

COUNCIL *on*  
FOREIGN  
RELATIONS

# Public Opinion on Global Issues

Chapter 9: U.S. Opinion on General Principles of World Order  
*[www.cfr.org/public\\_opinion](http://www.cfr.org/public_opinion)*

December 16, 2011

## 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).<sup>1</sup>

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).<sup>2</sup>

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.”<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup>

### **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.<sup>5</sup>

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 2010, 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 (82 percent) favored the idea. This represents a slight drop from 2008 when 88 percent of Americans held this position. In 2006, people in South Korea, China, and India were also asked this question and majorities in each case concurred, with Americans (86 percent) at the upper end of the spectrum in terms of their level of approval.<sup>6</sup>

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-five percent of U.S. respondents said that the United States should participate. This was a slight decrease from the American position found in the international 2006 poll (89 percent), where again the United States had the highest public support of participation in the treaty compared to the other countries asked.<sup>7</sup>

The same poll surveyed people in the United States on their feelings regarding participating in the international agreement on the International Criminal Court. Seventy percent of Americans said their country should take part. Findings were similar in previous CCGA surveys: 71 percent in 2006 and 68 percent in 2008.<sup>8</sup>

Large majorities of Americans believe the United States should take part in a new international treaty to combat climate change. CCGA found that 67 percent of U.S. respondents favor U.S. participation in "a new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse-gas emissions" (CCGA 2010).<sup>9</sup> This represents a nine point drop from 2008 when 76 percent favored a new international treaty.<sup>10</sup> In 2006, seven in ten Americans indicated that they believed their country should participate in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming.<sup>11</sup>

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.<sup>12</sup>

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).<sup>13</sup>

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).<sup>14</sup>

### **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.<sup>15</sup>

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.<sup>16</sup>

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.”<sup>17</sup>

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.<sup>18</sup>

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.<sup>19</sup>

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.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup>

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.”<sup>22</sup>

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.<sup>23</sup>

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.<sup>24</sup>

### *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 2010, 70 percent favored doing so. CCGA has asked this question regularly since 2002 and found support ranging from 68 to 77 percent.<sup>25</sup>

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.<sup>26</sup>

### *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).<sup>27</sup>

Large majorities of Americans reject a hegemonic role for the United States. In 2010, CCGA 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 8 percent chose this option. Likewise, the position, “The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems” also received relatively low levels of support (19 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-one percent favored this position. When the question was asked previously by CCGA in 2006, results were similar, although support for U.S. withdrawal from international efforts was lower, at only 12 percent. Support for the multilateral approach was slightly higher at 75 percent and support for the hegemonic role was about the same (10 percent). CCGA and WPO also asked the question internationally in 2006 and, interestingly, Americans concur with publics of most other nations on this general principle; 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.<sup>28</sup>

Gallup has regularly asked Americans about “the role the United States should play in trying to solve international problems.” Consistently, only small minorities have endorsed the option of the United States playing “the leading role,” most recently 16 percent in 2011. At the same time, few Americans support the idea of playing only a “minor role” (25 percent) or “no role” (7 percent). The most popular option is for the United States to “take a major role, but not the leading one” (50 percent in 2011). Results were similar in 2009, when 52 percent sided with taking a major role.<sup>29</sup>

Other U.S. polls have also found widespread rejection of the United States playing a hegemonic or “world policeman role.” The 2010 CCGA poll asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: “The U.S. is playing the role of world policeman more than it should be.” In this case, 79 percent of Americans agreed, essentially the same as the 76 percent that agreed in 2006.<sup>30</sup> Similarly in a 2006-2007 WPO-CCGA poll, three-quarters of Americans said the United States does not have “the responsibility to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur.” This was even higher than the average of nine countries (65%) that were asked the same question and said that the United States does not have this responsibility.<sup>31</sup> In another 2006 poll, 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).<sup>32</sup>

Interestingly, in 2003, Americans agreed with Europeans that U.S. unilateralism poses a threat—in this case 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.<sup>33</sup>

At the same time, when presented the choice of the United States as the sole hegemon or some other country or group of countries becoming as powerful as the United States, a majority prefers for the United States to remain the world’s dominant player. 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,” 57 percent of respondents preferred the option of preserving U.S. superiority, though 29 percent said it would be acceptable for others to achieve equal power and 14 percent did not know or refused to answer (Pew 2009).<sup>34</sup>

This does not necessarily mean, though, that U.S. hegemony is the preferred option. A follow-up question suggested that this commitment to maintaining U.S. supremacy is fairly soft. The 57 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, or not?” Responses leaned slightly toward not risking alienation of allies, with 28 percent of the full sample taking this position.<sup>35</sup>

*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.<sup>36</sup> And when WPO asked this same question in January 2007, support for a stronger United Nations rose to 66 percent among Americans.<sup>37</sup>

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.<sup>38</sup>

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.<sup>39</sup>

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 2002 an unusually high 55 percent endorsed it as a very important foreign policy goal (this was during the period of UN deliberations about Iraq before the Iraq war). After the UN Security Council declined to endorse the war, this figure fell to 38% and has remained in the 37 to 40 percent range.<sup>40</sup>

Pew has also found consistently large U.S. majorities in favor of making the goal of strengthening the United Nations a priority. Asked most recently in October 2009, 81 percent of respondents said strengthening the United Nations should have top priority (37 percent) or some priority (44 percent). Support was slightly higher in October 2005, when 83 percent either said that it should have top priority (40 percent) or some priority (43 percent).<sup>41</sup>

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).<sup>42</sup>

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.”<sup>43</sup>

### **Giving the United Nations Expanded Powers**

Polling reveals consistent U.S. support for giving the United Nations new powers. In 2010, CCGA polled people in the United States on six proposals for new powers for the United Nations, as a follow-up to an international poll carried out between 2006-2008. Five out of six proposals received strong support.

On having a **standing UN peacekeeping force**, a strong majority of Americans were in favor (64 percent). This represents a decrease of eight points from the 2006 finding (72 percent), which was a bit higher than the average of 66 percent among the twenty-two nations polled.<sup>44</sup>

On giving the United Nations the authority to **go into countries to investigate violations of human rights**, nearly three-quarters of Americans were in favor (72 percent). In 2006, this number was 75 percent; which was again higher than the global average of 65 percent.<sup>45</sup>

Taking this a step further, CCGA also asked about “creating an **international marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide.**” Seventy-three percent of Americans were in favor of this idea, while 26 percent were opposed (this question was only asked in the United States). Support was essentially the same in 2008 when the question was first asked, with 71 percent of Americans in favor and 27 percent opposed.<sup>46</sup>

On giving the United Nations **the power to regulate the international arms trade**, 55 percent of Americans were in favor. Support dropped five points from 2006, when 60 percent favored this proposal, compared to 58 percent globally.<sup>47</sup>

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-four percent of Americans favored the idea.<sup>48</sup> In 2008, support for this proposal was a nearly identical 63 percent (the question was not asked globally).<sup>49</sup>

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 44 percent in favor and 54 percent against.<sup>50</sup> Opposition to the proposal increased four points from 50 percent in 2006, while support was roughly the same (45 percent). While U.S. support was just below the 2006-2008 global average (48 percent), the United States had much higher levels of opposition (50 percent) than other nations polled (average 36 percent).<sup>51</sup>

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?**”<sup>52</sup>

### ***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.<sup>53</sup>

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.<sup>54</sup>

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).<sup>55</sup>

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).<sup>56</sup>

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).<sup>57</sup>

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).<sup>58</sup>

### **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.<sup>59</sup> When a 2006 WPO poll asked the same question, once again, roughly seven in ten Americans (72 percent) agreed.<sup>60</sup>

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).<sup>61</sup>

### **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.<sup>62</sup>

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.<sup>63-64</sup> 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.<sup>65</sup>

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).<sup>66</sup>

### **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.<sup>67</sup>

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.<sup>68</sup>

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).<sup>69</sup>

***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 2010 CCGA poll, 72 percent supported this idea. Polled in 2006 as part of a wider international poll, 75 percent of Americans supported this idea (a higher figure than the global average of 65 percent).<sup>70</sup>

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.”<sup>71</sup> 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).<sup>72</sup> 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).<sup>73</sup>

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.”<sup>74</sup>

**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<sup>75</sup>

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 2010 CCGA poll, 66 percent of Americans said that the United Nations has such a responsibility. This finding represents a drop of eight points from 74 percent in a 2006 poll that included other countries, when the American position was substantially higher than the global average of 61 percent.<sup>76</sup>

### *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.<sup>77</sup>

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.<sup>78</sup>

### *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.<sup>79</sup>

**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.<sup>80</sup>

**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.<sup>81</sup>

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.<sup>82</sup>

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.<sup>83</sup>

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.<sup>84</sup>

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.<sup>85</sup>

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.<sup>86</sup>

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).<sup>87</sup>

### *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.<sup>88</sup>

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.<sup>89</sup>

### *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).<sup>90</sup>

Americans are optimistic about the potential for cooperation with Europe. In 2011, GMF presented respondents with two competing statements on cooperation between the United States and Europe. Most Americans (71 percent) agreed that there were enough common values for cooperation on international problems (up from 67 percent in 2008), while a minority (23 percent) said the United States and the European Union have such different values that cooperation is impossible. In comparison, in the average of the twelve European countries surveyed 68 percent said cooperation was possible (26 percent said it was not).<sup>91</sup>

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.<sup>92</sup>

Questions about making relations closer have elicited different responses. In 2007 GMF found 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).<sup>93</sup> In 2011, 33 percent said “the partnership in security and diplomatic affairs between the United States and the European Union” should become closer, while another 33 percent said the United States should take a more independent approach and 31 percent said relations should remain the same. In the average of 12 European countries polled, 39 percent favored the United States and EU working together more closely, 38 percent favored a more independent approach, and 21 percent favored relations remaining about the same.<sup>94</sup>

Americans are substantially more confident that they have common ground with Europe than with China. Asked by GMF in 2010 whether China and the United States had “enough common values to be able to cooperate on international problems” or “have such different values that cooperating on international problems is possible”, 53 percent of Americans thought that the two countries were able to cooperate. While a majority, it was substantially less than the 77 percent who took this position in regard to the European Union.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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?

	<b>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>	<b>B. If our government thinks it is not in our nation’s interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws.</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
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

## <sup>2</sup> 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

## <sup>3</sup> 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)

<sup>4</sup> **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

<sup>5</sup> **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
<b>Great Britain</b>	84	12	4
<b>France</b>	84	13	3
<b>Germany</b>	68	26	7
<b>The Netherlands</b>	86	12	2
<b>Italy</b>	83	14	2
<b>Poland</b>	84	11	6
<b>European Average</b>	80	16	4
<b>United States</b>	76	21	3

<sup>6</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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
<b>2002</b>	84	13	3
<b>2004</b>	87	9	3
<b>2006</b>	86	10	4
<b>2008</b>	88	11	1



---

<b>2010</b>	82	15	3
-------------	----	----	---

**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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	86	10	4
<b>China</b>	73	17	10
<b>India</b>	57	31	12
<b>South Korea</b>	86	13	2

<sup>7</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. 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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	89	8	3
<b>2010</b>	85	12	3

**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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	89	8	3
<b>China</b>	65	19	16
<b>India</b>	50	32	19
<b>South Korea</b>	86	12	2

<sup>8</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	77	20	4
<b>2004</b>	76	19	5
<b>2006</b>	71	25	5

---

<b>2008</b>	68	30	2
<b>2010</b>	70	26	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 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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	71	25	5
<b>South Korea</b>	87	11	2

<sup>9</sup> **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

<sup>10</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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 green house gas emissions

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2008</b>	76	23	2
<b>2010</b>	67	30	3

<sup>11</sup> **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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	70	23	7
<b>South Korea</b>	88	11	2

<sup>12</sup>

**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

<sup>13</sup> **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

<sup>14</sup> **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

<sup>15</sup> **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

<sup>16</sup> **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

<sup>17</sup> **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

<sup>18</sup> **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

<sup>19</sup> **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

<sup>20</sup> **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

<sup>21</sup> **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

<sup>22</sup> **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

<sup>23</sup> **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

<sup>24</sup> **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

<sup>25</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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

	<b>Should participate</b>	<b>Should not participate</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	77	20	4
<b>2004</b>	76	19	5
<b>2006</b>	71	25	5
<b>2008</b>	68	30	2
<b>2010</b>	70	26	4

<sup>26</sup> **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?

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<b>April 2006</b>	68	29	3
<b>CCGA June 2002</b>	65	28	7

<sup>27</sup> **Bertelsmann Foundation of Germany 2005**

What is the best framework for ensuring peace and stability?

	<b>A System Led by the United Nations</b>	<b>A System Led by a Balance of Regional Powers</b>	<b>A System Led by a Single World Power</b>	<b>A System Led by Two World Powers</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Brazil</b>	36	45	9	6	4
<b>China</b>	51	36	6	3	4
<b>France</b>	46	34	5	4	11
<b>Germany</b>	68	21	4	3	4
<b>Great Britain</b>	47	40	3	2	8
<b>India</b>	33	37	16	12	2
<b>Japan</b>	33	29	1	1	36
<b>Russia</b>	28	33	15	10	14
<b>United States</b>	33	52	6	4	5
<b>Average</b>	42	36	7	5	10

<sup>28</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

Which statement comes closest to your position?

	<b>As the sole remaining superpower, the U.S. should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.</b>	<b>The U.S. should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.</b>	<b>The U.S. should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems.</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	7	79	14	1
<b>2004</b>	8	78	10	4
<b>2006</b>	10	75	12	3
<b>2010</b>	8	71	19	1

**WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007**

Which statement comes closest to your position?

	<b>As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.</b>	<b>The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.</b>	<b>The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems.</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	10	75	12	3
<b>Argentina</b>	1	34	55	10
<b>Armenia</b>	7	58	27	8
<b>China</b>	9	68	14	9
<b>France</b>	3	75	21	1
<b>India</b>	34	42	10	13
<b>Israel</b>	24	62	10	5
<b>Mexico</b>	12	59	22	8
<b>Palestine</b>	5	36	55	4

---

<b>Peru</b>	10	61	22	7
<b>Philippines</b>	20	55	16	9
<b>Russia</b>	8	42	38	12
<b>South Korea</b>	14	79	6	0
<b>Thailand</b>	8	47	18	27
<b>Ukraine</b>	3	52	34	11
<b>Average</b>	11	56	24	8

<sup>29</sup> **Gallup Poll February 2011**

Next we would like you to think about the role the US (United States) should play in trying to solve international problems. Do you think the US 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?

16%	Leading role
50	Major role
25	Minor role
7	No role
1	No opinion

**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

<sup>30</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

Please select if you agree or disagree with the following statement: The U.S. is playing the role of world policeman more than it should be.

U.S. World Policeman more than it should be

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	65	34	1
<b>2004</b>	80	18	3
<b>2006</b>	76	21	3
<b>2008</b>	77	23	0
<b>2010</b>	79	20	1



<sup>31</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	22	75	3
<b>Armenia</b>	21	70	9
<b>Australia</b>	27	70	3
<b>China</b>	30	61	9
<b>India</b>	53	35	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	20	69	11
<b>Palestine</b>	20	76	4
<b>South Korea</b>	39	60	1
<b>Ukraine</b>	17	69	14
<b>Average</b>	28	65	8

<sup>32</sup> **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

<sup>33</sup> **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")

	<b>Extremely important threat</b>	<b>Important threat</b>	<b>Not important threat</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Great Britain</b>	25	43	26	6
<b>France</b>	34	54	11	1
<b>Germany</b>	40	48	11	1
<b>The Netherlands</b>	24	53	19	4
<b>Italy</b>	29	46	21	4
<b>Poland</b>	24	43	18	15
<b>Portugal</b>	28	44	17	11
<b>European Average</b>	31	47	17	5
<b>United States</b>	21	46	24	9

<sup>34</sup> **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

**Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/Council on Foreign Relations America's Place in the World Survey, Oct, 2009**

In the future, should US (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 US?

57%	U.S. policies should keep U.S. as the only superpower
29	Okay if China/Another country/European Union became as powerful
14	Don't know/Refused

<sup>35</sup> **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

**Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/Council on Foreign Relations America's Place in the World Survey, Oct, 2009**

Should US (United States) policies try to keep it so America is the only military superpower even if it risks alienating our principal allies, or not?

40%	Even if risks alienating allies
49	Not if risks alienating allies
11	Don't know/Refused

<sup>36</sup> **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)
<b>Argentina</b>	44	22	4	30
<b>Australia</b>	74	17	4	5
<b>Brazil</b>	61	22	6	12
<b>Canada</b>	72	22	1	5

---

<b>China</b>	54	17	5	23
<b>Chile</b>	69	18	5	8
<b>France</b>	54	37	1	8
<b>Germany</b>	87	7	3	3
<b>Great Britain</b>	75	20	1	4
<b>India</b>	55	23	9	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	77	9	8	6
<b>Italy</b>	58	33	3	7
<b>Japan</b>	65	3	0	32
<b>Lebanon</b>	58	18	10	13
<b>Mexico</b>	71	5	12	12
<b>Russia</b>	57	11	10	22
<b>Philippines</b>	77	18	3	3
<b>Poland</b>	61	11	3	25
<b>South Africa</b>	64	26	2	8
<b>South Korea</b>	56	38	4	3
<b>Spain</b>	78	10	2	10
<b>Turkey</b>	40	24	17	19
<b>United States</b>	59	37	1	3
<b>Average</b>	64	19	5	12

<sup>37</sup> **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
<b>Iran</b>	70	14	16
<b>United States</b>	66	32	3

<sup>38</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007**

Strengthening the United Nations

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/Decline	Total
<b>United States</b>	40	39	19	2	100
<b>Armenia</b>	41	39	12	8	100
<b>Australia</b>	64	27	9	1	101
<b>China</b>	51	35	8	6	100
<b>India</b>	49	35	10	7	101
<b>Mexico</b>	56	26	14	4	100
<b>South Korea</b>	32	58	9	1	100
<b>Thailand</b>	45	34	4	17	100

<sup>39</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends, June 2003**

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.

	<b>Yes, needs to be strengthened</b>	<b>No, does not need to be strengthened</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>Great Britain</b>	78	18	4
<b>France</b>	71	25	4
<b>Germany</b>	80	18	2
<b>The Netherlands</b>	69	26	5
<b>Italy</b>	72	22	6
<b>Poland</b>	61	23	16
<b>Portugal</b>	81	14	5
<b>European Average</b>	74	21	5
<b>United States</b>	70	26	4

<sup>40</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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

	<b>Very important</b>	<b>Somewhat important</b>	<b>Not important</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>1974</b>	46	32	14	8
<b>1978</b>	47	32	13	8
<b>1982</b>	48	32	13	7
<b>1986</b>	46	33	16	5
<b>1990</b>	52	36	8	4
<b>1994</b>	51	33	12	4
<b>1998</b>	45	39	11	5
<b>2002</b>	55	33	12	1
<b>2004</b>	38	43	17	2
<b>2006</b>	40	39	19	2
<b>2008</b>	39	40	21	1
<b>2010</b>	37	42	21	1

<sup>41</sup> **Pew Research Center for the People & the Press/Council on Foreign Relations America's Place in the World Survey, Oct, 2009**

(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?

37% Top priority  
44 Some priority  
17 No priority  
2 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

<sup>42</sup> **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
<b>WPO/KN 12/06</b>	66	32	3
<b>BBC 11/04</b>	59	37	4

<sup>43</sup> **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

<sup>44</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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 standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

---

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2004</b>	74	20	6
<b>2006</b>	72	24	5
<b>2008</b>	70	29	1
<b>2010</b>	64	35	1

#### **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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	48	30	22
<b>Peru</b>	77	19	4
<b>United States</b>	72	24	5
<b>Armenia</b>	75	15	10
<b>France</b>	74	25	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	79	17	4
<b>Poland</b>	63	11	26
<b>Russia</b>	58	22	20
<b>Ukraine</b>	54	19	28
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	64	21	14
<b>Egypt</b>	53	47	0
<b>Iran</b>	62	13	25
<b>Israel</b>	64	31	6
<b>Turkey</b>	51	24	25
<b>Kenya</b>	85	14	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	84	15	1
<b>China</b>	62	25	13
<b>India</b>	58	30	12
<b>Indonesia</b>	74	14	12
<b>Philippines</b>	46	44	9
<b>South Korea</b>	68	30	1
<b>Thailand</b>	73	12	15
<b>Average</b>	66	23	12

<sup>45</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs

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.

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	75	22	3
<b>2008</b>	73	26	1
<b>2010</b>	72	26	1

#### **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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	46	29	24
<b>Peru</b>	75	23	3
<b>United States</b>	75	22	3
<b>Armenia</b>	67	16	18
<b>France</b>	92	8	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	86	11	3
<b>Poland</b>	58	14	28
<b>Russia</b>	64	17	19
<b>Ukraine</b>	66	13	21
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	77	11	12
<b>Egypt</b>	51	49	0
<b>Iran</b>	54	22	25
<b>Israel</b>	64	31	5
<b>Turkey</b>	47	25	28
<b>Kenya</b>	81	17	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	83	15	3
<b>China</b>	57	28	16
<b>India</b>	54	29	17
<b>Indonesia</b>	71	14	15
<b>Philippines</b>	46	46	9
<b>South Korea</b>	74	25	2
<b>Thailand</b>	52	26	22
<b>Average</b>	65	22	13

<sup>46</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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 marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	75	21	4
<b>2008</b>	71	27	2
<b>2010</b>	73	26	1

<sup>47</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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.

Giving the UN the power to regulate the international arms trade

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2004</b>	57	36	7
<b>2006</b>	60	34	6
<b>2008</b>	57	41	2
<b>2010</b>	55	44	1

**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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	36	42	22
<b>Peru</b>	52	43	5
<b>United States</b>	60	34	6
<b>Armenia</b>	58	27	15
<b>France</b>	77	22	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	69	26	5
<b>Poland</b>	44	28	28
<b>Russia</b>	55	28	17
<b>Ukraine</b>	57	22	21
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	63	27	10
<b>Egypt</b>	53	47	0
<b>Iran</b>	59	16	26
<b>Israel</b>	60	34	6
<b>Turkey</b>	34	39	27



---

<b>Kenya</b>	85	13	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	84	15	2
<b>China</b>	59	28	13
<b>India</b>	57	31	12
<b>Indonesia</b>	64	22	15
<b>Philippines</b>	32	58	10
<b>South Korea</b>	75	23	2
<b>Thailand</b>	44	37	19
<b>Average</b>	58	30	12

<sup>48</sup> **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

<sup>49</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2008</b>	63	35	2
<b>2010</b>	64	35	2

<sup>50</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs,**

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.

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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	51	42	7
<b>2004</b>	49	45	6
<b>2006</b>	45	50	5
<b>2008</b>	46	51	3
<b>2010</b>	44	54	2

<sup>51</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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.

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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	51	42	7
<b>2004</b>	49	45	6
<b>2006</b>	45	50	5
<b>2008</b>	46	51	3
<b>2010</b>	44	54	2

**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

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	32	42	27
<b>Peru</b>	38	55	7
<b>United States</b>	45	50	5
<b>Armenia</b>	46	28	26
<b>France</b>	70	30	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	61	33	6
<b>Poland</b>	40	27	33
<b>Russia</b>	39	36	25
<b>Ukraine</b>	44	20	36
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	47	30	24
<b>Egypt</b>	39	61	0
<b>Iran</b>	39	31	30
<b>Israel</b>	52	39	9
<b>Turkey</b>	33	36	31
<b>Kenya</b>	74	23	3
<b>Nigeria</b>	65	31	5
<b>China</b>	55	27	17
<b>India</b>	47	37	17
<b>Indonesia</b>	50	33	17
<b>Philippines</b>	33	56	11
<b>South Korea</b>	53	44	3

---

<b>Thailand</b>	48	29	23
<b>Average</b>	48	36	16

<sup>52</sup> **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

<sup>53</sup> **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.

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	73	17	9
<b>United States</b>	83	13	4
<b>France</b>	85	14	1
<b>Russia</b>	64	20	17
<b>Ukraine</b>	69	11	21
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	79	10	11
<b>Egypt</b>	83	17	0
<b>Iran</b>	69	20	12
<b>Israel</b>	83	15	2
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	78	20	2
<b>Turkey</b>	64	16	20
<b>Kenya</b>	90	10	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	88	10	2
<b>China</b>	72	18	9
<b>India</b>	63	28	9
<b>Indonesia</b>	83	7	10
<b>South Korea</b>	74	25	1
<b>Thailand</b>	62	23	15
<b>Average</b>	76	16	8

<sup>54</sup> **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

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	65	21	13
<b>United States</b>	83	14	4
<b>France</b>	84	13	3
<b>Russia</b>	70	14	17
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	82	11	7
<b>Egypt</b>	78	22	0
<b>Israel</b>	77	17	6
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	81	17	2
<b>Turkey</b>	68	15	18

---

<b>Kenya</b>	88	11	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	89	10	1
<b>China</b>	70	18	11
<b>India</b>	66	22	12
<b>Indonesia</b>	71	15	14
<b>South Korea</b>	76	23	1
<b>Thailand</b>	67	14	19
<b>Average</b>	76	16	8

<sup>55</sup> **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

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	71	20	9
<b>United States</b>	76	20	3
<b>France</b>	84	16	1
<b>Russia</b>	65	18	17
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	80	10	10
<b>Egypt</b>	81	19	0
<b>Israel</b>	85	12	3
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	61	36	3
<b>Turkey</b>	69	13	17
<b>Kenya</b>	76	22	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	87	11	2
<b>China</b>	67	23	10
<b>India</b>	60	28	11
<b>Indonesia</b>	81	7	13
<b>South Korea</b>	61	38	1
<b>Thailand</b>	71	16	13
<b>Average</b>	73	19	7

<sup>56</sup> **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.

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	70	21	10
<b>United States</b>	62	33	5
<b>France</b>	50	48	2
<b>Russia</b>	55	27	19
<b>Ukraine</b>	51	22	26
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	59	26	16
<b>Egypt</b>	74	26	0
<b>Israel</b>	62	33	5
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	38	59	3
<b>Turkey</b>	58	23	19
<b>Kenya</b>	84	15	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	81	17	2
<b>China</b>	47	40	14

---

<b>India</b>	53	34	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	68	19	14
<b>South Korea</b>	43	55	1
<b>Thailand</b>	52	31	18
<b>Average</b>	59	31	10

<sup>57</sup> [WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago](http://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

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>United States</b>	57	39	5
<b>France</b>	50	48	2
<b>Russia</b>	53	22	25
<b>Ukraine</b>	52	20	27
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	59	20	21
<b>Egypt</b>	51	49	0
<b>Israel</b>	54	39	7
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	39	57	4
<b>Turkey</b>	58	20	23
<b>Kenya</b>	84	15	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	75	21	4
<b>China</b>	47	34	19
<b>India</b>	50	32	18
<b>Indonesia</b>	62	25	14
<b>South Korea</b>	42	56	2
<b>Thailand</b>	59	21	20
<b>Average</b>	56	32	12

<sup>58</sup> [WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago](http://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

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	54	30	15
<b>United States</b>	57	38	5
<b>France</b>	52	45	3
<b>Russia</b>	35	37	28
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	43	38	19
<b>Egypt</b>	64	36	0
<b>Israel</b>	58	34	7
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	67	30	3
<b>Turkey</b>	43	32	26
<b>Kenya</b>	76	22	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	76	22	3
<b>China</b>	37	45	18
<b>India</b>	51	34	16

---

<b>Indonesia</b>	51	28	21
<b>South Korea</b>	32	65	2
<b>Thailand</b>	46	29	25
<b>Average</b>	53	35	12

<sup>59</sup> **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

	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	28	36	17	13	6
<b>United States</b>	35	34	34	15	2
<b>France</b>	34	40	40	11	1
<b>Germany</b>	23	37	37	15	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	41	35	35	7	5
<b>Italy</b>	23	38	38	15	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	31	43	43	8	1
<b>Poland</b>	18	39	39	9	16
<b>Portugal</b>	45	33	8	8	7
<b>Spain</b>	24	43	15	11	7
<b>Slovakia</b>	31	36	13	10	10
<b>Turkey</b>	24	25	18	19	14

<sup>60</sup> **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.

	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>Iran</b>	31	38	16	6	9
<b>United States</b>	26	46	16	11	2

<sup>61</sup> **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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	37	57	6
<b>France</b>	41	53	6
<b>Germany</b>	20	76	4
<b>The Netherlands</b>	33	61	6
<b>Italy</b>	24	70	6
<b>Poland</b>	37	52	11
<b>Portugal</b>	25	72	3
<b>EU Average</b>	31	63	6
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	55	41	4
<b>France</b>	47	48	5
<b>Germany</b>	34	64	2
<b>The Netherlands</b>	44	51	5
<b>Italy</b>	32	63	5
<b>Poland</b>	38	55	7
<b>Portugal</b>	39	56	5
<b>EU Average</b>	41	54	5
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	56	37	7
<b>France</b>	45	50	5
<b>Germany</b>	33	66	1
<b>The Netherlands</b>	52	46	2
<b>Italy</b>	37	59	4
<b>Poland</b>	31	58	11
<b>Portugal</b>	44	54	2
<b>EU Average</b>	43	53	5
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	49	48	3
<b>France</b>	43	49	8
<b>Germany</b>	30	63	7
<b>The Netherlands</b>	40	56	4
<b>Italy</b>	24	71	5
<b>Poland</b>	41	47	12
<b>Portugal</b>	34	61	5
<b>EU Average</b>	37	56	6
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	66	31	3

---

<b>France</b>	54	44	2
<b>Germany</b>	29	67	4
<b>The Netherlands</b>	54	43	3
<b>Italy</b>	34	62	4
<b>Poland</b>	51	40	9
<b>Portugal</b>	47	49	4
<b>EU Average</b>	48	48	4
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>DK / Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	51	43	6
<b>France</b>	44	52	4
<b>Germany</b>	32	66	2
<b>The Netherlands</b>	45	49	6
<b>Italy</b>	26	68	6
<b>Poland</b>	38	49	13
<b>Portugal</b>	28	66	6
<b>EU Average</b>	38	56	6
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	70	27	3
<b>France</b>	56	39	5
<b>Germany</b>	46	51	3
<b>The Netherlands</b>	48	46	6
<b>Italy</b>	44	52	4
<b>Poland</b>	38	45	17
<b>Portugal</b>	48	50	2
<b>EU Average</b>	50	44	6
<b>United States</b>	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?

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Not support</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	58	40	2
<b>France</b>	47	49	4
<b>Germany</b>	33	63	4
<b>The Netherlands</b>	40	55	5
<b>Italy</b>	38	60	2
<b>Poland</b>	40	47	13
<b>Portugal</b>	38	54	8
<b>EU Average</b>	42	53	5



---

<b>United States</b>	73	20	7
----------------------	----	----	---

<sup>62</sup> **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?

	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Not essential</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	78	15	7
<b>United States</b>	58	38	4
<b>France</b>	86	10	5
<b>Germany</b>	78	18	5
<b>United Kingdom</b>	83	15	3
<b>Italy</b>	87	10	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	85	13	1
<b>Poland</b>	73	12	15
<b>Portugal</b>	69	16	15
<b>Spain</b>	86	9	5
<b>Slovakia</b>	78	11	11
<b>Turkey</b>	59	26	15

<sup>63</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	65	29	6
<b>United States</b>	78	15	7
<b>France</b>	82	16	2
<b>Germany</b>	56	42	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	77	18	6
<b>Italy</b>	77	20	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	76	21	2
<b>Poland</b>	53	36	11
<b>Portugal</b>	57	30	14
<b>Spain</b>	77	18	5
<b>Slovakia</b>	61	24	15
<b>Turkey</b>	30	52	18

<sup>64</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	55	38	7
<b>United States</b>	66	27	6
<b>France</b>	70	25	5

<b>Germany</b>	40	55	5
<b>United Kingdom</b>	65	25	9
<b>Italy</b>	68	27	4
<b>Netherlands</b>	67	29	5
<b>Poland</b>	27	64	9
<b>Portugal</b>	52	28	20
<b>Spain</b>	68	24	8
<b>Slovakia</b>	26	57	17
<b>Turkey</b>	4	48	8

<sup>65</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	27	68	5
<b>United States</b>	49	46	5
<b>France</b>	29	67	4
<b>Germany</b>	16	83	1
<b>United Kingdom</b>	31	66	3
<b>Italy</b>	25	69	6
<b>Netherlands</b>	26	71	3
<b>Poland</b>	24	63	13
<b>Portugal</b>	37	56	7
<b>Spain</b>	28	67	6
<b>Slovakia</b>	24	66	10
<b>Turkey</b>	41	53	6

<sup>66</sup> **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?

	<b>U.N. approval</b>	<b>Too difficult</b>	<b>Don't know/ Refused</b>
<b>United States</b>	41	48	10
<b>Great Britain</b>	64	30	6
<b>France</b>	63	35	2
<b>Germany</b>	80	15	6
<b>Russia</b>	37	41	21
<b>Turkey</b>	45	44	11
<b>Pakistan</b>	38	34	28
<b>Jordan</b>	47	38	15
<b>Morocco</b>	42	42	16

<sup>67</sup> **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

	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	15	36	25	16	7

<b>United States</b>	18	35	22	17	9
<b>France</b>	15	41	25	14	5
<b>Germany</b>	15	40	29	15	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	20	39	21	11	9
<b>Italy</b>	8	32	30	26	4
<b>Netherlands</b>	14	48	23	12	3
<b>Poland</b>	11	36	23	10	20
<b>Portugal</b>	26	37	14	9	14
<b>Spain</b>	13	31	27	19	10
<b>Slovakia</b>	21	38	14	16	11
<b>Turkey</b>	23	25	20	18	13

<sup>68</sup> **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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	61	32	7
<b>United States</b>	79	16	5
<b>France</b>	76	21	3
<b>Germany</b>	51	47	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	74	20	7
<b>Italy</b>	65	29	6
<b>Netherlands</b>	78	21	1
<b>Poland</b>	56	29	15
<b>Portugal</b>	58	30	12
<b>Spain</b>	76	20	4
<b>Slovakia</b>	50	31	19
<b>Turkey</b>	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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	50	42	8
<b>United States</b>	60	34	6
<b>France</b>	58	35	7
<b>Germany</b>	34	63	4
<b>United Kingdom</b>	64	28	7
<b>Italy</b>	64	29	7
<b>Netherlands</b>	63	34	3
<b>Poland</b>	26	64	10
<b>Portugal</b>	54	29	17

---

<b>Spain</b>	61	29	10
<b>Slovakia</b>	19	59	23
<b>Turkey</b>	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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	65	29	6
<b>United States</b>	78	15	7
<b>France</b>	82	16	2
<b>Germany</b>	56	42	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	77	18	6
<b>Italy</b>	77	20	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	76	21	2
<b>Poland</b>	53	36	11
<b>Portugal</b>	57	30	14
<b>Spain</b>	77	18	5
<b>Slovakia</b>	61	24	15
<b>Turkey</b>	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?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	55	38	7
<b>United States</b>	66	27	6
<b>France</b>	70	25	5
<b>Germany</b>	40	55	5
<b>United Kingdom</b>	65	25	9
<b>Italy</b>	68	27	4
<b>Netherlands</b>	67	29	5
<b>Poland</b>	27	64	9
<b>Portugal</b>	52	28	20
<b>Spain</b>	68	24	8
<b>Slovakia</b>	26	57	17
<b>Turkey</b>	4	48	8

#### <sup>69</sup> 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, not very important or not at all important?)...Initiating military force only when we have our allies

51%	Very important
34	Somewhat important
6	Not very important

5 Not at all important  
3 Don't know

<sup>70</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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.

Giving the UN the authority to go into countries in order to investigate violations of human rights

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	75	22	3
<b>2008</b>	73	26	1
<b>2010</b>	72	26	1

**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...

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	46	29	24
<b>Peru</b>	75	23	3
<b>United States</b>	75	22	3
<b>Armenia</b>	67	16	18
<b>France</b>	92	8	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	86	11	3
<b>Poland</b>	58	14	28
<b>Russia</b>	64	17	19
<b>Ukraine</b>	66	13	21
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	77	11	12
<b>Egypt</b>	51	49	0
<b>Iran</b>	54	22	25
<b>Israel</b>	64	31	5
<b>Turkey</b>	47	25	28
<b>Kenya</b>	81	17	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	83	15	3
<b>China</b>	57	28	16
<b>India</b>	54	29	17
<b>Indonesia</b>	71	14	15
<b>Philippines</b>	46	46	9
<b>South Korea</b>	74	25	2
<b>Thailand</b>	52	26	22
<b>Average</b>	65	22	13

<sup>71</sup> **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?

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	91	4	5
<b>Mexico</b>	85	12	3
<b>United States</b>	70	25	5
<b>France</b>	76	20	4
<b>Germany</b>	91	8	2
<b>Britain</b>	68	24	8
<b>Italy</b>	81	14	5
<b>Russia</b>	55	29	16
<b>Ukraine</b>	73	9	18
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	89	8	4
<b>Egypt</b>	64	33	3
<b>Jordan</b>	50	33	17
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	54	41	5
<b>Turkey</b>	60	19	20
<b>Kenya</b>	94	4	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	87	12	1
<b>China</b>	62	16	22
<b>Hong Kong*</b>	73	16	12
<b>Macau*</b>	68	15	17
<b>India</b>	55	26	19
<b>Indonesia</b>	70	13	17
<b>South Korea</b>	62	35	4
<b>Taiwan*</b>	78	12	10
<b>Thailand</b>	44	25	31
<b>Average</b>	70	19	10

<sup>72</sup> 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?

	<b>Do more</b>	<b>Do less</b>	<b>Do about the same as it has been doing</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	85	2	8	5
<b>Mexico</b>	88	2	8	2
<b>United States</b>	59	7	28	5
<b>France</b>	64	6	26	4
<b>Germany</b>	58	7	34	2
<b>Britain</b>	64	6	22	8
<b>Italy</b>	83	6	8	3
<b>Russia</b>	45	8	23	24
<b>Ukraine</b>	57	4	18	22
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	58	9	29	4
<b>Egypt</b>	55	22	22	1
<b>Jordan</b>	62	17	8	13

<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	48	23	26	3
<b>Turkey</b>	69	7	8	16
<b>Kenya</b>	91	5	3	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	88	7	4	1
<b>China</b>	51	5	15	29
<b>Hong Kong*</b>	65	2	26	7
<b>Macau*</b>	65	1	22	12
<b>India</b>	54	14	16	17
<b>Indonesia</b>	66	6	12	17
<b>South Korea</b>	69	3	25	3
<b>Taiwan*</b>	62	2	25	11
<b>Thailand</b>	60	7	13	20
<b>Average</b>	65	8	17	10

<sup>73</sup> 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?

	<b>Make efforts to further the rights of women</b>	<b>Improper interference in a country's internal affairs</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	78	18	4
<b>Mexico</b>	88	9	3
<b>United States</b>	59	38	2
<b>France</b>	74	19	7
<b>Britain</b>	70	26	5
<b>Russia</b>	52	30	18
<b>Ukraine</b>	69	16	16
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	66	23	11
<b>Egypt</b>	30	70	
<b>Iran</b>	52	36	12
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	49	48	3
<b>Turkey</b>	70	20	11
<b>Kenya</b>	91	8	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	66	32	2
<b>China</b>	86	10	4
<b>Hong Kong*</b>	67	23	10
<b>India</b>	48	28	24
<b>Indonesia</b>	74	16	10
<b>South Korea</b>	78	21	1
<b>Thailand</b>	64	21	15
<b>Average</b>	67	26	8

<sup>74</sup> 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

<sup>75</sup> **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?

	<b>UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary</b>	<b>This would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	86	8	7
<b>Mexico</b>	69	27	4
<b>United States</b>	53	43	5
<b>France</b>	70	26	4
<b>Germany</b>	74	23	3
<b>Great Britain</b>	68	26	7
<b>Italy</b>	66	24	10
<b>Russia</b>	40	40	20
<b>Ukraine</b>	42	29	29
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	55	38	7
<b>Egypt</b>	48	48	4
<b>Jordan</b>	46	37	17
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	65	31	4
<b>Turkey</b>	61	19	20
<b>Kenya</b>	81	14	5
<b>Nigeria</b>	57	32	10
<b>China</b>	59	28	12
<b>Hong Kong</b>	63	28	9
<b>Macau</b>	63	26	11
<b>India</b>	51	24	26
<b>Indonesia</b>	55	17	28
<b>South Korea</b>	58	37	4
<b>Taiwan</b>	78	15	6
<b>Thailand</b>	52	14	33
<b>Average</b>	60	28	12

<sup>76</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

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?

UN Security Council responsibility to authorize use of military force to prevent genocide



	<b>Has this responsibility</b>	<b>Does not have responsibility</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2008</b>	67	30	4
<b>2010</b>	66	28	6

### 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?

	<b>Has this responsibility</b>	<b>Does not have this responsibility</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	48	27	25
<b>United States</b>	74	22	4
<b>Armenia</b>	66	19	16
<b>France</b>	54	39	7
<b>Great Britain</b>	70	22	8
<b>Poland</b>	54	15	31
<b>Russia</b>	48	31	21
<b>Ukraine</b>	40	16	44
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	42	23	35
<b>Egypt</b>	80	20	0
<b>Iran</b>	59	25	16
<b>Israel</b>	64	28	8
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	69	27	4
<b>Turkey</b>	39	20	40
<b>Kenya</b>	89	8	3
<b>Nigeria</b>	78	18	5
<b>China</b>	76	13	11
<b>India</b>	51	25	25
<b>Indonesia</b>	82	5	14
<b>Thailand</b>	44	22	33
<b>Average</b>	61	21	18

### <sup>77</sup> 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?

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Chile</b>	63	14	23
<b>Mexico</b>	68	30	3
<b>United States</b>	67	31	2
<b>France</b>	71	25	4
<b>Germany</b>	78	18	4
<b>Great Britain</b>	81	15	4
<b>Russia</b>	45	40	15
<b>Ukraine</b>	63	25	12
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	83	8	9
<b>Egypt</b>	61	39	0
<b>Iraq</b>	65	23	12

<b>Pakistan</b>	55	38	7
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	57	41	2
<b>Turkey</b>	46	45	9
<b>Kenya</b>	82	17	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	78	22	1
<b>China – Hong Kong*</b>	55	36	9
<b>China – Macau*</b>	63	23	14
<b>India</b>	45	48	7
<b>Indonesia</b>	20	74	6
<b>Taiwan*</b>	61	33	6
<b>Average</b>	63	31	7

\* Not included in Global Average

<sup>78</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think that [Country] would or would not benefit from having international observers monitor elections here?

	<b>Would</b>	<b>Would not</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Chile</b>	59	16	25
<b>Mexico</b>	66	30	4
<b>United States</b>	46	51	3
<b>France</b>	45	50	6
<b>Germany</b>	49	36	14
<b>Great Britain</b>	46	51	3
<b>Russia</b>	43	42	15
<b>Ukraine</b>	63	25	12
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	71	16	14
<b>Egypt</b>	63	37	0
<b>Iraq</b>	67	21	12
<b>Pakistan</b>	49	43	8
<b>Palestinian territories</b>	57	40	3
<b>Turkey</b>	46	45	9
<b>Kenya</b>	85	14	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	74	24	3
<b>China – Hong Kong*</b>	55	36	10
<b>China – Macau*</b>	66	23	11
<b>India</b>	38	51	11
<b>Indonesia</b>	25	62	14
<b>Taiwan*</b>	59	32	10
<b>Average</b>	55	36	9

\*Not included in the Global Average

<sup>79</sup> **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
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
Chile	23	12	54	0	0	9	1	0
India	23	12	24	0	0	40	0	0
Slovenia	10	45	33	0	0	10	2	0
Bulgaria	7	40	40	0	0	12	0	0
Romania	19	26	36	0	0	17	2	0
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
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
Jordan	16	17	54	0	0	12	0	0
Cyprus	24	39	37	0	0	0	0	0
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

<b>Germany</b>	23	26	46	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Average</b>	22	19	48	1	0	7	2	0

<sup>80</sup> 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

	<b>National govts</b>	<b>Regional orgs</b>	<b>UN</b>	<b>National govts, w/ UN coordination</b>	<b>Non profit / NGO</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Italy</b>	32	22	37	0	0	8	1	0
<b>Spain</b>	13	20	54	0	0	14	0	0
<b>United States</b>	34	27	32	0	0	3	3	0
<b>Canada</b>	46	11	33	0	0	9	1	0
<b>Japan</b>	17	15	46	0	15	0	7	0
<b>Mexico</b>	36	14	42	8	0	2	0	0
<b>South Africa</b>	31	15	45	0	0	0	10	0
<b>Australia</b>	38	14	43	0	0	0	5	0
<b>Sweden</b>	33	23	41	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Argentina</b>	22	5	48	0	0	24	2	0
<b>Finland</b>	42	17	37	0	0	3	1	0
<b>South Korea</b>	31	9	60	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Poland</b>	45	15	36	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	32	16	48	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Brazil</b>	30	15	45	0	0	7	3	0
<b>Chile</b>	29	9	51	0	0	10	1	0
<b>India</b>	30	16	12	0	0	43	0	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	20	44	24	0	0	11	1	0
<b>Bulgaria</b>	15	27	44	0	0	14	0	0
<b>Romania</b>	31	19	28	0	0	19	2	0
<b>China</b>	22	6	27	0	0	45	1	0
<b>Taiwan</b>	24	23	50	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Turkey</b>	37	19	35	0	0	9	1	0
<b>Ukraine</b>	29	18	39	0	0	11	3	0
<b>Ghana</b>	18	13	64	0	0	3	2	0
<b>Moldova</b>	39	29	26	0	0	6	0	0
<b>Georgia</b>	67	8	21	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Thailand</b>	45	25	29	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	42	9	40	0	0	7	2	0
<b>Vietnam</b>	22	15	52	0	0	10	1	0
<b>Serbia</b>	36	16	38	0	0	8	2	0
<b>New Zealand</b>	25	0	20	41	0	9	5	0
<b>Egypt</b>	30	23	43	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Morocco</b>	14	17	44	0	0	0	26	0
<b>Iran</b>	22	15	58	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Jordan</b>	15	16	57	0	0	13	0	0
<b>Cyprus</b>	42	20	38	0	0	0	0	0

<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	31	16	48	0	0	5	1	0
<b>Andorra</b>	30	12	55	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	25	36	39	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	15	13	51	0	0	15	3	3
<b>Ethiopia</b>	13	13	61	0	0	7	6	2
<b>Mali</b>	27	13	41	0	0	11	7	2
<b>Rwanda</b>	10	17	72	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Zambia</b>	13	20	62	0	0	3	2	0
<b>Germany</b>	25	25	45	0	0	5	1	0
<b>Average</b>	29	17	43	1	0	8	2	0

<sup>81</sup> **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

	<b>National govts</b>	<b>Regional orgs</b>	<b>UN</b>	<b>National govts, w/ UN coordination</b>	<b>Non profit/ NGO</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Italy</b>	22	12	60	0	0	6	1	0
<b>Spain</b>	15	13	59	0	0	12	0	0
<b>United States</b>	28	16	50	0	0	4	3	0
<b>Canada</b>	22	7	66	0	0	5	0	0
<b>Japan</b>	11	8	72	0	2	0	6	0
<b>Mexico</b>	22	5	65	0	0	6	1	0
<b>South Africa</b>	47	14	32	0	0	0	7	0
<b>Australia</b>	21	9	66	0	0	0	4	0
<b>Sweden</b>	19	8	70	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Argentina</b>	22	5	52	0	0	21	1	0
<b>Finland</b>	29	10	58	0	0	2	1	0
<b>South Korea</b>	47	6	47	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Poland</b>	28	6	64	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	27	9	60	0	0	3	1	0
<b>Brazil</b>	22	5	66	0	0	6	2	0
<b>Chile</b>	40	6	44	0	0	9	1	0
<b>India</b>	44	10	14	0	0	32	0	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	26	30	33	0	0	10	1	0
<b>Bulgaria</b>	22	17	50	0	0	11	0	0
<b>Romania</b>	38	11	34	0	0	14	2	0
<b>China</b>	18	2	36	0	0	44	1	0
<b>Taiwan</b>	25	16	55	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Turkey</b>	46	9	37	0	0	8	1	0
<b>Ukraine</b>	52	8	29	0	0	8	3	0
<b>Ghana</b>	23	9	64	0	0	3	1	0
<b>Moldova</b>	37	19	39	0	0	5	0	0
<b>Georgia</b>	79	2	15	0	0	3	0	0

<b>Thailand</b>	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	14	4	74	0	0	7	1	0
<b>Vietnam</b>	50	7	35	0	0	8	1	0
<b>Serbia</b>	51	9	32	0	0	7	2	0
<b>New Zealand</b>	6	0	33	49	0	8	5	0
<b>Egypt</b>	36	17	44	0	0	3	*	0
<b>Morocco</b>	50	4	29	0	0	0	18	0
<b>Iran</b>	41	12	42	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Jordan</b>	24	19	44	0	0	13	0	0
<b>Cyprus</b>	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	32	12	53	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Andorra</b>	26	8	64	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	47	6	34	0	0	9	2	2
<b>Ethiopia</b>	41	10	40	0	0	5	3	1
<b>Mali</b>	46	5	38	0	0	6	3	1
<b>Rwanda</b>	50	41	8	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Zambia</b>	29	19	47	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Germany</b>	20	20	54	0	0	6	1	0
<b>Average</b>	34	11	45	1	0	7	2	0

<sup>82</sup> 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

	<b>National govts</b>	<b>Regional orgs</b>	<b>UN</b>	<b>National govts, w/ UN coordination</b>	<b>Non profit/ NGO</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Italy</b>	45	29	19	0	0	6	1	0
<b>Spain</b>	28	20	40	0	0	13	0	0
<b>United States</b>	42	33	18	0	0	3	3	0
<b>Canada</b>	52	23	20	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Japan</b>	17	26	31	0	16	0	7	0
<b>Mexico</b>	41	19	32	6	0	1	0	0
<b>South Africa</b>	48	32	15	0	0	0	6	0
<b>Australia</b>	46	29	20	0	0	0	6	0
<b>Sweden</b>	39	34	25	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Argentina</b>	40	11	30	0	0	18	1	0
<b>Finland</b>	40	40	18	0	0	2	1	0
<b>South Korea</b>	54	27	20	0	0	0	*	0
<b>Poland</b>	59	21	18	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	46	19	32	0	0	3	1	0
<b>Brazil</b>	51	25	18	0	0	5	2	0
<b>Chile</b>	51	21	19	0	0	7	1	0
<b>India</b>	37	21	8	0	0	33	0	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	39	36	13	0	0	10	2	0

<b>Bulgaria</b>	48	28	14	0	0	10	0	0
<b>Romania</b>	51	24	8	0	0	15	2	0
<b>China</b>	34	9	16	0	0	40	1	0
<b>Taiwan</b>	66	17	15	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Turkey</b>	33	41	18	0	0	8	1	0
<b>Ukraine</b>	49	30	9	0	0	8	3	0
<b>Ghana</b>	62	28	7	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Moldova</b>	51	37	7	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Georgia</b>	72	15	9	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Thailand</b>	61	33	6	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	79	4	5	0	0	5	2	6
<b>Vietnam</b>	48	20	24	0	0	7	1	0
<b>Serbia</b>	41	34	16	0	0	7	2	0
<b>New Zealand</b>	43	0	8	37	0	7	5	0
<b>Egypt</b>	57	17	24	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Morocco</b>	36	22	22	0	0	0	20	0
<b>Iran</b>	39	35	22	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Jordan</b>	44	19	26	0	0	12	0	0
<b>Cyprus</b>	46	40	15	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	62	19	18	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Andorra</b>	54	22	22	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	45	43	12	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	50	16	19	0	0	10	3	2
<b>Ethiopia</b>	36	18	36	0	0	6	3	1
<b>Mali</b>	49	28	12	0	0	6	4	1
<b>Rwanda</b>	48	43	7	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Zambia</b>	55	26	13	0	0	5	2	0
<b>Germany</b>	36	29	31	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Average</b>	47	25	18	1	0	6	2	0

<sup>83</sup> **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

	<b>National govts</b>	<b>Regional orgs</b>	<b>UN</b>	<b>National govts, w/ UN coordination</b>	<b>Non profit / NGO</b>	<b>DK</b>	<b>No answer</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Italy</b>	27	15	51	0	0	6	2	0
<b>Spain</b>	16	14	56	0	0	13	1	0
<b>United States</b>	42	18	33	0	0	3	3	0
<b>Canada</b>	45	10	40	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Japan</b>	27	11	47	0	9	0	7	0
<b>Mexico</b>	41	9	41	0	0	7	2	0
<b>South Africa</b>	60	16	20	0	0	0	5	0
<b>Australia</b>	30	9	56	0	0	0	5	0

<b>Sweden</b>	17	9	72	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Argentina</b>	39	4	38	0	0	19	1	0
<b>Finland</b>	33	8	56	0	0	2	1	0
<b>South Korea</b>	49	9	41	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Poland</b>	49	7	41	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	26	8	63	0	0	3	1	0
<b>Brazil</b>	44	11	39	0	0	5	2	0
<b>Chile</b>	51	7	32	0	0	9	1	0
<b>India</b>	36	10	13	0	0	41	0	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	39	30	20	0	0	9	1	0
<b>Bulgaria</b>	34	26	30	0	0	10	0	0
<b>Romania</b>	43	10	30	0	0	15	2	0
<b>China</b>	32	4	17	0	0	48	1	0
<b>Taiwan</b>	56	10	31	0	0	3	0	0
<b>Turkey</b>	40	12	39	0	0	8	1	0
<b>Ukraine</b>	57	13	20	0	0	8	3	0
<b>Ghana</b>	67	9	22	0	0	1	1	0
<b>Moldova</b>	55	17	24	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Georgia</b>	79	7	11	0	0	4	0	0
<b>Thailand</b>	50	24	26	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	55	3	34	0	0	6	2	1
<b>Vietnam</b>	59	5	27	0	0	7	1	0
<b>Serbia</b>	50	8	34	0	0	6	2	0
<b>New Zealand</b>	25	0	19	43	0	8	5	0
<b>Egypt</b>	45	15	37	0	0	2	*	0
<b>Morocco</b>	34	6	42	0	0	0	18	0
<b>Iran</b>	16	5	75	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Jordan</b>	21	16	50	0	0	13	0	0
<b>Cyprus</b>	29	36	35	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	45	11	41	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Andorra</b>	28	8	61	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	38	29	34	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	32	6	45	0	0	12	3	3
<b>Ethiopia</b>	20	12	54	0	0	7	6	2
<b>Mali</b>	35	7	44	0	0	7	5	2
<b>Rwanda</b>	29	37	32	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Zambia</b>	54	13	26	0	0	3	3	0
<b>Germany</b>	20	19	55	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Average</b>	40	12	38	1	0	7	2	0

<sup>84</sup> 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

<sup>85</sup> **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

<sup>86</sup> **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

<sup>87</sup> **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

<sup>88</sup> **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
<b>Italy</b>	20	40	29	8	2	1
<b>Spain</b>	20	48	14	4	13	1
<b>United States</b>	20	45	24	5	2	4
<b>Canada</b>	29	55	12	2	2	1
<b>Japan</b>	11	61	4	1	22	-
<b>Mexico</b>	35	55	7	2	1	0
<b>South Africa</b>	42	41	10	3	4	-
<b>Australia</b>	21	56	18	1	-	3

---

<b>Sweden</b>	18	65	15	1	2	-
<b>Argentina</b>	15	48	24	5	7	1
<b>Finland</b>	18	45	28	7	2	0
<b>South Korea</b>	14	66	16	3	-	-
<b>Poland</b>	21	48	20	4	7	0
<b>Switzerland</b>	32	46	18	5	0	-
<b>Brazil</b>	27	51	19	2	1	0
<b>Chile</b>	26	41	19	9	5	0
<b>India</b>	27	31	13	3	25	0
<b>Slovenia</b>	17	52	17	7	6	1
<b>Bulgaria</b>	17	25	30	20	8	-
<b>Romania</b>	15	33	26	14	11	2
<b>China</b>	10	51	10	1	27	1
<b>Turkey</b>	37	43	11	3	5	1
<b>Ukraine</b>	25	29	23	13	8	2
<b>Ghana</b>	45	39	12	1	1	1
<b>Moldova</b>	26	36	28	6	3	0
<b>Georgia</b>	22	22	32	16	9	1
<b>Thailand</b>	33	63	4	0	-	0
<b>Indonesia</b>	29	58	7	1	3	1
<b>Vietnam</b>	31	52	6	-	8	3
<b>Colombia</b>	40	54	3	1	2	-
<b>Serbia</b>	30	44	17	4	3	2
<b>Egypt</b>	28	28	24	19	1	0
<b>Morocco</b>	14	26	26	20	-	14
<b>Iran</b>	30	51	16	2	0	0
<b>Jordan</b>	34	33	14	13	6	-
<b>Cyprus</b>	28	45	23	3	-	1
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	25	47	24	3	1	1
<b>Andorra</b>	25	62	11	2	0	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	41	49	9	1	-	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	42	37	10	3	6	2
<b>Ethiopia</b>	41	49	7	1	2	1
<b>Mali</b>	59	32	4	1	2	2
<b>Rwanda</b>	43	55	1	1	1	0
<b>Zambia</b>	32	37	21	5	4	1
<b>Germany</b>	16	32	28	15	7	1
<b>Average</b>	27	45	16	5	6	1

<sup>89</sup> 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

<sup>90</sup> 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

<b>Kenya</b>	71	28	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	73	26	1
<b>China</b>	63	30	7
<b>China – Hong Kong</b>	72	18	10
<b>China - Macao</b>	60	29	11
<b>India</b>	59	34	7
<b>Indonesia</b>	52	40	8
<b>South Korea</b>	28	71	1
<b>Taiwan</b>	42	49	9
<b>Average</b>	55	39	7

<sup>91</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2011**

Some people say that the United States and the European Union have enough common values to be able to cooperate on international problems. Others say that the US and the EU have such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible. Which view is closer to your own?

	<b>Enough common values to cooperate on international problems</b>	<b>Such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	68	26	5
<b>United States</b>	71	23	6
<b>Turkey</b>	37	40	23
<b>Bulgaria</b>	70	18	12
<b>France</b>	68	31	2
<b>Germany</b>	66	31	3
<b>Italy</b>	74	22	4
<b>Netherlands</b>	72	23	5
<b>Poland</b>	63	23	15
<b>Portugal</b>	73	23	3
<b>Romania</b>	69	17	14
<b>Slovakia</b>	59	26	15
<b>Spain</b>	72	25	3
<b>Sweden</b>	68	27	5
<b>United Kingdom</b>	64	30	6

**German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2010**

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?

	<b>Enough common values to cooperate on international problems</b>	<b>Such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	67	25	8
<b>United States</b>	77	23	0
<b>France</b>	67	31	2
<b>Germany</b>	74	24	2

<b>United Kingdom</b>	64	34	3
<b>Italy</b>	78	19	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	76	21	2
<b>Poland</b>	65	24	11
<b>Portugal</b>	77	22	1
<b>Spain</b>	76	22	2
<b>Slovakia</b>	66	23	11
<b>Turkey</b>	39	31	30
<b>Bulgaria</b>	71	11	18
<b>Romania</b>	71	14	14

### 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?

	<b>Enough common values to cooperate on international problems</b>	<b>Such different values that cooperating on international problems is impossible</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	55	35	10
<b>United States</b>	67	23	10
<b>France</b>	60	38	2
<b>Germany</b>	54	43	3
<b>United Kingdom</b>	52	41	7
<b>Italy</b>	63	35	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	59	37	4
<b>Poland</b>	56	28	16
<b>Portugal</b>	57	36	8
<b>Spain</b>	59	36	4
<b>Slovakia</b>	59	25	16
<b>Turkey</b>	27	33	39
<b>Bulgaria</b>	57	24	19
<b>Romania</b>	72	12	15

### <sup>92</sup> 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

	<b>Agree strongly</b>	<b>Agree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree somewhat</b>	<b>Disagree strongly</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
<b>European Average</b>	42	38	8	7	4	80	15
<b>United States</b>	61	28	5	5	2	89	9
<b>France</b>	52	38	5	4	1	90	9
<b>Germany</b>	48	37	8	6	1	86	14
<b>United Kingdom</b>	50	35	8	4	3	85	12
<b>Italy</b>	35	46	12	7	1	81	19
<b>Netherlands</b>	60	31	4	4	1	91	8

<b>Poland</b>	40	45	7	3	6	85	9
<b>Portugal</b>	45	31	9	9	7	76	17
<b>Spain</b>	41	47	7	4	2	88	11
<b>Slovakia</b>	32	39	12	5	12	71	17
<b>Turkey</b>	21	26	12	23	18	47	35
<b>Bulgaria</b>	35	43	7	4	10	78	11
<b>Romania</b>	37	39	7	5	12	76	12

<sup>93</sup> **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

<sup>94</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2011**

Do you think that the partnership in security and diplomatic affairs between the United States and the European Union should become closer, should remain about the same, or should the [European Union/United States] take a more independent approach from the [United States/European Union]?

	<b>Become closer</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>Take a more independent approach</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	39	21	38	3
<b>United States</b>	33	31	33	3
<b>Turkey</b>	12	33	34	22
<b>Bulgaria</b>	32	31	33	4
<b>France</b>	42	14	44	1
<b>Germany</b>	33	25	41	1
<b>Italy</b>	50	10	36	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	30	25	44	1
<b>Poland</b>	40	26	27	8
<b>Portugal</b>	29	25	44	2
<b>Romania</b>	50	31	15	4
<b>Slovakia</b>	28	34	32	6
<b>Spain</b>	47	8	43	2
<b>Sweden</b>	25	35	36	4
<b>United Kingdom</b>	26	29	39	4

**German Marshall Fund June 2010**

Do you think that the partnership in security and diplomatic affairs between the United States and the European Union should become closer, should remain about the same, or should the (European Union/United States) take a more independent approach from the (United States/European Union)?

	<b>Become closer</b>	<b>Remain about the same</b>	<b>Take a more independent approach</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>United States</b>	45	25	30	1
<b>France</b>	42	11	45	2

---

<b>Germany</b>	35	26	39	1
<b>United Kingdom</b>	30	23	45	2
<b>Italy</b>	53	8	38	1
<b>Netherlands</b>	32	20	47	2
<b>Poland</b>	45	20	30	5
<b>Portugal</b>	33	22	45	1
<b>Spain</b>	52	9	38	2
<b>Slovakia</b>	31	32	33	4
<b>Turkey</b>	10	30	30	31
<b>Bulgaria</b>	38	25	30	7
<b>Romania</b>	56	23	17	5
<b>European Average</b>	38	19	37	6

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.