

# GLOBAL POLL SHOWS WORLD PERCEIVED AS MORE DANGEROUS PLACE

*While Criminal Violence, Not Terrorism, Key Concern In Daily Life, Eleven Country Survey Shows That U.S. Missile Defense Initiative Seen As Creating A More Dangerous World*

*Widespread Support For Nuclear Test Ban And Abolition Of Nuclear Weapons, But Limited Consensus On What And Who Will Make The World A Safer Place*

*After Passage Of 50 Years Worrying Gaps Appear In Global Public's Awareness Of The Significance Of Hiroshima And Nagasaki*

## The Centre for Public Opinion and Democracy



Located at the Liu Centre on the main campus of the University of British Columbia, Canada, the *Centre for Public Opinion and Democracy* was established to undertake original research and secondary analysis of existing studies in the growing field of global public opinion. For further information contact [UBCGlobal.net](http://UBCGlobal.net).

Public Release Date: May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2002

*For more information on this news release, please contact:*

**Dr. Angus Reid**  
Executive Director  
Phone: +1 604 697 0027  
email: [angusreid@angusreid.net](mailto:angusreid@angusreid.net)

**Julie Wagemakers**  
Program Manager  
Phone: +1 604 822 4288  
email: [julie.wagemakers@ubc.ca](mailto:julie.wagemakers@ubc.ca)

# **GLOBAL POLL SHOWS WORLD PERCEIVED AS MORE DANGEROUS PLACE**

***While Criminal Violence, Not Terrorism, Key Concern In Daily Life, Eleven Country Survey Shows That U.S. Missile Defense Initiative Seen As Creating A More Dangerous World***

***Widespread Support For Nuclear Test Ban And Abolition Of Nuclear Weapons, But Limited Consensus On What And Who Will Make The World A Safer Place After Passage Of 50 Years Worrying Gaps Appear In Global Public's Awareness Of The Significance Of Hiroshima And Nagasaki***

**Vancouver, British Columbia, CANADA: May 16, 2002** – Criminal violence, not terrorism, heads the list of concerns about safety and security for citizens in eleven countries, including the USA, according to the majority of citizens in an eleven-country poll conducted by the Centre for Public Opinion and Democracy at the Liu Centre for the Study of Global Issues, University of British Columbia in association with the Simons Centre and the Japanese Asahi Shimbun newspaper.

Though most respondents among the over 6000 polled feel that the world has become a more dangerous place, there is less consensus on what can be done and who will take a leadership position in order to make the world a safer place. Further, only in the United States do a majority of citizens believe that the missile defense system approved by the Bush administration will create a “safer” world – in fact, in nine of the eleven countries surveyed majorities believe that the initiative will make the world a more dangerous place.

### ***Criminal Violence Dominates Current Security Concerns***

When asked to name the one threat of most concern in their daily life, fear of criminal violence dominates the responses in all but two of the eleven countries included in this poll. Responses to an open ended question inviting participants to name the potential threat or danger of greatest concern to them “right now” reveals a great many concerns - with criminal violence heading the list. Concern about crime is greatest in the two poorest countries surveyed, Brazil (84%) and South Africa (47%). Only in the two Asian countries participating in this survey were other issues more dominant.

Unaided concerns about terrorism were voiced by fewer than one in ten respondents. It is noteworthy that even in countries such as India and the USA which have had recent terrorist attacks, this issue is named by fewer than one in five respondents. Indeed other issues such as the prospect of nuclear war or proliferation of nuclear weapons captures greater public attention in Japan (21%), Russia (17%), the United Kingdom (15%) and Germany (13%). Other widespread fears include natural or ecological disasters or accidents, especially among Japanese (24%), South Koreans (21%) and Canadians (17%). More personal concerns include mentions of health threats, particularly among South Africans (22%) and to a lesser extent among South Koreans and Canadians (14% each) and Japanese (12%).

<b>Perceived Threats</b>						
<b>Selected Unaided Mentions</b>						
<i>There are many different potential threats and dangers to people's personal security in today's world. Thinking of all the threats that you might face in your life, which <u>one</u> is of the most concern to you now?</i>						
Percentage mentioning:						
	Criminal violence	Nuclear war/ proliferation	Disasters/ major accidents	Economic threats	Terrorism	Health threats
Brazil*	84%	1%	3%	3%	1%	4%
S Africa*	47%	3%	7%	6%	4%	22%
France	46%	5%	14%	2%	10%	8%
UK	26%	15%	13%	2%	6%	6%
India*	24%	5%	13%	21%	19%	5%
Canada	24%	5%	17%	9%	8%	14%
Russia*	22%	17%	10%	7%	13%	9%
USA	22%	6%	13%	7%	15%	8%
Germany	14%	12%	8%	13%	9%	3%
S Korea	6%	9%	21%	14%	3%	14%
Japan	6%	21%	24%	20%	12%	12%
*urban samples						

## **Consensus On A More Dangerous World But Personal Safety Depends On Where You Live**

In all the eleven countries polled, the majority of citizens agreed that the world has become more dangerous in the last twelve months. The highest level of agreement shows up in Brazil (89%), Japan (88%), India (78%) and South Africa (76%). Despite the events of 9/11, the perception of danger is more muted among Americans, with the smallest majority (53%) agreeing that the world has become more dangerous. This later finding is particularly at odds with the fiery rhetoric of the Bush administration which has invested considerable energy on its “war on terrorism” and “axis of evil” campaigns.

Perceptions of a more dangerous “world” don’t necessarily translate into concerns about personal safety - except among respondents in the poorest countries included in this international survey. Thus in Brazil (59%) or South Africa (62%), the majority of citizens must cope not only with a feeling that the world has become more hazardous but also with a heightened sense of personal risk. Not surprisingly this sense of personal danger is much less common in the wealthier countries surveyed - for example, fewer than one in five Americans (17%) and just one out of ten Germans or Canadians (11% each) report feeling any heightened sense of danger in their personal lives.

<b>Perceptions of Increased Threats to World Security and Personal Safety</b>			
<i>When you think about potential threats to the security of the world, do you think that over the past 12 months, the world has become more dangerous, stayed the same, or become more safe?</i>			
<i>When you think about your own personal safety over the past 12 months, do you feel that your life has become more dangerous, stayed the same, or become more safe?</i>			
Percentage saying <b>the world</b> has become more dangerous		Percentage saying <b>personal life</b> has become more dangerous	
Brazil*	89%	Brazil*	59%
Japan	88%	S Africa*	62%
India*	78%	India*	40%
S Africa*	76%	Russia*	31%
UK	74%	Japan	29%
France	68%	S Korea	27%
Russia*	68%	UK	23%
S Korea	66%	France	18%
Germany	61%	USA	17%
Canada	56%	Germany	11%
USA	53%	Canada	11%
*urban samples			

## ***What and who will make the world a safer place?***

Citizens participating in this 11-country poll are most likely to point to poverty reduction programs as the way to make the world as safer place. Large numbers also see a strong role for a greater emphasis on democracy and better trade links. Less clear is who will provide the leadership to bring these and other programs to fruition.

On the “what” of creating a safer world most urban Brazilians, and about two thirds of those in France, Germany and South Africa point directly to the need to reduce world poverty through direct aid. Canada, US and the UK support this “cure” though still, the 50% plus range is more muted. In the final four countries – two of which (India and Russia) are relatively poor – and two of which (Japan and South Korea) are Asian; those who feel that direct aid should play a major role stand at fewer than 50% of respondents.

On the issue of increased trade and investment there is even less consensus. Only in Brazil does a majority of those polled feel that this will play a major role in making the world a safer place. Support for democracy as an antidote to increased danger also lacks resonance with citizens in most of the eleven countries polled – only in urban Brazil, France and Germany do more than 50% of those polled point to increased democracy as playing a major role in making the world a safer place.

On the issue of “who” is playing a major role to increase global security – the most noteworthy finding from this survey is the failure of the UN to receive anything close to an enthusiastic endorsement. Those ascribing a “major role” to the UN range from a low of 22% in South Korea to a high of 52% in Canada.

A common misconception is that the inability (or unwillingness) of the UN to fulfill its leadership mandate is offset by the USA as the world’s only remaining superpower. With the exception of Canada, Germany and the UK, only a minority of respondents in the other countries and areas polled see the US as playing a major role in making the world a safer place. With increasing US unilateralism on several fronts including missile defense and the international criminal court America’s rating as a leader in global security may be increasingly in doubt even among its traditional NATO allies.

Finally, this poll sees little weight placed on citizens groups and other NGOs as effective mechanisms for increasing global security and safety. Only in Brazil do such organizations receive widespread support as effective agents of change.

**Can Certain Groups or Processes Make the World Safer?**

*I'm going to name a few countries or groups that could have a major impact on the world. Please tell me if you think their current actions or policies play a major role, a moderate role, or no role at all in making the world a safer place?*

	Percentage saying "major role"					
	A reduction in world poverty	Increased trade and investment between countries	An increase in the number of democracies in the world	United States	United Nations	Citizens' groups that work for peace and justice
Brazil*	81%	59%	53%	43%	46%	67%
India*	36%	43%	37%	41%	33%	35%
S Africa*	65%	48%	42%	37%	43%	34%
France	62%	40%	50%	43%	45%	28%
S Korea	26%	36%	31%	33%	22%	26%
Canada	57%	40%	40%	72%	52%	23%
USA	51%	45%	47%	80%	46%	20%
UK	51%	45%	38%	61%	50%	18%
Japan	40%	21%	26%	29%	37%	14%
Germany	62%	42%	55%	67%	40%	12%
Russia*	43%	34%	19%	45%	31%	10%

\*urban samples

**Global Warming seen as biggest future threat**

Asked to comment on the likelihood of five specific threats (see table below) actually occurring over the next ten years, a plurality of respondents in eight of the eleven countries polled, say that global warming will definitely happen. Among the three countries naming other risks as more likely, South Africans are more obsessed by crime (though global warming comes in a close second) while both Americans and Russians are more likely to point to the likelihood of a war between the West and the Islamic world. Perhaps reflecting the views of their President on the Kyoto accord, the percentage of Americans anxious about global warming is only about half the level found elsewhere.

Belief in the reality of the global warming risk towers over other concerns in Western Europe and Asia. In the three poorest countries polled (India, Brazil and South Africa) it shares the top spot with other concerns – especially the risk of crime victimization. Though a terrorist nuclear attack and “holy war” garner less concern, it is worth noting that risk of the former is seen as highest in the three poorest countries – India, Brazil and South Africa.

<b>Perceived Probability of Possible Threats to the World</b>					
<i>Please tell me if you think each of the following possible threats is something that you think will definitely happen, probably happen, probably not happen, or definitely not happen in the next 10 years.</i>					
	Percentage saying “definitely happen”				
	You being a victim of violence in your own country	A major war between western countries and Islamic countries	Terrorists using nuclear bombs or weapons of mass destruction	Harmful effects of global warming or other environmental problems	A worldwide depression or economic collapse
Brazil*	33%	37%	30%	38%	31%
S Africa*	27%	28%	22%	20%	27%
India*	20%	31%	36%	37%	33%
France	11%	17%	17%	31%	12%
UK	7%	18%	11%	29%	10%
USA	7%	18%	10%	15%	7%
Japan	7%	9%	15%	36%	20%
Russia*	5%	14%	4%	9%	8%
S Korea	5%	22%	21%	44%	17%
Germany	4%	6%	5%	29%	6%
Canada	4%	14%	12%	31%	12%
*urban samples					

***Majority Of Those Polled In Nine Countries Believe The Bush Missile Defense Plan Will Make The World A More Dangerous Place***

At a time when the USA is looking for allies to support its “War on Terrorism”, the Bush Administration’s intention to proceed with its missile defense shield threatens to undermine its leadership position. A majority of citizens in nine of eleven countries polled feel the Bush Administration’s plan to push ahead with a missile defense initiative will make the world more dangerous.

Only in the United States do a majority of citizens believe that the missile defense system approved by the Bush administration will create a “safer” world. In nine of the other ten countries polled, including some of the US’s most important allies, majorities of the general public believe that this initiative is creating a higher level of risk and danger worldwide. The peoples most likely to feel the world will be a more dangerous place given the Americans’ missile defense plans include the Brazilians (80%) and the South Koreans (74%). Across Western Europe opponents outnumber supporters of this plan by almost two to one.

Even in Canada a slight majority feel that this program will create a more dangerous world - compared to only 42% who agree with a majority of their southern neighbours that the missile defense system will create a safer world.

Among the urban respondents polled in India, attitudes towards this initiative are the most mixed - 43% say they feel safer with such an initiative and 28% say it will make the world more dangerous, but another 29% “don’t know.” This finding is not surprising in light of renewed tensions between India and Pakistan - both nuclear nations.

<b>Response to the US Missile Defense System</b>			
<i>As you may know, the United States announced plans to introduce a Missile Defense system to shoot down incoming enemy missiles. Based on whatever you've seen, read, or heard, all things considered, do you think the Strategic Missile Defense Initiative will make the world a safer place or a more dangerous place?</i>			
	Safer	Don't know	More Dangerous
USA	64%	4%	33%
India*	43%	28%	29%
Canada	42%	6%	52%
Germany	32%	9%	59%
UK	32%	16%	52%
France	25%	6%	69%
S Africa*	24%	27%	49%
Japan	21%	20%	59%
S Korea	18%	8%	74%
Brazil*	16%	5%	80%
Russia*	15%	30%	55%
*urban samples			

Though Russians are the least likely to feel the missile defenses will make the world safer (15%), twice as many are undecided (30%).



***A Significant Majority Of Citizens In Nuclear-Armed Countries Support A Treaty Prohibiting All Nuclear Weapons—And Just Over Half Think It Will Be Accomplished Sometime In The 21st Century***

The majority of citizens in nuclear-armed countries that were part of this eleven-country survey support having all countries sign a treaty prohibiting all nuclear weapons. The study also found widespread support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a “no first use” policy and a pledge by nuclear powers not to use their weapons against non-nuclear adversaries. The study included five of the world’s eight nuclear powers – the United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom and India – as well as such leading non-nuclear powers as Japan, Germany, Canada, South Korea, South Africa and Brazil. These results are especially significant at a time when the Bush administration in the US has abandoned several major arms treaties and is considering a more hawkish stance on the first use of nuclear weapons.

Notwithstanding the broad consensus in America favoring policies that limit the use and spread of nuclear weapons, there is a worrisome minority of Americans (as much as one quarter) who disavow the most sacred rules that have formed the basis of nuclear policy over the past half century. In a nation where as few as forty percent of electors may actually cast a vote for president, twenty five percent becomes a big number.

The only other country that approaches the Americans’ level of dissent with the global anti-nuclear consensus is India, where up to one in four stop short of agreeing to restrictions on the potential use of their country’s newly-developed nuclear arsenal

***No First Use***

The “no first use policy” gets “strong” agreement even from citizens of nuclear powers, especially Russia (75%), France (68%), the United Kingdom (64%) and the US (62%). On the other hand respondents that disagree with this policy represent only a fraction of respondents in most of the countries polled. The highest level of public opposition to no first use is in the USA – a total of twenty percent (10% strongly disagree with the “no first use” policy and a further 10% disagree “somewhat”). India follows closely behind the US (18%), followed by the UK (14%). It is noteworthy that in Russia, those who disagree with the no first use policy represent only about 2% of the population – a tenth the level in the USA.

<b>Opinions on “No First Use” Policy</b>					
<i>Do you agree or disagree, strongly or somewhat, that:</i>					
<i>Countries with nuclear arms should agree they will never be the first to use their nuclear weapons in a conflict?</i>					
	Agree		Disagree		Don't know
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
<i>Nuclear powers</i>					
USA	62%	17%	10%	10%	1%
Russia*	75%	19%	2%	0%	3%
France	68%	19%	4%	8%	1%
UK	64%	19%	7%	7%	4%
India*	53%	19%	7%	11%	9%
<i>Non-nuclear powers</i>					
Germany	80%	9%	6%	5%	1%
Brazil*	73%	14%	2%	9%	1%
Canada	70%	16%	6%	8%	0%
South Korea	70%	16%	8%	4%	2%
Japan	63%	31%	4%	1%	0%
S Africa*	45%	24%	9%	6%	17%
*urban samples					

### **No Use Against Non Nuclear Powers**

Like “no first use”, the vast majority of citizen’s who participated in this 11 country poll agree with the principle that “countries with nuclear arms should agree that they will not use nuclear arms against countries that don’t have them.” This principle which is intended to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, finds near universal support across the entire sample. The two major pockets of opposition are found in the US where almost one quarter of those polled disagree and India which displays similar levels of antagonism to this principle. Not surprisingly, citizens of non-nuclear powers are slightly more likely to voice strong agreement with the idea that nuclear powers should pledge not to target their non-nuclear neighbors; the proportions strongly supporting this principle in Brazil (76%), Germany (74%), South Korea (73%), and Canada (70%), run just ahead of those in the United Kingdom (69%), Russia (68%) and France (64%) and more substantially in front of the USA (58%).

<b>Opinions on “No Use Against Non-Nuclear Powers” Policy</b>					
<i>Do you agree or disagree, strongly or somewhat, that:</i>					
<i>Countries with nuclear arms should agree they will not use nuclear weapons against countries that don't have them?</i>					
	Agree		Disagree		Don't know
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
<i>Nuclear powers</i>					
USA	58%	18%	13%	11%	1%
Russia*	68%	21%	5%	2%	4%
France	64%	19%	6%	10%	0%
UK	69%	13%	8%	7%	3%
India*	45%	22%	10%	13%	11%
<i>Non-nuclear powers</i>					
Germany	74%	8%	7%	8%	2%
Brazil*	76%	13%	3%	6%	2%
Canada	70%	13%	8%	8%	1%
South Korea	73%	15%	6%	3%	2%
Japan	70%	25%	3%	1%	1%
S Africa*	53%	23%	6%	5%	13%
*urban samples					

### ***Banning Nuclear Testing***

Massive majorities of those polled across the 11 countries included in this international survey support the belief that all countries should sign the comprehensive test ban treaty which outlaws the testing of nuclear weapons. Opposition to this policy is highest again in the USA where just over one in five Americans say they disagree with this principle.

<b>Opinions on a Nuclear Weapons Test Ban</b>					
<i>Do you agree or disagree, strongly or somewhat, that:</i>					
<i>All countries should sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to outlaw nuclear weapons testing?</i>					
	Agree		Disagree		Don't know
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
<i>Nuclear powers</i>					
USA	57%	21%	10%	11%	1%
Russia*	76%	16%	3%	1%	4%
France	72%	18%	5%	4%	1%
UK	71%	18%	5%	3%	3%
India*	60%	12%	4%	6%	18%
<i>Non-nuclear powers</i>					
Germany	88%	8%	2%	2%	0%
Brazil*	87%	8%	2%	2%	1%
Canada	74%	16%	6%	4%	0%
South Korea	67%	17%	8%	3%	4%
Japan	68%	27%	4%	1%	1%
S Africa*	48%	24%	5%	5%	19%
*urban samples					

### ***Should Nuclear Weapons Be Banned?***

The idea of all countries signing a treaty that bans nuclear weapons receives massive support everywhere. Again the only pocket of significant opposition is found in the USA where just under one quarter of respondents say they would oppose such a plan.

<b>Opinions on Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons</b>					
<i>Do you agree or disagree, strongly or somewhat, that:</i>					
<i>All countries should sign a treaty that prohibits all nuclear weapons?</i>					
	Agree		Disagree		Don't know
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
<i>Nuclear powers</i>					
USA	61%	15%	10%	14%	0%
Russia*	78%	13%	4%	1%	4%
France	72%	18%	5%	4%	0%
UK	72%	12%	7%	7%	2%
India*	66%	12%	3%	4%	14%
<i>Non-nuclear powers</i>					
Germany	88%	5%	3%	3%	0%
Brazil*	89%	7%	2%	2%	1%
Canada	83%	8%	4%	5%	0%
South Korea	69%	18%	9%	3%	2%
Japan	77%	20%	2%	1%	0%
S Africa*	53%	22%	5%	5%	14%
*urban samples					

### ***Will Nuclear Weapons Be Outlawed In The 21st Century?***

Though most citizens worldwide would prefer to see a treaty which bans nuclear weapons, there is little consensus on the likelihood of this actually occurring within the next 100 years. Most optimistic on this front are Russians (68% “strongly agree”) and French (53% “strongly agree”). But only a minority in Japan, South Korea and the United States think a complete ban is likely in the next 100 years. Just one in four Americans (26%) and South Koreans (23%) and one in five Japanese (20%) “strongly agree” with this prediction.

<b>Potential for a Complete Ban of Nuclear Weapons</b>					
<i>Do you agree or disagree, strongly or somewhat, that:</i>					
<i>Nuclear weapons will eventually be outlawed by all nations some time in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?</i>					
	Agree		Disagree		Don't know
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly	
<i>Nuclear powers</i>					
USA	26	19	21	33	1
Russia*	68	16	6	3	7
France	53	20	13	14	1
UK	35	26	18	19	3
India*	28	21	8	13	30
<i>Non-nuclear powers</i>					
Germany	46	16	27	9	2
Brazil*	37	15	13	28	6
Canada	41	20	17	21	1
South Korea	23	17	31	25	4
Japan	20	29	36	14	1
S Africa*	31	20	12	11	27
*urban samples					

***Japanese Of All Ages Remember, But One In Three Americans Don't Attribute Any Special Historical Significance To The Cities Most Think That The Use Of Nuclear Bombs In Hiroshima And Nagasaki Has Served To Prevent Their Subsequent Use***

Awareness of the special historical or social significance of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki – where in 1945, the first nuclear weapons were used – varies widely. Virtually all Japanese (99%) are able to cite the historical significance of the two cities – not surprising, since the events represent a major turning point in their modern history that is commemorated annually. European references to the cities' significance, especially in Russia (92%) and Germany (88%), trailed only slightly behind that of Japan. In Canada and the UK awareness levels drop to about three-quarters of the adult populations (76% and 73%, respectively).

Perhaps most surprising are the results from the American sample. Only two-thirds (67%) of Americans, residents in the country that dropped the nuclear

bombs on the two cities, could link any historical or social significance to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Among respondents in the US under age 35 proportions of correct responses to the open-ended (unaided) question drop to 61%. Put differently, about a third of all adults in the US and almost 40% of those under age 35 were unable to identify the significance of the two cities.

In several other countries, awareness among adults of the special significance of these two cities is even lower than the USA. Roughly, half of the surveyed urban populations in South Africa (55%) and India (49%) gave a “don’t know” response to the question. (However, the level of awareness among Indians with a secondary education (33%) rivals that of general populations elsewhere.) More surprising is the finding that only 60% of adults in South Korea, the most proximate country to Japan included in the study, were able to correctly cite the historical significance of the two Japanese cities.

<b>Awareness of the Significance of Hiroshima and Nagasaki</b>				
<i>One last question before we turn to other topics. What, if any, special historical or social significance do the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have?</i>				
Percentage unaided mentions				
	Mentions relating to war, atomic or nuclear weapons, tragedy	Mentions relating to other things	No special significance	Don't know
Japan	99%	0%	0%	1%
Russia*	92%	1%	2%	5%
Germany	88%	1%	4%	7%
France	83%	3%	6%	9%
Canada	76%	4%	9%	10%
UK	73%	2%	4%	21%
USA	67%	4%	16%	14%
Brazil*	60%	2%	6%	31%
S Korea	60%	3%	2%	34%
India*	49%	2%	1%	49%
S Africa*	32%	3%	10%	55%
*urban samples				

## ***The Impact of Hiroshima And Nagasaki***

Among those respondents who were aware of the historical significance of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the majority (63%) agreed that the destruction of these two cities has served to prevent the use of nuclear weapons since then. Americans who were aware of the bombing of these cities (the 67% referred to above) were the most likely to see the “preventative” effects of this action, while Japanese respondents were among the least likely to ascribe this historical role to the bombing of their cities. In all other survey areas with the exception of Brazil’s urban sample, a majority of respondents also held this view.

<b>Historical Impact of Hiroshima and Nagasaki</b>			
<b>(asked only of those aware of special significance of the two cities)</b>			
<i>Some people have said that it is because of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that there have been no nuclear wars since then. Do you agree or disagree with this conclusion?</i>			
	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
USA	73%	26%	1%
Canada	69%	30%	1%
UK	68%	26%	5%
India*	65%	27%	7%
France	60%	37%	3%
S Africa*	60%	26%	15%
Germany	59%	37%	4%
Russia*	59%	25%	16%
Japan	57%	22%	21%
S Korea	56%	39%	5%
Brazil*	48%	48%	4%
*urban samples			

—30—

*For more information on this news release, please contact:*

**Dr. Angus Reid**  
**Phone: +1 604 697 0027**  
**Email: [angusreid@angusreid.net](mailto:angusreid@angusreid.net)**

**Julie Wagemakers**  
**Phone: +1 604 822 4288**  
**Email: [julie.wagemakers@ubc.ca](mailto:julie.wagemakers@ubc.ca)**



## *Research Methods*

Current survey questions were placed on international polling firm Ipsos-Reid's *Global Express*, a quarterly international omnibus survey ([www.ipsos-reid.com](http://www.ipsos-reid.com)). Interviews were conducted between February 20 and March 20, 2002 with 6,036 adults (ages 18+) across 11 countries.

- The target sample size in each country was 500, except for the United States where 1,000 interviews were conducted. Within each country, the survey results can be said to be within  $\pm 4.5$  percentage points of what they would have been had the entire adult population been surveyed;  $\pm 3.1$  percentage points in the United States.
- In 7 of these 11 surveyed countries, the samples provide full national coverage with data collection via randomized telephone interviewing.
- Door-to-door interviewing was used for the remaining non-national samples of Brazil, India, Russia and South Africa where the sample coverage was limited to the largest urban areas; all social classes (SECs) were included in these urban sample frames.

Country level data were weighted to match the latest available census data to ensure that the samples were demographically representative of the adult population in the surveyed areas. Cross country total percentages have also been weighted to reflect each country's or area's proportional share of the sample.

# The Centre for Public Opinion and Democracy



Located at the Liu Centre on the main campus of the University of British Columbia, Canada, the *Centre for Public Opinion and Democracy* was established to undertake original research and secondary analysis of existing studies in the growing field of global public opinion. For further information contact [UBCGlobal.net](http://UBCGlobal.net).

**University of British Columbia  
6476 N.W. Marine Drive  
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z2**