



**THE
POLICY
INSTITUTE**

**KING'S
College
LONDON**

The Age of Impunity?

Global attitudes to human rights

**Ipsos Global Advisor research, in partnership with
the Policy Institute at King's College London**

Q1. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?


Half around the world believe countries should intervene to stop war crimes – though not quite as convinced their own country should be the one intervening

% Agree across all countries



Q1. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? The [NATIONALITY] military should always put avoiding civilian casualties and following the rules of warfare ahead of the [NATIONALITY] national interest


Every country more likely to put protecting civilian casualties ahead of national interest, especially Turkey and Poland – but less convinced in Brazil, Belgium and Japan



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q1. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? If a country commits war crimes other countries should intervene to stop it, even if that infringes on its sovereignty


Similarly most countries on balance support intervention to stop war crimes, especially Poland, India and South Africa, but less so in several Latin American countries



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q1. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? If another country commits war crimes [COUNTRY] should intervene to stop it, even if that infringes on its sovereignty


But most countries are less likely to support intervention to stop war crimes if it requires action by their own country – changes particularly notable in Hungary, South Korea, several Latin American countries and Sweden



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q1. To what extent, if at all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? If [COUNTRY] commits war crimes other countries should intervene to stop our country, even if that infringes on our sovereignty

On average half are willing to accept intervention in their own country's affairs if it commits war crimes – but balance of opinion tighter in Russia and some Latin American countries, and opposed in Turkey




Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q2. Which of these statements, if any, is closest to how you think your country should consider international laws on human rights when deciding what to do?


On average, four in ten think their country should never break international laws on human rights – but two in ten say human rights no more important than other considerations

% Across all countries



Q2. Which of these statements, if any, is closest to how you think your country should consider international laws on human rights when deciding what to do?

Support for never breaking laws on human rights highest in Poland, Hungary, and Spain – but less than half in most countries



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q3a. Which two or three of the following, if any, do you think should be most important to [YOUR COUNTRY's] leaders when deciding on relations with other countries?


Q3b. And which two or three of the following, if any, do you think are most important to [YOUR COUNTRY's] leaders when deciding on relations with other countries?

Economic and security benefits seen as most important in international relations – human rights and respect for international law equal third



% Should be most important: all countries

% is most important




Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q3a. Which two or three of the following, if any, do you think should be most important to [YOUR COUNTRY's] leaders when deciding on relations with other countries? Economic benefits

Economic benefits important in most countries – but human rights at least as important in Australia, Canada, Britain, Hungary, Sweden and US.


Top three:
 #1 most important per country
 #2 most important per country
 #3 most important per country



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q3b. And which two or three of the following, if any, do you think are most important to [YOUR COUNTRY's] leaders when deciding on relations with other countries?

Nearly every country thinks their leaders put economic benefits first in international relations – Sweden the only one that thinks human rights are more important to their leaders




Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q4. Which of the following, if any, is closest to your views about [YOUR COUNTRY's] trade with other countries?


Globally, public opinion is split on whether human rights should take precedence over trade benefits

% Across all countries



Q4. Which of the following, if any, is closest to your views about [YOUR COUNTRY's] trade with other countries?


European countries – especially Sweden and Britain – most likely to only want to trade with countries with good human rights records. Russia, South Korea, Malaysia, Turkey and Latin American countries more likely to prioritise trade regardless of human rights



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries,

Q5. For each of the following, do you think they *CURRENTLY* mostly use their influence for good or for bad around the world?


Canada and the UN most likely to be seen as using their influence for good – less so for Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel and Russia.



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries, *asked in the 17 countries not already specified

Q6. And for each of the following, COMPARED WITH 10 YEARS AGO, do you think they are NOW more likely, less likely or about as likely to use their influence for good around the world?

Most do not see big changes in countries' use of influence over the last ten years, but around three in ten think Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Russia, and the US less likely to use their influence for good than previously



Base: 17,022 online adults aged 16-74 across 24 countries, *asked in the 17 countries not already specified

- This survey is an international sample of 17,022, adults aged 18-74 in the US, South African, Turkey and Canada, and age 16-74 in all other countries, were interviewed. The Fieldwork was conducted from 19th April- 3 May 2019. Approximately 1000+ individuals participated on a country by country basis via the Ipsos Online Panel with the exception of Argentina, Belgium, Chile, Hungary, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Poland, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Sweden and Turkey, where each have a sample approximately 500+.
- 15 of the 24 countries surveyed online generate nationally representative samples in their countries (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, and United States).
- Brazil, Chile, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Russia,, South Africa and Turkey produce a national sample that is more urban & educated, and with higher incomes than their fellow citizens. We refer to these respondents as “Upper Deck Consumer Citizens”. They are not nationally representative of their country.
- Where results do not sum to 100 or the ‘difference’ appears to be +/-1 more/less than the actual, this may be due to rounding, multiple responses or the exclusion of don't knows or not stated responses.
- The precision of Ipsos online polls are calculated using a credibility interval with a poll of 1,000 accurate to +/- 3.1 percentage points and of 500 accurate to +/- 4.5 percentage points. For more information on the Ipsos use of credibility intervals, please visit the Ipsos website

ABOUT IPSOS

Ipsos ranks third in the global research industry. With a strong presence in 87 countries, Ipsos employs more than 16,000 people and has the ability to conduct research programs in more than 100 countries. Founded in France in 1975, Ipsos is controlled and managed by research professionals. They have built a solid Group around a multi-specialist positioning – Media and advertising research; Marketing research; Client and employee relationship management; Opinion & social research; Mobile, Online, Offline data collection and delivery.

Ipsos is listed on Eurolist - NYSE-Euronext. The company is part of the SBF 120 and the Mid-60 index and is eligible for the Deferred Settlement Service (SRD).

ISIN code FR0000073298, Reuters ISOS.PA, Bloomberg IPS:FP
www.ipsos.com

GAME CHANGERS

At Ipsos we are passionately curious about people, markets, brands and society. We deliver information and analysis that makes our complex world easier and faster to navigate and inspires our clients to make smarter decisions.

We believe that our work is important. Security, simplicity, speed and substance applies to everything we do.

Through specialisation, we offer our clients a unique depth of knowledge and expertise. Learning from different experiences gives us perspective and inspires us to boldly call things into question, to be creative.

By nurturing a culture of collaboration and curiosity, we attract the highest calibre of people who have the ability and desire to influence and shape the future.

“GAME CHANGERS” - our tagline - summarises our ambition.

ABOUT THE POLICY INSTITUTE

The Policy Institute at King’s College London works to solve society’s challenges with evidence and expertise. We combine the rigour of academia with the agility of a consultancy and the connectedness of a think tank. Our research draws on many disciplines and methods, making use of the skills, expertise and resources of not only the institute, but the university and its wider network too.