

COUNCIL *on*  
FOREIGN  
RELATIONS

# Public Opinion on Global Issues

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

*[www.cfr.org/public\\_opinion](http://www.cfr.org/public_opinion)*

January 2012

## 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 by GMF in 2007 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.<sup>1</sup>

When asked whether they supported four different types of aid by Chicago Council on Global Affairs in 2010, majorities of Americans offered support for every type. The two most popular were “food and medical assistance to people in needy countries” and “aid to help farmers in needy countries become more productive”—both favored by 74 percent. These were followed by “aid that helps needy countries develop their economies” (62% support) and the non-altruistic “aid to increase U.S. influence over countries that are important to U.S. interests” (58%). Majority support was lower in 2010 than in 2004 for questions where a trend was available: those favoring “food and medical assistance” went from 82 to 74 percent support, and “aid to help needy countries develop their economies” went from 70 to 62 percent support.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

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).<sup>5</sup>

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).<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>8</sup> 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).<sup>9</sup>

### *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 favor 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.<sup>10</sup>

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).<sup>11</sup>

Americans tend to say that their government should cut back on economic aid. In 2010, 60 percent of Americans said their government should cut back on economic aid to other nations (up from 55 percent in 2008 ), 33 percent said it should be kept the same and 7 percent that it should be expanded— (CCGA) When Americans were asked by GMF in 2002 and 2003 whether their own government is spending too much, too little, or the right amount on “economic aid to other nations,” 48 percent in 2002 and 59 percent in 2003 said the U.S. government was spending too much. By contrast, on

average, across seven European countries in 2002, just 24 percent said their government was spending too much, and 31 percent said so in 2003. The most common European response was that their country is spending the right amount (44 percent in 2002, 37 percent in 2003).<sup>12</sup>

American attitudes about government aid spending levels, however, appear to rest on extreme overestimates of how much the United States is spending. A 2010 WorldPublicOpinion.org poll asked respondents to estimate 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.) On average, respondents said they believed 27 percent of the federal budget was currently going to aid (median 25 percent) and said that 13 percent (median: 10 percent) was the appropriate level (ten times the actual percentage). In a similar 2002 CCGA poll, the median response was identical.<sup>13</sup>

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. At the same time it should be noted that 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 many may not believe what they are told about the actual levels of foreign aid spending.<sup>14</sup> Thus the effect of receiving information may be more modest than it would be if respondents were fully confident in the information.

A Hart Research poll (February 2011) divided the sample, telling half that foreign aid is less than 1 percent of the budget and leaving the other half without this information. All were then asked: “Should U.S. spending to address problems facing people in poor and developing countries increase, stay the same, or decrease?” Among those who did not get the information 45 percent wanted to cut it, 20 percent wanted to increase it and 32 percent to keep it the same. Among those who were told that foreign aid is less than 1 percent support for cutting it dropped 19 points to 26 percent, those wanted to increase it jumped 12 points to 32 percent and 39 percent wanted to maintain it at current levels.<sup>15</sup>

World Values Survey (WVS) presented respondents from various countries 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 was too high, 25 percent said it was too low and 51 percent said that this spending was about right, and. Globally, views were also generally mixed between those saying aid levels were 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.<sup>16</sup>

Especially interesting is how Americans treat foreign aid in the context of a budget balancing exercise in which they are not only given information about the amount of foreign aid but permitted to trade aid off against other budget items, including popular domestic programs like education. The Program on Public Consultation (PPC) presented a representative sample of Americans with an on-line questionnaire on the discretionary budget and the deficit, giving respondents a chance to make tradeoffs in an integrated framework—as policymakers must do. The public did not single out foreign aid for cuts. Rather, presented with budgets for five distinct foreign aid categories—humanitarian assistance, development assistance, global health, Economic Support Funds (generally targeted at political allies), and military aid—the respondents increased some, protected others, and cut yet others. Respondents saw 31 items of the discretionary budget and the Office of Management and Budget’s projection of the 2015 allocation for each area. They also saw the projected deficit associated with the discretionary budget, and got constant feedback on how their budget choices were affecting that deficit. On average, respondents made substantial cuts to the aid programs with geostrategic objectives: the Economic Support Fund (cut 23 percent) and military aid (cut 15 percent). However, programs with a more altruistic purpose did much better. Humanitarian aid was actually increased by 18 percent, while global health was lightly nicked (cut 2 percent); development assistance got cut a bit more (14 percent). On average, though, altruistic programs were cut just 3 percent—even in the context of seeking to reduce the federal budget deficit. They were also cut less than the average for all discretionary budget items, which was 11 percent.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, these cuts may have been influenced by misperceptions about what percentage of the federal budget actually goes to foreign aid, as well as a reluctance to believe the modest amounts presented constituted total foreign aid spending.

At the very end of the questionnaire respondents were asked to estimate “about what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid.” The median response was 15 percent. Since, as discussed above, a 2010 PIPA poll and a 2002 CCGA poll both found a higher median estimate of 25 percent, the budget study respondents’ estimate of 15 percent suggests that the exercise had some impact on their assumptions, but only a limited amount. The budget study next asked them what percentage of the budget they thought foreign aid should be; their median response was 5 percent (higher than the 3.9 percent of the total discretionary budget they had been shown in the budget exercise).

The U.S. public also tends to resist paying higher taxes in order 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.<sup>18</sup>

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).<sup>19</sup>

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.)<sup>20</sup>

### **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.<sup>21</sup>

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.<sup>22</sup>

### ***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.<sup>23</sup> (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.<sup>24</sup>

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.<sup>25</sup>

***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.<sup>26</sup>

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).<sup>27</sup>

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).<sup>28</sup>

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).<sup>29</sup>

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).<sup>30</sup>

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.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **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

	<b>Very favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat unfavorable</b>	<b>Very unfavorable</b>	<b>DK/Refused</b>	<b>Favorable</b>	<b>Unfavorable</b>
<b>Germany</b>	18	37	34	8	3	55	42
<b>France</b>	44	41	9	5		85	15
<b>Italy</b>	53	40	5	2		93	7
<b>Poland</b>	20	53	15	3	8	74	18
<b>Slovakia</b>	14	48	26	6	6	63	31
<b>United Kingdom</b>	39	36	10	10	4	76	21
<b>United States</b>	28	38	17	13	4	66	30
<b>European Average</b>	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

	<b>Very favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat favorable</b>	<b>Somewhat unfavorable</b>	<b>Very unfavorable</b>	<b>Don't know/refused</b>
<b>Germany</b>	23	46	22	6	3
<b>France</b>	44	41	9	6	0
<b>Italy</b>	40	54	5	1	0
<b>Poland</b>	15	53	23	2	6
<b>United Kingdom</b>	36	31	16	13	3
<b>United States</b>	26	39	20	11	4
<b>European Average</b>	32	45	15	6	2

<sup>2</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2010

Here are some types of foreign aid. Please select whether you favor or oppose them:

Food and medical assistance to people in needy countries

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	84	12	4
<b>2002</b>	87	13	1
<b>2004</b>	82	13	4
<b>2010</b>	74	23	3

Aid that helps needy countries develop their economies

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	74	21	5
<b>2002</b>	74	24	2
<b>2004</b>	70	25	5
<b>2010</b>	62	35	3

Aid to help farmers in needy countries become more productive \

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2010</b>	74	25	2

Aid to increase U.S. influence over counties that are important to U.S. interests

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2010</b>	58	39	2

<sup>3</sup> 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?

	<b>Do</b>	<b>Do not</b>	<b>DK/ NS</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	85	10	5
<b>Mexico</b>	90	8	1
<b>United States</b>	81	17	2
<b>France</b>	79	19	2
<b>Germany</b>	87	12	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	81	14	5
<b>Italy</b>	89	10	2
<b>Russia</b>	54	29	17
<b>Ukraine</b>	87	6	7
<b>Egypt</b>	71	27	3

<b>Jordan</b>	81	11	8
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	50	49	1
<b>Turkey</b>	81	15	4
<b>Kenya</b>	92	8	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	87	12	1
<b>China</b>	83	5	12
<b>India</b>	72	14	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	87	4	8
<b>South Korea</b>	90	10	1
<b>Taiwan</b>	91	5	4
<b>Average</b>	80	15	5

\* Taiwan not included in average

#### <sup>4</sup> **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

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Depends/ Neither</b>	<b>DK/ NA</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	54	26	29	25	14	12	2	18
<b>Brazil</b>	67	31	45	22	14	17	1	1
<b>Canada</b>	87	11	44	43	7	5	-	2
<b>Chile</b>	68	25	37	31	18	7	2	5
<b>China</b>	73	17	21	52	14	2	5	5
<b>France</b>	87	10	52	35	7	3	1	2
<b>Germany</b>	83	15	53	30	11	4	1	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	86	12	50	36	9	3	-	2
<b>India</b>	89	9	57	32	7	1	1	1
<b>Indonesia</b>	55	38	14	41	30	8	2	5
<b>Italy</b>	87	11	53	34	6	5	1	1
<b>Mexico</b>	88	8	56	32	4	4	-	3
<b>Nigeria</b>	73	23	39	34	15	8	2	2
<b>Russia</b>	52	27	16	36	18	9	5	16
<b>South Africa</b>	83	12	58	25	6	6	3	3
<b>Spain</b>	86	12	45	41	8	4	-	2
<b>Turkey</b>	52	15	20	33	13	2	5	28
<b>Uruguay</b>	56	26	23	32	11	15	2	16
<b>United States</b>	83	14	37	46	9	5	-	2
<b>Average</b>	74	18	39	35	12	6	2	6

#### <sup>5</sup> **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?

	<b>Germany</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Poland</b>	<b>Slovakia</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>European Average</b>
<b>Alleviating poverty</b>	65	58	43	60	65	65	49	59
<b>Helping poor countries trade</b>	23	33	40	25	31	38	17	31

<b>Preventing breeding grounds for terrorism</b>	21	29	28	29	20	29	31	26
<b>Contributing to global stability</b>	24	21	20	26	14	25	35	23
<b>Encouraging democracy</b>	35	38	37	16	26	22	23	31
<b>Gaining political allies</b>	5	3	5	7	10	5	13	5
<b>Helping with natural disaster relief</b>	28	31	22	46	45	22	32	29
<b>Fighting health problems like AIDS</b>	49	57	45	36	40	41	37	46
<b>Supporting economic growth</b>	40	27	49	35	36	38	36	38
<b>None of these (spontaneous)</b>	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	1
<b>DK/ Refused</b>	1	-	-	3	3	4	4	2

<sup>6</sup> German Marshall Fund Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

Which of the following two positions comes closest to your view?

	<b>Development assistance strengthens support for democratic institutions in developing countries</b>	<b>Development assistance weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries</b>	<b>Development assistance neither strengthens nor weakens support for democratic institutions in developing countries (spontaneous)</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>
<b>Germany</b>	77	13	4	6
<b>France</b>	76	18	3	3
<b>Italy</b>	74	9	13	5
<b>Poland</b>	64	10	12	14
<b>Slovakia</b>	63	13	8	15
<b>United Kingdom</b>	72	18	2	8
<b>United States</b>	64	11	16	9
<b>European Average</b>	71	14	7	9

<sup>7</sup> 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.

	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>
<b>United States</b>	19	30	26	20	5
<b>France</b>	17	30	23	28	3
<b>Germany</b>	20	33	25	19	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	24	31	22	15	8
<b>Italy</b>	21	35	25	19	3
<b>The Netherlands</b>	18	35	25	19	3
<b>Poland</b>	18	30	25	14	13
<b>Portugal</b>	23	26	15	23	13
<b>Spain</b>	17	25	15	23	13
<b>Slovakia</b>	17	25	29	23	7
<b>Turkey</b>	28	17	15	28	13
<b>European Average</b>	20	29	22	21	8

<sup>8</sup> German Marshall Fund/Chicago Council on Global Affairs World Views 2002

To assist a population struck by famine

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	90	9	1
<b>France</b>	89	10	1
<b>Germany</b>	83	14	3
<b>The Netherlands</b>	93	6	1
<b>Italy</b>	91	8	1
<b>Poland</b>	92	5	3
<b>United States</b>	81	16	3
<b>European Average</b>	88	10	2

<sup>9</sup> 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

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>
<b>United States</b>	81	16	3
<b>France</b>	92	7	1
<b>Germany</b>	94	5	1
<b>United Kingdom</b>	93	5	3
<b>Italy</b>	85	14	1
<b>The Netherlands</b>	98	2	1
<b>Poland</b>	86	12	3
<b>Portugal</b>	85	7	8
<b>Spain</b>	95	5	1
<b>Slovakia</b>	84	11	5
<b>Turkey</b>	87	9	4
<b>European Average</b>	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

	<b>Approve very much</b>	<b>Approve somewhat</b>	<b>Disapprove somewhat</b>	<b>Disapprove very much</b>	<b>I don't know anything about this topic</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>
<b>United States</b>	43	32	11	10	2	2	75	21

<b>France</b>	61	26	5	5	1	2	88	10
<b>Germany</b>	34	39	15	11	1	1	73	25
<b>United Kingdom</b>	51	29	9	7	1	3	80	16
<b>Italy</b>	55	31	7	7	1	-	86	13
<b>Netherlands</b>	55	27	8	9	1	1	82	17
<b>Poland</b>	30	41	10	7	11	1	71	17
<b>Portugal</b>	52	32	5	7	3	1	84	12
<b>Spain</b>	47	43	4	5		1	90	9
<b>Slovakia</b>	22	41	14	10	8	5	62	24
<b>Turkey</b>	37	21	8	18	16	-	58	26
<b>Bulgaria</b>	17	27	11	17	20	8	44	28
<b>Romania</b>	24	32	11	13	15	5	57	24
<b>European Average</b>	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
<b>United States</b>	26	38	15	18	1	3	64	33
<b>France</b>	33	38	14	12	1	2	71	25
<b>Germany</b>	20	38	14	12	1	2	71	25
<b>United Kingdom</b>	29	41	14	13	1	4	69	27
<b>Italy</b>	30	40	16	12	1	1	70	28
<b>Netherlands</b>	40	35	9	15		1	75	24
<b>Poland</b>	17	37	23	14	5	4	54	37
<b>Portugal</b>	35	38	10	13	3	2	73	22
<b>Spain</b>	32	49	10	8		1	81	18
<b>Slovakia</b>	11	33	22	18	8	8	44	40
<b>Turkey</b>	28	22	12	22	16		50	34
<b>Bulgaria</b>	11	28	22	25	7	6	39	48
<b>Romania</b>	26	36	11	15	8	5	61	25
<b>European Average</b>	27	37	16	15	3	2	64	30

<sup>10</sup> 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
<b>United States</b>	25	69	6
<b>Canada</b>	20	77	3
<b>Argentina</b>	5	85	11
<b>Bolivia</b>	16	76	8
<b>Brazil</b>	7	91	2

---

<b>Chile</b>	10	86	4
<b>Mexico</b>	14	78	8
<b>Peru</b>	14	78	8
<b>Venezuela</b>	17	81	2
<b>France</b>	19	81	0
<b>Germany</b>	21	75	3
<b>Great Britain</b>	20	77	4
<b>Italy</b>	12	78	10
<b>Spain</b>	5	91	4
<b>Sweden</b>	15	82	4
<b>Bulgaria</b>	6	84	10
<b>Czech Republic</b>	24	74	2
<b>Poland</b>	7	88	5
<b>Russia</b>	10	74	16
<b>Slovakia</b>	27	69	4
<b>Ukraine</b>	5	85	10
<b>Egypt</b>	12	84	5
<b>Israel</b>	16	77	7
<b>Jordan</b>	17	76	7
<b>Kuwait</b>	23	70	6
<b>Lebanon</b>	12	85	2
<b>Morocco</b>	18	58	24
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	8	80	12
<b>Turkey</b>	5	77	18
<b>Bangladesh</b>	46	52	2
<b>China</b>	11	83	6
<b>India</b>	33	56	11
<b>Indonesia</b>	54	38	8
<b>Japan</b>	26	63	11
<b>Malaysia</b>	13	73	14
<b>Pakistan</b>	13	56	31
<b>South Korea</b>	17	76	7
<b>Ethiopia</b>	29	67	3
<b>Ghana</b>	37	56	7
<b>Ivory Coast</b>	39	61	0
<b>Kenya</b>	36	62	2
<b>Mali</b>	42	57	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	34	60	6
<b>Senegal</b>	28	71	1
<b>South Africa</b>	22	71	8
<b>Tanzania</b>	45	48	7
<b>Uganda</b>	39	53	8

<sup>11</sup> **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

<sup>12</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2010**

Below is a list of present federal government programs. For each, please select whether you feel it should be expanded, cut back or kept about the same.

**25/5. Economic Aid to Other Nations**

Year	<b>(N=1290)</b>				Total (%)
	Expand (%)	Cut Back (%)	Keep Same (%)	Not Sure (%)	
1974	10	55	28	7	100
1978	11	50	31	8	100
1982	8	54	31	7	100
1986	11	48	35	6	100
1990	7	61	27	5	100
1994	9	58	28	5	100
1998	13	48	36	3	100
2002 (telephone)	14	48	35	3	100
2004 (telephone)	10	49	38	3	100
2004 (internet)	8	64	26	2	100
2008 (internet)	8	55	36	0	100
2010 (internet)	7	60	33	0	100
Change in % points 2008-2010	-1	+5	-3	0	

**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
<b>United Kingdom</b>	33	25	32	10
<b>France</b>	30	25	39	6
<b>Germany</b>	40	12	42	6
<b>The Netherlands</b>	26	18	48	8
<b>Italy</b>	18	29	41	12
<b>Poland</b>	25	13	33	29
<b>Portugal</b>	43	14	25	19
<b>United States</b>	59	8	26	7
<b>European Average</b>	31	19	37	13

2002	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	DK/ Refused
<b>United Kingdom</b>	31	22	45	2
<b>France</b>	2	58	35	4
<b>Germany</b>	29	20	48	3
<b>The Netherlands</b>	21	18	58	2
<b>Italy</b>	15	45	38	2
<b>Poland</b>	44	12	39	6
<b>Portugal</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>United States</b>	48	14	35	3
<b>European Average</b>	24	29	44	3

<sup>13</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org November 2010**

Q44. Just based on what you know, please tell me your hunch about what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid. You can answer in fractions of percentage points as well as whole percentage points.

Mean..... 27%  
Median..... 25

Q45. What do you think would be an appropriate percentage of the federal budget to go to foreign aid, if any?

Mean..... 13%  
Median..... 10

**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

<sup>14</sup> To learn more about this PIPA study, see “Americans on Federal Budget Priorities—A Study of U.S. Public Attitudes” from October 3, 2000.

<sup>15</sup> **Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, February 2011**

Should U.S. spending to address problems facing people in poor and developing countries increase, stay the same, or decrease?

	[respondents told foreign aid is less than 1% of budget]	[respondents not told]
Increase	32%	20%
Stay same	39	32
Decrease	26	45
Don't know/ refused	3	3

1,206 likely 2012 voters interviewed by telephone February 22-27, 2011. Margin of error: +/-3.0 percentage points.

<sup>16</sup> **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?

	<b>Too low</b>	<b>About right</b>	<b>Too high</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>
<b>Spain</b>	40.30%	33.10%	4.80%	21.80%
<b>United States</b>	25.00	50.80	20.10	4.10
<b>Japan</b>	14.60	34.30	15.60	35.50
<b>Australia</b>	42.40	46.70	8.60	2.30
<b>Sweden</b>	45.50	45.90	4.30	4.40
<b>Finland</b>	34.50	57.60	5.80	2.10
<b>Switzerland</b>	45.20	47.90	2.40	4.40
<b>Thailand</b>	24.30	60.80	14.40	0.50
<b>Andorra</b>	69.70	24.90	1.40	4.00
<b>Germany</b>	25.70	49.00	10.00	15.20
<b>Average</b>	35.30	46.00	9.20	9.50

<sup>17</sup> To see the details of this somewhat complex study do to: [http://www.public-consultation.org/studies/budget\\_feb11.html](http://www.public-consultation.org/studies/budget_feb11.html)

<sup>18</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>
<b>Italy</b>	43%	42%	15%
<b>Spain</b>	36	51	13
<b>United States</b>	23	73	4
<b>Japan</b>	18	58	25
<b>South Africa</b>	28	54	18
<b>Australia</b>	32	64	3
<b>Sweden</b>	49	48	4
<b>Finland</b>	36	60	4
<b>Switzerland</b>	47	46	7
<b>Turkey</b>	65	30	6
<b>Thailand</b>	68	32	0
<b>Andorra</b>	56	41	3
<b>Germany</b>	23	69	8
<b>Average</b>	39	52	9

<sup>19</sup> **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".

	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Italy</b>	6.75
<b>Spain</b>	6.38
<b>United States</b>	7.61
<b>Japan</b>	7
<b>Mexico</b>	6.73
<b>South Africa</b>	7.99
<b>Australia</b>	7.03
<b>Sweden</b>	5.99
<b>Argentina</b>	8.26

---

<b>Finland</b>	6.95
<b>South Korea</b>	8.33
<b>Poland</b>	7.63
<b>Switzerland</b>	6.67
<b>Brazil</b>	7.18
<b>Chile</b>	8.18
<b>India</b>	6.15
<b>Slovenia</b>	8.49
<b>Bulgaria</b>	7.27
<b>Romania</b>	7.58
<b>China</b>	6.61
<b>Turkey</b>	7.97
<b>Ukraine</b>	7.48
<b>Ghana</b>	7.73
<b>Moldova</b>	7.31
<b>Thailand</b>	7.16
<b>Indonesia</b>	8.16
<b>Vietnam</b>	8.21
<b>Serbia</b>	8.05
<b>Egypt</b>	9.01
<b>Morocco</b>	7.86
<b>Jordan</b>	9.13
<b>Cyprus</b>	8.17
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	8.79
<b>Andorra</b>	7.77
<b>Malaysia</b>	7.01
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	6.2
<b>Ethiopia</b>	7.97
<b>Mali</b>	5.76
<b>Rwanda</b>	7.37
<b>Zambia</b>	7.29
<b>Germany</b>	7.43
<b>Average</b>	7.5

<sup>20</sup> **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%

<sup>21</sup> **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?

	<b>Would be willing</b>	<b>Would not be willing</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
<b>United States</b>	75	22	3
<b>France</b>	86	14	1
<b>Germany</b>	76	20	4
<b>Great Britain</b>	79	15	6
<b>Italy</b>	84	12	4
<b>Russia</b>	54	24	23
<b>Turkey</b>	78	11	10
<b>South Korea</b>	80	18	1
<b>Average</b>	77	17	7

\*Per person, per year cost to cut hunger by half and reduce severe poverty in respondent's currency:

	<b>Amount in USD</b>	<b>Amount in Respondent's Currency</b>
<b>France</b>	\$45	29 EUROS
<b>Italy</b>	\$39	25 EUROS
<b>Great Britain</b>	\$49	25 POUNDS
<b>South Korea</b>	\$23	24,000 WON
<b>Turkey</b>	\$10	12 LIRAS
<b>United States</b>	\$56	\$56
<b>Germany</b>	\$43	27 EUROS
<b>Russia</b>	\$11	257 RUBLES

## <sup>22</sup> World Values Survey 2005-2008

Have you ever heard of the Millennium Development Goals?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Italy</b>	17	82	1
<b>Spain</b>	17	81	2
<b>United States</b>	5	92	3
<b>Japan</b>	11	86	3
<b>Mexico</b>	16	83	1
<b>South Africa</b>	13	87	0
<b>Australia</b>	13	85	2
<b>Sweden</b>	30	67	3
<b>Argentina</b>	9	89	2
<b>Finland</b>	20	79	1
<b>South Korea</b>	21	78	0
<b>Poland</b>	7	92	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	23	74	3
<b>Brazil</b>	21	79	1
<b>Chile</b>	28	70	2
<b>India</b>	21	79	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	16	73	12
<b>Bulgaria</b>	9	90	1

<b>Romania</b>	7	89	4
<b>China</b>	5	73	22
<b>Turkey</b>	6	94	0
<b>Ukraine</b>	11	89	0
<b>Peru</b>	14	83	3
<b>Ghana</b>	38	57	5
<b>Moldova</b>	20	81	0
<b>Thailand</b>	40	60	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	20	71	9
<b>Vietnam</b>	33	67	0
<b>Serbia</b>	18	77	6
<b>Egypt</b>	8	90	2
<b>Morocco</b>	19	59	23
<b>Jordan</b>	9	81	10
<b>Cyprus</b>	18	82	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	18	81	1
<b>Andorra</b>	13	87	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	22	78	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	27	65	8
<b>Ethiopia</b>	64	33	2
<b>Mali</b>	43	49	8
<b>Rwanda</b>	25	74	2
<b>Zambia</b>	41	52	7
<b>Germany</b>	25	71	4
<b>Average</b>	20	76	4

<sup>23</sup> **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?

	<b>National governments (percent)</b>	<b>Regional Organization (percent)</b>	<b>United Nations (percent)</b>	<b>DK/NA (percent)</b>
<b>Italy</b>	19	19	56	6
<b>Spain</b>	15	18	54	13
<b>United States</b>	30	23	41	5
<b>Japan</b>	14	14	42	30
<b>Mexico</b>	23	11	58	8
<b>South Africa</b>	28	17	49	6
<b>Australia</b>	31	15	49	5
<b>Sweden</b>	14	31	51	4
<b>Argentina</b>	19	9	51	22
<b>Finland</b>	27	15	55	4
<b>South Korea</b>	32	12	56	0
<b>Poland</b>	21	16	61	3
<b>Switzerland</b>	27	16	52	5
<b>Brazil</b>	26	16	50	8
<b>Chile</b>	22	12	58	8
<b>India</b>	23	12	24	40
<b>Slovenia</b>	10	45	33	12

<b>Bulgaria</b>	8	40	40	13
<b>Romania</b>	19	26	36	20
<b>China</b>	17	6	29	48
<b>Taiwan</b>	22	31	43	4
<b>Turkey</b>	31	16	44	8
<b>Ukraine</b>	20	17	50	13
<b>Ghana</b>	24	16	55	6
<b>Moldova</b>	20	36	39	5
<b>Thailand</b>	65	25	9	1
<b>Indonesia</b>	13	26	51	10
<b>Vietnam</b>	13	15	61	10
<b>Serbia</b>	20	18	52	10
<b>Egypt</b>	26	21	49	4
<b>Morocco</b>	19	13	42	26
<b>Jordan</b>	16	17	54	13
<b>Cyprus</b>	28	33	39	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	20	20	57	4
<b>Andorra</b>	24	11	63	3
<b>Malaysia</b>	18	43	38	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	13	11	61	16
<b>Ethiopia</b>	11	11	68	9
<b>Mali</b>	21	12	55	12
<b>Rwanda</b>	17	19	61	4
<b>Zambia</b>	15	29	48	7
<b>Germany</b>	24	25	46	5
<b>Average</b>	22	20	48	11

<sup>24</sup> GMF Trade and Poverty Reduction Survey, 2007

Please tell me who, in your opinion, should have the primary responsibility for delivering development assistance

	<b>Germany</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Poland</b>	<b>Slovakia</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>European Average</b>
<b>The U.S. government</b>	5	4	4	7	11	3	17	5
<b>The European Union</b>	19	24	20	24	13	12	2	20
<b>Individual European governments</b>	5	13	18	14	14	13	2	12
<b>International organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations</b>	54	40	48	36	42	46	37	46
<b>Charities, foundations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</b>	8	12	3	7	12	14	18	9
<b>Religious organizations</b>	3	1	2	2	2	2	6	2
<b>Private companies and businesses</b>	2	4	1	1	1	3	8	2
<b>None of these (spontaneous)</b>	2	1	2	2	1		5	1
<b>DK/ Refused</b>	3	1	7	7	4	7	6	4

<sup>25</sup> World Values Survey 2005-2008

Should policies regarding refugees be decided by the national governments, by regional organizations, or by the United Nations?

	<b>National governments</b>	<b>Regional Organizations</b>	<b>United Nations</b>	<b>DK/NA</b>
<b>Italy</b>	32%	22%	37%	9%

---

<b>Spain</b>	13	20	54	14
<b>United States</b>	34	27	33	6
<b>Japan</b>	17	15	46	23
<b>Mexico</b>	36	14	42	9
<b>South Africa</b>	29	16	47	8
<b>Australia</b>	38	14	44	5
<b>Sweden</b>	34	23	40	3
<b>Argentina</b>	22	5	50	23
<b>Finland</b>	42	17	37	4
<b>South Korea</b>	29	8	62	1
<b>Poland</b>	45	15	37	4
<b>Switzerland</b>	32	17	45	6
<b>Brazil</b>	30	15	45	10
<b>Chile</b>	29	10	52	9
<b>India</b>	30	16	12	43
<b>Slovenia</b>	20	44	24	12
<b>Bulgaria</b>	15	26	44	15
<b>Romania</b>	31	19	28	22
<b>China</b>	22	6	27	45
<b>Taiwan</b>	22	24	51	4
<b>Turkey</b>	37	19	35	10
<b>Ukraine</b>	30	18	39	13
<b>Ghana</b>	18	13	64	5
<b>Moldova</b>	39	29	26	6
<b>Thailand</b>	45	25	29	1
<b>Indonesia</b>	43	9	40	9
<b>Vietnam</b>	22	15	52	11
<b>Serbia</b>	36	16	38	10
<b>Egypt</b>	30	23	42	5
<b>Morocco</b>	14	17	44	26
<b>Jordan</b>	15	15	57	13
<b>Cyprus</b>	43	20	36	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	32	15	47	6
<b>Andorra</b>	30	13	54	3
<b>Malaysia</b>	25	36	39	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	16	13	53	18
<b>Ethiopia</b>	13	13	62	13
<b>Mali</b>	28	13	42	18
<b>Rwanda</b>	10	17	72	2
<b>Zambia</b>	13	20	63	5
<b>Germany</b>	25	25	45	6
<b>Average</b>	28	18	43	11

<sup>26</sup> 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

<sup>27</sup> **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

<sup>28</sup> **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

<sup>29</sup> **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.

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
<b>Germany</b>	27	46	21	4	-	2	73	25
<b>France</b>	24	49	20	6	-	-	73	26
<b>Italy</b>	28	54	12	4	1	1	82	16
<b>Poland</b>	25	51	10	3	4	7	76	13
<b>Slovakia</b>	23	47	14	3	5	7	71	17
<b>United Kingdom</b>	29	44	16	7	1	3	73	23
<b>United States</b>	25	43	15	9	5	3	68	24
<b>European Average</b>	26	49	16	5	3	4	75	20

<sup>30</sup> **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

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree (spontaneous)</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
<b>Germany</b>	49	30	15	5	-	1	79	20
<b>France</b>	40	37	15	8	-	-	77	22
<b>Italy</b>	47	41	7	3	1	1	88	10
<b>Poland</b>	36	45	10	4	4	3	80	13
<b>Slovakia</b>	44	35	10	3	4	5	79	13
<b>United Kingdom</b>	44	28	16	10	1	1	72	26
<b>United States</b>	40	30	14	9	5	3	69	23
<b>European Average</b>	43	36	12	6	3	2	79	17

<sup>31</sup> **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.

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Don't know / No answer</b>
<b>Australia</b>	84	12	5
<b>Brazil</b>	73	17	10
<b>Canada</b>	84	12	4
<b>Chile</b>	68	16	16
<b>China</b>	90	7	3
<b>Egypt</b>	77	23	-
<b>France</b>	78	14	8
<b>Germany</b>	75	22	3
<b>Great Britain</b>	81	13	5
<b>India</b>	47	19	34
<b>Indonesia</b>	78	12	10
<b>Italy</b>	77	18	5

---

<b>Kenya</b>	76	19	5
<b>Mexico</b>	57	29	14
<b>Nigeria</b>	50	46	4
<b>Philippines</b>	71	17	12
<b>Russia</b>	77	6	18
<b>South Korea</b>	72	23	5
<b>Spain</b>	76	17	7
<b>Turkey</b>	65	12	23
<b>United States</b>	70	21	9
<b>Average</b>	73	18	10

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](http://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.