Luxembourg	52	33	15
Hungary	70	21	9
Malta	59	12	29
The Netherlands	59	38	3
Austria	42	46	12
Poland	52	31	17
Portugal	65	23	12
Romania	57	21	22
Slovenia	50	43	7
Slovakia	42	49	9
Finland	61	32	7
Sweden	50	46	4
United Kingdom	66	26	8
Average	57	33	10

³⁸⁸ Eurobarometer March 2008

To what extent do you support or oppose the following in the work place?

Monitoring the recruitment procedures to ensure that candidates from ethnic minorities have the same chance of being selected for interview or hired as other candidates with similar skills and qualifications

	Support	Opposed	DK
Belgium	77	22	1
Bulgaria	73	10	17
Czech Republic	68	26	6
Denmark	84	12	4
German	58	38	4
Estonia	76	16	8
Greece	76	24	
Spain	72	14	14
France	80	14	6
Ireland	78	10	12
Italy	66	26	8
Republic of Cyprus	77	17	6
Latvia	71	19	10
Lithuania	71	18	11
Luxembourg	77	13	10
Hungary	78	14	8
Malta	60	16	24
The Netherlands	82	17	1
Austria	55	34	11
Poland	67	19	14
Portugal	76	14	10
Romania	67	14	19

Slovenia	72	23	5
Slovakia	66	27	7
Finland	78	19	3
Sweden	83	16	1
United Kingdom	78	17	5
Average	71	21	8

³⁸⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006

As you may know, the [COUNTRY] has signed treaties that limit what a government can do to pressure detainees to give information. Here are some methods that are not allowed. For each one please say whether you approve of having a rule against it or if you think such a rule is too restrictive.

Using physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	75	21	4
Great Britain	53	45	2
Germany	76	21	3
Poland	67	27	6
India	35	39	27

Threatening physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	60	37	3
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	69	28	3
Poland	54	38	8
India	33	39	28

Treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	61	36	4
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	72	25	3
Poland	59	32	8
India	32	42	25

³⁹⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Clear rules should be maintained	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS
Argentina	76	13	5	6

Mexico	73	17	7	3
United States	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palestinian Territories	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Kenya	41	44	14	2
Nigeria	41	39	15	5
China	66	10	18	6
Hong Kong	67	9	13	12
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
South Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

³⁹¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	DK/NS
Argentina	18	76	6
Mexico	24	73	3
United States	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7
Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22
Palestinian Territories	28	66	6
Turkey	51	36	13
Kenya	58	41	2
Nigeria	54	41	5
China	28	66	6
Hong Kong	22	67	12
India	59	28	13
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	51	48	1

	Clear rules should be maintained	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS
Thailand	44		36	19
Average	35		57	8
Argentina	76	13	5	6
Mexico	73	17	7	3
United States	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palestinian Territories	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Kenya	41	44	14	2
Nigeria	41	39	15	5
China	66	10	18	6
Hong Kong	67	9	13	12
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
South Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

³⁹² Associated Press-Ipsos Poll November 2005

How do you feel about the use of torture against suspected terrorists to obtain information about terrorism activities? Can that...?

	Often be Justified	Sometimes be Justified	Rarely be Justified	Never be Justified	Not Sure
United States	11	27	23	36	3
Canada	9	19	21	49	2
Mexico	9	22	18	40	11
South Korea	6	47	33	10	4
France	12	20	25	40	3
Germany	8	22	20	48	2
Italy	9	14	14	50	3
Spain	7	14	16	54	9
United Kingdom	9	21	21	48	1

³⁹³ BBC July 2006

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	Neither / Depends	DK / NA
Australia	22	75	2	1
Brazil	32	61	4	4
Canada	22	74	3	1
Chile	22	62	6	10
China	37	49	8	6
Egypt	25	65	6	3
France	19	75	4	2
Germany	21	71	6	1
India	32	23	28	17
Indonesia	40	51	4	4
Iraq	42	55	-	3
Israel	43	48	1	8
Italy	14	81	5	1
Kenya	38	53	3	6
Mexico	24	50	10	17
Nigeria	39	49	5	7
Philippines	40	56	2	3
Poland	27	62	5	7
South Korea	31	66	2	1
Russia	37	43	10	10
Spain	16	65	8	11
Turkey	24	62	7	7
Ukraine	29	54	11	7
Great Britain	24	72	2	2
United States	36	58	4	3
Average	29	59	6	6

³⁹⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006

As you may know, the [COUNTRY] has signed treaties that limit what a government can do to pressure detainees to give information. Here are some methods that are not allowed. For each one please say whether you approve of having a rule against it or if you think such a rule is too restrictive.

Using physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	75	21	4
Great Britain	53	45	2
Germany	76	21	3
Poland	67	27	6
India	35	39	27

Threatening physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	60	37	3

Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	69	28	3
Poland	54	38	8
India	33	39	28

Treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	61	36	4
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	72	25	3
Poland	59	32	8
India	32	42	25

³⁹⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006**

When acts of torture have been committed by military personnel, but their commander says that he or she did not order it and was not aware of it, should the commander be held responsible or not held responsible?

	Held responsible	Not held responsible	DK/NA
United States	58	37	5
Great Britain	73	23	4
Germany	72	21	6
Poland	59	31	10
India	41	27	32

³⁹⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006**

If the United States requests permission to fly through [COUNTRY'S] airspace when it is transporting a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture, do you think [COUNTRY] should allow the United States to do this, or do you think that it should refuse permission?

	Should allow United States to fly through airspace	Should refuse permission	DK/NA
Great Britain	26	66	7
Germany	35	55	10
Poland	36	48	16
India	28	42	30

³⁹⁷ **Pew Global Attitudes Project October 2007**

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with it:

It is the responsibility of the (state or government) to take care of very poor people who can't take care of themselves

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	DK/ Refused
United States	28	42	17	11	3

Canada	40	41	14	3	1
Argentina	55	34	7	3	2
Bolivia	34	44	17	4	2
Brazil	60	30	8	2	0
Chile	54	36	8	1	1
Mexico	31	50	14	2	2
Peru	49	37	9	3	2
Venezuela	44	42	11	2	0
Great Britain	53	38	5	3	1
France	49	34	14	3	0
Germany	52	40	4	3	1
Italy	46	40	7	2	4
Spain	53	43	3	0	1
Sweden	56	30	8	4	1
Bulgaria	67	26	1	0	5
Czech Republic	58	30	9	2	1
Poland	54	35	9	2	0
Russia	57	29	9	2	2
Slovakia	44	42	12	2	0
Ukraine	64	23	8	4	1
Turkey	62	24	10	1	3
Egypt	38	29	26	6	1
Jordan	34	33	29	3	1
Kuwait	70	23	3	3	1
Lebanon	60	32	4	1	1
Morocco	67	25	2	0	5
Palestinian Territories	68	21	5	4	3
Israel	60	30	9	1	1
Pakistan	58	26	8	2	6
Bangladesh	65	28	5	1	0
Indonesia	48	45	5	1	0
Malaysia	54	39	5	1	1
China	46	44	8	1	1
India	57	35	6	2	0
Japan	15	44	31	7	2
South Korea	30	57	11	1	1
Ethiopia	57	29	12	1	1
Ghana	46	38	17	8	1
Ivory Coast	65	27	5	3	0
Kenya	58	31	8	3	0
Mali	61	28	8	3	0
Nigeria	66	24	7	3	0
Senegal	68	22	8	2	0
South Africa	50	35	10	4	0
Tanzania	73	20	5	2	1
Uganda	54	30	10	3	2

³⁹⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the [country's] government should be responsible for ensuring that its citizens can meet their basic need for food OR do you think that is NOT the government's responsibility?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	94	3	1	1
Mexico	89	7	2	2
United States	74	25		1
France	86	13	1	1
Germany	93	5	2	0
Great Britain	86	10	3	1
Italy	92	5	3	0
Russia	77	12	10	1
Ukraine	89	6	3	2
Azerbaijan	93	5	2	1
Egypt	82	14	3	1
Jordan	96	2		2
Palestinian Territories	80	17	1	1
Turkey	87	10	3	1
Kenya	96	4	0	
Nigeria	84	10	3	3
China	96	1	2	2
Hong Kong	92	4	4	0
Macau	95	3	1	1
India	70	10	13	7
Indonesia	97	2	1	0
South Korea	85	12	2	1
Taiwan	92	3	2	3
Thailand	85	1	9	4
Average	87	8	3	2

³⁹⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

What about the basic need for healthcare? Do you think the government should or should not be responsible for ensuring that people can meet this need?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	97	1	0	1
Mexico	96	2	1	1
United States	77	21		2
France	92	7	1	0
Germany	95	4	1	0
Great Britain	93	4	2	1
Italy	97	2	2	0
Russia	96	2	2	1
Ukraine	97	1	1	1
Azerbaijan	96	2	2	1

Egypt	81	14	4	0
Jordan	97	1		2
Palestinian Territories	79	19	2	1
Turkey	96	3	1	0
Kenya	96	4	0	0
Nigeria	95	3	1	1
China	96	1	2	1
Hong Kong	94	2	4	1
Macau	99	1	1	0
India	70	12	11	6
Indonesia	97	2	1	0
South Korea	93	4	1	1
Taiwan	96	1	2	1
Thailand	88	2	5	6
Average	92	5	2	1

⁴⁰⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

What about the basic need for education? Do you think the government should or should not be responsible for ensuring that people can meet this need?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	98	1	0	1
Mexico	96	2	2	1
United States	83	16		1
France	89	10	1	0
Germany	93	5	2	0
Great Britain	96	3	1	1
Italy	95	3	1	1
Russia	94	3	2	1
Ukraine	95	2	2	1
Azerbaijan	89	3	7	2
Egypt	77	19	4	1
Jordan	97	1		2
Palestinian Territories	85	11	3	2
Turkey	97	2	0	0
Kenya	95	5	0	0
Nigeria	91	3	6	0
China	98	1	1	1
Hong Kong	97	1	2	1
Macau	98	1	0	1
India	64	8	19	8
Indonesia	97	2	1	1
South Korea	95	3	1	1

Taiwan	95	2	1	2
Thailand	90	1	3	6
Average	91	5	3	1

⁴⁰¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

As you may know there are a number of international laws based on agreements between most nations, including our own. These govern a wide set of issues ranging from fishing rights to the use of military force. Which of these two views is closer to yours?

	A. Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.	B. If our government thinks it is not in our nation's interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws.	DK/NR
Chile	58	27	15
Mexico	44	53	3
United States	69	29	2
France	61	35	4
Germany	70	26	4
Great Britain	54	43	3
Poland	62	29	10
Russia	54	34	13
Ukraine	67	19	14
Azerbaijan	60	31	10
Egypt	63	37	0
Iraq	46	31	24
Pakistan	38	56	6
Palestinian territories	50	46	4
Turkey	46	46	8
Kenya	65	34	1
Nigeria	65	34	2
China	74	18	8
Hong Kong*	47	38	15
Macao	51	37	12
India	49	42	9
Indonesia	53	34	13
South Korea	56	44	1
Taiwan*	68	24	8
Average	57	36	7

*Not included in the Global average

⁴⁰² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

As compared to the average [Country citizen] would you say you are more supportive or less supportive of consistently abiding by international laws?

	More supportive	Less supportive	About the same (vol.)	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Chile	45	21	11	5	18
Mexico	71	14	5	5	5
United States	66	30	-	-	4
France	64	21	4	5	6
Great Britain	57	29	5	1	8
Poland	55	17	17	3	7
Russia	28	15	29	11	18

Ukraine	47	12	16	8	17
Egypt	49	38	7	6	
Iraq	21	41	19	9	11
Palestinian territories	18	62	11	7	1
Turkey	43	27	14	6	11
Kenya	62	26	8	3	1
Nigeria	57	38	1	4	
Hong Kong*	70	5	10	7	8
Macao*	73	5	1	2	18
India	35	27	14	14	10
Indonesia	54	29	6	5	6
Taiwan*	83	8	0	4	5
Average	49	28	11	6	8

*Not included in Global Average

⁴⁰³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

As you may know, there is an international law that prohibits a nation from using military force against another nation except in self defense or to defend an ally. Do you approve or disapprove of there being such a law?

- 79% Approve
- 17 Disapprove
- 5 (No Answer)

⁴⁰⁴ **Gallup/USA Today Poll, September 2006**

When interrogating prisoners, members of the U.S. (United States) military are required to abide by the Geneva Convention standards which prohibit the humiliating and degrading treatment of prisoners. When CIA or Central Intelligence Agency questions suspects whom they believe have information about possible terror plots against the United States, do you think--they should have to abide by the same Geneva Convention standards that apply to the U.S. military, or they should be able to use more forceful interrogation techniques than the Geneva Convention standards that apply to the U.S. military?

- 57% Abide by Geneva Convention standards
- 38 Able to use more forceful techniques
- 2 Other/Depends (Vol.)
- 3 No opinion

⁴⁰⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002**

For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of (own country) military troops?

To uphold international law

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/Other
Great Britain	84	12	4
France	84	13	3
Germany	68	26	7
The Netherlands	86	12	2
Italy	83	14	2
Poland	84	11	6
European Average	80	16	4
United States	76	21	3

⁴⁰⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	86	10	4
China	73	17	10
India	57	31	12
South Korea	86	13	2

⁴⁰⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	81	14	5
2002 (internet)	84	13	3
2004 (internet)	87	9	3
2006 (internet)	86	10	4
2008 (internet)	88	11	1

⁴⁰⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

An agreement under the treaty banning biological weapons that would allow international inspectors to examine biological research laboratories to ensure that countries are not producing biological weapons

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	89	8	3
China	65	19	16
India	50	32	19
South Korea	86	12	2

⁴⁰⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	71	25	5
South Korea	87	11	2

⁴¹⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	71	22	7
2002 (internet)	77	20	4
2004 (internet)	76	19	5
2006 (internet)	71	25	5
2008 (internet)	68	30	2

⁴¹¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

A new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse-gas emissions

76%	Should participate
23	Should not participate
2	Not sure/Decline

⁴¹² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/Decline
United States	70	23	7
South Korea	88	11	2

⁴¹³

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/CFR America's Place In The World Survey October 2005

Would you favor or oppose the United States signing a treaty with other nations to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons, including our own?

70%	Favor
24	Oppose
6	Don't know/Refused

⁴¹⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

As you may know, the United States and other countries have signed a number of treaties that establish standards for protecting the human rights of their citizens.

As a general rule, do you approve or disapprove of the United States being part of such treaties?

86%	Approve
10	Disapprove
4	No answer

⁴¹⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

As you may know, the United States has signed a number of treaties that prohibit the use of torture. Do you approve or disapprove of the United States signing these treaties?

82% Approve
 15 Disapprove
 3 No answer

⁴¹⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

As a general rule, when the United States enters into international agreements, do you think there should or should not be an independent international body, such as a court, to judge whether the parties are complying with the agreement?

76% Should
 21 Should not
 3 No answer

⁴¹⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

Do you think there should or should not be an international body, such as a court, to judge whether countries are abiding by the human rights standards of the treaties?

79% Should
 17 Should not
 5 No answer

STATEMENT: Below are some issues that are governed by treaties the United States has signed together with other countries. For each one please select whether the United States should or should not agree to have an international body, such as a court, to judge disputes that may arise about how the treaty applies to specific instances.

Which countries have the right to fish in certain waters

66% Should agree
 30 Should not agree
 4 No answer

When a country can give preferential trade treatment to another country

51% Should agree
 44 Should not agree
 5 No answer

Where the exact the border is between two countries

74% Should agree
 22 Should not agree
 4 No answer

Whether countries are enforcing their labor laws

64% Should agree
 32 Should not agree
 4 No answer

Whether countries are enforcing their environmental laws

69% Should agree
 27 Should not agree
 4 No answer

What rights countries give to foreigners who are arrested and charged with a crime

- 64% Should agree
- 33 Should not agree
- 3 No answer

⁴¹⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

It is much easier for the United States to pursue its interests if the world is a place where countries are resolving disputes peacefully in accordance with international law.

- 41% Very convincing
- 44 Somewhat convincing
- 10 Somewhat unconvincing
- 3 Very unconvincing
- 2 No answer

We cannot simply let countries decide if they are in compliance with an agreement. Otherwise they will find excuses for not really complying. We need an objective party to judge whether they are complying.

- 35% Very convincing
- 49 Somewhat convincing
- 11 Somewhat unconvincing
- 4 Very unconvincing
- 1 No Answer

⁴¹⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

Even if the United States loses a case from time to time, it is better for the United States to generally use international courts to resolve its disputes with other countries than to allow some disputes to escalate to destructive levels.

- 33% Very convincing
- 45 Somewhat convincing
- 13 Somewhat unconvincing
- 6 Very unconvincing
- 3 No answer

Because we use courts to resolve our disputes, the United States is a much better place to live than countries where the rule of law is weak. Since this works for us at home, we should generally try to resolve our international disputes in the same way.

- 22% Very convincing
- 47 Somewhat convincing
- 20 Somewhat unconvincing
- 8 Very unconvincing
- 2 No Answer

⁴²⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

Because there are so many people in the world who are looking for opportunities to try to undermine the United States, judges from other countries cannot be trusted to be impartial.

- 20% Very convincing
- 45 Somewhat convincing
- 22 Somewhat unconvincing
- 10 Very unconvincing
- 3 No answer

⁴²¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

Submitting to international courts would violate the United States' sovereign right to protect its citizens and its interests.

- 23% Very convincing
- 35 Somewhat convincing
- 28 Somewhat unconvincing
- 11 Very unconvincing
- 3 No answer

⁴²² **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

Because the United States is the most powerful country in the world, it has the means to get its way in international disputes. It has nothing to gain from submitting to the jurisdiction of international courts, where its arguments are put on the same footing as those of weaker countries.

- 15% Very convincing
- 33 Somewhat convincing
- 34 Somewhat unconvincing
- 17 Very unconvincing
- 2 No answer

⁴²³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

The United States uses its power in the world to do the right thing. Sometimes that means the United States must make the hard decisions that are not popular, but necessary for peace. Being subject to international courts would tie America's hands and undermine its ability to make the tough but necessary decisions.

- 23% Very convincing
- 39 Somewhat convincing
- 24 Somewhat unconvincing
- 12 Very unconvincing
- 3 No answer

⁴²⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

So now having heard these arguments, as a general rule, when the United States enters into international agreements, do you think there should or should not be an independent international body, such as a court, to judge whether the parties are complying with the agreement?

- 71% Should
- 25 Should not
- 4 No answer

⁴²⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006**

As a general rule, when the United States is part of treaties on human rights, do you think:

25% The United States should claim a special exception, so that U.S. compliance with the treaty is never subject to the judgment of an international body

- 69 The United States should not claim a special exception for the United States
- 6 No answer

⁴²⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	71	22	7
2002 (internet)	77	20	4
2004 (internet)	76	19	5
2006 (internet)	71	25	5
2008 (internet)	68	30	2

⁴²⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006

A permanent International Criminal Court has been established by the UN (United Nations) to try individuals suspected of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Some say the United States should not support the Court because trumped-up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation. Others say that the U.S. should support the court because the world needs a better way to prosecute war criminals, many of whom go unpunished today. Do you think the U.S. should or should not support the permanent international criminal court?

	Should	Should not	No answer
April 2006	68	29	3
CCGA June 2002	65	28	7

⁴²⁸ Bertelsmann Foundation of Germany 2005

What is the best framework for ensuring peace and stability?

	A System Led by the United Nations	A System Led by a Balance of Regional Powers	A System Led by a Single World Power	A System Led by Two World Powers	DK/NR
Brazil	36	45	9	6	4
China	51	36	6	3	4
France	46	34	5	4	11
Germany	68	21	4	3	4
Great Britain	47	40	3	2	8
India	33	37	16	12	2
Japan	33	29	1	1	36
Russia	28	33	15	10	14
United States	33	52	6	4	5
Average	42	36	7	5	10

⁴²⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Which statement comes closest to your position?

	As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.	The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.	The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems.	Not sure/ Decline
United States	10	75	12	3
Argentina	1	34	55	10
Armenia	7	58	27	8
China	9	68	14	9

France	3	75	21	1
India	34	42	10	13
Israel	24	62	10	5
Mexico	12	59	22	8
Palestine	5	36	55	4
Peru	10	61	22	7
Philippines	20	55	16	9
Russia	8	42	38	12
South Korea	14	79	6	0
Thailand	8	47	18	27
Ukraine	3	52	34	11
Average	11	56	24	8

⁴³⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007**

Do you think that the United States has the responsibility to play the role of 'world policeman,' that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur?

	Yes	No	Not sure/ Decline
United States	22	75	3
Armenia	21	70	9
Australia	27	70	3
China	30	61	9
India	53	35	13
Indonesia	20	69	11
Palestine	20	76	4
South Korea	39	60	1
Ukraine	17	69	14
Average	28	65	8

⁴³¹ **Time/CNN/Harris Interactive Poll February 2003**

Do you think the United States has the ability to play the role of 'world policeman,' that is to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur or don't you think so?

38% Yes
 56 No
 6 Not sure

⁴³² **Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll January 2006**

Which statement comes closer to your view?...The United States has a responsibility to fight violations of international law and aggression around the world even without the cooperation of its allies. The United States should work only in a coordinated effort with its allies to fight violations of international law and aggression around the world.

27% Fight alone
 63 Fight with allies
 2 U.S. should not be involved at all (Vol.)
 8 Don't know

⁴³³ **Gallup Poll February 2009**

Next we would like you to think about the role the United States should play in trying to solve international problems. Do you think the United States should--take the leading role in world affairs, take a major role, but not the leading role, take a minor role, or take no role at all in world affairs?

23% Leading role
 52 Major role
 17 Minor role
 6 No role
 2 No opinion

⁴³⁴ **Pew News Interest Index Poll October 2005**

(We have a few questions about America's place in the world...Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.)...Since the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, we should go our own way in international matters, not worrying too much about whether other countries agree with us or not.

32% Agree
 63 Disagree
 5 Don't know/Refused

⁴³⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to Europe ("to the United States" in the United States) in the next 10 years. Please tell me if you think each one on the list is an extremely important threat, an important threat, or not an important threat at all.

U.S. unilateralism (If needed: The tendency of the United States to "go it alone")

	Extremely important threat	Important threat	Not important threat	DK/NR
Great Britain	25	43	26	6
France	34	54	11	1
Germany	40	48	11	1
The Netherlands	24	53	19	4
Italy	29	46	21	4
Poland	24	43	18	15
Portugal	28	44	17	11
European Average	31	47	17	5
United States	21	46	24	9

⁴³⁶ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/CFR America's Place In The World Survey October 2005**

In the future, should U.S. (United States) policies try to keep it so America is the only military superpower, or would it be acceptable if China, another country or the European Union became as militarily powerful as the U.S.?

50% U.S. policies should keep U.S. as the only superpower

35 Okay if China/Another country/European Union became as powerful
15 Don't know/Refused

⁴³⁷ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/CFR America's Place In The World Survey October 2005**

Should U.S. (United States) policies try to keep it so America is the only military superpower even if it risks alienating our principal allies, or not?

Subpopulation/Note: Asked of those who said in the future U.S. policies should try to keep it so America is the only military superpower (50%)

46% Even if risks alienating allies
44 Not if risks alienating allies
10 Don't know/Refused

⁴³⁸ **BBC December 2004**

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative... The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	44	22	4	30
Australia	74	17	4	5
Brazil	61	22	6	12
Canada	72	22	1	5
China	54	17	5	23
Chile	69	18	5	8
France	54	37	1	8
Germany	87	7	3	3
Great Britain	75	20	1	4
India	55	23	9	13
Indonesia	77	9	8	6
Italy	58	33	3	7
Japan	65	3	0	32
Lebanon	58	18	10	13
Mexico	71	5	12	12
Russia	57	11	10	22
Philippines	77	18	3	3
Poland	61	11	3	25
South Africa	64	26	2	8
South Korea	56	38	4	3
Spain	78	10	2	10
Turkey	40	24	17	19
United States	59	37	1	3
Average	64	19	5	12

⁴³⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org Jan2007**

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative...

The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Refused/DK
Iran	70	14	16
United States	66	32	3

⁴⁴⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Strengthening the United Nations

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline	Total
United States	40	39	19	2	100
Armenia	41	39	12	8	100
Australia	64	27	9	1	101
China	51	35	8	6	100
India	49	35	10	7	101
Mexico	56	26	14	4	100
South Korea	32	58	9	1	100
Thailand	45	34	4	17	100

⁴⁴¹ German Marshall Fund TransatlanticTrends-Jun2003

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies.

For the United Nations, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	DK/Refusal
Great Britain	78	18	4
France	71	25	4
Germany	80	18	2
The Netherlands	69	26	5
Italy	72	22	6
Poland	61	23	16
Portugal	81	14	5
European Average	74	21	5
United States	70	26	4

⁴⁴² Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Strengthening the United Nations

Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
----------------	--------------------	---------------	-------------------

1974	46	32	14	8
1978	47	32	13	8
1982	48	32	13	7
1986	46	33	16	5
1990	52	36	8	4
1994	51	33	12	4
1998	45	39	11	5
2002(telephone)	57	28	13	2
2002 (internet)	55	33	12	1
2004 (internet)	38	43	17	2
2006 (internet)	40	39	19	2
2008 (internet)	39	40	21	1

443

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political/Foreign Policy Poll September 2008

(As I read a list of possible long-range foreign policy goals which the United States might have, tell me how much priority you think each should be given.)...Strengthening the United Nations...Do you think this should have top priority, some priority, or no priority at all?

32%	Top priority
46	Some priority
19	No priority
3	Don't know/Refused

Pew Research Center/Council on Foreign Relations October 2005

(As I read a list of possible long-range foreign policy goals which the United States might have, tell me how much priority you think each should be given.)...Strengthening the United Nations...Do you think this should have top priority, some priority, or no priority at all?

40%	Top priority
43	Some priority
14	No priority
3	Don't know/Refused

444 WorldPublicOpinion.org/Knowledge Networks December 2006

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative

The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Refused/Don't know
WPO/KN 12/06	66	32	3
BBC 11/04	59	37	4

445

Gallup Poll February 2009

Now thinking more specifically, which of the following roles would you like to see the United Nations play in world affairs today--should it play--a leading role where all countries are required to follow UN policies, a major role, where the UN establishes policies, but where individual countries still act separately when they disagree with the UN, or should it play a minor role, with the UN serving mostly as a forum for communication between nations, but with no policy making role?

26%	Leading Role
38	Major Role
30	Minor Role
1	Should not exist (Vol.)
1	Other (Vol.)
5	No opinion

⁴⁴⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	48	30	22
Peru	77	19	4
United States	72	24	5
Armenia	75	15	10
France	74	25	1
Great Britain	79	17	4
Poland	63	11	26
Russia	58	22	20
Ukraine	54	19	28
Azerbaijan	64	21	14
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	62	13	25
Israel	64	31	6
Turkey	51	24	25
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	84	15	1
China	62	25	13
India	58	30	12
Indonesia	74	14	12
Philippines	46	44	9
South Korea	68	30	1
Thailand	73	12	15
Average	66	23	12

⁴⁴⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19

Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

⁴⁴⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the UN (United Nations), here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Creating an international marshalls service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
2006 (internet)	75	21	4
2008 (internet)	71	27	2

⁴⁴⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to regulate the international arms trade

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	36	42	22
Peru	52	43	5
United States	60	34	6
Armenia	58	27	15
France	77	22	1
Great Britain	69	26	5
Poland	44	28	28
Russia	55	28	17
Ukraine	57	22	21
Azerbaijan	63	27	10
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	59	16	26
Israel	60	34	6
Turkey	34	39	27
Kenya	85	13	2
Nigeria	84	15	2
China	59	28	13

India	57	31	12
Indonesia	64	22	15
Philippines	32	58	10
South Korea	75	23	2
Thailand	44	37	19
Average	58	30	12

⁴⁵⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the UN (United Nations), here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a UN agency control access to all nuclear fuel in the world to ensure that none is used for weapons production

63%	Favor
35	Oppose
2	Not sure/Decline

⁴⁵¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to fund its activities by imposing a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	32	42	27
Peru	38	55	7
United States	45	50	5
Armenia	46	28	26
France	70	30	1
Great Britain	61	33	6
Poland	40	27	33
Russia	39	36	25
Ukraine	44	20	36
Azerbaijan	47	30	24
Egypt	39	61	0
Iran	39	31	30
Israel	52	39	9
Turkey	33	36	31
Kenya	74	23	3
Nigeria	65	31	5
China	55	27	17
India	47	37	17
Indonesia	50	33	17
Philippines	33	56	11
South Korea	53	44	3
Thailand	48	29	23
Average	48	36	16

⁴⁵² **Harris Poll November 2001**

In order to prepare for a possible future international terrorist attack do you think that the United Nations should be given broader powers that would force member countries to work together to fight terrorism?

71%	Yes
24	No
5	Not sure/refused

⁴⁵³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	73	17	9
United States	83	13	4
France	85	14	1
Russia	64	20	17
Ukraine	69	11	21
Azerbaijan	79	10	11
Egypt	83	17	0
Iran	69	20	12
Israel	83	15	2
Palestinian territories	78	20	2
Turkey	64	16	20
Kenya	90	10	1
Nigeria	88	10	2
China	72	18	9
India	63	28	9
Indonesia	83	7	10
South Korea	74	25	1
Thailand	62	23	15
Average	76	16	8

⁴⁵⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	65	21	13
United States	83	14	4
France	84	13	3
Russia	70	14	17
Azerbaijan	82	11	7
Egypt	78	22	0
Israel	77	17	6
Palestinian territories	81	17	2
Turkey	68	15	18
Kenya	88	11	1
Nigeria	89	10	1
China	70	18	11
India	66	22	12
Indonesia	71	15	14
South Korea	76	23	1
Thailand	67	14	19
Average	76	16	8

⁴⁵⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10
Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13
South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

⁴⁵⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: preventing a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	70	21	10
United States	62	33	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	55	27	19
Ukraine	51	22	26
Azerbaijan	59	26	16
Egypt	74	26	0
Israel	62	33	5
Palestinian territories	38	59	3
Turkey	58	23	19
Kenya	84	15	1
Nigeria	81	17	2
China	47	40	14
India	53	34	13
Indonesia	68	19	14
South Korea	43	55	1
Thailand	52	31	18
Average	59	31	10

⁴⁵⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
United States	57	39	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	53	22	25
Ukraine	52	20	27
Azerbaijan	59	20	21
Egypt	51	49	0
Israel	54	39	7
Palestinian territories	39	57	4
Turkey	58	20	23
Kenya	84	15	2
Nigeria	75	21	4
China	47	34	19
India	50	32	18
Indonesia	62	25	14
South Korea	42	56	2
Thailand	59	21	20
Average	56	32	12

⁴⁵⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	54	30	15
United States	57	38	5
France	52	45	3
Russia	35	37	28
Azerbaijan	43	38	19
Egypt	64	36	0
Israel	58	34	7
Palestinian territories	67	30	3
Turkey	43	32	26
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	76	22	3
China	37	45	18
India	51	34	16
Indonesia	51	28	21
South Korea	32	65	2
Thailand	46	29	25
Average	53	35	12

⁴⁵⁹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
European Average	28	36	17	13	6
United States	35	34	34	15	2
France	34	40	40	11	1
Germany	23	37	37	15	2
United Kingdom	41	35	35	7	5
Italy	23	38	38	15	3
Netherlands	31	43	43	8	1
Poland	18	39	39	9	16
Portugal	45	33	8	8	7
Spain	24	43	15	11	7
Slovakia	31	36	13	10	10
Turkey	24	25	18	19	14

⁴⁶⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org December 2006**

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following: The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
Iran	31	38	16	6	9
United States	26	46	16	11	2

⁴⁶¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States government has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	37	57	6
France	41	53	6
Germany	20	76	4
The Netherlands	33	61	6
Italy	24	70	6
Poland	37	52	11
Portugal	25	72	3
EU Average	31	63	6
United States	58	31	11

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	55	41	4
France	47	48	5
Germany	34	64	2
The Netherlands	44	51	5
Italy	32	63	5

Poland	38	55	7
Portugal	39	56	5
EU Average	41	54	5
United States	68	24	8

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	56	37	7
France	45	50	5
Germany	33	66	1
The Netherlands	52	46	2
Italy	37	59	4
Poland	31	58	11
Portugal	44	54	2
EU Average	43	53	5
United States	72	24	4

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	49	48	3
France	43	49	8
Germany	30	63	7
The Netherlands	40	56	4
Italy	24	71	5
Poland	41	47	12
Portugal	34	61	5
EU Average	37	56	6
United States	53	38	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	66	31	3
France	54	44	2
Germany	29	67	4
The Netherlands	54	43	3
Italy	34	62	4
Poland	51	40	9
Portugal	47	49	4
EU Average	48	48	4
United States	78	17	5

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	DK / Refused
--	----------------	--------------------	---------------------

United Kingdom	51	43	6
France	44	52	4
Germany	32	66	2
The Netherlands	45	49	6
Italy	26	68	6
Poland	38	49	13
Portugal	28	66	6
EU Average	38	56	6
United States	67	23	10

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	70	27	3
France	56	39	5
Germany	46	51	3
The Netherlands	48	46	6
Italy	44	52	4
Poland	38	45	17
Portugal	48	50	2
EU Average	50	44	6
United States	75	16	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	58	40	2
France	47	49	4
Germany	33	63	4
The Netherlands	40	55	5
Italy	38	60	2
Poland	40	47	13
Portugal	38	54	8
EU Average	42	53	5
United States	73	20	7

⁴⁶² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If a situation like Iraq arose in the future, do you think it is essential to secure the approval of the UN before using military force, or don't you think it is essential?

	Essential	Not essential	DK/Refusal
European Average	78	15	7
United States	58	38	4
France	86	10	5
Germany	78	18	5
United Kingdom	83	15	3
Italy	87	10	3
Netherlands	85	13	1

Poland	73	12	15
Portugal	69	16	15
Spain	86	9	5
Slovakia	78	11	11
Turkey	59	26	15

⁴⁶³ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	65	29	6
United States	78	15	7
France	82	16	2
Germany	56	42	2
United Kingdom	77	18	6
Italy	77	20	3
Netherlands	76	21	2
Poland	53	36	11
Portugal	57	30	14
Spain	77	18	5
Slovakia	61	24	15
Turkey	30	52	18

⁴⁶⁴ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	55	38	7
United States	66	27	6
France	70	25	5
Germany	40	55	5
United Kingdom	65	25	9
Italy	68	27	4
Netherlands	67	29	5
Poland	27	64	9
Portugal	52	28	20
Spain	68	24	8
Slovakia	26	57	17
Turkey	4	48	8

⁴⁶⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Would you still support the use of the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces if the UN does not approve it?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	27	68	5
United States	49	46	5
France	29	67	4
Germany	16	83	1

United Kingdom	31	66	3
Italy	25	69	6
Netherlands	26	71	3
Poland	24	63	13
Portugal	37	56	7
Spain	28	67	6
Slovakia	24	66	10
Turkey	41	53	6

⁴⁶⁶ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2004**

Now a question about using military force, do you think (survey country) should have U.N. approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat or do you think that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats?

	U.N. approval	Too difficult	Don't know/ Refused
United States	41	48	10
Great Britain	64	30	6
France	63	35	2
Germany	80	15	6
Russia	37	41	21
Turkey	45	44	11
Pakistan	38	34	28
Jordan	47	38	15
Morocco	42	42	16

⁴⁶⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them:
NATO approval makes military action legitimate

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
European Average	15	36	25	16	7
United States	18	35	22	17	9
France	15	41	25	14	5
Germany	15	40	29	15	2
United Kingdom	20	39	21	11	9
Italy	8	32	30	26	4
Netherlands	14	48	23	12	3
Poland	11	36	23	10	20
Portugal	26	37	14	9	14
Spain	13	31	27	19	10
Slovakia	21	38	14	16	11
Turkey	23	25	20	18	13

⁴⁶⁸ **GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004**

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	61	32	7
United States	79	16	5

France	76	21	3
Germany	51	47	2
United Kingdom	74	20	7
Italy	65	29	6
Netherlands	78	21	1
Poland	56	29	15
Portugal	58	30	12
Spain	76	20	4
Slovakia	50	31	19
Turkey	34	52	14

GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	50	42	8
United States	60	34	6
France	58	35	7
Germany	34	63	4
United Kingdom	64	28	7
Italy	64	29	7
Netherlands	63	34	3
Poland	26	64	10
Portugal	54	29	17
Spain	61	29	10
Slovakia	19	59	23
Turkey	42	45	13

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	65	29	6
United States	78	15	7
France	82	16	2
Germany	56	42	2
United Kingdom	77	18	6
Italy	77	20	3
Netherlands	76	21	2
Poland	53	36	11
Portugal	57	30	14
Spain	77	18	5
Slovakia	61	24	15
Turkey	30	52	18

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	55	38	7
United States	66	27	6
France	70	25	5
Germany	40	55	5
United Kingdom	65	25	9
Italy	68	27	4
Netherlands	67	29	5
Poland	27	64	9
Portugal	52	28	20
Spain	68	24	8
Slovakia	26	57	17
Turkey	4	48	8

⁴⁶⁹ **Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll March 2008**

(How important to our foreign policy should each of the following be? Should this be very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important?)...Initiating military force only when we have the support of our allies

51%	Very important
34	Somewhat important
6	Not very important
5	Not at all important
3	Don't know

⁴⁷⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17

Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

⁴⁷¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

As you may know, the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country. Do you think the UN SHOULD or SHOULD NOT actively promote human rights in member states?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	91	4	5
Mexico	85	12	3
United States	70	25	5
France	76	20	4
Germany	91	8	2
Britain	68	24	8
Italy	81	14	5
Russia	55	29	16
Ukraine	73	9	18
Azerbaijan	89	8	4
Egypt	64	33	3
Jordan	50	33	17
Palestinian Territories	54	41	5
Turkey	60	19	20
Kenya	94	4	2
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	62	16	22
Hong Kong*	73	16	12
Macau*	68	15	17
India	55	26	19
Indonesia	70	13	17
South Korea	62	35	4
Taiwan*	78	12	10
Thailand	44	25	31
Average	70	19	10

⁴⁷² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?

	Do more	Do less	Do about the same as it has been doing	DK / NS
Argentina	85	2	8	5
Mexico	88	2	8	2
United States	59	7	28	5
France	64	6	26	4

Germany	58	7	34	2
Britain	64	6	22	8
Italy	83	6	8	3
Russia	45	8	23	24
Ukraine	57	4	18	22
Azerbaijan	58	9	29	4
Egypt	55	22	22	1
Jordan	62	17	8	13
Palestinian Territories	48	23	26	3
Turkey	69	7	8	16
Kenya	91	5	3	1
Nigeria	88	7	4	1
China	51	5	15	29
Hong Kong*	65	2	26	7
Macau*	65	1	22	12
India	54	14	16	17
Indonesia	66	6	12	17
South Korea	69	3	25	3
Taiwan*	62	2	25	11
Thailand	60	7	13	20
Average	65	8	17	10

⁴⁷³ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?

	Make efforts to further the rights of women	Improper interference in a country's internal affairs	DK / NS
Argentina	78	18	4
Mexico	88	9	3
United States	59	38	2
France	74	19	7
Britain	70	26	5
Russia	52	30	18
Ukraine	69	16	16
Azerbaijan	66	23	11
Egypt	30	70	
Iran	52	36	12
Palestinian Territories	49	48	3
Turkey	70	20	11
Kenya	91	8	1
Nigeria	66	32	2
China	86	10	4
Hong Kong*	67	23	10
India	48	28	24
Indonesia	74	16	10

South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	64	21	15
Average	67	26	8

⁴⁷⁴ **National Opinion Research Center August 2004**

Which of these two statements comes closer to your view?...If a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene. Even if human rights are seriously violated, the country's sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene.

75%	If a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene
18	Even if human rights are seriously violated, the country's sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene
4	Don't know what the United Nations is (Vol.)
3	Can't choose

⁴⁷⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

In May 2008, Burma, [if you feel it is necessary, Add: "also known as Myanmar"] had a major cyclone that left over a million people without food and water. Though the Burmese government was not effectively delivering aid, it refused to let in relief organizations. As a general rule, in such circumstances, should the UN bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary, even against the will of the government OR do you think this would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty?

	UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary	This would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty	DK / NS
Argentina	86	8	7
Mexico	69	27	4
United States	53	43	5
France	70	26	4
Germany	74	23	3
Great Britain	68	26	7
Italy	66	24	10
Russia	40	40	20
Ukraine	42	29	29
Azerbaijan	55	38	7
Egypt	48	48	4
Jordan	46	37	17
Palestinian territories	65	31	4
Turkey	61	19	20
Kenya	81	14	5
Nigeria	57	32	10
China	59	28	12
Hong Kong	63	28	9
Macau	63	26	11
India	51	24	26
Indonesia	55	17	28
South Korea	58	37	4
Taiwan	78	15	6
Thailand	52	14	33
Average	60	28	12

⁴⁷⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	Has this responsibility	Does not have this responsibility	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	48	27	25
United States	74	22	4
Armenia	66	19	16
France	54	39	7
Great Britain	70	22	8
Poland	54	15	31
Russia	48	31	21
Ukraine	40	16	44
Azerbaijan	42	23	35
Egypt	80	20	0
Iran	59	25	16
Israel	64	28	8
Palestinian territories	69	27	4
Turkey	39	20	40
Kenya	89	8	3
Nigeria	78	18	5
China	76	13	11
India	51	25	25
Indonesia	82	5	14
Thailand	44	22	33
Average	61	21	18

⁴⁷⁷ World PublicOpinion.org 2009

Do you think that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections countries should or should not be willing to have international observers from the United Nations monitor their elections?

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Chile	63	14	23
Mexico	68	30	3
United States	67	31	2
France	71	25	4
Germany	78	18	4
Great Britain	81	15	4
Russia	45	40	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	83	8	9
Egypt	61	39	0
Iraq	65	23	12
Pakistan	55	38	7
Palestinian territories	57	41	2
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	82	17	1
Nigeria	78	22	1
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	9
China – Macau*	63	23	14
India	45	48	7
Indonesia	20	74	6
Taiwan*	61	33	6

Average	63	31	7
----------------	----	----	---

* Not included in Global Average

⁴⁷⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think that [Country] would or would not benefit from having international observers monitor elections here?

	Would	Would not	DK/NR
Chile	59	16	25
Mexico	66	30	4
United States	46	51	3
France	45	50	6
Germany	49	36	14
Great Britain	46	51	3
Russia	43	42	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	71	16	14
Egypt	63	37	0
Iraq	67	21	12
Pakistan	49	43	8
Palestinian territories	57	40	3
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	74	24	3
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	10
China – Macau*	66	23	11
India	38	51	11
Indonesia	25	62	14
Taiwan*	59	32	10
Average	55	36	9

*Not included in the Global Average

⁴⁷⁹ **World Values Survey 2005–2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Aid to developing countries

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A	Margin of Error
Italy	19	19	56	0	0	5	1	0	
Spain	15	18	54	0	0	13	1	0	
United States	31	22	41	0	0	3	3	0	
Canada	34	9	51	0	0	6	0	0	
Japan	14	14	42	0	17	0	8	0	
Mexico	23	11	58	6	0	1	0	0	
South Africa	29	17	47	0	0	0	8	0	
Australia	32	14	49	0	0	0	5	0	
Sweden	14	31	51	0	0	4	0	0	
Argentina	18	7	50	0	0	23	1	0	

Finland	26	15	55	0	0	2	1	0	
South Korea	32	11	56	0	0	0	0	0	
Poland	21	16	61	0	0	3	0	0	
Switzerland	28	16	52	0	0	3	1	0	
Brazil	26	15	50	0	0	6	3	0	2.6
Chile	23	12	54	0	0	9	1	0	2.2
India	23	12	24	0	0	40	0	0	
Slovenia	10	45	33	0	0	10	2	0	3.1
Bulgaria	7	40	40	0	0	12	0	0	3.2
Romania	19	26	36	0	0	17	2	0	2.2
China	17	6	29	0	0	47	1	0	
Taiwan	22	31	44	0	0	3	0	0	
Turkey	31	16	44	0	0	8	1	0	
Ukraine	19	17	50	0	0	11	3	0	
Ghana	24	16	55	0	0	4	2	0	
Moldova	20	36	39	0	0	4	0	0	
Georgia	22	12	58	0	0	8	0	0	
Thailand	65	25	9	0	0	0	1	0	
Indonesia	13	25	51	0	0	8	2	1	3.2
Vietnam	13	15	61	0	0	9	1	0	
Serbia	20	18	52	0	0	8	2	0	
New Zealand	17	0	23	48	0	7	5	0	
Egypt	26	21	50	0	0	4	0	0	
Morocco	19	13	42	0	0	0	26	0	
Iran	19	20	56	0	0	4	1	0	1.9
Jordan	16	17	54	0	0	12	0	0	
Cyprus	24	39	37	0	0	0	0	0	3.1
Trinidad and Tobago	20	20	57	0	0	3	1	0	
Andorra	25	11	62	0	0	2	1	0	
Malaysia	18	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	
Burkina Faso	12	11	59	0	0	13	3	2	
Ethiopia	11	11	68	0	0	5	4	1	
Mali	21	12	55	0	0	7	5	1	
Rwanda	17	19	61	0	0	3	0	0	
Zambia	15	29	48	0	0	4	3	0	
Germany	23	26	46	0	0	4	1	0	
Average	22	19	48	1	0	7	2	0	--

⁴⁸⁰ World Values Survey 2005–2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Refugees

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	32	22	37	0	0	8	1	0
Spain	13	20	54	0	0	14	0	0

United States	34	27	32	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	46	11	33	0	0	9	1	0
Japan	17	15	46	0	15	0	7	0
Mexico	36	14	42	8	0	2	0	0
South Africa	31	15	45	0	0	0	10	0
Australia	38	14	43	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	33	23	41	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	48	0	0	24	2	0
Finland	42	17	37	0	0	3	1	0
South Korea	31	9	60	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	45	15	36	0	0	4	0	0
Switzerland	32	16	48	0	0	4	1	0
Brazil	30	15	45	0	0	7	3	0
Chile	29	9	51	0	0	10	1	0
India	30	16	12	0	0	43	0	0
Slovenia	20	44	24	0	0	11	1	0
Bulgaria	15	27	44	0	0	14	0	0
Romania	31	19	28	0	0	19	2	0
China	22	6	27	0	0	45	1	0
Taiwan	24	23	50	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	37	19	35	0	0	9	1	0
Ukraine	29	18	39	0	0	11	3	0
Ghana	18	13	64	0	0	3	2	0
Moldova	39	29	26	0	0	6	0	0
Georgia	67	8	21	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	45	25	29	0	0	0	1	0
Indonesia	42	9	40	0	0	7	2	0
Vietnam	22	15	52	0	0	10	1	0
Serbia	36	16	38	0	0	8	2	0
New Zealand	25	0	20	41	0	9	5	0
Egypt	30	23	43	0	0	4	0	0
Morocco	14	17	44	0	0	0	26	0
Iran	22	15	58	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	15	16	57	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	42	20	38	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	31	16	48	0	0	5	1	0
Andorra	30	12	55	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	25	36	39	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	15	13	51	0	0	15	3	3
Ethiopia	13	13	61	0	0	7	6	2
Mali	27	13	41	0	0	11	7	2
Rwanda	10	17	72	0	0	2	0	0
Zambia	13	20	62	0	0	3	2	0
Germany	25	25	45	0	0	5	1	0
Average	29	17	43	1	0	8	2	0

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? International peacekeeping

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	22	12	60	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	12	0	0
United States	28	16	50	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	7	0
Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	12	53	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	26	8	64	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	47	6	34	0	0	9	2	2
Ethiopia	41	10	40	0	0	5	3	1

Mali	46	5	38	0	0	6	3	1
Rwanda	50	41	8	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	29	19	47	0	0	4	1	0
Germany	20	20	54	0	0	6	1	0
Average	34	11	45	1	0	7	2	0

⁴⁸² **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Protection of the environment

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	45	29	19	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	28	20	40	0	0	13	0	0
United States	42	33	18	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	52	23	20	0	0	4	0	0
Japan	17	26	31	0	16	0	7	0
Mexico	41	19	32	6	0	1	0	0
South Africa	48	32	15	0	0	0	6	0
Australia	46	29	20	0	0	0	6	0
Sweden	39	34	25	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	40	11	30	0	0	18	1	0
Finland	40	40	18	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	54	27	20	0	0	0	*	0
Poland	59	21	18	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	46	19	32	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	51	25	18	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	21	19	0	0	7	1	0
India	37	21	8	0	0	33	0	0
Slovenia	39	36	13	0	0	10	2	0
Bulgaria	48	28	14	0	0	10	0	0
Romania	51	24	8	0	0	15	2	0
China	34	9	16	0	0	40	1	0
Taiwan	66	17	15	0	0	2	0	0
Turkey	33	41	18	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	49	30	9	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	62	28	7	0	0	2	1	0
Moldova	51	37	7	0	0	4	0	0
Georgia	72	15	9	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	61	33	6	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	79	4	5	0	0	5	2	6
Vietnam	48	20	24	0	0	7	1	0
Serbia	41	34	16	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	43	0	8	37	0	7	5	0
Egypt	57	17	24	0	0	2	0	0
Morocco	36	22	22	0	0	0	20	0
Iran	39	35	22	0	0	4	1	0

Jordan	44	19	26	0	0	12	0	0
Cyprus	46	40	15	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	62	19	18	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	54	22	22	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	45	43	12	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	50	16	19	0	0	10	3	2
Ethiopia	36	18	36	0	0	6	3	1
Mali	49	28	12	0	0	6	4	1
Rwanda	48	43	7	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	55	26	13	0	0	5	2	0
Germany	36	29	31	0	0	4	1	0
Average	47	25	18	1	0	6	2	0

483 World Values Survey 2005-2008

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations? Human Rights

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	27	15	51	0	0	6	2	0
Spain	16	14	56	0	0	13	1	0
United States	42	18	33	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	45	10	40	0	0	4	1	0
Japan	27	11	47	0	9	0	7	0
Mexico	41	9	41	0	0	7	2	0
South Africa	60	16	20	0	0	0	5	0
Australia	30	9	56	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	17	9	72	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	39	4	38	0	0	19	1	0
Finland	33	8	56	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	49	9	41	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	49	7	41	0	0	3	0	0
Switzerland	26	8	63	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	44	11	39	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	7	32	0	0	9	1	0
India	36	10	13	0	0	41	0	0
Slovenia	39	30	20	0	0	9	1	0
Bulgaria	34	26	30	0	0	10	0	0
Romania	43	10	30	0	0	15	2	0
China	32	4	17	0	0	48	1	0
Taiwan	56	10	31	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	40	12	39	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	57	13	20	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	67	9	22	0	0	1	1	0
Moldova	55	17	24	0	0	4	0	0

Georgia	79	7	11	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	50	24	26	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	55	3	34	0	0	6	2	1
Vietnam	59	5	27	0	0	7	1	0
Serbia	50	8	34	0	0	6	2	0
New Zealand	25	0	19	43	0	8	5	0
Egypt	45	15	37	0	0	2	*	0
Morocco	34	6	42	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	16	5	75	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	21	16	50	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	29	36	35	0	0	0	1	0
Trinidad and Tobago	45	11	41	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	28	8	61	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	38	29	34	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	32	6	45	0	0	12	3	3
Ethiopia	20	12	54	0	0	7	6	2
Mali	35	7	44	0	0	7	5	2
Rwanda	29	37	32	0	0	2	1	0
Zambia	54	13	26	0	0	3	3	0
Germany	20	19	55	0	0	4	1	0
Average	40	12	38	1	0	7	2	0

⁴⁸⁴ **CBS News/New York Times Poll July 2006**

Which of the following statements comes closer to your point of view--the United States should take the lead in solving international crises and conflicts, or the United States should let other countries and the United Nations take the lead in solving international crises and conflicts?

- 31% United States should take lead
- 59 United States should not take lead
- 6 Depends/Some of both (Vol.)
- 4 Don't know/No answer

⁴⁸⁵ **Pew News Interest Index Poll September 2006**

Who should take the lead in dealing with Iran's nuclear program?...The United States or the United Nations

- 21% The United States
- 70 The United Nations
- 2 Other (Vol.)
- 7 Don't know/Refused

⁴⁸⁶ **Gallup/USA Today Poll, August 2006**

What role do you think the United States should play in developing a peace agreement between Israel and Hezbollah? Do you think the United States should--take the leading role, let the United Nations take the leading role but still be involved, or not get involved at all?

- 14% United States should take leading role
- 56 United Nations take leading role, but United States still involved
- 29 United States should not get involved at all
- 2 No opinion

487 **FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll March 2009**

Do you think the United Nations should be in charge of the worldwide effort to combat climate change and the United States should report to the United Nations on this effort, or should it be up to individual countries and the United States would be allowed to make decisions on its own?

36% United Nations should be in charge
57 Individual countries should be in charge
7 Don't know

488 **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you see yourself? (Read out and code one answer for each statement): I see myself as a world citizen

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	No answer
Italy	20	40	29	8	2	1
Spain	20	48	14	4	13	1
United States	20	45	24	5	2	4
Canada	29	55	12	2	2	1
Japan	11	61	4	1	22	-
Mexico	35	55	7	2	1	0
South Africa	42	41	10	3	4	-
Australia	21	56	18	1	-	3
Sweden	18	65	15	1	2	-
Argentina	15	48	24	5	7	1
Finland	18	45	28	7	2	0
South Korea	14	66	16	3	-	-
Poland	21	48	20	4	7	0
Switzerland	32	46	18	5	0	-
Brazil	27	51	19	2	1	0
Chile	26	41	19	9	5	0
India	27	31	13	3	25	0
Slovenia	17	52	17	7	6	1
Bulgaria	17	25	30	20	8	-
Romania	15	33	26	14	11	2
China	10	51	10	1	27	1
Turkey	37	43	11	3	5	1
Ukraine	25	29	23	13	8	2
Ghana	45	39	12	1	1	1
Moldova	26	36	28	6	3	0
Georgia	22	22	32	16	9	1
Thailand	33	63	4	0	-	0

Indonesia	29	58	7	1	3	1
Vietnam	31	52	6	-	8	3
Colombia	40	54	3	1	2	-
Serbia	30	44	17	4	3	2
Egypt	28	28	24	19	1	0
Morocco	14	26	26	20	-	14
Iran	30	51	16	2	0	0
Jordan	34	33	14	13	6	-
Cyprus	28	45	23	3	-	1
Trinidad and Tobago	25	47	24	3	1	1
Andorra	25	62	11	2	0	0
Malaysia	41	49	9	1	-	0
Burkina Faso	42	37	10	3	6	2
Ethiopia	41	49	7	1	2	1
Mali	59	32	4	1	2	2
Rwanda	43	55	1	1	1	0
Zambia	32	37	21	5	4	1
Germany	16	32	28	15	7	1
Average	27	45	16	5	6	1

489 WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

Do you consider yourself more a citizen of [country], more a citizen of the world, or both equally?

	Citizen of [country]	Citizen of the world	Both equally	Neither/None of the above	DK/NS
Argentina	64	10	24	0	1
Mexico	56	9	35	1	0
United States	72	5	22		1
France	48	14	37	2	0
Germany	59	19	18	3	1
Great Britain	59	9	29	2	1
Italy	51	21	27		1
Russia	79	5	13	2	1
Ukraine	81	6	10	2	1
Azerbaijan	89	4	5	1	1
Egypt	73	13	13	1	0
Jordan	80	8	7	2	3
Palestinian territories	70	14	13	2	1
Turkey	80	9	10	1	0
Kenya	88	9	3		0
Nigeria	69	11	19	0	1
China - Mainland	35	6	44		15
China - Hong Kong	62	5	29	2	2
China - Macao	61	6	27	2	4
India	40	14	32	6	9
Indonesia	68	2	27	0	4
South Korea	83	5	11	1	0
Taiwan	36	8	54	1	2

Thailand	48	15	23	3	11
Average	66	10	20	1	3

⁴⁹⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

In general, when [Country] government negotiates with other countries do you think that the government:

	A. Should be more ready to act cooperatively to achieve mutual gains	B. Tends to be too willing to compromise and is often taken advantage of.	DK/NR
Chile	60	26	15
Mexico	35	63	2
United States	54	44	2
France	43	48	9
Germany	47	46	8
Great Britain	31	65	4
Poland	34	53	14
Russia	54	34	12
Ukraine	49	35	16
Azerbaijan	67	29	4
Egypt	76	23	1
Iraq	60	24	16
Pakistan	42	54	5
Palestinian territories	69	29	2
Turkey	81	14	5
Kenya	71	28	1
Nigeria	73	26	1
China	63	30	7
China – Hong Kong	72	18	10
China - Macao	60	29	11
India	59	34	7
Indonesia	52	40	8
South Korea	28	71	1
Taiwan	42	49	9
Average	55	39	7

⁴⁹¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

Some people say that the United States and the European Union have enough common values to be able to cooperate on international problems. Other say that the United States and the European Union have such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible. Which view is closer to your own?

	Enough common values to cooperate on international problems	Such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible	DK/Refusal
European Average	55	35	10
United States	67	23	10
France	60	38	2
Germany	54	43	3
United Kingdom	52	41	7
Italy	63	35	3
Netherlands	59	37	4

Poland	56	28	16
Portugal	57	36	8
Spain	59	36	4
Slovakia	59	25	16
Turkey	27	33	39
Bulgaria	57	24	19
Romania	72	12	15

⁴⁹² **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following.

When our country acts on a national security issue, it is critical that we do so together with our closest allies

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal	Agree	Disagree
European Average	42	38	8	7	4	80	15
United States	61	28	5	5	2	89	9
France	52	38	5	4	1	90	9
Germany	48	37	8	6	1	86	14
United Kingdom	50	35	8	4	3	85	12
Italy	35	46	12	7	1	81	19
Netherlands	60	31	4	4	1	91	8
Poland	40	45	7	3	6	85	9
Portugal	45	31	9	9	7	76	17
Spain	41	47	7	4	2	88	11
Slovakia	32	39	12	5	12	71	17
Turkey	21	26	12	23	18	47	35
Bulgaria	35	43	7	4	10	78	11
Romania	37	39	7	5	12	76	12

⁴⁹³ **Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll September 2007**

(Please tell me if each of the following would enhance our security a great deal, somewhat or not at all.)...Closer cooperation with the European Union

28%	A great deal
50	Somewhat
17	Not at all
5	Don't know

⁴⁹⁴ **Gallup Poll 2005**

In your view, does the United Nations play a necessary role in the world today, or not?

64%	Yes, necessary role
34	No, not
2	No opinion

⁴⁹⁵ **German Marshall Fund 2005**

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following: The United Nations (UN) can manage many of the world's most pressing problems better than any single country.

25%	Agree strongly
-----	----------------

- 31 Agree somewhat
- 18 Disagree somewhat
- 25 Disagree strongly
- 2 Don't know/ Refused

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following: The United Nations (UN) enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries.

- 25% Agree strongly
- 41 Agree somewhat
- 16 Disagree somewhat
- 14 Disagree strongly
- 4 Don't know/ Refused

⁴⁹⁶ **Program on International Policy Attitudes/ Knowledge Networks 2003**

In general, would you like to see the United Nations play a greater role or a lesser role in dealing with world problems?

- 72% Greater role
- 24 Lesser role
- 4 No opinion

⁴⁹⁷ **Gallup Poll 2005**

Should the United States give up its membership to the United Nations, or not?

- 13% Yes, should
- 85 No, should not
- 2 No opinion

⁴⁹⁸ **Public Agenda Foundation 2006**

Would you say that the U.S. support of UN Peacekeeping efforts is important and worthwhile, or a waste of resources?

- 69% Important and worthwhile
- 24 A waste of resources
- 1 Other (Vol.)
- 6 Don't know

⁴⁹⁹ **World Public Opinion.org/ Program on International Policy Attitudes/ Knowledge Networks, October 2006**

Please tell me which comes closer to your point of view:

	As the world becomes more interconnected, and problems such as terrorism and the environment are of a more international nature, it will be increasingly necessary for the United States to work through international institutions	International institutions are slow and bureaucratic, and often used as places for other countries to criticize and block the United States. It is better for the United States to try and solve problems like terrorism and the environment on our own instead	(No Answer)
October 2006	69%	23	8
January 2004	64%	30	6
October 1999	56%	39	5

⁵⁰⁰ **World Public Opinion.org/Knowledge Networks, October 2006, and Program on International Policy Attitudes, November 1995**

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: For the United States to move away from its role as world policeman and reduce the burden of its large defense budget, the United States should invest in efforts to strengthen the UN's ability to deal with potential conflict around the world.

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
WPO/KN October 2006	68%	28	4
PIPA November 1995	73%	24	3

⁵⁰¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Please select whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. When dealing with international problems, the United States should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that the United States will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.

U.S.-UN joint decision-making

52%	Agree
46	Disagree
2	Not sure/ Decline

World Public Opinion 2009

When dealing with international problems, the United States should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations, even if this means that the United States will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.

60%	Agree
37	Disagree
3	Don't know/ Refused

Please select whether you agree or disagree with the following statement. When dealing with international problems, the U.S. should be more willing to make decisions within the United Nations even if this means that the United States will sometimes have to go along with a policy that is not its first choice.

U.S.-UN joint decision-making

	Agree	Disagree	Not sure/Decline
WPO/KN October 2006	61%	35	4
CCGA 2006	60%	36	4
CCGA 2004	66%	29	4

⁵⁰² **Public Agenda Foundation Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll, March 2008**

Please tell me if each of the following would enhance our security a great deal, somewhat or not at all: Closer cooperation with the UN

A great deal	35%
Somewhat	45
Not at all	15
Don't know	5

Public Agenda Foundation 2006

Please tell me if each of the following would enhance our security a great deal, somewhat, or not at all...Closer cooperation with the UN

	A great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't know
September 6	36%	40	21	3
January 6	33%	46	18	3
June 5	34%	37	26	3

⁵⁰³ **Pew Research Center**

We have a few questions about America's place in the world...Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements....The United States should cooperate fully with the United Nations

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know/Refused
December 6	57	35	8
October 5	54	39	7
August 4	6	30	10

⁵⁰⁴ **Program on International Policy Attitudes, 2000**

Now that the Cold War has ended, how important do you think it is for the United States to cooperate with other countries by working through the United Nations-extremely important, somewhat important, not so important, or not important at all?

Extremely important	41%
Somewhat important	40
Not so important	7
Not important at all	10
Don't know	2

⁵⁰⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs /PIPA, September 2005**

In general, is it better for the United States to promote democracy by:

Acting on its own because the United States can act more decisively and effectively	25%
Working through the UN because such efforts will be seen as more legitimate	68
No answer	7

⁵⁰⁶ **Program on International Policy Attitudes, 1999**

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement:

Because the world is so interconnected today, the United States should participate in efforts to maintain peace, protect human rights, and promote economic development. Such efforts serve U.S. interests because they help to create a more stable world that is less apt to have wars and is better for the growth of trade and other U.S. goals.

Agree	79%
Disagree	18
Don't know	3

Refused *

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is nice to think that joining in international efforts makes a more stable world. But in fact, the world is so big and complex that such efforts only make a minimal difference with little benefit to the United States. Therefore, it is not really in the U.S. interest to participate in them.

Agree 39%
 Disagree 58
 Don't know 3
 Refused *

⁵⁰⁷ **Gallup Poll, 2009**

Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?

Good job 26%
 Poor job 65
 No opinion 9

Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?

	Good job	Poor job	No opinion
Gallup 2/2007	29%	66%	5%
Gallup 2/2006	30	64	7
Gallup 2/2005	36	61	3
Gallup 2/2004	36	60	4
Gallup 8/2003	37	60	3
CBS 3/2003	38	55	7
Gallup/CNN/USA Today 3/2003	37	58	5
CBS/NYT 2/2003	51	41	8
Gallup/CNN/USA Today 1/2003	50	42	8
Gallup/CNN/USA Today 10/2002	43	51	6
CBS 9/2002	40	50	10
Gallup 2/2002	58	36	6
CBS 11/2001	63	27	10
AP 11/2001	64	24	12
Gallup 2/2001	54	38	8
Gallup 5/2000	52	43	5
UNA-USA/Wirthlin 8/1998	60	37	3

⁵⁰⁸ **Fox News/ Opinion Dynamics Poll, September 2007**

Do you approve or disapprove of the jobs the United Nations is doing?

Approve 34%
 Disapprove 48
 Don't know 18

Fox News, March 2005

Do you approve or disapprove of the job the United Nations is doing?

Approve 32%
 Disapprove 46
 Don't know 22

⁵⁰⁹ **NBC/ Wall Street Journal 2005**

How much confidence would you say that you have in the United Nations: a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence, or none at all?

	A great deal of confidence	Quite a lot of confidence	Not very much confidence	No confidence at all	Not sure
1-Sep	7%	26	44	21	2
1-May	9%	21	47	20	3

⁵¹⁰ World Values Survey 2005-2008

I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence, or none at all? United Nations

	A great deal	Quite a lot	Not very much	None at all	Don't know	No answer	N/A
France	10	45	29	15	2	0	0
Great Britain	8	31	34	14	12	1	0
Italy	9	47	31	8	5	1	0
Netherlands	2	33	40	17	7	1	0
Spain	6	51	31	7	5	1	0
United States	4	28	44	19	2	2	0
Canada	11	43	28	9	8	1	0
Japan	5	47	24	5	19	0	0
Mexico	15	36	27	18	3	1	0
South Africa	15	32	23	9	21	0	0
Australia	6	38	43	11	0	2	0
Sweden	13	64	18	3	1	0	0
Argentina	2	17	36	31	13	1	0
Finland	8	55	32	4	1	0	0
South Korea	6	49	36	8	0	1	0
Poland	6	34	33	9	17	0	0
Switzerland	6	42	38	10	3	1	0
Brazil	14	32	27	20	5	2	0
Chile	7	31	31	20	11	0	0
India	13	13	10	5	57	3	0
Slovenia	5	25	49	12	8	2	0
Bulgaria	11	41	23	11	14	0	0
Romania	10	44	20	9	15	1	0
China	5	22	11	3	59	1	0
Taiwan	3	26	43	23	5	0	0
Turkey	6	22	27	35	10	1	0
Ukraine	5	30	21	19	21	4	0
Russian Federation	7	27	24	17	22	2	0
Peru	8	20	38	21	0	14	0
Ghana	34	36	19	4	5	3	0
Moldova	12	33	34	14	7	0	0
Georgia	7	37	29	13	14	1	0
Thailand	7	23	49	22	0	0	0
Indonesia	12	35	34	10	8	2	0
Vietnam	37	31	11	1	19	1	0
Colombia	14	33	26	21	6	0	0
Serbia	3	22	39	29	5	2	0
New Zealand	5	37	30	11	13	4	0

Egypt	7	26	25	35	8	0	0
Morocco	3	13	29	28	0	28	0
Iran	14	23	49	9	4	1	0
Jordan	18	15	20	31	17	0	0
Cyprus	11	30	35	24	0	0	0
Iraq	5	6	12	62	12	2	0
Trinidad and Tobago	10	29	41	13	6	0	0
Andorra	3	37	41	17	2	0	0
Malaysia	8	41	35	16	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	20	28	16	10	18	4	4
Ethiopia	5	30	35	20	5	4	0
Mali	32	29	19	9	6	4	2
Rwanda	9	28	31	10	21	1	0
Zambia	25	29	28	14	3	2	0
Germany	5	31	40	16	8	1	0
Average	10	32	30	16	10	2	0

⁵¹¹ **Public Agenda Foundation, June 2005**

Some people say they are worried about various things, while others are not. I am going to read you several statements. For each statement, please tell me if this is something that you worry about a lot, is this something you worry about somewhat, or is this something you do not worry about....The United Nations may be ineffective.

Worry a lot	27%
Worry somewhat	37
Don't worry	34
Don't know	2

⁵¹² **CBS Poll, 2001**

Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?

Good job	Poor job	No opinion
63	27	10

Program on International Policy Attitudes/ Knowledge Networks, October- November 2003

Thinking about how countries have been working together in the UN lately, would you say that the results achieved there have been:

Very satisfactory	3%
Somewhat satisfactory	49
Somewhat unsatisfactory	34
Very unsatisfactory	19
No answer	4

⁵¹³ **Pew Global Attitudes Project Poll, April 2007**

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of...the United Nations

Very favorable	9%
Somewhat favorable	39
Somewhat unfavorable	23
Very unfavorable	16
Don't know/ Refused	13

Pew Global Attitudes Project, June 2009

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of...the United Nations

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused
United States	18	43	16	13	10
Canada	19	51	14	6	10
Britain	17	50	15	7	12
France	9	65	20	6	0
Germany	6	59	23	4	7
Spain	8	53	20	4	14
Poland	10	62	10	2	16
Russia	10	46	17	6	21
Turkey	3	15	11	46	26
Egypt	15	41	23	21	0
Jordan	13	31	23	34	0
Lebanon	30	32	18	20	0
Palestinian Territories	4	26	24	43	3
Israel	5	27	34	31	3
China	10	45	25	7	13
India	11	32	18	12	27
Indonesia	24	55	8	1	12
Japan	5	40	33	7	15
Pakistan	5	23	16	15	42
South Korea	9	70	10	1	10
Argentina	4	26	17	8	45
Brazil	3	49	24	5	20
Mexico	20	38	15	5	23
Kenya	48	28	6	4	14
Nigeria	39	32	15	8	6
Average	14	42	18	13	14

⁵¹⁴ Pew Research Center for the People and the Press Values Update Survey, December 2006

I'd like to get your opinion of some groups and organizations in the news. Is your overall opinion of...the United Nations very favorable, mostly favorable, mostly unfavorable, or very unfavorable?

Very favorable	14%
Somewhat favorable	43
Somewhat unfavorable	19
Very unfavorable	14
Never heard of (Vol.)	1
Can't rate (Vol.)	9

Date	Very Favorable	Mostly Favorable	Mostly Unfavorable	Very Unfavorable	DK/Ref
7/19/06@	12	41	24	12	11
6/1/06\$	8	53	22	14	3
5/2/06@	15	36	19	19	11
10/12/05@	9	39	24	15	13

5/30/05\$	11	51	19	16	3
3/17/05@	14	45	11	21	9
2/7/05€		43**	48**		9
12/04\$	12	47	23	13	6
6/1/04\$	15	49	20	14	-
2/24/04@	14	41	20	15	10
6/10/03\$	16	50	20	12	2
5/21/03#	13	44	23	16	4
2/19/03#	16	49	22	11	2
2/6/03#	18	50	17	12	3
8/21/01@	23	54	12	6	4
09/09/99*	19	57	14	5	5
06/13/99*	19	51	16	7	7
12/00/98^	20	15	23	19	4
09/11/97*	11	53	19	9	8
02/06/97#	21	52	16	8	3
02/25/96*	19	46	20	9	6
06/11/95*	14	53	20	8	5
02/12/95*	13	49	18	8	12
07/25/94*	21	55	14	5	5
05/24/93+	21	52	13	4	10
01/25/93#	22	55	14	5	4
05/31/90+	15	55	13	6	11

- @ Organization: Pew Research [Is your overall opinion of...]
- \$ Organization: German Marshall Fund [Would you say your overall opinion of...]
- € Organization: Gallup
- * Organization: Pew/Times Mirror
- + Organization: Pew/Times Mirror ["How would you describe your opinion of..."]
- # Organization: Time/CNN ["In general, is your opinion of..."]
- ^ Organization: Zogby ["Is your overall opinion toward the..."]

⁵¹⁵ **Democracy Corps Poll, May 2009**

Now, I'd like to rate your feelings toward some people and organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward that person or organization. If you have no opinion or never heard of that person or organization, please say so...The United Nations: Give the United Nations a rating, with 100 meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. (If "Don't know," ask:) Would you say you are unable to give an opinion of the United Nations, or have you never heard of the United Nations?

Warm 51-100	39%
Cool 0-49	34
Not particularly warm or cold 50	21
Never heard of/ Don't know/ Refused	6

Religion and Ethics Newsweekly/ United Nations Foundation Religion and America's Role in the World Survey, September 2008

Now, I'd like to rate your feelings toward some people and organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward that person or organization. If you have no opinion

or never heard of that person or organization, please say so....The United Nations: Give the United Nations a rating, with 100 meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. (If "Don't know," ask:) Would you say you are unable to give an opinion of the United Nations, or have you never heard of the United Nations?

Warm 51-100	44%
Cool 0-49	30
Not particularly warm or cold 50	22
Never heard of/ Don't know/ Refused	4

Public Support for Ethanol Survey, June 2008

Now, I'd like to rate your feelings toward some people and organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward that person or organization. If you have no opinion or never heard of that person or organization, please say so....The United Nations: Give the United Nations a rating, with 100 meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. (If "Don't know," ask:) Would you say you are unable to give an opinion of the United Nations, or have you never heard of the United Nations?

Warm 51-100	36%
Cool 0-49	37
Not particularly warm or cold 50	22
Never heard of/Don't know/Refused	5

Democracy Corps Poll, March 2008

Now, I'd like to rate your feelings toward some people and organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward that person or organization. If you have no opinion or never heard of that person or organization, please say so....The United Nations: Give the United Nations a rating, with 100 meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. (If "Don't know," ask:) Would you say you are unable to give an opinion of the United Nations, or have you never heard of the United Nations?

Warm 51-100	42%
Cool 0-49	35
Not particularly warm or cold 50	21
Never heard of/Don't know/Refused	2

Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2008

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The United Nations

Year	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar/decline
2002	64	69	33	27	18	5	13	4
2004	57	69	25	23	15	5	20	12
2006	55	60	24	22	16	5	20	14
2008	54	50	24	22	20	5	25	4

⁵¹⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The United Nations

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees
United States	55°	60°	24	22	16	5	20
Armenia	72°	80°	51	14	19	2	10
China	75°	80°	52	29	8	2	2
India	63°	70°	40	15	12	4	20
Mexico	80°	80°	60	14	10	1	3
Palestinian Territories	58°	60°	39	11	20	2	25
South Korea	70°	70°	39	39	18	2	2
Thailand	71°	--	38	8	22	1	6

⁵¹⁷ **World Public Opinion/ Knowledge Networks 2006, BBC 2005**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world...The United Nations

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (Vol.)	Neither (Vol.)	Don't know/No answer
WPO/KN 12/06	64%	27	-	-	9
BBC 11/2005	52%	36	3	4	5

⁵¹⁸ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA, January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world:

The United Nations

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA
Afghanistan	79	8	6	8
Argentina	34	31	4	31
Australia	61	26	5	9
Brazil	46	36	5	13
Canada	65	20	3	12
Congo	55	16	15	15
Finland	77	8	6	9
France	52	33	7	8
Germany	80	6	8	5
Ghana	74	8	8	9
Great Britain	66	24	2	8

India	44	12	16	29
Indonesia	80	8	9	3
Iran	63	21	10	6
Iraq	34	40	22	4
Italy	56	19	6	19
Kenya	74	3	7	16
Mexico	62	17	6	15
Nigeria	75	8	8	9
Philippines	74	13	4	9
Poland	72	7	4	17
Russia	38	14	16	32
Saudi Arabia	41	20	25	14
Senegal	60	8	11	21
South Africa	48	9	15	29
South Korea	76	19	0	4
Spain	61	17	9	13
Sri Lanka	36	7	5	52
Tanzania	69	10	14	8
Turkey	32	18	25	25
United States	52	36	3	9
Zimbabwe	57	5	20	18
Average	59	16	9	15

⁵¹⁹ **Gallup International, June-July 2005**

Which, if any, of the following global institutions have you heard of?... United Nations (UN)

United Nations

United States	73%
Average of 65 countries	83%

And is your overall opinion of...the United Nations (UN) positive, neutral or negative?

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	DK/NR
United States	35	38	26	1
Average of 65 countries	48	35	13	4

⁵²⁰ **German Marshall Fund December 2004**

Among the following reasons that could explain why you have a favorable opinion of the UN, which one best explains why you have a favorable opinion of the UN? [ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO SAID "FAVORABLE" TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]

	Military actions are not legal unless the UN approves them	Many global problems can't be solved by any single country	We can't afford to pay the whole cost of international actions; we need others to share the cost	All of the above (vol.)	None of the above(vol.)	DK/NR
United States	11	48	33	6	2	1
France	24	57	14	3	1	2
Germany	26	49	18	6	0	1

⁵²¹ **German Marshall Fund December 2004**

Among the following reasons that could explain why you have an unfavorable opinion of the UN, which one best explains why you have an unfavorable opinion of the UN? [ASKED ONLY OF THOSE WHO SAID "UNFAVORABLE" TO PREVIOUS QUESTION]

	Other countries should not have a veto when [survey country's] important interests are at stake	The UN is wasteful and inefficient with its money	When we need international action, it has to be done quickly, but the UN slows things down	All of the above (vol.)	None of the above (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	11	27	48	9	5	1
France	22	29	40	2	3	5
Germany	15	35	40	3	4	3

522 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The United Nations (UN) enables the costs of international actions to be shared among different countries

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	25	41	16	14	4
France	25	50	14	6	5
Germany	21	50	20	6	3
United Kingdom	33	44	11	6	6
Italy	19	49	18	6	8
Netherlands	31	50	11	4	4
Poland	13	47	12	3	24
Portugal	42	36	8	3	10
Spain	22	51	12	5	11
Slovakia	27	41	14	4	13
Turkey	27	25	18	15	16
European Average	24	45	15	7	9

523 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The United Nations (UN) can manage many of the world's most pressing problems better than any single country

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	25	31	18	25	2
France	31	45	16	7	1
Germany	43	41	12	4	0
United Kingdom	32	35	18	11	4
Italy	33	44	14	7	2
Netherlands	34	45	13	7	2
Poland	29	42	13	3	13
Portugal	54	31	6	3	6
Spain	35	48	8	4	4
Slovakia	31	41	14	5	7

Turkey	26	27	16	16	15
European Average	34	40	14	8	5

⁵²⁴ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose additional countries becoming permanent members

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	63	8	1	28
Australia	81	13	3	3
Brazil	73	12	2	14
Canada	84	12	1	3
Chile	55	21	4	20
China	54	33	5	8
France	67	25	1	8
Germany	81	16	1	1
Great Britain	74	21	2	4
India	87	6	1	6
Indonesia	69	21	3	6
Italy	86	9	2	4
Japan	59	5	0	36
Lebanon	72	7	16	5
Mexico	52	14	11	22
Russia	44	28	1	27
Philippines	73	25	1	1
Poland	67	9	2	22
South Africa	76	16	1	7
South Korea	56	40	1	3
Spain	80	7	2	12
Turkey	59	21	3	17
United States	70	23	3	4
Average	69	17	3	11

⁵²⁵ BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the UN Security Council

Germany

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	48	17	1	27	8
Australia	69	9	1	8	13
Brazil	56	15	2	15	12
Canada	72	13	0	4	12
Chile	49	6	3	21	21
China	42	15	3	8	33

France	65	6	0	4	25
Germany	79	3	0	1	16
Great Britain	63	12	1	4	21
India	45	20	10	19	6
Indonesia	55	15	4	6	21
Italy	72	14	1	4	9
Japan	50	4	0	41	5
Lebanon	64	15	9	6	7
Mexico	35	13	9	28	14
Russia	45	7	3	18	28
Philippines	59	13	1	2	25
Poland	54	13	1	23	9
South Africa	60	15	1	7	16
South Korea	43	14	1	2	40
Spain	66	8	2	16	7
Turkey	41	12	7	20	21
United States	60	13	0	4	23
Average	56	12	3	12	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Germany

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	62	32	4	2
China	41	27	21	11
India	40	22	25	13
South Korea	54	31	14	2
Average	49	28	16	7

⁵²⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Germany

Favor	66%
Oppose	31
Not sure/ Decline	3

⁵²⁷ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

Japan

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	48	17	1	26	8
Australia	67	10	1	9	13
Brazil	61	10	3	14	12
Canada	72	12	0	3	12
Chile	50	6	2	22	21
China	10	51	2	5	33
France	58	11	0	6	25
Germany	64	16	1	2	16
Great Britain	61	15	1	3	20
India	53	15	8	18	6
Indonesia	61	9	3	5	21
Italy	66	20	1	4	9
Japan	64	3	0	29	5
Lebanon	63	15	8	7	7
Mexico	46	10	5	25	14
Russia	41	10	3	18	28
Philippines	68	5	1	1	25
Poland	52	12	1	26	9
South Africa	57	18	1	8	16
South Korea	26	32	0	2	40
Spain	58	15	3	18	7
Turkey	42	10	7	20	21
United States	62	11	0	4	23
Average	54	14	2	12	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Japan

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	66	29	3	2
China	10	75	8	6
India	46	29	16	9
South Korea	18	72	8	1
Average	35	51	9	5

⁵²⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Japan

Favor	67%
Oppose	30
Not sure/ Decline	3

529 **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

India

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	51	11	1	29	8
Australia	60	16	2	10	13
Brazil	51	20	1	15	12
Canada	61	20	0	7	12
Chile	44	5	3	26	21
China	31	24	3	9	33
France	45	22	1	8	25
Germany	44	36	1	3	16
Great Britain	62	13	1	4	21
India	88	1	0	4	6
Indonesia	48	19	4	7	21
Italy	61	22	1	7	9
Japan	31	13	0	52	5
Lebanon	48	32	5	9	7
Mexico	38	10	7	30	14
Russia	37	10	4	21	28
Philippines	45	25	2	2	25
Poland	38	20	1	31	9
South Africa	49	24	1	9	16
South Korea	31	26	1	2	40
Spain	52	17	3	20	7
Turkey	24	23	9	23	21
United States	51	19	0	6	23
Average	47	19	2	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

India

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	53	42	4	2
China	37	32	20	11
India	75	11	7	8
South Korea	46	34	18	2
Average	53	30	12	6

530 **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

India

Favor	53%
Oppose	42
Not sure/ Decline	4

531 **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

Brazil

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	58	9	1	25	8
Australia	50	22	1	15	13
Brazil	70	6	1	11	12
Canada	61	20	0	7	12
Chile	56	2	2	19	21
China	36	16	4	11	33
France	50	18	1	8	25
Germany	45	33	1	4	16
Great Britain	50	21	2	6	21
India	27	35	10	21	6
Indonesia	43	21	7	8	21
Italy	64	19	1	7	9
Japan	29	12	0	55	5
Lebanon	52	26	8	7	7
Mexico	59	6	5	16	14
Russia	32	13	4	22	28
Philippines	54	15	2	3	25
Poland	43	16	1	31	9
South Africa	47	25	1	10	16
South Korea	30	27	1	3	40
Spain	54	16	4	19	7
Turkey	27	20	9	23	21
United States	51	18	1	8	23
Average	47	18	3	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Brazil

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	52	42	5	2
China	39	25	23	13
India	36	23	25	17

South Korea	41	37	19	3
Average	42	32	18	9

⁵³² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

Brazil

Favor	53%
Oppose	43
Not sure/ Decline	4

⁵³³ **BBC January 2005**

Would you favor or oppose adding each of the following specific countries as permanent members of the Security Council

South Africa

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)	Oppose expansion
Argentina	53	11	1	28	8
Australia	49	27	2	10	13
Brazil	56	15	2	15	12
Canada	56	25	0	7	12
Chile	43	5	4	27	21
China	39	16	3	10	33
France	44	24	1	7	25
Germany	47	33	1	3	16
Great Britain	49	25	1	4	21
India	34	31	10	19	6
Indonesia	39	24	6	10	21
Italy	59	24	1	6	9
Japan	28	12	0	55	5
Lebanon	50	26	7	10	7
Mexico	24	22	11	28	14
Russia	24	19	4	25	28
Philippines	47	24	2	2	25
Poland	35	24	1	31	9
South Africa	72	6	1	5	16
South Korea	26	30	1	3	40
Spain	50	20	3	20	7
Turkey	25	23	9	22	21
United States	48	23	0	6	23
Average	43	21	3	15	17

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

South Africa

	Should	Should not	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	45	48	5	2
China	38	27	20	15
India	35	25	22	18
South Korea	38	40	19	3
Average	39	35	17	10

⁵³⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council are China, France, Russia, Britain, and the United States. Some people have proposed that the permanent membership should be expanded. Would you favor or oppose each of the following specific countries becoming permanent members:

South Africa

Favor	47%
Oppose	49
Not sure/ Decline	4

⁵³⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

Some say that in order for the European Union to assume a greater international role it needs to do certain things. To what extent do you agree with the following: The European Union should have a single permanent seat on the United Nations (UN) Security Council, even if it replaces the permanent seats of the United Kingdom and France.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	[DK/Refusal]
United States	13	23	21	34	9
France	20	42	19	15	3
Germany	21	43	21	12	4
United Kingdom	16	21	23	32	8
Italy	25	37	20	8	11
Netherlands	33	32	18	13	4
Poland	21	37	15	7	19
Portugal	39	27	13	7	14
Spain	26	49	11	4	10
Slovakia	25	36	15	7	17
Turkey	18	19	17	21	26
European Average	22	35	18	15	11

⁵³⁶ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2005**

As you may know, there are currently five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, and any one of them can veto (block) any resolution. Some people have proposed that this should be changed so that if a decision was supported by all the other members, no one member [if Permanent 5 member (i.e., China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, or United States) add "not even [COUNTRY,]" could veto the decision. Would you favor or oppose this change?

	Favor	Oppose	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	48	17	3	32
Australia	75	20	2	3
Brazil	62	19	2	18

Canada	68	26	1	5
Chile	47	22	3	28
China	48	36	5	12
France	44	43	1	12
Germany	70	25	2	3
Great Britain	56	35	3	6
India	77	13	3	7
Indonesia	73	14	4	9
Italy	67	25	2	6
Japan	46	13	0	42
Lebanon	84	9	2	5
Mexico	39	15	16	30
Russia	25	29	10	36
Philippines	58	35	4	3
Poland	52	23	2	24
South Africa	61	29	2	9
South Korea	52	40	5	4
Spain	71	13	2	14
Turkey	53	24	4	18
United States	57	34	2	7
Average	58	24	3	14

537 **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Having your country's official representative to the United Nations General Assembly be elected by the people of your country.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	81	3	1	1	14
Australia	66	30	1	1	2
Brazil	77	9	1	1	12
Canada	77	19	-	1	3
Chile	80	6	1	2	10
China	79	13	3	1	4
France	74	20	1	2	4
Germany	85	11	1	1	1
Britain	77	19	1	1	2
India	85	6	1	1	7
Indonesia	83	9	5	1	2
Italy	76	18	1	2	3
Mexico	78	6	7	1	8
Philippines	66	29	2	1	2
Poland	75	7	1	6	12
Russia	42	28	5	9	16
South Korea	59	37	2	-	2
Turkey	74	8	5	-	12
United States	64	32	1	-	3
Average	74	16	2	2	6

538 **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Creating a new UN Parliament, made up of representatives directly elected by citizens, having powers equal to the current UN General Assembly that is controlled by national governments.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	66	6	2	1	26
Australia	56	35	3	1	6
Brazil	73	10	2	-	15
Canada	65	28	1	1	6
Chile	64	7	4	4	21
China	68	20	4	1	7
Germany	66	24	3	1	5
Britain	64	28	1	1	6
India	56	22	10	3	10
Indonesia	73	13	7	2	5
Italy	70	20	1	2	7
Mexico	80	5	8	-	7
Philippines	65	29	2	-	4
Poland	59	9	1	7	23
Russia	33	22	5	10	29
South Korea	62	33	1	-	3
Turkey	55	18	10	1	17
United States	55	35	1	-	9
Average	63	20	4	2	11

539 **GlobeScan 2005**

The United Nations is currently exploring possible reforms. Please tell me if you favor or oppose each of the following proposals.

Giving leaders of major environmental and social groups, trade unions, and business organizations a formal role in shaping United Nations policies and actions, rather than having only government leaders do this.

	Favor	Oppose	Depends	Neither	DK/NA
Argentina	60	11	3	1	25
Australia	61	32	3	-	3
Brazil	70	15	2	-	14
Canada	64	30	1	1	4
Chile	61	8	4	4	22
China	61	28	4	-	8
France	57	31	1	2	8
Germany	57	37	3	1	2
Britain	65	30	1	1	3
India	55	20	8	5	11
Indonesia	70	12	9	2	6
Italy	68	22	2	2	7
Mexico	77	6	10	-	7
Philippines	72	21	3	1	3
Poland	52	16	2	6	24
Russia	36	19	5	9	31
South Korea	61	35	2	-	3

Turkey	56	16	9	1	18
United States	52	43	1	-	3
Average	61	23	4	2	11

⁵⁴⁰ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2002**

Here is a list of groups, organizations. For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of international organizations like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad in (survey country)?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	DK/R
United States	10	50	18	8	14
Canada	11	53	15	7	15
Argentina	3	13	24	42	18
Bolivia	17	47	19	6	11
Brazil	2	28	34	14	22
Guatemala	27	46	12	6	10
Honduras	22	47	13	3	16
Mexico	16	43	15	5	21
Peru	16	39	12	8	25
Venezuela	28	40	19	9	4
Great Britain	12	55	19	4	10
France	8	58	22	6	7
Italy	12	46	18	5	19
Germany	9	57	24	3	7
Bulgaria	10	38	17	6	29
Czech Republic	8	62	19	2	9
Poland	4	46	18	3	29
Russia	3	39	17	10	31
Slovakia	8	66	15	3	8
Ukraine	18	44	14	10	14
Angola	26	48	7	4	15
Ghana	32	40	11	2	14
Ivory Coast	39	48	9	4	0
Kenya	40	31	13	10	6
Mali	25	44	8	6	18
Nigeria	34	45	7	4	11
Senegal	37	44	9	5	5
South Africa	30	38	7	6	19
Tanzania	18	35	12	4	32
Uganda	32	31	6	3	27
Bangladesh	16	26	9	8	41
China	20	50	5	1	25
India	29	21	4	5	41
Indonesia	13	35	22	8	22
Japan	9	48	17	1	25
Philippines	26	55	9	2	7
South Korea	5	53	21	5	16
Vietnam	52	33	2	1	12
Jordan	7	25	29	34	5
Lebanon	15	29	20	14	23
Pakistan	9	14	8	10	59

Turkey	8	16	17	40	20
Uzbekistan	40	45	4	1	10

⁵⁴¹ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world:

The World Bank.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/ No difference	DK/NA (vol)
Afghanistan	79	7	5	2	7
Argentina	26	47	4	1	23
Australia	42	34	5	4	16
Brazil	48	34	3	2	12
Canada	43	28	3	4	22
Congo	75	6	11	2	6
Finland	59	21	8	2	11
France	48	28	5	1	17
Germany	51	20	9	5	15
Ghana	76	6	9	0	8
Great Britain	45	37	2	4	13
India	51	9	19	4	17
Indonesia	80	12	6	0	2
Iran	42	21	13	12	11
Iraq	44	18	29	2	6
Italy	37	27	6	7	24
Kenya	81	5	6	1	7
Mexico	44	22	14	8	13
Nigeria	83	6	5	2	4
Philippines	69	16	6	1	8
Poland	60	7	4	2	26
Russia	41	10	13	6	30
Saudi Arabia	55	12	20	3	10
Senegal	74	6	7	2	12
South Africa	58	5	7	4	27
South Korea	66	29	1	1	4
Spain	55	22	10	2	12
Sri Lanka	44	8	6	1	41
Tanzania	79	8	8	2	3
Turkey	30	28	20	6	15
United States	47	28	4	5	17
Zimbabwe	43	19	18	5	15
Average	55	18	9	3	14

⁵⁴² **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world

The International Monetary Fund.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/No difference (vol.)	DK/NA/ (vol)
Afghanistan	36	13	20	6	24
Argentina	19	60	3	1	18
Australia	35	30	5	4	27
Brazil	27	57	3	2	12
Canada	38	25	3	4	30
Congo	66	10	13	1	10
Finland	53	17	6	3	21
France	42	31	6	1	21
Germany	49	16	10	6	19
Ghana	66	9	13	2	11
Great Britain	44	30	2	4	21
India	39	10	21	10	21
Indonesia	64	24	8	1	3
Iran	38	24	15	11	12
Iraq	39	22	30	3	6
Italy	38	25	5	7	25
Kenya	73	8	7	1	11
Mexico	47	21	15	5	12
Nigeria	67	16	6	2	9
Philippines	62	19	5	1	14
Poland	57	6	5	3	29
Russia	36	14	13	6	31
Saudi Arabia	52	9	23	4	11
Senegal	67	6	9	2	16
South Africa	39	7	10	4	39
South Korea	64	33	1	1	1
Spain	53	24	9	1	13
Sri Lanka	38	7	5	1	48
Tanzania	66	14	13	3	4
Turkey	15	49	19	5	12
United States	37	26	3	6	29
Zimbabwe	38	23	21	6	13
Average	47	21	10	6	18

⁵⁴³ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The World Bank

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar / Decline
United States	46°	50°	8	14	27	6	20	25
Armenia	63°	60°	35	16	24	4	14	7

China	74°	75°	40	28	9	2	2	19
India	60°	70°	35	18	11	5	21	10
Palestinian Territories	40°	50°	13	11	23	3	35	15
South Korea	61°	60°	19	39	33	4	5	0
Thailand	67°	--	30	7	26	1	7	29
Average	59°	63°	26	19	22	4	15	15

⁵⁴⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The World Bank

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar / Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	51	49	12	19	23	6	20	20	100
2004 (internet)	46	50	11	15	23	6	23	23	100
2006 (internet)	46	50	8	14	27	6	20	25	100
2008 (internet)	48	50	13	15	36	7	23	6	100

⁵⁴⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2008**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF)

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	48	49	6	17	21	7	16	33	100
2004 (internet)	44	50	9	11	23	5	23	29	100
2006 (internet)	44	50	6	13	24	6	20	30	100
2008 (internet)	44	50	9	11	40	7	25	9	100

WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that organization, leave the box blank and move on to the next question.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF)

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees (percent)	75-51 degrees (percent)	50 degrees (percent)	49-31 degrees (percent)	30-0 degrees (percent)	Not familiar / Decline (percent)
United States	44°	50°	6	13	24	6	20	30
Armenia	50°	50°	15	13	24	7	21	19
China	70°	70°	27	28	11	2	2	31
India	55°	60°	24	22	15	7	20	12
Palestinian Territories	38°	50°	10	11	24	3	34	19
South Korea	59°	60°	19	35	31	7	7	0
Thailand	65°	--	29	8	25	2	9	28
Average	54	58	19	19	22	5	16	20

⁵⁴⁶ Gallup International Voice of the People 2005

Which, if any, of the following global institutions have you heard of?

The World Bank

	Not mentioned	Mentioned	Total
Austria	53	48	100
Denmark	10	90	100
Finland	13	87	100
France	32	68	100
Germany	15	85	100
Greece	42	58	100
Ireland	15	85	100
Italy	28	73	100
Netherlands	33	67	100
Norway	18	82	100
Portugal	22	78	100
Spain	54	46	100
Switzerland	14	86	100
United Kingdom	27	73	100
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	95	100
Bulgaria	28	72	100
Croatia	9	91	100
Czech Republic	21	79	100
Kosovo	32	69	100
Lithuania	43	58	100
Macedonia	19	81	100
Moldova	23	77	100
Poland	25	75	100
Romania	22	78	100
Russia	32	68	100
Serbia	10	90	100
Ukraine	35	65	100
Egypt	20	80	100
Israel	13	87	100
Turkey	21	79	100
Argentina	32	68	100
Bolivia	25	75	100

Canada	26	74	100
Colombia	30	70	100
Costa Rica	28	72	100
Ecuador	35	65	100
Guatemala	45	55	100
Mexico	32	68	100
Nicaragua	22	78	100
Panama	37	63	100
Dominican Republic	23	77	100
Peru	31	69	100
Uruguay	17	83	100
United States	43	58	100
Venezuela	59	41	100
Hong Kong	35	65	100
Indonesia	42	58	100
India	24	76	100
South Korea	29	71	100
Malaysia	25	75	100
Pakistan	34	66	100
Philippines	31	69	100
Singapore	34	67	100
Taiwan	53	47	100
Thailand	32	68	100
Vietnam	50	50	100
Cameroon	5	95	100
Kenya	24	76	100
Nigeria	12	88	100
South Africa	47	53	100
Ghana	9	91	100
Senegal	26	74	100
Togo	18	82	100
Ethiopia	22	78	100
Paraguay	22	78	100
Iceland	17	83	100
Japan	57	43	100
Total	28	72	100

⁵⁴⁷ Gallup International Voice of the People 2005

And is your overall opinion of the World Bank positive, neutral or negative?

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	DK/NA	Total
Austria	10	9	22	7	48
Denmark	29	49	10	2	90
Finland	16	52	13	7	87
France	22	30	10	5	68
Germany	11	50	21	4	85
Greece	17	25	15	1	58
Ireland	20	34	25	6	85
Italy	25	28	15	5	73
Netherlands	15	43	4	5	67
Norway	13	42	17	10	82

Portugal	46	18	7	7	78
Spain	16	21	6	3	46
Switzerland	21	40	17	8	86
United Kingdom	16	35	16	5	73
Bosnia and Herzegovina	43	36	12	4	95
Bulgaria	33	26	5	8	72
Croatia	28	38	21	4	91
Czech Republic	23	41	9	6	79
Kosovo	47	16	1	4	69
Lithuania	33	18	3	4	58
Macedonia	35	28	14	5	81
Moldova	47	22	2	6	77
Poland	28	39	5	3	75
Romania	40	22	8	7	78
Russia	23	39	6	0	68
Serbia	25	38	20	7	90
Ukraine	27	26	5	6	65
Egypt	39	18	9	14	80
Israel	42	33	8	4	87
Turkey	22	18	32	8	79
Argentina	8	18	32	9	68
Bolivia	30	17	26	2	75
Canada	18	35	15	6	74
Colombia	28	22	14	6	70
Costa Rica	30	16	18	9	72
Ecuador	16	22	25	2	65
Guatemala	20	24	8	3	55
Mexico	26	27	13	2	68
Nicaragua	60	10	6	2	78
Panama	31	15	13	4	63
Dominican Republic	49	11	12	5	77
Peru	30	23	12	4	69
Uruguay	17	23	30	14	83
United States	13	30	12	3	58
Venezuela	20	14	5	1	41
Hong Kong	20	34	5	5	65
Indonesia	23	27	7	1	58
India	51	12	3	9	76
South Korea	22	39	4	5	71
Malaysia	33	24	6	11	75
Pakistan	22	22	10	13	66
Philippines	50	10	8	1	69
Singapore	23	33	5	6	67
Taiwan	13	25	3	6	47
Thailand	24	35	5	4	68

Vietnam	30	16	2	2	50
Cameroon	48	23	14	10	95
Kenya	48	16	8	4	76
Nigeria	55	23	9	0	88
South Africa	24	20	5	4	53
Ghana	63	19	6	4	91
Senegal	52	7	5	9	74
Togo	57	9	8	8	82
Ethiopia	49	18	10	1	78
Paraguay	36	24	12	6	78
Iceland	26	45	6	6	83
Japan	10	30	1	1	43
Total	29	26	11	5	71

⁵⁴⁸ **Gallup International Voice of the People 2005**

Which, if any, of the following global institutions have you heard of?

The International Monetary Fund

	Not mentioned	Mentioned	Total
Austria	56	44	100
Denmark	60	40	100
Finland	19	81	100
France	25	75	100
Germany	14	86	100
Greece	23	77	100
Ireland	25	75	100
Italy	17	83	100
Netherlands	33	67	100
Norway	39	61	100
Portugal	25	75	100
Spain	54	46	100
Switzerland	14	86	100
United Kingdom	23	77	100
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6	94	100
Bulgaria	18	82	100
Croatia	4	96	100
Czech Republic	20	80	100
Kosovo	46	54	100
Lithuania	50	50	100
Macedonia	20	80	100
Moldova	38	62	100
Poland	43	57	100
Romania	19	81	100
Russia	34	66	100

Serbia	9	91	100
Ukraine	32	68	100
Egypt	29	71	100
Israel	23	77	100
Turkey	18	82	100
Argentina	17	83	100
Bolivia	39	61	100
Canada	38	62	100
Colombia	26	74	100
Costa Rica	25	75	100
Ecuador	30	70	100
Guatemala	54	46	100
Mexico	38	62	100
Nicaragua	28	72	100
Panama	40	60	100
Dominican Republic	11	89	100
Peru	35	65	100
Uruguay	8	92	100
United States	57	43	100
Venezuela	59	41	100
Hong Kong	13	87	100
Indonesia	28	72	100
India	67	33	100
South Korea	6	94	100
Malaysia	42	58	100
Pakistan	42	58	100
Philippines	50	50	100
Singapore	36	64	100
Taiwan	44	56	100
Thailand	21	79	100
Vietnam	58	42	100
Cameroon	8	92	100
Kenya	37	63	100
Nigeria	25	75	100
South Africa	69	31	100
Ghana	30	70	100
Senegal	34	66	100
Togo	26	74	100
Ethiopia	46	54	100
Paraguay	24	76	100
Iceland	25	75	100
Japan	47	53	100
Total	32	68	100

And is your overall opinion of the International Monetary Fund positive, neutral or negative?

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	DK/NA	Total
Austria	8	9	21	7	44
Denmark	11	24	3	2	40
Finland	12	53	10	7	81
France	22	34	13	6	75
Germany	15	47	21	3	86
Greece	23	36	17	1	77
Ireland	22	31	18	4	75
Italy	28	34	16	4	83
Netherlands	16	41	5	5	67
Norway	6	32	12	11	61
Portugal	33	25	8	8	75
Spain	21	15	6	4	46
Switzerland	22	43	11	9	86
United Kingdom	18	39	14	6	77
Bosnia and Herzegovina	40	39	12	4	94
Bulgaria	32	28	12	10	82
Croatia	30	38	26	3	96
Czech Republic	21	40	12	7	80
Kosovo	36	12	1	4	54
Lithuania	26	19	1	4	50
Macedonia	30	26	19	5	80
Moldova	35	18	3	6	62
Poland	16	34	4	3	57
Romania	37	22	14	7	81
Russia	20	38	8	0	66
Serbia	25	38	20	8	91
Ukraine	29	26	7	7	68
Egypt	28	17	12	14	71
Israel	38	28	6	6	77
Turkey	13	14	49	7	82
Argentina	7	17	50	9	83
Bolivia	21	15	23	2	61
Canada	16	28	14	4	62
Colombia	26	23	18	7	74
Costa Rica	28	16	20	10	75
Ecuador	13	22	32	3	70
Guatemala	17	19	6	3	46
Mexico	23	26	11	1	62
Nicaragua	50	12	8	2	72
Panama	29	14	13	4	60
Dominican Republic	47	13	25	4	89
Peru	24	23	15	3	65

Uruguay	18	21	43	10	92
United States	9	23	8	3	43
Venezuela	22	11	6	1	41
Hong Kong	28	46	6	7	87
Indonesia	33	25	13	1	72
India	17	9	3	5	33
South Korea	32	42	16	4	94
Malaysia	24	18	8	8	58
Pakistan	19	17	9	11	58
Philippines	33	9	8	1	50
Singapore	22	29	7	6	64
Taiwan	18	26	5	7	56
Thailand	21	34	20	4	79
Vietnam	24	15	1	3	42
Cameroon	46	21	14	11	92
Kenya	36	14	10	3	63
Nigeria	44	18	13	1	75
South Africa	13	13	3	2	31
Ghana	44	16	6	4	70
Senegal	42	9	4	11	66
Togo	46	11	7	9	74
Ethiopia	28	16	8	2	54
Paraguay	34	24	14	4	76
Iceland	23	41	4	7	75
Japan	13	37	2	1	53
Total	24	24	13	5	67

⁵⁵⁰ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

The World Bank.

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	52	38	10
France	53	39	8
Germany	47	44	8
The Netherlands	57	33	10
Italy	72	26	12
Poland	54	24	21
European Average	53	36	11
United States	49	39	12

⁵⁵¹ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

The International Monetary Fund

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	50	38	12
France	59	30	11
Germany	41	53	6
The Netherlands	55	35	10
Italy	70	19	11
Poland	49	25	26
European Average	53	35	12
United States	42	38	20

⁵⁵² **German Marshall Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey 2006**

Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of:

The World Trade Organization

	Favorable	Unfavorable	DK/NR
Denmark	52	30	18
France	51	44	5
Italy	68	19	13
Portugal	47	14	39
Slovakia	44	31	26
United Kingdom	56	22	22
United States	48	32	20
Average	52	29	19

⁵⁵³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

The World Trade Organization was established to rule on disputes over trade treaties. If another country files a complaint with the World Trade Organization and it rules against [survey country], as a general rule, should [survey country] comply with that decision or not?

	Yes	No	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/Decline
United States	73	22	3	1
Armenia	26	35	24	14
China	58	19	16	8
India	37	29	21	14
Mexico	53	21	18	8
Philippines	48	49	n/a	3
South Korea	37	52	10	1
Thailand	34	17	25	24
Ukraine	40	12	29	19

⁵⁵⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

The World Trade Organization was established to rule on disputes over trade treaties. If another country files a complaint with the World Trade Organization and it rules against the United States, as a general rule, should the United States comply with that decision or not?

	Yes	No	Depends (vol.)	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	64	24	3	9	100
2004 (internet)	69	24	n/a	6	100
2006 (internet)	73	22	3	1	100
2008 (internet)	72	25	n/a	3	100

⁵⁵⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

As you may know when there is a dispute about whether a country is abiding by international law, the case is tried in front of the International Court of Justice, also called the World Court. It is comprised of fifteen justices from around the world. If there were a case involving [country], how confident are you the Court's decision would be fair and impartial? Would you say that you are:

	Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not very confident	Not at all confident	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Mexico	14	28	38	15	2	3
United States	8	49	31	11	-	1
France	15	54	19	6	2	4
Germany	29	45	17	4	2	3
Great Britain	13	55	23	7	1	2
Poland	24	49	13	3	7	4
Russia	5	20	35	14	10	17
Ukraine	11	33	20	9	11	16
Egypt	22	45	18	9	6	0
Iraq	15	24	23	17	3	19
Pakistan	14	33	20	23	2	7
Palestinian Territories	6	40	38	14	1	1
Turkey	10	23	25	26	3	13
Kenya	40	39	15	2	2	2
Nigeria	30	36	22	9	1	2
China	17	45	22	4	5	7
Macau	20	45	14	4	5	12
India	20	33	18	14	11	4
Indonesia	5	31	48	3	3	10
South Korea	3	37	52	7	0	1
Taiwan	10	44	31	8	-	7
Average	16	38	26	10	4	6

*Macau, Taiwan not included in average

⁵⁵⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004**

The World Court is part of the United Nations. It makes rulings on disputes between countries based on treaties the countries have signed. There is a debate about whether countries should give the World Court more power by making a general commitment to accept the decisions of the World Court or restrict the power of the Court by deciding on a case-by-case basis whether they will accept the Court's decisions. Do you think the United States should or should not make the general commitment to accept the decisions of the World Court?

Should	57%
Should not	35

Don't know/Refused 7

PIPA 1999

The World Court is part of the United Nations. It makes rulings on disputes between countries based on treaties the countries have signed. Some countries have made commitments to accept the decisions of the World Court. Other countries decide in advance for each case whether to accept the court's decisions. Do you think the United States should or should not make the commitment to accept the decisions of the World Court?

Should make commitment 53%
 Should not make commitment 38
 Never accept (vol.) 9
 Don't know *

⁵⁵⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	71	22	7	100
2002 (internet)	77	20	4	100
2004 (internet)	76	19	5	100
2006 (internet)	71	25	5	100
2008 (internet)	68	30	2	100

⁵⁵⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2002**

A permanent International Criminal Court has been established by the United Nations to try individuals suspected of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Some say the United States should not support the Court because trumped up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation. Others say that the United States should support the court because the world needs a better way to prosecute war criminals, many of whom go unpunished today. Do you think the United States should or should not support the permanent international criminal court?

	Should support	Should not support	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002	65	28	7	100

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Trial of suspected terrorists in the International Criminal Court

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
1998	84	10	6	100
2002 (telephone)	83	14	3	100
2002 (internet)	82	15	2	100
2004 (internet)	82	13	4	100
2008 (internet)	79	19	2	100

⁵⁵⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2002**

A permanent International Criminal Court has been established by the United Nations to try individuals suspected of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Some say the United States should not support the Court because trumped up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation. Others say that the United States should support the court because the world needs a better way to prosecute war criminals, many of whom go unpunished today. Do you think the United States should or should not support the permanent international criminal court?

	Should support	Should not support	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002	65	28	7	100

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Trial of suspected terrorists in the International Criminal Court

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
1998	84	10	6	100
2002 (telephone)	83	14	3	100
2002 (internet)	82	15	2	100
2004 (internet)	82	13	4	100
2008 (internet)	79	19	2	100

⁵⁶⁰ **Greenberg Quinlan Rosner poll, 2006**

Now, the International Criminal Court is an independent, permanent court in Europe. It puts people accused of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes on trial. The International Criminal Court is supported by many countries, but not the United States government. Some people believe that the United States should help the International Criminal Court by sharing intelligence about genocide that would build its case against the government of Sudan's leaders, who are accused of planning and implementing the genocide. Others believe that the United States should not help the International Criminal Court because there is some chance that, in the future, its prosecutors might try to prosecute the United States military personnel for their actions in Iraq or in other military missions around the world. Which comes closer to your view?

United States should help the International Criminal Court	53%
United States should not help the International Criminal Court	38
Both (Vol.)	< .5
Neither (Vol.)	1
Don't know/Refused	8

⁵⁶¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations.

International Criminal Court

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	DK/ NR	Total
2008 (internet)	52	50	17	15	36	4	21	6	100

⁵⁶² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Some people say that the world is facing some new problems that require some new international institutions or agencies to deal with them. Do you think that there should or should not be new international institutions to:

	Should be	Should not be	Not sure/ Decline	Total
52/1. Monitor whether countries are meeting their treaty obligations to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions that contribute to climate change	68	30	2	100
52/2. Monitor financial markets worldwide and report on potential crises	59	38	2	100
52/3. Monitor the worldwide energy market and predict potential shortages	69	30	2	100
52/4. Provide information and assistance to countries dealing with problems resulting from large scale migration of people across borders	57	42	1	100

⁵⁶³ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

Some people say that NATO is still essential to our country's security. Others say it is no longer essential. Which of these views is closer to your own?

	Still essential	No longer essential	DK/R
European average	57	30	10
United States	59	32	9
France	62	34	4
Germany	62	36	2
United Kingdom	68	25	7
Italy	55	41	4
Netherlands	70	26	4
Poland	51	32	18
Portugal	60	30	10
Spain	60	35	5
Slovakia	47	27	26
Turkey	38	32	31
Bulgaria	54	25	21
Romania	57	19	24

⁵⁶⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002**

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

NATO

	Yes, needs to be strengthened	No, does not need to be strengthened	Don't know/other
Great Britain	66	28	6
France	62	33	5
Germany	62	34	4
The Netherlands	62	36	3
Italy	61	34	5
Poland	68	19	12
European Average	63	31	6
United States	61	29	10

565 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

Overall, do you think the [NATIONALITY] government is spending too much, too little, or about the right amount in support of the NATO alliance?

	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/R
United States	32	17	35	16
Turkey	23	11	31	35

566 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

NATO allows democratic countries to act together.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European average	24	47	14	7	8
United States	30	43	10	6	11
France	20	54	15	7	4
Germany	24	54	15	5	4
United Kingdom	33	45	9	5	9
Italy	15	49	20	11	6
Netherlands	35	50	8	4	3
Poland	18	47	13	3	19
Portugal	40	35	9	3	13
Spain	24	51	10	6	9
Slovakia	20	44	14	11	10
Turkey	27	30	16	13	14

567 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

[EUROPE] NATO enables European countries to influence the United States when it is considering military action
 [United States] NATO can help the United States share its military burden

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European average	16	34	25	16	9
United States	34	41	10	8	8
France	16	35	26	20	4
Germany	18	35	29	15	3
United Kingdom	23	36	17	14	9
Italy	10	31	30	23	6
Netherlands	24	42	21	11	3
Poland	10	38	24	9	19
Portugal	24	30	18	15	13
Spain	13	30	29	17	11
Slovakia	14	35	20	17	14
Turkey	21	27	19	15	17

568 Los Angeles Times Poll, June 2004

Should the United States give NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) the principal role in the security of Iraq, or not?

Yes	56%
No	31
Don't know	13

569 Democracy Corps Poll, May 2009

(Now, I'd like to rate your feelings toward some people and organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward that person or organization. If you have no opinion or never heard of that person or organization, please say so.)...NATO, which is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization...Give NATO, which is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization a rating, with 100 meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. (If "Don't know," ask:) Would you say you are unable to give an opinion of NATO, which is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or have you never heard of NATO, which is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Warm 51-100	36%
Cool 0-49	22
Not particularly warm or cold 50	21
Never heard of/Don't know/Refused	21

Chicago Council on Global Affairs June 2008

Please rate your feelings toward some international organizations, with one hundred meaning a very warm, favorable feeling, zero meaning a very cold, unfavorable feeling, and fifty meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from zero to one hundred, the higher the number the more favorable your feelings are toward those organizations.

NATO

	Mean	Median	100-76 degrees	75-51 degrees	50 degrees	49-31 degrees	30-0 degrees	Not familiar/ Decline	Total
2008 (internet)	57°	50°	22	25	29	5	14	6	100

570 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them.

[EUROPE] NATO is dominated by the United States, Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States.
 [United States] The United States is stretched too thin, Europe should have its own defense alliance separate from the United States

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/R
European average	30	36	18	9	7
United States	34	32	16	11	7
France	32	29	20	5	3
Germany	32	34	23	9	2
United Kingdom	32	31	18	12	7
Italy	29	45	16	7	4
Netherlands	30	39	18	10	3
Poland	26	34	19	6	16
Portugal	36	27	16	10	12
Spain	29	39	17	7	9
Slovakia	32	32	15	8	13
Turkey	29	27	14	13	17

571 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To defend a NATO ally that has been attacked

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/NR
European Average	75	19	6
France	79	16	5
Germany	74	22	4
United Kingdom	85	10	5
Italy	67	27	5
Netherlands	86	11	3
Poland	73	19	8
Portugal	70	13	17
Spain	69	23	9
Slovakia	50	28	22
Turkey	60	27	13
United States	87	9	4

⁵⁷² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent do you tend to agree or disagree that all NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action? [If respondent asks: "NATO is the Alliance among the United States, Canada, and many European states".]

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NR	Agree	Disagree
European Average	24	33	20	16	8	57	35
France	19	43	21	15	2	62	36
Germany	22	33	27	15	2	56	43
United Kingdom	50	32	9	6	3	82	15
Italy	17	34	26	22	2	51	48
Netherlands	53	28	8	8	2	82	16
Poland	19	38	21	10	12	57	31
Portugal	31	38	12	14	6	68	26
Spain	24	32	19	22	3	56	41
Slovakia	9	28	33	15	14	37	49
Turkey	11	18	14	23	35	28	37
Belgium	17	25	24	23	11	42	47
Romania	25	39	19	7	12	63	25
United States	54	28	7	5	6	82	12

⁵⁷³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent do you agree or disagree that all NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/NR	Agree	Disagree
European Average	28	30	18	16	8	58	34
France	24	38	19	17	2	62	36
Germany	32	30	20	16	1	62	36
United Kingdom	56	24	9	8	3	80	17
Italy	18	33	25	22	3	50	47

Netherlands	59	23	8	8	2	82	17
Poland	20	37	22	10	11	57	32
Portugal	29	35	15	15	7	64	29
Spain	28	32	17	20	2	60	37
Slovakia	9	28	32	20	11	37	52
Turkey	9	18	14	23	37	27	36
Belgium	16	25	22	25	13	41	47
Romania	26	42	16	6	11	67	21
United States	60	22	7	6	5	82	13

⁵⁷⁴ **BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA January 2009**

Is your view of the European Union's influence mainly positive or mainly negative?

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative
Canada	73	9
United States	62	19
Chile	64	13
Central America	56	20
Mexico	37	15
Germany	81	5
Spain	76	11
Italy	72	12
France	71	17
United Kingdom	55	28
Russia	31	23
Egypt	39	35
Turkey	34	44
Ghana	70	7
Nigeria	58	26
Australia	65	16
Philippines	65	21
China	57	28
Japan	39	3
Indonesia	37	25
India	36	11
Average	54	20

⁵⁷⁵ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/CFR America's Place In The World Survey, October 2005**

Do you think a stronger European Union is a good thing for the United States, a bad thing for the United States, or doesn't it matter for the United States?

Good thing	47%
Bad thing	12
Doesn't matter	28
Don't know/Refused	13

⁵⁷⁶ **German Marshall Fund 2005**

Do you think a more powerful European Union *would* compete or cooperate with the United States?

Compete	41%
Cooperate	45
Don't know/Refused	6

577 Pew Global Attitudes Project Poll, February 2004

In your opinion, would it be a good thing or a bad thing if the European Union becomes as powerful as the United States?

Good	33%
Bad	50
Don't know/Refused	17

578 Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2007

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with it:

It is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.

	Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	DK/NR
United States	35	42	14	6	3
Canada	26	45	17	10	2
Argentina	17	35	18	22	8
Bolivia	23	39	22	10	5
Brazil	42	42	10	5	1
Chile	24	36	23	12	5
Mexico	20	52	20	5	3
Peru	26	39	18	9	7
Venezuela	21	51	19	8	0
Britain	19	48	19	9	5
France	26	41	18	15	0
Germany	11	30	29	29	1
Italy	25	48	15	7	6
Spain	11	54	18	9	9
Sweden	37	38	11	10	4
Bulgaria	13	21	26	25	15
Czech Republic	23	39	22	14	1
Poland	16	40	26	11	7
Russia	21	40	21	10	8
Slovakia	16	31	28	23	2
Ukraine	16	36	27	17	6
Turkey	36	38	13	6	6
Egypt	14	26	30	29	2
Jordan	12	25	29	29	5
Kuwait	58	22	6	10	5
Lebanon	21	37	23	15	5
Morocco	24	23	9	12	33
Palestinian Territories	28	31	15	19	7
Israel	39	37	18	4	2
Pakistan	46	26	11	3	14
Bangladesh	57	30	7	4	2
Indonesia	23	51	16	7	3
Malaysia	15	46	20	12	6
China	16	50	22	6	6
India	58	32	7	3	1

Japan	10	50	26	8	6
South Korea	5	38	40	13	4
Ethiopia	24	24	32	18	2
Ghana	26	44	18	11	1
Ivory Coast	44	34	14	8	0
Kenya	41	34	14	10	1
Mali	49	27	17	7	0
Nigeria	40	34	14	9	2
Senegal	36	36	17	9	1
South Africa	31	41	14	8	5
Tanzania	39	22	10	24	4
Uganda	25	29	21	19	6
Average	27	37	19	12	5

⁵⁷⁹ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	73	17	9
United States	83	13	4
France	85	14	1
Russia	64	20	17
Ukraine	69	11	21
Azerbaijan	79	10	11
Egypt	83	17	0
Iran	69	20	12
Israel	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	78	20	2
Turkey	64	16	20
Kenya	90	10	1
Nigeria	88	10	2
China	72	18	9
India	63	28	9
Indonesia	83	7	10
South Korea	74	25	1
Thailand	62	23	15
Average	76	16	8

⁵⁸⁰ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	Should	Should not	DK/ NR
Mexico	65	21	13
United States	83	14	4
France	84	13	3
Russia	70	14	17
Azerbaijan	82	11	7
Egypt	78	22	0
Israel	77	17	6
Palestinian Territories	81	17	2

Turkey	68	15	18
Kenya	88	11	1
Nigeria	89	10	1
China	70	18	11
India	66	22	12
Indonesia	71	15	14
South Korea	76	23	1
Thailand	67	14	19
Average	76	16	8

⁵⁸¹ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10
Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian Territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13
South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

⁵⁸² Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	54	30	15
U.S.	57	38	5
France	52	45	3
Russia	35	37	28
Azerbaijan	43	38	19
Egypt	64	36	0
Israel	58	34	7
Palestinian Territories	67	30	3
Turkey	43	32	26
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	76	22	3
China	37	45	18
India	51	34	16
Indonesia	51	28	21

South Korea	32	65	2
Thailand	46	29	25
Average	53	35	12

⁵⁸³ **Harris Poll, October 1999**

Do you agree or disagree with the following?

The old idea of national sovereignty which did not allow foreign interference in the domestic affairs of any country, even if it killed many of its own people, is no longer acceptable and must change.

68%	Agree
22	Disagree
10	Don't know/Refused

⁵⁸⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	Has this responsibility	Does not have this responsibility	DK/NR
Argentina	48	27	25
United States	74	22	4
Armenia	66	19	16
France	54	39	7
Great Britain	70	22	8
Poland	54	15	31
Russia	48	31	21
Ukraine	40	16	44
Azerbaijan	42	23	35
Egypt	80	20	0
Iran	59	25	16
Israel	64	28	8
Palestinian Territories	69	27	4
Turkey	39	20	40
Kenya	89	8	3
Nigeria	78	18	5
China	76	13	11
India	51	25	25
Indonesia	82	5	14
Thailand	44	22	33
Average	61	21	18

⁵⁸⁵ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	Does have responsibility	Does not have responsibility	Not sure/Decline	Total
2006 (internet)	72	22	4	100
2008 (internet)	67	30	4	100

⁵⁸⁶ **Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life Survey, July 2005**

Do you agree or disagree that the U.S. (United States) and other Western powers have a moral obligation to use military force if necessary, to prevent one group of people from committing genocide against another?

69%	Agree
21	Disagree
10	Don't know/Refused

⁵⁸⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NR
Argentina	48	30	22
Peru	77	19	4
U.S.	72	24	5
Armenia	75	15	10
France	74	25	1
Great Britain	79	17	4
Poland	63	11	26
Russia	58	22	20
Ukraine	54	19	28
Azerbaijan	64	21	14
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	62	13	25
Israel	64	31	6
Turkey	51	24	25
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	84	15	1
China	62	25	13
India	58	30	12
Indonesia	74	14	12
Philippines	46	44	9
South Korea	68	30	1
Thailand	73	12	15
Average	66	23	12

⁵⁸⁸ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? International peacekeeping

	National governments	Regional orgs	UN	National governments, with UN coordination	Nonprofit/ Nongov't orgs	Commercial enterprise	DK	No answer	NA
Italy	22	12	58	0	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	0	12	0	6

United States	28	16	50	0	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	0	7	0
Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	12	53	0	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	26	8	64	0	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	47	6	34	0	0	0	9	2	0
Ethiopia	41	10	40	0	0	0	5	3	2
Mali	46	5	38	0	0	0	6	3	1

Rwanda	50	41	8	0	0	0	1	0	1
Zambia	29	19	47	0	0	0	4	1	0
Germany	20	20	54	0	0	0	6	1	0
Average	34	11	45	1	0	0	7	2	0

⁵⁸⁹ **Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll, January 2006**

Would you say that the U.S. (United States) support of the U.N. (United Nations) Peacekeeping effort is...important and worthwhile, a waste of resources?

69%	Important and worthwhile
24	A waste of resources
1	Other (Vol.)
6	Don't know

⁵⁹⁰ **Kaiser Family Foundation March 2004**

(I am going to read you several things the United States helps fund with other countries around the world. For each, please tell me whether you think the U.S. government currently spends too much, not enough, or about the right amount on that particular international effort.) What about...peacekeeping?

32%	Too much
25	Not enough
35	About the right amount
8	Don't know/Refused

⁵⁹¹ **NBC News, Wall Street Journal/Hart And Teeter Research Companies 2003**

Based on its role in the recent Iraq conflict, do you think that the United Nations can effectively function as an international peacekeeping force, or not?

Yes, can effectively function	50%
No, cannot effectively function	42
No answer	8

⁵⁹² **International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999**

Is the [international force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	Better	Worse	No Difference	DK/ NR
Georgia	9	9	52	8
Abkhazia	2	2	15	2
Cambodia	2	2	9	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	13	13	40	7
Lebanon	8	8	44	8
Somalia	27	27	10	17
Average	51	14	27	7

⁵⁹³ **International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999**

Is the [peacekeeping force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	Better	Worse	No Difference	DK/ NR
Total Security Council	54	8	29	8

Great Britain	58	4	31	7
United States	52	15	28	5
France	52	9	27	12
Russia	54	4	31	11
Total War Torn	51	14	27	7
Georgia	31	9	52	8
Abkhazia	81	2	15	2
Cambodia	88	2	9	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	41	13	40	7
Lebanon	41	8	44	8
Somalia	46	27	10	17

⁵⁹⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004**

In general, when South Korea/the United States is asked to be part of a United Nations international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world, do you think we should take part, or should we leave this job to other countries? (South Korea, United States)

And now, please tell me, if the United Nations asks member countries to participate in a military or police peacekeeping force being sent to some part of the world, what do you think Mexico should do, participate in the peacekeeping force or leave this type of activity to other countries? (Mexico)

	Should take part	Should not take part	DK/NR
South Korea	83	17	n/a
United States	78	19	3
Mexico	48	36	6

⁵⁹⁵ **Program on International Policy Attitudes, July 2000**

As a general rule, when it becomes necessary for the United States to use military force, do you think it is best for the United States to:

49%	Act as part of a United Nations operation
26	Act as part of a NATO operation
17	Act on its own
8	Don't Know/Refused

⁵⁹⁶ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/NR
European Average	77	17	6
United States	66	29	5
France	84	14	2
Germany	84	15	2
Great Britain	81	16	3
Italy	77	21	2
Netherlands	88	11	1
Poland	61	31	8
Portugal	76	12	12
Spain	85	13	3
Slovakia	58	26	16

Turkey	77	14	8
---------------	----	----	---

⁵⁹⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide food and medical assistance to victims of war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	89	8	3
United States	81	16	3
France	92	7	1
Germany	94	5	1
Great Britain	83	5	3
Italy	85	14	1
Netherlands	98	2	1
Poland	86	12	3
Portugal	85	7	8
Spain	95	5	1
Slovakia	84	11	5
Turkey	87	9	4

⁵⁹⁸ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To stop the fighting in a civil war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	62	31	7
United States	38	49	13
France	68	27	5
Germany	41	54	5
Great Britain	57	35	8
Italy	56	38	5
Netherlands	56	40	4
Poland	45	47	8
Portugal	63	25	12
Spain	70	23	7
Slovakia	83	11	6
Turkey	81	14	5

⁵⁹⁹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To remove a government that abuses human rights

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	53	39	8
United States	57	36	7
France	53	43	4
Germany	36	60	4

Great Britain	59	33	8
Italy	54	41	5
Netherlands	53	43	4
Poland	48	41	11
Portugal	63	24	13
Spain	55	38	7
Slovakia	40	43	17
Turkey	64	25	11

⁶⁰⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	77	19	4	100
2004 (internet)	75	22	4	100
2006 (internet)	71	24	5	100
2008 (internet)	69			100

⁶⁰¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?

To maintain peace and order in post-conflict Balkans

	Approve	Disapprove	(Don't know about topic)	NR
European Average	65	29	4	2
United States	54	38	5	4
France	70	24	2	4
Germany	60	38	1	1
Great Britain	66	27	2	5
Italy	73	25	1	1
Netherlands	74	24	1	1
Poland	58	33	7	2
Portugal	77	18	3	2
Spain	76	23	0	1
Slovakia	62	31	4	3
Turkey	53	33	14	0
Bulgaria	55	39	3	3
Romania	58	30	8	4

⁶⁰² **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?

To monitor and support a ceasefire in Southern Lebanon

	Approve	Disapprove	(I don't know anything about this topic)	DK/ NR
European Average	58	36	5	2
United States	55	39	2	4
France	73	23	1	2
Germany	45	52	1	1

Great Britain	65	30	2	4
Italy	66	32	1	1
Netherlands	70	28	1	1
Poland	47	39	10	5
Portugal	63	32	3	2
Spain	69	30	1	1
Slovakia	45	38	10	7
Turkey	46	38	16	1
Bulgaria	35	40	18	7
Romania	47	37	12	5

⁶⁰³ **CNN Poll, August 2006**

Now here are a few questions about the conflict in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab group known as Hezbollah which is based in Lebanon. Would you favor or oppose the presence of United States (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force on the border between Israel and Lebanon?

51% Favor
 45 Oppose
 4 No opinion

⁶⁰⁴ **CBS News/New York Times Poll, July 2006**

In order to try and end the fighting between Israel and the Hezbollah militants in Lebanon, would you favor or oppose the United Nations sending in a peacekeeping force? (If Yes, ask:) Would you favor or oppose the United States sending ground troops as part of the United Nations peacekeeping force?

32% Favor UN troops and U.S. troops
 28 Favor UN, oppose U.S.
 32 Oppose UN troops
 8 Don't know/No answer

⁶⁰⁵ **Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll, March 2004**

As you may know, the United States recently sent peacekeeping troops to Haiti. Do you think it was necessary for the United States to send peacekeeping troops to Haiti or not?

52% Yes, necessary
 28 No, not necessary
 5 Depends (vol.)
 15 Not sure

⁶⁰⁶ **Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll, August 2003**

Would you favor or oppose the presence of U.S. (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force in Liberia?

61% Favor
 33 Oppose
 6 No opinion

⁶⁰⁷ **NBC News, Wall Street Journal 2003**

The West African nation of Liberia, which was founded by former U.S. (United States) slaves, has recently experienced growing poverty and civil war. The United Nations wants to negotiate a cease-fire in this war and send armed peacekeepers to enforce it. Would you approve or disapprove of sending a thousand American soldiers to Liberia as part of a UN peacekeeping force?

Would approve of sending American soldiers	58%
Would disapprove of sending American soldiers	35
Depends (vol.)	3
Not sure	

⁶⁰⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To be part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	65	30	5	100
2004 (internet)	52	43	5	100
2006 (internet)	51	44	6	100
2008 (internet)	52	47	2	100

⁶⁰⁹ **PIPA 2006**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

As part of an international force to help keep the peace between India and Pakistan

2004

Favor	51%
Oppose	44
Not sure/ Decline	5

2006

Favor	40%
Oppose	54
Note sure/Decline	6

⁶¹⁰ **CBS/New York Times, January 2002**

Do you approve or disapprove of the military attacks led by the United States against targets in Afghanistan?

87 %	Approve
9	Disapprove
4	Don't know

⁶¹¹ **NBC News, November 2001**

Do you think that the duration of a campaign against terrorism will be short—that is, it will last for a few months—medium, meaning that it will last one or two years, or do you think that a campaign will be long and will last for several years or longer?

7 %	Short
27	Medium
62	Long
4	Not sure

⁶¹² **Gallup/USA Today Poll, March 2009**

Thinking now about the U.S. (United States) military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?

Yes No No opinion

November 2001	9	89	2
September 2009	37	61	2

⁶¹³ **CBS/News York Times, September 2009**

What is your impression of how the war in Afghanistan is going for the United States right now—very well, somewhat well, somewhat badly, or very badly?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Somewhat badly	Very badly	Don't know/No Answer
October 2001	25	58	11	2	4
November 2001	41	48	5	2	4
December 2001	51	42	4	1	2
January 2002	43	49	4	2	2
May 2002	18	55	17	3	7
June 2002	14	51	21	8	5
July 2002	13	54	21	7	5
September 2002	14	58	16	3	9
March 2003	30	46	11	3	1
August 2008	3	25	40	18	14
September 2008	2	29	32	23	14
December 2008	2	25	44	18	11
March 2009	3	30	36	21	10
April 2009	3	33	37	15	12
June 2009	2	28	40	15	15
July 2009	3	34	40	15	9
August 2009	2	35	34	18	11
September 2009	3	32	38	15	12

Gallup/USA Today Poll, September 2006

In general, how would you say things are going for the United States in Afghanistan—very well, moderately well, moderately badly, or very badly?

6 %	Very well
43	Moderately well
30	Moderately badly
16	Very badly
4	Don't know

⁶¹⁴ **Associated Press/Gfk, October 2009**

And please tell me if you approve, disapprove, or neither approve nor disapprove of the way Barack Obama is handling each of the following issues. How about...the situation in Afghanistan? (If Approve/Disapprove, ask:) Strongly or somewhat?

	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Neither approve nor disapprove (vol.)	Somewhat disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Don't know
April 2009	27	33	12	14	12	2
October 2009	16	29	14	15	26	*

⁶¹⁵ **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, April 2009**

Do you think other countries that are allies of the United States are doing enough or not doing enough to help the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan?

20 %	Yes, doing enough
------	-------------------

78 No, not doing enough
 2 No opinion

⁶¹⁶ **NBC News/Wall Street Journal, September 2009**

Do you think that we should have an immediate and orderly withdrawal of all troops from Afghanistan, or not?

38 % Yes, should
 55 No, should not
 7 Not sure

⁶¹⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009**

Do you think the NATO mission in Afghanistan should be continued or do you think it should be ended now?

66 % NATO mission should be continued
 30 NATO mission should be ended now
 4 Don't know/No response

⁶¹⁸ **CBS News, October 2009**

From what you have seen or heard about the situation in Afghanistan, what should the United States do now? Should the United States increase the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, keep the same number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan as there are now, or decrease the number of troops in Afghanistan?

37 % Increase
 17 Keep the same
 38 Decrease
 8 Unsure

⁶¹⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009**

As you may know, the Obama administration decided to increase the number of American troops in Afghanistan. Do you approve or disapprove of this decision?

67 % Approve
 31 Disapprove
 2 Don't know/No response

⁶²⁰ **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, April 2009**

Regardless of how you feel about the war in Afghanistan in general, do you favor or oppose President (Barack) Obama's plan to send about 20 thousand more U.S. troops to Afghanistan in an attempt to stabilize the situation there?

68 % Favor
 31 Oppose
 * No opinion

⁶²¹ **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, April 2009**

If Barack Obama announced a plan to send even more U.S. troops (than the 20 thousand) to Afghanistan, would you favor or oppose that plan?

45 % Favor
 52 Oppose
 2 No opinion

⁶²² **NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll, September 2009**

Would you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose increasing troop levels in Afghanistan?

- 19 % Strongly support
- 25 Somewhat support
- 20 Somewhat oppose
- 31 Strongly oppose
- 5 Not sure

⁶²³ **ABC/Washington Post, October 2009**

U.S. military commanders have requested approximately 40,000 more U.S. troops for Afghanistan. Do you think Obama should or should not order these additional forces to Afghanistan? Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?

- 33 % Should, strongly
- 14 Should, somewhat
- 10 Should not, somewhat
- 38 Should not, strongly
- 4 DK/R

⁶²⁴ **USA Today/Gallup, October 2009**

Do you think each of these is, or is not, an important reason to keep U.S. troops in Afghanistan? How about....to weaken terrorists' ability to stage attacks against the United States?

- 80 % Is important
- 15 Is not important
- 5 DK/R

From what you know or have read, do you think the United States' military action in Afghanistan is or is not making progress toward achieving each of the following goals. How about... to weaken terrorists' ability to stage attacks against the United States?

- 55 % Is making progress
- 37 Is not making progress
- 8 DK/R

⁶²⁵ **USA Today/Gallup, October 2009**

Do you think each of these is, or is not, an important reason to keep U.S. troops in Afghanistan? How about....to keep the Taliban from taking control of Afghanistan?

- 69 % Is important
- 24 Is not important
- 8 DK/R

From what you know or have read, do you think the United States' military action in Afghanistan is or is not making progress toward achieving each of the following goals. How about... to keep the Taliban from taking control of Afghanistan?

- 51 % Is making progress
- 40 Is not making progress
- 9 DK/R

⁶²⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 2009**

If the Taliban were to regain power in Afghanistan do you think this would be very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

0 %	Very good
4	Somewhat good
17	Somewhat bad
77	Very bad
2	Don't know/No Response

⁶²⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that in regard to the violence that is occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan the UN Security Council:

	Does not have the right to authorize intervention	Has the right, but not a responsibility, to authorize intervention	Has a responsibility to authorize intervention	DK/ NR
Argentina	19	15	22	43
United States	11	35	48	7
Armenia	9	15	29	46
France	8	29	55	8
Great Britain	8	24	57	11
Poland	8	23	23	47
Ukraine	16	22	10	52
Egypt	32	21	47	0
Israel	7	31	46	16
Kenya	25	37	35	4
Nigeria	17	34	45	4
China	12	38	20	30
India	20	30	29	21
Thailand	12	17	17	54
Average	15	27	35	25

⁶²⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Would you favor or oppose the use of [country] troops to participate in an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/ NR
United States	65	28	7
Armenia	27	45	28
France	84	3	14
Great Britain	71	18	11
Poland	28	42	31
Ukraine	13	56	32
Egypt	78	23	0
Israel	39	52	9
Kenya	84	16	1
Nigeria	81	16	3
Thailand	35	37	28
Average	55	30	15

⁶²⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To be a part of an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2006 (internet)	65	28	7	100
2008 (internet)	62	35	4	100

⁶³⁰ **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, October 2007**

Now thinking about the situation in Darfur, a region in the African country of Sudan...do you favor or oppose the presence of U.S. (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force in Darfur?

61%	Favor
32	Oppose
7	Don't know/Undecided/Refused

⁶³¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?
To provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan.

	Approve	Disapprove	(I don't know anything about this topic)	DK/ NR
European Average	76	18	5	1
United States	75	21	2	2
France	88	10	1	2
Germany	73	25	1	1
Great Britain	80	16	1	3
Italy	86	13	1	0
Netherlands	82	17	1	1
Poland	71	17	11	1
Portugal	84	12	3	1
Spain	90	9	0	1
Slovakia	62	24	8	5
Turkey	58	26	16	0
Bulgaria	44	28	20	8
Romania	57	24	15	5

⁶³² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

If North Korea were to attack South Korea, would you favor or oppose the U.S. contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN sponsored effort to reverse the aggression?

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2002 (telephone)	57	35	8	100
2004 (internet)	64	31	5	100
2006 (internet)	65	30	5	100

Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

If North Korea invaded South Korea

Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
--------------	---------------	--------------------------	--------------

1990	26	61	13	100
1994	39	48	13	100
1998	30	58	12	100
2002 (telephone)	36	56	8	100
2004 (internet)	43	51	6	100
2006 (internet)	45	49	6	100

⁶³³ **CCFR/German Marshall Fund/Harris Interactive 2002**

If Iraq were to invade Saudi Arabia, would you favor or oppose the U.S. (United States) contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN (United Nations) sponsored effort to reverse the aggression?

Favor 77%
 Oppose 18
 Not sure/Decline 5

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. I'd like to ask your opinion about some situations. First, would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops

If Iraq invaded Saudi Arabia

	Favor	Oppose	Note Sure/NR	Total
1990	61	30	10	100
1994	52	38	10	100
1998	46	43	11	100
2002	48	46	6	100

⁶³⁴ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

If China invaded Taiwan

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
1998	27	58	15	100
2002 (telephone)	32	58	10	100
2004 (internet)	33	61	7	100
2006 (internet)	32	61	6	100

If Arab forces invaded Israel

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
1990	45	44	12	100
1994	42	42	16	100
1998	38	49	13	100
2002	48	45	7	100
2004	43	52	5	100

If Iran attacked Israel

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2006 (internet)	53	42	5	100

635 Program on International Policy Attitudes 1995

Now I am going to read to you a series of arguments that have been made about the U.S. (United States) military and U.N. (United Nations) peace operations. For each one, please tell me if you agree or disagree with the statement. When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is generally best for the U.S. to address the problem together with other nations working through the U.N. rather than going it alone.

Agree	89%
Disagree	8
Don't know/Refused	3

When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is better for the U.S. to act on its own, rather than working through the U.N. because they can move more quickly and probably more successfully.

Agree	29%
Disagree	66
Don't know/Refused	5

636 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent do you tend to agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decided to take military action?

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ NR
European Average	57	34	9
United States	82	12	6
France	62	36	2
Germany	56	43	2
Great Britain	82	15	3
Italy	51	48	2
Netherlands	82	16	2
Poland	57	21	12
Portugal	68	26	6
Spain	56	41	3
Slovakia	37	49	14
Turkey	28	37	35
Bulgaria	42	47	11
Romania	63	25	12

637 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

To what extent to you agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops?

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ NR
European Average	58	34	8
United States	82	13	5
France	62	36	2
Germany	62	36	1
Great Britain	80	17	3
Italy	50	47	3
Netherlands	82	17	2
Poland	57	32	11

Portugal	64	29	7
Spain	60	37	2
Slovakia	37	52	11
Turkey	27	36	37
Bulgaria	41	47	13
Romania	67	21	11

⁶³⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project, Spring 2007**

Now I'm going to read you a list of things that may be problems in our country. As I read each one, please tell me if you think it is a very big problem, a moderately big problem, a small problem or not a problem at all:

Terrorism

	Very big problem	Moderately big problem	Small problem	Not a problem at all	DK/Refused
United States	44	38	15	3	1
Canada	24	32	31	12	2
Argentina	42	24	15	14	6
Bolivia	42	29	16	10	2
Brazil	44	28	15	12	1
Chile	46	19	17	16	2
Mexico	50	26	15	7	2
Peru	70	21	7	1	1
Venezuela	41	34	16	8	0
United Kingdom	30	41	23	4	2
France	54	29	15	1	0
Germany	31	43	18	7	1
Italy	73	20	6	1	0
Spain	66	26	5	1	1
Sweden	3	10	48	34	4
Bulgaria	24	18	31	21	7
Czech Republic	16	26	40	16	2
Poland	35	30	22	10	3
Russia	48	36	13	2	1
Slovakia	17	17	42	23	2
Ukraine	23	22	26	26	3
Turkey	72	17	6	2	3
Egypt	53	30	13	3	1
Jordan	42	23	17	18	0
Kuwait	37	12	14	32	5
Lebanon	76	17	5	1	0
Morocco	81	10	2	1	5
Palestinian Territories	51	20	8	15	6
Israel	70	21	7	2	1
Pakistan	76	18	3	1	2
Bangladesh	77	16	5	1	2
Indonesia	48	37	13	1	1
Malaysia	10	18	32	32	8
China	11	26	36	19	8
India	72	22	5	1	1
Japan	59	29	9	2	1
South Korea	12	34	36	13	5
Ethiopia	23	23	33	19	1

Ghana	20	21	31	26	3
Ivory Coast	57	19	14	10	0
Kenya	24	26	33	15	2
Mali	15	11	20	51	2
Nigeria	40	18	22	20	1
Senegal	22	12	14	49	2
South Africa	20	21	26	27	6
Tanzania	19	11	18	44	8
Uganda	34	15	19	21	12
Average	41	23	19	14	3

⁶³⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of the United States in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

International terrorism

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1994	69	25	3	3
1998	84	13	1	2
2002 (telephone)	91	7	2	—
2004 (telephone)	81	16	1	2
2004 (internet)	75	22	1	2
2006 (internet)	74	23	2	1
2008 (internet)	70	26	3	1

⁶⁴⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Combating international terrorism

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1998	79	17	2	2
2002 (telephone)	91	7	1	1
2002 (internet)	83	15	2	1
2004 (internet)	71	25	2	2
2006 (internet)	72	25	2	1
2008 (internet)	67	29	4	1

⁶⁴¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006–2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	71	20	9
United States	76	20	3
France	84	16	1
Russia	65	18	17
Azerbaijan	80	10	10

Egypt	81	19	0
Israel	85	12	3
Palestinian Territories	61	36	3
Turkey	69	13	17
Kenya	76	22	2
Nigeria	87	11	2
China	67	23	10
India	60	28	11
Indonesia	81	7	13
South Korea	61	38	1
Thailand	71	16	13
Average	73	19	7

⁶⁴² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004**

In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures.

Working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members enforce them

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/Decline
July 2004	87	9	4
June 2002	88	10	2

⁶⁴³ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures.

Working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members enforce them

84%	Favor
15	Oppose
1	Not sure/Decline

U.S. air strikes against terrorist training camps and other facilities

79%	Favor
19	Oppose
2	Not sure/Decline

Trial of suspected terrorists in the International Criminal Court

79%	Favor
19	Oppose
2	Not sure/Decline

Attacks by U.S. ground troops against terrorist training camps and other facilities

72%	Favor
26	Oppose
2	Not sure/Decline

Helping poor countries develop their economies

69%	Favor
30	Oppose

2 Not sure/Decline

Assassination of individual terrorist leaders

68% Favor
 29 Oppose
 2 Not sure/Decline

Making a major effort to be even-handed in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

67% Favor
 31 Oppose
 3 Not sure/Decline

Using torture to extract information from suspected terrorists

36% Favor
 61 Oppose
 3 Not sure/Decline

⁶⁴⁴ **Program on International Policy Attitudes/Knowledge Networks, September 2003**

Here is a list of some approaches that have been proposed for the U.S. government to try. For each one, please indicate how high a priority the U.S. government should give to each of these approaches. Please answer on a scale of +5 to -5, with +5 meaning that you think that trying this approach should be given a very high priority, -5 meaning that you think this approach should definitely not be tried, and 0 meaning that you think that it should just continue to be considered.

Setting up a UN database of terrorists to which all countries would contribute

7% Low priority (-5 to -1)
 13 Continue to be considered (0)
 76 High priority (+1 to +5)

Mean 2.66

⁶⁴⁵ **Associated Press September 2001**

Do you think the United Nations should or should not play a major role in pulling countries together to fight against terrorism?

90% Should
 7 Should not
 3 DK/R

Program on International Policy Attitudes, November 2001

(I would now like you to consider a list of possible approaches for trying to reduce the problem of terrorism. For each one I would like to know if you favor or oppose this approach...) What about working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and to make sure UN members cooperate in enforcing them?

71% Strongly favor
 19 Somewhat favor
 2 Somewhat oppose
 5 Strongly oppose
 4 Don't know/Refused

⁶⁴⁶ **Program on International Policy Attitudes, November 2001**

In the event that the UN has evidence that there is an international terrorist group operating in a country, there are a number of things that the UN Security Council might consider doing. I'm going to read some of these options, and for each one I would like to know if you think this is the kind of thing the UN Security Council should be ABLE to do, or if you think this would make it too powerful.

What about requiring the country to allow a UN-sponsored police force to enter the country and conduct investigations?

- 70% Should be able
- 25 Too powerful
- 5 Don't know/Refused

What about requiring the country to freeze the assets of the suspected terrorist group?

- 86% Should be able
- 12 Too powerful
- 3 Don't know/Refused

What about requiring the country to provide intelligence on the suspected terrorist group?

- 88% Should be able
- 7 Too powerful
- 5 Don't know/Refused

What about requiring the country to arrest the suspected terrorist group?

- 87% Should be able
- 10 Too powerful
- 3 Don't know/Refused

What about sending in an international military force to capture the suspected terrorist group, if the country refuses to do so?

- 82% Should be able
- 13 Too powerful
- 5 Don't know/Refused

⁶⁴⁷ **Harris, November 2001**

In order to prepare for a possible future international terrorist attack do you think that the United Nations should be given broader powers that would force member countries to work together to fight terrorism?

- 71% Yes
- 24 No
- 5 Not sure/refused

⁶⁴⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004**

In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures.

Trial of suspected terrorists in an International Criminal Court

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/Decline
June 2008	79	19	2
July 2004	82	13	4
June 2002	83	14	3
1998	84	10	6

⁶⁴⁹ **NBC News/Wall Street Journal September 2001**

I'd like to read you several possible responses by the United States to these attacks. For each one, please tell me whether you would strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose that response by the United States. . . . Build a case against the people who are specifically responsible and seek justice in the world court

- 62% Strongly favor
- 13 Somewhat favor

- 7 Somewhat oppose
- 15 Strongly oppose
- 3 Not sure

⁶⁵⁰ **Program on International Policy Attitudes November 2001**

If Osama Bin Laden were captured, we would need to decide whether he would be tried in a federal court in New York or in an International Criminal Tribunal. Some say it would be better to have Bin Laden tried in an International Criminal Tribunal because it would be more likely that the world would view the trial as impartial and less likely to lead to further terrorist attacks against the United States. Others say it would be better to have Bin Laden tried in New York because the crime took place in America and we can be more confident that justice will be done. Do you think it would be better to have bin Laden tried in an International Criminal Tribunal or in New York?

- 49% International Criminal Tribunal
- 44 New York
- 7 Don't know/Refused

⁶⁵¹ **GlobeScan, January 2008**

How effectively do you think Europe and North America are working together in the following area?

Fighting global terrorism

	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Refused	DK/NA
United Kingdom	39	15	43	3	-
United States	38	19	42	2	-
Canada	36	16	44	-	4
France	45	18	25	-	12
Germany	26	24	44	5	1
Spain	28	17	52	3	-
Ireland	40	17	41	1	1
Turkey	18	12	58	-	12
Poland	41	17	37	-	5
Average	35	17	43	2	4

⁶⁵² **Gallup Poll May 2004**

In your opinion, would you say that the European Union tends to play a positive role, a negative role, or neither a positive nor a negative role regarding... the war against terrorism?

- 41% Positive role
- 18 Negative role
- 31 Neither positive nor negative
- 10 No opinion

⁶⁵³ **Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll January 2003**

Do you think European countries like France and Germany are--or are not--willing to do their fair share in the war on terrorism?

- 52% Yes, are willing
- 43 No, are not
- 5 No opinion

⁶⁵⁴ **BBC, September 2008**

In the conflict between al Qaeda and the United States do you think al Qaeda is winning, the United States is winning, or neither side is winning?

	Al Qaeda is winning	Neither side is winning	United States is winning	Never heard of al Qaeda/ DK/ NA/ Other
United States	8	56	31	7
Canada	7	70	13	10
Brazil	12	52	10	26
Costa Rica	12	56	18	14
Panama	11	47	16	26
Mexico	8	73	9	10
Italy	11	71	10	8
France	9	73	7	11
Russia	8	33	12	47
Germany	6	38	35	21
United Kingdom	5	75	11	9
United Arab Emirates	16	29	16	39
Lebanon	12	44	26	18
Turkey	11	29	38	22
Egypt	10	40	39	11
Nigeria	17	25	34	24
Kenya	12	33	45	21
Pakistan	21	24	11	44
Indonesia	14	36	18	32
India	10	21	21	48
Australia	8	70	14	8
China	5	45	22	28
Philippines	2	39	39	20
Average	10	47	22	22

⁶⁵⁵ CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, December 2007

Who do you think is currently winning the war on terrorism--the United States and its allies, neither side, or the terrorists?

- 32% The United States and its allies
- 46 Neither side
- 21 Terrorists
- 1 Don't know/Undecided/Refused

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political/Media Update Survey, July 2007

Do you think the United States is winning or losing the war on terrorism?

- 40% Winning
- 39 Losing
- 12 Neither (vol.)
- 9 Don't know/Refused

Gallup Poll June 2007

Who do you think is currently winning the war against terrorism—the United States and its allies, neither side, or the terrorists?

29%	United States and its allies
50	Neither side
20	The terrorists
2	No opinion

⁶⁵⁶ **BBC, September 2008**

Do you think what U.S. leaders refer to as the “war on terror” has made al Qaeda stronger, weaker, or has had no effect either way?

	Made al Qaeda stronger	Had no effect	Made al Qaeda weaker	Never heard of al Qaeda/ DK/ NA
United States	33	26	34	7
Canada	32	38	15	15
Brazil	34	28	9	29
Costa Rica	27	36	22	15
Panama	28	26	21	25
Mexico	48	33	8	11
Italy	43	36	13	8
France	48	33	7	12
Russia	12	31	16	41
Germany	31	24	34	11
United Kingdom	40	36	13	11
United Arab Emirates	27	23	17	33
Lebanon	39	32	18	11
Turkey	31	18	32	19
Egypt	21	31	44	4
Nigeria	22	18	37	23
Kenya	16	15	58	11
Pakistan	24	30	13	33
Indonesia	24	33	12	31
India	16	19	27	38
Australia	41	31	17	11
China	23	29	25	23
Philippines	19	40	21	20
Average	30	29	22	19

⁶⁵⁷ **BBC, January 2006**

Do you think that the war in Iraq has increased, decreased, or had no effect on the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world?

Increased	Decreased	Has had no effect	Other/DK/NA (vol)
-----------	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

Afghanistan	39	29	20	12
Argentina	76	3	11	11
Australia	73	4	19	3
Brazil	56	15	27	3
Canada	69	5	22	5
Chile	47	16	23	14
China	85	5	6	5
Congo	44	16	21	20
Egypt	83	1	6	10
Finland	82	4	11	3
France	67	3	27	4
Germany	80	4	14	2
Ghana	42	30	5	23
Great Britain	77	3	17	3
India	44	18	19	20
Indonesia	72	7	10	11
Iran	77	12	8	3
Iraq	75	12	11	2
Italy	81	1	15	3
Kenya	41	34	10	15
Mexico	10	12	59	19
Nigeria	29	49	6	16
Philippines	61	13	8	18
Poland	76	6	12	5
Russia	58	5	26	12
Saudi Arabia	49	2	9	40
Senegal	61	17	11	11
South Africa	42	18	10	30
South Korea	84	4	12	0
Spain	79	4	12	5
Sri Lanka	31	6	10	53
Tanzania	49	37	7	7
Turkey	64	6	14	17
United States	55	21	21	3
Zimbabwe	44	16	8	32
Average	60	12	15	13

⁶⁵⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2008

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	DK/NS
Argentina	18	76	6
Mexico	24	73	3
United States	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7

Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22
Palestinian Territories	28	66	6
Turkey	51	36	13
Kenya	58	41	2
Nigeria	54	41	5
China	28	66	6
Hong Kong	22	67	12
India	59	28	13
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	51	48	1
Thailand	44	36	19
Average	35	57	8

[Asked only to those who answered “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat...”]

What about cases that have nothing to do with terrorism? Do you think that there should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases or that in general governments should be allowed to use torture to try to get information?

	Clear rules should be maintained	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS on 1 st question
Argentina	76	13	5	6
Mexico	73	17	7	3
United States	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palest Territories	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Kenya	41	44	14	2
Nigeria	41	39	15	5
China	66	10	18	6
Hong Kong	67	9	13	12
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
South Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

⁶⁵⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

As you may know, [country] has signed treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and that require that the International Committee of the Red Cross to have access to them. Do you think that these treaties are:

	Important for making sure governments treat people humanely (percent)	Too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism (percent)	DK/ NS (percent)
United States	73	23	4
Great Britain	64	32	4
Germany	72	22	6
Poland	60	24	16
India	42	26	32
Average	62	25	12

⁶⁶⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

Is it your impression that current U.S. policies for detaining people it has captured and is holding in Guantanamo Bay are or are not legal, according to international treaties on the treatment of detainees?

	Are legal (percent)	Are not legal (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
United States	52	38	9
Great Britain	22	65	14
Germany	8	85	7
Poland	18	50	32
India	28	34	38
Average	26	54	20

⁶⁶¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

Is it your impression that the U.S. government is:

	Currently allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists (percent)	Making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
United States	47	45	8
Great Britain	62	27	12
Germany	76	14	10
Poland	49	24	27
India	33	23	44
Average	53	27	20

⁶⁶² Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll July 2006

Do you think that the U.S. (United States) detainment of suspected terrorists at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba has damaged the United States' image with the rest of the world, or not? (If Has, ask:) Has it damaged it a lot or a little?

- 23% Damaged a lot
- 31 Damaged a little
- 39 Not damaged
- 7 Don't know

⁶⁶³ NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll June 2009

(Let me read you a few decisions President (Barack) Obama has made recently, and for each one please tell me whether you favor or oppose this action.)...Ordering closure of the Guantanamo Bay prison for terror suspects

- 39% Favor

52 Oppose
9 Not sure

⁶⁶⁴ **Gallup/USA Today Poll May 2009**

As you may know, since 2001, the United States has held people from other countries who are suspected of being terrorists in a prison at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. Do you think the United States should--or should not--close this prison and move some of the prisoners to U.S. prisons?

32% Yes, should
65 No, should not
3 No opinion

⁶⁶⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

The possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
United States	69	27	3	1
Armenia	62	21	7	10
Australia	68	25	6	1
China	27	43	17	12
India	54	27	12	7
Israel	72	17	7	4
Mexico	75	17	4	3
South Korea	50	40	9	0
Ukraine	45	31	7	17

⁶⁶⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of the United States in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

The possibility of unfriendly countries becoming nuclear powers

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1994	72	21	3	4
1998	75	18	3	4
2002 (telephone)	85	12	2	1
2004 (telephone)	66	26	5	3
2004 (internet)	64	31	3	2
2006 (internet)	69	27	3	1
2008 (internet)	67	30	3	0

⁶⁶⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that [survey country] might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of [survey country], a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
United States	74	22	2	2

Armenia	58	24	12	6
Australia	82	14	4	0
China	52	33	7	8
India	56	25	9	10
Mexico	65	23	8	3
South Korea	56	38	6	1
Thailand	57	20	7	17

⁶⁶⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1990	84	12	2	2
1994	82	14	2	2
1998	82	14	1	3
2002 (telephone)	90	8	1	1
2002 (internet)	86	12	2	1
2004 (internet)	73	23	2	2
2006 (internet)	74	22	2	2
2008 (internet)	73	25	2	1

Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll March 2008

(How important to our foreign policy should each of the following be? Should this be very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important?)...Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons

75%	Very important
21	Somewhat important
2	Not very important
1	Not at all important
1	Don't know

⁶⁶⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

I would like you to consider a possible international agreement for eliminating all nuclear weapons. All countries with nuclear weapons would be required to eliminate them according to a timetable. All other countries would be required not to develop them. All countries, including [country], would be monitored to make sure they are following the agreement. Would you favor or oppose such an agreement?

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	85	8	2	2	3
Mexico	70	17	7	3	3
United States	39	38	13	7	2
France	58	28	7	5	3
Britain	55	26	9	8	2
Russia	38	31	8	6	16
Ukraine	53	27	5	2	14
Azerbaijan	48	22	8	14	8
Egypt	39	44	7	10	0
Iran	50	18	8	5	19
Israel	42	25	13	12	8

Pakistan	20	26	21	20	13
Palestinian Territories	33	37	14	8	9
Turkey	55	10	5	5	24
Kenya	68	28	2	1	1
Nigeria	55	31	8	4	2
China	60	23	9	5	3
India	31	31	11	9	18
Indonesia	60	21	6	5	9
South Korea	53	33	11	4	1
Thailand	45	22	4	4	25
Average	50	26	9	7	9

⁶⁷⁰ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/CFR America's Place In The World Survey October 2005**

Would you favor or oppose the U.S. (United States) signing a treaty with other nations to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons, including our own?

- 70% Favor
- 24 Oppose
- 6 Don't know/Refused

⁶⁷¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	70	21	10
United States	62	33	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	55	27	19
Ukraine	51	22	26
Azerbaijan	59	26	16
Egypt	74	26	0
Israel	62	33	5
Palestinian Territories	38	59	3
Turkey	58	23	19
Kenya	84	15	1
Nigeria	81	17	2
China	47	40	14
India	53	34	13
Indonesia	68	19	14
South Korea	43	55	1
Thailand	52	31	18
Average	59	31	10

⁶⁷² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?
The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

- Should participate
- Should not participate
- Not sure/ Decline

2002 (telephone)	81	14	5
2002 (internet)	84	13	3
2004 (internet)	87	9	3
2006 (internet)	86	10	4
2008 (internet)	88	11	1

⁶⁷³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

In the past, the international community has agreed that all countries have the right to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes. Now it has been proposed that certain countries not be allowed to develop nuclear fuel out of concern they will use it to develop nuclear weapons. Do you think this proposal is a good idea or a bad idea?

	Good Idea	Bad Idea	Not sure/ Decline
United States	66	31	3
Argentina	48	29	23
Armenia	61	22	18
China	57	23	20
France	56	40	4
India	49	36	15
Israel	69	27	3
Palestinian Territories	40	57	3
Peru	56	42	2
Poland	61	19	20
Russia	59	23	19
Thailand	41	33	26
Ukraine	60	17	24

⁶⁷⁴ **BBC July 2006**

Which of the following positions about new countries developing nuclear fuel is closer to your own?

	All countries should be free to produce nuclear fuel under United Nations oversight, because they have the right to have nuclear energy and should not have to depend on other countries	Because nuclear fuel can be developed for use in nuclear weapons, the United Nations should try to stop new countries from producing nuclear fuel but should provide them with the fuel they need	Neither / Depends	DK / NA
Australia	32	60	6	2
Brazil	28	60	8	5
Canada	31	59	6	3
Chile	26	55	9	11
China	44	42	8	5
Egypt	49	39	6	5
France	44	46	6	4
Germany	28	63	6	2
India	25	29	22	24
Indonesia	46	45	3	5
Iraq	42	51	-	3
Israel	30	59	3	8
Italy	29	57	12	2
Kenya	35	51	5	9
Mexico	33	60	8	-

Nigeria	38	48	4	10
Philippines	32	56	8	4
Poland	32	49	6	14
South Korea	22	76	1	1
Russia	26	46	14	13
Spain	14	61	13	12
Turkey	51	29	8	12
Ukraine	26	50	11	13
Great Britain	36	55	6	3
United States	29	56	7	7
Average	33	52	7	7

⁶⁷⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes:

To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
United States	57	39	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	53	22	25
Ukraine	52	20	27
Azerbaijan	59	20	21
Egypt	51	49	0
Israel	54	39	7
Palestinian Territories	39	57	4
Turkey	58	20	23
Kenya	84	15	2
Nigeria	75	21	4
China	47	34	19
India	50	32	18
Indonesia	62	25	14
South Korea	42	56	2
Thailand	59	21	20
Average	56	32	12

⁶⁷⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the UN (United Nations), here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a UN agency control access to all nuclear fuel in the world to ensure that none is used for weapons production

63%	Favor
35	Oppose
2	Not sure/Decline

⁶⁷⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Do you think that Iran is producing nuclear fuel strictly for its energy needs or do you think it is also trying to develop nuclear weapons?

	Iran is producing nuclear strictly for energy needs	Iran is also trying to develop nuclear weapons	Neither / Depends	DK / NA
Australia	21	65	5	10
Brazil	10	72	6	13
Canada	10	68	5	16
Chile	13	58	4	25
China	18	58	11	13
Egypt	38	54	4	4
France	10	66	7	16
Germany	15	65	10	9
India	18	32	19	31
Indonesia	35	47	6	11
Iraq	38	60	-	1
Israel	9	83	1	7
Italy	10	74	4	13
Kenya	13	63	5	20
Mexico	20	41	4	35
Nigeria	26	46	4	23
Philippines	26	59	6	8
Poland	7	67	3	23
South Korea	11	76	2	11
Russia	12	48	13	27
Spain	11	58	8	23
Turkey	15	59	10	17
Ukraine	17	39	11	33
Great Britain	19	57	6	19
United States	5	83	3	9
Average	17	60	6	17

⁶⁷⁸ CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll December 2007

Based on what you have heard or read, do you think that the government of Iran is or is not attempting to develop its own nuclear weapons?

61% Yes, is
33 No, is not
7 Don't know/Undecided/Refused

⁶⁷⁹ BBC July 2006

How concerned would you be if Iran were to develop nuclear weapons? Would you be...?

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	Depends	DK / NA
Australia	67	24	4	4	0	1
Brazil	57	17	10	12	0	4
Canada	63	24	6	5	1	1
Chile	49	25	12	6	1	7
China	23	45	22	7	1	1
Egypt	37	37	17	7	1	1
France	46	39	11	3	1	1
Germany	57	27	11	2	2	0
India	29	28	9	11	8	16

Indonesia	16	37	31	9	3	4
Iraq	25	40	20	14		0
Israel	64	18	7	9	0	3
Italy	65	25	6	3	0	0
Kenya	48	21	11	12	1	6
Mexico	34	21	15	8	5	17
Nigeria	31	24	16	16	2	11
Philippines	36	30	18	10	2	4
Poland	53	27	10	3	2	7
South Korea	30	52	14	2	0	0
Russia	25	33	21	7	4	10
Spain	42	33	9	7	2	6
Turkey	28	29	24	7	8	4
Ukraine	21	36	16	7	8	12
Great Britain	67	23	5	4	0	0
United States	72	20	5	2	0	0
Average	43	29	13	7	2	5

⁶⁸⁰ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006**

I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to [Europe/the United States] in the next 10 years. Please tell me if you think each one on the list is an extremely important threat, an important threat, or not an important threat at all.

Iran acquiring nuclear weapons

	Extremely important threat	Important threat	Not an important threat at all	DK/ Refused
United States	75	19	5	1
France	53	37	9	1
Germany	67	26	7	1
United Kingdom	56	30	10	4
Italy	62	29	7	1
Netherlands	62	27	9	1
Poland	64	31	3	3
Portugal	69	17	10	4
Spain	68	25	7	-
Slovakia	5	11	24	60
Turkey	35	30	21	13
Bulgaria	43	36	9	12
Romania	57	28	8	8
European Average	53	27	10	10

⁶⁸¹ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political Survey June 2009**

(I'd like your opinion about some possible international concerns for the United States.) Do you think that...Iran's nuclear program...is a major threat, a minor threat or not a threat to the well being of the United States?

69%	Major threat
20	Minor threat
5	Not a threat
5	Don't know/Refused

Gallup Poll April 2009

(Next, please tell me how concerned you are about each of the following international matters--are you very concerned, moderately concerned, not too concerned, or not concerned at all?) How about...Iran's nuclear capabilities?

54%	Very concerned
29	Moderately concerned
9	Not too concerned
6	Not at all concerned
3	No opinion

⁶⁸² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

If Iran obtains nuclear weapons, how likely or not do you think it is that the following will happen? Just give us your best guess.

Iran will attack other countries in the region

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	44	31	16	7	3	75	22
France	20	35	31	10	4	55	41
Germany	33	35	23	7	3	68	29
United Kingdom	28	34	23	9	5	62	33
Italy	10	46	26	6	3	65	32
Netherlands	20	34	32	12	3	53	44
Poland	16	47	19	3	14	64	22
Portugal	39	36	17	7	11	65	24
Spain	30	38	21	9	3	68	30
Slovakia	10	35	31	7	18	44	38
Turkey	17	32	18	15	18	49	33
Bulgaria	16	34	20	9	21	50	29
Romania	23	29	21	9	18	52	30
European Average	24	37	23	9	7	61	32

Other countries in the Middle East will decide that, like Iran, they should have nuclear weapons as well

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	50	33	8	6	3	83	13
France	28	39	20	10	3	67	30
Germany	37	34	16	10	3	71	20
United Kingdom	37	41	13	7	3	77	20
Italy	21	50	21	5	3	71	27
Netherlands	32	39	19	9	1	71	28
Poland	20	47	15	4	15	67	18
Portugal	35	36	13	7	9	71	20
Spain	32	40	15	11	2	72	26
Slovakia	15	43	20	6	16	58	26
Turkey	18	40	12	7	23	58	19
Bulgaria	20	44	11	4	21	64	16
Romania	25	33	16	6	21	58	22
European Average	28	40	16	8	8	68	24

Iran will supply nuclear weapons to terrorists

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	56	27	10	5	3	82	15
France	26	39	23	7	5	65	30
Germany	40	34	17	6	2	75	23
United Kingdom	34	34	17	8	6	69	25
Italy	30	47	16	4	3	77	20
Netherlands	30	36	23	8	4	65	31
Poland	25	49	12	3	13	73	14
Portugal	34	38	18	8	3	72	26
Spain	33	38	20	6	18	56	26
Slovakia	18	38	20	6	18	56	26
Turkey	21	27	13	16	23	47	30
Bulgaria	22	33	15	7	23	55	22
Romania	29	28	16	7	19	57	24
European Average	30	37	17	8	8	68	24

Iran will threaten Europe with nuclear weapons

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	36	30	20	9	5	67	29
France	16	26	41	14	3	42	55
Germany	23	32	31	12	2	56	43
United Kingdom	23	30	29	14	4	54	42
Italy	17	37	33	10	2	55	43
Netherlands	14	27	40	18	2	40	58
Poland	22	48	17	4	10	70	20
Portugal	22	33	23	13	10	54	36
Spain	24	31	29	15	2	54	44
Slovakia	13	30	31	10	16	43	41
Turkey	25	34	11	9	21	59	20
Bulgaria	18	34	10	9	20	52	27
Romania	22	28	21	10	10	50	31
European Average	21	33	28	11	7	54	39

Iran will only use nuclear weapons for defensive purposes (if attacked themselves)

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not very likely	Not likely at all	DK/Refused	Likely	Not Likely
United States	19	24	25	27	5	43	52
France	23	35	28	11	4	58	38
Germany	29	22	27	20	2	52	47
United Kingdom	24	33	25	12	6	57	37
Italy	10	36	36	15	3	45	52
Netherlands	22	30	29	16	3	52	45
Poland	13	37	26	7	18	50	32
Portugal	21	27	27	16	10	47	43
Spain	21	34	25	17	3	55	42
Slovakia	10	27	29	13	22	37	42
Turkey	30	26	12	11	21	56	22

Bulgaria	13	29	21	11	27	42	32
Romania	18	27	20	14	22	45	33
European Average	22	31	26	14	8	52	39

⁶⁸³ **Quinnipiac University Poll November 2008**

Should President (Barack) Obama personally negotiate with the leaders of Iran to limit their nuclear program?

62%	Yes
28	No
10	Don't know/No answer

⁶⁸⁴ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2009**

Do you think the United States should or should not establish diplomatic relations with Iran while Iran has a nuclear program?

53%	Should
37	Should not
10	Don't know/No answer

⁶⁸⁵ **BBC December 2007**

What action should the UN Security Council take if Iran continues to produce nuclear fuel?

	Not pressure Iran	Use only diplomatic efforts	Impose economic sanctions	Authorize military strike
Canada	6	42	35	10
United States	4	31	45	15
Central America	26	30	17	3
Argentina	16	31	12	1
Mexico	15	65	10	6
Chile	13	39	23	4
Germany	17	44	34	3
Russia	12	38	24	3
Portugal	10	46	32	4
Spain	9	45	28	8
France	8	46	24	7
Great Britain	7	50	29	5
Italy	4	52	29	7
Egypt	56	29	13	3
Turkey	21	33	28	5
Israel	6	15	37	34
Nigeria	25	41	17	12
Ghana	18	43	17	8
Kenya	16	56	16	9
Indonesia	19	53	16	2
India	17	26	20	6
Philippines	13	63	16	3

China	13	42	27	13
Australia	7	47	35	7
South Korea	7	37	48	5
Japan	4	53	37	2

⁶⁸⁶ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

The UN Security Council has asked Iran to stop enriching uranium. If Iran continues to enrich uranium do you think the UN Security Council should:

	Not pressure Iran to stop enriching uranium	Continue diplomatic efforts to get Iran to stop enriching uranium	Impose economic sanctions on Iran	Authorize a military strike against Iran's nuclear energy facilities	Not sure/Decline
2006 (internet)	3	35	41	18	3
2008 (internet)	3	27	48	20	2

⁶⁸⁷ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

Diplomatic efforts are underway to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Should these efforts fail, which of the following strategies would you most favor?

	Accept that Iran may develop nuclear weapons	Maintain the present level of diplomatic pressure on Iran	Increase diplomatic pressure on Iran but rule out the use of military force	Increase diplomatic pressure on Iran and maintain the option of using military force	DK/Refused
United States	6	13	27	49	6
France	2	19	54	22	2
Germany	4	11	56	27	2
United Kingdom	8	20	38	28	5
Italy	3	14	59	23	2
Netherlands	7	14	45	31	4
Poland	5	19	47	14	15
Portugal	3	13	62	15	8
Spain	4	18	53	20	5
Slovakia	4	18	56	8	14
Turkey	23	17	12	12	35
Bulgaria	4	20	47	12	17
Romania	3	17	46	8	26
European Average	6	16	47	21	9

⁶⁸⁸ **NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll July 2008**

And now, thinking about Iran, if Iran continues with its nuclear research and is close to developing a nuclear weapon, do you believe that the United States should or should not initiate military action to destroy Iran's ability to make nuclear weapons? (If Should/Should not, ask:) And do you feel strongly about that, or not?

31%	Should initiate military action-feel strongly
10	Should initiate military action-do not feel strongly
13	Should not initiate military action-do not feel strongly
33	Should not initiate military action-feel strongly
13	Not sure

Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll November 2007

If Iran continues to produce material that can be used to develop nuclear weapons, would you support or suppose the United States taking military action against Iran. (If Support/Oppose, ask:) Would you support/oppose that strongly or only somewhat?

- 29% Support strongly
- 17 Support somewhat
- 14 Oppose somewhat
- 26 Oppose strongly
- 14 Don't know

⁶⁸⁹ **Gallup/USA Today Poll November 2007**

What do you think the United States should do to get Iran to shut down its nuclear program--take military action against Iran, or rely mainly on economic and diplomatic efforts?

- 18% Take military action
- 73 Rely on economic/diplomatic efforts
- 8 No opinion

Gallup/USA Today Poll November 2007

Suppose U.S. (United States) economic and diplomatic efforts do not work (to get Iran to shut down its nuclear program). If that happens, do you think the United States should--or should not--take military action against Iran?

Subpopulation/Note: Asked of those who said the United States should rely mainly on diplomatic and economic efforts to get Iran to shut down its nuclear program (73 percent)

- 34% Yes, should
- 55 No, should not
- 11 No opinion

⁶⁹⁰ **BBC December 2007**

If UN inspectors are given access, should Iran be allowed to produce nuclear fuel for electricity?

	Should be allowed	Should not be allowed
Canada	58	36
United States	55	38
Mexico	79	6
Chile	36	36
Central America	30	38
Argentina	26	24
Great Britain	71	22
Portugal	59	26
Italy	58	30
France	56	24
Spain	49	36
Germany	38	50
Russia	33	24
Egypt	86	14

Turkey	30	54
Israel	28	62
Kenya	56	39
Nigeria	46	40
Ghana	45	39
Australia	64	31
Indonesia	56	31
China	51	40
South Korea	38	51
Philippines	27	60
India	24	25
Japan	23	54

⁶⁹¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

If Iran were to allow UN inspectors permanent and full access throughout Iran, to make sure it is not developing nuclear weapons, do you think Iran should or should not be allowed to produce nuclear fuel for producing electricity?

56% Should be allowed

41 Should not be allowed

3 Not sure/Decline

⁶⁹² **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2006**

And who do you think can best handle the issue of Iranian nuclear weapons?

	The United Nations	The NATO alliance	The United States	The European Union	DK/Refused
United States	36	18	22	13	10
France	49	22	8	17	5
Germany	47	12	8	25	9
United Kingdom	56	17	6	13	8
Italy	52	13	9	17	9
Netherlands	55	21	9	9	6
Poland	28	13	18	15	26
Portugal	45	14	10	18	13
Spain	44	14	8	25	9
Slovakia	50	20	6	8	16
Turkey	21	14	5	25	34
Bulgaria	34	15	10	10	30
Romania	36	21	8	10	26
European Average	43	15	8	19	14

⁶⁹³ **Pew News Interest Index Poll February 2006**

Who should take the lead in dealing with Iran's nuclear program--the United States or countries in the European Union?

30% The United States

51 Countries in the European Union

11 Other (Vol.)

8 Don't know/Refused

694 **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

In your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem?

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Serious	Not Serious	DK/R
United States	44	30	14	11	74	25	2
Canada	47	37	7	8	84	15	1
Britain	50	34	10	5	84	15	2
France	68	28	3	1	96	4	0
Germany	60	30	6	2	90	8	1
Spain	61	29	4	2	90	6	3
Poland	36	47	10	2	83	12	5
Russia	44	34	14	4	78	18	4
Turkey	65	19	4	3	84	7	9
Egypt	54	23	11	6	77	17	6
Jordan	54	24	11	5	78	16	6
Lebanon	53	30	14	1	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	59	29	5	5	88	10	2
Israel	48	41	6	3	89	9	2
China	30	54	12	1	84	13	3
India	67	26	2	0	93	2	5
Indonesia	46	35	9	2	81	11	7
Japan	65	25	7	2	90	9	0
Pakistan	50	16	3	2	66	5	29
South Korea	68	29	2	0	97	2	1
Argentina	69	25	3	1	94	4	2
Brazil	90	4	2	1	94	3	3
Mexico	65	25	3	1	90	4	7
Kenya	48	30	9	4	78	13	10
Nigeria	57	29	6	3	86	9	5
Average	56	29	7	3	85	10	5

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/ Refused
United States	42	30	13	11	3
Britain	56	28	10	5	1
France	72	24	3	1	0
Germany	61	29	7	2	1
Spain	67	28	2	2	1
Poland	51	35	8	1	4
Russia	49	25	14	7	4
Turkey	82	7	3	2	5
Egypt	38	38	16	6	3
Jordan	41	35	20	4	1
Lebanon	43	35	19	2	1
Australia	62	27	6	3	1
China	24	51	17	1	7
India	66	22	5	1	5
Indonesia	46	32	9	3	10
Japan	73	22	4	1	0
Pakistan	48	12	5	3	31

South Korea	68	29	3	1	0
Argentina	70	24	3	1	3
Brazil	92	4	1	1	1
Mexico	70	18	6	1	4
Nigeria	45	25	11	6	13
South Africa	47	19	10	4	20
Tanzania	75	14	6	3	2

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2007

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/Refused
United States	47	28	13	9	2
Canada	58	29	8	4	2
Argentina	69	21	2	1	7
Bolivia	68	24	4	1	3
Brazil	88	8	1	2	2
Chile	75	17	2	1	5
Mexico	57	24	10	2	7
Peru	66	20	4	1	9
Venezuela	78	17	1	2	1
Britain	45	37	10	5	3
France	68	27	4	1	0
Germany	60	26	8	4	2
Italy	57	35	2	1	6
Spain	70	25	2	0	3
Sweden	64	25	5	2	4
Bulgaria	66	19	5	1	8
Czech Republic	61	29	8	3	0
Poland	40	47	8	2	4
Russia	40	33	19	6	3
Slovakia	65	28	5	1	1
Ukraine	59	30	7	1	2
Turkey	70	18	3	1	8
Egypt	32	37	18	8	6
Jordan	32	32	25	8	3
Kuwait	69	19	6	6	1
Lebanon	41	42	15	2	1
Morocco	69	13	6	3	10
Palestinian Territories	59	22	5	7	7
Israel	48	37	11	2	2
Pakistan	41	21	5	3	30
Bangladesh	85	12	2	0	1
Indonesia	43	32	9	3	12
Malaysia	46	32	10	2	10
China	42	46	7	1	4
India	57	28	4	1	10
Japan	78	19	2	1	1
South Korea	75	22	2	0	0

⁶⁹⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next ten years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all:

Global Warming

	Critical	Important but not Critical	Not Important	DK/NS
United States	46	39	13	2
Armenia	47	26	16	11
Australia	69	26	5	0
China	47	33	12	8
India	51	27	10	12
Iran	61	16	9	14
Israel	52	25	15	7
Mexico	70	18	7	5
South Korea	67	29	4	0
Ukraine	33	33	11	23

⁶⁹⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of the United States in the next ten years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

Global Warming

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline	Total
1998	43	38	12	7	100
2002 (telephone)	46	33	17	4	100
2004 (telephone)	37	42	17	5	100
2004 (internet)	37	47	14	2	100
2006 (internet)	46	39	13	2	100
2008 (internet)	44	37	18	1	100

Climate Change

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2008 (internet)	39	40	20	1	100

⁶⁹⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007

And in the next ten years, please tell me how likely you are to be personally affected by each of the following threats:

The effects of global warming

	Likely	Not Likely	DK/R
European Average	85	13	3
United States	70	28	2
France	89	10	1
Germany	82	17	*
United Kingdom	80	20	1
Italy	87	12	1
Netherlands	77	23	1
Poland	83	13	3
Portugal	91	6	4

Spain	93	7	1
Slovakia	77	18	5
Turkey	84	7	9
Bulgaria	79	12	9
Romania	81	10	9

⁶⁹⁸ **GlobeScan 2003 and 2006**

How serious a problem do you consider each of the following issues to be? Is it a very serious problem, somewhat serious problem, not very serious problem or not a serious problem at all? What about [...]?

Climate change or global warming, due to the Greenhouse Effect

	Very serious		Somewhat serious		Not very serious		Not at all serious	
	2006	2003	2006	2003	2006	2003	2006	2003
Argentina	80	64	14	21	2	7	*	1
Brazil	78	74	15	18	4	5	1	2
Canada	57	40	33	41	6	11	3	5
China	39	37	41	42	15	17	2	1
France	70	46	24	43	3	8	1	1
Germany	73	54	20	33	5	10	1	2
Great Britain	70	50	21	35	6	9	2	3
India	65	67	25	24	8	5	1	1
Indonesia	44	36	37	43	14	16	2	1
Italy	68	63	26	30	4	5	1	1
Mexico	67	71	21	23	4	3	4	1
Nigeria	47	35	33	32	13	18	3	8
Russia	59	43	29	34	7	15	1	1
South Africa	44	30	28	32	9	18	5	6
Turkey	64	37	34	40	2	16	*	1
United States	49	31	27	40	12	13	9	11
Average	65	49	25	33	3	11	2	3

⁶⁹⁹ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

In your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem?

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Serious	Not Serious	DK/R
United States	44	30	14	11	74	25	2
Canada	47	37	7	8	84	15	1
Britain	50	34	10	5	84	15	2
France	68	28	3	1	96	4	0
Germany	60	30	6	2	90	8	1
Spain	61	29	4	2	90	6	3
Poland	36	47	10	2	83	12	5
Russia	44	34	14	4	78	18	4
Turkey	65	19	4	3	84	7	9
Egypt	54	23	11	6	77	17	6
Jordan	54	24	11	5	78	16	6
Lebanon	53	30	14	1	83	15	2
Palestinian Territories	59	29	5	5	88	10	2

Israel	48	41	6	3	89	9	2
China	30	54	12	1	84	13	3
India	67	26	2	0	93	2	5
Indonesia	46	35	9	2	81	11	7
Japan	65	25	7	2	90	9	0
Pakistan	50	16	3	2	66	5	29
South Korea	68	29	2	0	97	2	1
Argentina	69	25	3	1	94	4	2
Brazil	90	4	2	1	94	3	3
Mexico	65	25	3	1	90	4	7
Kenya	48	30	9	4	78	13	10
Nigeria	57	29	6	3	86	9	5
Average	56	29	7	3	85	10	5

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/Refused
United States	42	30	13	11	3
Britain	56	28	10	5	1
France	72	24	3	1	0
Germany	61	29	7	2	1
Spain	67	28	2	2	1
Poland	51	35	8	1	4
Russia	49	25	14	7	4
Turkey	82	7	3	2	5
Egypt	38	38	16	6	3
Jordan	41	35	20	4	1
Lebanon	43	35	19	2	1
Australia	62	27	6	3	1
China	24	51	17	1	7
India	66	22	5	1	5
Indonesia	46	32	9	3	10
Japan	73	22	4	1	0
Pakistan	48	12	5	3	31
South Korea	68	29	3	1	0
Argentina	70	24	3	1	3
Brazil	92	4	1	1	1
Mexico	70	18	6	1	4
Nigeria	45	25	11	6	13
South Africa	47	19	10	4	20
Tanzania	75	14	6	3	2

Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2007

	Very serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	Not a problem	Don't know/Refused
United States	47	28	13	9	2
Canada	58	29	8	4	2
Argentina	69	21	2	1	7
Bolivia	68	24	4	1	3
Brazil	88	8	1	2	2
Chile	75	17	2	1	5
Mexico	57	24	10	2	7

Peru	66	20	4	1	9
Venezuela	78	17	1	2	1
Britain	45	37	10	5	3
France	68	27	4	1	0
Germany	60	26	8	4	2
Italy	57	35	2	1	6
Spain	70	25	2	0	3
Sweden	64	25	5	2	4
Bulgaria	66	19	5	1	8
Czech Republic	61	29	8	3	0
Poland	40	47	8	2	4
Russia	40	33	19	6	3
Slovakia	65	28	5	1	1
Ukraine	59	30	7	1	2
Turkey	70	18	3	1	8
Egypt	32	37	18	8	6
Jordan	32	32	25	8	3
Kuwait	69	19	6	6	1
Lebanon	41	42	15	2	1
Morocco	69	13	6	3	10
Palestinian Territories	59	22	5	7	7
Israel	48	37	11	2	2
Pakistan	41	21	5	3	30
Bangladesh	85	12	2	0	1
Indonesia	43	32	9	3	12
Malaysia	46	32	10	2	10
China	42	46	7	1	4
India	57	28	4	1	10
Japan	78	19	2	1	1
South Korea	75	22	2	0	0

⁷⁰⁰ BBC July 2007

As you may know there has been an increase in the temperature of the earth-Do you believe that human activity, including industry and transportation, is or is not a significant cause of climate change?

	Human activity IS a significant cause	Human activity IS NOT a significant cause	DK / NA
Australia	81	16	3
Brazil	88	8	4
Canada	77	21	2
Chile	85	9	6
China	87	11	2
Egypt	66	33	1
France	89	8	4
Germany	87	11	2
Britain	78	17	5
India	47	21	33
Indonesia	71	17	11
Italy	92	7	1
Kenya	72	20	8
Mexico	94	4	2
Nigeria	72	18	9
Philippines	76	20	4

Russia	79	12	9
South Korea	91	7	2
Spain	93	5	1
Turkey	70	14	16
United States	71	24	5
Average	79	14	6

⁷⁰¹ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned or not at all concerned about each of the following possibilities related to energy issues:

That the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	69	25	5	1	*
Brazil	61	20	10	8	1
Canada	62	29	4	4	1
Chile	50	28	10	6	6
Egypt	41	36	15	7	1
France	45	45	7	3	1
Germany	43	40	13	3	1
Britain	66	27	4	2	1
India	41	20	13	8	18
Israel	42	33	12	10	2
Italy	60	31	7	2	1
Kenya	55	24	11	5	5
Mexico	35	39	18	5	3
Philippines	47	41	8	2	2
Poland	17	41	23	8	12
Russia	20	46	20	4	9
South Korea	43	47	7	1	2
Ukraine	35	38	14	3	10
United States	53	29	10	8	1
Average	47	34	11	5	4

⁷⁰² **BBC July 2007**

As you may know there is some discussion these days about whether it is necessary to take steps to reduce the impact of human activities that are thought to cause global warming or climate change. Would you say that you believe that:

	It is not necessary to take any steps	It is necessary to take modest steps over the coming years	It is necessary to take major steps starting very soon	DK / NA
Australia	3	25	70	1
Brazil	4	16	76	4
Canada	7	20	72	2
Chile	2	16	78	5
China	4	25	70	2
Egypt	14	43	43	*
France	1	13	85	1
Germany	4	45	50	1
Britain	3	25	70	2

India	12	26	37	26
Indonesia	4	22	64	10
Italy	1	13	86	*
Kenya	12	31	53	4
Mexico	1	13	83	3
Nigeria	16	27	50	7
Philippines	7	19	70	4
Russia	6	44	43	8
South Korea	5	45	48	2
Spain	2	6	91	1
Turkey	11	19	59	11
United States	6	33	59	2
Average	6	25	65	5

⁷⁰³ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

There is a controversy over what the countries of the world, including [survey country], should do about the problem of global warming. Here are three statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own point of view.

	Until we are sure that global warming really is a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs	The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost	Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs	DK/NS
United States	17	37	43	3
Argentina	3	19	63	16
Armenia	19	32	37	12
Australia	8	23	69	0
China	8	41	42	9
France	2	20	78	*
India	24	30	19	26
Israel	10	29	54	7
Philippines	18	49	27	7
Poland	11	39	30	20
Russia	22	34	32	12
Thailand	7	41	27	24
Ukraine	14	37	30	19

⁷⁰⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

Using the same scale, how high a priority do you think the government SHOULD place on addressing climate change?

	0 - 4 (Low priority)	5	6 - 10 (High Priority)	DK/ refused	Mean	Median
Mexico	2	4	90	4	9.09	10
United States	42	13	44	1	4.71	5
France	3	6	89	3	8.03	8
Germany	5	12	83	0	7.57	8
Great Britain	4	6	89	1	8.20	8
Poland	8	9	77	6	7.88	8
Russia	8	12	65	15	7.39	8
Ukraine	7	6	72	16	7.95	8
Egypt	12	6	82	0	7.18	8

Iraq	37	9	35	19	5.14	5
Palestinian Territories	43	14	34	9	4.91	5
Turkey	5	5	83	8	8.34	9
Kenya	20	15	63	2	6.48	6
Nigeria	3	6	89	2	7.81	8
China	1	3	94	2	8.86	9
Macau	8	14	60	18	7.00	7
India	16	14	59	11	6.73	7
Indonesia	7	6	75	12	7.38	7
South Korea	6	12	82	0	7.42	8
Taiwan	5	9	82	4	7.52	8
Average	13	9	73	6	7.28	7.50

⁷⁰⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trend 2008**

Which among these should be the top priority for the next American president and European leaders?

	Climate change	Int'l terrorism	Int'l economic problems	Managing relations with Russia	Spread of nuclear weapons	Stabilizing Afghanistan	Managing relations with china	Easing tensions in the Middle East
European Average	24	25	19	3	6	4	3	15
United States	8	26	21	1	9	7	5	18
France	30	18	19	*	6	2	4	17
Germany	42	13	12	4	7	4	4	18
United Kingdom	21	22	16	2	7	9	5	19
Italy	25	25	19	2	7	2	3	14
Netherlands	28	21	14	2	6	5	3	19
Poland	9	25	23	10	9	6	2	12
Portugal	29	17	19	2	7	5	3	13
Spain	30	28	21	1	3	2	1	13
Slovakia	9	33	29	6	9	2	1	10
Turkey	8	47	22	2	5	1	*	9
Bulgaria	7	38	33	4	8	1	*	14
Romania	9	35	27	7	7	4	1	13

⁷⁰⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

How high a priority does the government place on addressing climate change? Please answer on a scale of 0-10 with 0 meaning "not a priority at all" and 10 meaning a "very high priority".

	Mean	Median	0 - 4	5	6 - 10	DK/ refused
Chile	5.07	5	34	15	34	17
Mexico	5.51	5	25	26	45	5
United States	3.84	4	61	17	21	1
France	5.42	5	27	27	44	2
Germany	7.02	7	9	13	78	0
Great Britain	5.92	6	20	21	58	1

Poland	5.89	5	25	21	44	10
Russia	4.57	5	35	18	26	20
Ukraine	2.18	2	65	6	7	21
Egypt	5.23	5	41	18	40	2
Iraq	3.65	4	50	13	17	19
Palestinian Territories	4.18	4	44	10	17	29
Turkey	4.69	5	40	15	33	11
Kenya	4.29	4	56	16	26	3
Nigeria	5.43	6	37	11	49	3
China	7.31	8	8	13	78	2
Hong Kong*	4.67	5	39	28	29	4
Macau*	4.60	5	37	22	28	13
India	5.41	5	32	15	43	10
Indonesia	5.85	6	16	18	50	15
South Korea	4.61	5	46	24	30	1
Taiwan	4.80	5	37	25	34	4
Average	5.06	5	35	17	39	9

Should your government place a higher priority on addressing climate change than it does?

	Should have a higher priority	Has placed the right priority	Should have lower priority	DK/Ref
Chile	62	13	8	18
Mexico	79	13	3	5
United States	52	24	21	2
France	76	18	4	3
Germany	46	27	27	0
Great Britain	77	14	8	1
Poland	54	25	10	10
Russia	56	16	4	23
Ukraine	68	5	2	24
Egypt	60	27	13	2
Iraq	39	23	17	20
Palestinian Territories	29	17	20	34
Turkey	65	16	8	11
Kenya	71	8	19	3
Nigeria	70	10	16	4
China	62	30	6	2
Hong Kong*	67	21	5	6
Macau*	52	20	6	23
Taiwan*	77	16	7	0
India	43	24	18	16
Indonesia	53	23	8	16
South Korea	81	13	6	1
Average	60	18	12	10

707 WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

What is your guess on how high a priority the average person in [Country] thinks the government should place on addressing climate change?

	0 - 4 (Low priority)	5	6 - 10 (High Priority)	DK/ refused	Mean	Median
Mexico	8	11	76	5	7.98	9
United States	67	14	18	0	3.71	3
France	9	16	66	9	6.77	7
Germany	10	24	66	0	6.47	6
Great Britain	10	23	65	3	6.52	7
Poland	22	18	51	10	6.25	6
Russia	7	11	59	23	7.22	8
Ukraine	8	7	64	21	7.76	8
Egypt	19	10	71	1	6.65	7
Iraq	32	15	32	22	5.05	5
Palestinian Territories	19	12	60	9	6.21	6
Turkey	13	15	60	12	6.98	7
Kenya	23	13	61	3	6.31	6
Nigeria	8	8	82	3	7.49	8
China	23	23	52	2	6.05	6
Macau	13	17	53	17	6.57	7
India	18	11	61	11	6.76	8
Indonesia	11	14	62	14	6.34	6
South Korea	36	31	32	1	4.98	5
Taiwan	10	16	67	6	6.88	7
Average	19	15	58	8	6.42	6.56

Does individual perceive themselves differently from the public on how high a priority climate change should be?

	Individuals think they have a higher priority	Has the same priority as the public	Individuals think they have a lower priority	DK/Ref
Chile	42	29	11	19
Mexico	38	45	12	6
United States	52	22	24	1
France	49	29	13	9
Germany	52	38	10	0
Great Britain	66	18	13	3
Poland	49	27	14	10
Russia	22	35	16	26
Ukraine	15	50	12	22
Egypt	37	39	23	1
Iraq	28	20	29	22
Palestinian Territories	18	15	52	15
Turkey	40	37	10	13
Kenya	40	19	39	3
Nigeria	36	30	30	3
China	77	16	5	3

Hong Kong*	38	40	14	8
Macau*	26	36	14	24
Taiwan*	35	47	18	0
India	23	29	33	16
Indonesia	47	27	12	14
South Korea	75	16	8	1
Average	42	28	19	10

⁷⁰⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the United States should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

A new international treaty to address climate change by reducing green house gas emissions

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline	Total
2008 (internet)	76	23	2	100

⁷⁰⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming

	Should Participate	Should not participate	NS/Decline
United States	70	23	7
South Korea	88	11	2

⁷¹⁰ **ABC News Poll, April 2001**

An international treaty calls on the United States and other industrialized nations to cut back on their emissions from power plants and cars in order to reduce global warming, also known as the greenhouse effect. Some people say this would hurt the U.S. economy and is based on uncertain science. Others say this is needed to protect the environment and could create new business opportunities. What's your view--do you think the United States should or should not join this treaty requiring less emissions from U.S. power plants and cars?

61%	Should join
26	Should not join
13	Not sure/Decline

Chicago Council on Global Affairs/ German Marshall Fund 2002

An international treaty calls on the United States and other industrialized nations to cut back on their emissions from power plants and cars in order to reduce global warming, also known as the greenhouse effect. Some people say this would hurt the U.S. economy and is based on uncertain science. Others say this is needed to protect the environment and could create new business opportunities. What's your view--do you think the United States should or should not join this treaty requiring less emissions from U.S. power plants and cars?

70%	Should join
25	Should not join
5	Not sure/Decline

⁷¹¹ **BBC July 2007**

Please tell me how necessary it is: For individuals in [country] to make changes in their life style and behavior in order to reduce the amount of climate changing gases they produce.

	Will definitely be necessary	Probably be necessary	Necessary	Probably not be necessary	Definitely not be necessary	Not necessary	DK / NA
Australia	55	32	87	7	5	11	2
Brazil	50	38	89	5	2	7	4
Canada	63	28	91	4	3	7	1
Chile	49	41	90	5	1	5	5
China	59	28	86	6	5	12	2
Egypt	31	41	71	16	12	29	0
France	49	42	91	5	3	8	1
Germany	36	52	87	10	2	12	1
Britain	53	33	87	9	3	12	1
India	34	27	61	12	6	18	21
Indonesia	46	38	84	8	2	10	6
Italy	62	31	93	5	2	6	1
Kenya	36	34	70	16	9	25	5
Mexico	64	28	92	3	4	7	1
Nigeria	30	35	65	22	11	33	2
Philippines	46	41	87	8	3	11	2
Russia	27	49	76	10	3	13	11
South Korea	28	58	86	13	1	13	1
Spain	68	24	93	4	2	7	1
Turkey	22	55	77	9	2	11	12
United States	48	31	79	10	9	19	2
Average	46	37	83	9	4	13	4

⁷¹² BBC July 2007

How much have you heard or read about global warming or climate change?

	A great deal	Some	Not very much	Nothing at all	DK/NA
Australia	54	36	9	2	*
Brazil	43	35	13	10	-
Canada	56	33	8	2	*
Chile	23	39	27	8	2
China	30	42	24	3	*
Egypt	17	41	25	16	-
France	62	30	5	3	*
Germany	28	48	22	2	*
Britain	61	29	6	3	1
India	15	33	33	3	16
Indonesia	8	20	47	18	7
Italy	51	36	11	1	*
Kenya	15	29	31	22	4
Mexico	43	30	23	4	-
Nigeria	20	30	38	10	2
Philippines	38	25	31	5	1
Russia	5	30	55	9	1
South Korea	43	51	4	1	1
Spain	32	45	19	3	-
Turkey	22	50	17	9	2

United States	59	30	8	2	*
Average	35	35	22	7	2

⁷¹³ **ABC News/Planet Green/Stanford Poll, July 2008**

Do you think most scientists agree with one another about how much of a threat global warming poses, or is there a lot of disagreement among scientists about that?

33%	Most agree
62	A lot of disagreement
5	No opinion

⁷¹⁴ **Program on International Policy Attitudes June 2005**

Which of the following statements is closest to your own opinion?

	a. There is a consensus among the great majority of scientists that global warming exists and could do significant damage	b. There is a consensus among the great majority of scientists that global warming does not exist and therefore poses no significant threat	c. Scientists are divided on the existence of global warming and its impact	(No answer)
June 2005	52	5	39	4
June 2004	43	4	50	4
September 1994	28	8	58	6

⁷¹⁵ **Program on International Policy Attitudes June 2005**

There is a controversy over what the countries of the world, including the United States, should do about the problem of global warming. I'm going to read you three statements. Please tell me which statement comes closest to your own point of view. [ARO]

	Until we are sure that global warming is really a problem, we should not take any steps that would have economic costs	The problem of global warming should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost	Global warming is a serious and pressing problem. We should begin taking steps now even if this involves significant costs	(No answer)
June 2005	21%	42	34	2
June 2004	23	45	31	1
October 1998	15	44	39	2

Suppose there were a survey of scientists that found that an overwhelming majority have concluded that global warming is occurring and poses a significant threat. If this were the case, do you think the United States should:

6%	Not take any steps to reduce greenhouse gases that would have economic costs
35	Take steps to reduce greenhouse gases, but only those that are low in cost
56	Take steps to reduce greenhouse gases even if this involves significant costs
3	(No answer)

⁷¹⁶ **BBC July 2007**

Please tell me how necessary you think it is:

To increase the cost of the types of energy that most cause climate change, such as coal and oil/petrol, in order to encourage individuals and industry to use less.

	Will definitely be necessary	Probably be necessary	Necessary	Probably not be necessary	Definitely not be necessary	Not Necessar y	DK / NA
Australia	42	38	80	10	7	17	2
Brazil	28	36	64	14	18	32	4
Canada	39	33	72	12	12	24	3
Chile	38	41	79	8	4	12	9
China	57	26	83	10	4	14	3
Egypt	24	37	61	25	13	38	1
France	25	36	61	20	16	36	4
Germany	19	52	71	20	8	28	2
Britain	35	41	76	11	9	20	3
India	25	24	49	18	10	28	23
Indonesia	36	47	83	8	2	10	8
Italy	24	23	47	26	24	50	3
Kenya	25	28	53	23	19	42	4
Mexico	31	30	61	10	23	33	6
Nigeria	17	30	47	28	23	51	1
Philippines	16	32	48	29	21	50	3
Russia	12	24	36	30	20	50	15
South Korea	5	44	49	37	12	49	2
Spain	33	19	52	29	13	42	4
Turkey	13	28	41	30	14	44	15
United States	29	36	65	17	15	32	3
Average	27	34	61	20	14	34	6

717 BBC July 2007

Would you favor or oppose raising taxes on the types of energy, such as coal and oil/petrol, that most cause climate change in order to encourage individuals and businesses to use less of these?

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Oppose	DK / NA
Australia	25	36	61	17	20	37	3
Brazil	14	28	42	16	39	55	4
Canada	31	26	57	18	22	40	2
Chile	24	37	61	17	13	30	9
China	50	35	85	10	4	14	2
Egypt	16	32	48	25	27	52	0
France	18	29	47	26	22	48	4
Germany	17	43	60	25	13	38	2
Britain	20	34	54	17	26	43	4
India	18	20	38	13	23	36	26
Indonesia	24	33	57	25	11	36	8
Italy	17	18	35	22	40	62	3
Kenya	19	30	49	23	25	48	2
Mexico	31	19	50	16	30	46	4
Nigeria	22	30	52	23	23	46	2
Philippines	14	22	36	30	28	58	5
Russia	13	28	41	32	12	44	16
South Korea	4	35	39	44	15	59	3
Spain	25	24	49	32	15	47	4
Turkey	11	32	43	31	11	42	15

United States	20	26	46	19	32	51	3
Average	21	29	50	23	21	44	6

718 **BBC July 2007**

What if the revenues of this energy tax were devoted only to increasing energy efficiency and developing energy sources that do not produce climate change?

	Somewhat or strongly favor	Somewhat or strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	26	11	2
Brazil	24	29	5
Canada	23	17	3
Chile	20	9	10
China	12	2	1
Egypt	25	27	0
France	32	15	5
Germany	20	20	1
Britain	22	18	6
India	22	16	24
Indonesia	23	12	9
Italy	43	18	4
Kenya	31	14	5
Mexico	24	11	15
Nigeria	24	21	3
Philippines	32	27	4
Russia	31	13	15
South Korea	31	30	1
Spain	37	12	3
Turkey	33	14	11
United States	28	23	3
Average	27	17	6

What if this energy tax was introduced at the same time as your other taxes were reduced by the same amount, keeping your total taxes at the current level even with the energy tax?

	Somewhat or strongly favor	Somewhat or strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	17	19	3
Brazil	24	30	4
Canada	24	16	2
Chile	17	11	12
China	8	6	1
Egypt	34	19	0
France	32	16	4
Germany	30	11	0
Britain	23	20	3
India	28	13	21
Indonesia	28	9	6
Italy	34	24	7
Kenya	28	17	6
Mexico	14	27	8
Nigeria	22	23	3
Philippines	29	21	13
Russia	34	12	13
South Korea	31	27	4

Spain	24	22	6
Turkey	36	13	9
United States	17	31	5
Average	26	18	6

⁷¹⁹ **CBS News/New York Times Poll , April 2007**

In order to help reduce global warming, would you be willing or not willing to pay more for electricity if it were generated by renewable sources like solar or wind energy?

75%	Willing
20	Not willing
5	Don't know/No answer

⁷²⁰ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: People should be willing to pay higher prices in order to address global climate change?

	Agree	Disagree	DK/R
United States	41	55	4
Canada	54	44	3
Britain	53	43	4
France	51	49	0
Germany	54	43	3
Spain	49	48	4
Poland	44	45	11
Russia	32	52	16
Turkey	61	23	16
Egypt	18	69	13
Jordan	15	73	13
Lebanon	46	45	9
Palestinian Territories	44	49	7
Israel	58	33	9
China	88	8	4
India	85	11	5
Indonesia	33	64	3
Japan	68	28	4
Pakistan	36	35	29
South Korea	69	26	5
Argentina	34	54	13
Brazil	48	41	11
Mexico	28	61	11
Kenya	45	48	7
Nigeria	42	54	4
Average	48	44	9

⁷²¹ **BBC July 2006**

Creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	74	18	5	2	1
Brazil	65	22	4	6	3
Canada	66	25	4	4	1

Chile	31	31	13	12	13
Egypt	32	34	24	8	2
France	63	28	4	3	2
Germany	50	35	9	4	2
Britain	62	24	5	6	2
India	49	19	14	5	13
Israel	59	25	7	4	6
Italy	75	20	2	2	1
Kenya	48	29	11	8	5
Mexico	32	35	13	11	9
Philippines	31	39	19	8	2
Poland	55	31	4	3	7
Russia	30	44	9	4	13
South Korea	31	51	14	3	2
Ukraine	42	36	9	4	9
United States	59	26	6	6	2
Average	50	30	9	5	5

722 BBC July 2006

Requiring auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	59	29	6	5	1
Brazil	35	23	16	23	3
Canada	47	30	10	10	2
Chile	24	34	17	10	15
Egypt	20	27	26	25	2
France	24	31	18	23	4
Germany	38	42	14	4	2
Great Britain	45	29	12	11	3
India	36	19	7	13	24
Israel	35	30	15	13	7
Italy	47	38	7	4	3
Kenya	33	28	18	13	7
Mexico	25	44	11	13	8
Philippines	20	29	29	21	1
Poland	18	30	21	13	18
Russia	36	41	11	1	11
South Korea	23	51	20	3	3
Ukraine	38	43	8	2	10
United States	50	27	10	11	1
Average	34	33	15	11	7

723 BBC July 2006

Building new nuclear power plants to reduce reliance on oil and coal

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	19	34	20	24	3
Brazil	23	24	15	35	3
Canada	22	30	18	25	6

Chile	18	24	20	24	15
Egypt	30	39	21	9	1
France	10	28	23	34	5
Germany	9	26	26	36	3
Britain	21	29	17	26	7
India	36	30	11	10	13
Israel	20	29	18	23	10
Italy	26	27	18	25	5
Kenya	36	30	12	15	8
Mexico	19	35	20	13	13
Philippines	27	33	20	18	2
Poland	13	18	26	30	14
Russia	5	23	36	24	12
South Korea	15	50	27	4	4
Ukraine	6	18	31	36	9
United States	29	34	15	18	4
Average	20	29	21	23	7

724 BBC July 2006

Increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know / No answer
Australia	30	39	18	12	1
Brazil	6	7	13	73	*
Canada	18	29	21	30	2
Chile	14	27	23	25	13
Egypt	20	26	23	28	2
France	7	23	24	41	5
Germany	12	35	26	26	1
Britain	31	31	16	18	4
India	25	27	14	22	13
Israel	14	22	26	31	6
Italy	5	17	34	42	2
Kenya	32	28	18	17	5
Mexico	7	19	27	43	3
Philippines	20	18	22	38	1
Poland	2	5	34	53	5
Russia	2	11	39	45	4
South Korea	6	35	45	12	1
Ukraine	3	9	31	55	2
United States	19	28	22	29	2
Average	14	23	25	34	4

725 BBC July 2007

Which of the following points of view is closer to your own?

	Because countries that are less wealthy produce relatively low emissions per person they SHOULD NOT be expected to limit their emissions of climate change gases along with wealthy countries.	Because total emissions from less wealthy countries are substantial and growing, these countries SHOULD limit their emissions of climate change gases along with wealthy countries.	DK / NA
Australia	23	71	5
Brazil	26	63	11
Canada	27	68	5
Chile	19	63	18
China	27	68	4
Egypt	53	47	*
France	31	61	8
Germany	34	61	5
Britain	25	70	5
India	24	33	43
Indonesia	24	54	22
Italy	49	42	9
Kenya	31	64	5
Mexico	14	75	11
Nigeria	50	42	8
Philippines	37	49	14
Russia	20	58	22
South Korea	39	56	5
Spain	20	72	8
Turkey	23	41	36
United States	18	75	7
Average	29	59	12

⁷²⁶ BBC July 2007

Would you support or oppose the following deal:

Wealthy countries agree to provide less wealthy countries with financial assistance and technology, while less wealthy countries agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy countries.

	Support	Oppose	DK / NA
Australia	84	12	5
Brazil	73	17	10
Canada	84	12	4
Chile	68	16	16
China	90	7	3
Egypt	77	23	
France	78	14	8
Germany	75	22	3
Britain	81	13	5
India	47	19	34
Indonesia	78	12	10
Italy	77	18	5
Kenya	76	19	5
Mexico	57	29	14
Nigeria	50	46	4

Philippines	71	17	12
Russia	77	6	18
South Korea	72	23	5
Spain	76	17	7
Turkey	65	12	23
United States	70	21	9
Average	73	18	10

⁷²⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

If the less developed countries make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions, do you think the developed countries should provide substantial aid to help them?

	Yes, should help less developed countries	No, should not provide aid	NS/DK/Depends
United States	64	32	4
Poland	84	1	14
Ukraine	72	4	24

If the developed countries are willing to provide substantial aid, do you think the less developed countries should make a commitment to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions?

	Yes, should make a commitment	No, should not make a commitment	NS/Decline
Argentina	68	7	25
Armenia	63	21	16
China	79	8	13
India	48	29	23
Thailand	49	9	43

⁷²⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

In thinking about a new agreement on climate change, do you favor or oppose the U.S. providing technological and financial aid to developing countries like China and India to help them limit the growth of their emissions, if they agree to make efforts to reach this goal.

U.S. providing technological and financial aid to developing countries to limit growth of emissions

48%	Favor
52	Oppose
1	Not sure/Decline

⁷²⁹ **ABC News/Washington Post Poll, June 2009**

Do you think the United States should take action on global warming only if other major industrial countries such as China and India agree to do equally effective things, or that the United States should take action even if these other countries do less, or that the United States should not take action on this at all?

20%	Take action only if other countries do equally effective things
59	Take action even if other countries do less effective things
18	Should not take action at all
3	No opinion

⁷³⁰ **Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll, March 2008**

How important to our foreign policy should each of the following be? Should this be very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important? Cooperating with other countries on reducing global warming

61%	Very important
26	Somewhat important
6	Not very important
6	Not at all important
1	Don't know

Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll , March 2008

What grade would you give the United States when it comes to achieving the following goals?

Working with other countries to reduce global warming

10%	A
20	B
25	C
17	D
16	F
12	Don't know

⁷³¹ **GlobeScan 2008**

Effectiveness of current cooperation between Europe and North America in combating climate change, rated on 0 to 100 scale: Above average (6-10), average (5), below average (0-4)

	Above average	Average	Below average	DK/NR
Average	19	16	58	7
United Kingdom	16	15	66	4
United States	17	19	58	6
Canada	17	16	60	6
France	24	20	44	11
Germany	12	14	71	3
Spain	15	11	70	4
Ireland	17	16	64	3
Turkey	27	15	38	20
Poland	22	19	52	7

⁷³² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Some people say that the world is facing some new problems that require some new international institutions or agencies to deal with them. Do you think that there should or should not be new international institutions to:

Monitor whether countries are meeting their treaty obligations to limit their greenhouse-gas emissions that contribute to climate change

68%	Should be
30	Should not be
2	Not sure/Decline

⁷³³ **BBC December 2006**

Thinking about the last year, please tell me if you approve or disapprove of how the United States government has dealt with each of the following:

The U.S. handling of global warming or climate change.

	Approve	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Disapprove	Somewhat disapprove	Strongly Disapprove	DK
Argentina	6	2	4	79	6	73	16
Australia	25	7	18	68	23	45	7
Brazil	17	5	12	73	17	56	10
Chile	17	5	12	63	16	47	20
China	39	13	26	35	14	21	26
Egypt	9	1	8	59	23	36	32
France	8	2	6	86	12	74	6
Germany	10	3	7	84	18	66	7
Britain	15	5	10	79	18	61	6
Hungary	17	4	13	53	19	34	31
India	48	25	23	23	13	10	30
Indonesia	38	15	23	52	25	27	10
Italy	13	3	11	74	18	56	13
Kenya	56	38	18	21	9	12	22
Lebanon	19	11	8	68	12	56	14
Mexico	10	1	9	67	40	27	24
Nigeria	67	35	32	25	17	8	9
Philippines	60	25	35	22	9	13	19
Poland	20	5	15	31	16	15	49
Portugal	14	5	9	79	14	65	8
Russia	27	3	24	36	20	16	38
South Korea	50	8	42	45	28	17	5
Turkey	11	3	8	65	20	45	24
United Arab Emirates	30	11	19	55	18	37	15
United States	39	12	27	54	17	37	7
Average	27	10	17	56	18	38	18

⁷³⁴ Pew Global Attitudes Project March 2008

Which one of the following, if any, is hurting the world's environment the most?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	None (vol.)	Other (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	4	0	40	3	5	22	7	0	1	18
Britain	4	3	40	2	2	36	4	1	0	10
France	10	1	34	3	3	35	12	0	0	0
Germany	6	1	39	3	2	34	9	0	0	6
Spain	4	2	17	2	3	51	7	0	1	13
Poland	2	3	23	2	2	26	25	0	1	17
Russia	6	1	18	3	4	28	16	0	2	18
Turkey	3	1	6	1	1	46	5	0	3	34
Egypt	6	5	20	9	18	22	13	0	4	4
Jordan	7	7	19	8	15	24	15	0	6	1
Lebanon	18	4	18	4	3	36	8	0	8	1
Australia	9	1	46	4	3	24	4	0	1	8
China	11	5	9	4	9	26	4	0	1	31
India	19	6	21	4	7	21	4	0	2	15
Indonesia	7	3	11	1	5	42	11	0	1	19
Japan	2	1	67	1	3	17	2	0	1	7
Pakistan	23	1	1	0	0	51	2	0	1	19
South Korea	4	0	64	1	2	19	1	0	2	6

Argentina	1	2	7	4	5	54	4	0	5	15
Brazil	5	3	11	14	6	44	5	0	0	13
Mexico	2	4	13	3	6	38	7	0	4	24
Nigeria	6	5	11	2	7	24	8	0	6	31
South Africa	7	4	16	2	6	11	6	0	2	44
Tanzania	11	3	5	2	8	27	9	0	1	32

735 Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2007

Which one of the following, if any, is hurting the world's environment the most?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	Other	DK/ Refused
United States	5	0	22	2	3	33	10	4	22
Canada	6	1	31	1	2	36	4	2	16
Argentina	1	1	3	3	4	49	1	4	35
Bolivia	2	3	10	1	7	47	5	1	23
Brazil	3	1	6	16	3	49	4	1	16
Chile	3	2	9	2	6	42	10	2	24
Mexico	5	6	11	3	5	39	6	2	22
Peru	4	3	8	1	7	46	10	2	20
Venezuela	6	1	9	1	5	55	8	2	12
Britain	5	1	31	3	1	41	4	3	13
France	9	1	23	1	2	53	9	0	2
Germany	4	1	33	1	1	45	8	1	8
Italy	4	1	22	1	4	31	4	1	32
Spain	7	0	7	2	4	56	2	0	22
Sweden	2	1	18	1	2	42	16	3	15
Bulgaria	1	0	3	2	1	41	4	1	48
Czech Rep.	4	3	19	2	1	48	12	0	11
Poland	3	4	11	2	3	29	19	0	29
Russia	2	2	14	2	3	26	16	2	33
Slovakia	4	2	13	3	2	55	8	1	12
Ukraine	1	0	6	1	4	37	8	4	38
Turkey	2	1	3	0	2	61	4	2	25
Egypt	6	8	19	6	19	27	6	3	7
Jordan	5	6	19	6	19	22	6	2	14
Kuwait	8	3	5	1	4	29	5	5	40
Lebanon	5	5	19	5	7	37	7	7	9
Morocco	4	3	7	2	2	31	2	2	47
Palestinian Territories	3	3	11	3	4	41	4	2	28
Israel	13	5	21	5	6	20	9	1	20
Pakistan	24	0	1	0	0	41	1	1	31
Bangladesh	13	2	3	1	4	61	3	0	14
Indonesia	3	2	6	1	4	52	4	2	27
Malaysia	6	1	3	0	1	38	2	4	44
China	7	1	11	2	9	38	2	3	29
India	29	4	10	5	4	25	3	2	17
Japan	1	1	34	0	7	36	1	1	18
South Korea	1	0	56	1	2	30	0	1	9

736 Pew Global Attitudes Project March 2008

Which of the following countries would you trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world's environment?

	India	Germany	China	Brazil	Japan	United States	Russia	None (vol.)	Other (vol.)	DK/NR
United States	3	15	2	4	7	57	1	0	2	9
Britain	3	45	4	3	8	12	1	6	0	19
France	3	71	2	6	6	6	3	0	2	1
Germany	2	80	1	2	2	3	2	0	1	6
Spain	7	36	4	5	7	9	1	5	3	20
Poland	1	25	2	6	16	24	1	0	3	21
Russia	3	26	3	3	19	5	15	0	2	20
Turkey	3	19	2	1	10	4	1	2	6	51
Egypt	7	14	13	5	18	7	2	17	8	9
Jordan	7	12	14	6	15	8	4	20	8	6
Lebanon	2	25	6	8	9	7	4	16	15	7
Australia	1	43	2	5	7	21	1	0	5	14
China	2	8	42	2	6	7	2	0	1	29
India	54	3	3	3	7	16	3	0	1	10
Indonesia	3	8	10	5	32	16	2	0	3	22
Japan	5	36	2	2	34	4	2	0	4	13
Pakistan	4	2	44	1	7	7	0	0	10	26
South Korea	3	33	1	5	23	13	1	0	6	16
Argentina	3	18	6	8	13	9	2	7	2	33
Brazil	3	11	5	43	12	14	0	1	0	10
Mexico	7	11	13	5	9	19	5	0	4	28
Nigeria	2	6	22	2	4	48	2	0	1	12
South Africa	4	12	8	6	5	26	2	0	4	32
Tanzania	5	11	7	11	6	18	4	0	7	32
Average	6	24	9	6	12	15	3	3	4	19

737 BBC July 2006

Please tell me if you are very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned or not at all concerned about each of the following possibilities related to energy issues.

That energy shortages and prices will destabilize the world economy.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	43	42	11	4	1
Brazil	51	24	13	10	1
Canada	45	40	9	4	2
Chile	40	33	12	7	8
Egypt	47	32	13	7	1
France	29	50	13	5	2
Germany	31	42	20	7	1
Great Britain	49	35	9	4	3
India	42	26	11	10	12
Israel	29	38	14	16	3
Italy	40	44	10	4	1
Kenya	54	28	11	3	5
Mexico	46	37	11	4	2
Philippines	60	35	3	1	1

Poland	20	43	21	7	9
Russia	10	38	32	9	10
South Korea	43	50	6	*	1
Ukraine	26	39	21	5	9
United States	44	38	12	4	2
Average	39	38	13	6	4

⁷³⁸ BBC July 2006

That competition for energy will lead to greater conflict and war between nations.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	40	42	11	6	1
Brazil	47	26	14	12	1
Canada	42	40	11	6	1
Chile	39	32	14	7	8
Egypt	41	38	17	4	*
France	28	43	17	9	3
Germany	37	38	18	6	1
Great Britain	46	37	9	6	2
India	35	24	16	9	15
Israel	29	33	16	18	4
Italy	42	35	16	5	2
Kenya	49	27	11	6	7
Mexico	33	27	23	14	4
Philippines	50	38	8	2	2
Poland	16	36	25	11	12
Russia	14	42	27	7	11
South Korea	34	56	9	1	1
Ukraine	31	40	17	4	9
United States	41	38	12	7	1
Average	36	36	15	7	4

⁷³⁹ BBC July 2006

That the way the world produces and uses energy is causing environmental problems including climate change.

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not at all concerned	DK / NA
Australia	69	25	5	1	*
Brazil	61	20	10	8	1
Canada	62	29	4	4	1
Chile	50	28	10	6	6
Egypt	41	36	15	7	1
France	45	45	7	3	1
Germany	43	40	13	3	1
Great Britain	66	27	4	2	1
India	41	20	13	8	18
Israel	42	33	12	10	2
Italy	60	31	7	2	1
Kenya	55	24	11	5	5
Mexico	35	39	18	5	3

Philippines	47	41	8	2	2
Poland	17	41	23	8	12
Russia	20	46	20	4	9
South Korea	43	47	7	1	2
Ukraine	35	38	14	3	10
United States	53	29	10	8	1
Average	47	34	11	5	4

⁷⁴⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of [survey country] in the next 10 years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

Disruption in energy supply

	Critical	Important but not Critical	Not Important	NS/Decline
United States	59	37	3	1
Armenia	58	23	8	10
Australia	52	40	8	0
China	53	29	9	8
India	43	32	13	11
Iran	47	12	27	14
Israel	33	37	19	10
South Korea	64	31	4	0

⁷⁴¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

And in the next 10 years, please tell me how likely you are to be personally affected by each of the following threats.

Energy dependence

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not likely at all	DK/ Refused	Likely	Not likely
United States	63	24	6	5	2	87	11
France	47	37	12	3	1	84	15
Germany	69	23	5	2	1	92	7
Great Britain	49	32	11	6	3	80	17
Italy	48	41	8	2	1	89	11
Netherlands	33	41	18	6	3	73	24
Poland	34	49	10	2	5	83	12
Portugal	45	34	10	5	6	79	15
Spain	60	31	5	3	1	91	8
Slovakia	30	46	15	4	6	75	18
Turkey	36	24	13	9	19	59	22
Bulgaria	43	37	7	4	9	81	11
Romania	29	44	14	5	6	73	20
European Average	44	37	11	4	5	81	15

⁷⁴² **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that [survey country] might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of [survey country], a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Securing adequate supplies of energy

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	NS/Decline
United States	72	25	2	2
Armenia	73	19	4	4
Australia	72	23	4	1
China	61	29	5	5
India	52	28	12	8
South Korea	63	33	3	
Thailand	59	23	3	15

⁷⁴³ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Some people say that the world is facing some new problems that require some new international institutions or agencies to deal with them. Do you think that there should or should not be new international institutions to:

Monitor the worldwide energy market and predict potential shortages

69%	Should be
30	Should not be
2	Not sure/Decline

⁷⁴⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Installing solar or wind energy systems

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	82	4	6	8
Mexico	86	4	6	3
United States	87	5	6	3
France	88	3	9	0
Germany	82	5	12	2
Great Britain	81	6	10	4
Italy	88	7	4	2
Poland	85	7	1	7
Russia	50	4	12	35
Ukraine	67	6	7	20
Azerbaijan	64	10	13	14
Jordan	76	11	3	10
Palestinian Territories	59	30	8	4
Turkey	84	4	3	9
Kenya	88	11	0	1
Nigeria	77	17	4	3
China	84	4	4	8
Hong Kong	59	16	18	8
Macau	64	9	15	12

India	62	13	16	10
Indonesia	64	16	8	13
South Korea	89	2	9	1
Taiwan	82	2	10	5
Thailand	75	7	5	13
Average	77	8	7	8

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

⁷⁴⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Requiring utilities to use more alternative energy, such as wind and solar, even if this increases the cost of energy in the short run

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	70	17	13
Mexico	58	38	5
United States	66	28	6
France	88	10	3
Germany	62	36	2
Great Britain	75	19	6
Italy	67	29	4
Poland	66	15	19
Russia	36	36	28
Ukraine	56	11	33
Azerbaijan	48	43	8
Jordan	77	13	10
Palestinian Territories	71	27	2
Turkey	71	12	17
Kenya	87	13	1
Nigeria	71	26	4
China	75	11	14
Hong Kong	78	15	7
Macau	76	13	11
India	63	20	17
Indonesia	65	13	22
South Korea	96	4	1
Taiwan	88	9	3
Thailand	73	9	17
Average	69	20	11

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

⁷⁴⁶ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2007**

In order to help reduce global warming, would you be willing or not willing to pay more for electricity if it were generated by renewable sources like solar or wind energy?

75%	Willing
20	Not willing
5	Unsure

⁷⁴⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Creating tax incentives to encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as solar or wind power.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	74	18	5	2	1
Brazil	65	22	4	6	3
Canada	66	25	4	4	1
Chile	31	31	13	12	13
Egypt	32	34	24	8	2
France	63	28	4	3	2
Germany	50	35	9	4	2
Great Britain	62	24	5	6	2
India	49	19	14	5	13
Israel	59	25	7	4	6
Italy	75	20	2	2	1
Kenya	48	29	11	8	5
Mexico	32	35	13	11	9
Philippines	31	39	19	8	2
Poland	55	31	4	3	7
Russia	30	44	9	4	13
South Korea	31	51	14	3	2
Ukraine	42	36	9	4	9
United States	59	26	6	6	2
Average	50	30	9	5	5

⁷⁴⁸ **Gallup Poll March 2009**

Would you prefer the government to increase, decrease, or not change the financial support and incentives it gives for producing energy from alternative sources such as wind and solar?

77%	Increase
8	Decrease
13	Not change
3	No opinion

⁷⁴⁹ **ABC News Washington Post Poll June 2008**

Do you think the government should offer tax breaks for companies to develop alternative energy sources, or should it leave it to the marketplace to develop alternative energy sources, without tax breaks?

63%	Offer tax breaks
32	Leave it to marketplace
4	No opinion

⁷⁵⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

As you may know there is some controversy about the possibility of making a major shift to alternative energy sources, such as wind and solar. Which view is closer to yours?

	This would cost so much money that it would hurt the economy	With the rising cost of energy, it would save money in the long run	DK / NS
Argentina	21	66	13
Mexico	18	73	10
United States	18	79	3

France	12	83	5
Germany	31	65	4
Great Britain	13	79	8
Italy	18	74	8
Poland	6	77	17
Russia	27	45	29
Ukraine	14	54	33
Azerbaijan	33	52	15
Jordan	21	61	18
Palestinian Territories	40	55	4
Turkey	19	57	24
Kenya	34	64	2
Nigeria	32	63	6
China	8	78	14
Hong Kong	10	83	7
Macau	9	79	12
India	29	51	19
Indonesia	15	59	27
South Korea	12	86	2
Taiwan	7	84	9
Thailand	13	59	28
Average	21	66	14

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

751 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Please indicate how important the following factors are to the United States remaining competitive with other countries in the global economy?

Investing in renewable energy

- 74% Very important
- 19 Somewhat important
- 4 Not very important
- 2 Not important at all
- 2 Not sure/Decline

752 George Washington University Battleground 2008 Survey August 2008

(Now, thinking about the issue of energy and finding new sources of domestic energy. I would like to read you a list of proposals regarding finding new domestic sources for energy. Please listen carefully as I read each statement and tell me if you would favor or oppose each of these proposals.)...Promoting energy conservation practices...(If Favor/Oppose, ask:) Is that strongly favor/oppose or somewhat favor/oppose?

- 71% Favor strongly
- 21 Favor somewhat
- 4 Oppose somewhat
- 3 Oppose strongly
- 2 Unsure

753 WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Modifying buildings to make them more energy efficient

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	80	4	8	8
Mexico	83	7	7	3
United States	83	4	11	2
France	89	2	9	1
Germany	85	6	7	1
Great Britain	89	2	8	2
Italy	88	8	3	1
Poland	83	9	1	7
Russia	58	8	14	20
Ukraine	66	6	7	21
Azerbaijan	60	17	17	6
Jordan	69	16	6	10
Palestinian Territories	54	31	10	4
Turkey	83	6	2	9
Kenya	75	23	2	1
Nigeria	55	28	12	5
China	80	6	4	10
Hong Kong	51	16	23	11
Macau	56	10	18	15
India	54	17	19	11
Indonesia	55	24	8	12
South Korea	85	3	10	2
Taiwan	73	4	16	8
Thailand	73	8	6	13
Average	74	11	8	7

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

754 WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Requiring businesses to use energy more efficiently, even if this might make some products more expensive

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	63	24	13
Mexico	47	49	4
United States	61	34	5
France	72	25	3
Germany	57	40	3
Great Britain	79	17	5
Italy	69	27	4
Poland	50	26	24
Russia	28	43	29
Ukraine	46	17	38
Azerbaijan	38	55	7
Jordan	62	27	11
Palestinian Territories	53	44	2
Turkey	63	18	19
Kenya	71	28	1
Nigeria	49	46	5
China	66	16	18

Hong Kong	71	18	10
Macau	71	18	12
India	62	25	14
Indonesia	37	47	16
South Korea	74	24	3
Taiwan	80	15	5
Thailand	65	17	18
Average	58	31	11

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

⁷⁵⁵ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political/Foreign Policy Poll September 2008**

(As I read some possible government policies to address America's energy supply, tell me whether you would favor or oppose each.)
Would you favor or oppose the government...establishing tax incentives to encourage conservation?

69%	Favor
23	Oppose
8	Don't know/Refused

⁷⁵⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

Do you favor or oppose the government doing each of the following:

Having an extra charge for the purchase of models of appliances and cars that are NOT energy efficient

	Favor	Oppose	DK / NS
Argentina	62	25	13
Mexico	39	57	4
United States	43	52	5
France	60	38	2
Germany	43	54	3
Britain	59	36	5
Italy	69	28	3
Poland	37	36	26
Russia	37	33	30
Ukraine	32	22	47
Azerbaijan	43	47	10
Jordan	37	52	11
Palestinian Territories	38	58	4
Turkey	56	26	19
Kenya	74	25	2
Nigeria	44	46	11
China	48	33	19
Hong Kong	55	36	9
Macau	53	35	12
India	47	27	26
Indonesia	61	21	18
South Korea	53	43	4
Taiwan	55	40	5
Thailand	19	64	17
Average	48	39	13

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

⁷⁵⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Increasing energy taxes to encourage conservation

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	30	39	18	12	1
Brazil	6	7	13	73	*
Canada	18	29	21	30	2
Chile	14	27	23	25	13
Egypt	20	26	23	28	2
France	7	23	24	41	5
Germany	12	35	26	26	1
Great Britain	31	31	16	18	4
India	25	27	14	22	13
Israel	14	22	26	31	6
Italy	5	17	34	42	2
Kenya	32	28	18	17	5
Mexico	7	19	27	43	3
Philippines	20	18	22	38	1
Poland	2	5	34	53	5
Russia	2	11	39	45	4
South Korea	6	35	45	12	1
Ukraine	3	9	31	55	2
United States	19	28	22	29	2
Average	14	23	25	34	4

⁷⁵⁸ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Values Survey April 2009**

(As I read some possible government policies to address America's energy supply, tell me whether you would favor or oppose each.)
 Would you favor or oppose the government...increasing taxes on gasoline to encourage carpooling and conservation?

24% Favor
 74 Oppose
 2 Don't know/Refused

⁷⁵⁹ **FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll June 2008**

Thinking now about the energy situation, please tell me if you favor or oppose the following ways to reduce the country's dependence on foreign oil and make the United States more energy independent. . . .

Rationing gasoline and oil

30% Favor
 63 Oppose
 7 Don't know/Refused

Increasing the federal tax on gasoline

13% Favor
 83 Oppose
 7 Don't know/Refused

⁷⁶⁰ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2007**

Would you be willing or not willing to pay higher taxes on gasoline and other fuels if the money was used for research into renewable sources like solar and wind energy?

64% Willing
 33 Not willing
 3 Unsure

⁷⁶¹ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2007**

In order to cut down on energy consumption and reduce global-warming, would you favor or oppose an increased federal tax on gasoline?

38% Favor
 58 Oppose
 4 Unsure

⁷⁶² **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Requiring auto makers to increase fuel efficiency, even if this means the price of cars would go up.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK / NA
Australia	59	29	6	5	1
Brazil	35	23	16	23	3
Canada	47	30	10	10	2
Chile	24	34	17	10	15
Egypt	20	27	26	25	2
France	24	31	18	23	4
Germany	38	42	14	4	2
Great Britain	45	29	12	11	3
India	36	19	7	13	24
Israel	35	30	15	13	7
Italy	47	38	7	4	3
Kenya	33	28	18	13	7
Mexico	25	44	11	13	8
Philippines	20	29	29	21	1
Poland	18	30	21	13	18
Russia	36	41	11	1	11
South Korea	23	51	20	3	3
Ukraine	38	43	8	2	10
United States	50	27	10	11	1
Average	34	33	15	11	7

⁷⁶³ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2007**

Which do you think should be a higher priority for the government--increasing the production of petroleum, coal and natural gas, or encouraging people to conserve energy?

21% Increasing production
 68 Encouraging conservation
 9 Both (Vol.)
 2 Don't know/No answer

⁷⁶⁴ **Gallup Poll March 2008**

Which of the following approaches to solving the nation's energy problems do you think the U.S. should follow right now: emphasize production of more oil, gas and coal supplies, or emphasize more conservation by consumers of existing energy supplies?

	Production	Conservation	Both/ Equally (vol.)	Neither/ Other (vol.)	Unsure
March 2008	29	61	5	3	2
March 2007	26	64	5	1	3
March 2006	35	55	6	1	2
March 2005	28	61	7	2	2
March 2004	31	59	6	2	2
March 2003	29	60	7	2	2

⁷⁶⁵ **CBS News/New York Times Poll April 2007**

Which do you think should be a higher priority for the government: increasing the production of petroleum, coal and natural gas, or encouraging people to conserve energy?

	Increasing Production (percent)	Encouraging Conservation (percent)	Both (vol.) (percent)	Neither (vol.) (percent)	Unsure (percent)
April 2007	21	68	9	0	2
October 2005	37	49	10	2	2

⁷⁶⁶ **ABC News/Planet Green/Stanford University poll July 2008**

What do you think is more important: finding new energy sources, or improving energy conservation?

64%	New energy sources
33	Improving conservation
3	Unsure

⁷⁶⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Building coal or oil-fired power plants

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	60	14	14	13
Mexico	46	39	12	5
United States	25	49	22	4
France	28	46	21	4
Germany	9	62	27	2
Great Britain	28	40	24	8
Italy	38	46	11	5
Poland	27	28	28	17
Russia	19	38	23	21
Ukraine	30	27	22	22
Azerbaijan	45	31	15	9
Jordan	63	19	7	11

Palestinian Territories	46	35	14	5
Turkey	52	26	11	11
Kenya	69	23	5	4
Nigeria	56	28	11	6
China	42	36	11	11
Hong Kong	23	30	34	12
Macau	30	28	25	16
India	36	27	24	13
Indonesia	50	24	10	15
South Korea	31	33	32	4
Taiwan	29	34	27	10
Thailand	41	19	13	28
Average	40	33	17	10

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

768 Pew News Interest Index Poll August 2006

As I read from a list tell me how important each of the following is a way to reduce terrorism in the future....Decrease American dependence on oil imported from the Middle East...Is this very important, fairly important, not too important, or not at all important as a way to reduce terrorism in the future?

67%	Very important
18	Fairly important
5	Not too important
5	Not at all important
5	Don't know/Refused

769 WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Do you think that ten years from now, the cost of oil will be higher, lower or about the same as it is now?

	Much Higher	Somewhat Higher	About the same as it is now	Somewhat lower	Much lower	DK / NS
Mexico	54	29	7	5	1	4
United States	63	25	6	4	2	0
France	81	5	9	2	2	1
Great Britain	58	27	7	3	2	3
Russia	35	26	12	5	2	20
Ukraine	55	23	6	2	0	13
Azerbaijan	45	25	12	6	1	12
Egypt	67	28	5	1	0	-
Iran	55	20	5	3	1	17
Palestinian Territories	46	26	14	6	3	6
Turkey	58	20	5	4	3	11
Nigeria	42	22	12	14	7	4
China	29	46	11	6	1	7
India	54	20	10	7	4	4
Indonesia	74	22	1	2	0	1
South Korea	56	31	7	5	2	0
Average	55	24	8	5	2	7

770 WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Do you think that governments should make long-term plans based on the assumption that:

	Enough new oil will be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future	Oil is running out and it is necessary to make a major effort to replace oil as a primary source of energy	DK / NS
Mexico	13	83	5
United States	23	76	2
France	8	91	1
Great Britain	13	85	3
Russia	27	53	20
Ukraine	18	63	19
Azerbaijan	29	58	12
Egypt	21	79	-
Iran	9	68	23
Palestinian Territories	29	68	4
Turkey	28	57	16
Nigeria	53	45	2
China	16	80	4
India	28	54	18
Indonesia	37	59	4
South Korea	4	97	-
Average	22	70	8

⁷⁷¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org February 2008

Which assumption do you think the [Survey country] government is acting on now:

	Enough new oil will be found so that it can remain a primary source of energy for the foreseeable future	Oil is running out and it is necessary to make a major effort to replace oil as a primary source of energy	DK / NS
Mexico	41	49	10
United States	57	41	3
France	36	55	10
Great Britain	34	56	10
Russia	37	34	29
Ukraine	28	44	28
Azerbaijan	50	31	18
Egypt	33	67	-
Iran	12	63	26
Palestinian Territories	30	61	9
Turkey	28	53	18
Nigeria	63	32	6
China	21	70	9
India	30	48	23
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	20	79	1
Average	35	53	13

⁷⁷² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military force?

To ensure the supply of oil

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Ref
United States	44	50	6
France	50	45	5
Germany	37	61	3
Great Britain	52	41	7
Italy	38	56	6
Netherlands	48	47	4
Poland	33	53	14
Portugal	57	27	16
Spain	43	49	8
Slovakia	30	43	27
Turkey	69	21	11
European Average	42	51	7

⁷⁷⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008

I would like you to consider different ways to deal with the problem of energy. For each one please tell me if you think our country should emphasize it more, less, or the same as now

Building nuclear energy power plants

	Emphasize more	Emphasize less	Same as now	DK/NS
Argentina	55	21	12	12
Mexico	32	50	12	7
United States	42	31	24	3
France	26	41	32	1
Germany	14	63	22	1
Great Britain	41	29	22	8
Italy	52	33	8	6
Poland	32	12	37	18
Russia	27	33	22	18
Ukraine	9	49	20	22
Azerbaijan	36	32	16	17
Jordan	58	21	9	12
Palestinian Territories	41	34	18	7
Turkey	48	26	12	14
Kenya	57	29	8	6
Nigeria	56	25	9	11
China	63	10	6	20
Hong Kong	22	35	32	11
Macau	23	44	17	15
India	51	16	17	17
Indonesia	23	40	10	27
South Korea	55	13	28	5
Taiwan	40	21	30	9
Thailand	22	31	10	37
Average	40	30	17	13

* Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan not included in average

774 ABC News/Planet Green/Stanford Poll July 2008

In general, would you favor or oppose building more nuclear power plants at this time? (If Favor/Oppose, ask:) Do you favor/oppose this strongly or somewhat?

25% Strongly favor
 19 Somewhat favor
 23 Strongly oppose
 30 Somewhat oppose
 3 No opinion

775 GlobeScan July 2005

Support for Nuclear Power

	Nuclear is safe; build more plants	Use what's there; don't build new	Nuclear dangerous; close all plants	DK/NA
South Korea	52	34	12	2
United States	40	29	20	11
Jordan	35	18	41	6
Australia	34	37	23	6
Canada	34	35	22	9
Indonesia	33	31	28	8
Great Britain	33	37	23	7
India	33	23	22	22
Mexico	32	28	23	17
France	25	50	16	9
Germany	22	47	26	5
Russia	22	41	20	17
Cameroon	21	21	27	31
Japan	21	61	15	3
Hungary	19	55	19	7
Saudi Arabia	16	25	36	23
Argentina	14	32	23	31
Morocco	13	4	49	34
Average	28	34	25	13

776 Gallup Poll March 2009

Thinking now about nuclear energy: Overall, do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity for the United States?

27% Strongly favor
 32 Somewhat favor
 23 Somewhat oppose
 20 Strongly oppose
 6 Unsure

Gallup Poll March 2001

Overall, do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity for the United States?

20%	Strongly favor
26	Somewhat favor
28	Somewhat oppose
20	Strongly oppose
6	No opinion

⁷⁷⁷ **BBC July 2006**

Please tell me if you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each of the following.

Building new nuclear power plants, to reduce reliance on oil and coal.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK/NA
Australia	19	34	20	24	3
Brazil	23	24	15	35	3
Canada	22	30	18	25	6
Chile	18	24	20	24	15
Egypt	30	39	21	9	1
France	10	28	23	34	5
Germany	9	26	26	36	3
Great Britain	21	29	17	26	7
India	36	30	11	10	13
Israel	20	29	18	23	10
Italy	26	27	18	25	5
Kenya	36	30	12	15	8
Mexico	19	35	20	13	13
Philippines	27	33	20	18	2
Poland	13	18	26	30	14
Russia	5	23	36	24	12
South Korea	15	50	27	4	4
Ukraine	6	18	31	36	9
United States	29	34	15	18	4
Average	20	29	21	23	7

⁷⁷⁸ **Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll June 2008**

"Thinking now about the energy situation, please tell me if you favor or oppose the following ways to reduce the country's dependence on foreign oil and make the United States more energy independent. . . ."

Building more nuclear power plants

51%	Favor
41	Oppose
9	Unsure

⁷⁷⁹ **Los Angeles Times/Bloomberg Poll August 2006**

One suggestion for reducing the problem of global warming is to increase the use of nuclear power as a source of energy and to decrease the use of fossil fuels, such as oil and natural gas. Would you, personally, support or oppose the increased use of nuclear power as a source of energy in order to prevent global warming?

61%	Support
30	Oppose
9	Unsure

780 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

As you may know, we depend on other countries for much of our energy needs. Which of the following approaches do you favor the most for ensuring a stable supply of energy?

	We should increase cooperation with energy producing countries even if their governments are undemocratic	We should reduce our energy dependence on other countries, even if energy prices would rise sharply at home as a result	We should apply diplomatic pressure, even if this increases tensions with energy producing countries	None of the above	DK/Refused
United States	23	48	15	9	5
France	33	39	22	5	2
Germany	38	35	22	2	2
United Kingdom	25	47	20	3	6
Italy	35	43	13	7	2
Netherlands	36	43	16	3	3
Poland	51	16	15	5	12
Portugal	41	26	16	8	10
Spain	30	40	22	5	3
Slovakia	42	23	12	12	10
Turkey	20	32	12	7	20
Bulgaria	48	12	14	12	14
Romania	54	21	7	8	11
European Average	35	35	18	5	7

781 Pew News Interest Index Poll August 2006

As I read from a list tell me how important each of the following is a way to reduce terrorism in the future....Decrease American dependence on oil imported from the Middle East...Is this very important, fairly important, not too important, or not at all important as a way to reduce terrorism in the future?

67%	Very important
18	Fairly important
5	Not too important
5	Not at all important
5	Don't know/Refused

782 German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

As you may know, some people are concerned about recent developments in Russia. Those who are concerned give a number of reasons. To what extent are you concerned or not about each of the following items:

Russia's role as an energy provider

	Very concerned	Somewhat concerned	Not very concerned	Not concerned at all	DK/Refused	Concerned	Not concerned
United States	24	37	19	14	6	61	33
France	17	37	32	12	1	55	44
Germany	36	42	15	6	1	78	21
United Kingdom	35	37	16	8	4	72	24
Italy	27	47	19	5	2	74	24
Netherlands	19	46	25	8	3	65	33
Poland	30	51	11	2	6	81	13
Portugal	25	35	18	11	11	60	30
Spain	15	36	33	12	4	51	45

Slovakia	16	44	27	7	6	60	34
Turkey	14	21	13	13	40	35	26
Bulgaria	13	31	22	24	10	44	46
Romania	30	38	16	8	8	69	23
European Average	23	39	21	10	8	62	30

783 BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Russia

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	10	52	25	10	3
Brazil	3	11	21	55	11
Canada	8	44	21	19	8
Chile	9	33	20	12	26
Egypt	22	28	21	24	5
France	5	30	33	22	11
Germany	11	36	37	13	2
Great Britain	5	37	31	22	5
India	32	29	8	5	25
Israel	11	31	21	29	8
Italy	6	39	37	11	8
Kenya	17	26	21	16	19
Mexico	17	20	24	31	8
Philippines	9	34	28	17	11
Poland	2	25	32	29	12
Russia	40	39	10	2	9
South Korea	1	17	62	5	15
Ukraine	24	35	21	13	7
United States	5	49	23	20	3
Average	13	32	26	19	10

784 BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Saudi Arabia

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	11	47	26	14	2
Brazil	1	7	20	61	10
Canada	6	36	24	27	7
Chile	7	27	25	14	26
Egypt	56	27	10	7	1
France	5	29	28	28	10
Germany	13	35	34	15	3
Great Britain	8	38	30	20	5
India	19	29	22	12	19
Israel	12	20	16	45	7

Italy	6	30	38	19	7
Kenya	24	31	18	14	13
Mexico	20	24	27	22	7
Philippines	27	36	21	11	5
Poland	6	34	24	13	23
Russia	5	19	29	13	34
South Korea	3	34	51	4	8
Ukraine	2	20	24	21	33
United States	5	36	26	30	3
Average	12	29	26	20	12

⁷⁸⁵ BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Venezuela

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	7	48	22	7	17
Brazil	1	12	18	59	10
Canada	7	41	22	14	16
Chile	7	32	26	13	23
Egypt	10	26	29	24	10
France	3	36	23	15	24
Germany	7	35	38	11	10
Great Britain	5	37	27	15	16
India	9	21	16	22	33
Israel	10	26	19	23	22
Italy	5	29	38	9	19
Kenya	10	23	21	15	30
Mexico	22	31	31	11	5
Philippines	6	29	33	17	16
Poland	5	30	18	9	37
Russia	2	15	25	13	44
South Korea	1	14	39	5	42
Ukraine	2	14	23	19	43
United States	5	44	19	23	9
Average	7	28	26	17	22

⁷⁸⁶ BBC July 2006

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Iran

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	4	30	38	26	2
Brazil	1	5	16	68	10
Canada	3	20	29	42	6

Chile	5	21	30	19	25
Egypt	40	33	18	8	2
France	1	16	27	45	11
Germany	2	11	41	45	1
Great Britain	3	24	32	36	5
India	22	29	16	12	20
Israel	7	7	11	69	6
Italy	2	11	43	37	8
Kenya	18	20	24	26	12
Mexico	18	22	25	25	10
Philippines	11	27	32	22	8
Poland	2	20	29	26	23
Russia	2	12	33	23	30
South Korea	1	16	61	9	13
Ukraine	2	12	30	27	29
United States	2	12	27	56	2
Average	8	18	29	33	12

⁷⁸⁷ **BBC July 2006**

For each of the following large energy exporting countries, please tell me how much you trust them to follow through on their commitments to deliver energy to other countries? Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all in?

Canada

	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all in	DK / NA
Australia	54	40	3	1	2
Brazil	7	16	19	49	11
Canada	45	41	7	5	2
Chile	15	37	15	8	26
Egypt	14	25	27	26	8
France	20	55	7	5	14
Germany	41	44	8	3	4
Great Britain	32	47	11	4	5
India	18	23	13	16	31
Israel	37	32	9	10	11
Italy	24	43	14	5	13
Kenya	21	28	14	13	23
Mexico	24	32	32	7	6
Philippines	27	40	16	9	8
Poland	20	36	10	5	29
Russia	7	30	19	12	32
South Korea	3	41	28	2	25
Ukraine	8	30	17	17	29
United States	47	42	5	4	1
Average	24	36	14	10	15

⁷⁸⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad thing for our country?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	16	49	20	10	65	30	5
Canada	32	53	8	3	85	11	5
Britain	29	53	11	3	82	14	4
France	28	55	13	4	83	17	0
Germany	32	53	12	2	85	14	1
Spain	35	54	6	2	89	8	3
Poland	22	59	10	2	81	12	6
Russia	24	56	11	2	80	13	7
Turkey	30	34	13	9	64	22	15
Egypt	24	43	26	8	67	34	1
Jordan	21	39	28	11	60	39	2
Lebanon	46	44	9	0	90	9	1
Palestinian Territories	44	36	12	6	80	18	1
Israel	47	41	6	3	88	9	2
China	26	67	3	0	93	3	3
India	48	48	3	1	96	4	1
Indonesia	21	58	14	1	79	15	5
Japan	20	53	17	4	73	21	6
Pakistan	47	32	9	2	79	11	10
South Korea	24	68	4	0	92	4	4
Argentina	16	49	18	6	65	24	11
Brazil	20	67	8	1	87	9	4
Mexico	27	52	12	4	79	16	6
Kenya	38	42	11	6	80	17	3
Nigeria	52	38	7	2	90	9	1
Average	31	50	12	4	81	16	4

Now thinking about you and your family: do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad for you and your family?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	11	52	21	7	63	28	8
Canada	25	60	7	2	85	9	6
Britain	20	60	10	3	80	13	8
France	20	62	14	4	82	18	0
Germany	18	64	13	1	82	14	4
Spain	25	60	6	1	85	7	7
Poland	18	64	9	1	82	10	8
Russia	15	50	11	2	65	13	22
Turkey	22	40	12	8	62	20	18
Egypt	18	42	28	11	60	39	1
Jordan	16	41	27	14	57	41	2
Lebanon	21	34	28	15	55	43	2
Palestinian Territories	38	44	10	5	82	15	2
Israel	31	53	6	2	84	8	8
China	16	66	5	0	82	5	12
India	39	55	4	1	94	5	1
Indonesia	13	58	21	2	71	23	6
Japan	16	57	15	2	73	17	10
Pakistan	34	40	7	2	74	9	18
South Korea	17	70	5	0	87	5	8
Argentina	11	46	17	6	57	23	19

Brazil	12	71	11	1	83	12	6
Mexico	22	52	13	3	74	16	9
Kenya	27	44	17	8	71	25	4
Nigeria	42	45	9	3	87	12	2
Average	22	53	13	4	75	17	8

⁷⁸⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for [country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	DK
United States	60	35	5
Argentina	55	22	23
Mexico	41	22	37
Peru	70	27	3
Armenia	65	18	17
France	51	42	7
Great Britain	53	30	17
Poland	52	21	27
Russia	41	24	34
Ukraine	55	11	34
Azerbaijan	63	16	20
Egypt	79	21	0
Iran	63	31	6
Israel	82	10	7
Palestinian Territories	58	28	15
Turkey	39	28	33
Nigeria	78	18	4
Kenya	89	9	2
Australia	65	27	8
China	87	6	7
India	54	30	16
Indonesia	61	31	8
Philippines	49	32	20
South Korea	86	12	2
Thailand	75	8	17
Average	63	22	15

⁷⁹⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good or mostly bad for the United States?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	Neutral/equally good and bad	Not sure/ Decline
1998	54	20	15	11
2002 (telephone)	56	27	8	9
2002 (internet)	61	32	n/a	7
2004 (internet)	64	31	n/a	5
2006 (internet)	60	35	n/a	5

2008 (internet) 58 39 n/a 4

⁷⁹¹ **GlobeScan June 2004**

As you may know, there are both positive and negative impacts from increasing globalization occurring in the world. By globalization, I mean the increased trade between countries in goods, services and investment. Thinking of you and your family's interests, do you think the overall effect of globalization is very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative?

	Positive	Negative	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Neutral/Other	DK/NA
Argentina	32	30	5	26	17	13	23	15
Brazil	72	22	17	55	15	7	4	2
Canada	67	30	10	57	23	8	1	2
Chile	54	22	12	42	18	4	20	4
China	60	13	9	51	12	1	21	6
France	35	45	1	34	36	9	15	5
Germany	55	38	5	51	34	4	5	1
Great Britain	67	28	9	59	23	5	2	3
India	73	18	31	42	10	8	7	2
Indonesia	61	22	14	47	19	3	16	1
Italy	53	31	6	46	25	6	14	3
Mexico	67	19	15	52	15	4	8	7
Nigeria	70	15	31	39	9	6	13	2
Russia	28	16	5	23	10	5	46	10
South Africa	71	19	26	45	12	7	6	4
Spain	55	19	15	40	13	6	18	8
Turkey	30	31	4	27	26	5	22	16
Uruguay	28	32	3	25	20	12	27	13
United States	65	31	8	57	24	8	1	2
Average	55	25	12	43	19	6	15	6

⁷⁹² **BBC February 2008**

Overall do you think economic globalization, including trade and investment, is growing much too quickly, a bit too quickly, a bit too slowly, or much too slowly?

	Growing much too quickly	Growing a bit too quickly	About Right/Depends/DK/NA	Growing a bit too slowly	Growing much too slowly
Canada	19	42	7	25	7
United States	19	35	9	28	9
Chile	22	30	14	22	12
Central America	18	27	7	30	18
Argentina	12	31	32	20	5
Brazil	10	26	13	21	30
Mexico	9	14	31	19	27
Spain	39	29	11	16	5
France	30	34	16	15	5
Italy	30	29	11	17	13
Great Britain	15	40	10	28	7

Germany	17	35	21	23	4
Portugal	13	23	5	35	24
Russia	10	13	52	16	9
United Arab Emirates	43	34	6	13	4
Egypt	24	53	1	16	6
Lebanon	32	27	6	21	14
Israel	17	30	19	21	13
Turkey	3	12	14	43	28
Ghana	21	34	7	28	10
Nigeria	15	39	10	25	11
Kenya	14	31	8	34	13
Australia	20	53	6	18	3
China	23	49	11	13	4
India	23	27	31	13	6
Japan	14	36	36	11	3
South Korea	12	38	11	32	7
Indonesia	11	29	6	39	15
Philippines	5	19	5	47	24
Average	19	32	14	24	12

793 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Overall, do you think economic globalization is happening too quickly, too slowly, or at the right pace?

40%	Too quickly
18	Too slowly
39	At the right pace
3	Not sure/Decline

794 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Promoting international trade

34%	Very important
57	Somewhat important
9	Not important
0	Not sure/decline

795 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Please indicate how important the following factors are to the United States remaining competitive with other countries in the global economy?

Supporting open trade around the world

32%	Very important
49	Somewhat important
13	Not very important
5	Not important at all
3	Not sure/Decline

⁷⁹⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: The [survey country] economy:

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	54	42	4
Argentina	65	20	15
Mexico	59	27	15
Peru	92	7	2
Armenia	75	15	9
France	64	34	2
Great Britain	67	24	9
Poland	76	11	13
Russia	66	20	13
Ukraine	78	9	13
Azerbaijan	85	7	8
Egypt	49	51	0
Israel	88	6	6
Palestinian Territories	70	25	5
Turkey	72	10	18
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	62	36	2
China	88	8	4
India	64	27	9
Indonesia	60	35	6
South Korea	79	20	1
Thailand	79	10	11
Average	72	21	8

⁷⁹⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: [survey country] companies

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	52	45	3
Argentina	61	22	16
Mexico	66	23	11
Armenia	64	21	15
France	55	43	2
Great Britain	65	26	10
Poland	77	9	14
Russia	51	34	15
Ukraine	69	10	21
Azerbaijan	80	8	13
Egypt	52	48	0
Israel	86	8	6

Palestinian Territories	67	25	8
Turkey	70	12	19
Kenya	76	23	2
Nigeria	54	44	3
China	78	12	9
India	59	31	10
Indonesia	49	39	13
South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	70	13	17
Average	66	25	10

⁷⁹⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Your own standard of living

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	64	31	5
Argentina	42	30	28
Mexico	53	29	18
Armenia	60	19	21
France	50	44	6
Great Britain	73	17	10
Poland	59	12	29
Russia	45	19	36
Ukraine	53	10	37
Azerbaijan	65	5	30
Egypt	44	56	0
Israel	74	10	15
Palestinian Territories	62	26	12
Turkey	61	16	23
Kenya	82	17	2
Nigeria	63	35	2
China	73	15	12
India	54	30	15
Indonesia	51	33	16
South Korea	56	38	6
Thailand	59	23	18
Average	59	25	16

⁷⁹⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Consumers like you

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	70	26	4
Argentina	46	31	23
Armenia	56	28	16
France	61	38	1
Great Britain	75	17	8
Poland	70	12	18

Russia	59	22	19
Ukraine	66	10	24
Azerbaijan	67	10	23
Egypt	54	46	0
Israel	77	12	11
Palestinian Territories	57	30	13
Turkey	62	17	22
Nigeria	77	21	2
Kenya	79	20	2
China	69	17	14
India	61	28	11
Indonesia	59	32	9
South Korea	68	29	3
Thailand	65	19	16
Average	65	23	12

⁸⁰⁰ Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2009

Now thinking about you and your family: do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad for you and your family?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States	11	52	21	7	63	28	8
Canada	25	60	7	2	85	9	6
Britain	20	60	10	3	80	13	8
France	20	62	14	4	82	18	0
Germany	18	64	13	1	82	14	4
Spain	25	60	6	1	85	7	7
Poland	18	64	9	1	82	10	8
Russia	15	50	11	2	65	13	22
Turkey	22	40	12	8	62	20	18
Egypt	18	42	28	11	60	39	1
Jordan	16	41	27	14	57	41	2
Lebanon	21	34	28	15	55	43	2
Palestinian Territories	38	44	10	5	82	15	2
Israel	31	53	6	2	84	8	8
China	16	66	5	0	82	5	12
India	39	55	4	1	94	5	1
Indonesia	13	58	21	2	71	23	6
Japan	16	57	15	2	73	17	10
Pakistan	34	40	7	2	74	9	18
South Korea	17	70	5	0	87	5	8
Argentina	11	46	17	6	57	23	19
Brazil	12	71	11	1	83	12	6
Mexico	22	52	13	3	74	16	9
Kenya	27	44	17	8	71	25	4
Nigeria	42	45	9	3	87	12	2
Average	22	53	13	4	75	17	8

⁸⁰¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Creating jobs in [survey country]

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	37	60	3
Argentina	53	30	17
Mexico	74	15	11
Armenia	61	26	13
France	26	73	2
Great Britain	52	37	11
Poland	71	14	15
Russia	52	27	21
Ukraine	66	14	20
Azerbaijan	77	9	14
Egypt	36	64	0
Israel	74	19	8
Palestinian Territories	62	26	11
Turkey	66	15	19
Kenya	70	27	2
Nigeria	50	46	4
China	73	17	10
India	56	32	11
Indonesia	55	37	9
South Korea	60	38	2
Thailand	74	13	13
Average	59	30	10

⁸⁰² WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: Job security for [survey country] workers

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	30	67	3
Argentina	38	39	23
Armenia	52	24	25
France	19	80	2
Great Britain	45	46	9
Poland	53	21	26
Russia	43	32	25
Ukraine	50	16	34
Azerbaijan	57	11	32
Egypt	35	65	0
Israel	63	25	12
Palestinian Territories	57	29	14
Turkey	62	16	22
Kenya	70	24	5
Nigeria	45	50	5
China	65	22	13
India	49	37	14
Indonesia	47	37	16
South Korea	51	47	2
Thailand	64	20	16
Average	50	35	15

 803 WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think international trade is good or bad for: The environment

	Good	Bad	DK
United States	45	49	6
Argentina	27	46	27
Mexico	41	41	19
Armenia	37	36	27
France	29	66	5
Great Britain	39	47	14
Poland	49	25	26
Russia	25	44	31
Ukraine	40	25	36
Azerbaijan	42	33	25
Egypt	37	63	0
Israel	56	23	21
Palestinian Territories	53	32	14
Turkey	58	19	23
Kenya	62	35	3
Nigeria	49	48	3
China	57	29	13
India	51	34	15
Indonesia	27	56	18
South Korea	47	49	4
Thailand	45	35	20
Average	44	40	17

804 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Below is a list of possible threats to the vital interest of the United States in the next ten years. For each one, please select whether you see this as a critical threat, an important but not critical threat, or not an important threat at all.

Economic competition from low-wage countries

	Critical	Important but not critical	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1998	40	44	12	4
2002 (telephone)	31	44	24	1
2004 (telephone)	35	40	21	4
2004 (internet)	35	48	14	2
2006 (internet)	32	55	11	1
2008 (internet)	38	49	12	1

805 WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good, or mostly bad for [country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	DK
United States	60	35	5
Argentina	55	22	23
Mexico	41	22	37

Peru	70	27	3
Armenia	65	18	17
France	51	42	7
Great Britain	53	30	17
Poland	52	21	27
Russia	41	24	34
Ukraine	55	11	34
Azerbaijan	63	16	20
Egypt	79	21	0
Iran	63	31	6
Israel	82	10	7
Palestinian Territories	58	28	15
Turkey	39	28	33
Nigeria	78	18	4
Kenya	89	9	2
Australia	65	27	8
China	87	6	7
India	54	30	16
Indonesia	61	31	8
Philippines	49	32	20
South Korea	86	12	2
Thailand	75	8	17
Aggregate average	63	22	15

WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

First of all, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good, or mostly bad for [Country]?

	Mostly good	Mostly bad	Neither good nor bad (vol.)	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Chile	52	13	17	3	16
Mexico	38	46	8	3	5
United States	53	44	0	0	3
France	47	38	6	4	5
Germany	46	35	7	10	3
Great Britain	49	38	8	1	5
Poland	59	24	12	2	4
Russia	32	26	14	13	15
Ukraine	53	13	14	0	21
Azerbaijan	63	16	5	4	12
Egypt	41	26	23	10	0
Iraq	30	20	18	3	29
Palestinian Territories	22	58	17	2	0
Turkey	51	26	6	2	16
Kenya	67	24	6	2	1
Nigeria	74	19	3	3	1

China	85	4	3	3	6
Hong Kong	81	11	4	2	2
Macau	71	11	6	2	10
Taiwan	81	4	4	2	10
India	56	19	13	7	5
Indonesia	39	44	3	5	10
Pakistan	55	17	13	14	2
South Korea	90	9	1	0	0
Average	52	27	9	4	7

⁸⁰⁶ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008 / 2009**

Turning to something else, do you believe that globalization, especially the increasing connections of our economy with others around the world, is mostly good, or mostly bad for [country]?

(2006-2008)	Mostly good	Mostly bad	(2009)	Mostly good	Mostly bad
Mexico	41	22	Mexico	38	46
United States	60	35	United States	53	44
France	51	42	France	47	38
Great Britain	53	30	Great Britain	49	38
Poland	52	21	Poland	59	24
Russia	41	24	Russia	32	26
Ukraine	55	11	Ukraine	53	13
Azerbaijan	63	16	Azerbaijan	63	16
Egypt	79	21	Egypt	41	26
Palestinian Territories	58	28	Palestinian Territories	22	58
Turkey	39	28	Turkey	51	26
Nigeria	78	18	Kenya	67	24
Kenya	89	9	Nigeria	74	19
China	87	6	China	85	4
India	54	30	India	56	19
Indonesia	61	31	Indonesia	39	44
South Korea	86	12	South Korea	90	9
Average	62	23	Average	54	28

⁸⁰⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think in the current economic crisis it is a good idea for our government to try to help [country] companies by making it harder for foreign companies to sell products here or do you think that would be a bad idea because other countries will then do the same thing to our companies?

	Good idea	Bad idea	DK/NR
Mexico	61	39	0
United States	42	55	3
France	36	57	7
Germany	25	68	7
Great Britain	29	68	3
Poland	35	53	12
Russia	55	27	18
Ukraine	53	18	30

Egypt	69	31	1
Iraq	47	24	30
Pakistan	46	47	7
Palestinian Territories	48	37	15
Turkey	67	24	9
Kenya	59	40	1
Nigeria	70	28	2
China	31	63	6
Hong Kong	28	65	7
Macau	43	36	21
India	49	41	10
Indonesia	55	33	12
South Korea	30	68	2
Taiwan	32	50	18
Average	48	43	9

⁸⁰⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad thing for our country?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	Good	Bad	DK/R
United States - 2009	16	49	20	10	65	30	5
United States - 2007	14	45	21	15	59	36	5
Canada	32	53	8	3	85	11	5
Britain	29	53	11	3	82	14	4
France	28	55	13	4	83	17	0
Germany	32	53	12	2	85	14	1
Spain	35	54	6	2	89	8	3
Poland	22	59	10	2	81	12	6
Russia	24	56	11	2	80	13	7
Turkey	30	34	13	9	64	22	15
Egypt	24	43	26	8	67	34	1
Jordan	21	39	28	11	60	39	2
Lebanon	46	44	9	0	90	9	1
Palestinian Territories	44	36	12	6	80	18	1
Israel	47	41	6	3	88	9	2
China	26	67	3	0	93	3	3
India	48	48	3	1	96	4	1
Indonesia	21	58	14	1	79	15	5
Japan	20	53	17	4	73	21	6
Pakistan	47	32	9	2	79	11	10
South Korea	24	68	4	0	92	4	4
Argentina	16	49	18	6	65	24	11
Brazil	20	67	8	1	87	9	4
Mexico	27	52	12	4	79	16	6
Kenya	38	42	11	6	80	17	3
Nigeria	52	38	7	2	90	9	1
Average	31	50	12	4	81	16	4

⁸⁰⁹ **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll April 2009**

As you may know, most countries in the world are in a recession. Do you think that the United States can recover from its recession on its own, or do you think the United States will recover from the recession only if the economy also improves in other parts of the world?

43%	United States can recover on its own
57	United States can only recover when other parts of the world do
*	No opinion

⁸¹⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Some people say that the world is facing some new problems that require some new international institutions or agencies to deal with them. Do you think that there should or should not be new international institutions to:

Monitor financial markets worldwide and report on potential crises

59%	Should be
38	Should not be
2	Not sure/Decline

⁸¹¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Which of these two positions is closer to yours?

	A. To prevent international economic instability, there should be a global regulating body that monitors big financial institutions to make sure they follow international standards.	B. A global financial regulating body is a bad idea because it would interfere in our economy and could make it less productive.	DK/ NR
Mexico	61	33	5
United States	44	52	4
France	70	24	6
Germany	71	24	5
Great Britain	60	36	5
Poland	48	25	27
Russia	39	36	25
Ukraine	42	29	29
Egypt	62	37	1
Iraq	42	31	27
Pakistan	59	37	3
Palestinian Territories	56	41	3
Turkey	41	36	23
Kenya	68	30	2
Nigeria	72	27	2
China	79	13	8
Hong Kong	65	31	4
Macau	66	21	14
India	51	40	10
Indonesia	51	23	27
South Korea	62	36	2
Taiwan	67	23	10
Average	57	32	11

⁸¹² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Which of these two positions is closer to yours?

	A. The world economy is so interconnected that nations should agree on standards to regulate banks that operate internationally	B. Each nation should maintain the freedom to make its own decisions about regulating its banks when they operate internationally.	DK/NR
Mexico	37	60	3
United States	43	55	2
France	55	41	4
Germany	56	41	4
Great Britain	48	48	4
Poland	45	42	14
Russia	38	47	15
Ukraine	40	36	24
Egypt	47	53	0
Iraq	35	39	26
Pakistan	39	58	4
Palestinian Territories	48	49	3
Turkey	33	50	17
Kenya	51	47	2
Nigeria	58	41	1
China	51	41	8
Hong Kong	49	49	2
Macau	49	43	8
India	49	42	10
Indonesia	39	34	27
South Korea	33	66	1
Taiwan	49	44	7
Average	45	47	9

⁸¹³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that countries that are part of international trade agreements should or should not be required to maintain minimum standards for working conditions?

	Should be required	Should not be required	DK
United States	93	5	2
Argentina	89	1	10
Mexico	67	22	11
Armenia	79	9	11
Great Britain	95	3	2
Poland	88	2	10
Ukraine	85	2	12
Azerbaijan	80	12	8
Egypt	77	23	0
Iran	75	7	18
Israel	91	5	3
Turkey	76	6	19
Kenya	96	4	0
Nigeria	87	13	1
China	84	8	7
India	56	25	19
Indonesia	82	5	13
Philippines	55	30	15
Average	81	10	9

814 WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that countries that are part of international trade agreements should or should not be required to maintain minimum standards for protection of the environment?

	Should be required	Should not be required	DK
United States	91	5	4
Argentina	90	1	9
Mexico	76	13	11
Armenia	82	9	9
Great Britain	96	2	2
Poland	90	2	8
Ukraine	88	2	10
Azerbaijan	83	6	10
Egypt	93	7	0
Israel	93	4	2
Turkey	75	6	19
Nigeria	87	12	1
Kenya	95	5	0
China	85	8	7
India	60	28	12
Indonesia	79	8	13
Thailand	69	10	21
Average	84	8	8

815 GMF Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey September 2006

(Now I'm going to read you some statements about moving toward freer trade. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it)...Freer trade puts the United States at a disadvantage because of our high labor and environmental standards. (Prompt:) Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

27%	Strongly agree
36	Somewhat agree
22	Somewhat disagree
9	Strongly disagree
1	Neither agree nor disagree (Vol.)
5	Don't know/Refused

(Now I'm going to read you some statements about moving toward freer trade. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it)...Freer trade puts the United States at a disadvantage because of our high labor and environmental standards. (Prompt:) Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	(Neither agree nor disagree) SPONTANEOUS	(Don't know/refused)
European Average	20	36	26	10	2	5
Germany	22	36	31	9	0	2
France	31	38	16	13	0	1
Italy	13	42	28	8	4	5
Poland	7	27	30	12	5	18
Slovakia	9	30	30	9	7	15
United Kingdom	23	37	24	9	1	6

United States	27	36	22	9	1	5		
----------------------	----	----	----	---	---	---	--	--

⁸¹⁶ **GlobeScan June 2004**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

Rich countries are playing fair in trade negotiations with poor countries

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/NA
<i>Argentina</i>	34	37	16	18	14	24	1	28
Brazil	20	76	7	13	24	52	2	2
Canada	23	72	6	16	31	40	*	6
Chile	42	37	12	30	24	13	5	17
China	48	36	11	37	28	8	9	7
France	16	76	5	11	32	44	1	8
Germany	34	63	20	14	33	30	1	2
<i>Great Britain</i>	23	68	7	16	33	35	2	8
India	55	37	20	35	23	14	2	7
Indonesia	59	36	29	30	30	6	2	3
Italy	14	77	3	11	31	46	3	7
Mexico	61	34	33	28	17	16	*	5
Nigeria	45	46	19	27	22	24	1	7
Russia	8	72	2	7	38	34	3	16
South Africa	37	50	18	19	23	27	4	9
Spain	19	75	6	13	40	35	2	4
Turkey	14	51	4	10	33	18	4	32
Uruguay	15	65	4	10	18	47	3	18
United States	25	62	5	20	34	28	2	10
Average	31	56	12	19	28	28	2	10

⁸¹⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

China	Average
United States	6.5
China	n/a
Japan	7.4
South Korea	8.3
Indonesia	7.7
Vietnam	7.5

⁸¹⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

Japan

	Average
United States	7.2
China	6.7
Japan	n/a
South Korea	7.8
Indonesia	8.1
Vietnam	7.8

⁸¹⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

South Korea

	Average
United States	5.1
China	6.8
Japan	6.6
South Korea	n/a
Indonesia	7.0
Vietnam	6.8

⁸²⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asia Soft Power 2008**

Please indicate how important you think economic relations such as trade and investment with each of the following countries are to [survey country's] economy? Please answer on a 0 to 10 scale; with 0 meaning not at all important and 10 meaning extremely important.

European Union

	Average
United States	7
China	7.6
Japan	7.1
South Korea	7.4
Indonesia	7.5
Vietnam	7.1

⁸²¹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

Japan

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	59.0	35.8	5.2
China	78.9	16	5.2
Japan	n/a	n/a	n/a
South Korea	73.6	24.0	2.4
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a

⁸²² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

China

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	41	54.3	4.6
China	n/a	n/a	n/a
Japan	53.4	39.0	7.7
South Korea	66.7	30.6	2.7
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a

⁸²³ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs Asian Soft Power 2008**

Do you think (survey country) should or should not have a free trade agreement that would lower barriers such as tariffs with each of the following countries?

South Korea

	Should Have (percent)	Should Not Have (percent)	Not Sure/ Decline (percent)
United States	48.6	45.6	5.8
China	82.1	12.2	5.7
Japan	63.4	28.9	7.7
South Korea	n/a	n/a	n/a
Indonesia	n/a	n/a	n/a
Vietnam	n/a	n/a	n/a

⁸²⁴ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey October 2007**

There has been talk recently of a new effort to deepen the economic ties between the European Union and the United States, by making transatlantic trade and investment easier. Would you support a transatlantic initiative like this?

	Yes	No	DK/ Refused
Germany	66	27	7
France	64	35	1
Italy	75	17	5
Poland	68	14	19
Slovakia	57	29	14
United Kingdom	74	17	9
United States	64	25	11
European Average	67	24	9
Average w/United States	67	23	9

⁸²⁵ **BBC January 2006**

Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world.

Global companies

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	Neither/ No difference (vol.)	DK/NA/ (vol)
Afghanistan	49	16	18	5	12
Argentina	26	40	6	1	28

Australia	30	49	8	4	9
Brazil	60	27	5	1	6
Canada	39	39	6	4	11
Congo	43	14	23	5	14
Finland	32	45	12	2	9
France	37	44	11	1	7
Germany	42	32	15	6	5
Ghana	46	13	23	5	12
Great Britain	36	47	4	3	10
India	41	14	21	6	18
Indonesia	53	24	17	1	4
Iran	49	42	2	4	3
Iraq	32	26	34	3	4
Italy	21	51	8	7	12
Kenya	50	11	18	6	15
Mexico	23	33	21	8	15
Nigeria	67	11	12	3	7
Philippines	60	17	10	1	12
Poland	49	13	9	5	23
Russia	27	18	16	6	33
Saudi Arabia	31	10	40	8	11
Senegal	51	8	18	3	20
South Africa	50	7	15	5	23
South Korea	61	32	2	1	4
Spain	36	36	13	3	12
Sri Lanka	22	12	8	2	56
Tanzania	50	13	26	6	5
Turkey	21	27	30	7	16
United States	44	38	4	4	10
Zimbabwe	30	11	30	10	18
Average	41	26	15	4	14

826 **GlobeScan June 2004**

Please tell me how much you trust each of the following institutions to operate in the best interests of our society. Would you say you have a lot of trust, some trust, not much trust, or no trust at all?

Global companies operating in [COUNTRY]

	Trust	No trust	A lot of trust	Some trust	Not much trust	No trust at all	DK/NA
Argentina	23	69	5	18	31	38	8
Australia	40	57	3	37	37	20	4
Brazil	39	60	8	31	30	30	1
Canada	53	40	3	50	27	13	6
Chile	33	64	7	27	37	26	3
China	69	21	13	56	19	2	8
France	22	72	1	20	43	30	6
Germany	41	56	7	34	43	13	2

Great Britain	45	50	3	42	33	17	5
India	59	39	20	39	23	16	2
Indonesia	62	35	11	51	32	2	3
Italy	23	71	2	21	43	28	7
Mexico	51	47	11	41	29	18	2
Nigeria	52	40	15	36	24	15	5
Russia	19	72	2	18	35	37	8
Spain	52	46	10	42	34	12	2
South Africa	63	29	18	44	19	9	6
Turkey	32	50	5	27	40	10	16
Uruguay	21	69	3	18	29	40	10
United States	51	41	3	47	28	13	8
Average	42	51	8	35	32	20	6

⁸²⁷ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Please indicate how important the following factors are to the United States remaining competitive with other countries in the global economy?

Encouraging foreign investors to invest in U.S. companies and projects

40%	Very important
40	Somewhat important
11	Not very important
6	Not important at all
3	Not sure/Decline

⁸²⁸ **Pew Global Attitudes Project Spring 2008**

When foreigners buy (survey country) companies, do you think this has a very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad impact on our country?

	Very good	Somewhat good	Somewhat bad	Very bad	DK/Refused
United States	3	22	33	34	7
Great Britain	6	37	34	15	9
France	3	30	42	25	0
Germany	2	18	58	20	3
Spain	7	43	31	8	12
Poland	4	33	36	20	7
Russia	7	22	33	32	5
Turkey	5	11	15	61	8
Egypt	5	22	32	38	3
Jordan	10	23	35	28	3
Lebanon	13	26	31	25	5
Australia	4	26	46	21	3
China	3	28	42	16	11
India	18	41	21	17	3
Indonesia	4	24	39	27	5
Japan	2	25	52	17	4
Pakistan	13	24	17	26	20
South Korea	3	35	50	9	4
Argentina	2	19	37	34	9
Brazil	4	36	43	13	4
Mexico	15	33	27	20	5

Nigeria	17	25	16	38	3
South Africa	26	26	16	26	5
Tanzania	13	19	28	39	2
Average	8	27	34	25	6

⁸²⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Recently some foreign government-owned funds have made major investments in American companies and financial institutions. Some observers say that as their role is purely economic, we should welcome such investment. Others say the risk of losing control of American companies and their technologies to foreign governments is too great. Are you in favor or not in favor of allowing foreign government investors to invest in U.S. companies and banks?

29%	In favor
68	Not in favor
3	Not sure/Decline

⁸³⁰ **GlobeScan June 2004**

Rich countries could reduce poverty in developing countries by allowing them to sell more food and clothing products to rich countries. In rich countries this would lower prices for food and clothing but would also mean significant job losses in these industries.

Would you support or oppose rich countries allowing more food and clothing imports from developing countries even if it meant significant job losses in rich countries?

	Support	Oppose	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	DK/NA
Argentina	53	20	15	39	17	3	26
Brazil	63	34	24	39	18	16	3
Canada	51	43	13	38	27	16	6
Chile	54	22	14	40	17	5	23
China	75	18	16	59	16	2	8
France	47	43	8	39	29	14	11
Germany	58	39	10	48	31	7	3
Great Britain	59	35	20	39	24	11	6
India	76	22	35	40	12	10	2
Indonesia	72	21	24	48	17	4	7
Italy	43	47	10	32	34	12	11
Mexico	70	20	42	28	13	7	10
Russia	41	26	11	30	18	8	33
Spain	72	16	19	52	10	6	12
Turkey	65	30	19	47	19	11	5
Uruguay	52	18	17	35	14	4	29
United States	35	60	6	28	35	25	6
Average	58	30	18	40	21	10	12

⁸³¹ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

Please tell me if you have a favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of:

Providing development assistance to poor countries

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	DK/Refused	Favorable	Unfavorable
--	-----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	------------------	--------------------

Germany	18	37	34	8	3	55	42
France	44	41	9	5		85	15
Italy	53	40	5	2		93	7
Poland	20	53	15	3	8	74	18
Slovakia	14	48	26	6	6	63	31
United Kingdom	39	36	10	10	4	76	21
United States	28	38	17	13	4	66	30
European Average	34	41	17	6	3	75	23

German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2005

Please tell me if you have a favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of:

Providing development assistance to poor countries

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Don't know/refused
Germany	23	46	22	6	3
France	44	41	9	6	0
Italy	40	54	5	1	0
Poland	15	53	23	2	6
United Kingdom	36	31	16	13	3
United States	26	39	20	11	4
European Average	32	45	15	6	2

⁸³² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the developed countries do or do not have a moral responsibility to work to reduce hunger and severe poverty in poor countries?

	Do	Do not	DK/ NS
Argentina	85	10	5
Mexico	90	8	1
United States	81	17	2
France	79	19	2
Germany	87	12	1
Great Britain	81	14	5
Italy	89	10	2
Russia	54	29	17
Ukraine	87	6	7
Egypt	71	27	3
Jordan	81	11	8
Palestinian Territories	50	49	1
Turkey	81	15	4
Kenya	92	8	1
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	83	5	12
India	72	14	13
Indonesia	87	4	8
South Korea	90	10	1
Taiwan	91	5	4
Average	80	15	5

* Taiwan not included in average

⁸³³ **GlobeScan June 2004**

For each of the following statements, please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

It is in rich countries' own economic self-interest to actively help poor countries develop

	Agree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Depends/ Neither	DK/ NA
Argentina	54	26	29	25	14	12	2	18
Brazil	67	31	45	22	14	17	1	1
Canada	87	11	44	43	7	5	-	2
Chile	68	25	37	31	18	7	2	5
China	73	17	21	52	14	2	5	5
France	87	10	52	35	7	3	1	2
Germany	83	15	53	30	11	4	1	1
Great Britain	86	12	50	36	9	3	-	2
India	89	9	57	32	7	1	1	1
Indonesia	55	38	14	41	30	8	2	5
Italy	87	11	53	34	6	5	1	1
Mexico	88	8	56	32	4	4	-	3
Nigeria	73	23	39	34	15	8	2	2
Russia	52	27	16	36	18	9	5	16
South Africa	83	12	58	25	6	6	3	3
Spain	86	12	45	41	8	4	-	2
Turkey	52	15	20	33	13	2	5	28
Uruguay	56	26	23	32	11	15	2	16
United States	83	14	37	46	9	5	-	2
Average	74	18	39	35	12	6	2	6

⁸³⁴ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

From the following list of possibilities, please select the top three most important reasons, in your opinion, for giving aid to poor countries. Most important reason? Second most important reason? Third most important reason?

	Germany	France	Italy	Poland	Slovakia	United Kingdom	United States	European Average
Alleviating poverty	65	58	43	60	65	65	49	59
Helping poor countries trade	23	33	40	25	31	38	17	31
Preventing breeding grounds for terrorism	21	29	28	29	20	29	31	26
Contributing to global stability	24	21	20	26	14	25	35	23
Encouraging democracy	35	38	37	16	26	22	23	31
Gaining political allies	5	3	5	7	10	5	13	5
Helping with natural disaster relief	28	31	22	46	45	22	32	29
Fighting health problems like AIDS	49	57	45	36	40	41	37	46
Supporting economic growth	40	27	49	35	36	38	36	38
None of these (spontaneous)	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	1
DK/ Refused	1	-	-	3	3	4	4	2

⁸³⁵ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

Which of the following two positions comes closest to your view?

	Development assistance strengthens support for democratic institutions in developing countries	Development assistance weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries	Development assistance neither strengthens nor weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused
Germany	77	13	4	6
France	76	18	3	3
Italy	74	9	13	5
Poland	64	10	12	14
Slovakia	63	13	8	15
United Kingdom	72	18	2	8
United States	64	11	16	9
European Average	71	14	7	9

⁸³⁶ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following.

Providing economic aid to raise living standards in countries where terrorists are recruited is the most appropriate way to fight terrorism.

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/ Refused
United States	19	30	26	20	5
France	17	30	23	28	3
Germany	20	33	25	19	2
United Kingdom	24	31	22	15	8
Italy	21	35	25	19	3
The Netherlands	18	35	25	19	3
Poland	18	30	25	14	13
Portugal	23	26	15	23	13
Spain	17	25	15	23	13
Slovakia	17	25	29	23	7
Turkey	28	17	15	28	13
European Average	20	29	22	21	8

⁸³⁷ German Marshall Fund/Chicago Council on Global Affairs World Views 2002

To assist a population struck by famine

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	90	9	1
France	89	10	1
Germany	83	14	3
The Netherlands	93	6	1
Italy	91	8	1
Poland	92	5	3
United States	81	16	3
European Average	88	10	2

⁸³⁸ German Marshall Fund/Chicago Council on Global Affairs World Views 2002

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide food and medical assistance to victims of war

	Approve	Disapprove	DK/ Refused
United States	81	16	3
France	92	7	1
Germany	94	5	1
United Kingdom	93	5	3
Italy	85	14	1
The Netherlands	98	2	1
Poland	86	12	3
Portugal	85	7	8
Spain	95	5	1
Slovakia	84	11	5
Turkey	87	9	4
European Average	90	8	3

As you may know, some countries have troops engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [Nationality] troops for the following operations?

To provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	I don't know anything about this topic	DK/ Refused	Approve	Disapprove
United States	43	32	11	10	2	2	75	21
France	61	26	5	5	1	2	88	10
Germany	34	39	15	11	1	1	73	25
United Kingdom	51	29	9	7	1	3	80	16
Italy	55	31	7	7	1	-	86	13
Netherlands	55	27	8	9	1	1	82	17
Poland	30	41	10	7	11	1	71	17
Portugal	52	32	5	7	3	1	84	12
Spain	47	43	4	5		1	90	9
Slovakia	22	41	14	10	8	5	62	24
Turkey	37	21	8	18	16	-	58	26
Bulgaria	17	27	11	17	20	8	44	28
Romania	24	32	11	13	15	5	57	24
European Average	40	32	9	10	7	3	73	18

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [Nationality] troops for the following operations?

To contribute to international reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	I don't know anything about this topic	DK/ Refused	Approve	Disapprove
United States	26	38	15	18	1	3	64	33
France	33	38	14	12	1	2	71	25

Germany	20	38	14	12	1	2	71	25
United Kingdom	29	41	14	13	1	4	69	27
Italy	30	40	16	12	1	1	70	28
Netherlands	40	35	9	15		1	75	24
Poland	17	37	23	14	5	4	54	37
Portugal	35	38	10	13	3	2	73	22
Spain	32	49	10	8		1	81	18
Slovakia	11	33	22	18	8	8	44	40
Turkey	28	22	12	22	16		50	34
Bulgaria	11	28	22	25	7	6	39	48
Romania	26	36	11	15	8	5	61	25
European Average	27	37	16	15	3	2	64	30

⁸³⁹ **Kaiser/Pew Global Health Survey May 2007**

Do you think the wealthier nations of the world are doing enough or not doing enough to help the poorer nations of the world with problems such as economic development, reducing poverty, and improving health?

	Doing enough	Not doing enough	DK/ Refused
United States	25	69	6
Canada	20	77	3
Argentina	5	85	11
Bolivia	16	76	8
Brazil	7	91	2
Chile	10	86	4
Mexico	14	78	8
Peru	14	78	8
Venezuela	17	81	2
France	19	81	0
Germany	21	75	3
Great Britain	20	77	4
Italy	12	78	10
Spain	5	91	4
Sweden	15	82	4
Bulgaria	6	84	10
Czech Republic	24	74	2
Poland	7	88	5
Russia	10	74	16
Slovakia	27	69	4
Ukraine	5	85	10
Egypt	12	84	5
Israel	16	77	7
Jordan	17	76	7
Kuwait	23	70	6
Lebanon	12	85	2
Morocco	18	58	24
Palestinian Territories	8	80	12
Turkey	5	77	18
Bangladesh	46	52	2
China	11	83	6
India	33	56	11
Indonesia	54	38	8
Japan	26	63	11

Malaysia	13	73	14
Pakistan	13	56	31
South Korea	17	76	7
Ethiopia	29	67	3
Ghana	37	56	7
Ivory Coast	39	61	0
Kenya	36	62	2
Mali	42	57	1
Nigeria	34	60	6
Senegal	28	71	1
South Africa	22	71	8
Tanzania	45	48	7
Uganda	39	53	8

⁸⁴⁰ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

The European Union can take greater responsibility for dealing with international threats in a number of different ways. For each of the following, please tell me if you agree or disagree that it is something that the European Union should undertake.

Spend more money on aid for development

	Agree	Disagree	DK/ Refused
United States	84	13	4
France	86	13	1
Germany	71	27	2
Great Britain	89	10	1
Italy	86	14	1
The Netherlands	63	35	2
Poland	93	5	2
Portugal	88	9	2
Spain	96	4	
Slovakia	73	15	12
Turkey	83	12	5
Bulgaria	87	8	5
Romania	90	6	4
European Average	84	13	3

⁸⁴¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

Now I am going to read a list of government programs. Is the government spending too much, too little, or about the right on:

Economic aid to other nations

2003	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	33	25	32	10
France	30	25	39	6
Germany	40	12	42	6
The Netherlands	26	18	48	8
Italy	18	29	41	12
Poland	25	13	33	29
Portugal	43	14	25	19
United States	59	8	26	7
European Average	31	19	37	13

2002	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/ Refused
United Kingdom	31	22	45	2
France	2	58	35	4
Germany	29	20	48	3
The Netherlands	21	18	58	2
Italy	15	45	38	2
Poland	44	12	39	6
Portugal	-	-	-	-
United States	48	14	35	3
European Average	24	29	44	3

⁸⁴² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2002**

Just based on what you know, please tell me your hunch about what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid?

*%	0
2	Less than 1, more than 0
7	1-3
9	4-6
10	7-10
15	11-20
15	21-30
10	31-40
6	41-50
14	51-100
12	Not sure/Decline
31	Mean
25	Median

What do you think would be an appropriate percentage of the federal budget to go to foreign aid, if any?

10%	0
3	Less than 1, more than 0
12	1-3
11	4-6
19	7-10
13	11-20
8	21-30
6	31-40
3	41-50
5	51-100
10	Not sure/Decline
17	Mean
10	Median

⁸⁴³ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

In 2003, this country's government allocated [a tenth of one percent]* of the national income to foreign aid- that is, [SUS 38.05]** per person. Do you think this amount is too low, too high, or about right?

	Too low	About right	Too high	DK/NA
Spain	40.30%	33.10%	4.80%	21.80%
United States	25.00	50.80	20.10	4.10
Japan	14.60	34.30	15.60	35.50

Australia	42.40	46.70	8.60	2.30
Sweden	45.50	45.90	4.30	4.40
Finland	34.50	57.60	5.80	2.10
Switzerland	45.20	47.90	2.40	4.40
Thailand	24.30	60.80	14.40	0.50
Andorra	69.70	24.90	1.40	4.00
Germany	25.70	49.00	10.00	15.20
Average	35.30	46.00	9.20	9.50

⁸⁴⁴ To learn more about this PIPA study, see “Americans on Federal Budget Priorities—A Study of U.S. Public Attitudes” from October 3, 2000.

⁸⁴⁵ **World Values Survey 2005–2008**

Would you be willing to pay higher taxes in order to increase your country’s foreign aid to poor countries?

	Yes	No	DK/NA
Italy	43%	42%	15%
Spain	36	51	13
United States	23	73	4
Japan	18	58	25
South Africa	28	54	18
Australia	32	64	3
Sweden	49	48	4
Finland	36	60	4
Switzerland	47	46	7
Turkey	65	30	6
Thailand	68	32	0
Andorra	56	41	3
Germany	23	69	8
Average	39	52	9

⁸⁴⁶ **World Values Survey 2005–2008**

Should your country’s leaders give top priority to help reducing poverty in the world or should they give top priority to solve your own country’s problems? Use a scale of one to ten, where one means “top priority to help reducing poverty in the world” and ten means “top priority to solve my own country’s problems”.

	Mean
Italy	6.75
Spain	6.38
United States	7.61
Japan	7
Mexico	6.73
South Africa	7.99
Australia	7.03
Sweden	5.99
Argentina	8.26
Finland	6.95
South Korea	8.33
Poland	7.63
Switzerland	6.67
Brazil	7.18
Chile	8.18

India	6.15
Slovenia	8.49
Bulgaria	7.27
Romania	7.58
China	6.61
Turkey	7.97
Ukraine	7.48
Ghana	7.73
Moldova	7.31
Thailand	7.16
Indonesia	8.16
Vietnam	8.21
Serbia	8.05
Egypt	9.01
Morocco	7.86
Jordan	9.13
Cyprus	8.17
Trinidad and Tobago	8.79
Andorra	7.77
Malaysia	7.01
Burkina Faso	6.2
Ethiopia	7.97
Mali	5.76
Rwanda	7.37
Zambia	7.29
Germany	7.43
Average	7.5

⁸⁴⁷ **Program on International Policy Attitudes September 1996**

Coming back to the subject of your tax money that goes to help poor people. Of this total amount:

What percentage of it should go to poor people in other countries and what percentage of it should go to poor people in America?

Percentage for other countries

Mean 22%

Median 20%

Percentage for Americans

Mean 78%

Median 80%

⁸⁴⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org September 2008**

As you may know, [country] is a member of the OECD, a group that includes most industrialized countries. These countries have agreed to a set of goals, called the Millennium Development Goals. A key goal has been to cut hunger by half throughout the world and reduce severe poverty by the year 2015. If the cost of achieving these goals were shared among these countries, the cost for [citizens] would be [enter country amount - see chart] per person per year. Assuming the people in the other countries were willing to pay their share, would you be willing to pay [enter country amount - see chart*] a year to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty?

	Would be willing	Would not be willing	DK / NS
United States	75	22	3
France	86	14	1
Germany	76	20	4

Great Britain	79	15	6
Italy	84	12	4
Russia	54	24	23
Turkey	78	11	10
South Korea	80	18	1
Average	77	17	7

*Per person, per year cost to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty in respondent's currency:

	Amount in USD	Amount in Respondent's Currency
France	\$45	29 EUROS
Italy	\$39	25 EUROS
Great Britain	\$49	25 POUNDS
South Korea	\$23	24,000 WON
Turkey	\$10	12 LIRAS
United States	\$56	\$56
Germany	\$43	27 EUROS
Russia	\$11	257 RUBLES

849 **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Have you ever heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

	Yes	No	DK/NR
Italy	17	82	1
Spain	17	81	2
United States	5	92	3
Japan	11	86	3
Mexico	16	83	1
South Africa	13	87	0
Australia	13	85	2
Sweden	30	67	3
Argentina	9	89	2
Finland	20	79	1
South Korea	21	78	0
Poland	7	92	0
Switzerland	23	74	3
Brazil	21	79	1
Chile	28	70	2
India	21	79	0
Slovenia	16	73	12
Bulgaria	9	90	1
Romania	7	89	4
China	5	73	22
Turkey	6	94	0
Ukraine	11	89	0
Peru	14	83	3
Ghana	38	57	5
Moldova	20	81	0
Thailand	40	60	0
Indonesia	20	71	9
Vietnam	33	67	0
Serbia	18	77	6
Egypt	8	90	2

Morocco	19	59	23
Jordan	9	81	10
Cyprus	18	82	0
Trinidad and Tobago	18	81	1
Andorra	13	87	0
Malaysia	22	78	0
Burkina Faso	27	65	8
Ethiopia	64	33	2
Mali	43	49	8
Rwanda	25	74	2
Zambia	41	52	7
Germany	25	71	4
Average	20	76	4

⁸⁵⁰ World Values Survey 2005-2008

Should policies regarding aid to developing countries be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

	National governments (percent)	Regional Organization (percent)	United Nations (percent)	DK/NA (percent)
Italy	19	19	56	6
Spain	15	18	54	13
United States	30	23	41	5
Japan	14	14	42	30
Mexico	23	11	58	8
South Africa	28	17	49	6
Australia	31	15	49	5
Sweden	14	31	51	4
Argentina	19	9	51	22
Finland	27	15	55	4
South Korea	32	12	56	0
Poland	21	16	61	3
Switzerland	27	16	52	5
Brazil	26	16	50	8
Chile	22	12	58	8
India	23	12	24	40
Slovenia	10	45	33	12
Bulgaria	8	40	40	13
Romania	19	26	36	20
China	17	6	29	48
Taiwan	22	31	43	4
Turkey	31	16	44	8
Ukraine	20	17	50	13
Ghana	24	16	55	6
Moldova	20	36	39	5
Thailand	65	25	9	1
Indonesia	13	26	51	10
Vietnam	13	15	61	10
Serbia	20	18	52	10
Egypt	26	21	49	4
Morocco	19	13	42	26

Jordan	16	17	54	13
Cyprus	28	33	39	0
Trinidad and Tobago	20	20	57	4
Andorra	24	11	63	3
Malaysia	18	43	38	0
Burkina Faso	13	11	61	16
Ethiopia	11	11	68	9
Mali	21	12	55	12
Rwanda	17	19	61	4
Zambia	15	29	48	7
Germany	24	25	46	5
Average	22	20	48	11

⁸⁵¹ **GMF Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

Please tell me who, in your opinion, should have the primary responsibility for delivering development assistance

	Germany	France	Italy	Poland	Slovakia	United Kingdom	United States	European Average
The U.S. government	5	4	4	7	11	3	17	5
The European Union	19	24	20	24	13	12	2	20
Individual European governments	5	13	18	14	14	13	2	12
International organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations	54	40	48	36	42	46	37	46
Charities, foundations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	8	12	3	7	12	14	18	9
Religious organizations	3	1	2	2	2	2	6	2
Private companies and businesses	2	4	1	1	1	3	8	2
None of these (spontaneous)	2	1	2	2	1		5	1
DK/ Refused	3	1	7	7	4	7	6	4

⁸⁵² **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Should policies regarding refugees be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

	National governments	Regional Organizations	United Nations	DK/NA
Italy	32%	22%	37%	9%
Spain	13	20	54	14
United States	34	27	33	6
Japan	17	15	46	23
Mexico	36	14	42	9
South Africa	29	16	47	8
Australia	38	14	44	5
Sweden	34	23	40	3
Argentina	22	5	50	23
Finland	42	17	37	4
South Korea	29	8	62	1
Poland	45	15	37	4
Switzerland	32	17	45	6
Brazil	30	15	45	10
Chile	29	10	52	9
India	30	16	12	43

Slovenia	20	44	24	12
Bulgaria	15	26	44	15
Romania	31	19	28	22
China	22	6	27	45
Taiwan	22	24	51	4
Turkey	37	19	35	10
Ukraine	30	18	39	13
Ghana	18	13	64	5
Moldova	39	29	26	6
Thailand	45	25	29	1
Indonesia	43	9	40	9
Vietnam	22	15	52	11
Serbia	36	16	38	10
Egypt	30	23	42	5
Morocco	14	17	44	26
Jordan	15	15	57	13
Cyprus	43	20	36	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	15	47	6
Andorra	30	13	54	3
Malaysia	25	36	39	0
Burkina Faso	16	13	53	18
Ethiopia	13	13	62	13
Mali	28	13	42	18
Rwanda	10	17	72	2
Zambia	13	20	63	5
Germany	25	25	45	6
Average	28	18	43	11

⁸⁵³ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight poverty

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	60	34	5	1	-	-	93	6
France	49	42	7	3	-	-	90	9
Italy	47	46	5	2	-	-	92	7
Poland	42	46	6	2	2	2	88	7
Slovakia	46	39	7	1	3	4	84	9
United Kingdom	53	35	8	4	-	1	87	11
United States	49	34	7	3	4	3	83	9
European Average	50	40	6	2	3	2	89	8

⁸⁵⁴ **German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007**

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight corruption.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	60	30	6	2	-	1	91	8
France	51	39	6	4	-	-	90	9
Italy	49	43	5	2	1	1	92	7
Poland	37	47	8	2	3	3	84	10
Slovakia	35	40	12	3	4	6	75	15
United Kingdom	59	29	7	4	-	2	87	11
United States	50	30	9	4	5	3	80	13
European Average	49	38	7	3	3	3	87	10

⁸⁵⁵ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to promote democratic government

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	46	39	10	3	-	2	85	13
France	47	42	8	3	-	1	89	11
Italy	48	44	5	2	1	1	91	7
Poland	24	50	10	3	5	7	74	14
Slovakia	29	42	15	3	4	7	71	18
United Kingdom	39	39	13	4	1	3	78	18
United States	24	36	21	10	5	4	61	31
European Average	39	43	10	3	3	4	81	14

⁸⁵⁵

⁸⁵⁶ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to open their markets to international trade.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	27	46	21	4	-	2	73	25
France	24	49	20	6	-	-	73	26
Italy	28	54	12	4	1	1	82	16
Poland	25	51	10	3	4	7	76	13
Slovakia	23	47	14	3	5	7	71	17
United Kingdom	29	44	16	7	1	3	73	23
United States	25	43	15	9	5	3	68	24
European Average	26	49	16	5	3	4	75	20

⁸⁵⁷ German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

I will now read some statements regarding aid to poor countries. For each statement, please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with it.

The level of aid to poor countries should be linked to the efforts these countries make to fight terrorism

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)	DK/ Refused	Agree	Disagree
Germany	49	30	15	5	-	1	79	20
France	40	37	15	8	-	-	77	22
Italy	47	41	7	3	1	1	88	10
Poland	36	45	10	4	4	3	80	13
Slovakia	44	35	10	3	4	5	79	13
United Kingdom	44	28	16	10	1	1	72	26
United States	40	30	14	9	5	3	69	23
European Average	43	36	12	6	3	2	79	17

⁸⁵⁸ BBC July 2007

Would you support or oppose the following deal: Wealthy COs agree to provide less-wealthy COs with financial assistance and technology, while less-wealthy COs agree to limit their emissions of climate changing gases along with wealthy COs.

	Support	Oppose	Don't know / No answer
Australia	84	12	5
Brazil	73	17	10
Canada	84	12	4
Chile	68	16	16
China	90	7	3
Egypt	77	23	-
France	78	14	8
Germany	75	22	3
Great Britain	81	13	5
India	47	19	34
Indonesia	78	12	10
Italy	77	18	5
Kenya	76	19	5
Mexico	57	29	14
Nigeria	50	46	4
Philippines	71	17	12
Russia	77	6	18
South Korea	72	23	5
Spain	76	17	7
Turkey	65	12	23
United States	70	21	9
Average	73	18	10

⁸⁵⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

As you may know, the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country. Do you think the UN SHOULD or SHOULD NOT actively promote human rights in member states?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	91	4	5
Mexico	85	12	3

United States	70	25	5
France	76	20	4
Germany	91	8	2
Great Britain	68	24	8
Italy	81	14	5
Russia	55	29	16
Ukraine	73	9	18
Azerbaijan	89	8	4
Egypt	64	33	3
Jordan	50	33	17
Palestinian Territories	54	41	5
Turkey	60	19	20
Kenya	94	4	2
Nigeria	87	12	1
China	62	16	22
Hong Kong	73	16	12
Macau	68	15	17
India	55	26	19
Indonesia	70	13	17
South Korea	62	35	4
Taiwan	78	12	10
Thailand	44	25	31
Average	70	19	10

⁸⁶⁰ **General Social Survey 2004 August 2004**

Which of these two statements comes closer to your view?...If a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene. Even if human rights are seriously violated, the country's sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene.

75% If a country seriously violates human rights, the United Nations should intervene

18 Even if human rights are seriously violated, the country's sovereignty must be respected, and the United Nations should not intervene

4 Don't know what the United Nations is (Vol.)

3 Can't choose

⁸⁶¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?

	Do more	Do less	Do about the same as it has been doing	DK / NS
Argentina	85	2	8	5
Mexico	88	2	8	2
United States	59	7	28	5

France	64	6	26	4
Germany	58	7	34	2
Great Britain	64	6	22	8
Italy	83	6	8	3
Russia	45	8	23	24
Ukraine	57	4	18	22
Azerbaijan	58	9	29	4
Egypt	55	22	22	1
Jordan	62	17	8	13
Palestinian Territories	48	23	26	3
Turkey	69	7	8	16
Kenya	91	5	3	1
Nigeria	88	7	4	1
China	51	5	15	29
Hong Kong	65	2	26	7
Macau	65	1	22	12
India	54	14	16	17
Indonesia	66	6	12	17
South Korea	69	3	25	3
Taiwan	62	2	25	11
Thailand	60	7	13	20
Average	65	8	17	10

⁸⁶² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, would favor or oppose...giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/NS
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0
Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28

Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

⁸⁶³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?

	Make efforts to further the rights of women	Improper interference in a country's internal affairs	DK / NS
Argentina	78	18	4
Mexico	88	9	3
United States	59	38	2
France	74	19	7
Great Britain	70	26	5
Russia	52	30	18
Ukraine	69	16	16
Azerbaijan	66	23	11
Egypt	30	70	
Iran	52	36	12
Palestinian Territories	49	48	3
Turkey	70	20	11
Kenya	91	8	1
Nigeria	66	32	2
China	86	10	4
Hong Kong	67	23	10
India	48	28	24
Indonesia	74	16	10
South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	64	21	15
Average	66	26	8

⁸⁶⁴ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations or regional organizations rather than by each national government separately. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the national governments. I'm going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

Human Rights

	National governments	Regional Organization	United Nations	DK/NR
Italy	27	15	51	8
Spain	16	14	56	13
United States	44	18	33	5
Japan	27	11	47	16
Mexico	41	9	41	8
South Africa	58	15	23	4
Australia	29	9	57	5
Sweden	16	9	73	2
Argentina	39	4	39	18
Finland	33	8	56	3
South Korea	49	10	40	0
Poland	49	7	41	3
Switzerland	25	8	62	4
Brazil	44	11	39	7
Chile	52	7	34	8
India	36	10	13	41
Slovenia	39	30	20	10
Bulgaria	34	26	30	11
Romania	43	10	30	17
China	32	4	17	48
Taiwan	54	10	32	4
Turkey	41	12	39	8
Ukraine	57	14	19	10
Ghana	67	9	22	3
Moldova	55	17	24	4
Thailand	50	24	26	0
Indonesia	55	3	35	8
Vietnam	59	5	27	8
Serbia	50	8	34	9
Egypt	45	15	37	3
Morocco	34	6	42	18
Jordan	21	15	50	13
Cyprus	33	29	37	1
Trinidad & Tobago	45	11	40	3
Andorra	27	8	62	3
Malaysia	38	29	34	0
Burkina Faso	33	6	46	15
Ethiopia	20	12	55	13
Mali	36	8	45	12
Rwanda	29	37	32	3
Zambia	54	13	26	6
Germany	21	19	55	5
Average	40	13	37	10

⁸⁶⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important is it for people to have the right to express any opinion, including criticisms of the government or religious leaders?
Is that very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	84	10	3	1	0	1
Mexico	87	8	2	1	0	1
United States	76	22	1	1	0	1
France	68	28	3	1	0	0
Germany	75	20	3	0	1	0
Great Britain	79	18	2	0	1	1
Italy	80	15	3	1	1	1
Russia	34	42	13	2	4	4
Ukraine	52	35	6	1	3	3
Azerbaijan	50	25	10	3	8	5
Egypt	43	37	18	2	2	0
Jordan	65	21	6	3	0	5
Palestinian Territories	67	27	3	2	0	2
Turkey	67	18	6	3	2	5
Kenya	74	20	4	2	1	0
Nigeria	86	9	2	3	0	0
Hong Kong	44	45	7	1	2	2
Macau	47	35	7	1	3	8
India	48	21	5	13	9	4
Indonesia	82	12	1	0	0	4
South Korea	56	38	5	0	1	1
Taiwan	53	38	5	1	1	2
Thailand	58	18	2	3	15	5
Average	66	22	5	2	2	2

⁸⁶⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government should or should not have the right to prohibit certain political or religious views from being discussed?

	Should have the right	Should not have the right	DK / NS
Argentina	29	69	2
Mexico	20	76	3
United States	13	85	2
France	27	71	2
Germany	41	56	3
Great Britain	39	53	7
Italy	30	63	7
Russia	29	55	16
Ukraine	29	63	9

Azerbaijan	32	64	4
Egypt	49	49	3
Jordan	41	47	12
Palestinian Territories	33	64	3
Turkey	25	64	11
Kenya	67	33	0
Nigeria	47	51	1
Hong Kong	16	78	6
India	38	44	18
Indonesia	55	32	12
South Korea	14	85	2
Taiwan*	15	81	5
Thailand	63	16	21
Average	36	57	7

⁸⁶⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think that:

	A. People should have the right to demonstrate peacefully to protest against the government	B. The government should have the right to ban peaceful demonstrations that it thinks would be politically destabilizing	DK / NS
Mexico	84	11	4
United States	94	5	2
France	91	7	2
Germany	84	15	1
Great Britain	87	11	2
Italy	87	10	3
Russia	76	17	7
Ukraine	82	11	7
Azerbaijan	72	28	1
Egypt	55	42	3
Jordan	53	35	12
Palestinian Territories	65	33	2
Turkey	67	21	12
Kenya	72	28	0
Nigeria	83	17	1
Hong Kong	82	11	8
Macau	72	16	12
India	68	20	12
Indonesia	83	10	8
South Korea	66	32	3
Taiwan	78	13	9

Thailand	55	29	17
Average	75	20	5

⁸⁶⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

How important is it for the media to be free to publish news and ideas without government control?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol)	DK / NS
Argentina	70	24	4	1	0	0
Mexico	79	15	4	0	1	1
Peru	65	31	3	0	0	1
United States	56	32	10	1	0	1
France	54	26	11	5	3	1
Britain	65	23	7	4	1	1
Russia	23	41	21	5	5	6
Ukraine	39	35	13	5	3	6
Azerbaijan	52	34	5	5	3	1
Egypt	64	33	2	0	0	0
Iran	29	36	9	8	3	16
Jordan	50	28	12	7	0	4
Palestinian Territories	52	30	12	5	0	1
Turkey	56	18	9	9	3	5
Kenya	70	21	7	2	0	0
Nigeria	54	37	6	1	1	1
China	58	27	10	1	2	2
Hong Kong*	56	29	4	0	8	3
India	34	18	8	6	33	2
Indonesia	42	31	13	3	2	8
South Korea	64	29	6	1	0	0
Thailand	45	28	6	1	16	5
Average	53	28	8	3	4	3

⁸⁶⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Do you think people in [country] should or should not have the right to read publications from all other countries, including those that might be considered enemies?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	92	7	1
Mexico	95	3	2
United States	92	7	1
France	82	15	4

Great Britain	89	7	4
Poland	84	7	9
Russia	71	15	14
Ukraine	82	8	10
Azerbaijan	73	14	13
Egypt	74	26	
Iran	79	6	16
Palestine	72	23	5
Turkey	74	18	9
Kenya	84	15	0
Nigeria	91	8	1
China	78	17	5
Hong Kong*	86	8	6
India	56	33	11
Indonesia	84	7	9
South Korea	73	26	1
Thailand	79	7	13
Average	80	13	6

⁸⁷⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think people in [country] should have the right to read whatever is on the Internet or do you think the government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the internet?

	People should have the right to read whatever is on the internet	Government should have the right to prevent people from having access to some things on the Internet	DK / NS
Argentina	84	13	3
Mexico	67	28	5
United States	75	24	1
France	52	44	4
Great Britain	61	35	5
Russia	57	27	17
Ukraine	64	21	16
Azerbaijan	79	12	10
Egypt	65	35	
Iran	32	44	24
Jordan	29	63	9
Palestinian Territories	52	44	4
Turkey	60	30	10
Kenya	59	38	2
Nigeria	72	23	5
China	71	21	8

Hong Kong	80	9	12
India	52	36	12
Indonesia	65	24	12
South Korea	69	31	0
Thailand	75	11	13
Average	62	30	8

⁸⁷¹ BBC November 2007

Which of the following statements on the freedom of the press is closest to your own view?

	Freedom of the press to report the news truthfully is very important to ensure we live in a fair society, even if it sometimes leads to unpleasant debates or social unrest.	While freedom of the press to report news truthfully is important, social harmony and peace are more important which sometimes means controlling what is reported for the greater good.	DK/NA
United States	70	28	2
Venezuela	64	36	
Brazil	52	48	
Mexico	51	46	3
Great Britain	67	29	4
Germany	67	26	7
Russia	39	47	14
Egypt	55	45	
United Arab Emirates	51	48	1
South Africa	63	34	3
Kenya	62	37	1
Nigeria	56	43	1
Singapore	43	48	9
India	41	48	11

⁸⁷² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important do you think it is for people of different religions to be treated equally? Would you say it is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	90	7	1	0	0	1
Mexico	83	11	3	1	0	1
United States	77	18	3	1		1
France	66	28	3	2	1	0
Germany	67	26	4	1	2	0
Great Britain	70	22	2	3	2	1
Italy	66	25	4	2	2	1

Poland	40	46	8	3		4
Russia	34	44	8	3	6	5
Ukraine	44	40	6	2	4	4
Azerbaijan	57	31	4	3	3	1
Egypt	29	45	18	6	2	1
Jordan	59	26	6	5		5
Palestinian Territories	52	36	10	1		2
Turkey	75	15	4	2	2	2
Kenya	83	16	1	0		
Nigeria	83	11	4	1	0	0
Hong Kong	54	38	4	1	1	1
Macau	56	29	5	1	2	7
India	56	20	2	13	6	4
Indonesia	82	13	2	0	1	2
South Korea	67	26	6	0	0	1
Taiwan	67	23	5	1	1	3
Thailand	61	16	6	3	8	6
Average	64	25	5	2	2	2

⁸⁷³ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think:

	A. Followers of any religion should be allowed to assemble and practice in [country].	There are some religions that people should not be allowed to practice in [country].	DK / NS
Mexico	76	19	5
United States	67	28	5
France	72	26	2
Germany	61	36	3
Great Britain	59	33	9
Italy	64	30	6
Poland	77	16	7
Russia	50	38	12
Ukraine	30	54	16
Azerbaijan	71	26	3
Egypt	31	67	3
Jordan	39	51	9
Palestinian Territories	56	43	2
Turkey	80	12	8
Kenya	75	25	0
Nigeria	77	22	1

Hong Kong	65	25	10
Macau	51	33	16
India	63	18	18
Indonesia	65	28	7
South Korea	48	50	2
Taiwan	75	14	12
Thailand	63	13	24
Average	61	32	7

⁸⁷⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: “In [country], people of any religion should be free to try to convert members of other religions to join theirs.”

	Agree	Disagree	DK/NS
Mexico	56	40	4
United States	58	38	4
France	33	64	3
Germany	49	46	6
Great Britain	37	57	7
Italy	44	53	3
Poland	27	60	14
Russia	23	62	15
Ukraine	30	48	22
Azerbaijan	32	63	5
Egypt	30	67	3
Jordan	34	60	7
Palestinian Territories	18	78	4
Turkey	34	55	10
Kenya	74	25	0
Nigeria	78	20	2
Hong Kong	63	30	8
Macau	58	31	11
India	33	52	15
Indonesia	17	72	12
South Korea	79	20	1
Taiwan	83	11	6
Thailand	36	45	18
Average	41	51	8

⁸⁷⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

How important do you think it is for women to have full equality of rights compared to men? Would you say that is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	71	24	3	0	1	1
Mexico	89	9	2	0	0	0
United States	77	20	2	1	0	1
France	75	22	2	2	0	0
Great Britain	89	9	1	0	1	0
Russia	35	41	17	3	1	3
Ukraine	44	35	15	3	1	2
Azerbaijan	55	30	11	3	1	1
Egypt	31	59	9	1	0	0
Iran	44	34	5	3	2	12
Jordan	55	28	10	5	0	2
Palestinian Territories	54	29	9	7	0	1
Turkey	80	11	3	3	2	1
Kenya	66	24	8	1	0	0
Nigeria	44	32	15	9	1	0
China	76	19	2	1	0	1
Hong Kong	41	42	5	1	9	1
India	41	19	6	6	26	1
Indonesia	71	20	4	1	1	3
South Korea	43	43	13	2	0	0
Thailand	49	35	3	1	10	3
Average	59	27	7	3	2	2

⁸⁷⁶ World Values Survey 2005–2008

Many things may be desirable, but not all of them are essential characteristics of democracy. Please tell me for each of the following things how essential you think it is as a characteristic of democracy. Use this scale where 1 means “not at all an essential characteristic of democracy” and 10 means it definitely is “an essential characteristic of democracy.”

Women have the same rights as men.

Spain	8.91
United States	8.58
Japan	8.27
Mexico	8.23
South Africa	8.09
Australia	9.21
Sweden	9.84
Argentina	9.47
Finland	9.17
South Korea	8.27
Poland	9.02
Switzerland	9.27

Brazil	8.44
Chile	8.54
India	8.21
Slovenia	8.89
Bulgaria	8.69
Romania	9.35
China	9.04
Taiwan	9.05
Turkey	8.77
Ukraine	8.35
Peru	8.93
Ghana	8.49
Moldova	8.7
Thailand	7.58
Indonesia	8.09
Vietnam	9.32
Serbia	8.61
Egypt	7.85
Morocco	7.61
Jordan	7.71
Cyprus	8.82
Trinidad and Tobago	8.85
Andorra	9.6
Malaysia	6.73
Burkina Faso	8.34
Ethiopia	9.05
Mali	7.88
Rwanda	7.8
Zambia	7.72
Germany	9.13
Average	8.53

⁸⁷⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination against women, or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Should make an effort	Should not be involved	DK / NR
Argentina	74	24	2
Mexico	96	3	1
United States	82	17	1
France	88	11	2
Great Britain	88	11	1
Russia	74	14	12
Spain	89	9	3
Ukraine	77	14	9
Azerbaijan	77	15	9
Egypt	77	23	0
Iran	70	18	12
Jordan	71	22	7

Palestinian Territories	77	17	6
Turkey	85	11	4
Kenya	97	3	
Nigeria	76	23	1
China	86	11	3
Hong Kong	70	24	6
India	53	38	9
Indonesia	93	6	2
South Korea	87	12	1
Thailand	83	9	8
Average	81	15	4

⁸⁷⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

How important is it for people of different races and ethnicities to be treated equally?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not very important	Not important at all	Depends (vol)	DK / NS
Argentina	72	24	3	1	1	0
Mexico	94	5	1	0	0	0
Peru	70	28	2	0	0	1
United States	79	17	2	1	0	1
France	69	25	2	2	1	1
Great Britain	87	10	1	0	0	1
Russia	37	46	10	3	1	3
Ukraine	50	37	8	2	1	3
Azerbaijan	68	21	8	2	1	1
Egypt	71	26	3	0	0	0
Iran	62	20	2	1	0	14
Jordan	73	17	5	2	0	2
Palestinian Territories	70	23	5	2	0	1
Turkey	73	15	5	3	2	2
Kenya	80	17	3	0	0	0
Nigeria	71	25	3	1	1	0
China	90	8	1	0	0	1
Hong Kong	47	41	4	1	6	1
India	44	15	5	5	30	2
Indonesia	75	14	5	1	2	3
South Korea	71	23	5	1	0	0
Thailand	39	36	6	2	13	4
Average	69	22	4	1	2	2

879 WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think that employers should or should not be allowed to refuse to hire a qualified person because of the person's race or ethnicity?

	Should	Should not	DK / NS
Argentina	23	73	4
Mexico	24	72	3
United States	13	86	1
France	6	94	1
Great Britain	16	83	1
Russia	18	72	10
Ukraine	15	77	9
Azerbaijan	8	82	10
Egypt	25	75	0
Iran	12	72	16
Palestinian Territories	23	74	3
Turkey	18	72	10
Kenya	28	72	1
Nigeria	34	64	1
China	10	88	3
Hong Kong	6	88	6
India	30	43	27
Indonesia	13	84	3
South Korea	41	58	1
Thailand	37	38	25
Average	21	72	7

880 WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government has the responsibility to try to prevent employers from refusing to hire someone because of a person's race or ethnicity or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Has responsibility	Should not be involved	Should be allowed not to hire	DK / NS
Argentina	60	16	23	2
Mexico	64	9	24	2
United States	69	17	13	1
France	69	23	6	3
Great Britain	69	13	16	2
Russia	58	13	18	11
Ukraine	65	10	15	10
Azerbaijan	72	9	8	10
Egypt	56	19	25	0
Iran	61	5	12	22

Palestinian Territories	53	19	23	4
Turkey	23	43	18	16
Kenya	63	9	28	0
Nigeria	56	8	35	1
China	77	11	10	3
Hong Kong	66	22	6	6
India	27	20	30	24
Indonesia	80	3	13	4
South Korea	53	6	41	0
Thailand	36	9	37	18
Average	58	14	21	7

⁸⁸¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the government should make an effort to prevent discrimination based on a person's race or ethnicity, or do you think the government should not be involved in this kind of thing?

	Should make an effort	Should not be involved	Government does too much (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	82	14	2	3
Mexico	94	5	1	1
United States	83	17	0	0
France	85	12	1	3
Great Britain	85	13	0	2
Russia	71	11	4	14
Spain	89	8	0	3
Ukraine	71	16	3	10
Azerbaijan	70	11	12	7
Egypt	73	27	1	0
Iran	76	10	0	14
Palestinian Territories	64	15	17	4
Turkey	79	8	4	9
Kenya	95	5	0	0
Nigeria	90	8	2	0
China	90	8	0	2
Hong Kong	78	17	1	5
India	46	17	6	31
Indonesia	88	8	2	2
South Korea	96	4	0	0
Thailand	64	10	10	16
Average	80	11	3	6

⁸⁸² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

The United States has signed a number of treaties establishing international laws governing how a country, in the context of armed conflict, must treat an individual it has detained—that is, has captured and is holding. These rules limit what the United States can do to detainees and what other countries can do when they detain Americans. Do you favor or oppose having such laws?

75% Favor
 22 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

⁸⁸³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006**

As you may know, the [COUNTRY] has signed treaties that limit what a government can do to pressure detainees to give information. Here are some methods that are not allowed. For each one please say whether you approve of having a rule against it or if you think such a rule is too restrictive.

Using physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	75	21	4
Great Britain	53	45	2
Germany	76	21	3
Poland	67	27	6
India	35	39	27

Threatening physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	60	37	3
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	69	28	3
Poland	54	38	8
India	33	39	28

Treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	61	36	4
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	72	25	3
Poland	59	32	8
India	32	42	25

⁸⁸⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

STATEMENT. The United States and most countries in the world have signed a number of conventions—that is, treaties that create international laws—that prohibit certain methods for trying to get information from detainees. Here are some of these prohibitions. For each one please select whether you favor having it or if you think it is too restrictive.

Governments should never use physical torture

59% Favor

39 Too restrictive
 2 Refused/Don't know

[IF "TOO RESTRICTIVE"]

Do you think the international conventions on the treatment of detainees should be changed to allow governments to use physical torture?

21% Yes
 17 No
 1 Refused/Don't know

⁸⁸⁵ **WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006**

As you may know, the [COUNTRY] has signed treaties that limit what a government can do to pressure detainees to give information. Here are some methods that are not allowed. For each one please say whether you approve of having a rule against it or if you think such a rule is too restrictive.

Using physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	75	21	4
Great Britain	53	45	2
Germany	76	21	3
Poland	67	27	6
India	35	39	27

Threatening physical torture

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	60	37	3
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	69	28	3
Poland	54	38	8
India	33	39	28

Treating detainees in a way that is humiliating or degrading

	Approve rule against	Rule too restrictive	DK/NA
United States	61	36	4
Great Britain	43	53	4
Germany	72	25	3
Poland	59	32	8
India	32	42	25

⁸⁸⁶ **Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll October 2001**

(I'd like to ask you a few questions about the events (terrorist attacks) that occurred on September 11th (2001) in New York City and Washington, DC)... (Would you be willing--or not willing--to have the United States government do each of the following, if the government thought it were necessary to combat terrorism?) How about... torture known terrorists if they know details about future terrorist attacks in the United States?

45% Willing
 53 Not willing
 2 No opinion

Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll January 2005

(Would you be willing--or not willing--to have the U.S. (United States) government do each of the following, if the government thought it were necessary to combat terrorism?) How about...torture known terrorists if they know details about future terrorist attacks in the U.S.?

39% Willing
 59 Not willing
 2 No opinion

⁸⁸⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Let's say that the United States is holding someone prisoner and intelligence sources say that there is a modest chance that this person has some information about a possible terrorist attack on the United States that may prove critical to stopping the attack, but this person denies having such information. Please select whether you would favor or oppose using each of the following methods as a way of trying to get the prisoner to reveal the information he may have.

Not allowing the detainee to sleep

53% Favor
 45 Oppose
 2 Refused/Don't know

Keeping a hood over the detainee's head for long periods of time

54% Favor
 44 Oppose
 2 Refused/Don't know

Bombarding the detainee with loud noise for long periods of time

47% Favor
 51 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

Exposing the detainee to extreme heat or cold

36% Favor
 61 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

Punching or kicking the detainee

16% Favor
 82 Oppose
 2 Refused/Don't know

Making the detainee go naked

28% Favor
 70 Oppose
 2 Refused/Don't know

Holding the detainee's head under water

20% Favor

77 Oppose
 4 Refused/Don't know

Applying electric shocks to the detainee

18% Favor
 79 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

Using threatening dogs to frighten detainees

37% Favor
 60 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

Forcing detainees to remain in a physically stressful position for an extended period

47% Favor
 50 Oppose
 3 Refused/Don't know

87% Favor
 11 Oppose
 1 Refused/Don't know

⁸⁸⁸ **Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll March 2003**

Do you favor or oppose allowing the government to use any means necessary, including physical torture, or obtain information from prisoners that might protect the United States from terrorist attacks?

44% Favor
 42 Oppose
 5 Depends (vol.)
 9 Not sure

If there were a possibility that a member of your own family could be saved, then would you favor or oppose allowing the government to use physical torture to obtain information from terrorist prisoners?

Question Note: Asked of those who oppose using physical torture to obtain information from terrorist prisoners

24% Favor
 60 Oppose
 5 Depends
 11 Not sure

FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll January 2009

Do you favor or oppose allowing the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), in extreme circumstances, to use enhanced interrogation techniques, even torture to obtain information from prisoners that might protect the United States from terrorist attacks?

43% Favor
 48 Oppose
 7 Depends (Vol.)
 3 Don't know

If there were a possibility that a member of your own family could be saved, then would you favor or oppose allowing the government to use physical torture, to obtain information from terrorist prisoners?

Subpopulation: Asked of those who oppose allowing the government to use enhanced interrogation techniques, even torture to obtain information from prisoners that might protect the United States from terrorist attacks (48 percent)

11% Favor
 79 Oppose
 6 Depends (Vol.)
 3 Don't know

⁸⁸⁹ **Newsweek Poll November 2005**

Would you support the use of torture by U.S. (United States) military or intelligence personnel if it might lead to the prevention of a major terrorist attack, or not?

58% Yes, support
 35 No, would not
 7 Don't know

⁸⁹⁰ **Newsweek Poll November 2005**

What if the use of torture by the United States makes it more likely that Americans will be tortured by our enemies? Would you support the use of torture under these circumstances, or not?

36% Yes, support
 57 No, would not
 7 Don't know

⁸⁹¹ **ABC News/Washington Post Poll May 2004**

Some people say it's acceptable to torture people suspected of terrorism, in cases where other methods have failed and the authorities believe the suspect has information that could prevent terrorist attacks and save lives. Other people say the use of torture is never acceptable because it's cruel, it may violate international law, it may not work, and it could be used unnecessarily or by mistake on innocent people. What's your view—do you think it's acceptable to torture people suspected of terrorism in some cases, or do you think the use of torture is never acceptable?

35% Torture is acceptable in some cases
 63 Torture is never acceptable
 1 No opinion

⁸⁹² **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	DK / NS
Argentina	18	76	6
Mexico	24	73	3
United States	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7
Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22
Palestinian Territories	28	66	6
Turkey	51	36	13

Kenya	58	41	2
Nigeria	54	41	5
China	28	66	6
Hong Kong	22	67	12
India	59	28	13
Indonesia	34	61	5
South Korea	51	48	1
Thailand	44	36	19
Average	35	57	8

	Clear rules should be maintained	Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK	Governments should be allowed to use torture	DK/NS
Argentina	76	13	5	6
Mexico	73	17	7	3
United States	53	31	13	3
France	82	12	4	2
Great Britain	82	11	4	3
Poland	62	20	7	11
Russia	49	29	7	15
Spain	82	6	6	7
Ukraine	59	18	8	15
Azerbaijan	54	26	8	12
Egypt	54	40	6	0
Iran	43	28	8	22
Palestinian Territories	66	23	5	6
Turkey	36	34	18	13
Kenya	41	44	14	2
Nigeria	41	39	15	5
China	66	10	18	6
Hong Kong	67	9	13	12
India	28	47	12	13
Indonesia	61	29	6	5
South Korea	48	38	13	1
Thailand	36	34	10	19
Average	57	26	9	8

⁸⁹³ BBC July 2006

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives	Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture	Neither / Depends	DK / NA
Australia	22	75	2	1
Brazil	32	61	4	4
Canada	22	74	3	1
Chile	22	62	6	10
China	37	49	8	6
Egypt	25	65	6	3
France	19	75	4	2

Germany	21	71	6	1
India	32	23	28	17
Indonesia	40	51	4	4
Iraq	42	55	-	3
Israel	43	48	1	8
Italy	14	81	5	1
Kenya	38	53	3	6
Mexico	24	50	10	17
Nigeria	39	49	5	7
Philippines	40	56	2	3
Poland	27	62	5	7
South Korea	31	66	2	1
Russia	37	43	10	10
Spain	16	65	8	11
Turkey	24	62	7	7
Ukraine	29	54	11	7
Great Britain	24	72	2	2
United States	36	58	4	3
Average	29	59	6	6

⁸⁹⁴ **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press March 2009**

Do you think the use of torture against suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?

	Often justified	Sometimes justified	Rarely justified	Never justified	Don't know/Refused
July 2004	15	28	21	32	4
March 2005	15	30	24	27	4
October 2005	15	31	17	32	5
September 2006	18	28	19	32	3
December 2006	12	31	25	29	3
November 2007	13	25	25	35	2
February 2008	17	31	20	30	2
March 2009	15	34	22	25	4

⁸⁹⁵ **Associated Press-Ipsos Poll November 2005**

How do you feel about the use of torture against suspected terrorists to obtain information about terrorism activities? Can that...?

	Often be Justified	Sometimes be Justified	Rarely be Justified	Never be Justified	Not Sure
United States	11	27	23	36	3
Canada	9	19	21	49	2
Mexico	9	22	18	40	11
South Korea	6	47	33	10	4
France	12	20	25	40	3
Germany	8	22	20	48	2
Italy	9	14	14	50	3
Spain	7	14	16	54	9
United Kingdom	9	21	21	48	1

⁸⁹⁶ **CBS News/New York Times Poll September 2006**

Do you think it is sometimes justified to use torture to get information from a suspected terrorist, or is torture never justified?

- 35% Sometimes justified
- 56 Never justified
- 5 Depends (Vol.)
- 4 Don't know/No answer

⁸⁹⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006**

As you may know, the [COUNTRY] has signed treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and that require that the International Committee of the Red Cross to have access to them. Do you think that these treaties are:

	Important for making sure governments treat people humanely	Too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism	DK/No Answer
United States	73	23	4
United Kingdom	64	32	4
Germany	72	22	6
Poland	60	24	16
India	42	26	32

⁸⁹⁸ **NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll July 2006**

Do you think that when the United States captures suspected terrorists these prisoners should receive all the same legal rights as prisoners of war, or not?

- 52% Yes, should receive same legal rights
- 42 No, should not receive same legal rights
- 2 Depends (Vol.)
- 4 Not sure

⁸⁹⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Here is a legal requirement for the treatment of detainees that are part of international laws the United States has agreed to. Please say whether you favor or oppose having this legal requirement: Detainees have a right to a hearing in which the government makes its case for why the detainee should be held and the detainee can challenge the government's right to hold him or her.

- 81% Favor
- 16 Oppose
- 3 Refused/Don't know

⁹⁰⁰ **Time/SRBI Poll August 2006**

(Please tell me if you would favor or oppose the government doing each of the following as a way to prevent terrorist attacks in the United States.)...Allow the federal government to jail anyone, without a hearing, who is not a U.S. citizen and is suspected of aiding terrorists

- 53% Favor
- 43 Oppose
- 3 No answer/Don't know

⁹⁰¹ **Time/SRBI Poll August 2006**

(Please tell me if you would favor or oppose the government doing each of the following as a way to prevent terrorist attacks in the United States.)...Allow law enforcement officials to hold people suspected of links to terrorist organizations in jail without bail for an unlimited amount of time

- 37% Favor
- 59 Oppose
- 4 No answer/Don't know

⁹⁰² **Third Way September 2006**

Please tell me if you support or oppose the following proposal President (George W.) Bush and the Republicans in Congress may offer....President (George W. Bush has proposed setting up a special trial system at Guantanamo Bay for suspected terrorists. While they would get a military judge and jury they would not have the right to hear classified evidence against them. Do you strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose this proposal?

- 25% Strongly support
- 26 Somewhat support
- 17 Somewhat oppose
- 26 Strongly oppose
- 6 Don't know

⁹⁰³ **NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll September 2006**

The Bush administration has announced a new policy in bringing suspected foreign terrorists to trial. The suspects would be tried by military tribunals, and they and their lawyers would not be allowed to view any evidence that has been classified for security reasons that is brought against them, and in some cases the suspects would not be allowed to be present at their court hearings. Do you favor or oppose this new policy? (If Favor/Oppose, ask:) And do you strongly favor/oppose it or somewhat favor/oppose it?

- 26% Strongly favor
- 15 Somewhat favor
- 21 Somewhat oppose
- 30 Strongly oppose
- 8 Not sure

⁹⁰⁴ **WorldPublicOpinion.org July 2006**

When acts of torture have been committed by military personnel, but their commander says that he or she did not order it and was not aware of it, should the commander be held responsible or not held responsible?

	Held responsible	Not held responsible	DK/NA
United States	58	37	5
Great Britain	73	23	4
Germany	72	21	6
Poland	59	31	10
India	41	27	32

⁹⁰⁵ **Pew Global Attitudes Project October 2007**

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with it:

It is the responsibility of the (state or government) to take care of very poor people who can't take care of themselves

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not important at all	DK/Refused
United States	28	42	17	11	3
Canada	40	41	14	3	1
Argentina	55	34	7	3	2
Bolivia	34	44	17	4	2
Brazil	60	30	8	2	0
Chile	54	36	8	1	1
Mexico	31	50	14	2	2
Peru	49	37	9	3	2
Venezuela	44	42	11	2	0
Great Britain	53	38	5	3	1
France	49	34	14	3	0
Germany	52	40	4	3	1
Italy	46	40	7	2	4
Spain	53	43	3	0	1
Sweden	56	30	8	4	1
Bulgaria	67	26	1	0	5
Czech Republic	58	30	9	2	1
Poland	54	35	9	2	0
Russia	57	29	9	2	2
Slovakia	44	42	12	2	0
Ukraine	64	23	8	4	1
Turkey	62	24	10	1	3
Egypt	38	29	26	6	1
Jordan	34	33	29	3	1
Kuwait	70	23	3	3	1
Lebanon	60	32	4	1	1
Morocco	67	25	2	0	5
Palestinian Territories	68	21	5	4	3
Israel	60	30	9	1	1
Pakistan	58	26	8	2	6
Bangladesh	65	28	5	1	0
Indonesia	48	45	5	1	0
Malaysia	54	39	5	1	1
China	46	44	8	1	1
India	57	35	6	2	0
Japan	15	44	31	7	2
South Korea	30	57	11	1	1
Ethiopia	57	29	12	1	1
Ghana	46	38	17	8	1
Ivory Coast	65	27	5	3	0
Kenya	58	31	8	3	0
Mali	61	28	8	3	0
Nigeria	66	24	7	3	0
Senegal	68	22	8	2	0
South Africa	50	35	10	4	0
Tanzania	73	20	5	2	1
Uganda	54	30	10	3	2

Do you think the [country's] government should be responsible for ensuring that its citizens can meet their basic need for food, OR do you think that is NOT the government's responsibility?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	94	3	1	1
Mexico	89	7	2	2
United States	74	25		1
France	86	13	1	1
Germany	93	5	2	0
Great Britain	86	10	3	1
Italy	92	5	3	0
Russia	77	12	10	1
Ukraine	89	6	3	2
Azerbaijan	93	5	2	1
Egypt	82	14	3	1
Jordan	96	2		2
Palestinian Territories	80	17	1	1
Turkey	87	10	3	1
Kenya	96	4	0	
Nigeria	84	10	3	3
China	96	1	2	2
Hong Kong	92	4	4	0
Macau	95	3	1	1
India	70	10	13	7
Indonesia	97	2	1	0
South Korea	85	12	2	1
Taiwan	92	3	2	3
Thailand	85	1	9	4
Average	87	8	3	2

⁹⁰⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

What about the basic need for healthcare? Do you think the government should or should not be responsible for ensuring that people can meet this need?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	97	1	0	1
Mexico	96	2	1	1
United States	77	21		2
France	92	7	1	0
Germany	95	4	1	0
Great Britain	93	4	2	1
Italy	97	2	2	0

Russia	96	2	2	1
Ukraine	97	1	1	1
Azerbaijan	96	2	2	1
Egypt	81	14	4	0
Jordan	97	1		2
Palestinian Territories	79	19	2	1
Turkey	96	3	1	0
Kenya	96	4	0	0
Nigeria	95	3	1	1
China	96	1	2	1
Hong Kong	94	2	4	1
Macau	99	1	1	0
India	70	12	11	6
Indonesia	97	2	1	0
South Korea	93	4	1	1
Taiwan	96	1	2	1
Thailand	88	2	5	6
Average	92	5	2	1

⁹⁰⁸ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

What about the basic need for education? Do you think the government should or should not be responsible for ensuring that people can meet this need?

	Should be responsible	Should not be responsible	Depends (vol.)	DK / NS
Argentina	98	1	0	1
Mexico	96	2	2	1
United States	83	16		1
France	89	10	1	0
Germany	93	5	2	0
Great Britain	96	3	1	1
Italy	95	3	1	1
Russia	94	3	2	1
Ukraine	95	2	2	1
Azerbaijan	89	3	7	2
Egypt	77	19	4	1
Jordan	97	1		2
Palestinian Territories	85	11	3	2
Turkey	97	2	0	0
Kenya	95	5	0	0
Nigeria	91	3	6	0
China	98	1	1	1
Hong Kong	97	1	2	1

Macau	98	1	0	1
India	64	8	19	8
Indonesia	97	2	1	1
South Korea	95	3	1	1
Taiwan	95	2	1	2
Thailand	90	1	3	6
Average	91	5	3	1