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BACKGROUND
This survey was conducted by Novus on behalf of the Global Challenges Foundation. The purpose of the survey is to map out attitudes towards global catastrophic risks and international collaborations in ten different countries. The aim of this mapping exercise is to understand public opinion.

TARGET GROUP
Members of the public who use the internet, aged 18-79, in the following countries: Australia, Brazil, China, Germany, India, Russia, South Africa, Sweden, UK and USA.

IMPLEMENTATION
A total of 10,154 interviews were conducted in ten different countries between 25 June and 9 July 2020. All interviews were conducted via web interviews, which means that the interviews reflect the proportion of the public that has access to the internet in each country. It is important to bear in mind that for some countries the results are represented to a greater extent by people living in larger cities who have a higher income and level of education. For Sweden, the survey was conducted through a Swedish panel randomly recruited by Novus that provides representative results. The surveys in the remaining nine countries were conducted by Novus’ business partners.

FIELD PERIOD:
25 JUNE – 9 JULY 2020

RESULTS
The results are provided in a graphical report containing results for each country.

When comparing differences between countries, we examined them by means of a t-test. A t-test aims to examine whether there are significant differences between two groups.

When we compare different significant differences in sub-groups (gender, age and education), these are compared, in contrast to the t-test, with the total for each country using what is known as a chi-2 test.

MARGIN OF ERROR
With 1,000 interviews:
At a drop-off rate of 20/80: +/- 2.5%
At a drop-off rate of 50/50: +/- 3.2%
Countries surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>No. of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 10,154 interviews
Results
The public’s perception of global catastrophic risks

When we talk about global catastrophic risks, we mean events or threats that might cause humanity serious damage worldwide, whether immediately or in the future, with the potential to affect 10% or more of the global population.
Summary

A SAFER OR A LESS SAFE WORLD

• A majority in all countries believe that the **world is less safe today** than it was two years ago. We find the biggest proportion who think the world has become less safe in South Africa, Australia, Russia and Brazil, while the lowest proportion may be found in India, Germany and Sweden.

• Older people are generally more inclined to feel that the world is less safe now than two years ago. A common feature for all countries, apart from Brazil, is that the number of those who feel that the world has become less safe increases with age.

CURRENT STATE OF THE WORLD

• When we ask them to describe their general view of the state of the world in their own words, this is shaped by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The word **pandemic** is one of the words that occurs most frequently in all countries. Other common descriptions of the state of the world are, for example, that it is **unsafe, frightening or chaotic**.

• **Climate and environmental issues** are also raised in several countries. This is particularly true of Germany and partly of Sweden, although these issues are also mentioned in different ways in many of the other countries. In the UK, Brazil, India and Russia, they are often mentioned in relation to pollution.
When it comes to global catastrophic risks, how much safer or less safe would you say the world is today, compared to two years ago?

- **South Africa**
  - Much safer: 7%
  - A little safer: 10%
  - No change: 9%
  - A little less safe: 23%
  - Far less safe: 51%
  - Don’t Know: 1%

- **Australia**
  - Much safer: 3%
  - A little safer: 6%
  - No change: 20%
  - A little less safe: 29%
  - Far less safe: 40%
  - Don’t Know: 3%

- **Russia**
  - Much safer: 3%
  - A little safer: 6%
  - No change: 22%
  - A little less safe: 38%
  - Far less safe: 30%
  - Don’t Know: 2%

- **Brazil**
  - Much safer: 4%
  - A little safer: 11%
  - No change: 17%
  - A little less safe: 31%
  - Far less safe: 36%
  - Don’t Know: 1%

- **China**
  - Much safer: 8%
  - A little safer: 13%
  - No change: 13%
  - A little less safe: 32%
  - Far less safe: 34%
  - Don’t Know: 0%

- **USA**
  - Much safer: 7%
  - A little safer: 6%
  - No change: 19%
  - A little less safe: 26%
  - Far less safe: 39%
  - Don’t Know: 3%

- **UK**
  - Much safer: 3%
  - A little safer: 8%
  - No change: 22%
  - A little less safe: 33%
  - Far less safe: 32%
  - Don’t Know: 3%

- **Sweden**
  - Much safer: 2%
  - A little safer: 7%
  - No change: 28%
  - A little less safe: 39%
  - Far less safe: 22%
  - Don’t Know: 3%

- **Germany**
  - Much safer: 2%
  - A little safer: 8%
  - No change: 28%
  - A little less safe: 31%
  - Far less safe: 28%
  - Don’t Know: 2%

- **India**
  - Much safer: 14%
  - A little safer: 19%
  - No change: 8%
  - A little less safe: 29%
  - Far less safe: 29%
  - Don’t Know: 1%

**Top Box**
- South Africa: 17%
- Australia: 8%
- Russia: 9%
- Brazil: 15%
- China: 21%
- USA: 15%
- UK: 11%
- Sweden: 8%
- Germany: 11%
- India: 33%

**Bottom Box**
- South Africa: 73%
- Australia: 69%
- Russia: 68%
- Brazil: 67%
- China: 66%
- USA: 66%
- UK: 65%
- Sweden: 61%
- Germany: 59%
- India: 58%

**BASE:** BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
**Older people feel that the world is less safe now than two years ago**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aged 18-29</th>
<th>Aged 30-49</th>
<th>Aged 50-64</th>
<th>Aged 65-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe the state of the world in no more than three words.
Please describe the state of the world in no more than three words
Please describe the state of the world in no more than three words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic 139</td>
<td>Scary 85</td>
<td>Pandemic 82</td>
<td>Climate 82</td>
<td>Pandemic 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried 110</td>
<td>Chaotic 71</td>
<td>Uncertain 62</td>
<td>Unsure 61</td>
<td>Scary 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain 77</td>
<td>Pandemic 66</td>
<td>Scary 61</td>
<td>COVID-19 56</td>
<td>Danger 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War 53</td>
<td>Chaos 54</td>
<td>Insecure 44</td>
<td>Pandemic 52</td>
<td>Uncertain 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaos 49</td>
<td>Confused 48</td>
<td>Danger 41</td>
<td>Danger 49</td>
<td>Unstable 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate crisis 36</td>
<td>Uncertain 44</td>
<td>Unstable 41</td>
<td>Broken 48</td>
<td>Worry 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern 35</td>
<td>Danger 43</td>
<td>Chaotic 41</td>
<td>Change 48</td>
<td>Chaotic 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump 31</td>
<td>Crazy 40</td>
<td>Chaos 38</td>
<td>War 48</td>
<td>Polluted 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 30</td>
<td>Sad 38</td>
<td>Scare 35</td>
<td>Environmental 44</td>
<td>Unsafe 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders 27</td>
<td>Scare 36</td>
<td>Recess 34</td>
<td>Overpopulated 35</td>
<td>Mess 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable 26</td>
<td>Unstable 36</td>
<td>Worried 33</td>
<td>Poverty 34</td>
<td>Confused 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried 24</td>
<td>Divide 31</td>
<td>Confused 33</td>
<td>Catastrophe 32</td>
<td>Selfish 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change 23</td>
<td>Unrest 28</td>
<td>Crazy 30</td>
<td>III 31</td>
<td>Divided 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe 21</td>
<td>Good 26</td>
<td>Unsafe 28</td>
<td>Terror 30</td>
<td>Scare 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famine 21</td>
<td>Bad 25</td>
<td>Crisis 27</td>
<td>Bad 29</td>
<td>Insecure 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis 20</td>
<td>Fear 23</td>
<td>Covid 26</td>
<td>Chaotic 28</td>
<td>Crisis 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty 19</td>
<td>Unsafe 23</td>
<td>Selfish 24</td>
<td>Dirty 27</td>
<td>Unsafe 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightening 17</td>
<td>Lost 22</td>
<td>Trouble 24</td>
<td>Endangered 27</td>
<td>Chaos 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarised 16</td>
<td>Hate 21</td>
<td>Virus 23</td>
<td>Disaster 25</td>
<td>Crazy 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Please describe the state of the world in no more than three words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pandemic</td>
<td>Chaotic</td>
<td>Pandemic</td>
<td>Epidemic</td>
<td>Pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Pandemic</td>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>Scary</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>Polluted</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Virus</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Chaotic</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Catastrophe</td>
<td>Corrupt</td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Sick</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Covid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warming</td>
<td>Worrisome</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Calamity</td>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>Turmoil</td>
<td>Polluted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Deforested</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemic</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Panic</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>COVID-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Covid</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The public’s risk assessment of global catastrophic risks
Summary

GLOBAL RISKS

• A majority of the population in all countries in the survey regard climate change, environmental degradation, political violence, weapons of mass destruction, pandemics, artificial intelligence, population increases and extreme poverty as potential global catastrophic risks.

• In certain countries, more events are more likely to be considered as potential risks. This is particularly true of people in India, Brazil and South Africa. On the other side, i.e. those who generally see fewer risks, we find the USA. People in the USA consider climate change, environmental degradation and pandemics to be significantly lower risks than those in most other countries.

• In general, women in most countries are more likely to view more events as potential risks. We see this in countries such as Sweden, the UK, Germany, Brazil and Russia, while women in countries such as China and India do not differ from men quite as much.
Summary

CLIMATE CHANGE

• Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps, is considered a global catastrophic risk to the greatest degree by people living in Brazil, South Africa and India. Residents in any of these three countries are more likely to consider climate change to be a risk than those in other countries in the survey.

OTHER LARGE-SCALE ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION

• Large-scale environmental degradation, such as pollution of water, air and soil, is considered a global disaster to the highest degree by people in Brazil, South Africa, Sweden and India.

POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE AND CONFLICTS THAT ESCALATE INTO WAR

• Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war are very much regarded as a risk in Brazil, but also in South Africa, Sweden and Russia.
Summary

THE USE OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION
(NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS)

• The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons) is considered to be a global catastrophic risk to a greater extent among people in Brazil, but it is also considered a major risk in Russia, India, South Africa and Sweden.

EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS

• Epidemics and pandemics are regarded as a global catastrophic risk to the greatest extent by people in Brazil, who are more likely to think so than those in other countries, although closely followed by Sweden, South Africa, China and India, who also regard it as a significant risk.

THE CREATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE THAT MIGHT ACHIEVE SUPERHUMAN KNOWLEDGE AND MAKE INDEPENDENT DECISIONS, THEREBY BECOMING A THREAT TO HUMANITY

• The creation of Artificial Intelligence that might be able to achieve superhuman knowledge and make independent decisions, which is regarded as a risk of a global catastrophic risk to the greatest extent by people in India, who believe this more than those in other countries.
Summary

**POPULATION GROWTH**

- Population growth is considered a global catastrophic risk to the greatest extent by people in India, they believe this more so than those in other countries. People in Russia consider it a risk to a lesser extent than those in other countries.

**EXTREME POVERTY**

- Extreme poverty is considered to be a global catastrophic risk to the greatest extent among people in South Africa and Brazil, with people in both countries mentioning it more than those in other countries. Extreme poverty is considered to be a risk to the least extent among the people of China.

**TOP 3 RANKING - WHICH RISKS NEED ADDRESSING MOST URGENTLY**

- For six out of ten countries, the issue of epidemics and pandemics leads the way as the issue that people believe should be addressed first. The issue of pandemics comes first in Australia, the UK, the USA, India, Brazil and China.

- In Sweden and Germany, by contrast, the issue of climate change leads the way, while extreme poverty comes first in South Africa, and the use of weapons of mass destruction comes first in Russia.
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: Brazil 93%, South Africa 91%, India 91%, China 89%, Sweden 88%, UK 85%, Russia 83%, Germany 83%, USA 73%

Bottom Box: Brazil 6%, South Africa 8%, India 8%, China 10%, Sweden 10%, UK 12%, Russia 14%, Germany 14%, USA 22%
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
Other large-scale environmental degradation, such as pollutions of water, air and soil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Top Box</th>
<th>Bottom Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk: Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war

Global Catastrophic Risks and International Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Box**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bottom Box**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box
- Brazil: 88%
- Russia: 83%
- India: 83%
- Sweden: 83%
- South Africa: 82%
- UK: 78%
- Australia: 77%
- USA: 76%
- Germany: 68%
- China: 67%

Bottom Box
- Brazil: 11%
- Russia: 13%
- India: 15%
- Sweden: 15%
- South Africa: 15%
- UK: 18%
- Australia: 18%
- USA: 19%
- Germany: 26%
- China: 31%
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk: Epidemics and pandemics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: Agree completely
Bottom Box: Don't Know
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
The creation of Artificial Intelligence that might achieve superhuman knowledge and make independent decisions, thereby becoming a threat to humanity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: 73%  Bottom Box: 25%
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
Population growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: Agree completely
Bottom Box: Disagree to some extent

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:

**Extreme poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box | Bottom Box
---|---
93% | 6% |
91% | 8% |
83% | 15% |
80% | 17% |
77% | 19% |
77% | 18% |
76% | 22% |
75% | 20% |
73% | 22% |
62% | 35% |

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
How much do you agree or disagree that the following may be considered a global catastrophic risk:
Replied that they agree fully or partly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other large-scale environmental degradation, such as water, air and soil pollution</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme poverty</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of Artificial Intelligence that might achieve superhuman knowledge and make independent decisions, thereby becoming a threat to humanity</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
How urgent do you think it is to address each of the following risks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Other large-scale environmental degradation, such as water, air and soil pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Epidemics and pandemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Epidemics and pandemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Epidemics and pandemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Epidemics and pandemics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
How urgent do you think it is to address each of the following risks?

Please rank the risks from those requiring “most urgent” to “least urgent” action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons)</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Extreme poverty</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>Extreme poverty</td>
<td>Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Epidemics and pandemics</td>
<td>Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war</td>
<td>Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,003), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
The world’s natural resources
Summary

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF POPULATION GROWTH BY 2100

- A majority in all countries, apart from India, have a negative view of the population growth that is expected to happen by the year 2100 according to the UN’s latest forecasts. People in Sweden, Germany and the UK are particularly negative about the consequences of impending population growth, more so than those in the other countries.

- A general observation is that younger people tend to see the consequences as something slightly more positive; this applies to most of the countries, apart from Sweden, Brazil and Russia.

- Highly educated people, regardless of country, tend to see the consequences as more negative.

LIMITED NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE WORLD

- When asked whether they believe that the world’s natural resources are sufficient to enable all the world’s inhabitants to have the same standard of living as the industrialised countries right now, given modern technology, natural resources are seen as insufficient in most of the countries. More than half of the people in almost all of the countries except Russia agree, fully or partly, that natural resources are insufficient. Those who feel in particular that they are insufficient compared to those in other countries are people in Sweden, Germany and the UK.
According to the UN’s latest forecasts, the world’s population will increase from 7.8 billion to 10.9 billion by 2100. Do you believe that the consequences of such an increase in the population would be:
According to the UN’s latest forecasts, the world’s population will increase from 7.8 billion to 10.9 billion by 2100. Do you believe that the consequences of such an increase in the population would be very or quite negative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Aged 18-29</th>
<th>Aged 30-49</th>
<th>Aged 50-64</th>
<th>Aged 65-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
According to the UN’s latest forecasts, the world’s population will increase from 7.8 billion to 10.9 billion by 2100. Do you believe that the consequences of such an increase in the population would be very or quite negative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Upper secondary school or equivalent</th>
<th>Institute of higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
With modern technology, to what extent do you agree that the world’s natural resources are sufficient to enable all of the inhabitants of the earth to have the same standard of living as industrialised countries have right now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Box:**
- India: 50%
- Brazil: 48%
- South Africa: 36%
- China: 35%
- Australia: 34%
- UK: 23%
- Germany: 22%
- Sweden: 14%

**Bottom Box:**
- India: 48%
- Brazil: 45%
- South Africa: 60%
- China: 61%
- Australia: 63%
- UK: 64%
- Germany: 73%
- Sweden: 81%

**BASE:** BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
COVID-19 pandemic
Summary

How Affected People Are by the COVID-19 Pandemic

- People in Brazil, South Africa, China and India respond to a greater extent than those in other countries that they are affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. In India and South Africa, the biggest proportion, 56%, say that they are highly affected.

- If we look at how different age groups perceive how much they are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, there are many differences between the countries. In Sweden, it is to a greater extent older people who feel significantly affected, while in many other countries it is those who are younger and/or middle-aged who feel significantly more affected; this is the case for people in Australia, South Africa, India, Germany and China. There are no significant differences between age groups in the USA, the UK, Brazil and Russia.

- In Sweden, the UK, Australia, Brazil and Russia, women are more likely to respond that they are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

In What Way People Are Affected by the Ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic

- Those who are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic often mention that they have worked from home and stayed at home, restrictions and isolation, as well as reduced social contacts.
Summary

CHANGES IN THE WAY THEY LIVE IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF INFECTION IN THE PANDEMIC

• When asked how they are prepared to change the way they live in order to prevent the spread of infection in the pandemic, a majority in all countries reply that they are willing to do at least one or more things.

• Changes that they might consider making differ slightly between countries; in Australia, the UK and Russia, people respond to a greater extent that they are prepared to accept a lockdown of society.
### How affected or unaffected would you say that you are by the following:
Ongoing COVID-19 pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Very much affected</th>
<th>Quite affected</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Quite unaffected</th>
<th>Very much unaffected</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Box**

- Brazil: 90%
- South Africa: 89%
- China: 89%
- India: 89%
- Russia: 87%
- UK: 77%
- USA: 70%
- Sweden: 69%
- Australia: 54%
- Germany: 28%

**Bottom Box**

- Brazil: 5%
- South Africa: 6%
- China: 3%
- India: 5%
- Russia: 12%
- UK: 14%
- USA: 12%
- Sweden: 15%
- Australia: 21%
- Germany: 49%
How affected or unaffected would you say that you are by the pandemic?
Highly or somewhat affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Aged 18-29</th>
<th>Aged 30-49</th>
<th>Aged 50-64</th>
<th>Aged 65-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
In what way are you affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic?
In what way are you affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic?
In what way or ways are you prepared to change the way you live in order to prevent the spread of infection in a pandemic?
In what way or ways are you prepared to change the way you live in order to prevent the spread of infection in a pandemic?

Russia

- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 62%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%

South Africa

- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 62%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%

India

- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 62%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%

Brazil

- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 62%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%

China

- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 62%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 55%
- Reduce level of social contacts: 82%
- Work from home as far as possible: 50%
- Travel Less: 47%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 75%
- Work from home as far as possible: 74%
- Use face covering in public environments: 70%
- Travel Less: 69%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 68%
- Use face covering in public environments: 62%
- Meet risk groups to a lesser extent: 43%
- Accept lockdown of society and quarantine: 1%
Climate change
Summary

HOW AFFECTED PEOPLE ARE BY CLIMATE CHANGE

• In half of the countries, a majority respond that they are affected by ongoing climate change; this is the case for people in India, Brazil, China, South Africa and Russia, all of whom say to a greater extent than those in other countries that they are affected.

• In six of the countries, women say to a greater extent that they are affected by ongoing climate change; this is the case in Sweden, the UK, Australia, Germany, Brazil and Russia.

• There are no specific trends in how affected people are when it comes to age.

HOW PEOPLE ARE AFFECTED

• Those affected by ongoing climate change often mention changes in the weather in the form of high temperatures, pollution, droughts/fires and floods.
Summary

PREVENTING FUTURE CLIMATE DISASTERS

• A large majority in all countries are prepared to make changes in their current way of life in order to avoid climate disasters in the future.

• The extent differs slightly between the countries. People in Brazil, India and South Africa express most strongly that we should make significant changes, while people in the USA, Australia and Germany do not think so to the same extent.

• There are no huge differences in terms of gender or age in the countries. There are some significant differences, such as women in Sweden, Australia and Germany believing to a greater extent that we should try to make significant changes that affect our current standard of living, as do those aged 18-29 in the USA and Russia.
### How affected or unaffected would you say that you are by the following:

*Ongoing climate change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Very much affected</th>
<th>Quite affected</th>
<th>Neither/nor</th>
<th>Quite unaffected</th>
<th>Very much unaffected</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Box:** 84%  **Bottom Box:** 5%

**BASE:** BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
In what way are you affected by ongoing climate change?
In what way are you affected by ongoing climate change?

Russia

South Africa

India

Brazil

China
To what extent do you agree or disagree that we should try to prevent climate disasters that may occur in decades or centuries, even if it means making significant changes to our daily lives, affecting our current standard of living?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Top Box</th>
<th>Bottom Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you agree or disagree that we should try to prevent climate disasters that may occur in decades or centuries, even if it means making significant changes to our daily lives, affecting our current standard of living? Agree fully or partly

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
The global system of governance


Summary

HUMAN ACTIONS ARE THE MAIN CAUSE OF GLOBAL WARMING

• A majority in all countries agrees that human actions are the main cause of global warming. The proportion is highest in Brazil and India, and lowest in Russia and Australia.

HUMAN ACTIONS ARE THE MAIN CAUSE OF THE COVID-19 OUTBREAK

• The majority in all countries also agree that human actions are the main cause of the COVID-19 outbreak, although not to the same degree as they agree that this is the case for global warming.

POLITICIANS ARE NOT DOING ENOUGH TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE

• The majority of people in all countries feel that politicians are not doing enough to combat climate change. Those who believe this most strongly are people in Brazil, South Africa and India, while people in Australia are least likely to believe this.

POLITICIANS ARE NOT DOING ENOUGH TO TACKLE THE SPREAD OF COVID-19

• The majority do not believe that politicians are doing enough to tackle the spread of the COVID-19 in seven of the countries.

• People in Brazil, India and China believe this most strongly, while people in Sweden, Australia and Germany are least likely to believe this. Only in Australia and Germany is there a bigger proportion who disagree with this statement than agree.
Summary

IT IS UNLIKELY THAT NUCLEAR WEAPONS WILL EVER BE USED AGAIN

- Five out of ten countries in the survey possess nuclear weapons: India, China, Russia, the UK and the USA. People living in India, China and Russia, which have nuclear weapons, believe to a greater extent that it is unlikely that nuclear weapons will ever be used again. India to a greater extent than all of the other countries, and China and Russia less than India, but to a greater extent than the rest. People in the UK end up somewhere in the middle in relation to the other countries, while people in the USA are less inclined to consider it unlikely. The USA, together with Australia and Germany, are the countries that least consider it unlikely.

IN THE YEARS AHEAD, INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION WILL INCREASE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

- Asked whether international collaboration is expected to increase in the years ahead as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis, the majority of respondents in India, China, South Africa and Brazil believe this to be the case, while the countries that believe it to the least extent are Russia, the USA, Germany and Australia.

IN THE YEARS AHEAD, NATIONALISM WILL INCREASE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

- Asked whether nationalism will increase in the years ahead as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis, the biggest proportion in India and South Africa says that it will increase, while people in the USA are less inclined to believe this will happen.
Summary

WHETHER THE UN SYSTEM HAS TO BE REFORMED IN ORDER TO BETTER MANAGE GLOBAL RISKS

- Asked to what extent they agree that the UN needs to be reformed in order to better manage global risks, the biggest proportion responding that this is necessary may be found in India, China and Brazil. The lowest proportion who believe this are in the UK and Sweden.

- In six of the countries, men are more inclined to agree that the UN has to be reformed; this is the case for men in Sweden, the USA, Australia, South Africa, Germany and Russia.

WHETHER A NEW GLOBAL SUPRANATIONAL ORGANISATION SHOULD BE CREATED FOR BINDING GLOBAL DECISIONS

- Asked whether they agree that a new global supranational organisation should be created to make binding global decisions on how to manage risks, people in India, China and South Africa agree to a greater extent than those in other countries that a new one should be created. People in Germany, the USA and Sweden believe this to a lesser extent, although there is still a majority in these countries too.

- In five of the countries, men are more inclined to believe that one should be created. This is the case in the USA, Australia, South Africa, Germany and Russia, while men in Sweden and the UK are less inclined to believe that such an organisation should be created.

- How current international systems are able to deal with global risks today

- Asked whether or not they agree on whether the current international system is able to make the decisions required to manage global risks, more than half in Germany and Sweden say that this is not the case, while people in India and China reply that it is.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
Human actions are the main cause of global warming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: Brazil (90%), India (89%), South Africa (86%), Sweden (80%), China (77%), UK (77%), Germany (70%), USA (66%), Russia (63%), Australia (62%)

Bottom Box: Brazil (4%), India (3%), South Africa (5%), Sweden (8%), China (7%), UK (8%), Germany (11%), USA (16%), Russia (15%), Australia (17%)
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
Human actions are the main cause of the COVID-19 outbreak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: 86%  Bottom Box: 7%

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
Politicians are not doing enough to tackle climate change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: 83%  Bottom Box: 8%

Top Box: 87%  Bottom Box: 8%

Top Box: 87%  Bottom Box: 8%

Top Box: 87%  Bottom Box: 8%

Top Box: 87%  Bottom Box: 8%

Top Box: 87%  Bottom Box: 8%
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Politicians are not doing enough to tackle the spread of COVID-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: 81% 12% 66% 66% 63% 63% 63% 61% 44% 44% 
Bottom Box: 12% 16% 16% 16% 17% 19% 20% 25% 25% 39%
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

It is unlikely that nuclear weapons will ever be used again

---

**India**
- Agree strongly: 19%
- Agree slightly: 26%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 25%
- Disagree slightly: 18%
- Disagree strongly: 9%
- Don't Know: 2%

**China**
- Agree strongly: 8%
- Agree slightly: 29%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 36%
- Disagree slightly: 18%
- Disagree strongly: 5%
- Don't Know: 4%

**Russia**
- Agree strongly: 9%
- Agree slightly: 28%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 37%
- Disagree slightly: 16%
- Disagree strongly: 7%
- Don't Know: 4%

**Brazil**
- Agree strongly: 10%
- Agree slightly: 17%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 23%
- Disagree slightly: 23%
- Disagree strongly: 23%
- Don't Know: 4%

**UK**
- Agree strongly: 5%
- Agree slightly: 19%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 27%
- Disagree slightly: 26%
- Disagree strongly: 14%
- Don't Know: 10%

**Sweden**
- Agree strongly: 7%
- Agree slightly: 15%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 21%
- Disagree slightly: 30%
- Disagree strongly: 15%
- Don't Know: 12%

**South Africa**
- Agree strongly: 6%
- Agree slightly: 15%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 28%
- Disagree slightly: 26%
- Disagree strongly: 21%
- Don't Know: 4%

**USA**
- Agree strongly: 6%
- Agree slightly: 13%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 26%
- Disagree slightly: 28%
- Disagree strongly: 19%
- Don't Know: 7%

**Australia**
- Agree strongly: 5%
- Agree slightly: 13%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 28%
- Disagree slightly: 30%
- Disagree strongly: 16%
- Don't Know: 7%

**Germany**
- Agree strongly: 4%
- Agree slightly: 13%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 24%
- Disagree slightly: 33%
- Disagree strongly: 19%
- Don't Know: 7%

---

**Top Box**
- 46%

**Bottom Box**
- 27%

---

**BASE:** BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GERM (n=1,016), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
In the years ahead, international collaboration will increase as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Top Box: 69%*  *Bottom Box: 9%*
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
In the years ahead, nationalism will increase as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Box** | **Bottom Box**
------------|---------------
67%         | 9%            |
57%         | 10%           |
55%         | 10%           |
52%         | 13%           |
52%         | 16%           |
49%         | 13%           |
44%         | 9%            |
44%         | 10%           |
42%         | 17%           |
38%         | 15%           |
To what extent do you agree or disagree that the UN has to be reformed in order to better manage global risks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box
- India: 92%
- China: 90%
- Brazil: 87%
- USA: 71%
- Australia: 70%
- Germany: 70%
- Russia: 70%
- Sweden: 68%
- UK: 68%

Bottom Box
- India: 5%
- China: 4%
- Brazil: 9%
- USA: 10%
- Australia: 10%
- Germany: 14%
- Russia: 11%
- Sweden: 7%
- UK: 10%
To what extent do you agree that a new global supranational organisation should be created to make binding global decisions on how to manage global risks?

A global supranational organisation is an international body that has been mandated by Member States to take binding decisions on certain defined issues. It does not replace national governments, but places global interests above the interests of nation states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agree completely</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree to some extent</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Box: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)

Bottom Box: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the fact that the current international system, with almost 200 independent states, is capable of taking the decisions necessary to manage global risks?

- **India**: 29% Agree completely, 39% Agree to some extent, 20% Disagree to some extent, 8% Completely Disagree, 4% Don't Know
- **China**: 13% Agree completely, 49% Agree to some extent, 25% Disagree to some extent, 5% Completely Disagree, 8% Don't Know
- **Russia**: 11% Agree completely, 40% Agree to some extent, 27% Disagree to some extent, 11% Completely Disagree, 11% Don't Know
- **Brazil**: 13% Agree completely, 35% Agree to some extent, 27% Disagree to some extent, 21% Completely Disagree, 4% Don't Know
- **South Africa**: 13% Agree completely, 32% Agree to some extent, 30% Disagree to some extent, 19% Completely Disagree, 7% Don't Know
- **USA**: 11% Agree completely, 26% Agree to some extent, 31% Disagree to some extent, 16% Completely Disagree, 17% Don't Know
- **UK**: 7% Agree completely, 29% Agree to some extent, 32% Disagree to some extent, 16% Completely Disagree, 16% Don't Know
- **Australia**: 6% Agree completely, 25% Agree to some extent, 30% Disagree to some extent, 20% Completely Disagree, 19% Don't Know
- **Germany**: 4% Agree completely, 26% Agree to some extent, 40% Disagree to some extent, 21% Completely Disagree, 10% Don't Know
- **Sweden**: 4% Agree completely, 25% Agree to some extent, 26% Disagree to some extent, 33% Completely Disagree, 13% Don't Know

**Top Box**
- India: 69%
- China: 62%
- Russia: 50%
- Brazil: 48%
- South Africa: 48%
- USA: 45%
- UK: 36%
- Australia: 31%
- Germany: 30%
- Sweden: 29%

**Bottom Box**
- India: 28%
- China: 30%
- Russia: 38%
- Brazil: 48%
- South Africa: 49%
- USA: 47%
- UK: 48%
- Australia: 50%
- Germany: 61%
- Sweden: 58%
To what extent do you agree or disagree that the UN has to be reformed in order to better manage global risks?
Agree fully or partly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top box: 75% 61% 70% 66% 76% 66% 74% 67% 85% 80% 92% 91% 77% 64% 87% 86% 90% 90% 78% 62%

To what extent do you agree that a new global supranational organisation should be created to make binding global decisions on how to manage global risks?
Agree fully or partly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top box: 51% 51% 63% 68% 56% 52% 56% 63% 79% 79% 90% 87% 61% 55% 70% 77% 80% 80% 78% 62%

The marked squares are respectively positive and negative significance by age and country, as each age category is tested if it is significantly smaller or larger than the national total. The colour purple means it is significantly bigger than the total and orange significantly smaller.
Allocation of responsibility
Summary

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with climate change, the population in six out of ten countries replies that existing global organisations are most appropriate, while four out of ten countries believe that a new global supranational organisation is most appropriate for dealing with this problem. The countries that mention a **new global supranational organisation** first of all are Australia, the UK (equal numbers believe that a new and an existing organisation are appropriate), South Africa and India.

- The USA is the country that responds to the lowest extent that a supranational organisation is most appropriate.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES SUCH AS POLLUTION

- The general public in seven countries believe that existing global organisations are most appropriate for dealing with environmental issues such as pollution, while three out of ten countries respond that a new global supranational organisation would be most appropriate. The countries that respond that existing ones are most appropriate are Sweden, the UK, the USA, Germany, Russia, Brazil and China, while **Australia, South Africa and India** respond that a **new organisation would be most appropriate**.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE OR CONFLICTS

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with politically motivated violence and conflicts, nine out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate for this. Only India responds that a new global supranational organisation would be more appropriate.
Summary

**MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS)**

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with weapons of mass destruction, **nine out of ten countries** believe that **existing global organisations are most appropriate for this**. India is the only country where the majority responds that a new global supranational actor is most appropriate.

**MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS**

- The population in all countries except India believes that **existing global organisations** are most appropriate for dealing with **epidemics and pandemics**.

**MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND OTHER POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS TECHNOLOGIES**

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with Artificial Intelligence and other potentially dangerous technologies, six out of ten countries respond that a **new global supranational organisation** is most appropriate (Australia, Russia, South Africa, India, Brazil, China)

- Three out of ten countries, **Sweden, the UK and Germany**, respond in the first instance that **existing global organisations** are most appropriate.

- **The USA** responds that **they themselves** are most appropriate. One in four Americans believes that they themselves are most appropriate, with a corresponding figure for Russia of one in twenty and for China of one in ten.
Summary

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH POPULATION GROWTH

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for managing population growth, eight out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate. South Africa and India respond primarily that their own country is most appropriate.

- In general, there is consistently a bigger proportion in each state that believes that their own state is appropriate for dealing with this issue.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH EXTREME POVERTY

- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for tackling extreme poverty, nine out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate. India replies that it is primarily their own state.
Most appropriate for dealing with climate change

- **Sweden**: 45% for existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc., 36% for A new global supranational organisation, 14% for your nation state, 8% for global companies, 3% for international courts, 1% for USA, 3% for China, 0% for Russia, 5% for other.

- **Australia**: 31% for existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc., 31% for A new global supranational organisation, 10% for your nation state, 8% for global companies, 3% for international courts, 2% for USA, 3% for China, 2% for Russia, 7% for other.

- **UK**: 36% for existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc., 36% for A new global supranational organisation, 10% for your nation state, 8% for global companies, 3% for international courts, 2% for USA, 2% for China, 1% for Russia, 3% for other.

- **USA**: 33% for existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc., 27% for A new global supranational organisation, 20% for your nation state, 9% for global companies, 2% for international courts, 1% for USA, 2% for China, 1% for Russia, 1% for other.

- **Germany**: 40% for existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc., 33% for A new global supranational organisation, 8% for your nation state, 8% for global companies, 2% for international courts, 2% for USA, 2% for China, 1% for Russia, 4% for other.
Most appropriate for dealing with climate change

Russia

South Africa

India

Brazil

China

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc:
- Russia: 40%
- South Africa: 35%
- India: 33%
- Brazil: 33%
- China: 48%

A new global supranational organisation:
- Russia: 32%
- South Africa: 33%
- India: 30%
- Brazil: 30%
- China: 42%

Your nation state:
- Russia: 13%
- South Africa: 14%
- India: 13%
- Brazil: 11%
- China: 8%

Global companies:
- Russia: 4%
- South Africa: 8%
- India: 5%
- Brazil: 12%
- China: 7%

International courts:
- Russia: 3%
- South Africa: 0%
- India: 3%
- Brazil: 3%
- China: 0%

Most appropriate for dealing with climate change:
- Russia: Your nation state
- South Africa: Global companies
- India: A new global supranational organisation
- Brazil: A new global supranational organisation
- China: Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with environmental issues such as pollution

Sweden
- Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc: 47%
- A new global supranational organisation: 30%
- Your nation state: 10%
- International courts: 4%
- Global companies: 3%
- China: 1%
- USA: 1%
- Russia: 0%
- Other: 3%

Australia
- Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc: 29%
- A new global supranational organisation: 29%
- Your nation state: 22%
- International courts: 7%
- Global companies: 4%
- USA: 2%
- China: 1%
- Russia: 1%
- Other: 5%

UK
- Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc: 29%
- A new global supranational organisation: 32%
- Your nation state: 13%
- Global companies: 8%
- USA: 3%
- International courts: 2%
- China: 1%
- Russia: 1%
- Other: 3%

USA
- Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc: 37%
- A new global supranational organisation: 32%
- Your nation state: 13%
- Global companies: 9%
- International courts: 3%
- China: 2%
- Russia: 1%
- Other: 6%

Germany
- Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc: 40%
- A new global supranational organisation: 29%
- Your nation state: 12%
- Global companies: 7%
- International courts: 2%
- China: 3%
- USA: 2%
- Other: 3%
Most appropriate for dealing with environmental issues such as pollution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>International courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Catastrophic Risks and International Collaboration
Most appropriate for dealing with politically motivated violence or conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with politically motivated violence or conflicts
Most appropriate for dealing with weapons of mass destruction

Sweden

Australia

UK

USA

Germany

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

International courts

Your nation state

USA

Global companies

Russia

China

Other

62% 38% 19% 8% 3% 2% 2% 0% 4% 52% 37% 20% 7% 5% 2% 1% 4%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

International courts

Your nation state

USA

Global companies

Russia

China

Other

48% 25% 9% 6% 4% 3% 2% 4% 3% 52% 37% 20% 6% 2% 1% 4% 5%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

International courts

Your nation state

USA

Global companies

Russia

China

Other

8% 11% 9% 20% 7% 6% 2% 7% 4% 2% 3% 7% 6% 2% 3% 4%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

International courts

Your nation state

USA

Global companies

Russia

China

Other

3% 7% 6% 6% 2% 3% 3% 2% 2% 1% 1% 5%
### Most appropriate for dealing with weapons of mass destruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bases:** BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with epidemics and pandemics

Sweden
Australia
UK
USA
Germany

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state
Global companies
International courts
China
USA
Russia
Other

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state
Global companies
International courts
China
USA
Russia
Other

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state
Global companies
International courts
China
USA
Russia
Other

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state
Global companies
International courts
China
USA
Russia
Other

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state
Global companies
International courts
China
USA
Russia
Other

53% 25% 12% 2% 1% 0% 5%

32% 31% 20% 4% 3% 1% 5%

38% 34% 15% 4% 3% 1% 4%

34% 27% 25% 3% 3% 0% 4%

41% 29% 16% 2% 1% 1% 4%
Most appropriate for dealing with epidemics and pandemics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASE**: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with AI and other potentially dangerous technologies

- Sweden
- Australia
- UK
- USA
- Germany

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 46%
A new global supranational organisation: 22%
International courts: 9%
Global companies: 8%
Your nation state: 7%
USA: 1%
China: 0%
Russia: 0%
Other: 6%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 31%
A new global supranational organisation: 28%
Your nation state: 12%
Global companies: 11%
International courts: 10%
USA: 4%
China: 3%
Russia: 0%
Other: 7%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 27%
A new global supranational organisation: 24%
Your nation state: 12%
Global companies: 10%
International courts: 7%
USA: 5%
China: 3%
Russia: 1%
Other: 5%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 25%
A new global supranational organisation: 24%
Your nation state: 20%
Global companies: 11%
International courts: 6%
USA: 4%
China: 2%
Other: 10%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 32%
A new global supranational organisation: 23%
Global companies: 12%
Your nation state: 10%
International courts: 6%
USA: 5%
China: 4%
Other: 1%
Most appropriate for dealing with AI and other potentially dangerous technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASE: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with population growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new global supranational organisation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your nation state</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International courts</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global companies</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, NATO, etc

A new global supranational organisation

Your nation state

China

International courts

Global companies

USA

Russia

Other

Bases: BRA (n=1,003), SAF (n=1,003), IND (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), RUS (n=1,015), GER (n=1,003), USA (n=1,000), AUS (n=1,001)
Most appropriate for dealing with population growth

- **Russia**
  - Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 40%
  - A new global supranational organisation: 30%
- **South Africa**
  - Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 26%
  - A new global supranational organisation: 21%
- **India**
  - Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 21%
  - A new global supranational organisation: 21%
- **Brazil**
  - Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 35%
  - A new global supranational organisation: 19%
- **China**
  - Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc: 49%
  - A new global supranational organisation: 26%

Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc

- **Global companies**: 40%
- **Russia**: 30%
- **USA**: 12%
- **Global companies**: 30%
- **Russia**: 5%
- **USA**: 5%
- **International courts**: 12%
- **Other**: 5%

A new global supranational organisation

- **China**: 8%
- **Global companies**: 7%
- **International courts**: 4%
- **Russia**: 2%
- **Other**: 1%
Most appropriate for dealing with extreme poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BASE: BRA (n=1,000), SAO (n=1,000), DCD (n=1,000), CHN (n=1,015), SWE (n=1,114), GBR (n=1,000), USA (n=1,000), IND (n=1,000)*
Most appropriate for dealing with extreme poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Existing global organisations in collaboration such as UN, EU, AU, NATO, etc</th>
<th>Your nation state</th>
<th>A new global supranational organisation</th>
<th>Global companies</th>
<th>International courts</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of results
The public’s perception of global catastrophic risks

A SAFER OR A LESS SAFE WORLD

• Asked whether the world has become safer or less safe over the past two years when it comes to global risks, a majority of all countries say that the world is less safe today than it was two years ago. We find the biggest proportion who think the world has become less safe in South Africa, Australia, Russia and Brazil, while the lowest proportion may be found in India, Germany and Sweden.

• Older people are generally more inclined to feel that the world is less safe now than two years ago. A common feature for all countries, apart from Brazil, is that the number of those who feel that the world has become less safe increases with age.

CURRENT STATE OF THE WORLD

• Asked how to describe the state of the world right now, we see that the view of the state of the world is largely shaped by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The word ‘pandemic’ is one of the words that occurs most frequently in all countries. Other common descriptions of the state of the world are, for example, that it is unsafe, frightening or chaotic.

• Climate and environmental issues are also raised in several countries. This is particularly true of Germany and partly of Sweden, although these issues are also mentioned in different ways in many of the other countries. In the UK, Brazil, India and Russia, they are often mentioned in relation to pollution.
The public’s risk assessment of global catastrophic risks

GLOBAL RISKS

• Asked whether or not they agree that climate change, environmental degradation, political violence, weapons of mass destruction, pandemics, artificial intelligence, population increases and extreme poverty are considered to represent a global risk, we see that the majority of the population in all countries in the survey consider these problems to be a potential risk.

• In certain countries, the public are more likely to consider more events to be potential risks. This is particularly true of people in India, Brazil and South Africa. On the other side, i.e. those who generally see fewer risks, we find the USA. People in the USA consider climate change, environmental degradation and pandemics to be significantly lower risks than those in most other countries.

• In general, women in most countries are more likely to view more events as potential risks. We see this in countries such as Sweden, the UK, Germany, Brazil and Russia, while women in countries such as China or India do not differ from men quite as much.
The public’s risk assessment of global catastrophic risks

**CLIMATE CHANGE**
- Climate change that causes environmental degradation, such as rising sea levels or melting polar ice caps, is considered a risk of a global disaster to the greatest degree by people living in Brazil, South Africa and India. Residents in any of these three countries are more likely to consider climate change to be a risk than those in other countries in the survey.

**OTHER LARGE-SCALE ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION**
- Large-scale environmental degradation, such as pollution of water, air and soil, is considered to represent a risk of a global disaster to the highest degree by people in Brazil, South Africa, Sweden and India.

**POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE AND CONFLICTS THAT ESCALATE INTO WAR**
- Politically motivated violence and conflicts that escalate into war are very much regarded as a risk in Brazil, but also in South Africa, Sweden and Russia.
The public’s risk assessment of global catastrophic risks

THE USE OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS)

• The use of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical and biological weapons) is considered to be a risk of global disaster to a greater extent among people in Brazil, where it is considered to be a risk to a greater extent than in the other countries, but it is also considered a major risk in Russia, India, South Africa and Sweden.

EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS

• Epidemics and pandemics are regarded as a risk of a global disaster to the greatest extent by people in Brazil, who are more likely to think so than those in other countries, closely followed by Sweden, South Africa, China and India, who also regard it as a significant risk.

THE CREATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE THAT MIGHT ACHIEVE SUPERHUMAN KNOWLEDGE AND MAKE INDEPENDENT DECISIONS, THEREBY BECOMING A THREAT TO HUMANITY

• The creation of Artificial Intelligence that might be able to achieve superhuman knowledge and make independent decisions, which is regarded as a risk of a global disaster to the greatest extent by people in India, who believe this more than those in other countries. People in South Africa and Brazil also view this as a risk to a very great extent.
The public’s risk assessment of global catastrophic risks

**POPULATION GROWTH**

- Population growth is considered a risk of a global disaster to the greatest extent by people in India, they believe this more so than those in other countries. People in Russia consider it a risk to a lesser extent than those in other countries.

**EXTREME POVERTY**

- Extreme poverty is considered to be a risk of a global disaster to the greatest extent among people in South Africa and Brazil, with people in both countries mentioning it more than those in other countries. Extreme poverty is considered to be a risk to the least extent among the people of China.

**TOP 3 RANKING - WHICH RISKS NEED ADDRESSING MOST URGENTLY**

- For six out of ten countries, the issue of epidemics and pandemics leads the way as the issue that people believe should be addressed first. The issue of pandemics comes first in Australia, the UK, the USA, India, Brazil and China.

- In Sweden and Germany, by contrast, the issue of climate change leads the way, while extreme poverty comes first in South Africa, and the use of weapons of mass destruction comes first in Russia.
POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF POPULATION GROWTH BY 2100

• A majority in all countries, apart from India, have a negative view of the population growth that is expected to happen by the year 2100 according to the UN’s latest forecasts. People in Sweden, Germany and the UK are particularly negative about the consequences of impending population growth, more so than those in the other countries.

• A general observation is that younger people aged 18-29 tend to see the consequences as something slightly more positive; this applies to most of the countries, apart from Sweden, Brazil and Russia.

• Highly educated people, regardless of country, tend to see the consequences as more negative.

LIMITED NATURAL RESOURCES IN THE WORLD

• When asked whether they believe that the world’s natural resources are sufficient to enable all the world’s inhabitants to have the same standard of living as the industrialised countries right now, given modern technology, natural resources are seen as insufficient in most of the countries. More than half of the people in almost all of the countries except Russia agree, fully or partly, that natural resources are insufficient. Those who feel in particular that they are insufficient compared to other countries are people in Sweden, Germany and the UK.
HOW AFFECTED PEOPLE ARE BY THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

- People in Brazil, South Africa, China and India respond to a greater extent than those in other countries that they are affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. In India and South Africa, the biggest proportion, 56%, say that they are highly affected.

- If we look at how different age groups perceive how much they are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, there are many differences between the countries. In Sweden, it is to a greater extent older people who feel significantly affected, while in many other countries it is those who are younger and/or middle-aged who feel significantly more affected; this is the case for people in Australia, South Africa, India, Germany and China. There are no significant differences between age groups in the USA, the UK, Brazil and Russia.

- In Sweden, the UK, Australia, Brazil and Russia, women are more likely to respond that they are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

IN WHAT WAY PEOPLE ARE AFFECTED BY THE ONGOING COVID-19 PANDEMIC

- Those who are affected by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic often mention that they have worked from home and stayed at home, restrictions and isolation, as well as reduced social contacts.
COVID-19 pandemic

CHANGES IN THE WAY THEY LIVE IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF INFECTION IN THE PANDEMIC

• When asked how they are prepared to change the way they live in order to prevent the spread of infection in the pandemic, a majority in all countries reply that they are willing to do at least one or more things.

• Changes that they might consider making differ slightly between countries; in Australia, the UK and Russia, people respond to a great extent that they are prepared to accept a lockdown of society.
Climate change

**HOW AFFECTED PEOPLE ARE BY CLIMATE CHANGE**

- In half of the countries, a majority respond that they are affected by ongoing climate change; this is the case for people in India, Brazil, China, South Africa and Russia, all of whom say to a greater extent than those in other countries that they are affected.

- In six of the countries, women say to a greater extent that they are affected by ongoing climate change; this is the case in Sweden, the UK, Australia, Germany, Brazil and Russia.

- There are no specific trends in how affected people are when it comes to age.

**HOW PEOPLE ARE AFFECTED**

- Those affected by ongoing climate change often mention changes in the weather in the form of high temperatures, pollution, droughts/fires and floods.
Climate change

PREVENTING FUTURE CLIMATE DISASTERS

• A large majority in all countries are prepared to make changes in their current way of life in order to avoid climate disasters in the future.

• The extent differs slightly between the countries. People in Brazil, India and South Africa express most strongly that we should make significant changes, while people in the USA, Australia and Germany do not think so to the same extent.

• There are no huge differences in terms of gender or age in the countries. There are some significant differences, such as women in Sweden, Australia and Germany believing to a greater extent that we should try to make significant changes that affect our current standard of living, as do those aged 18-29 in the USA and Russia.
Global system of governance

HUMAN ACTIONS ARE THE MAIN CAUSE OF GLOBAL WARMING

- A majority in all countries agrees that human actions are the main cause of global warming. The proportion is highest in Brazil and India, and lowest in Russia and Australia.

HUMAN ACTIONS ARE THE MAIN CAUSE OF THE COVID-19 OUTBREAK

- The majority in all countries also agree that human actions are the main cause of the COVID-19 outbreak, although not to the same degree as they agree that this is the case for global warming.

POLITICIANS ARE NOT DOING ENOUGH TO TACKLE CLIMATE CHANGE

- The majority of people in all countries feel that politicians are not doing enough to combat climate change. Those who believe this most strongly are people in Brazil, South Africa and India, while people in Australia are least likely to believe this.

POLITICIANS ARE NOT DOING ENOUGH TO TACKLE THE SPREAD OF THE COVID-19

- The majority do not believe that politicians are doing enough to tackle the spread of the COVID-19 in seven of the countries.

- People in Brazil, India and China believe this most strongly, while people in Sweden, Australia and Germany are least likely to believe this. Only in Australia and Germany is there a bigger proportion who disagree with this statement than agree.
IT IS UNLIKELY THAT NUCLEAR WEAPONS WILL EVER BE USED AGAIN

- Five out of ten countries in the survey possess nuclear weapons: India, China, Russia, the UK and the USA. People living in India, China and Russia, which have nuclear weapons, believe to a greater extent that it is unlikely that nuclear weapons will ever be used again. India to a greater extent than all of the other countries, and China and Russia less than India, but to a greater extent than the rest. People in the UK end up somewhere in the middle in relation to the other countries, while people in the USA are less inclined to consider it unlikely. The USA, together with Australia and Germany, are the countries that least consider it unlikely.

IN THE YEARS AHEAD, INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION WILL INCREASE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

- Asked whether international collaboration is expected to increase in the years ahead as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis, the majority of respondents in India, China, South Africa and Brazil believe this to be the case, while the countries that believe it to the least extent are Russia, the USA, Germany and Australia.

IN THE YEARS AHEAD, NATIONALISM WILL INCREASE AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

- Asked whether nationalism will increase in the years ahead as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis, the biggest proportion in India and South Africa says that it will increase, while people in the USA are less inclined to believe this will happen.
Global system of governance

**WHETHER THE UN SYSTEM HAS TO BE REFORMED IN ORDER TO BETTER MANAGE GLOBAL RISKS**

- Asked to what extent they agree that the UN needs to be reformed in order to better manage global risks, the biggest proportion responding that this is necessary may be found in India, China and Brazil. The lowest proportion who believe this are in the UK and Sweden.

- In six of the countries, men are more inclined to agree that the UN has to be reformed; this is the case for men in Sweden, the USA, Australia, South Africa, Germany and Russia.

**WHETHER A NEW GLOBAL SUPRANATIONAL ORGANISATION SHOULD BE CREATED FOR BINDING GLOBAL DECISIONS**

- Asked whether they agree that a new global supranational organisation should be created to make binding global decisions on how to manage risks, people in India, China and South Africa agree to a greater extent than those in other countries that a new one should be created. People in Germany, the USA and Sweden believe this to a lesser extent, although there is still a majority in these countries too.

- In five of the countries, men are more inclined to believe that one should be created. This is the case in the USA, Australia, South Africa, Germany and Russia, while men in Sweden and the UK are less inclined to believe that such an organisation should be created.

**HOW CURRENT INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMS ARE ABLE TO DEAL WITH GLOBAL RISKS TODAY**

- Asked whether or not they agree on whether the current international system is able to make the decisions required to manage global risks, more than half in Germany and Sweden say that this is not the case, while people in India and China reply that it is.
Allocation of responsibility

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with climate change, most respondents, i.e. six out of ten countries reply that existing global organisations are most appropriate, while four out of ten countries believe that a new global supranational organisation is most appropriate for dealing with this problem. The countries that mention a new global supranational organisation first of all are Australia, the UK, South Africa and India.

• The USA is the country with the lowest percentage responding that a supranational organisation is most appropriate.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES SUCH AS POLLUTION

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with environmental issues such as pollution, seven countries respond that existing global organisations are, while three out of ten countries respond that a new global supranational organisation would be most appropriate. The countries that respond that existing ones are most appropriate are Sweden, the UK, the USA, Germany, Russia, Brazil and China, while Australia, South Africa and India respond that a new organisation would be most appropriate.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE OR CONFLICTS

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with politically motivated violence and conflicts, nine out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate for this. Only India responds that a new global supranational organisation would be more appropriate.
MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS)

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with weapons of mass destruction, nine out of ten countries believe that existing global organisations are most appropriate for this. India is the only country where the majority responds that a new global supranational actor is most appropriate.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with epidemics and pandemics, all countries apart from India, which is more inclined to believe in a new supranational organisation, believe that existing global organisations are most appropriate.

MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND OTHER POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS TECHNOLOGIES

• Asked which organisations are most appropriate for dealing with Artificial Intelligence and other potentially dangerous technologies, six out of ten countries respond that a new global supranational organisation is most appropriate, namely Australia, Russia, South Africa, India, Brazil, China.

• Three out of ten countries, Sweden, the UK and Germany, respond in the first instance that existing global organisations are most appropriate.

• The USA responds that they themselves are most appropriate. One in four Americans believes that they themselves are most appropriate, with a corresponding figure for Russia of one in twenty and for China of one in ten.
Allocation of responsibility

**MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH POPULATION GROWTH**
- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for managing population growth, eight out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate. South Africa and India respond primarily that their own country is most appropriate.

- In general, there is consistently a bigger proportion in each state that believes that their own state is appropriate for dealing with this issue.

**MOST APPROPRIATE FOR DEALING WITH EXTREME POVERTY**
- Asked which organisations are most appropriate for tackling extreme poverty, nine out of ten countries respond that existing global organisations are most appropriate. India replies that it is primarily their own state.
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