

COUNCIL *on*  
FOREIGN  
RELATIONS

# Public Opinion on Global Issues

Chapter 4a: World Opinion on Transnational Threats: Terrorism

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

November 2009

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

### *Concern about Terrorism*

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

Asked how big a problem terrorism is in their country (Pew 2007), in sixteen out of forty-seven nations a majority or plurality said it was a very big problem; in fifteen nations a majority or plurality said it was at least a moderately big problem; and in thirteen nations a majority or plurality said it was a small problem or not a problem at all. An average of 41 percent of respondents across all countries polled said that terrorism is a very big problem in their country, while 23 percent said it was a moderately big problem, 19 percent said it is a small problem, and 14 percent said it is not a problem at all.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

### *Attitudes Toward al-Qaeda and Osama bin Laden*

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

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

While negative views of al-Qaeda are most common in nearly all of the countries surveyed, this is not the case in Egypt and Pakistan—both pivotal nations in the conflict with al-Qaeda. In both of these countries, far more people have

either mixed or positive feelings toward al-Qaeda (Egypt 20 percent positive, 40 percent mixed; Pakistan 19 percent positive, 22 percent mixed) than have negative feelings (Egypt 35 percent, Pakistan 19 percent).

In addition, there are several other countries where negative views are less than a majority position: China (48 percent), India (44 percent), Indonesia (35 percent), Nigeria (42 percent), and the Philippines (42 percent).<sup>2</sup>

### **Osama bin Laden**

Asked how much confidence they have in Osama bin Laden to “to do the right thing regarding world affairs” (Pew 2008), in not a single country out of twenty-three polled did a majority say that they had some confidence or a lot of confidence, while in twenty-one countries a majority said they had no confidence or not too much confidence. An average of 77 percent of respondents across all twenty-three countries polled said they had not too much confidence or no confidence at all, and only 10 percent said they had a lot of confidence or some confidence. Large majorities said they have no confidence at all in bin Laden in France (95 percent), Germany (90 percent), and Australia (89 percent).

When Pew polled nine nations and territories with large Muslim populations in a more recent poll (2009), it found that a majority in seven and a plurality in one said that they did not have confidence in bin Laden. However a slight majority of the Palestinians (51 percent) said that they did have confidence in the al-Qaeda leader, as did significant numbers in Nigeria (32 percent), Jordan (28 percent), and Egypt (23 percent).<sup>3</sup>

These findings are consistent with a 2008 WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) poll, which asked respondents whether they had positive, negative or mixed feelings about bin Laden. A majority of Palestinian respondents (56 percent) expressed positive feelings toward Osama bin Laden, as did a significant number of Egyptians (44 percent), Jordanians (27 percent), and Pakistanis (25 percent). Of the populations polled, only in Turkey and Azerbaijan did large majorities express negative feelings toward bin Laden.<sup>4</sup>

### ***Support for Multilateral Action against Terrorism***

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

Respondents in sixteen countries around the world were asked whether “the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force ... to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups” (WPO 2006-2008). A majority in all countries polled said the UN Security Council should have this right; Nigeria (87 percent), Israel (85 percent), and France (84 percent) had the largest majorities. Respondents in South Korea (61 percent), the Palestinian Territories (61 percent), and India (60 percent) were the least supportive of the right to intervene, though majorities still supported it. Across the sixteen countries polled, 73 percent said the UN Security Council should have the right to intervene and just 19 percent said it should not have the right to intervene.<sup>5</sup>

### ***Regional Cooperation on Terrorism***

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

A poll of seven European countries, Canada, and the United States (GlobeScan 2008) found poor ratings of transatlantic cooperation on fighting global terrorism. On average, just 35 percent gave positive ratings, while 43 percent give negative ratings. The most negative attitudes were in Turkey and Spain, which had majorities giving a negative assessment. The French were divided.<sup>6</sup>

When Eurobarometer asked respondents in twenty-five countries in March 2006 whether “more decision-making should take place at a European level or whether less decision-making should take place at a European level” in the fight against terrorism, 80 percent of those polled favored more European decision-making, with Luxembourg (92 percent) as the highest result and the United Kingdom (63 percent) as the lowest result. Only 12 percent believed that there should be less European level decision-making on this issue.<sup>7</sup>

A 2008 Eurobarometer poll of the twenty-seven EU member states also found that all countries polled believed that decisions related to fighting terrorism should be made jointly within the European Union rather than by national governments. In the European average, 79 percent favored the European Union making decisions and 18 percent favored national governments.<sup>8</sup>

### *Assessments of U.S. Efforts against Terrorism*

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

In no country out of twenty-three polled did a majority believe that either the United States or al-Qaeda is winning in their conflict (BBC/GlobeScan/PIPA 2008). The most significant numbers that believe al-Qaeda is winning were found in Pakistan (21 percent), Nigeria (17 percent), and the United Arab Emirates (16 percent). The greatest numbers saying that the United States is winning were found in Kenya (45 percent), Philippines (39 percent), and Egypt (39 percent). On average, 47 percent of respondents around the world believed that neither side is winning; 22 percent that the United States is winning; and 10 percent that al-Qaeda is winning. The countries with the largest numbers thinking neither side is winning are in the United Kingdom (75 percent), France (73 percent), and Mexico (73 percent).<sup>9</sup>

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

On average, 30 percent said the war on terror had made al-Qaeda stronger, 22 percent believed it had weakened al-Qaeda, while 29 percent believed it had had no effect.<sup>10</sup>

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

average, 60 percent believed it had increased the threat of terrorist attacks, 15 percent said it had had no effect, and 12 percent believed it had decreased this threat.<sup>11</sup>

### *Principles for Treatment of Terrorism Suspects*

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

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

Five publics favored an exception for using torture in the case of terrorists: India (59 percent), Kenya (58 percent), Nigeria (54 percent), Turkey (51 percent), and Thailand (44 percent). South Koreans were divided.<sup>12</sup>

A poll conducted in five countries from around the world (WPO 2006) also found that only small minorities were persuaded that the challenge of terrorism made treaties prohibiting the secret holding of detainees too restrictive. Respondents were told that their government had signed “treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and require that the International Committee of the Red Cross have access to them.” They were then presented the argument that such treaties are “too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism” as well as the counter-argument that “such treaties are “important for making sure governments treat people humanely.” Majorities in the United States (73 percent), Britain (64 percent), Germany (72 percent), and Poland (60 percent), and also a plurality in India (42 percent) rejected the view that such treaties were too restrictive in favor of abiding by the treaties. Across the five countries, an average of 62 percent believed the treaties are important for making sure governments treat people humanely while 25 percent believed them too restrictive.<sup>13</sup>

### *U.S. Treatment of Terrorism Suspects*

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

In 2006, publics in five countries were asked whether then-current U.S. policies for detaining suspects at Guantanamo Bay were legal or illegal (WPO 2006). Majorities or pluralities in Germany (85 percent), Great Britain (65 percent),

Poland (50 percent), and India (34 percent) believed U.S. detention policies in place at Guantanamo were illegal. Only in the United States did a slight majority (52 percent) think they were legal. Less than one-third of respondents in India (28 percent), Great Britain (22 percent), Poland (18 percent), and Germany (8 percent) believed the detainment policies to be legal. On average, 54 percent said the policies were not legal and 26 percent said they were legal.<sup>14</sup>

In the same 2006 poll, respondents were asked whether they believed that the U.S. government was “making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture” or whether it was “allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists.” Majorities in Germany (76 percent) and Great Britain (62 percent) said they believed the U.S. government was allowing torture, along with 49 percent in Poland and 33 percent in India. About a quarter of respondents from Great Britain (27 percent), Poland (24 percent), and India (23 percent), and just 14 percent in Germany believed efforts were being made to prevent torture. The U.S. public was divided on whether the government was making efforts to prevent torture by interrogators (45 percent) or allowing it (47 percent). Across the five countries, an average of 53 percent said they believed the U.S. government was allowing torture, while 27 percent said it was trying to prevent such torture.<sup>15</sup>

There was also little support for cooperating with extraordinary renditions by the United States. Respondents in four countries were asked whether the United States should be allowed to use their nation’s airspace to transport a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture. Majorities in Great Britain (66 percent) and Germany (55 percent) said their country should not grant the United States such permission, as did a plurality in Poland (48 percent) and India (42 percent).<sup>16</sup> The Polish (36 percent) and Germans (35 percent) had the largest minorities in support of granting such permission, while India (28 percent) and Great Britain (26 percent) had smaller minorities supporting such permission. On average, 53 percent of all respondents said their countries should refuse permission, while 31 percent were in favor of granting permission.

#### *Absence of Consensus over Who Was Behind 9/11 Attacks*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout the world, large numbers said they did not know or declined to answer. These were majorities in China (56 percent), Thailand (56 percent), and Indonesia (57 percent).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pew Global Attitudes Project, Spring 2007

Now I'm going to read you a list of things that may be problems in our country. As I read each one, please tell me if you think it is a very big problem, a moderately big problem, a small problem, or not a problem at all:

## Terrorism

	Very big problem	Moderately big problem	Small problem	Not a problem at all	DK/Refused
United States	44	38	15	3	1
Canada	24	32	31	12	2
Argentina	42	24	15	14	6
Bolivia	42	29	16	10	2
Brazil	44	28	15	12	1
Chile	46	19	17	16	2
Mexico	50	26	15	7	2
Peru	70	21	7	1	1
Venezuela	41	34	16	8	0
United Kingdom	30	41	23	4	2
France	54	29	15	1	0
Germany	31	43	18	7	1
Italy	73	20	6	1	0
Spain	66	26	5	1	1
Sweden	3	10	48	34	4
Bulgaria	24	18	31	21	7
Czech Republic	16	26	40	16	2
Poland	35	30	22	10	3
Russia	48	36	13	2	1
Slovakia	17	17	42	23	2
Ukraine	23	22	26	26	3
Turkey	72	17	6	2	3
Egypt	53	30	13	3	1
Jordan	42	23	17	18	0
Kuwait	37	12	14	32	5
Lebanon	76	17	5	1	0
Morocco	81	10	2	1	5
Palestinian Territories	51	20	8	15	6
Israel	70	21	7	2	1
Pakistan	76	18	3	1	2
Bangladesh	77	16	5	1	2
Indonesia	48	37	13	1	1
Malaysia	10	18	32	32	8
China	11	26	36	19	8
India	72	22	5	1	1
Japan	59	29	9	2	1
South Korea	12	34	36	13	5
Ethiopia	23	23	33	19	1



<b>Ghana</b>	20	21	31	26	3
<b>Ivory Coast</b>	57	19	14	10	0
<b>Kenya</b>	24	26	33	15	2
<b>Mali</b>	15	11	20	51	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	40	18	22	20	1
<b>Senegal</b>	22	12	14	49	2
<b>South Africa</b>	20	21	26	27	6
<b>Tanzania</b>	19	11	18	44	8
<b>Uganda</b>	34	15	19	21	12
<b>Average</b>	41	23	19	14	3

### <sup>2</sup> BBC September 2008

Overall, would you say your feelings about al-Qaeda are positive, negative, or mixed?

	Positive	Mixed	Negative	Never heard of al-Qaeda/ DK/NS
<b>United States</b>	2	9	84	5
<b>Canada</b>	1	19	71	9
<b>Panama</b>	7	16	57	20
<b>Costa Rica</b>	6	13	68	13
<b>Mexico</b>	4	26	61	9
<b>United Kingdom</b>	4	22	67	7
<b>Russia</b>	2	10	60	28
<b>Germany</b>	1	9	86	4
<b>France</b>	1	10	85	4
<b>Italy</b>	1	8	87	4
<b>Egypt</b>	20	40	35	5
<b>Lebanon</b>	7	14	72	7
<b>Turkey</b>	2	8	82	8
<b>Nigeria</b>	25	12	42	21
<b>Kenya</b>	14	15	67	4
<b>Pakistan</b>	19	22	19	40
<b>Indonesia</b>	16	23	35	26
<b>Philippines</b>	15	33	42	10
<b>India</b>	11	13	44	32
<b>China</b>	5	26	48	21
<b>Australia</b>	2	16	76	6

### <sup>3</sup> Pew Global Attitudes Project, Spring 2008

For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs- a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all.

Osama bin Laden

	<b>A lot of confidence</b>	<b>Some confidence</b>	<b>Not too much confidence</b>	<b>No confidence at all</b>	<b>DK/ Refused</b>
Great Britain	0	1	5	86	7
France	0	1	4	95	0
Germany	2	2	4	90	2
Spain	0	1	6	91	3
Poland	0	3	9	83	4
Russia	7	7	16	52	18
Turkey	1	2	3	77	18
Egypt	2	16	31	38	13
Jordan	3	16	33	41	8
Lebanon	0	1	11	87	1
Australia	1	2	4	89	4
China	2	11	22	31	34
India	2	6	4	72	16
Indonesia	4	32	23	17	24
Japan	0	3	13	76	8
Pakistan	15	19	9	19	38
South Korea	1	4	21	65	10
Argentina	1	3	6	74	15
Brazil	0	2	4	88	5
Mexico	0	2	8	72	18
Nigeria	21	12	13	40	14
South Africa	4	7	8	56	25
Tanzania	4	7	7	73	8
Average	3	7	11	66	13

**Pew Global Attitudes Project 2009**

For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs:

Osama bin Laden

	<b>A lot of confidence</b>	<b>Some confidence</b>	<b>Not too much confidence</b>	<b>No confidence at all</b>	<b>DK/R</b>
Turkey	1	2	9	68	22
Egypt	4	19	31	37	9
Jordan	8	20	32	29	12
Lebanon	1	1	9	89	1
Palestinian Territories	17	34	18	29	2
Israel	1	2	23	72	2
Indonesia	3	21	32	21	23
Pakistan	4	14	13	34	35
Nigeria	17	15	16	44	8
Average	6	14	20	47	13

**<sup>4</sup> WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

Overall, would you say your feelings toward Osama bin Laden are very positive, somewhat positive, mixed, somewhat negative, or very negative?

	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Mixed	Somewhat negative	Very negative	DK/NS
<b>Egypt</b>	20	24	25	7	10	14
<b>Indonesia</b>	5	9	21	16	10	39
<b>Pakistan</b>	10	15	26	9	6	34
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	1	3	6	49	33	8
<b>Jordan</b>	13	14	27	7	13	26
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	24	32	22	10	10	2
<b>Turkey</b>	4	5	9	13	55	14

**<sup>5</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**

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
<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>6</sup> GlobeScan, January 2008**

How effectively do you think Europe and North America are working together in the following area?

Fighting global terrorism

	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Refused	DK/NA
United Kingdom	39	15	43	3	-
United States	38	19	42	2	-
Canada	36	16	44	-	4
France	45	18	25	-	12
Germany	26	24	44	5	1
Spain	28	17	52	3	-
Ireland	40	17	41	1	1
Turkey	18	12	58	-	12
Poland	41	17	37	-	5
Average	35	17	43	2	4

### <sup>7</sup> Eurobarometer March 2006

For each of the following areas, please tell me if you believe that more decision-making should take place at a European level or on the contrary that less decision-making should take place at a European level.

The fight against terrorism

	More decision making at a European level	Less decision making at a European level	No change is needed (vol.)	DK/NR
European Average	80	12	4	4
Belgium	88	7	4	1
Czech Republic	91	6	1	1
Denmark	89	7	2	2
Germany	85	9	5	1
Estonia	81	11	1	7
Greece	74	19	7	0
Spain	71	11	7	11
France	88	7	1	3
Ireland	74	12	6	8
Italy	76	14	6	4
Cyprus	89	8	1	2
Latvia	81	9	3	7
Lithuania	71	17	2	10
Luxemburg	92	3	3	2
Hungary	79	7	8	6
Malta	86	7	3	4
Netherlands	90	3	5	1
Austria	73	20	4	3
Poland	91	6	0	3
Portugal	79	10	3	8
Slovenia	81	11	4	4
Slovakia	84	9	4	3
Finland	85	11	3	1
Sweden	90	7	1	2

---

<b>United Kingdom</b>	63	26	6	6
-----------------------	----	----	---	---

<sup>8</sup> Eurobarometer November 2008

For each of the following areas, do you think that decisions should be made by the (national) government, or made jointly within the European Union?

**Fighting terrorism**

	<b>(National) Government</b>	<b>Jointly within the European Union</b>	<b>DK</b>
<b>Belgium</b>	18	79	3
<b>Bulgaria</b>	9	84	7
<b>Czech Republic</b>	11	88	1
<b>Denmark</b>	9	90	1
<b>Germany</b>	12	87	1
<b>Estonia</b>	9	88	3
<b>Greece</b>	23	77	0
<b>Spain</b>	33	63	4
<b>France</b>	15	82	3
<b>Ireland</b>	22	72	6
<b>Italy</b>	23	70	7
<b>Cyprus</b>	18	79	3
<b>Latvia</b>	8	89	3
<b>Lithuania</b>	11	85	4
<b>Luxemburg</b>	9	89	2
<b>Hungary</b>	9	90	1
<b>Malta</b>	12	85	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	8	91	1
<b>Austria</b>	22	76	2
<b>Poland</b>	11	85	4
<b>Portugal</b>	17	77	6
<b>Romania</b>	14	80	6
<b>Slovenia</b>	16	82	2
<b>Slovak Republic</b>	7	92	1
<b>Finland</b>	13	86	1
<b>Sweden</b>	8	90	2
<b>United Kingdom</b>	29	67	4
<b>European Average</b>	18	79	3

<sup>9</sup> BBC, September 2008

In the conflict between al-Qaeda and the United States do you think al-Qaeda is winning, the United States is winning, or neither side is winning?

	Al Qaeda is winning	Neither side is winning	United States is winning	Never heard of al Qaeda/ DK/ NA/ Other
United States	8	56	31	7
Canada	7	70	13	10
Brazil	12	52	10	26
Costa Rica	12	56	18	14
Panama	11	47	16	26
Mexico	8	73	9	10
Italy	11	71	10	8
France	9	73	7	11
Russia	8	33	12	47
Germany	6	38	35	21
United Kingdom	5	75	11	9
United Arab Emirates	16	29	16	39
Lebanon	12	44	26	18
Turkey	11	29	38	22
Egypt	10	40	39	11
Nigeria	17	25	34	24
Kenya	12	33	45	21
Pakistan	21	24	11	44
Indonesia	14	36	18	32
India	10	21	21	48
Australia	8	70	14	8
China	5	45	22	28
Philippines	2	39	39	20
Average	10	47	22	22

<sup>10</sup> BBC, September 2008

Do you think what U.S. leaders refer to as the “war on terror” has made al-Qaeda stronger, weaker, or has had no effect either way?

	Made al-Qaeda stronger	Had no effect	Made al-Qaeda weaker	Never heard of al-Qaeda/ DK/ NA
United States	33	26	34	7
Canada	32	38	15	15
Brazil	34	28	9	29
Costa Rica	27	36	22	15
Panama	28	26	21	25
Mexico	48	33	8	11
Italy	43	36	13	8
France	48	33	7	12
Russia	12	31	16	41
Germany	31	24	34	11
United Kingdom	40	36	13	11
United Arab Emirates	27	23	17	33
Lebanon	39	32	18	11
Turkey	31	18	32	19
Egypt	21	31	44	4
Nigeria	22	18	37	23
Kenya	16	15	58	11
Pakistan	24	30	13	33
Indonesia	24	33	12	31
India	16	19	27	38
Australia	41	31	17	11
China	23	29	25	23
Philippines	19	40	21	20
Average	30	29	22	19

<sup>11</sup> BBC, January 2006

Do you think that the war in Iraq has increased, decreased, or had no effect on the likelihood of terrorist attacks around the world?

	Increased	Decreased	Has had no effect	Other/DK/NA (vol)
Afghanistan	39	29	20	12
Argentina	76	3	11	11
Australia	73	4	19	3
Brazil	56	15	27	3
Canada	69	5	22	5
Chile	47	16	23	14
China	85	5	6	5
Congo	44	16	21	20

Egypt	83	1	6	10
Finland	82	4	11	3
France	67	3	27	4
Germany	80	4	14	2
Ghana	42	30	5	23
Great Britain	77	3	17	3
India	44	18	19	20
Indonesia	72	7	10	11
Iran	77	12	8	3
Iraq	75	12	11	2
Italy	81	1	15	3
Kenya	41	34	10	15
Mexico	10	12	59	19
Nigeria	29	49	6	16
Philippines	61	13	8	18
Poland	76	6	12	5
Russia	58	5	26	12
Saudi Arabia	49	2	9	40
Senegal	61	17	11	11
South Africa	42	18	10	30
South Korea	84	4	12	0
Spain	79	4	12	5
Sri Lanka	31	6	10	53
Tanzania	49	37	7	7
Turkey	64	6	14	17
United States	55	21	21	3
Zimbabwe	44	16	8	32
Average	60	12	15	13

<sup>12</sup> WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2008

Most countries have agreed to rules that prohibit torturing prisoners. Which position is closer to yours?

	<b>Terrorists pose such an extreme threat that governments should now be allowed to use some degree of torture if it may gain information that saves innocent lives</b>	<b>Clear rules against torture should be maintained because any use of torture is immoral and will weaken international human rights standards against torture</b>	<b>DK / NS</b>
Argentina	18	76	6
Mexico	24	73	3
United States	44	53	3
France	16	82	2
Great Britain	16	82	3
Poland	27	62	11
Russia	36	49	15
Spain	11	82	7
Ukraine	26	59	15
Azerbaijan	33	54	12
Egypt	46	54	0
Iran	35	43	22



<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	28	66	6
<b>Turkey</b>	51	36	13
<b>Kenya</b>	58	41	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	54	41	5
<b>China</b>	28	66	6
<b>Hong Kong</b>	22	67	12
<b>India</b>	59	28	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	34	61	5
<b>South Korea</b>	51	48	1
<b>Thailand</b>	44	36	19
<b>Average</b>	35	57	8

[Asked only to those who answered “Terrorists pose such an extreme threat...”]

What about cases that have nothing to do with terrorism? Do you think that there should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases or that in general governments should be allowed to use torture to try to get information?

	<b>Clear rules should be maintained</b>	<b>Should be rules prohibiting torture in all other cases - Depends - DK</b>	<b>Governments should be allowed to use torture</b>	<b>DK/NS on 1<sup>st</sup> question</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	76	13	5	6
<b>Mexico</b>	73	17	7	3
<b>United States</b>	53	31	13	3
<b>France</b>	82	12	4	2
<b>Great Britain</b>	82	11	4	3
<b>Poland</b>	62	20	7	11
<b>Russia</b>	49	29	7	15
<b>Spain</b>	82	6	6	7
<b>Ukraine</b>	59	18	8	15
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	54	26	8	12
<b>Egypt</b>	54	40	6	0
<b>Iran</b>	43	28	8	22
<b>Palest Territories</b>	66	23	5	6
<b>Turkey</b>	36	34	18	13
<b>Kenya</b>	41	44	14	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	41	39	15	5
<b>China</b>	66	10	18	6
<b>Hong Kong</b>	67	9	13	12
<b>India</b>	28	47	12	13
<b>Indonesia</b>	61	29	6	5
<b>South Korea</b>	48	38	13	1
<b>Thailand</b>	36	34	10	19
<b>Average</b>	57	26	9	8

<sup>13</sup> WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006

As you may know, [country] has signed treaties that prohibit governments from holding people in secret and that require that the International Committee of the Red Cross to have access to them. Do you think that these treaties are:

	<b>Important for making sure governments treat people humanely (percent)</b>	<b>Too restrictive because our government needs to have all options available when dealing with threats like terrorism (percent)</b>	<b>DK / NS (percent)</b>
<b>United States</b>	73	23	4
<b>Great Britain</b>	64	32	4
<b>Germany</b>	72	22	6
<b>Poland</b>	60	24	16
<b>India</b>	42	26	32
<b>Average</b>	62	25	12

<sup>14</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006**

Is it your impression that current U.S. policies for detaining people it has captured and is holding in Guantanamo Bay are or are not legal, according to international treaties on the treatment of detainees?

	<b>Are legal (percent)</b>	<b>Are not legal (percent)</b>	<b>DK / NS (percent)</b>
<b>United States</b>	52	38	9
<b>Great Britain</b>	22	65	14
<b>Germany</b>	8	85	7
<b>Poland</b>	18	50	32
<b>India</b>	28	34	38
<b>Average</b>	26	54	20

<sup>15</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006**

Is it your impression that the U.S. government is:

	<b>Currently allowing interrogators to use torture to get information from suspected terrorists (percent)</b>	<b>Making every effort to make sure that interrogators never use torture (percent)</b>	<b>DK / NS (percent)</b>
<b>United States</b>	47	45	8
<b>Great Britain</b>	62	27	12
<b>Germany</b>	76	14	10
<b>Poland</b>	49	24	27
<b>India</b>	33	23	44
<b>Average</b>	53	27	20

<sup>16</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org, July 2006**

If the United States requests permission to fly through [country's] airspace when it is transporting a terrorism suspect to a country that has a reputation for using torture, do you think [country] should allow the United States to do this or do you think that it should refuse permission?

	Should allow U.S. to fly through airspace (percent)	Should refuse permission (percent)	DK / NS (percent)
Great Britain	26	66	7
Germany	35	55	10
Poland	36	48	16
India	28	42	30
Average	31	53	16

<sup>17</sup> WorldPublicOpinion.org, 2008

As you know, on September 11, 2001 the United States was attacked. Who do you think was behind the 9/11 attacks? [OPEN ENDED RESPONSES]

	Al-Qaeda/Bin Laden/Islamic extremists	The U.S. government	Israel	Other Arabs/Saudis/ Egyptians	Other	DK/NS
Mexico	33	30	1	5	13	19
France	63	8	0	3	4	23
Germany	64	23	1	0	2	9
Great Britain	57	5	1	2	10	26
Italy	56	15	1	3	4	21
Russia	57	15	2	4	2	19
Ukraine	42	15	1	3	2	39
Azerbaijan	69	5	6	6	1	13
Egypt	16	12	43	2	9	18
Jordan	11	17	31	2	2	36
Palestinian Territories	42	27	19	7	2	3
Turkey	39	36	3	1	0	21
Kenya	77	4	3	3	0	12
Nigeria	71	7	2	4	2	14
China	32	9	0	1	2	56
Hong Kong	54	7	0	2	2	35
Macau	51	7	0	1	2	40
India	62	6	7	6	6	12
Indonesia	23	14	5	1	0	57
South Korea	51	17	1	5	4	22
Taiwan	53	4	0	5	5	34
Thailand	35	5	2	3	0	56
Average	47	14	7	3	3	25

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).