

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

November 2009

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).¹

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).²

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.”³

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.⁴

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.⁵

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

International Treaties

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

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

One such treaty is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In 2006, CCGA asked people in the United States whether they favor their country participating in “the treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide.” A large majority (86 percent) favored the idea. People in South Korea, China, and India were also asked this question and majorities in each case concurred, with Americans at the upper end of the spectrum in terms of their level of approval.⁶ When CCGA again asked this question in 2008, 88 percent of Americans favored U.S. participation.⁷

CCGA also asked if respondents believed their country should participate in an agreement under the Biological Weapons Treaty that would allow for international inspections. Eighty-nine percent of U.S. respondents said that the United States should. Again, the United States had the highest public support of participation in the treaty compared to the other countries asked.⁸

The same poll surveyed people in the United States on their feelings regarding participating in the international agreement on the International Criminal Court. Seventy-one percent of Americans said their country should take part.⁹ In 2008, CCGA again asked this question and found 68 percent in favor.¹⁰

Large majorities of Americans believe the United States should take part in a new international treaty to combat climate change. CCGA found that 76 percent of U.S. respondents favor U.S. participation in “a new international treaty to address climate change by reducing greenhouse-gas emissions” (CCGA 2008).¹¹ In 2006, seven in ten Americans indicated that they believed their country should participate in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming.¹²

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.¹³

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).¹⁴

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).¹⁵

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.¹⁶

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.¹⁷

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.”¹⁸

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.¹⁹

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.²⁰

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.²¹

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.²²

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.”²³

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.²⁴

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.²⁵

International Criminal Court

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

CCGA has regularly asked Americans whether the United States should “participate in the International Criminal Court (ICC) that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won’t

try them.” In 2008, 68 percent favored doing so. CCGA has asked this question regularly since 2002 and found support ranging from 68 to 77 percent.²⁶

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.²⁷

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).²⁸

Large majorities of Americans reject a hegemonic role for the United States. In 2006, CCGA and WPO presented three options for the U.S. role in the international system. The least popular choice argued, “As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.” Just 10 percent chose this option. Likewise, the position, “The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems” also received low levels of support (12 percent). By far, the preferred option was a multilateral approach, which reasoned, “The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.” Seventy-five percent favored this position. Interestingly, Americans concur with publics of most other nations on this; in thirteen out of fifteen countries polled, majorities preferred that the United States adopt a multilateral approach to world affairs, with an average of 56 percent of respondents endorsing it.²⁹

The same poll asked whether the “United States has the responsibility to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur.” Here again, three-quarters of Americans rejected this hegemonic idea. This was even higher than the average of the nine countries polled (65 percent) saying that the United States does not have this responsibility.³⁰

Other, U.S.-only polls have also found widespread rejection of the United States playing a hegemonic role in the world. Fifty-six percent of U.S. respondents in 2003 agreed that the United States does not have “the ability to play the role of ‘world policeman,’ that is to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur” (Time/CNN/ Harris 2003).³¹ 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).³²

Gallup has regularly asked about “the role the United States should play in trying to solve international problems.” Repeatedly, only small minorities have endorsed the option of the United States playing “the leading role,” most recently 23 percent in 2009. At the same time, few Americans support the idea of playing only a “minor role” (17 percent) or “no role” (6 percent). Consistently, the most popular option is for the United States to “take a major role, but not the leading one” (52 percent in 2009).³³

Majorities also consistently reject the position that “the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, we should go our own way in international matters, not worrying too much about whether other countries agree with us or not.” In 2005, 63 percent rejected this position, while 32 percent endorsed it.³⁴

Interestingly, in 2003, Americans agreed with Europeans that U.S. unilateralism poses a threat to the United States itself. The GMF poll asked respondents to rate the threat of “the United States going it alone.” Only 24 percent said it was not a threat at all, while two-thirds said it was an extremely important threat (21 percent) or an important threat (46 percent). On average in Europe, 47 percent said it was an important threat to Europe, 31 percent said it was an extremely important threat, and 17 percent said it was not an important threat.³⁵

At the same time, a plurality of Americans does want to ensure that no other country becomes the global hegemon. Asked whether the United States should preserve its role as “the only military superpower” or whether it was “acceptable if China, another country, or the European Union became as militarily powerful as the United States,” 50 percent of respondents preferred the option of preserving U.S. superiority, though 35 percent said it would be acceptable for others to achieve equal power and 15 percent did not answer (Pew 2005).³⁶

However, a follow-up question suggested that this commitment to maintaining U.S. supremacy is fairly soft. The 50 percent who had advocated that the United States should maintain superiority were asked, “Should U.S. policies try to keep it so America is the only military superpower even if it risks alienating our principal allies?” Responses were evenly divided, such that only 23 percent of the full sample expressed determination to maintain superiority if it would alienate U.S. allies.³⁷

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.³⁸ And when WPO asked this same question in January 2007, support for a stronger United Nations rose to 66 percent among Americans.³⁹

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.⁴⁰

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.⁴¹

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

At the same time, respondents do not rank this goal high on the list of U.S. policy priorities. The percentage saying that strengthening the United Nations should be “very important” is generally under half. In a 2002 internet poll, an unusually high 55 percent endorsed it as a very important foreign policy goal, but by the 2008 poll, the figure had fallen to just 39 percent.⁴²

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

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).⁴⁴

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.”⁴⁵

Giving the United Nations Expanded Powers

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

On having a **standing UN peacekeeping force**, a strong majority of Americans were in favor (72 percent). This figure was a bit higher than the average of 66 percent among the twenty-two nations polled.⁴⁶

On giving the United Nations the authority to **go into countries to investigate violations of human rights**, three-quarters of Americans were in favor (75 percent); again, this was higher than the global average of 65 percent.⁴⁷

Taking this a step further in 2008, CCGA also asked about “creating an **international marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide.**” Seventy-one percent of Americans were in favor of this idea, while 27 percent were opposed (this question was only asked in the United States).⁴⁸

On giving the United Nations **the power to regulate the international arms trade**, 60 percent of Americans were in favor, compared to 58 percent globally.⁴⁹

CCGA also asked about having a “UN agency **control access to all nuclear fuel in the world to ensure that none is used for weapons production.**” Sixty-three percent of Americans favored the idea (the question was not asked globally).⁵⁰

Opposition was stronger to giving the United Nations the power to **impose a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil**, with 45 percent in favor and 50 percent against. While U.S. support was just below the global average (48 percent), the United States had much higher levels of opposition (50 percent) than other nations polled (average 36 percent).⁵¹

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?**”⁵²

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.⁵³

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.⁵⁴

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).⁵⁵

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).⁵⁶

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).⁵⁷

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).⁵⁸

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

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).⁶¹

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.⁶²

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.⁶³⁻⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵

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).⁶⁶

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.⁶⁷

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.⁶⁸

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).⁶⁹

Intervention in Internal Affairs

A robust majority of Americans approve of the United Nations intervening in the internal affairs of states to investigate human rights abuses and to promote human rights in member states. An equally large majority approves of the United Nations using military force to deliver urgent humanitarian aid if the government tries to block the aid and to protect people from severe human rights abuses, even against the will of the government. Majorities also support the idea that the UN has not only the right, but the “responsibility to protect” in the event of severe human rights violations.

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

As discussed above, a large U.S. majority approves of giving the United Nations the authority to go into countries to investigate violations of human rights. In a 2006 CCGA poll, 75 percent of Americans supported this idea (a higher figure than the global average of 65 percent).⁷⁰

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.”⁷¹ 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).⁷² 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).⁷³

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.”⁷⁴

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.⁷⁵

As discussed in more depth in the Violent Conflict component (see Chapter 3), large majorities in most countries endorse the principle that the United Nations not only has the right but also the responsibility to authorize military intervention “to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government.” In a 2006 CCGA poll, 74 percent of Americans said that the United Nations has such a responsibility, which is substantially higher than the global average of 61 percent.⁷⁶

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.⁷⁷

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.⁷⁸

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.⁷⁹

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.⁸⁰

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.⁸¹

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.⁸²

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.⁸³

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.⁸⁴

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.⁸⁵

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.⁸⁶

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).⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸

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.⁸⁹

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).⁹⁰

In 2008, GMF presented respondents in the United States with two competing statements on cooperation between the United States and Europe. Most Americans (67 percent) agreed that there were enough common values for cooperation on international problems, while some (23 percent) said the United States and the European Union have such different values that cooperation is impossible. In comparison, the average of the twelve European countries

surveyed was not as optimistic, though still a majority (55 percent) said cooperation was possible (35 percent said it was not).⁹¹

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.⁹²

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).⁹³

¹ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

As you may know there are a number of international laws based on agreements between most nations, including our own. These govern a wide set of issues ranging from fishing rights to the use of military force. Which of these two views is closer to yours?

	A. Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.	B. If our government thinks it is not in our nation's interest, it should not feel obliged to abide by international laws.	DK/NR
Chile	58	27	15
Mexico	44	53	3
United States	69	29	2
France	61	35	4
Germany	70	26	4
Great Britain	54	43	3
Poland	62	29	10
Russia	54	34	13
Ukraine	67	19	14
Azerbaijan	60	31	10
Egypt	63	37	0
Iraq	46	31	24
Pakistan	38	56	6
Palestinian territories	50	46	4
Turkey	46	46	8
Kenya	65	34	1
Nigeria	65	34	2
China	74	18	8
Hong Kong*	47	38	15
Macao	51	37	12
India	49	42	9
Indonesia	53	34	13
South Korea	56	44	1
Taiwan*	68	24	8
Average	57	36	7

*Not included in the Global average

² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

As compared to the average [Country citizen] would you say you are more supportive or less supportive of consistently abiding by international laws?

	More supportive	Less supportive	About the same (vol.)	Depends (vol.)	DK/NR
Chile	45	21	11	5	18
Mexico	71	14	5	5	5
United States	66	30	-	-	4
France	64	21	4	5	6
Great Britain	57	29	5	1	8

Poland	55	17	17	3	7
Russia	28	15	29	11	18
Ukraine	47	12	16	8	17
Egypt	49	38	7	6	
Iraq	21	41	19	9	11
Palestinian territories	18	62	11	7	1
Turkey	43	27	14	6	11
Kenya	62	26	8	3	1
Nigeria	57	38	1	4	
Hong Kong*	70	5	10	7	8
Macao*	73	5	1	2	18
India	35	27	14	14	10
Indonesia	54	29	6	5	6
Taiwan*	83	8	0	4	5
Average	49	28	11	6	8

*Not included in Global Average

³ 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)

⁴ 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

⁵ Chicago Council on Global Affairs/German Marshall Fund Worldviews 2002

For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of (own country) military troops?

To uphold international law

Approve

Disapprove

DK/Other

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

⁶ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

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

⁷ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapon test explosions worldwide

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	81	14	5
2002 (internet)	84	13	3
2004 (internet)	87	9	3
2006 (internet)	86	10	4
2008 (internet)	88	11	1

⁸ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

An agreement under the treaty banning biological weapons that would allow international inspectors to examine biological research laboratories to ensure that countries are not producing biological weapons

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

⁹ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

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

¹⁰ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	71	22	7
2002 (internet)	77	20	4
2004 (internet)	76	19	5
2006 (internet)	71	25	5
2008 (internet)	68	30	2

¹¹ **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

¹² **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006**

Based on what you know, do you think [survey country] should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming

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

13

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

¹⁴ 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

¹⁵ 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

¹⁶ 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

¹⁷ **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

¹⁸ 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

¹⁹ 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

²⁰ 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

21 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

22 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

23 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

24 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

25 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

²⁶ Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Based on what you know, do you think the U.S. should or should not participate in the following treaties and agreements?

The agreement on the International Criminal Court that can try individuals for war crimes, genocide, or crimes against humanity if their own country won't try them

	Should participate	Should not participate	Not sure/ Decline
2002 (telephone)	71	22	7
2002 (internet)	77	20	4
2004 (internet)	76	19	5
2006 (internet)	71	25	5
2008 (internet)	68	30	2

²⁷ WorldPublicOpinion.org April 2006

A permanent International Criminal Court has been established by the UN (United Nations) to try individuals suspected of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Some say the United States should not support the Court because trumped-up charges may be brought against Americans, for example, U.S. soldiers who use force in the course of a peacekeeping operation. Others say that the U.S. should support the court because the world needs a better way to prosecute war criminals, many of whom go unpunished today. Do you think the U.S. should or should not support the permanent international criminal court?

	Should	Should not	No answer
April 2006	68	29	3
CCGA June 2002	65	28	7

²⁸ Bertelsmann Foundation of Germany 2005

What is the best framework for ensuring peace and stability?

	A System Led by the United Nations	A System Led by a Balance of Regional Powers	A System Led by a Single World Power	A System Led by Two World Powers	DK/NR
Brazil	36	45	9	6	4
China	51	36	6	3	4
France	46	34	5	4	11
Germany	68	21	4	3	4

Great Britain	47	40	3	2	8
India	33	37	16	12	2
Japan	33	29	1	1	36
Russia	28	33	15	10	14
United States	33	52	6	4	5
Average	42	36	7	5	10

²⁹ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Which statement comes closest to your position?

	As the sole remaining superpower, the United States should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems.	The United States should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries.	The United States should withdraw from most efforts to solve international problems.	Not sure/ Decline
United States	10	75	12	3
Argentina	1	34	55	10
Armenia	7	58	27	8
China	9	68	14	9
France	3	75	21	1
India	34	42	10	13
Israel	24	62	10	5
Mexico	12	59	22	8
Palestine	5	36	55	4
Peru	10	61	22	7
Philippines	20	55	16	9
Russia	8	42	38	12
South Korea	14	79	6	0
Thailand	8	47	18	27
Ukraine	3	52	34	11
Average	11	56	24	8

³⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Do you think that the United States has the responsibility to play the role of 'world policeman,' that is, to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur?

Yes	No	Not sure/ Decline
------------	-----------	------------------------------

United States	22	75	3
Armenia	21	70	9
Australia	27	70	3
China	30	61	9
India	53	35	13
Indonesia	20	69	11
Palestine	20	76	4
South Korea	39	60	1
Ukraine	17	69	14
Average	28	65	8

³¹ **Time/CNN/Harris Interactive Poll February 2003**

Do you think the United States has the ability to play the role of 'world policeman,' that is to fight violations of international law and aggression wherever they occur or don't you think so?

38%	Yes
56	No
6	Not sure

³² **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

³³ **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

³⁴ Pew News Interest Index Poll October 2005

(We have a few questions about America's place in the world...Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.)...Since the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, we should go our own way in international matters, not worrying too much about whether other countries agree with us or not.

32% Agree
 63 Disagree
 5 Don't know/Refused

³⁵ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003

I am going to read you a list of possible international threats to Europe ("to the United States" in the United States) in the next 10 years. Please tell me if you think each one on the list is an extremely important threat, an important threat, or not an important threat at all.

U.S. unilateralism (If needed: The tendency of the United States to "go it alone")

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

³⁶ 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

³⁷ 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

³⁸ **BBC December 2004**

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative...The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Depends (vol)	DK/NA (vol)
Argentina	44	22	4	30
Australia	74	17	4	5
Brazil	61	22	6	12
Canada	72	22	1	5
China	54	17	5	23
Chile	69	18	5	8
France	54	37	1	8
Germany	87	7	3	3
Great Britain	75	20	1	4
India	55	23	9	13
Indonesia	77	9	8	6
Italy	58	33	3	7
Japan	65	3	0	32
Lebanon	58	18	10	13
Mexico	71	5	12	12
Russia	57	11	10	22
Philippines	77	18	3	3
Poland	61	11	3	25
South Africa	64	26	2	8
South Korea	56	38	4	3
Spain	78	10	2	10
Turkey	40	24	17	19
United States	59	37	1	3
Average	64	19	5	12

³⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org Jan2007**

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative...

The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Refused/DK
Iran	70	14	16
United States	66	32	3

⁴⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2007

Strengthening the United Nations

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

⁴¹ German Marshall Fund TransatlanticTrends-Jun2003

Some say that because of the increasing interaction between countries, we need to strengthen international institutions to deal with shared problems. Others say that this would only create bigger, unwieldy bureaucracies.

For the United Nations, please tell me if it needs to be strengthened or not.

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

42 Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008

Below is a list of possible foreign policy goals that the United States might have. For each one please select whether you think that it should be a very important foreign policy goal of the United States, a somewhat important foreign policy goal, or not an important goal at all?

Strengthening the United Nations

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Not sure/ Decline
1974	46	32	14	8
1978	47	32	13	8
1982	48	32	13	7
1986	46	33	16	5
1990	52	36	8	4
1994	51	33	12	4
1998	45	39	11	5
2002 (telephone)	57	28	13	2
2002 (internet)	55	33	12	1
2004 (internet)	38	43	17	2
2006 (internet)	40	39	19	2
2008 (internet)	39	40	21	1

43

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political/Foreign Policy Poll September 2008

(As I read a list of possible long-range foreign policy goals which the United States might have, tell me how much priority you think each should be given.)...Strengthening the United Nations...Do you think this should have top priority, some priority, or no priority at all?

32%	Top priority
46	Some priority
19	No priority
3	Don't know/Refused

Pew Research Center/Council on Foreign Relations October 2005

(As I read a list of possible long-range foreign policy goals which the United States might have, tell me how much priority you think each should be given.)...Strengthening the United Nations...Do you think this should have top priority, some priority, or no priority at all?

40%	Top priority
43	Some priority
14	No priority
3	Don't know/Refused

44 WorldPublicOpinion.org/Knowledge Networks December 2006

For each of the following possible future trends, please tell me if you would see it as mainly positive or mainly negative

The United Nations becomes significantly more powerful in world affairs.

	Mainly positive	Mainly negative	Refused/Don't know
WPO/KN 12/06	66	32	3
BBC 11/04	59	37	4

45

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

⁴⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

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

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	48	30	22
Peru	77	19	4
United States	72	24	5
Armenia	75	15	10
France	74	25	1
Great Britain	79	17	4
Poland	63	11	26
Russia	58	22	20
Ukraine	54	19	28
Azerbaijan	64	21	14
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	62	13	25
Israel	64	31	6

Turkey	51	24	25
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	84	15	1
China	62	25	13
India	58	30	12
Indonesia	74	14	12
Philippines	46	44	9
South Korea	68	30	1
Thailand	73	12	15
Average	66	23	12

⁴⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

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

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

⁴⁸ **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the UN (United Nations), here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Creating an international marshalls service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
2006 (internet)	75	21	4
2008 (internet)	71	27	2

⁴⁹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to regulate the international arms trade

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	36	42	22
Peru	52	43	5
United States	60	34	6
Armenia	58	27	15
France	77	22	1
Great Britain	69	26	5
Poland	44	28	28
Russia	55	28	17
Ukraine	57	22	21
Azerbaijan	63	27	10
Egypt	53	47	0
Iran	59	16	26
Israel	60	34	6
Turkey	34	39	27
Kenya	85	13	2
Nigeria	84	15	2
China	59	28	13
India	57	31	12
Indonesia	64	22	15
Philippines	32	58	10
South Korea	75	23	2
Thailand	44	37	19
Average	58	30	12

⁵⁰ **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

⁵¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Giving the UN the power to fund its activities by imposing a small tax on such things as the international sale of arms or oil

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	32	42	27
Peru	38	55	7
United States	45	50	5
Armenia	46	28	26
France	70	30	1
Great Britain	61	33	6
Poland	40	27	33
Russia	39	36	25
Ukraine	44	20	36
Azerbaijan	47	30	24
Egypt	39	61	0
Iran	39	31	30
Israel	52	39	9
Turkey	33	36	31
Kenya	74	23	3
Nigeria	65	31	5
China	55	27	17
India	47	37	17
Indonesia	50	33	17
Philippines	33	56	11
South Korea	53	44	3
Thailand	48	29	23
Average	48	36	16

⁵² **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

⁵³ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

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

⁵⁴ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	65	21	13
United States	83	14	4
France	84	13	3
Russia	70	14	17
Azerbaijan	82	11	7
Egypt	78	22	0
Israel	77	17	6
Palestinian territories	81	17	2
Turkey	68	15	18
Kenya	88	11	1
Nigeria	89	10	1
China	70	18	11
India	66	22	12
Indonesia	71	15	14
South Korea	76	23	1
Thailand	67	14	19
Average	76	16	8

⁵⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

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

⁵⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: preventing a country that does not have nuclear weapons from acquiring them.

	Should	Should not	Not sure/ Decline
Mexico	70	21	10
United States	62	33	5
France	50	48	2
Russia	55	27	19
Ukraine	51	22	26
Azerbaijan	59	26	16
Egypt	74	26	0
Israel	62	33	5
Palestinian territories	38	59	3
Turkey	58	23	19
Kenya	84	15	1
Nigeria	81	17	2
China	47	40	14
India	53	34	13
Indonesia	68	19	14
South Korea	43	55	1
Thailand	52	31	18

Average	59	31	10
----------------	----	----	----

⁵⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To prevent a country that does not have nuclear weapons from producing nuclear fuel that could be used to produce nuclear weapons

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

⁵⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

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

India	51	34	16
Indonesia	51	28	21
South Korea	32	65	2
Thailand	46	29	25
Average	53	35	12

⁵⁹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005**

And, do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following:
The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it

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

⁶⁰ **WorldPublicOpinion.org December 2006**

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly with the following: The use of military force is more legitimate when the United Nations (UN) approves it.

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

⁶¹ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2003**

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States government has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	37	57	6
France	41	53	6

Germany	20	76	4
The Netherlands	33	61	6
Italy	24	70	6
Poland	37	52	11
Portugal	25	72	3
EU Average	31	63	6
United States	58	31	11

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	55	41	4
France	47	48	5
Germany	34	64	2
The Netherlands	44	51	5
Italy	32	63	5
Poland	38	55	7
Portugal	39	56	5
EU Average	41	54	5
United States	68	24	8

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	56	37	7
France	45	50	5
Germany	33	66	1
The Netherlands	52	46	2
Italy	37	59	4
Poland	31	58	11
Portugal	44	54	2
EU Average	43	53	5
United States	72	24	4

Imagine North Korea has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	49	48	3
France	43	49	8
Germany	30	63	7
The Netherlands	40	56	4
Italy	24	71	5
Poland	41	47	12

Portugal	34	61	5
EU Average	37	56	6
United States	53	38	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. NATO has decided to attack North Korea to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	66	31	3
France	54	44	2
Germany	29	67	4
The Netherlands	54	43	3
Italy	34	62	4
Poland	51	40	9
Portugal	47	49	4
EU Average	48	48	4
United States	78	17	5

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	DK / Refused
United Kingdom	51	43	6
France	44	52	4
Germany	32	66	2
The Netherlands	45	49	6
Italy	26	68	6
Poland	38	49	13
Portugal	28	66	6
EU Average	38	56	6
United States	67	23	10

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council has decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	70	27	3
France	56	39	5
Germany	46	51	3
The Netherlands	48	46	6
Italy	44	52	4
Poland	38	45	17
Portugal	48	50	2
EU Average	50	44	6
United States	75	16	9

Imagine Iran has acquired weapons of mass destruction. The United States and its allies have decided to attack Iran to force that country to give up these weapons. Would you support [country] government decision to take part in this military action or not?

	Support	Not support	Don't know/Refused
United Kingdom	58	40	2
France	47	49	4
Germany	33	63	4
The Netherlands	40	55	5
Italy	38	60	2
Poland	40	47	13
Portugal	38	54	8
EU Average	42	53	5
United States	73	20	7

⁶² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If a situation like Iraq arose in the future, do you think it is essential to secure the approval of the UN before using military force, or don't you think it is essential?

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

⁶³ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	65	29	6
United States	78	15	7
France	82	16	2
Germany	56	42	2
United Kingdom	77	18	6
Italy	77	20	3

Netherlands	76	21	2
Poland	53	36	11
Portugal	57	30	14
Spain	77	18	5
Slovakia	61	24	15
Turkey	30	52	18

⁶⁴ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

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

⁶⁵ **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Would you still support the use of the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces if the UN does not approve it?

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

⁶⁶ **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2004**

Now a question about using military force, do you think (survey country) should have U.N. approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat or do you think that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats?

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

⁶⁷ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2005

Here is a list of statements about NATO. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of them:
NATO approval makes military action legitimate

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal
European Average	15	36	25	16	7
United States	18	35	22	17	9
France	15	41	25	14	5
Germany	15	40	29	15	2
United Kingdom	20	39	21	11	9
Italy	8	32	30	26	4
Netherlands	14	48	23	12	3
Poland	11	36	23	10	20
Portugal	26	37	14	9	14
Spain	13	31	27	19	10
Slovakia	21	38	14	16	11
Turkey	23	25	20	18	13

⁶⁸ GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	61	32	7
United States	79	16	5
France	76	21	3
Germany	51	47	2
United Kingdom	74	20	7

Italy	65	29	6
Netherlands	78	21	1
Poland	56	29	15
Portugal	58	30	12
Spain	76	20	4
Slovakia	50	31	19
Turkey	34	52	14

GMF Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was NATO approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

	Yes	No	DK/Refusal
European Average	50	42	8
United States	60	34	6
France	58	35	7
Germany	34	63	4
United Kingdom	64	28	7
Italy	64	29	7
Netherlands	63	34	3
Poland	26	64	10
Portugal	54	29	17
Spain	61	29	10
Slovakia	19	59	23
Turkey	42	45	13

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to intervene in a foreign country in order to eliminate the threat of a terrorist attack?

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

German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004

If there was UN approval, would you be willing to use the [COUNTRY'S] armed forces to establish peace in a civil war in an African country?

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

⁶⁹ Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll March 2008

(How important to our foreign policy should each of the following be? Should this be very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important?)...Initiating military force only when we have the support of our allies

51%	Very important
34	Somewhat important
6	Not very important
5	Not at all important
3	Don't know

⁷⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org/Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2006-2008

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

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure/ Decline
Argentina	46	29	24
Peru	75	23	3
United States	75	22	3
Armenia	67	16	18
France	92	8	1
Great Britain	86	11	3
Poland	58	14	28
Russia	64	17	19
Ukraine	66	13	21
Azerbaijan	77	11	12
Egypt	51	49	0

Iran	54	22	25
Israel	64	31	5
Turkey	47	25	28
Kenya	81	17	2
Nigeria	83	15	3
China	57	28	16
India	54	29	17
Indonesia	71	14	15
Philippines	46	46	9
South Korea	74	25	2
Thailand	52	26	22
Average	65	22	13

⁷¹ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008**

As you may know, the members of the UN General Assembly have agreed on a set of principles called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some people say the United Nations should actively promote such human rights principles in member states. Others say this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs and human rights should be left to each country. Do you think the UN SHOULD or SHOULD NOT actively promote human rights in member states?

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

Average	70	19	10
----------------	----	----	----

⁷² WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Would you like to see the UN do more, do less, or do about the same as it has been doing to promote human rights principles?

	Do more	Do less	Do about the same as it has been doing	DK / NS
Argentina	85	2	8	5
Mexico	88	2	8	2
United States	59	7	28	5
France	64	6	26	4
Germany	58	7	34	2
Britain	64	6	22	8
Italy	83	6	8	3
Russia	45	8	23	24
Ukraine	57	4	18	22
Azerbaijan	58	9	29	4
Egypt	55	22	22	1
Jordan	62	17	8	13
Palestinian Territories	48	23	26	3
Turkey	69	7	8	16
Kenya	91	5	3	1
Nigeria	88	7	4	1
China	51	5	15	29
Hong Kong*	65	2	26	7
Macau*	65	1	22	12
India	54	14	16	17
Indonesia	66	6	12	17
South Korea	69	3	25	3
Taiwan*	62	2	25	11
Thailand	60	7	13	20
Average	65	8	17	10

⁷³ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

Do you think the UN should make efforts to further the rights of women or do you think this is improper interference in a country's internal affairs?

	Make efforts to further the rights of women	Improper interference in a country's internal affairs	DK / NS
Argentina	78	18	4
Mexico	88	9	3
United States	59	38	2
France	74	19	7

Britain	70	26	5
Russia	52	30	18
Ukraine	69	16	16
Azerbaijan	66	23	11
Egypt	30	70	
Iran	52	36	12
Palestinian Territories	49	48	3
Turkey	70	20	11
Kenya	91	8	1
Nigeria	66	32	2
China	86	10	4
Hong Kong*	67	23	10
India	48	28	24
Indonesia	74	16	10
South Korea	78	21	1
Thailand	64	21	15
Average	67	26	8

⁷⁴ 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

⁷⁵ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2008

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

	UN should bring in shipments of aid, escorted by military protection if necessary	This would be too much of a violation of a country's sovereignty	DK / NS
Argentina	86	8	7
Mexico	69	27	4
United States	53	43	5
France	70	26	4
Germany	74	23	3

Great Britain	68	26	7
Italy	66	24	10
Russia	40	40	20
Ukraine	42	29	29
Azerbaijan	55	38	7
Egypt	48	48	4
Jordan	46	37	17
Palestinian territories	65	31	4
Turkey	61	19	20
Kenya	81	14	5
Nigeria	57	32	10
China	59	28	12
Hong Kong	63	28	9
Macau	63	26	11
India	51	24	26
Indonesia	55	17	28
South Korea	58	37	4
Taiwan	78	15	6
Thailand	52	14	33
Average	60	28	12

⁷⁶ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

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

Average	61	21	18
----------------	----	----	----

⁷⁷ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

Do you think that when there are concerns about the fairness of elections countries should or should not be willing to have international observers from the United Nations monitor their elections?

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Chile	63	14	23
Mexico	68	30	3
United States	67	31	2
France	71	25	4
Germany	78	18	4
Great Britain	81	15	4
Russia	45	40	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	83	8	9
Egypt	61	39	0
Iraq	65	23	12
Pakistan	55	38	7
Palestinian territories	57	41	2
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	82	17	1
Nigeria	78	22	1
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	9
China – Macau*	63	23	14
India	45	48	7
Indonesia	20	74	6
Taiwan*	61	33	6
Average	63	31	7

* Not included in Global Average

⁷⁸ **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009**

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

	Would	Would not	DK/NR
Chile	59	16	25
Mexico	66	30	4
United States	46	51	3
France	45	50	6
Germany	49	36	14
Great Britain	46	51	3
Russia	43	42	15
Ukraine	63	25	12
Azerbaijan	71	16	14
Egypt	63	37	0

Iraq	67	21	12
Pakistan	49	43	8
Palestinian territories	57	40	3
Turkey	46	45	9
Kenya	85	14	1
Nigeria	74	24	3
China – Hong Kong*	55	36	10
China – Macau*	66	23	11
India	38	51	11
Indonesia	25	62	14
Taiwan*	59	32	10
Average	55	36	9

*Not included in the Global Average

⁷⁹ 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	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A	Margin of Error
Italy	19	19	56	0	5	1	0	
Spain	15	18	54	0	13	1	0	
United States	31	22	41	0	3	3	0	
Canada	34	9	51	0	6	0	0	
Japan	14	14	42	0	0	8	0	
Mexico	23	11	58	6	1	0	0	
South Africa	29	17	47	0	0	8	0	
Australia	32	14	49	0	0	5	0	
Sweden	14	31	51	0	4	0	0	
Argentina	18	7	50	0	23	1	0	
Finland	26	15	55	0	2	1	0	
South Korea	32	11	56	0	0	0	0	
Poland	21	16	61	0	3	0	0	
Switzerland	28	16	52	0	3	1	0	
Brazil	26	15	50	0	6	3	0	2.6
Chile	23	12	54	0	9	1	0	2.2
India	23	12	24	0	40	0	0	
Slovenia	10	45	33	0	10	2	0	3.1
Bulgaria	7	40	40	0	12	0	0	3.2
Romania	19	26	36	0	17	2	0	2.2
China	17	6	29	0	47	1	0	
Taiwan	22	31	44	0	3	0	0	
Turkey	31	16	44	0	8	1	0	
Ukraine	19	17	50	0	11	3	0	

Ghana	24	16	55	0	0	4	2	0	
Moldova	20	36	39	0	0	4	0	0	
Georgia	22	12	58	0	0	8	0	0	
Thailand	65	25	9	0	0	0	1	0	
Indonesia	13	25	51	0	0	8	2	1	3.2
Vietnam	13	15	61	0	0	9	1	0	
Serbia	20	18	52	0	0	8	2	0	
New Zealand	17	0	23	48	0	7	5	0	
Egypt	26	21	50	0	0	4	0	0	
Morocco	19	13	42	0	0	0	26	0	
Iran	19	20	56	0	0	4	1	0	1.9
Jordan	16	17	54	0	0	12	0	0	
Cyprus	24	39	37	0	0	0	0	0	3.1
Trinidad and Tobago	20	20	57	0	0	3	1	0	
Andorra	25	11	62	0	0	2	1	0	
Malaysia	18	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	
Burkina Faso	12	11	59	0	0	13	3	2	
Ethiopia	11	11	68	0	0	5	4	1	
Mali	21	12	55	0	0	7	5	1	
Rwanda	17	19	61	0	0	3	0	0	
Zambia	15	29	48	0	0	4	3	0	
Germany	23	26	46	0	0	4	1	0	
Average	22	19	48	1	0	7	2	0	--

⁸⁰ World Values Survey 2005-2008

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

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	32	22	37	0	0	8	1	0
Spain	13	20	54	0	0	14	0	0
United States	34	27	32	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	46	11	33	0	0	9	1	0
Japan	17	15	46	0	15	0	7	0
Mexico	36	14	42	8	0	2	0	0
South Africa	31	15	45	0	0	0	10	0
Australia	38	14	43	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	33	23	41	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	48	0	0	24	2	0
Finland	42	17	37	0	0	3	1	0
South Korea	31	9	60	0	0	0	0	0

Poland	45	15	36	0	0	4	0	0
Switzerland	32	16	48	0	0	4	1	0
Brazil	30	15	45	0	0	7	3	0
Chile	29	9	51	0	0	10	1	0
India	30	16	12	0	0	43	0	0
Slovenia	20	44	24	0	0	11	1	0
Bulgaria	15	27	44	0	0	14	0	0
Romania	31	19	28	0	0	19	2	0
China	22	6	27	0	0	45	1	0
Taiwan	24	23	50	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	37	19	35	0	0	9	1	0
Ukraine	29	18	39	0	0	11	3	0
Ghana	18	13	64	0	0	3	2	0
Moldova	39	29	26	0	0	6	0	0
Georgia	67	8	21	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	45	25	29	0	0	0	1	0
Indonesia	42	9	40	0	0	7	2	0
Vietnam	22	15	52	0	0	10	1	0
Serbia	36	16	38	0	0	8	2	0
New Zealand	25	0	20	41	0	9	5	0
Egypt	30	23	43	0	0	4	0	0
Morocco	14	17	44	0	0	0	26	0
Iran	22	15	58	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	15	16	57	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	42	20	38	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	31	16	48	0	0	5	1	0
Andorra	30	12	55	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	25	36	39	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	15	13	51	0	0	15	3	3
Ethiopia	13	13	61	0	0	7	6	2
Mali	27	13	41	0	0	11	7	2
Rwanda	10	17	72	0	0	2	0	0
Zambia	13	20	62	0	0	3	2	0
Germany	25	25	45	0	0	5	1	0
Average	29	17	43	1	0	8	2	0

⁸¹ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

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

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	22	12	60	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	12	0	0
United States	28	16	50	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	7	0
Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	13	0	0
Cyprus	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	32	12	53	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	26	8	64	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	47	6	34	0	0	9	2	2
Ethiopia	41	10	40	0	0	5	3	1
Mali	46	5	38	0	0	6	3	1

Rwanda	50	41	8	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	29	19	47	0	0	4	1	0
Germany	20	20	54	0	0	6	1	0
Average	34	11	45	1	0	7	2	0

⁸² **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

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

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit/ NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	45	29	19	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	28	20	40	0	0	13	0	0
United States	42	33	18	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	52	23	20	0	0	4	0	0
Japan	17	26	31	0	16	0	7	0
Mexico	41	19	32	6	0	1	0	0
South Africa	48	32	15	0	0	0	6	0
Australia	46	29	20	0	0	0	6	0
Sweden	39	34	25	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	40	11	30	0	0	18	1	0
Finland	40	40	18	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	54	27	20	0	0	0	*	0
Poland	59	21	18	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	46	19	32	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	51	25	18	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	21	19	0	0	7	1	0
India	37	21	8	0	0	33	0	0
Slovenia	39	36	13	0	0	10	2	0
Bulgaria	48	28	14	0	0	10	0	0
Romania	51	24	8	0	0	15	2	0
China	34	9	16	0	0	40	1	0
Taiwan	66	17	15	0	0	2	0	0
Turkey	33	41	18	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	49	30	9	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	62	28	7	0	0	2	1	0
Moldova	51	37	7	0	0	4	0	0
Georgia	72	15	9	0	0	4	0	0
Thailand	61	33	6	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	79	4	5	0	0	5	2	6
Vietnam	48	20	24	0	0	7	1	0
Serbia	41	34	16	0	0	7	2	0

New Zealand	43	0	8	37	0	7	5	0
Egypt	57	17	24	0	0	2	0	0
Morocco	36	22	22	0	0	0	20	0
Iran	39	35	22	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	44	19	26	0	0	12	0	0
Cyprus	46	40	15	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	62	19	18	0	0	2	1	0
Andorra	54	22	22	0	0	2	1	0
Malaysia	45	43	12	0	0	0	0	0
Burkina Faso	50	16	19	0	0	10	3	2
Ethiopia	36	18	36	0	0	6	3	1
Mali	49	28	12	0	0	6	4	1
Rwanda	48	43	7	0	0	1	0	0
Zambia	55	26	13	0	0	5	2	0
Germany	36	29	31	0	0	4	1	0
Average	47	25	18	1	0	6	2	0

⁸³ World Values Survey 2005-2008

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

	National govts	Regional orgs	UN	National govts, w/ UN coordination	Non profit / NGO	DK	No answer	N/A
Italy	27	15	51	0	0	6	2	0
Spain	16	14	56	0	0	13	1	0
United States	42	18	33	0	0	3	3	0
Canada	45	10	40	0	0	4	1	0
Japan	27	11	47	0	9	0	7	0
Mexico	41	9	41	0	0	7	2	0
South Africa	60	16	20	0	0	0	5	0
Australia	30	9	56	0	0	0	5	0
Sweden	17	9	72	0	0	2	0	0
Argentina	39	4	38	0	0	19	1	0
Finland	33	8	56	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	49	9	41	0	0	0	0	0
Poland	49	7	41	0	0	3	0	0
Switzerland	26	8	63	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	44	11	39	0	0	5	2	0
Chile	51	7	32	0	0	9	1	0
India	36	10	13	0	0	41	0	0
Slovenia	39	30	20	0	0	9	1	0

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

⁸⁴ 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

⁸⁵ 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

⁸⁶ **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

⁸⁷ **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

⁸⁸ **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

People have different views about themselves and how they relate to the world. Using this card, would you tell me how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how you see yourself? (Read out and code one answer for each statement): I see myself as a world citizen

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	No answer
Italy	20	40	29	8	2	1
Spain	20	48	14	4	13	1
United States	20	45	24	5	2	4
Canada	29	55	12	2	2	1
Japan	11	61	4	1	22	-
Mexico	35	55	7	2	1	0
South Africa	42	41	10	3	4	-
Australia	21	56	18	1	-	3
Sweden	18	65	15	1	2	-
Argentina	15	48	24	5	7	1

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

⁸⁹ 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

⁹⁰ WorldPublicOpinion.org 2009

In general, when [Country] government negotiates with other countries do you think that the government:

	A. Should be more ready to act cooperatively to achieve mutual gains	B. Tends to be too willing to compromise and is often taken advantage of.	DK/NR
Chile	60	26	15
Mexico	35	63	2
United States	54	44	2
France	43	48	9
Germany	47	46	8
Great Britain	31	65	4
Poland	34	53	14
Russia	54	34	12
Ukraine	49	35	16
Azerbaijan	67	29	4
Egypt	76	23	1
Iraq	60	24	16
Pakistan	42	54	5
Palestinian territories	69	29	2
Turkey	81	14	5

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

⁹¹ German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008

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

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

⁹² German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following.

When our country acts on a national security issue, it is critical that we do so together with our closest allies

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	DK/Refusal	Agree	Disagree
European Average	42	38	8	7	4	80	15
United States	61	28	5	5	2	89	9

France	52	38	5	4	1	90	9
Germany	48	37	8	6	1	86	14
United Kingdom	50	35	8	4	3	85	12
Italy	35	46	12	7	1	81	19
Netherlands	60	31	4	4	1	91	8
Poland	40	45	7	3	6	85	9
Portugal	45	31	9	9	7	76	17
Spain	41	47	7	4	2	88	11
Slovakia	32	39	12	5	12	71	17
Turkey	21	26	12	23	18	47	35
Bulgaria	35	43	7	4	10	78	11
Romania	37	39	7	5	12	76	12

⁹³ **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

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.