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ABSTRACT

Can commonalities in political culture and identity drive states closer together in the long run and result in the formation of natural alliances? This dissertation discusses the possibility that states which share a common constructed identity can better coordinate their international agendas. In particular, it applies this natural alliance theory to the trans-Atlantic community and discusses the implications of a common constructed identity for the future of the partnership.

The collapse of the European political system in the first half of the 20th century laid the grounds for an integrative paradigm which not only focused on trade and security cooperation, but also on the construction of a shared trans-Atlantic narrative and identity. This unprecedented integrative paradigm provided the partnership with a historical and intellectual capital that continues to strengthen the alliance’s resilience today: A common constructed identity and intellectual software can drive states closer together by providing them with focal points to coordinate their long-term mutual expectations. As a result, natural alliances tend to endure in spite of changes in the international context and distinguish themselves from other partnerships driven by other logics.

In this dissertation, I develop a taxonomy reflecting these different logics and propose a methodology to identify a natural alliance. I apply this methodology to the trans-Atlantic partnership and find it to be a natural alliance since 1991 at least, in spite of three limitations: (1) The extent to which Eastern European countries are part of this natural alliance is still unclear; (2) It is inaccurate to exclude New Zealand and Australia from this natural alliance, although they do not belong to the trans-Atlantic community;
and (3) In addition, apparent societal shifts in Japan and South Korea since 2000 could further challenge the geographic denomination of the trans-Atlantic community in time. These findings suggest that Washington can increase its leverage by distinguishing between various types of alliance opportunities in order to manage an increasingly wide array of international threats. They also suggest that the trans-Atlantic partnership is going global not only because of its missions but also because of its potential international members.
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CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION
RETHINKING ALLIANCES IN THE NEW CENTURY

The practice and analysis of international relations have often favored factors such as state interests and the balance of power and threats over common identities, like-mindedness and shared values in the explanation of alliances between states. In fact, the field’s track record in incorporating cultural components in its explanation of state interactions and state alignments in particular is poor: In its search for a parsimonious explanation, the temptation to identify a unique dynamic with the most significant explanatory power for state alliances has been great. Since cultural components are much harder to quantify and their impact much more complex to assess, the literature has often dismissed them as secondary at best and as irrelevant at worse. Even more revealing of this low regard is the notion that only state interests are strategic in nature, not cultural components.

This dissertation explores an alternative view, in which culture, and more specifically political culture and identity, play a major role in state alignments, and in particular in the partnership between the United States and European countries. According to this view, a nation’s identity can constitute a significant strategic factor in times of crisis. In particular, the way the élite and public opinion represent themselves, tell or retell history and interpret present events to better prepare for the future can help a nation construct and adapt its identity to a changing strategic landscape. In turn, this “constructed identity” shapes a nation’s intellectual software and provides it with a strategic blueprint for the future. As a result, countries sharing commonalities in constructed identity may be more “obvious” or “natural” allies in the long run because
they are less likely to misunderstand each other, though disagreements and frictions may still emerge. This view does not assert that a country’s natural allies have a greater strategic value but suggests that there may not be a single dynamic explaining state alliances. The latter may follow different logics.

In this perspective, the traditional definition of alliances remains highly relevant, but is incomplete because it assumes that all alliances follow the same, tactical logic and therefore tend to be short-lived. But, in the case of the United States for instance, the official distinction between NATO allies, major non-NATO allies and other partners hints at the potential differences in the nature of alliances. In addition, while strategic and geopolitical considerations may drive its security cooperation agreements, the latter are also often designed to address long term objectives and outlive the regional landscape in which they were initially manufactured. Similarly, persisting and resilient partnerships between the United States and some of its strategic allies suggest that some alliances are not merely tactical or designed to deter a threat to the survival or to the interests of the coalition’s members. Historical drivers, pushing states towards cooperation even if immediate interests are not at stake, are also salient features of some of the United States’ strategic partnerships – Saudi Arabia and Japan are two obvious instances. Additionally, the idea that the relationship between the United States and Europe forms a core and unique axis of international relations seems to be widely shared among policymakers and analysts.¹

Therefore, in practice, countries maintain very different types of partnerships: special relationships, long term partnerships with strong historical roots and instrumental alliances with precisely defined goals. This diversity of partnerships points to the
possible different dynamics driving states closer together, beyond sheer interests. It has also blurred the conceptual boundaries between alliances, partnerships and collective security mechanisms in the new century, as well as between instrumental alliances with precisely defined goals and open-ended alliances which seek to alleviate global uncertainty and introduce some predictability in international relations. As a result, the exploration of the relevance of looser and broader definitions of alliances seems fully justified. In particular, understanding the role that commonalities in political culture and constructed identity play in state alignments can provide policymakers with a more precise idea of the functions of persistent and special relationships and of natural alliances in the current strategic landscape.

The major aim of this dissertation is to explore why some alliances are more persistent than others, with a special focus on the resilience of the trans-Atlantic alliance. In addition to similar regime types and to a sense of common history, the commonalities in the constructed identity of the United States and some European nations may be an additional driver of this resilient and expanding partnership. This dissertation addresses the role of such commonalities in explaining the formation and the persistence of the partnership. It will also explore the possibility that the current U.S.-European relationship is a “natural alliance.”

**What Is a Natural Alliance?**

A natural alliance is a resilient partnership that finds its foundation in a common constructed identity and political culture. Natural allies are conscious of adhering to the same international standards that they consider as universally applicable, independent of
context. As a result, a natural alliance tends to endure and displays the ability and the willingness to act over time, in spite of changes in the international context and in the nature of the threats and challenges its members must face. Indeed, a natural alliance is more likely to better resist exogenous shocks though these may affect it in the short run. The probability that outside events change its fundamental _raison d’être_ in the long run is low.

This does not exclude the possibility that natural allies may consider their relationship as tactical or instrumental on very specific issues or in a given, short timeframe. It does not exclude the possibility that the overall successful history of the partnership positively influences the current terms of the cooperation. But a natural alliance requires a third dynamic. Natural allies are likely to find in the like-mindedness of their political leaders, intellectuals and public opinions additional focal points to coordinate their reactions and mutual expectations about the long run. This set of focal points allows them in turn to base their long term strategies on similar templates of analysis. Rather than a set of narrowly defined interests linking them one another, natural allies adhere to a broad structure of rules, accepted behaviors and standards. Reciprocity between them does not need to be specified explicitly in a formal agreement and may be generalized on limited conditions and become, as a result, diffuse.² In this sense, a natural alliance is an open-ended commitment.

Because of the fundamental role of the electorate in countries with a universal suffrage, of the interrelated bureaucracies and of accountability mechanisms, a natural alliance should be more likely to emerge between democracies.³ In fact, electorates and bureaucracies in the allied countries also play a significant role in the continuation of a
natural alliance. By sustaining the common set of standards which policymakers define, and by approving, through democratic expression, the political terms of the country’s engagement, the electorate can check and balance political decisions regarding its alliances. Similarly, democratic members of an alliance are likely to be held more accountable for the violation of the common set of standards. By outlasting changes in the legislature and in executive powers, bureaucracy contributes to the emergence of a sense of persistence across periods that helps define over time the contours of the country’s rules of engagement. The most meaningful time frame to analyze a natural alliance is therefore the long run.

Nevertheless, the definition of a natural alliance should not necessarily exclude the possibility of a “latent natural alliance” which has not become a practical reality but could become so if an external event drives the latent partners closer together. Commonalities in political culture and in values will always precede the formation of the alliance, but their existence can allow the natural alliance to become a reality if changes in international conditions make the partnership relevant in the eyes of the political elite and public opinion and if the conditions for repetitive alignments are present. For instance, the rise of China as a major actor of the Pacific could lead industrialized countries like New Zealand, Japan and South Korea to redefine their identity in accordance with or in opposition to the new power. This redefinition has the potential to affect these countries’ relationship with Western countries and the United States in particular. Therefore, the notion of natural alliance primarily focuses on an alliance’s resilience but also on a partnership’s formation. The term “natural” does not suggest that
the alliance has always existed or that it is not politically manufactured but that a common constructed identity will draw natural allies closer together in the long run.

**How Strategically Significant Is 21st Century Europe?**

As it has persisted through time, the trans-Atlantic partnership has grown increasingly complex and networked. A common history and the adherence to a similar governance paradigm based on democracy and free markets are at the heart of the sense of shared identity on both sides of the Atlantic. But while it is deeply rooted in history and may be one of the most widely discussed and documented partnerships, the logic and relevance of the U.S.-European axis which emerged during the Cold War is still a source of controversy on both sides of the Atlantic. Does the current strategic landscape, characterized by the rise of China and the possible emergence of a condominium between the United States and the new power justify greater pragmatism on the part of the Europeans? In addition, is accounting for the potentially greater commonalities in constructed identity between Europeans and the United States an unpragmatic approach? The notion that these commonalities can constitute a strategic asset for the partnership is worth exploring further.

**The Asian challenge**

Globalization, international economics and the acceleration of international trade are the central driver of international relations. The growing economic ties between Washington and Beijing could therefore suggest that the world has experienced a shift of power from the Atlantic to the Pacific. As a result, the U.S.-Chinese condominium may be replacing the U.S.-European axis in the psyche of U.S. policymakers. However, a
brief look at the current economic ties between the United States and China on the one hand and the United States European countries on the other suggests a much more complex and subtle situation that the proposition of a shift from the Atlantic to the Pacific would suggest.

Global imbalances—a sizeable U.S. trade deficit combined with a significant Chinese financial account surplus—have led U.S. policymaker and academic Lawrence Summers to recycle a Cold War concept in a very interesting way. The extreme interdependence that these imbalances have created between China and the United States has resulted in a “financial balance of terror” according to Summers because of the economic and geopolitical risks it entails. The parallel with the Cold War is obvious but also illustrative of the changing strategic landscape. The underlying idea during the Cold War was that Europe found itself in the middle of the struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union and was, as a result, the major stake and the strategic prize for both opponents. Today, if there is indeed a new “balance of terror,” the geographical unit separating the two major actors from each other is the Pacific Ocean. In effect, the increasing focus on the risks associated with these global imbalances has the potential to sideline Europe and to undermine the continent’s strategic attractiveness.

In practice, the size and significance of the U.S.-Chinese economic ties seem to overshadow the strategic significance of any other partnership that the United States can maintain. In 2008, China’s share represented nearly 14.5% of U.S. total international trade, exceeding by 1.4% the aggregate share of the top five European partners of the United States—Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, France, and Belgium. The United States’ largest trade deficit was with China—exceeding $266 billion or nearly a
third of the total U.S. trade deficit, against a deficit of $175.6 billion with OPEC countries and $93.4 billion with the twenty-seven countries of the European Union. One mechanical consequence of this trading relationship has been the increasing amount of dollar-denominated reserves of the Chinese central bank which now holds between 1 and 3 trillion dollars in international reserve assets.\(^7\)

But this economic relationship between the United States and China is characterized by interdependence rather than by dependence. The size of the U.S. debt to China has arguably increased Beijing’s leverage in its interactions with Washington, though some disagree with this view.\(^8\) Conversely, China has largely relied on the consumption of U.S. households to promote its economic expansion and a sudden stop in U.S. demand has compromised Beijing’s economic prospects. This extreme interdependence has influenced to a large extent the terms of the partnership as well as its prospects. It has led to speculations of a *de facto* (though likely ephemeral by some accounts) merger of the two countries given the economic complementarities that they display. This “dual country of ‘Chimerica,’” constituted of “Siamese twins ‘leaking into each other,’” in which the East saves and produces, and the West consumes, has formed a coherent bloc so long as the economic crisis did not challenge this cohesion.\(^9\) As a result, the recognition of this extreme interdependence has also shaped an attempt by both sides of the Pacific to recognize and institutionalize to some extent this tactical but complex partnership.\(^10\) This institutionalization of negotiations and diplomatic exchanges occurred through the strategic dialogue for instance, leading some commentators to believe in the existence of an informal G2 overshadowing the significance of any other summit—G7 and G20 included.\(^11\) This international setting would entail a new
manifestation of bipolarity, which would strongly differ from Cold War bipolarity and which would rely on mutually accepted reciprocal engagements on a specific set of global issues.

It is interesting to note, however, that Chinese officials have rejected the notion of a G2 because they still consider themselves as a developing nation or as being involved in a privileged relationship with the United States. This suggests that evidence of a nascent cooperative relationship does not necessarily entail that the United States and China will perceive it in similar terms. It is also interesting to note the rate at which cooperation in this framework can quickly deteriorate. In fact, greater interdependence has entailed more frequent frictions in spite of the existence of an officially recognized strategic dialogue. Conversely, strains in the relationship do not necessarily suggest that future cooperation is impossible.

**An alternative narrative**

As convincing as it may sound, the narrative that emphasizes on the centrality of the current U.S.-Chinese relationship in international economics and international affairs only represents one side of the coin and overlooks the even deeper economic and political ties and integration between the United States and countries from the European continent. In contrast with trading ties, foreign direct investments represent a durable commitment to an economic relationship and entail greater risk because they involve a transfer of capital abroad—contrary to foreign borrowing and lending. This may explain why a significant majority of U.S. and European corporations prefer to invest in similar economies that offer reliable safeguards in terms of infrastructure and property rights.
This economic dynamic is far more integrative financially and politically speaking given the governance stakes that are involved.

In fact, several studies have pointed to the fact that Europe is by far the greatest contributor of foreign direct investments in the United States with a share of 70% of all direct investments—versus 14% for Asia-Pacific countries.15 Another in-depth study, by Daniel Hamilton and Joseph Quinlan of the Center for Transatlantic Relations at John Hopkins University, has detailed the deepness of this relationship.16 More than a quarter of extra-European Union outflows of foreign direct investments went to the United States in 2006 and represented more than twelve times European investments in China. Conversely, U.S. investments in the Netherlands and in the United Kingdom—the top two recipients of U.S. foreign direct investments—were higher than in either of the two U.S. partners of NAFTA, Mexico and Canada. The total amount of U.S. investments in Brazil, Russia, India and China—the “BRIC”—was equivalent to the amount of U.S. investments in Germany, and investment positions in Europe exceed positions in the BRIC by a ratio of sixteen to one. Between 2000 and 2008, U.S. companies invested less in China than in Belgium and less than half than investments in Ireland. In spite of a significant increase in U.S. affiliate sales in China since 2000, they remain equivalent to U.S. affiliate sales in Belgium, represent half of sales in France, and a third of sales in Germany. Nearly two-thirds of research and development expenditures of U.S. firms are made in Europe—the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Switzerland received half of those investments. Foreign direct investments and research and development expenditures have also driven trans-Atlantic trade through related-party trade.
The significance of this economic relationship has made the trans-Atlantic economy the largest in the world, involving fourteen million jobs and $3.75 trillion in mutual investments.\textsuperscript{17} It is indicative of a more profound political relationship because it entails a more profound and durable commitment from both sides of the Atlantic. It reinforces the need for greater governance to ensure continuing expansion of these ties. In practice, the creation of a trans-Atlantic Economic Council in 2007 has constituted a first step towards the achievement of a unified transatlantic market that the European Parliament has called for by 2015.\textsuperscript{18} Such a project would not only entail removing obstacles to free trade but greater coordination of economic policy and financial regulation.

This alternative narrative suggests that the idea that the U.S.-European axis is now irrelevant in the current strategic landscape because it has been replaced by a U.S.-Chinese condominium is not fully accurate. A rivalry between Asia and the European Union to build stronger ties with the United States more accurately describes the key strategic consequences of the global imbalances.\textsuperscript{19} The relative political stability that the European continent has enjoyed in the past decade should not be a reason for the United States to focus less on the region as some argue, but an asset to consider when Washington seeks reliable allies to solve global problems.\textsuperscript{20} In other words, the dynamics of the U.S.-Chinese relationship can be better understood and more efficiently managed if Washington considers the totality of its alliance portfolio beyond the region-specific ties in maintains in the Pacific. In fact, the emphasis on economic ties that go beyond international trade suggests that the prospects of the U.S.-European partnerships can be correctly assessed only if the long term political needs of this deeper integration
are accounted for. The European Parliament also called for the creation of a trans-Atlantic Political Council in the very same resolution—thus explicitly linking it to the already-existing trans-Atlantic Economic Council mentioned above—to enhance political consultation on foreign issues and to enable both parties to coordinate their responses to global challenges including Iran’s nuclear aspirations and the rise of the BRIC.\textsuperscript{21} More broadly, calls for the creation of a G2—composed of the United States and the European Union this time—show the extent to which the need for political integration does not necessarily follow the logic of global imbalances and trade, but also the logic of benefits from greater political coordination and predictability.\textsuperscript{22} It is also noteworthy that Washington has systematically turned to European capitals since 2001 to solve the Afghan crisis and not to Beijing or to New Delhi in spite of Chinese and Indian stakes in the region and in spite of the significance of their armed forces.

From this standpoint, European countries can emerge as a decisive partner for the United States in its efforts to provide the necessary incentives to China in order to convince Beijing to fully adhere to the current international system—though the joint ability of the United States and of European countries to pressure and offer incentives to Beijing to reach this goal is likely to weaken with time.\textsuperscript{23} While its relationship with Beijing has been very much instrumental and designed to manage global imbalances, the deeper relationship that Washington maintains with European capitals can prove to be a decisive strategic asset towards the resolution of this pressing global issue and on other international challenges. This does not suggest that there Washington should rank its strategic alliances on the basis of their instrumental or more profound nature. The real
issue lies in finding the right alliance mix—similar to the right policy mix that economic policymakers seek to reach better outcomes—to deal with international challenges.

Identity-based alliances

In this context, a pragmatic approach to international affairs is not one that is necessarily and exclusively inspired by power considerations, economic ties and realpolitik. In fact, commonalities in political culture and in constructed identity, as well as a sense of shared history, can constitute a strategic asset for better coordination and greater predictability. From this standpoint, identity-based alliances can display greater relevance than previously argued. This movement does not suggest that traditional alliances, based on tactics and whose strategic usefulness has been widely documented and is intuitively straightforward, are outdated. It does suggest that another dynamic, based on identities, may have been muted by the Cold War and is now playing a fundamental role as it did in the past. The logic driving these identity-based alliances deserves further exploration at this point.

In fact, the end of the Cold War and of the ideological struggle between the West and the East has granted identity with a new significance in domestic and international politics. The recent reemergence of issues related to values, identity and political polarization in domestic politics tends to suggests cultural identification plays a significant role in political dynamics at the national level at least. With the acceleration of globalization, greater awareness about differences in political identities and in ideologies have been growingly acute in the West that no longer faces an existential threat from the Soviet Union. As a result, while it is celebrated by some and dreaded by others, tribalism and communitarianism have emerged as two defining dynamics of the
twenty-first century domestic political debates. More broadly, the emergence of multiculturalism and challenges to the continuity of the social contract and the preservation of domestic peace have been at the center of both U.S. and European debates, though intellectuals and policymakers have admittedly set up the problem in different terms.

While these trends seem to be well understood at the domestic level, both academic and policy circles have failed to integrate the real identity-related dynamics of international politics. The reemergence of Kant’s theory on democratic peace in the late 1970s constituted an initial analysis which focused on institutional commonalities between democracies as a factor of international stability. However, it failed to account for the potential effects of cultural differences between countries that had adopted similar regimes—the distrust between the United States towards Japan in the 1980s is a revealing instance. The Copenhagen School of International Relations later coined the concept of “societal security,” which points to the domestic consequences of international threats against a society’s identity and values. In the tradition of the constructivist school of international relations and its affiliates, these efforts suggest that culture exerts an influence on the behavior of states and potentially on their alignment choices. However, the frameworks constructivism has developed regarding alliances are far from convincing because they have been unable to differentiate themselves from the traditional realist framework and to entirely prove the role of cultural considerations in international relations.

Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations* is a particularly interesting framework in the debate regarding identity-based alliances. However, the theory’s very pessimistic
response is far from convincing because it focuses more on bloodlines, kinship and predetermined cultural groups rather than on actors’ constructed identity. It considers civilizations as closed entities with static identities that cannot be influenced by external forces. A simple glance at the historical experience of Western countries in particular suggests instead that Western civilizations have been in constant movement and that these evolutions have continuously affected national political cultures and identities. In addition, relations between the West and the rest of the world seem to display more complexity and subtlety than the notion of an inevitable clash of civilizations actually suggests. Huntington’s thesis is also unconvincing because it has generated confusion and has led some of his proponents to link any international violence to an “inevitable” clash of civilizations.

In reality, we lack a model that considers the dynamic and perpetual construction, definition and redefinition of identities and the effects this has on traditional partnerships. The uncertainty that the changing international strategic landscape generates can drive states to reaffirm what they consider to be their identity’s and the international system’s most salient and significant features that they want to preserve, in addition to reaffirming a potential strategic edge that helps them protect their vital interests. This process suggests a broader definition of state survival and interests. It is at the heart of the construction of a national identity and can potentially affect alignment choices. Alliances may be tactical and allow countries to achieve short run objectives, but may also potentially be natural when they allow countries to preserve what they consider to be essential features of the international system and their own inalienable characteristics.
In this context, the trans-Atlantic community emerges as a convincing candidate for a natural alliance. This is not to say that there are no tensions between the United States and European countries and that their views are always congruent. It is hard, however, not to analyze cultural similarities in another way than in relative terms when comparing states from very different regions. From this standpoint, the trans-Atlantic community seems to display unique features compared to other alliances that the United States maintains with countries in other regions of the world. Shedding light on the different logics driving alliances, and testing the extent to which commonalities in political culture can constitute a driver of state alignments, can therefore be particularly useful to better understand international dynamics and state interactions.

**Puzzles**

As I argued above, in spite of the most recent developments which expanded the already-existing constructivist paradigm, the integration of culture and identity in international relations models is still unsatisfactory. In addition, we lack a methodology to think about alliances between states in a systematic way. In this dissertation, I propose to make a distinction between tactical, historical and natural alliances and to explore the definition and the contours of the latter type of partnerships. I insist that this typology is not meant to consider which of these partnerships are more strategically useful. Rather, the objective is to explore whether a country can draw some strategic value from distinguishing between the different natures of its partnerships and whether a combination of tactical, historical and natural partnerships can help achieve objectives more efficiently and at a lesser cost.
Previous contribution on alliances

Prior to this elaboration of the “natural alliance” paradigm, three major schools of thought on international relations provided some insights on alignment between states: the balance-of-power theory, the democratic peace theory and Huntington’s research on the clashes of civilizations. It is noteworthy that each of these paradigms provides insights on state alliances by focusing more on the likely triggers of war and peace rather than on the factors that drive states closer to one another. In other words, alliances are either presented as exogenous and consequences of international conditions rather than tools that states can actively use to reach their objectives. Chapter 3 will review in detail all of these theories. Table 1 summarizes their insight by pointing to the variable that is identified as key by each school of thought, the historical cases that they explain best and the instances where they perform particularly poorly.

As one can see from Table 1, previous theories have failed to fully explain a wide range of puzzles which include repetitive alignment patterns since the nineteenth century until World War II and instances in which partnerships have persisted in spite of tensions and refusal from one party to deepen the relationship. By assuming that natural alliances are a two-way street—i.e. it must be recognized by both parties as such—the theory that I offer proposes to explain repetitive alignments and resilient partnerships as well as persisting tensions in some partnerships because of diverging perceptions of stakeholders. The triangular case of Turkey, the European Union, and the United States is particularly illustrative. Turkey and the United States consider their partnership as historically and tactically justified. Some members of the European Union do not refute this logic, but refer to their common constructed identity to refuse entry of Turkey in the organization. These miscalculations and diverging perceptions of the partnerships by the different actors involved have rarely been integrated in previous models of alignments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment Variable</th>
<th>Best Fit</th>
<th>Puzzles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance of Power</strong></td>
<td>WWI alignments, NATO creation, Cold War, European Union institutional crisis</td>
<td>European Project, NATO persistence and expansion after the Cold War, Repetitive alignment patterns in Europe, Lasting peace between the United States and Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic Peace Theory</strong></td>
<td>European Construction, NATO creation, expansion and resilience, U.S.-Japan strategic alliance, Greater Middle East Project under the George W. Bush Administration</td>
<td>Resilience of Bretton Woods institutions, Tensions between Turkey and the European Union, European institutional crisis, The 2008 Georgia-Russian War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clashes of Civilization</strong></td>
<td>The wars in the Balkans of the 1990s, The Global War on Terror, Tensions between Russia and the European Union</td>
<td>First Gulf War, Second Gulf War, Sunni-Shiite Violence, Initial approval of the war in Afghanistan, Turkey as a member of NATO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Alliance</strong></td>
<td>NATO creation, expansion and resilience, Repetitive Alignment patterns: WWI, WW2, Cold War, European Construction, European Institutional Crisis, Europe and Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Contribution of a natural alliance theory**

The contribution of a natural alliance theory is dual. It is the first time that a theory focuses on the role of constructed identity, rather than on kinship or cultural aspects of policymaking. In the framework of international relations, a common constructed identity can play a fundamental role in explaining alliances between states. In particular, the European DNA is very much present in the United States’ culture because of the different waves of immigration from Europe to the other side of the Atlantic. The United States DNA is also at the heart of the European construction and project. While these historical facts are widely accepted, we have yet to fully explore the strategic asset that this common DNA can represent.

A theory of natural alliances also suggests that not all alliances follow the same logic and that some may follow different logics at the same time. In general terms, alliances are necessarily political by design—that is, manufactured through a political process which is influenced by strategic concerns of all parties. In the short run, most of them are instrumental and tactical as they address a specific threat or challenge. Some of them are historical when they survive fundamental ruptures in the international system and when parties involved justify their continued cooperation on the basis of past successful collaboration. Only those countries sharing a common constructed identity have the potential to become natural, while potentially remaining historical and tactical. These three different layers are therefore not mutually exclusive.
Hypotheses and Methodology

If natural alliances do exist and the trans-Atlantic community is indeed one, the evidence would show that the United States and European countries—a set that the methodology will define—share greater commonalities in political culture relative to the rest of the world and that they react to international crises in similar ways. Those commonalities have the potential to constitute additional cement for a durable partnership. This is a weak formulation of the natural alliance hypothesis. A stronger formulation would add that an agreement on how to proceed on a given issue is more likely to occur between natural allies than between allies that are not natural. The research design that I propose below will lead me to consider which of these formulations, if any, is the most realistic.

Research questions, hypotheses and research design

First Research Question: To what extent do the United States and Europe share a common political culture and constructed identity?

I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

- Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:
  - The United States is more like Europe than like other countries
  - Similarities between the United States and Europe are no greater than those between the United States and the rest of the world

- Similarities between some European countries and the United States:
  - There is greater homogeneity among European countries than among some countries and the United States
Some European states share greater values, beliefs and perceptions with the United States than with other European states

- Stability over time
  - Variables measured display some inertia over time
  - Variables are very volatile over time

In order to answer this question, I will use multidimensional scaling and the World Values Survey data to obtain a visual representation of clusters of countries with commonalities in political culture and identity. I will also use another data set, drawn from the Pew Global Attitudes project, to compare and test the robustness of results. Greater similarities in terms of political culture and constructed identity between the United States and European countries would suggest that the partnership is a community—the first foundation of a natural alliance.

Second Research Question: To what extent do countries belonging to a same community react in similar ways to international crises and issues?

I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

- Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:
  - The United States reacts more like Europe than like other countries
  - Similarities in reactions between the United States and Europe are no greater than those between the United States and the rest of the world
- Similarities between some European countries and the United States:
• There is greater homogeneity in reactions among European countries than among some countries and the United States
• Some European states react in more similar terms to the United States than to other European states

• Stability over time
  o Commonalities in reactions display some inertia over time
  o Commonalities in reactions are very volatile over time

In order to answer this question, I will use multidimensional scaling and data from various cross-country opinion polls from the Pew Global Attitudes project to obtain a visual representation of clusters of countries which react to international crises and challenges. Chapter 4 provides more details regarding the research methodology. Greater similarities in terms of both constructed identity and reactions to current international affairs would suggest that the trans-Atlantic partnership is not only a community but a natural alliance as well.

Third Research Question: To what extent is an agreement more likely between identified natural allies than between non-natural allies? I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

• Agreement on how to proceed on a given issue:
  o An agreement is more likely between natural allies
  o Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement

• Agreement on how to proceed over time
An agreement is more likely between natural allies on long term questions

Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement on long term questions.

In order to answer this question, I rely on interviews with policymakers and policy analysts as well as on results from the first two research questions. The main objective is to describe the strategic asset that commonalities in political culture and identity can represent for natural allies identified in the first two steps of the research.

Policy Implications

A Congressional Research Service report published in 2004 considered a wide array of scenarios for the future of the trans-Atlantic partnership, ranging from a lesser significance of Europe in U.S. foreign strategy to the elaboration of a “new bargain.” It suggested that the need for “a serious and sustained U.S.-European dialogue and consultation” was robust in a majority of the scenarios that the report explored except if the United States opted for the status quo. Even if Washington decided to “de-emphasize Europe,” it would still need to engage in consultation in order to protect the significant economic ties of the trans-Atlantic community.34

The nature of the trans-Atlantic dialogue is therefore a crucial question and at the center of a debate between those who favor of an institutionalization of the partnership beyond NATO, those who favor the status quo and those who favor more flexible and mission-determined cooperation. The institutionalization of the trans-Atlantic community, which would be equivalent to a generalization of article 5 of the NATO
Charter beyond the military obligation that it currently expresses, would be the logical consequence of the identification of the U.S.-European alliance as natural. This would suggest that the second and broader definition of the concept of alliance discussed above and which favors the idea of broad security cooperation would be more appropriate and that *ad hoc* coalitions are likely to be vulnerable to “mission fatigue” because of a lack of deeper cooperation. It would also suggest that there is a pressing need for a better integration of NATO and European policies and missions to achieve their objective better and at a lesser cost. The opposite conclusion—namely that there is no evidence that the trans-Atlantic community is a natural alliance—would also be highly informative for both United States and European policymakers, especially with regards to the optimal nature and structure of the U.S.-European consultation mechanism. In the wake of the European institutional crisis triggered in 2005, this research could offer U.S. policymakers with a roadmap to distinguish between their different European options and allies.

Results of this research will therefore shed light on the possible role of European nations and of the specificity—or lack thereof—of the trans-Atlantic community in the grand strategy of the United States. If there is some strategic relevance in distinguishing between tactical, historical and natural alliances, a key challenge for the United States will lie in finding the right “alliance mix.” If the U.S.-European partnership emerges as natural, it has the potential the act as a core alliance in the international system and its successes can attract additional partners. From this standpoint, the U.S.-European partnership can contribute to greater stability and consultation. Building a “healthy” international system and capitalizing on the current strength of the United States’
international position will hinge on its ability to build and maintain a successful set of alliances and manage its alliance portfolio. The question of Europe’s centrality in this portfolio needs to be addressed, especially given the potential of the U.S.-European partnership to reproduce successful patterns of cooperation and therefore alleviate the effects of international uncertainty.

Outline

The rest of the dissertation is divided as follows. The next section (chapters 2 and 3) is the literature review. Chapter 2 reviews the historical evidence related to the notion of natural alliances. Chapter 3 surveys the theoretical literature in political science, economics, biology and other fields that are relevant to the theory of natural alliances. The following section (chapters 4, 5, and 6) presents the research. Chapter 4 offers a systematic taxonomy for alliances and a framework for natural alliances. Chapter 5 discusses results for research questions one and two. Chapter 6 explores the operational character of natural alliances and discusses results to research question three. The last section (chapter 7) concludes.
Exploring whether or not the trans-Atlantic community is a natural alliance can seem paradoxical for two contradictory reasons. On the one hand, European nations spent a large portion of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries fighting each other or were divided in two static blocs on each side of the Iron Curtain. On the other hand, since the end of the Second World War and the emergence of a shared sense of community on both sides of the Atlantic—that formal agreements like NATO and informal exchanges helped materialize in practice—it seems that no alliance has surpassed the U.S.-European relationship in terms of resilience and attractiveness. Far from harming the prospects of the partnership, the end of the Cold War seems to have reinvigorated the interest of Eastern European countries for regional institutions such as the European Union and NATO. While the first observation would suggest that the partnership is anything but natural, the second suggests that the natural aspect of the alliance is not only obvious but strengthening through time. This contradiction calls for a historical review of the emergence and the persistence of the sense of community between the United States and European nations.

Ludwig Dehio argues that:

[…] it is possible to imagine a history of the Western world that relates all events to the principles of unity and diversity. It could, after all, be said that for more than a thousand years the pendulum has swung back and forth between a tendency toward unification, which never led to total unity, and a divisive tendency, which never led to complete disintegration. In different epochs the two tendencies are linked with varying circumstances and forces.¹
Dehio’s view is that there has been a delicate balance between two historical forces that has led the West to navigate between two conflicting trends of coexistence. It also suggests that the history of the West is a cumulative process, based on two contradictory forces—a unifying one and a divisive one that feed each other. As a result of this cumulative process, the “swing of the pendulum” in the West is all the more so flagrant and reinforced through time: the extreme rivalry and divisions in the West of the first half of the twentieth century bears a striking contrast with its unprecedented, ever-expanding unification and over determined through the creation, resilience and expansion of NATO and the European project. There is no equivalent of this extreme state of violence or this unification process during the nineteenth century in Europe, which experienced both trends in a less radical way. The movement that World War II triggered seems to have accelerated a convergence of Western civilizations, affecting in the process national political cultures in a way that has favored greater commonalities relative to the rest of the world. In addition, it seems hard to understand this acceleration without considering previous historical dynamics of the relationship, as the following pages will contend. Does this suggest that this cumulative and over-determined process of history has led to the emergence of a new paradigm of governance based on an extreme form of unity that the “swing of the pendulum” will have difficulty breaking? Or does it suggest that the trans-Atlantic community’s unity, designed in the aftermath of the Second World War, only hints to an upcoming and even more extreme form of division?

This chapter explores the historical dynamics and drivers that have led to the current partnership between the United States and European countries. The question of the resilience of this partnership, given these historical dynamics and drivers, is at the
heart of the examination. In particular, the unprecedented and lasting influence of the unifying trend on the Western politics in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War remains a puzzle that tactics, history and politics alone cannot explain. The possibility that these dynamics led to the construction of a common identity which has made the unifying force stronger relative to the divisive trend suggests that the “natural alliance” hypothesis bears great relevance. This chapter seeks to demonstrate the historical foundation of natural alliances which are not a spontaneous manifestation of like-mindedness but a product of a dynamic and historical process of identity construction. The fundamental question is whether or not the historical evidence suggests that the United States and its European allies were conscious of adhering to the same international standards that they considered universally applicable.

**A Dual Struggle**

Nineteenth century Europe is an illustrative theater of the “swing of the pendulum” that Dehio refers to. European powers of the time are confronted with a dual challenge: preserving the stability and the efficiency of the European political system—the cohesive force of European politics—and containing potential threats related to both internal and external security—the divisive force. At the beginning of the century, Napoleon’s France provided a link between the two dimensions of this challenge, as its expansionist ambitions not only undermined the regional stability of the European political system but it also epitomized the risk of revolutionary contagion in the eyes of the conservative monarchies of the region—namely Prussia, Russia and Austria.
The struggle for unity

Prince von Metternich, Austria’s negotiator at the Congress of Vienna which followed France’s defeat in 1815 and the end of the Napoleonic Wars, sought to reconcile these two dimensions by designing a new “Concert of Europe.” This political system would rely on the balance-of-power model and would allow the major powers of the time—namely Austria, Russia, Prussia, Great Britain, and France—to guarantee both international and domestic stability.\(^2\) It was the first mechanism in modern Europe not to solely rely on the use of force and to consecrate the role of diplomacy. In the short run, it made the use of force very costly because efforts required to shift the distribution of power were too significant and because the sense of shared values constrained members of the Concert in their choices.\(^3\) Because member-states abided by the same principles of self-constraint, the Concert may also have been one of the first attempts to create a system with the potential to improve the members’ understanding of regional trends and to limit the uncertainty surrounding the intentions of other countries.

But Metternich also believed that wars and revolutions were related because each laid the ground for the other. Therefore, in Metternich’s mind, there was a necessary connection between internal and external security. The extent to which rivals of France could undermine the revolutionary forces within Europe was essential in the preservation of their territorial integrity \(and\) in the preservation of the region’s monarchy.\(^4\) That is why Metternich was also confident that, in the long run, “the new Concert of Europe could make the social and political processes of western Europe and possibly the whole world stand still or even retrogress,” thereby showing that he did not grasp substantial social and political consequences of the nascent industrial revolution.\(^5\) As a result, while
Great Britain fully adhered to the first principle of maintaining the balance of power on the continent, the Concert of Europe created a real breach between the liberal European countries and the conservative monarchies because only Russia and Prussia accepted Metternich’s guiding principles for the European political system.\(^6\)

In fact, the Concert of Europe was made possible by cooperation between Austria’s Metternich and Great Britain’s Castlereagh which allowed for the implementation of peace without the humiliation of France which would have left Prussia with an overwhelmingly dominant position in Continental Europe.\(^7\) It led to the emergence of the Quadruple Alliance between Great Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia, which was designed to contain France and to guarantee regional stability. But this tactical alliance was not enough because Metternich did not believe that it provided sufficient stability to the European continent. In his opinion, long term stability of the continent laid in the hands of the conservative forces of Europe, namely the crowned heads of Prussia, Austria and Russia against a republican France where the ideology of Revolution had first appeared.\(^8\) This led to the emergence of the Holy Alliance, between Russia, Austria and Prussia. If the Quadruple Alliance was manufactured to contain France’s expansionist aspirations from a geopolitical point of view, the Holy Alliance emerged with the willingness of the three powers to contain what France symbolized – the ideals of Revolution and of the Republic.\(^9\) The Holy Alliance members’ inclination for stability and status quo outweighed the geopolitical benefits of pushing individual strategic advantages. Commonalities in political culture provided the real cement of this alliance.\(^10\) It therefore excluded, by design, a possible cooperation with Great Britain, and even more so cooperation with France.
The Crimean War put an end to the Holy Alliance as Prussia and Austria did not side with Russia against Great Britain and France. But it did not undermine the political willingness of European conservative monarchies to maintain internal tranquility and weaken the revolutionary forces that were spreading in the continent. After the unification of Germany, it was the turn of German Chancellor Bismarck to offer his own model in the wake of the new revolutions and social changes of the middle of the century. The Three Emperors’ League was the major result of Bismarck’s initiative, though the three allies were now more confident of their individual capacity to suppress radical movements—which they continued to loathe—alone. Of course, the traditional geopolitical perspective, and specifically Germany’s unique geographical situation, weighted in the calculations of the powers’ decision-makers and intellectuals. But with traditional and conservative forces becoming increasingly dominant in Germany, a new rapprochement with the other champions of order against revolutionary, socialist forces, namely Russia and Austria, became possible again. The new strategic landscape shaped Germany’s preferences in terms of alliances once again, preferring powers emblematic of order against “zones of revolutionary change” such as France, Poland and the Balkans. Even the series of terrorist attacks in Russia, claimed by diverse anarchic groups, did not affect the country’s image. Perceptions still placed Russia among nations attached to “order.”

**A complex system of alliances and no necessary equilibrium**

The dual challenge identified at the beginning of the nineteenth century by a wide set of European actors therefore had cumulative, complex, non-linear and contradictory effects on state alignments throughout the century. In fact, state alignments followed two
specific imperatives: one was geopolitical and tactical while the other was ideological. For instance, though France and Great Britain were geopolitical rivals because of territorial and geopolitical oppositions, they maintained some ideological affinities, especially with regards to the similar legacies of their respective revolutions. Similarly, in spite of their geopolitical opposition, Austria and Russia were ideological allies in the effort to contain the revolutionary contagion of the time. In addition, the existing ideological repugnance between the two countries did not prevent France and Russia from aligning at the end of the century as both powers were seeking to improve their strategic position in the continent in opposition to Great Britain and in response to a rising Germany. States sought to enhance their strategic positions through tactical alliances and preserve some distinct features through relationships with like-minded countries.

In addition, the widely-accepted model of the balance-of-power which was considered as the optimal mechanism to safeguard a nation’s most vital interests did not necessarily work efficiently during the period. In fact, for such a model to work, states must feel no lasting obligation to other nations and can therefore freely choose their partners at any point in time. Put differently, the balance-of-power paradigm suggests that there cannot be any alliance handicap and that alignments can be the sole by-product of states’ willingness to balance dominant powers. The historical evidence suggests that this condition was not verified in practice. Contrary to the Darwinist metaphor that the balance-of-power seems to suggest—namely that states are passive and apolitical actors in the wake of international change and only seek to maximize the likelihood of their
survival regardless of the type of countries they must align with to accomplish this goal—
countries may consider some partners more reliable than others.

Repetitive alliances between the three conservative monarchies, even if they were short-lived and often opportunistic, are illustrative of the willingness of these forces to preserve some essential features of their state’s identity. This also explains why Great Britain’s fears of Russian expansion during the nineteenth century were not only framed in geopolitical terms but in civilizational ones as well. In particular, Great Britain sided with France during the Crimean War, not only to check Russia’s expansion, but also to fight in a war that the British considered a “battle of civilization against barbarism.” In a similar way, U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, also a champion of the balance of power, regarded the rise of Germany in Continental Europe as a geopolitical menace for the United States. But Roosevelt’s preference for Great Britain in this balance of power over Germany was due to “such intangible non-power factors as cultural affinity and historical experience. Indeed, there were strong cultural ties between England and America for which there was no counterpart in U.S.-German relations. Moreover, the United States was used to Great Britain ruling the seas and was comfortable with the idea, and no longer suspected Great Britain of expansionist designs in the Americas. Germany, however, was regarded with apprehension.” Arguably, seen through the prism of Wilsonian idealism, the outbreak of World War I represented a threat to the liberal and democratic political system that the United Kingdom represented at the time in Europe, contrasting with an “autocratic” and “expansive” Germany, making the former the United States’ natural choice. This cumulative process of historical and cultural experiences also laid the ground for repetitive alliances between the three liberal
powers—the United States, the United Kingdom and France—during the two World Wars of the twentieth century.

Repetitive alliances of the period contrast with continuous rivalries and impossible alliances. For instance, Bismarck was convinced that “Franco-German political enmity” was a “permanent element of past and future history” and that he needed to keep his rival unstable and isolated for strategic reasons. He therefore brought his support to the Third Republic against a second restoration of the monarchy in France because the latter would have provided his rival with far more alliance alternatives that could have been harmful to German interests in the region. In addition, some potential partnerships were considered as obvious moves by some countries while they were considered as unthinkable by others. The Anglo-German relationship is quite illustrative of these miscalculations and misperceptions. Bismarck considered that a war between the two countries was inconceivable. Emperor William II not only found such a war impossible but also yearned for an alliance with Great Britain. Such an alliance with autocratic Germany was unthinkable on the British side because it would have involved an open-ended military alliance that British leaders abhorred at the time and that they suspected that Germany would obtain a strategic edge on the continent and upset the balance of power that London valued greatly. In reality, throughout the nineteenth century, Great Britain had never considered its support or even its neutrality towards Germany on grounds other than tactical ones. This made a long term rapprochement between Great Britain and Germany impossible, most notably because Germany overestimated the benefits that the British would associate with such a partnership and was too demanding in their bargain.


**Wilsonianism’s Victory in the West**

The balance-of-power model was predominant at the time because statesmen and diplomats firmly believed in its virtues and because the Enlightenment had provided the intellectual framework to justify the implementation of such a mechanism. The balance-of-power model found its roots in the Enlightenment, which contended that an international system composed of rational states seeking to protect their specific, selfish interests, would be able to reach a state of equilibrium naturally. The parallel with Adam Smith’s “Invisible Man” allowing markets to function properly and James Madison’s praise of selfish interests confronting each other and leading to political harmony is striking. Similarly, Jomini’s search for enduring principles of war, independent of context and actors, assumed the existence of universal processes and rules from which one could not depart.

However, in practice, the balance-of-power paradigm relied on faulty assumptions, most notably the notions that there was no alliance handicap and that states had the ability to accurately assess their strategic positions in spite of international uncertainty. World War I showed the extent to which the model failed in avoiding what it was designed to counter, namely a devastating war in the continent. But the great European war was more a result of a long process than a instantaneous manifestation of the system’s failure. The nineteenth century had unleashed an overwhelming potential for worldly activities, scientific progress and rational methods which, combined with a decreasing influence of traditions, faith and philosophy, made the acquisition of power all the more so cost-effective and attractive. In the words of Dehio,

[...] the course of the nineteenth-century history entitles us to say that the actual agent that provoked this movement was a heightened and optimistic
will to live, a spread of the thirst for worldly power, bringing in its train a new and furious phase of the struggle for existence. Tradition, faith, and beauty, the calming agents of this struggle, were driven back along the entire front in battles that swayed back and forth. However magnificent the manifestations of the threatened spirit were left behind in art, poetry, and religion, the retreat could not be reversed.29

As a result, the balance-of-power paradigm did not offer the European political system a model of political governance to manage this overwhelming amount of untapped energy that proved destructive as the first half of the twentieth century showed. In fact, the balance-of-power paradigm provided universal, guiding laws about political processes and not about political principles of governance.

A Universality-based paradigm

The Holy Roman Empire had previously attempted to provide the continent with such universal political principles of governance which were based on the “medieval aspiration to universality” and in which “one emperor would rule over the secular world and one Pope over the Universal Church.”30 Its collapse did not mean the end of universality-based alternatives to the balance-of-power paradigm. In fact, the French Revolution of 1789—which resembled in many ways its English predecessor of 1688—provided a blueprint for universal political principles of governance and a conception of the nation-state that was diametrically opposed to the German vision of the nation. Contrary to the English Revolution a century before, the main heirs of the French Revolution sought to export it throughout Europe, thus crystallizing in the process the rivalry between these two conceptions of the nation-state.

In the early nineteenth century, German philosopher and poet Henri Heine, who maintained an intimate tie with France and its 1789 ideals until very late in his life, drew a striking contrast between the state of mind and the history of revolution attempts in the
two major powers of Continental Europe of the time.\textsuperscript{31} German theologian Thomas Müntzer, Heine noted, provided the basis for a German revolution, by promising a better afterlife as well as equality and fraternity on earth, in opposition to the doctrine of Martin Luther. This German attempt of a revolution, which had an intimate link with religion, failed. In contrast, the French Revolution of 1789, while it was based on the same initial aspirations of equality and fraternity, maintained an intimate link with philosophy and was conceived in opposition to the Clergy.\textsuperscript{32} The failure of a revolution in Germany and the success of the French Revolution led Heine to underscore the profound societal differences that he observes in both countries, in the early 1830s. In a text written in 1832, he argued that:

\begin{quote}
Germany can never be a republic because she is royalist by essence. France on the other hand is republican in nature. By that, I do not mean that the French have more republican virtues than we do. Not at all: These virtues are not overabundant either in France. I am only referring to the specific way republicanism and royalism distinguish themselves from one another, but also they manifest themselves as two completely different facts. [...] The royalism of a people consists in respecting authorities, believing in the individuals that represent these authorities and, in the process, displaying an attachment to these individuals. A people’s republicanism lies in the fact that a republican does not believe in any authority, respects only its laws, relentlessly demands that representatives be held accountable for these laws, observes them with defiance, controls them, never displays attachment to individuals, and, most of all, when these individuals try to take advantage of the people, seeks to belittle them through contradiction, sarcasm and persecution.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

These significant intellectual and societal differences led to diametrically opposed approaches to regional and international issues. Heine often expressed great admiration for the French who relentlessly sought to spread the universal ideals of the Revolution throughout Europe, as if they had a messianic mission comparable to the one of the Hebrews who sought to reach the Promised Land. He found this attitude to be a
strikingly different manifestation of patriotism relative to German patriotism: A patriotic French was so passionate about the ideals of his country that he sought to spread them to the rest of the world, while a patriotic German focuses on the specificities of his country, leading him to a more isolationist attitude. The French Revolution as a manifestation of an aspiring universal civilization contrasts with the German culture which focuses on the specificities of the German nation.

The opposition between those who defended the universal legacies of the French Revolution and the proponents of cultural nationalities became a salient feature of the nineteenth century and a particular manifestation of the struggle between liberal and universalist aspirations on the one hand and conservative forces on the other. Many other contemporaries of the time raised the striking contrast between Berlin and Paris for instance. For instance, Austrian writer Stefan Zweig noted that while the former had never undergone a revolution and displayed significant social rigidity, the legacy of the French Revolution was still very present in the country’s capital where the “proletarian worker” felt as free and as considered as his employer. Zweig also described the Austrian society as highly stratified and hierarchical, which valued stability and scientific progress over radical political change. More broadly, revolutions in the United States and in France provided the grounds for a universal logic in their foreign policy that more conservative powers such as Germany and Austria flatly rejected. The patterns observed at the international level were therefore echoed at the societal level as well to some extent. This opposition provided the intellectual rejection of the individualistic, balance-of-power paradigm with additional strength.
Wilsonianism is the most illustrative practical application of this paradigm in the international realm. The collective security model was designed to defend international law without defining a specific threat as traditional alliances did. The underlying assumption of a collective security mechanism was that there exist universally accepted standards of behavior and international norms that all countries should abide to. This argument is at the heart of the Kantian philosophy and the notion of perpetual peace between democratic republics which find wars too costly and establish reciprocity as a favored practice in international affairs in order to enhance global welfare. In addition, this paradigm of international governance would suggest that standard-abiding countries are more natural partners than those who do not abide or who seek to promote norms that contradict what the security community defines as universal. It bore a striking difference with the balance-of-power paradigm which was founded on the notion that state social and societal features did not matter in the conduct of foreign policy.

**The discredit of the balance-of-power model**

The inability of the balance-of-power paradigm to promote and preserve peace in Europe and the subsequent political collapse of the continent proved disastrous. In fact, the effects and conditions of the First World War proved insufficient to impose a new system of governance, based on collective security—an alternative to the balance of power that had the major advantage of being defended by President Wilson. This alternative was promoted on the grounds that the balance of power exacerbated rivalries and, because it was solely based on military alliances, accelerated escalation. World War I presented the most tragic evidence of this state of affairs. But Wilson was unable to convert the United States’ success into a durable commitment to European security.
American public opinion had considered its country’s intervention as fulfilling a higher end and not necessarily as preserving vital interests abroad. As a result, the weakness with which Wilson defended his objectives in Europe did not alleviate the public’s radical opposition to a permanent presence in Europe.\(^3^9\)

But in spite of Wilson’s and the League of Nation’s failure, World War I not only contributed to the centrality of the United States but also irremediably embedded the country in Europe’s history and in the continent’s constructed identity. Because the war had triggered Europe’s decline as a leading region of the world, it also profoundly modified the terms of the United States’ security. Europe’s political problems and sources of instability were now to be solved by the only non-European power able to do so. The solution that Wilson had formulated emerged as “the great signpost of a liberal world order.”\(^4^0\) It may not have been implemented in the immediate aftermath of World War I but profoundly influenced the terms of the United States’ implication and embeddedness in the European continent.

In fact, Franklin Roosevelt would defend a very similar point of view regarding the nefarious effects of “exclusive alliances” in Europe less than three decades later.\(^4^1\) Therefore, the most noteworthy outcome of the struggle between these two models was the major discredit that Western leaders associated with the balance-of-power model and the shared sense that building unity through the promotion of universally accepted norms was the only solution to preserve peace in the long run. The end of the Second World War signaled the total victory of the paradigm of universality and to some extent the model of collective security that Woodrow Wilson had conceived and that NATO and the European Union best exemplify today. As Kissinger puts it:
Wilson’s intellectual victory proved more seminal than any political triumph could have been. For, whenever America has faced the task of constructing a new world order, it has returned in one way or another to Woodrow Wilson’s precepts. At the end of World War II, it helped build the United Nations on the same principles as those of the League, hoping to found peace on a concord of the victors. When this hope died, America waged the Cold War not as a conflict between two superpowers but as a moral struggle for democracy. When communism collapsed, the Wilsonian idea that the road to peace lay in collective security, coupled with the world-wide spread of democratic institutions, was adopted by administrations of both major American political parties.42

The discredit brought on the balance-of-power paradigm led the United States to commit to European security and to promote a new Western paradigm based on collective security and multilateral cooperation. The accumulation of tragic historical experiences completed the swing of the pendulum to greater unity after the divisive force had devastated the European continent.

*From universality to institutionalization …*

The United States, as the uncontested major power in the West, sought to institutionalize its universal aspirations through a set of different international and regional institutions. The objective of the Bretton Woods negotiations, which successfully took place even before the war ended, was to create a “new and universal economic order” and required ratification of countries “representing at least 65 percent of total quotas” allocated at the conference before its implementation. The tragic recollection of the economic warfare and rivalries of the 1930s, in the aftermath of the 1929 crisis, was a fundamental driver of the United States’ willingness to make the system universal—or at least to have it ratified by wide array of countries—and to include the Soviet Union specifically. In the same spirit and with the same recollection the Great Depression, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade sought to
unconditionally generalize the principle of the “most favored nations” in order to promote free trade and to enhance the welfare of all trading partners. At the political level, the same concept of universality was embedded in one of the founding documents of the United Nations—the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

But because the Soviet Union saw in this new set of interconnected institutions a tool to protect Western capitalist interests, it decided to opt out—and pressured its satellites to act similarly. The direct result is that short of institutionalizing its universal aspirations, the United States institutionalized, in an unprecedented way, a partnership with European nations, refusing to cave in to the country’s traditional isolationist temptation and recognizing their interests in actively engaging in European affairs and enhancing European welfare. While the major and immediate objective of the partnership was to contain the Soviet Union, it progressively laid the grounds for a near unconditional generalization of reciprocity by design—in theory at least. In particular, the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which was not an international but a regional organization, accelerated the institutionalization of the partnership, especially through the fifth article of its charter which established reciprocity as a norm in the case of an attack against one of the alliance’s members. With the organization, “the strategic interdependence of the West became binding.” This interdependence survived the threat that the organization was designed to counter.

The challenge that the United States faced given its inability to universalize the standards of the Bretton Woods institutions echoed in many ways the dual imperative—geopolitical and ideological—that European nations faced in the aftermath of France’s defeat in 1815. As expressed by the NSC-68 document, U.S. strategy in the wake of the
Cold War faced a realist imperative—containing the Soviet threat and not allowing it to obtain a strategic edge that it would necessarily exploit—and a liberal imperative—building a “healthy system,” independent of the existence of a major and existential threat.\textsuperscript{46} The combination of those two objectives would potentially disallow the pendulum to swing back towards more divisions that had proven even more devastating than in the past.

\textit{… To rivalries and bitterness}

The Bretton Woods institutions did not prevent the emergence of frictions and strong disagreements.

The Suez crisis is perhaps the most revealing instance of the existing strains between the trans-Atlantic partners to the extent that it made Europe’s demise as a set of major international powers official. But the consequences of the Eisenhower’s opposition to the Franco-British action against Nasser and the nationalization of the canal seemed to have been interpreted in two distinct ways. One interpretation consisted in pointing out that no single European country was now strong enough to rival with the United States. As a result, unification within what is now the European Union was the only way for the Old Continent to remain relevant in the international sphere. The French, and President de Gaulle in particular, favored this interpretation and “constructed a new identity as the ostensible leader of Europe, upholding a set of universal values in competition with the Americans.”\textsuperscript{47} The Franco-German reconciliation became a major driver of the European construction, though it was in large part made possible by the institutionalization of NATO. In fact, it is only the combination of the latter and the
unification of Europe that provided the most solid evidence that a five-century old civil war in Europe had been terminated.\textsuperscript{48}

The British offered the second interpretation at the time, considering the event as evidence that they were dependent on Washington to the extent that they would never be able to part with the United States. A preference for their partnership with the United States, to the detriment, at times, of their relationship to the rest of Europe, became a salient feature of British foreign policy—a feature that Washington opted to translate in terms of “interdependence” with a unified Europe rather than in terms of dependence.\textsuperscript{49}

This strategic distancing from the Continent on the part of Great Britain made the Franco-German partnership all the more so relevant.\textsuperscript{50} It is noteworthy that this took place just a decade after the final steps of the partnership’s institutionalization. These two conflicting trends have shaped Europe’s identity in contradictory, leaving the question of the place of United States in this identity open. De Gaulle’s unequivocal cooperation with Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis provides some substantial evidence of the ambiguity of this marriage which was never quite a forced one without being a happy one either.

President de Gaulle’s withdrawal from NATO’s joint military command is another illustrative instance of these tensions. But it is noteworthy that this withdrawal only occurred after the United States and Great Britain had rejected his proposal to create a Western directorate—with the United States, Great Britain, and France—which would have entailed an unprecedented political intimacy between political powers.\textsuperscript{51} In fact, the withdrawal did not entail any durable estrangement between France and the rest of the West. In reality, France’s withdrawal was made possible thanks to its unique identity within the West which sought to mix a market-based economy with significant state
interventionism, especially in the social realm. As a result, as Bueno de Mesquita argues, in the struggle between the West and the Soviet Union, France emerged as a “swing vote.” This explains the paradox of France’s position: the country had a greater ability to leverage its influence outside of NATO’s joint military command than within it.

Within the trans-Atlantic community, the swing of the pendulum seems to have been avoided, either because it has been delayed by these institutions or because it has been made impossible.

**The Persisting Partnership**

Depending on the implications that one draws from the increasingly daunting U.S. international agenda in the wake of the end of the Cold War and the growingly diverse challenges that Washington must face in the coming years, the policy implications and the conclusions regarding the prospects of the U.S.-European prospects differ. While some will claim that the centrality of the partnership is less salient because of these challenges, others claim that the opposite and that the current strategic landscape has re-demonstrated the relevance of the trans-Atlantic alliance.

*NATO as the epitome for the trans-Atlantic community*

NATO has come to epitomize the trans-Atlantic community, not merely as a military alliance but also as a community of nations which a shared sense of history and identity and which adhere to the same Western paradigm of political and economic governance. In fact, in the post-World War II landscape, NATO, which was initially manufactured to face a common enemy, the Soviet Union, helped formalize the members’ common identity and political culture. The costs associated with creating a
new institution once NATO’s initial *raison d’être* collapsed and the costs of managing a necessary open-ended alliance with the emergence of new and more diffuse threats allowed the organization and its framework based on diffuse reciprocity—a respect and promotion of mutual obligations based on shared values and norms, best represented by Article V of the NATO charter—to persist beyond the end of the Cold War.\(^{54}\) The cooperation also goes beyond the mere military and political spheres, reaching the ideational realm through global forums and collaborative work between governmental and non-governmental agencies.\(^{55}\) It has become an archetype of a new form of alliance which has the ability to generate value in itself, by allowing its members to manage expectations and to hedge against an uncertain future.

This common identity that NATO helped to forge during and after the Cold War has laid the foundations for a resilient alliance beyond mere military cooperation. An increasing number of politicians and international observers see the alliance as crucial and have discussed the opportunity to institutionalize it in order to organize diplomatic cooperation, facilitate burden sharing and favor the emergence of a common agenda.\(^{56}\) Shared values and past history, argued former French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur, should be the foundation of a Western Union between the European Union and the United States.\(^{57}\) In similar terms, Phillip Bobbitt argued in favor of a “joint doctrine” between the United States, the only true global power, and the European Union, the only political power to have succeeded in developing a supranational framework of governance.\(^{58}\) This doctrine would be a pillar of a “G2,” an informal structure whose role would be to coordinate the United States and Europe’s international diplomatic policies and organize their interventions in the framework of international law.\(^{59}\)
From this standpoint, the end of the Cold War may have had the paradoxical effect of reinforcing the resilience of NATO because the organization is less vulnerable to contingencies on the ground relative to major shifts in members’ grand strategies. As Werner Weidenfeld puts it, the fate of the Western world and of the trans-Atlantic alliance depends on the extent to which “political and cultural links across the Atlantic […] can be preserved and kept alive by future generations, even when external circumstances change.”60 Similarly, regarding France’s re-integration into NATO’s joint military command, Brzezinski observed that:

France’s actions spoke louder than words. A state with a proud sense of its universal vocation sensed something about NATO—not the NATO of the Cold War but the NATO of the twenty-first century—that made it rejoin the world's most important military alliance at a time of far-reaching changes in the world's security dynamics. France’s action underlined NATO's vital political role as a regional alliance with growing global potential.61

The mission and potential of the partnership are therefore not solely defined in terms of its past historical achievements. The debate is clearly forward-looking also. This cumulative historical process therefore played a major role in strengthening the resilience of the trans-Atlantic alliance, which suggests that a common, historically constructed identity is at the basis of the U.S.-European alliance. This resilience is the by-product of long term dynamics that discredited the balance-of-power model and promoted the idea of collective security based on a shared adherence to principles considered as universal.

**Terms of estrangement?**

While many have argued that NATO strengthened the partnership to the extent that the organization cannot solely be considered as a military alliance but also as a
political community, a growing number of analysts have questioned its actual relevance and the relevance of open-ended alliances as well.

Menon argues that the end of the Cold War has made a burdensome alliance such as NATO irrelevant, and expects a shift towards “contingent alignments and specific coalitions created for particular ends” to avoid constraining alliances, unilateralism or isolationism.62 Other scholars and international observers have put the emphasis on the perceptual rift that emerged after the Cold War and increased since. Robert Kagan’s famous observation that “on major strategic and international questions today, Americans are from Mars and Europeans are from Venus” sums up well a shared sense, among students of international relations, of estrangement between the two continents.63 Kagan argues that the split culminated in 2003 with the disagreement between the United States on the one hand and Germany and France on the other, but is the result of a long process that started with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Kagan later confirmed this point of view by pointing out that the Cold War drove Europe and the United States closer together because of “mutual dependence,” and not “mutual affection,” making the prospect of a “permanent alliance” all the less likely.64 Similarly, Thomson argues that while the end of the Soviet Union signified the disappearance of an existential threat for Europe, it only represented a shift in the vector of threats for the United States.65 Therefore, like Kagan, rather than linking this divergence to short-term political considerations, Thomson sees in this split a long-term process that results from conflicting global views. It is noteworthy that like Kagan, Thomson’s conclusion is not that the alliance has or will rupture but that a redefinition of the partnership, accounting for the changes in the strategic landscape since the end of the Cold War, is necessary.66
In addition to these disagreements regarding the international conditions and their shifts since 1991, the United States and Europe have relied on foreign policy traditions which may follow similar rationales but which have not necessarily fostered cooperation. In the United States, Mead describes four trends that have all served as templates for foreign policymakers in the past: The Hamiltonian trend, also known as the realist tradition; the Jacksonian trend, a more populist school attached to the notions of self-help and coercion; the Jeffersonian trend, which seeks to make the United States a global reference of democracy for the rest of the world; and the Wilsonian trend, the idealist and interventionist school of thought, which seeks to spread democracy across the world. These traditions have found counterparts in Europe. The sovereignist tradition of European foreign policy, for whom the nation-state remains the relevant unit of analysis and which considers the European construction and cooperation with the United States with great suspicion, can be considered as a mix of the Hamiltonian and Jacksonian trend, applied to Europe. A more atlanticist, federalist and idealist tradition has also emerged in Europe as a counterpart to the Wilsonian trend of foreign policy. Therefore, there are similarities in the broad templates—or a mix of templates—that Europe and the United States have chosen over time. However, taken together, these different traditions may result in confrontational configurations as they seek to promote domestic—and perhaps regional in the case of Europe—interests exclusively, while considerations pertaining to strategic alliances are secondary.

Similarly, a set of studies have documented the lasting imprints of traditional values and the diverging degrees of secularization within the Western world. What is now known as the “Inglehart Map” relies on factor analysis to show the cultural
boundaries existing between Protestant, Catholic and English-speaking Europe, Latin America, Africa, South Asia, Orthodox countries, Confucian nations, and states from the former Communist bloc. Norris and Inglehart find that, overall, secularization has been a salient trend in economically-developed nations, but also that the proportion of people who adhere to traditional religious views has increased globally because of demographic trends in poorer countries. This view is congruent with the notion that Enlightenment, as a proponent of rationality and scientific knowledge, has led Western populations to move away from traditional religious beliefs. However, Norris and Inglehart find that there are significant differences within the West, and that the United States and Ireland emerge as two notable outliers because of their atypical level of religiosity. They suggest that higher levels of inequality and lower societal and human security in the United States have led to greater religiosity. They also find that religious-influenced worldviews also tend to persist through time, allowing differences between Protestant and Catholic countries in Europe to sustain in spite of secularization. Differences in religion are therefore likely to drive countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership further apart by affecting their worldviews, their value system and their identity. But rather than considering the effects of these differences within the West, the authors focus on the divergence between the West and the rest of the world, predicting that “the expanding gap between the sacred and the secular societies around the globe will have important consequences for world politics, raising the role of religion on the international agenda.” The prediction seems reasonable in the light of the debates at the United Nations and elsewhere regarding the role of religion. But it fails to address the effects of these differences on long existing partnerships.
Conclusion

The contradicting predictions and prospects of the trans-Atlantic community show the extent to which we may be lacking a new paradigm to model resilient relationships. If we build on the pendulum metaphor, a relevant question could consist in asking whether the set of institutions built in the immediate aftermath of World War II and their resilience makes a new swing back towards division all the more so difficult, or if the past period, which has lasted for more than half a century only hints to what could be a swing towards an even more divisive force.

Rajan Menon offers one scenario for division when he views NATO as a Cold War legacy which bears no more relevance given the need for increased flexibility, including in alliances, in an uncertain world. The natural alliance hypothesis suggests that the some partnerships may constitute a tool to alleviate uncertainty, rather than being an object of uncertainty. The previous review of the historical evidence suggests that past dynamics makes this hypothesis highly relevant because actors involved in the trans-Atlantic community have developed a substantial cooperation capital which continues to attract new members. The next section offers to review the theoretical literature, mainly in political science and in economics, to further explore the components that could and should be included in a framework for natural alliances.
CHAPTER III—LITERATURE REVIEW (PART 2)
RIVAL AND SYNTHETIC EXPLANATIONS FOR ALLIANCES

A commonly used Darwinian metaphor depicts states as passively observing strategic changes in the international system and forced to respond in a quasi-Pavlovian way to these ruptures in order to guarantee their survival and their interests. Political reality, in this view, has its own “objective laws” that are “impervious” to state preferences and that profoundly constrain the ability of actors to transform the international system. As a result, this metaphor suggests that the international structure constrains states to the extent that the latter follow the same logic when they seek to align with each other. No single state is specific because of its historical or cultural particularities and all nations obey immutable principles akin to biological laws of survival. This view considers that alliances between states are ahistorical, acultural and therefore, in a way, apolitical since they obey unchanging principles of behavior. One can quickly notice the limitation of this depiction of state alliances, manufactured political products *par excellence* since Ancient Greece, as apolitical phenomena.

An alternative narrative on alliances could consider the role of a nation’s intellectual software which defines its mode of thinking and of operating in its international strategic landscape. Relying on this intellectual software, nations identify features of the international system as well as some of their own characteristics that they wish to preserve in their own interest. Rather than passive actors seeking to maximize their chances of survival, states emerge as active members of an international system that they can shape through alliances and interactions with other countries. As a result, state alignments do not systematically obey the same rules and may rely on different logics,
depending on the context and the goal that states are seeking to achieve. Historical and cultural particularities of states may therefore influence alignment patterns. This narrative depicts alliances as less mechanical and automatic in nature, and more as a mindful and complexly calculated expression of state interests. It does not necessarily contradict the notion that states seek to guarantee their survival, but involves a broader definition of survival that relies on a more positive approach—preserving features—rather than on a more pessimistic one—containing powers and threats.

The difference between these two narratives plays a crucial role in understanding two major disagreements in the literature regarding alliances and in particular: (a) the appropriate framework for and the effects of uncertainty on alliances and (b) the practical implications of alliances on international stability. Clearing up this misconceptions and reconciling these different views involves accepting the notion that alliances do not necessarily follow the same logic and may differ in nature. The following literature review lays the ground for a more systematic taxonomy of state alliances that can clear up these disagreements.

The rest of this chapter is divided as follows. First, I discuss the notion and the meaning of a state’s intellectual software and its effects on alignments. Then, I explore and detail the terms of the disagreements on alliances between different schools of international relations. This explanation leads me to contend that different alliance logics and rationales may be at the heart of these diverging narratives and disagreements. I find that tactics, regime type and history, and commonalities in identity and in political culture are three potential triggers for state alignment according to the literature.
The Revenge of the Software Over the Hardware

Biology and international relations

The transposition of Charles Darwin’s findings in biology to the field of international relations has suggested that the struggle for power and resources is a central driver of state behavior. The process of natural selection entails a struggle for survival in which only those states that are the most adapted to the international environment prevail. As a result, historical experience is neither decisive nor transmitted from generation to generation within a given country. Specific state and system features are not accounted for in this framework. In this sense, the Darwinian metaphor mentioned above suggests that the existence of ironclad laws that constrain the behavior of states in similar ways and that lead them to act in a way that maximizes their likelihood of survival, irrespective of their particular features.

However synthetic, the use of Charles Darwin’s findings is unsatisfactory at many levels. The suggestion that countries will never pay attention to their allies’ and to the international system’s characteristics because they only and systematically seek to reach a unique objective—maximizing their likelihood of survival—is an easily refutable proposition. As the previous chapter showed, embedded in the U.S. strategy of the early Cold War was the notion that a “healthy international system” would constitute a key strategic asset for Washington’s foreign policy, irrespective of the existence of the Soviet threat. Similarly, those that celebrate the persisting trans-Atlantic partnership point to the common features of the different members of the community and the similar features of the international system that they seek to preserve. These observations suggest that history and common experience of formative historical events can potentially lead actors
to construct a similar identity and intellectual software. States may identify some of their own features and some characteristics of the international system that they want to preserve, because the persistence of those features and characteristics are intrinsically to the states’ definition of survival.\(^4\)

More profoundly, if one analyzes the contribution of Charles Darwin’s findings to the fields of social sciences and to international relations theory in particular, it is hard for one to ignore the most recent development in the field of biology concerning Darwinism and genetics. The recent re-emergence of epigenetics in biology is particularly interesting from this point of view.\(^5\) As one journalist puts it,

\[\ldots\text{]}\text{epigenetics is the study of changes in gene activity that do not involve alterations to the genetic code but still get passed down to at least one successive generation. These patterns of gene expression are governed by the cellular material the epigenome—that sits on top of the genome, just outside it [\ldots] It is these epigenetic "marks" that tell your genes to switch on or off, to speak loudly or whisper. It is through epigenetic marks that environmental factors like diet, stress and prenatal nutrition can make an imprint on genes that is passed from one generation to the next.}\(^6\)

Recent experiences and research have suggested that this imprint is of particular importance for the genome’s functioning. For instance, some scientists now believe that talent is more closely related to the environment one develops in and to the diligence with which one works rather than to innate features. In fact, the debate between nature and nurture may be obsolete because the interactions between genes and the environment in which one evolves may better explain outcomes and results. These new findings point to the possibility that not one but two dynamics are affecting an individual’s cell type. In particular, if a person’s genome can be thought of as an individual’s “hardware,” her epigenome can be thought of as her “software.”\(^7\)
Therefore, there are grounds to build a refined metaphor that applies these new findings in biology to international relations. Just like the same genome associated with a different epigenome will produce a different cell type, a country with a different historical experience will lead to differences in behavior in the same strategic landscape because of differences in constructed identity and intellectual software. As a result, any single event at a given time will not have a linear effect on all states because of the distribution of power and the threat perception, as we already knew previously, but also because of past historical experiences that have led countries to construct their identities in different or similar ways and that have contributed to creating different types of intellectual software at the country level. Commonalities in constructed identity, in turn, have the potential to favor coordination between states.

**Intellectual software and strategic culture**

The notion of intellectual software resembles in many ways the concept of strategic culture. The latter was first developed in a 1977 RAND Corporation report which found that because Soviets and Americans are not “culture-free” or “preconception-free game theorists,” their interpretation and strategic thinking with regards to the use of nuclear weapons may widely differ. This may lead the Soviets to prefer unilateral damage prevention to the detriment of cooperative strategies, contrary to American expectations.\(^8\) Strategic culture was therefore thought of as an additional source of constraint on state behavior and as an additional tool to understand the strategy of rival states.\(^9\) Therefore, strategic culture was initially conceived more as a force to account for when dealing with an enemy rather than as a potential unifying force between allies sharing a common intellectual software.
However, later developments of the concept laid the ground for a different approach to strategic culture, and in particular one which focused on the standardizing and regulating power of culture on decision-making processes. This approach relies on social psychology models and discusses how agents manage incoming flows of new information and update, gradually, their knowledge structure which may be slow to change and more enduring than for a rational and unitary actor. Therefore, in this analysis, strategic culture plays a key role in shaping policymakers’ interpretations and decisions in a way that leaves a lasting imprint. This approach to strategic culture hints to the possible role of commonalities in countries’ intellectual software in making coordination and multi-player decision-making processes more efficient and less costly.

The advent of a political project for the European Union led some analysts to raise this question of a common strategic culture between allies, emphasizing the complexities of the elaboration of such a doctrine, in more explicit terms. The major contribution of this new body of literature is to shed light on the potential benefits that states can draw from a common intellectual and strategic software in order to enhance the prospects of coordination and cooperation. After all, it is interesting to note the semantic ambiguity behind the idea of a “strategic culture,” which could also be understood as a culture strategically chosen or used for international purposes. Admittedly, culture refers to a set of values, beliefs and to an identity that one would expect to display inertia over time. However, sociological approaches have also shed light on how culture shapes action, specifically by providing a “tool kit” of values from which actors can build a portfolio of possible strategies. In this perspective, culture does not define the ends of actions, but provides the foundation on which strategies of action rely.
the concept would allow us to think about “strategic culture” as a strategic use of culture, making the latter a strategic tool for coordination rather than a force constraining state action.

The revision would lead us to consider the potential emergence of a common strategic culture between allies as the elaboration of a common manufactured intellectual software because countries would find some strategic utility in being more aware of their own identity and the identity of their potential partners and rivals. This would suggest that it is not a unique dynamic—namely the struggle for survival—driving states together but possibly several different logics triggering states to align with others. The next sections focus on the disagreements in the literature regarding the way alliances emerge and function, and the last section points to three distinct logics for state alignments.

First Disagreement: Finding the Appropriate Framework for Alliances

The traditional definition of alliances emphasizes the tactics—mainly military ones—of states who seek to enhance the likelihood of survival and to protect their vital interests against other states. With the end of the Cold War, some academic and policy circles have broadened the concept to include formal or informal political commitments and security partnerships that are not necessarily dependent on the existence of an immediate threat. In fact, a striking feature of policy and academic debates is the significant divergence regarding the implications of the changing strategic landscape and the growing uncertainty in an interconnected world for alliances and security cooperation agreements between states. Does this growing uncertainty apply to all realms of international relations, including alliances? Or are the latter a tool to hedge against
uncertainty, allowing states to signal their intentions and their commitments and thereby introducing some predictability in future alignments? Two schools of thought have debated the implications of the new strategic environment on alliances between states. The first claims that greater uncertainty entails a greater need for flexibility in security partners.14 According to this view, ad hoc coalitions have emerged as the relevant choice for states, even if they entail greater uncertainty regarding the prospects of long term partnerships. This school of thought puts the emphasis on the threat and the adversary to explain the formation and the sustainment of an alliance. The second current regards alliances as a device alleviating the most salient effects of uncertainty and as the most appropriate response to the enlarging set of global threats.15 This school considers with greater optimism the prospect of long term alliances which help states introduce greater predictability in an uncertain global landscape by promoting security cooperation beyond or independent of the existence of a major threat. It views the international system and the alliances that compose it as strategic assets that allow states to deal with a wide set of diffuse threats. These two views are not necessarily contradictory and reflect different definitions of the concept of alliance. But reviewing the terms of this disagreement can be most helpful in understanding the functions and the purpose that are assigned to alliances today.

Adversary-based alliances in an uncertain strategic landscape

The first model, of realist inspiration and which some challengers of realism have also adopted, is adversary- and deterrence-based. A major assumption of this framework is that anarchy best characterizes the international system in which there is no central authority. The framework describes a central mechanism in the balance-of-power and the
balance-of-threat models. This view cannot conceive an alliance without the existence of a rival country or a threat. As a result, an alliance is necessarily short-lived and adversary-based, and is contingent on the persistence of the power or threat it was originally designed to counter. For instance, Walt defines alliances as “expedient responses to external threats.”\(^\text{16}\) Snyder contends that “alliances have no meaning apart from the adversary threat to which they are a response.”\(^\text{17}\) These views illustrate best how realism has modeled cooperation between two states. In the realist framework, the same causes lead to the same consequences—namely the emergence of a power or a threat will lead to the emergence of a counter coalition. The formation of an alliance is quite mechanical from this point of view because it does not display any utility beyond the containment of a particular threat. It obeys precisely defined and comprehensible principles of state behavior.

This contention assumes a very narrow definition of an alliance between two or a set of states and dismisses the possibility of an enduring and open-ended partnership because the composition of alliances will constantly change with the distribution of power and the perception of threats.\(^\text{18}\) As a result, alliances are as affected by global uncertainty as any other object or manifestation of international politics. This view is largely influenced by the belief in the existence of a security dilemma.

The security dilemma depicts a situation akin to Rousseau’s “stag hunt,” in which states have no certainty about the intentions of other countries—cooperating and reaching an outcome preferred by all actors or pursuing unilateral goals in spite of the lesser payoffs. States do not necessarily have aggressive objectives towards their neighbors but they feel compelled to increase their defense expenditures fearing that other countries do
have expansionist aspirations, or may have such ambitions in the future.\textsuperscript{19} The increase in defense expenditures, which is initially meant as a defensive measure against the potential aggressive intentions of others, signals in turn hostile aims to other countries which have no way to accurately interpret it for what it is.\textsuperscript{20} As a result, other countries will increase their defense budgets, and conditions for the well-documented spiral of escalation are united. The security dilemma concept suggests that “who aligns with whom results from a bargaining process that is theoretically indeterminate.” Indeed, an application of the security dilemma to alliance politics suggests that states will feel compelled to align instead of abstaining.\textsuperscript{21} Because other countries will interpret the alliance formation as a hostile move, alliance formations will accelerate escalation. Proponents of the security dilemma therefore insist on two key features of international politics: (a) there is no clear way to interpret the intentions of other states even if they form an alliance at some point in time and (b) states are passive subjects in the wake of changes in structure, the emergence and the disappearance of threats and merely react to those after having observed them.

This assumption leads to a widely-shared conclusion that uncertainty prevails in all realms of international politics, including alliances. Waltz finds that “the condition of insecurity—at least, the uncertainty about the other’s future intentions and actions—works against [state] cooperation,”\textsuperscript{22} and that “in the absence of an external authority, a state cannot be sure that today’s friend will not be tomorrow’s enemy.”\textsuperscript{23} Similarly, Mearsheimer contends that “alliances are only temporary marriages of convenience: today’s alliance partner might be tomorrow’s enemy, and today’s enemy might be tomorrow’s alliance partner.”\textsuperscript{24} This view concludes that “alliance handicaps” do not
exist since past partnerships do not shape or condition future state choices of alignments. The process that characterizes interactions between states is therefore ahistorical because it does not have any memory.

This conclusion is not merely theoretical and has significant policy implications regarding the optimal alignment behavior of states. The argument that uncertainty pervades to all realms of international politics, including to alliances, entails for a greater need for flexibility. It is at the heart of Betts’s refutation of the relevance of collective security mechanisms which are rigid in nature and which do not display the necessary “flexibility and adaptability to unforeseen contingencies” in the wake of the end of the Cold War. Ad hoc alliances will have the greatest ability to address a wide set of contingencies. Menon updates the finding and contends that current U.S. partnerships—a Cold War legacy—“have become impediments that inhibit creative strategic thinking at home, while infantilizing our partners who live under the American shadow.” He reaches a similar conclusion, as he argues that only “contingent alignments and specific coalitions created for particular ends” will lead to successful and efficient outcomes.

To summarize, in this view, a global landscape characterized by increased uncertainty call for greater flexibility and adaptability and therefore entails that future alliances are not a given but a variable. International uncertainty results in uncertain future alliances.

**Standalone alliances as a hedging strategy against uncertainty**

A second framework considers the possibility of standalone and open-ended alliances which have an intrinsic value and internal dynamics independent of the external
environment. It considers alliances and collective security mechanisms as potential
devices for states to signal their long term intentions and therefore to coordinate their
policies more easily. This view is more heteroclite in its theoretical foundations but
primarily relies on the liberal school of international relations and game theory.

Central to this view is the notion that systematic distrust towards partners may not
be a strictly dominant strategy on the part of states. Put differently, states may seek ways
to signal their non-hostile intentions to potential partners and their willingness to
cooperate because they believe that cooperation can yield more profitable outcomes.
Through their alignment choices, states can hedge not against a single contingency as
Betts suggests but against a wide set of future scenarios and therefore see in their
alignments the possibility to introduce some predictability in the international system. A
common ideology, or more specifically a common constructed identity, can feed
countries’ motivation to align with one another, even in spite of the absence of an initial
threat, and agree to address a wide set of international set of issues.

In his seminal work on reciprocity in international relations, Keohane finds that in
some instances of international regimes, “actors recognize that a ‘veil of ignorance’
separates them from the future but nevertheless offer benefits to others on the assumption
that these will rebound to their own advantage in the end.”28 Similarly, Bueno de
Mesquita concludes that:

In the nineteenth century, defense pacts were typically couched in very
specific language that laid out exactly what circumstances had to arise
before the alliance promise of mutual defense would be invoked. Today,
defense pacts, such as NATO […] are much broader, with few narrowing
contingencies. Perhaps this broadening of defense pacts reflects the
difficulties inherent in anticipating what might arise in a world with many
more democratic governments that must be responsive to the changing
wants of their constituents.29
Finally, Hunter argues that the Atlantic Alliance has some strategic utility in itself and “preserving [it], not just for its own sake but also for the sake of continuing to promote a broader community of interests and values, not least in economic and other nonmilitary areas” would be strategically justified on the part of the United States. These views suggest that alliances may allow states to signal their intentions to potential partners and their commitment to sustained cooperation which can be beneficial to all parties in the long run. It may also be a way for states to manage an ever-widening set of contingencies and possible unanticipated forces—a distinctive feature of the post-Cold War era.

If states can better deal with international uncertainty through their alliances, then there may be an “alliance handicap” affecting alignments between states. Efficient cooperation between a set of states at some point in time may increase the likelihood of future cooperation because of common expectations and because of the recognition of the initial efficient partnership. States may offer others some benefits which can payoff later of because of existing mutual commitments. This mechanism is at the heart of the idea of collective security systems which “institutionalize, and therefore promote, cooperative relations among states,” argue Charles and Clifford Kupchan. Not only does a collective security arrangement increase the likelihood of the emergence of a counter-coalition when a major threat has been identified, but it also reduces the probability of misperceptions and “unintended spirals” leading to confrontation. Put differently, institutionalized alliances can enhance communication between its members and allow a partnership to sustain beyond the disappearance of a threat it was designed to counter.
To sum up, in this view, alliances result from the willingness of states to hedge against an uncertain future. States are not passively subjected to structural change and do not necessarily react to it according to a principle akin to biological laws of survival. They can be active agents of change whose adaptation and alignments are part of a calculated strategy against an uncertain future.

**Diverging perceptions of the nature of the international system**

Diverging perceptions of the nature of the international system and architecture are at the heart of this disagreement regarding the effects of uncertainty on alliances. Both approaches consider the international system as a complex system but each only takes into account one of the several conclusions of complex systems theory, ignoring other results.

A complex system is composed of interconnected components which all have the potential of affecting the system’s functioning. But taken as a whole, the system may also display some properties, features or behave in way that is not easily predictable if one only observes the properties, features and behavior of the components that compose it. In this sense, complex systems are both “atomistic” and “holistic” at the same time. The application of the concept of complex systems to international relations has provided additional insights on interactions between states, especially because it seeks to challenge the determinism of previous international relations theories. The international system is a network of interacting states, policies and strategies with a complex degree of integration. The effects of these interactions are more “synergistic,” “contingent” and “recursive” than they are “additive” or “linear”, given their high dependence on context and on structure. A single component, independent of its relative size or power, has the
potential of triggering major shifts within the structure. But as a whole, the international system also displays short term and long term dynamics which go beyond the mere addition of the sum of individual states. As such, the international system can be modeled as a complex system.

Waltz, proponent of the idea that international uncertainty applies to alliances, first initiated this trend by positing the anarchic, complex and chaotic nature of international relations as well as the system level effects on relations between states. He concluded that because it entailed a too even distribution of power, multi-polarity blurred the clear-cut boundaries between enemies and allies that involved a bipolar system. Therefore bipolarity was a factor of stability. Later studies and efforts to integrate complex systems theory in the analysis of international relations led to similar conclusions which established a relationship between the increase of interactions in the international system with the increase of structural vulnerability of the system, leading to highly uncertain outcomes.

However, these conclusions continue to be highly influenced by the realist assumption of anarchy and by its major corollary—uncertainty which pervades to all realms of international relations including to alliances. By his own admission, Waltz chooses to leave aside the characteristics of actors, the way they act in the international system and the interactions between them in order to focus on a “purely positional picture” which depicts the way states “stand in relation to one another.” In other words, Waltz only focuses on the “holistic” nature of the system while neglecting its “atomistic” features. In reality, results of complex systems theory are more subtle. Complex systems theory teaches us that a highly interconnected and homogeneous ensemble is
highly unstable. But this does not necessarily lead to chaos. Chaos, or a state of “extreme unpredictability” in which the system is very sensible to small changes in initial conditions, is only one possible outcome. Another outcome can be self-organization: a complex system may “just grow” by repeating the geometries it involves at one point in time continuously in time. The repetition of some of its geometries enables the system to evolve and to adapt to crises by providing some sources of certainty in a quite uncertain system.

This suggests that the chaotic and unstable system may be a potential for distortion of state behavior because states will voluntarily seek to reproduce familiar patterns beyond the defense of their interests in order to alleviate the effects of uncertainty. The defense of interests may be only one dynamic of state behavior. The interactions between states affect the system because they have a legacy. The process is not without memory. There is an alliance handicap because states are constrained beyond their national interest in their alignment with other countries. This is particularly true of members of a coalition designed to counter a threat or a hegemon because they can capitalize on their successful cooperation.

Therefore, if a first dynamic explaining state behavior is the defense of national interest, a second dynamic, which is not necessarily incompatible or contradictory, is seeking to introduce some points of references in an environment characterized by uncertainty. These two dynamics are therefore likely to affect international stability.
Second Disagreement: Practical Implications of Alliances on International Stability

The previous sections showed that different dynamics drove states to align with each other. Among those dynamics, one is straightforward and widely-documented. It describes the tactical and instrumental use that states make out of alliances which serve short-term and context-defined objectives. Another dynamic is deeper and pertains to the longer run. It results from the need to establish mutually accepted reference points in an uncertain environment. Those reference points are a source of predictability and allow states to signal their intentions and better interpret the intentions of others. They may be a by-product of commonalities in history or in institutions, or the fruit of a common constructed identity. Taken together, these dynamics can be a far greater source of international stability in a multi-polar context than the previous literature has suggested.

Tactics and stabilizing alignments

Two competing narratives seek to envision possible scenarios in the wake of the current debate around the reform of the international political and economic system. The first narrative emphasizes on the colliding interests between Western countries, and namely the United States and Western European nations, and emerging political powers, namely the group commonly referred to as the BRIC—Brazil, Russia, India, and China. The internal dynamics of international summits and institutions determine the content of the broader agenda of the international community and specifically what the latter decides to discuss and what it decides to ignore. This view concludes that, in the light of the diverging interests between actors, power struggles and confrontations are much likelier. This narrative predicts the centrality of geopolitical concerns and realpolitik in state strategies. One observer takes this logic a step further by predicting that this
international context would lead to the return to geopolitical practices and the balance of power of the nineteenth century.44

The second narrative considers the ability of the trans-Atlantic Community to influence outcomes, given their current leverage—which will not necessarily persist through time. This view considers the successful cooperation between the United States and European countries which has led to the establishment of an international system that may have proven its limits but that promoted the Western paradigm of free markets and political liberalism.45 This narrative puts the emphasis on the ability of the West to restate and prove once again the efficiency of such a paradigm. With the right set of incentives, the United States and European countries have the ability to attract emerging powers into this system.46 More generally, the existence of a core axis between the United States and Europe can also be considered as a source of stability if it is successful enough. In the words of the former National Security Advisor of President Ford, Brent Scowcroft:

You need some points of constancy in the world, of predictability, of shared commitment. I still think, for example, that a redefined Atlantic Alliance makes sense as a factor of stability in the world, provided it’s open-ended and willing to admit others once they’re prepared to join.47

Both narratives insist on the centrality of the trans-Atlantic community as a core axis of cooperation and political consultation. They differ on the consequences of the existence of such an axis. While the first narrative sees this axis as a potential source of exacerbation of the rivalry, the second considers that the trans-Atlantic community has a unique opportunity to rebuild a healthy system and to promote a governance model that could benefit all stakeholders. In addition, the second narrative considers that while it has the ability to do so now, the trans-Atlantic community may not have the necessary
leverage to undertake such a task in a few decades when the power of the BRIC will have materialized.

These two narratives clearly illustrate the coexistence of two dynamics that manifest themselves in state interactions. On the one hand, interdependent powers are forced to negotiate the future of the international political and economic architecture. On the other hand, within these negotiations, they seek to alleviate the effects of uncertainty by reaffirming some of their key features. This explains why the trans-Atlantic community can emerge as a stabilizing force.

**Homogeneity and heterogeneity in the international system**

Inseparable from the previous debate is the question of cultural differences and the alleged homogenization of civilizations as a result of globalization. A corollary of complex systems theory is that heterogeneity can be a factor of stability. Far from being a real disadvantage, the existence of an alliance handicap can lead to a logic of blocs that promotes international stability: persisting alliances provide some certainty to states which can lead them to downgrade the threats of countries outside the bloc. Heterogeneity among actors can lead them to search for reliable partners—that is, allies who see the world as they do. In fact, if globalization has led to an increased consciousness about others, it also seems to have led to questions regarding one’s own identity, and to a reasserted willingness to defend the principles and culture that actors consider as just or universal. This has led many authors to see in heterogeneity—and consciousness about that heterogeneity—to believe that conflict was inevitable. But there is no evidence that the logic of rivalry will necessarily prevail on the logic of alliances and cooperation.
Moreover, the existence of different blocs of alliances contributes to international stability because the failure of one bloc of alliances (and the potential failure of its paradigm) will not undermine the stability of the system as a whole. Put differently, if the international system is homogeneous because one bloc of alliances has imposed its model, a major crisis within the latter and its potential subsequent collapse will lead to great instability and uncertainty. Daniel Cohen claims that this is at the heart of the financial crisis which started in 2007: Because globalization has led, in his opinion, to the westernization of the world, a major crisis in the Western model could mean the undermining of the global civilization as a whole.49 This would only be true if homogeneity is a distinctive feature of the international system—that is, if there are no major differences in terms of identity and culture across countries. The reverse situation—blocs of homogeneous alliances which, taken together, are a source of heterogeneity—would actually generate greater international stability. International diversity can therefore be an additional stabilizing force.

Alliances Do Not Necessarily Follow the Same Logic

The previous sections suggest that there are different and complex dynamics driving states together and apart, and more broadly affecting their interactions. The real misunderstandings stem from the initial assumption made by all currents in international relations theory, namely that a single framework can characterize alliances because they all follow the same logic. The revision of this assumption can lead to a more constructive exploration of alliances and of their potential role in international politics.
More specifically, the coexistence of tactical alliances and enduring ones, both at a given point in time or when history is considered as a whole, suggests that state partnerships, which are politically manufactured by design, can serve different purposes. A given alliance may include members who perceive their respective benefits in different terms relative to their other partners. Similarly, Alliance A may serve a purpose X while alliance B may serve a purpose Y, though both alliances may include an overlapping set of countries and coexist. In addition, while alliance A may serve a given purpose at its inception, its rationale may evolve over time and contribute to additional or different objectives. The challenge lies in reviewing these different rationales in order to assess the extent to which different alliance formation models offer rival explanations or in fact concentrate on different phenomena.

Alliances as a response to a power or a threat

The realist and neorealist schools of international relations have influenced alliance theory beyond the disagreements that it displays with other currents, namely the liberal school and constructivism. Central to the realist framework of international relations is the notion of state reaction to changes in the international landscape. In particular, realism considers the international distribution of power as the major explanatory variable for alliance formation. A redistribution of power, leading a state to emerge as more powerful, will lead weaker states to coalesce and to balance the new international power. Morgenthau first formulated this balance-of-power theory with the belief that alliance formation is mechanical because it obeys “objective laws” that state preferences cannot influence.50 The neorealist refinement of the balance-of-power theory led to a greater focus on threats rather than power as the explanatory variable for alliance
formation. In both cases, as discussed above, alliances are considered as a mechanical manifestation of a country’s willingness to protect its most vital interests, irrespective of its particularities. Alliances are considered as strategic only to the extent that they are tactical.

These pessimistic conclusions are highly dependent on the narrow definition of the alliance concept. Walt’s analysis of alliance formation is quite illustrative of this specific limitation in the realist framework. The sample that he chooses to test his hypothesis stems from this definition: By his own account, it includes an overwhelming amount of “young nations” from a homogeneous region in terms of identity—the Middle East—and whose interactions are therefore more tactical in nature than strategic in the short period he takes into account. In addition, also as a result of the narrow definition, when he explores whether ideology plays a role in alliance formation, the hypothesis that he tests is whether or not ideology can provide cement for an alliance against a common enemy. An alternative way of assessing the role of ideology could have consisted in testing whether or not a common ideology can provide cement for sustained cooperation even if the initial threat the alliance was designed to counter disappeared, or whether a common ideology could be driving state alignments even in the absence of an initial threat. The difference is subtle but significant. This does not question the validity of Walt’s results but makes them highly dependent on context. Said differently, Walt’s framework is only useful to analyze short term, tactical interactions between states seeking to reach short term goals.

In addition, even if alliances are tactical in nature, they may not necessarily serve the same purpose relative to one another or for each of the composing members.
finds a difference in logic between symmetric alliances—in which states aggregate their capabilities to increase their security—and asymmetric alliances—which involves powerful states guaranteeing greater security for weaker states in exchange for greater policy autonomy. While a symmetric alliance serves the same purpose for all of its members, an asymmetric alliances helps its members which do not have the same power capability fulfill objectives that differ in nature. Relying on historical data, Morrow also contends that asymmetric alliances are more likely to sustain because they provide their members with what they lacked most—either autonomy or power.53

Finally, in the case of persisting threats, the additional challenge of burden sharing may modify the internal dynamics of the alliance. Olson and Zeckhauser applied the classic collective action model to NATO members and found that the usual conclusion—“the larger nation “will pay a share of the costs that is larger than its share other benefits, and thus the distribution of costs will be quite different form that which a system of benefit taxation would bring about”—is verified. However, if smaller countries draw non-collective benefits from military spending—in dealing alone with an insurgency for instance—Olson and Zeckhauser conclude that,

[…] a decline in the amity, unity, and community of interest among allies need not necessarily reduce the effectiveness of an alliance, because the decline in these alliance “virtues” produces a greater ratio of private to collective benefits. This suggests that alliances troubled by suspicions and disagreements may continue to work reasonably well. To be sure, the degree of coordination among the allies will decline, and this will reduce the efficiency of the alliance forces […] but the alliance forces will be larger.54

Persisting threats and converging interests may therefore not be the only glue holding an alliance together. The alliance’s internal dynamics can also account for its
resilience since diverging interests may have the paradoxical effect of creating the conditions for greater contribution from smaller states.

To summarize, a first alliance rationale that can be identified here is tactics. This rationale usually corresponds to a reasoning that concentrates on the short term and that regards the alliance as a mechanical and an instrumental response to a threat. Conditions on the ground fully justify the alliance: Opportunistic states, involved in cynical calculations and diplomatic practices, agree to this “marriage of convenience” to reach their objectives—namely, protecting their interests and enhancing the likelihood of survival. It does not suggest however that all members will necessarily seek to reach the same objectives when they align. It does not suggest either that all alliances are tactical in the same way—namely that they are all meant to aggregate the defense capabilities of all states. In addition, in the case of persisting threats, members may take unilateral action to increase their contribution to draw non-collective benefits. As a result, diverging interests do not necessarily lead to the collapse of a deterrence-based alliance.

**Influences of regime type and history**

In contrast with the realism current of international relations, the liberal school considers the prospects of cooperation between states with greater optimism, considering the effects of repeated interactions, interdependence between states and the potential influence of supranational institutions. In this view, alliances are not necessarily the result of a mechanical process but the by-product of political, historical and economic considerations.

In particular, the Democratic Peace theory contends that the nature of the regimes involved in an alliance may help states alleviate the effects of international uncertainty.
Specifically, tenants of this theory argue that republican democracies are domestically restrained from going to war with each other given the very features of their regime based on the rule of law and which include a “constitutional guarantee of caution” in the exercise of war.\textsuperscript{56} Combined with their structural and institutional features, their adherence to liberal principles and democratic processes and the pressure of public opinions substantially reduces the likelihood of war between them—though it does not do the same to the likelihood of conflict between democratic and non-democratic states.\textsuperscript{57} As a result, partnerships between democracies may be able to sustain even in the absence of an immediate threat because of the nature of the regimes involved in the alliance. Even if they are unlikely to achieve the “perpetual peace” conceived by Immanuel Kant, democratic states may find in the nature of their regime a focal point to sustain long term cooperation.\textsuperscript{58}

Relying on a radically different approach to international relations—Marxism and more specifically on Antonio Gramsci’s work on historical blocs—Stephen Gill reaches a similar conclusion regarding ties between Western countries in the aftermath of World War 2. He observes that the “congruence or ‘fit’ between interpenetrating political, economic and military structures” between Western capitalist states in the aftermath of the World War 2 constituted a solid foundation for what he calls an “organic alliance.”\textsuperscript{59} This “Gramscian metaphor” is based on the notion of “historic blocs”—a “historical congruence between material forces, institutions, and ideologies” which is “politically organized around a set of ideas” or “dominant ideology.”\textsuperscript{60} The metaphor “implies that U.S. post-war policies have produced a structural change in international relations, one that has a great deal of permanence and continuity.”\textsuperscript{61} Gill contends that the end of the
Second World War gave birth to a new international historical bloc centered around the United States that relied on the growing political, economic and military interpenetration between Western countries. This new international historical bloc provided the cement for the nascent international system, based on the Bretton Woods and the United Nations’ system of economic and political multilateralism. The United States’ dominant position allowed it to institutionalize a wide set of economic and financial standards and to promote and protect the political and financial interests of the capitalist system. But Gill also asserts that the bloc “brought together not only fractions of productive and financial capital, but also elements in the state apparatuses, centrist political parties and non-communist organized labor in the major capitalist nations. Forces associated with the bloc in the USA were able to forge consciously links with counterparts in Europe, to form a concept of transatlantic political community.” Gill’s contention that this “organic alliance structure” revolving around the United States’ dominant role suggests that some partnerships may be more resilient because of the nature of the ties between countries and because the alliance is not merely tactical.

These two frameworks depart from the traditional organizational and institutional arguments of the liberal school of international relations which claim that the resilience of an institutionalized partnership can be explained by bureaucratic inertia. Those arguments consist in pointing to the strong, powerful and privileged bureaucracies existing in international organizations such as NATO that have a significant stake in seeing their organization persist even if it has outlived its purpose. Put simplistically and bluntly, international organizations never disappear. Other studies suggest that organizational and institutional inertia is insufficient to explain the persistence of an
organization like NATO which has allowed its members to forge common culture and which has allowed for the emergence of a partnership and a security regime that its members value. Together with Democratic Peace Theory and Gill’s “organic alliance” theory, these studies suggest that threats and organizational inertia alone cannot explain the resilience of the trans-Atlantic partnership. They have the merit of discussing the role of history, institutions and democratic values in the persistence of some alliances.

These frameworks are limited in a number of ways though. Beyond the criticism that has been addressed to the theory of Democratic Peace, it is significant to point out that its argument is about regime type only. In fact, according to the Democratic Peace Theory, there would be no difference between the U.S.-Japanese partnership and the trans-Atlantic community. This contradicts the intuition that one could have with regards to the existence of a unique partnership between Western countries, or, at the very least, falls short of providing some predictions regarding culturally different blocs. Gill’s “organic alliance” theory attempts to explain this uniqueness—in other words, what makes the U.S.-European alliance a “community”—but centers his observations around the United States’ role, in the aftermath of the Second World War in particular. His approach is therefore highly dependent on context and does not inform us on the nature of the partnership after the end of the Cold War. In particular, it fails to explain the persistence of the trans-Atlantic relationship and the willingness of the European countries to continue to cooperate with the United States in spite of the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the existential threat that the Soviet Union represented. It does not offer a systemic analysis of alliances. In addition, the notion of “organic alliances” has generated a lot of confusion. There does not seem to be a consensus on which
countries are included in the organic alliance and which countries are not. Gill’s earlier work on the Trilateral Commission and the effects of American power seemed to suggest that Japan could be included in this organic alliance.\(^{63}\) The work reviewed above seems to suggest that the concept applies to the trans-Atlantic community only—and others have followed this narrower definition.\(^{64}\)

To summarize, these two pieces of the literature suggest that institutions as well as history can affect states’ alignment behavior. These two components are also deeply related. Institutions—as Kant himself knew—are a product of history and historical learning process. Perpetual peace is not an instant consequence but the fruit of long, historical trends. Similarly, the notion of organic alliances is based on the idea that institutions are the vector of ideologies and practices and help the latter reproduce themselves over time. But it also seems that the historical rationale of an alliance is more general and that institutions are a more specific logic of state alignments. This means that history can allow cooperative practices to repeat over time without a concurrent reproduction of an ideology. Put differently, we can differentiate between historical allies who do not necessarily share commonalities in regime type and historical-institutional partners which do.

**Culture and coordination**

The constructivist school of international relations has sought to challenge the previous and dominant other two currents by hypothesizing the role of state culture and identity in the formation of beliefs and policies. In particular, in his seminal work on constructivism, Wendt challenges the notion that state identity and interests can be exogenously determined. Instead, he argues that “the process of creating institutions is
one of internalizing new understandings of self and other, of acquiring new role identities, not just of creating external constraints on the behavior of exogenously constituted actors.\textsuperscript{65} Put differently, constructivism challenged the traditional realist prism by hypothesizing that “security environments in which states are embedded are an important part cultural and institutional, rather than just material” and that “cultural environments affect not only the incentives for different kinds of state behavior but also the basic character of states.”\textsuperscript{66}

As a result, a mere cost-benefit analysis of the strategic landscape may not be sufficient in explaining or predicting state preferences, especially in terms of alignment. A state’s identity is likely to shape the country’s roadmap and international policy as well as its inclination towards cooperation with other states. Barnett finds that identity politics matter more that the “logic of anarchy” when states seek to identify threats to their security and survival because identity “signals which states are considered more or less desirable partners.”\textsuperscript{67} Similarly, in exploring the reasons of NATO’s resilience, Risse-Kappen argues that norms of cooperation are “firmly embedded in the political culture of liberal states” and that “democratic peace” best characterizes the long-term relationship between members of the trans-Atlantic organization that the realist theory failed to predict.\textsuperscript{68}

However, this constructivist challenge remains disappointing because it does not translate into a new and original framework compared to the realist and liberal models. As Barnett formulates it, it merely recycles the realist framework of alliance formation and focuses on state perceptions and interpretations of threats to explain alignments between states. Risse-Kappen’s model remains quite inconclusive about differences in
the prospects between democracies sharing a similar identity as well as between democracies in general. 69 His discussion of the persistence of NATO relies heavily on the Democratic Peace theory and the introduction of the identity variable in the framework fails to provide additional insights: by the author’s own admission, the U.S.-Japanese security relationship remains an anomaly because it is “highly institutionalized” in spite of the fact that “the collective identity component seems to be weaker.”70

Overall, in spite of a profound disagreement regarding the triggers of alliance formation, this formulation of constructivism is overwhelmingly turned towards the external environment of the alliance to the detriment of its internal dynamics. A more satisfactory elaboration of the constructivist hypothesis could concentrate on the role of identity and culture as a coordination device explaining why some alliances persist. This type of elaboration is all the more desirable as constructivist theory has already developed analytical tools that can be useful though they are not necessarily applied to coordination between states.

Schelling was arguably the first to have explored the idea that culture could emerge as a coordination device when he introduced the notion that common perceptions could allow for coordination between individuals. According to Schelling, an agent’s ability to refer to historical precedents and shared norms leads to the emergence of focal points—equilibria in a game that appear more natural in the light of the players’ experience and identity—through interdependent and recursive decision making. 71 In Schelling’s own words:
People can often concert their intentions or expectations with others if each knows that the other is trying to do the same. Most situations—perhaps every situation for people who are practiced at this kind of game—provide some clue for coordinating behavior, some focal point for each person’s expectation of what the other expects him to expect to be expected to do. Finding the key, or rather finding a key—any key that is mutually recognized as the key becomes the key—may depend on imagination more than on logic; it may depend on analogy, precedent, accidental arrangement, symmetry, aesthetic or geometric configuration, casuistic reasoning, and who the parties are and what they know about each other.

Imagination—and perhaps symbols, history, common references and shared identity—may be as helpful as mathematics and logic in the resolution of the coordination problem. Schelling suggests that poets may outperform logicians in solving coordination problems. Additional studies developed this point further. If, as the “folk theorem” in Economics suggests, “all games with repeated play have multiple equilibria,” Goldstein and Keohane find that “when there are no ‘objective’ criteria on which to base choice, ideas focus expectations and strategies.” In a very similar fashion, O’Neill asserts that focal points result from “beliefs about others’ beliefs about extra-game factors,” “agreements” or “precedents.” Resorting to a shared sense of identity to justify a joint policy or to convince another country to join an alliance or a mission-specific partnership can therefore be effective in theory.

But not only does culture allow actors to coordinate their actions, the norms and standards it provides also allow for widely-documented collective action problems to be resolved. Arrow demonstrated through his “Impossibility Theorem” that consistent individual preference orderings do not necessarily lead to, in the aggregate, a consistent collective preference ordering. In addition, as argued Elster, there is no guarantee that strategic interactions among actors will necessarily yield one, unique solution.
Arbitration between different possibilities will emerge as a necessity, in order to sustain cooperation among actors. Both authors conclude that social norms and the existence of a consensus on social goals may play a fundamental role in resolving aggregation problems, by a priori constraining and providing a framework for strategic interactions. These norms and consensus constitute a pillar of the synchronization device to solve collective action problems, especially in the framework of an institutionalized partnership.

In fact, the institutionalization of a partnership can explain the persistence and even the strengthening of these commonalities and focal points. In exploring the reasons for the persistence of NATO after the end of the Cold War, Wallander finds that both sunk costs and transaction costs matter in explaining the organization’s resilience. Sunk costs refer to the lower cost of maintaining the existing organization compared to cost of creating a new organization. Transaction costs refer to the costs associated to managing an alliance, and in particular to information provision and transparency regarding the commitments of members of the alliance. Following this logic, cultural like-mindedness and a shared sense of identity can lead to higher sunk costs—the institutionalization of the partnership relies on a solid foundation and creating a new institution would thus entail greater costs—and to lower transaction costs—cultural commonalities make the alliance’s management less complex leading its members to assess more favorably its overall benefits.

While Schelling first stated the idea that culture could be a coordination device for individuals, Huntington, in his seminal work on alliances between countries from the same civilization, may have been the first to suggest that culture could serve as a rallying
point for like-minded countries. He found that “[…] societies sharing cultural affinities cooperate with each other” while “at the local fault line wars, largely between Muslims and non-Muslims, generate ‘kin-country rallying’, the threat of broader escalation, and hence efforts by core states to halt these wars.”\textsuperscript{79} The determinism in Huntington’s framework, the fact that he considers civilizations as cohesive and inert blocks and the marginal significance he grants to states have been two major pieces of criticism against his model. But the merit of the model, from an alliance formation perspective, lies in the notion that like-mindedness can generate rapprochements.

There are arguably two distinct and mutually incompatible conclusions that one can draw regarding the relationship between culture and coordination. The first relates to Huntington’s argument about kinship and bloodlines, and suggests that culturally homogeneous countries will stand together.\textsuperscript{80} Huntington never tests this hypothesis and never explores the role of cultural homogeneity in the formation of alliances. For that reason, his model and conclusions have often been accused of being deterministic. An alternative conclusion—which is much closer to Schelling’s findings—is that constructed identity, not kinship, is a decisive alternative force of alignment between states. This conclusion suggests that the identity driver is a two-way street—it needs to be recognized as a force of alignment by all parties involved to be effective in practice. This conclusion also suggests that states may possibly misperceive the nature of the relationship they are involved in or they want to establish, and may therefore fail to reach their goals.
Intellectual Software as the Missing and Undocumented Driver

The different dynamics that the previous section shed light on are not necessarily mutually exclusive or even contradictory. Their coexistence suggests that states may have short-term interests but also elaborate long-run strategies to better cope with shifts in the international system. In reality, there are two significant issues that emerge in this review. One is the extent to which the explanations that are offered are presented as rival and non-compatible, when they should be describing, in fact, different phenomena—though their manifestations are commonly regrouped in the same construct of “alliance.” In addition, the previous literature has failed to account for persisting cooperation and alliances without the existence of a threat. These observations call for a better classification and characterization of the different natures of alliances between states as well as for an exploration of the “natural alliance” concept.

The second issue lies in the extent to which constructed identity is accurately integrated in alliance models and, more broadly, in international strategic thought. The previous review of the main currents of international relations theory suggests that while commonalities in constructed identity may constitute an additional force driving states closer together, this hypothesis has not been theoretically formulated and would deserve additional attention. A theory of alliances based on a common constructed identity would go beyond the Democratic Peace Theory and would account for the role of culture as a potential and additional coordination device between states. In particular, it would theorize the central role of a country’s intellectual software and its correlation with reactions to international crises and agenda elaboration.
A recurring metaphor to characterize alliances between states is the image of marriage. It is noteworthy because depending on the dimension or nature that each school focuses on, it will draw different lessons with regards to alliance persistence. Realists consider alliances as a “marriage of convenience.” But a marriage of convenience is not designed to persist. In organizational and institutional explanations of the resilience of some alliances, the liberal school of international relations points to inertia and habits akin to those existing between a wife and a husband. In fact, a marriage that is uniquely based on inertia and habits may sustain over time but may be vulnerable and lack resilience in the wake of changes of the external environment. So what can type of union can be based on common habits and values and still display resilience?

Schelling’s reference to a wife and a husband suggests that psychic mechanisms, based on a common intellectual software or even a similar intellectual DNA, implies both knowledge of and adherence to a similar set of broad principles by both partners. He finds that the ability of a husband and a wife who are lost in a department store to find a “geometrically unique point” or, simply put, an “obvious place to meet” is as high as the ability of two mathematicians to resolve this coordination and game theory problem. The reason is that the convergence of expectations of the wife and the husband is actually a “psychic mechanism,” rooted in a similar understanding of the context. This similar understanding is the by-product of a common intellectual software or constructed identity which both have the capacity to strengthen a union’s resilience. To the author’s knowledge, the transposition of this framework at the international level and, in
particular, a theory of alliances based on this notion of constructed identity, have yet to be developed.

The next chapter seeks to address these two issues by providing a synthetic and systematic taxonomy and by providing a framework for natural alliances.
CHAPTER IV—ANALYSIS (PART 1)
A FRAMEWORK FOR NATURAL ALLIANCES

A common principle of traditional frameworks for alliances in the international relations literature is that a single dynamic should explain the formation and the sustainment of partnerships and thus outperform alternative explanations. Although it often allows currents of the literature to provide a parsimonious model, a major drawback of this setting is that it presupposes a unique explanation for a phenomenon that is generically named “alliances.” However, international relations schools of thought focus on a phenomenon which has manifested itself in the international arena in very different ways and according to very different logics. The assumption that a single explanation can be provided for all alliances is therefore far from being satisfactory.

The instance of the United States’ alliance portfolio is particularly illustrative. The legacy of the Cold War has provided NATO allies of the United States with a special status in the U.S. alliance portfolio, given the vital interests that they were associated with throughout the second half of the twentieth century. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union provided the United States with the opportunity and the incentive to diversify their portfolio through the designation of “major non-NATO allies” and thereby to define its vital interests according to a wider array of criteria. This status has allowed the United States to redefine and adapt its strategies in accordance with the evolving strategic landscape and by establishing and maintaining ties with crucial, non-European partners. It is noteworthy, however, that the United States did not need to appoint other crucial allies to this status to maintain diplomatic and military ties. Those countries include Saudi Arabia, a long-term U.S. ally.
in the Middle East which has benefited from significant weapons deals as late as 2007, Qatar, which is the host of the U.S. Air Force, and India, the world’s largest democracy and crucial counterweight to Chinese influence in Asia. In addition, these strategic partnerships have not prevented the United States to seek short run cooperation with rival powers such as Iran and China on issues such as Afghanistan and Pakistan or China and Russia regarding Iran’s nuclear ambitions.

The alliance portfolio of the United States and the way it has been managed since the end of the Cold War seems to suggest that its real strategic value lies in the possibility to leverage the diverse interests and natures of U.S. partners and alliances. The previous chapter’s review of the literature showed that we lack a systematic and operational typology to analyze the different logics of alliances as well as the effects of these diverging logics on the efficiency of foreign policies. In the light of the diverse natures of partnerships between the United States and its allies, it would be particularly useful to develop a tool that would shed some light on the policy implications of these different logics.

In practice, there are three identifiable levels of cooperative interactions between states: tactical, historic and natural. Distinguishing between these three different types of interactions can help us assess the sustainability of the partnership as well as the likely sources of tensions and strains. It can also allow policymakers to design their strategies according to the different natures of the partnerships included in their alliance portfolio and thus draw some strategic benefits related to alliance diversification. This chapter aims at clarifying the differences between these different logics as well as their connections and to develop a systematic taxonomy of alliances. In doing that, it will also
provide a framework for natural alliances in particular and to formulate hypotheses regarding its existence and features.

**A Typology of Alliances**

The review of the theoretical literature in political science and economics presented in the previous chapter uncovered three different types of alliances: tactical alliances, historic alliances and natural alliances. This section seeks to clarify the definitions and features of each of these partnerships as well as the links between them.

**Tactical alliances**

Alliances are designed to balance an immediate source of power or threat to a state’s survival and interests. They can also have offensive and predatory objectives. The terms of the alliance, be it informal or not, are either specified in a document or embedded in an implicit understanding. Tactical alliances are instrumental and often opportunistic in nature as they allow states to address a pressing and urgent issue. Leaders usually justify them on the basis of conditions on the ground and by the imperatives of *realpolitik*. A strong geopolitical interest or the identification of a common threat to both countries’ survival helps the alliance sustain. But once the interest changes or is redefined, or once the threat disappears, the alliance cannot persist. In fact, the paradox of tactical alliances is that even if they act as catalysts of tensions, they do not exclude a rapprochement between members of two different coalitions and the possibility of a quick collapse of an alliance.

The August 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of nonaggression signed by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union is illustrative of tactical alliances. The degree of
confusion and the lack of strategic analysis and foresight on the part of Western Europe led the Allied powers to underestimate the substantial geopolitical consequences of Hitler’s annexation of Austria and Sudetenland. But Hitler’s expansion in Eastern Europe was particularly worrisome to Stalin who saw in Nazi Germany and the Third Reich project a major threat to his country’s territorial integrity. Stalin’s proclivity for cold, amoral and strategic calculations provided the Soviet leader with foresight which contrasted with Western attitudes of the time and which justified an alliance with Hitler in spite of striking ideological differences. In this context, the Soviets considered the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact as the appropriate tool to draw the contours of and preserve their sphere of influence in Eastern Europe while Hitler considered this improbable and temporary rapprochement as a strategic move to keep Stalin in check during his confrontation with Western democracies. Hitler’s domination of Western Europe, as early as 1940, made the pact irrelevant.

The current and implicit relationship between Israel and some Sunni countries—Saudi Arabia in particular—can also shed additional light on the nature of tactical alliances. In particular, Iran’s potential acquisition of the nuclear bomb has represented an overriding threat driving former enemies of the Middle East closer together in spite of a relative status quo on the major topic of hostility—the Israeli-Arab conflict. Saudi authorities had arguably foreseen the coming challenge by making their own peace plan public as early as 2002—that is, before the U.S. intervention in Iraq. The subsequent fall of Saddam Hussein empowered Iran—where a majority of the population, ninety percent, is Shiite—which emerged as a major powerhouse of the region and only accelerated this improbable rapprochement. However, there is no evidence that this tactical alliance—
which is based on the common objective of containing Iran’s influence in the region and
countering its nuclear ambitions—could extend to other realms of cooperation or could
be sustained if the Iranian threat disappeared.

Finally, the current relationship between the United States and China is indicative
of the complexities of coordination and tactics in the international realm. While some
characterize this relationship as a “marriage of convenience” and therefore as a traditional
tactical alliance,2 others consider that the relationship displays the features of a cold war
in which a durable entente will never be possible in spite of temporary truces.3

Admittedly, ambiguity and subtlety always seem to have played a crucial tactical role in
the U.S.-Chinese relationship. Nixon’s triangular approach during the Cold War and the
subsequent rapprochement with Beijing in order to further isolate Moscow had already
hinted the ambiguous nature of the relationship that hostility and rivalry could not
characterize alone. In the current period, an atypical aspect of this relationship lies in the
fact that the two powers have sought to manage their extreme interdependence—and its
principal result, commonly referred to as “global imbalances”—rather jointly counter a
state threat or power. In fact, this relationship challenges the traditional realist
framework which would have predicted more rivalry between the old superpower and the
new aspiring power. In reality, the first objective of this organized cooperation is
managing the extreme state of interdependence which entails significant stakes for both
Beijing and Washington. But more profoundly, China has sought to make the new
international distribution of power official by formalizing its relationship with the
world’s leading power through the strategic dialogue and a set of bilateral exchanges that
some have characterized as a G2. Washington’s foreign strategy in the Pacific arena has
also been opportunistic in the sense that the United States has sought to take advantage of
the financial crisis and the emergence of new political powers in order to strengthen its
international ties. In this case also, the realms in which U.S. and Chinese powers are
rivals exceed by far the realms in which they cooperate. Diverging approaches to the
Copenhagen summit in December 2009 and tensions between Google and Beijing tend to
show how frail this relationship is. But past attempts for coordination and to manage the
state of extreme interdependence through a form of institutionalization of the partnership
suggest that both powers could consider favoring, to some extent, a relationship based on
common interests and objectives rather than on systematic rivalry.

The discussion of these three instances of tactical alliances suggests that tactics
should be understood as part of a broader strategy. They are not necessarily or uniquely
military in nature, even if they are often pictured as such. More broadly, tactical alliances
are often the result of pragmatic reflections of leaders who are seeking to achieve short
run objectives that are part of a broader and longer-run strategy. A tactical
rapprochement does not require a sense of friendship or sympathy or the total absence of
tensions prior to the alliance. Neither does it exclude hostility in the future. While they
are opportunistic in design and are valued as such by diplomats, the true efficiency of
tactical alliances lies in the extent to which they improve the overall strategic position of
a country with predefined long-term goals.

*Historical alliances*

The notion that some alliances are more resilient than others because they
capitalize on a long historical tradition of cooperation is very intuitive. For instance, the
claim that the U.S.-Japanese partnership and the U.S.-Saudi alliance are strategic not
merely because they are tactical but also because they rely on a long tradition of cooperation is not a controversial claim. Therefore, there is a useful distinction to make between short-term tactical alliances and historical alliances. Historical alliances are enduring partnerships that sustain in spite of significant ruptures or structural changes in the international system. Its structural features, which outlast time-specific contingencies, allow allies to sustain cooperation, relying on past successes as focal points to justify additional partnerships. The “shadow of the future” weighs in on a historical alliance because uncertainty about international prospects makes the partnership an attractive tool to hedge against a wide set of scenarios. Historical allies tend to accept short term compromise that may not be fully congruent with national interests with the hope that they will obtain some benefits in the longer run. Such a trade-off is impossible in the framework of a tactical alliance.

For instance, the alliance between the United States and Saudi Arabia was first formalized between President Roosevelt and King Abdul-Aziz on the USS Quincy at Great Bitter Lake in Egypt in February 1945. In exchange for a continuous supply of oil from Saudi Arabia, President Roosevelt guaranteed the Kingdom’s long term security. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of bipolarity, the persistence of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the fall of Saddam Hussein, though they profoundly changed the strategic landscape in which Saudi Arabia operates, never challenged the foundations of the initial partnership. The two countries involved in the alliance have continuously reinvented the purpose of the alliance in spite of significant ruptures in the international system. The repeated interactions over time have strengthened the partnership and have allowed cooperation to extend to other dimensions of the partnership. In addition, the
partnership has displayed a remarkable resilience in spite of strong disagreements between the United States and Saudi Arabia on issues such as the Israeli-Arab conflict and Iraq. The gratifications that Saudi Arabia receives beyond these disagreements have proven to have more weight in the Kingdom’s strategic calculus. This is not to say that future contingencies and ruptures will not challenge the partnership’s foundation which remains nevertheless solid.

More broadly, a set of very different historical contingencies can lead to the emergence of historical alliances. While the U.S.-Saudi Arabia emerged with a pragmatic agreement between two leaders, the basis of the U.S.-Japanese and the U.S.-German alliances was, paradoxically, a military occupation that followed a very violent conflict. Regime changes in Japan and Germany, as well as substantial aid on the part of the United States, allowed these two partnerships to sustain over time. An additional distinction can be made between historical alliances that solely rely on a sense of shared history—like the U.S.-Saudi relationship—and historical alliances that also rely on an institutional dimension like commonalities of regime types—the U.S.-Japanese and the U.S.-South Korean relationships arguably obey that institutional and historical logic. The diversity of these historical alliances suggest that a power like the United States can diversify its alliance portfolio by maintaining different types of alliances and by building long term relationships that are based on different logics. Historical alliances constitute a heteroclite set of partnerships by nature but offer the United States with the possibility to hedge against a wide set of historical contingencies, as ruptures may weaken some of these partnerships and strengthen others.
Natural alliances

The concept of natural alliances takes the logic of historical partnerships one step further. It hypothesizes the role of commonalities in political culture and identity in the explanation of the persistence of some alliances. The difference between a historical and a natural alliance may appear subtle, but is fundamental. Because natural allies share a common political culture and a common identity—potentially in addition to a shared sense of history—they have an additional device to coordinate and to sustain their relationship. The standards and norms which actors perceive as generally accepted are unconditionally generalized to the extent that the reciprocity becomes diffuse and easier to sustain. As a result, scenarios for conflict or strain between natural allies are associated with much lower likelihoods.

Commonalities in political culture and identity play a relevant role because they are recognized as such. In other words, a natural alliance needs to be recognized as such by both parties. The process is as much about commonalities as about a shared constructed identity which results from initial similarities in political culture and an accumulation process that affects all identities involved. From this standpoint, the U.S.-European partnership is an obvious candidate. The different waves of European migration to the United States since the early seventeenth century and, conversely, the United States political influence on Europe through its interventions in the two World Wars, in the reconstruction of the continent after World War II and during the Cold War, have been two significant components in the two parties’ constructed identity. In this regard, the institutionalization of the relationship between the two partners, through the Bretton Woods agreement and especially through the creation of NATO, was at the basis
of the grand bargain between the United States and Western Europe. Calls for a “Bretton Woods II,” for a reform of the United Nations Security Council and of the International Monetary Fund, and continued discussions regarding NATO’s global role seem to suggest the quasi-universal dimension of these references. A potential difference between emerging powers and the trans-Atlantic community is that while the former can consider these institutions as tools for international governance, the latter may consider them as strategic assets that reinforce a paradigm that they still find desirable.

Contrary to historical alliances, natural alliances constitute a much more homogeneous set by design since the common denominator is smaller given the potential diversity of historical experiences on the one hand and the narrow similarities in political culture on the other. If there is a metaphor linking natural alliances to marriages, another metaphor could link historical alliances to friendship. Friendship is not exclusive by nature—you can have many friends. The same does not apply to marriage. In international relations, the coexistence of historical and natural alliances in a country’s partnership portfolio can offer increased leverage but could also require a delicate diplomatic balance. There is therefore no evidence that a natural alliance will not require equal management on the part of a country willing to draw all potential benefits.

To the author’s knowledge, the hypothesis of a natural alliance has not yet been tested, though the sections two and three of this paper have shown that the historical and theoretical literature would benefit from such a concept. Proponents of the liberal school of international relations, and more specifically its neoliberal current, have suggested that the unconditional generalization of reciprocity in the framework of the European construction has made the latter endeavor unique from a historical point of view. This
suggests that natural alliances are uncommon, but no less relevant given the strategic asset they can represent for states involved.

**Links between the different levels**

There are obvious links between these three alliance dynamics. First, these dynamics are all strategic in nature. In other words, it does not seem reasonable to equate pragmatism with tactics when history and commonalities in political culture can also be the foundation of a strategic approach to an international issue. Similarly, these dynamics are not necessarily exclusive. A natural alliance may also rely on a historical component and be justified by tactics on punctual events. In fact, when one analyzes an alliance, one may opt to choose its short-run dynamics to assess whether a country’s tactics are congruent with its objectives or its long-run dynamics to assess the partnership’s sustainability. In other words, tactical reasons can explain the cooperation between two natural allies on the very short run because a natural alliance can also be tactical. But unless we distinguish between these two dimensions, we will fail to understand the underlying dynamics of a partnership—is it merely tactical, or is there a historical and/or a natural dimension to it? The advantage of this typology is that it helps us distinguish between the three potential layers of state cooperation and can enhance the accuracy of predictions regarding their long term sustainability. This distinction can also allow us to assess the effects of misperceptions of the nature of an alliance. There are potential diverging views of an alliance, even among states that constitute it. If one state considers an alliance—or even a potential alliance—as natural while the other considers it as merely tactical, this can help explain state miscalculations without abandoning the assumption of state rationality. The instance of the Anglo-German relationship at the end
of the nineteenth century is particularly illustrative from this point of view as chapter 2 discussed.

Second, the dynamic of an alliance may evolve in time. A tactical alliance may become a historical one for instance. The example of the strong tactical alliance between Syria and Iran is particularly interesting from this point of view. In many ways, this axis is instrumental and opportunistic as it ties two regimes which do not have particularly strong allies otherwise. In addition, in spite of the religious kinship that has motivated the relationship since its inception on the Iranian side, Syria has a long tradition of secularism and considered these religious ties in a pragmatic and instrumental way rather than in a dogmatic way. Recent events in the region, including the Iran-Iraq war and the fall of Saddam Hussein have not profoundly changed the terms of this alliance since Iraq was the common enemy. The rise of Hezbollah in southern Lebanon could affect the overall distribution of power in the region, especially to the detriment of Syria but has not done so in a way that has questioned this partnership yet. The real challenge to this solid Damascus-Tehran axis could come from a rapprochement between Syria and Israel through a resolution of the Golan Height issue or, more broadly, from a rapprochement between Syria—where a majority of the population is Sunni even if the ruling El-Assad family, is Alawite, an offshoot of Shiite Islam—and its Sunni neighbors. Conversely, a rapprochement between Iran and the West on the nuclear issue could potentially make the Damascus-Tehran axis useless or irrelevant for Tehran. If the tactical partnership survived those events or similar ones, it could be considered as resilient in the wake of major ruptures in the strategic landscape and could thus become a historical partnership.
Different strategic benefits and values

There is no necessary ranking between these different dynamics. The “natural alliance” hypothesis does not suggest that natural partnerships may yield greater benefits or are the only reliable ties that a country can count on. On the contrary, an underlying question in the exploration of the “natural alliance” hypothesis concerns the possibility to find a right “alliance mix” similar to the right “policy mix” that economic policy-makers often seek—by combining budgetary and monetary policies for instance—to reach their objectives. Another formulation of the question would consist in asking whether tactical, historical and natural alliances can be considered as strategic complements in a country’s alliance portfolio. Each dynamic does not necessarily yield a higher benefit but a combination of alliances may yield greater profits than single, bilateral partnerships. The next section provides a general framework for natural alliances and describes the potential strategic complements between these different dynamics.

Natural Alliances: Mechanisms and Functioning

The realist and the liberal imperatives of foreign policy

The literature review in chapters 2 and 3 and the previous taxonomy suggests that a country’s foreign policy is driven by two sets of imperatives that I will call realist and liberal. The realist imperative is perhaps the most straightforward and widely-documented driver of foreign policy. It consists in addressing the most expedient threats to a nation’s interests and survival and designing the most effective short-term strategies to maintain to status quo or to obtain a strategic advantage, depending on the country’s international objectives. The realist imperative is best answered with tactical alliances
that help a country achieve its short term goals and necessarily entails some heterogeneity across actors with differing interests but similar objectives. The liberal imperative influences a country’s long run foreign policy, and is perhaps the privilege of regional or international powers that have the leverage and the clout to shape the global strategic landscape. It consists in monitoring international trends and identifying major sources of uncertainty in order to hedge against future and potentially harmful contingencies. The liberal imperative requires building partnerships that go beyond serving a country’s short term objectives and tactics and entails some homogeneity across actors sharing a similar strategic blueprint for the future. Instances of post-Napoleon Europe and of the early stages of the Cold War discussed in chapter 2 suggest that far from being contradictory, these two imperatives are actually orthogonal in practice.

There can still exist tensions between the need to address international anarchy and chaos and the requirement to build a healthy international system. These tensions primarily result from an inter-temporal incoherence: foreign policies are often shortsighted and tend to be mainly driven by the realist imperative. As a result, this imperative tends to drain most of a country’s resources and energy to the detriment of longer run objectives. Nevertheless, major crises or the immediate aftermath of a significant conflict offer major international powers or institutions the opportunity to overhaul the structure of the international system so as to correct previous flaws and introduce some predictability and some order into it. Metternich’s Austria and Truman’s United States are illustrative instances of this political willingness to improve the governance of the system.
This suggests that international anarchy does not necessarily mean constant disorder and instability that would have the ability to reproduce continuously. The brief review of complex systems theory in chapter 3 showed that that the international political system can potentially grow when its components—states—seek to reproduce familiar patterns and geometries in order to alleviate the uncertainty caused by anarchy. As a result, if the realist imperative implies that a state will seek to defend its interests, the liberal imperative can potentially oblige a state to seek to introduce some points of references in an environment characterized by uncertainty.

Natural alliances, heterogeneity and international stability

Globalization has had a contradictory effect on identity: It has entailed greater diversity through greater consciousness about other cultures but, because this greater diversity has often been translated in terms of unstable identities, it also seems to have led to questions regarding one’s own identity, and to a reasserted willingness to defend the principles and culture that actors consider as just or universal. There are therefore two contradictory forces entailed by globalization, one leading to greater homogeneity through multiculturalism and one leading to greater heterogeneity through the (re)affirmation of founding values and identities that will differ across the globe.

Chapter 3 indicated that according to complex systems theory, a highly interconnected and homogeneous system is highly unstable. A corollary is that this heterogeneity can be a factor of stability. But what are the sources of international heterogeneity in this case? In order for heterogeneity to exist, it needs to be defined in terms of alternative models and different identities existing within the system. If all countries are all different and share no commonalities from this point of view, they are in
a way very alike because they will have no other way to coordinate beyond tactics. This situation would result in a homogeneous system in which all states would seek to enhance their prospects of survival. In contrast, heterogeneity comes from the coexistence of civilizations which all claim a specific identity. The coexistence of these civilizational blocs makes the international system heterogeneous because the system’s different components are clearly identifiable. As a result, alliance handicaps, and even more deeply natural alliances are a factor of international stability because failure of one part does not undermine the stability of the system as a whole. The natural alliance hypothesis therefore departs from the traditional pessimistic view regarding the consequences of heterogeneity in the international system and suggests that natural alliances can contribute to the international system’s stability.

**Natural alliances and foreign policy**

A natural alliance is a resilient partnership that finds its foundation in a common constructed identity and political culture. Natural allies are conscious of adhering to the same international standards that they consider universally applicable, independent of context. As a result, a natural alliance tends to endure and displays the ability and the willingness to act over time, in spite of changes in the international context and in the nature of the threats and challenges its members must face. Indeed, a natural alliance is more likely to better resist to exogenous shocks though these may affect it in the short run. The probability that outside events change its fundamental *raison d’être* in the long run is low.

The notion that natural allies belong to a same “community of destinies” is central. During my discussions regarding the prospects of the U.S.-European strategic
partnership, it was not rare for interviewees to bring up questions related to domestic politics, including the debate in the United States regarding health care, or the debate in Europe regarding public officials’ positions on Islam in public spheres. Though those questions are traditionally left out of international relations models, policymakers and analysts increasingly raise them either to emphasize that Europeans and the United States are facing the very same challenges and need to unite, or to contend that like-mindedness between the two continents is overestimated and that the United States and the Europeans do not share similar views about the world. These comments justify the exploration of the natural alliance hypothesis as well as the importance given to commonalities in political culture and constructed identity.

Given the coexisting realist and liberal drivers of foreign policy, natural alliances provide their members with a specific strategic utility by offering additional focal points for coordination as well as the opportunity to introduce some predictability in their external relations. A similar constructed identity may not provide the ability to solve short term or pressing challenges because the latter often require tactical answers, but allow states to identify longer term partners with whom they share an intellectual software that makes far-sighted policies all the more so efficient. In this sense, while states will seek to protect their vital interests and to guarantee their survival through instrumental and opportunistic alliances, they will also seek to protect what they consider to be their most defining features—which, in the aggregate, constitute their constructed identity—and to develop and adapt their intellectual software through natural alliances.

Political culture is the most effective measure of the potential for the emergence of a common constructed identity and intellectual software. The norms and guiding
principles that a society adheres to is not only illustrative of the way it models social interactions in the domestic and the international realms, but can also clarify the mechanisms of the intellectual framework through which a society will consider an international issue or crisis. From this standpoint, the best reflection of a political culture that one can obtain stems from the observation of what a society considers acceptable and what it considers unacceptable. Public opinion can be imagined as a central piece of a checks and balances system, in which the political class and the elite formulate beliefs and introduce norms that are either accepted or rejected by society. The beliefs of public opinion and the norms that it adheres to is likely to be more stable than political cycles and changes that reveal a country’s mood or state of mind at a given point in time rather than its intellectual software.

As in the case of tactical and historical alliances, natural alliances will necessarily be politically manufactured. A theory of natural alliances does not suggest that some partnerships will just emerge following principles akin to the laws of physics or biology as Huntington suggested, but hints that some partnerships may display greater resilience because the cumulative process of history and its effects on international political systems and on the narratives on identity and history are pushing countries closer to one another and are reducing the likelihood of a long term estrangement. Just as any other type of alliance, natural alliances require political management and strategies, though, most probably, some that are tailored to the context, the terms and the history of the partnership.
Approach

If the trans-Atlantic community were a natural alliance, what would one expect to see in practice? According to the definition of natural alliances, natural allies would necessarily display greater commonalities in terms of political culture and greater congruence in constructed identities relative to other countries in the world. In addition, natural allies would necessarily react in similar ways to international crises and issues—that is, to questions that related to immediate events rather than to deeper, ingrained beliefs about how societies and the world should work.

Summary of research questions and hypotheses

Once these two conditions are observed, there are two, broad possible formulations of the natural alliance hypothesis. A weak formulation of the hypothesis consists in saying that natural partners should be more conscious of the commonalities in identity and in political culture as those may facilitate coordination, agenda elaboration, burden sharing and perhaps institutionalization of the partnership. The strong form of the natural alliance hypothesis consists in stating that an agreement on a given, long-term issue is more likely between countries that share commonalities in political culture and react in similar ways to international crises than between countries that do not. It is also useful to recall here the specific hypotheses that were stated in the introduction and that the next two chapters will seek to test.

First Research Question: To what extent do the United States and Europe share a common political culture and constructed identity? I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:
• Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:
  o The United States is more like Europe than like other countries
  o Similarities between the United States and Europe are no greater

• Similarities between some European countries and the United States:
  o There is greater homogeneity among European countries than among some countries and the United States
  o Some European states share greater values, beliefs and perceptions with the United States than with other European states

• Stability over time
  o Variables measured display some inertia over time
  o Variables are very volatile over time

Second Research Question: To what extent do countries belonging to a same community react in similar ways to international crises and issues? I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

• Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:
  o The United States reacts more like Europe than like other countries
  o Similarities in reactions between the United States and Europe are no greater

• Similarities between some European countries and the United States:
There is greater homogeneity in reactions among European countries than among some countries and the United States.

Some European states react in more similar terms to the United States than to other European states.

- Stability over time
  - Commonalities in reactions display some inertia over time
  - Commonalities in reactions are very volatile over time

Third Research Question: To what extent is an agreement more likely between identified natural allies than between non-natural allies? I will seek to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

- Agreement on how to proceed on a given issue:
  - An agreement is more likely between natural allies
  - Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement

- Agreement on how to proceed over time
  - An agreement is more likely between natural allies on long term questions
  - Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement on long term questions
Methodology

I define political culture as the set of values and beliefs about political systems, practices and standards that a population considers appropriate and through which the international strategic landscape is interpreted. Describing the contents and the contours of a country’s political culture can be a very complex task given the subtleties and the particularities of nations. The description would be in itself a standalone exercise that would heavily depend on anthropology. Describing national political cultures in a systematic way that allows for cross-country comparisons is all the more so challenging. Such a comparison of political cultures would involve repeating the initial exercise as many times as there are countries involved in the study, making a series of bilateral comparisons between all of the countries, and attempting a form a synthesis. The reader can understand that such an exercise goes beyond the scope of this study. The possibility to obtain a fully accurate, quantitative and parsimonious indicator of a country’s political culture that could be compared to other countries hinges on the complexity of the definition of a political culture.

An alternative approach consists of aggregating relevant information and providing a visual representation of differences and similarities of all countries involved in the research—that is to say in a multilateral way. The World Values Survey database offers an attractive operational tool in that regards by providing the answers to a wide range of questions that all relate to a country’s political culture. The surveys were administered in the United States, in Europe and in the rest of the world. Appendix C provides a list of the countries and the dates at which the surveys were administered. The survey of these publics, who are the recipients and approvers of the political philosophy
which regulates society, provides what I call a “proxy” to the country’s political culture. Although it does not represent all aspects of the country’s political culture, aggregating the data offers the opportunity to make comparisons across countries and measure similarities and differences among them. In particular, aggregating the data using multidimensional scaling, a method that I discuss below, may not provide substantial information on the actual contents of national political cultures, but provides us with the opportunity to make instantaneous, multilateral comparisons. The data from the World Values Survey will therefore play a key role in answering the first research question and testing the associated hypotheses. Appendix F provides the complete list of questions administered in the World Values Surveys.

I adopt a very similar approach to answer the second research question and to test the associated hypotheses. Instead of concentrating on political culture, this research questions focuses on reactions to international crises and views regarding global issues and conflicts. Therefore, I change the dataset and use various cross-country polls that allow a comparison of these reactions across a wide set of nations. Polls from the PEW Global Attitudes project is the most significant source of data. Appendix D provides the list of polls and the countries surveyed in each. In this second step, as previously, we may lose information with regards to the actual reaction of a country, but the aggregation of the numbers will allow us to make multilateral comparisons across a wide set of countries. Appendix I provides the full list of questions from these polls that I use in the second step.

The third research question requires a more qualitative analysis. It will entail looking at the results from the first two steps and confronting the evidence with the
natural alliance theory. In this case, I rely on interviews with key policymakers and policy analysts from various regions of the world. The major objective of this approach is to explore the operational value of natural alliances.

**Data**

I use two major datasets to tackle the first two research questions, the World Values Survey database and polls administered by the PEW Global Attitudes project. While the first database provides significant information relating to a country’s political culture, most of the variables of the second address issues related to current international affairs and crises. However, some questions in the PEW polls, that the next chapter’s appendix identifies, addresses issues relating to political culture and national identity. I use these questions in the first step of the research in order to test the robustness of results relying on different samples. Appendix G provides a list of those questions from the PEW surveys that relate to political culture and identity.

The first step of the research primarily relies on the data provided by the World Values Survey. The survey was done over five different waves: 1981-1984, 1989-1993, 1994-1999, 1999-2004 and 2005-2008. Three sets of variables defined by the database itself are particularly useful in the measurement of a country’s political culture. The first category is “Politics and Society” (Category E) which regroups a set of variables that is the most straightforward descriptor of a country’s political culture. In this part of the survey, questions explore what respondents consider as a legitimate political approach to issues and as appropriate forms of actions. In the later waves of the survey, starting with the second one, additional questions, relating to societal governance and weighting the
struggle between conservative and liberal forces, increase the disposable information on the country’s political culture. The last two waves of the survey include perceptions of democracy, poverty, immigration and foreign countries.

The “Religion” (Category F) category might almost be considered as a misnomer, as it relates more to what Huntington once called the “separation of spiritual and temporal authority.”8 Such a struggle, which translates into different roles for religion in society, also shapes a country’s political culture. In commentaries and cross-country comparisons of Europe and the United States, this religious feature often stands out as a defining difference. Europeans have established a strict separation between religion and state as a respect to “secularism.” In the United States, policymakers designed the separation between church and state as a safeguard against religious persecution—and thus as a guarantee of freedom to practice any religion of one’s choosing—rather than a means to completely eliminate religious influence in society. Religious denomination—on which Huntington concentrated—9 and the actual importance and influence of religion in society may therefore be of equal importance. As a result, in an analysis and comparison of political cultures, the religious dimension plays a fundamental role.

Very much like variables of the “Religion” category, variables included in the “National Identity” (Category G) group can potentially point to major differences across societies of the trans-Atlantic community. Questions in this category—which is the most succinct of the database—relate to the relationship individuals maintain with their countries, regions and localities and the degree to which they are nationalistic. Data is available in all four waves of the survey.
I collect the data from the World Values Survey database using the online data analysis tools. I collect data for European countries and the United States, as well as for other countries from other regions to test whether the cleavage is within the trans-Atlantic community or just between single countries—in other words, is the trans-Atlantic community unique compared to other countries?

The second step relies on the PEW Global Attitudes project which has administered a series of cross-country surveys since 2001. Apart from the specific questions that relate to national identity and political culture which I use in the first step of the analysis, a majority of these variables play a key role in addressing the second research question on reactions and attitudes towards current international affairs, international crises and issues relating to outlook and the global commons. I collect the data available on the PEW Global Attitudes project website for different surveys between 2001 and 2009. This allows me to test whether the constitution of clusters of countries sharing commonalities in political culture and constructed identity varies or stays the same when I consider data relating to current international affairs.

An MDS User Guide

*From raw data to a one-mode matrix*

In the first two steps of the research, I obtain a 2-mode, country-by-response matrix for each of the different surveys from the World Values Survey or from the PEW Global Attitudes project. Since the purpose of the analysis is to lead a cross-country comparison, I transform this 2-mode matrix into a 1-mode, country-by-country, similarity matrix which now represents a single set of actors and in which the first
column is the transpose of the first row, the second column is the transpose of the second row and so on.  

Figure 1 provides an illustration of this transformation. In this example, the survey includes nine countries and three questions—each with three possible answers. Matrix 1 is based on the raw data drawn from the polls.

![Matrix 1: Country*Response Matrix](image)

![Matrix 2: Country*Country Matrix](image)

### Table 2. From a two-mode to a one-mode matrix

The second matrix is a symmetric, one-mode, similarity matrix. Any given cell is filled with the similarity coefficient—in this case the correlation coefficient—between the country of the row and the country of the column. For instance, let us consider countries 1 and 7, whose answers are underscored in yellow in matrix one. I calculate the correlation coefficient between the first and the seventh lines of matrix 1. I then report the value of the correlation coefficient in the cell of the first column and the seventh line and in the cell of the seventh column and the first line—since the correlation coefficient between answers in country 1 and in country 7 is equal to the correlation coefficient between answers in country 7 and in country 1. The same is happening between country 4 and country 9: the correlation coefficient between those two lines is reported in the cell.
of the fourth column and the ninth line as well as in the cell of the fourth line and the ninth column. Calculating all of these correlation coefficients for all of pairs of countries allows us to populate the second matrix. The diagonal of this matrix is of little interest since the correlation coefficient between a country and itself will always be one. In the next chapter, each poll or sample drawn from a poll generates a two-mode matrix that I transform into a one-mode matrix according to the procedure described above.

**Advantages and issues in using MDS**

This second matrix is key to the analysis. The information that it contains reflects how similar or how different the countries included in the sample are: A positive and high correlation coefficient points to significant similarities while a lower and perhaps negative correlation coefficient points to substantial differences in the way the sampled populations think. This information provides one measure of commonalities in political culture and in constructed identity and can only be assessed in relative terms since there is no unique or objective measure of “high” or “low” correlation coefficients.

However, as such, the data and the evidence presented in the matrix are difficult to interpret. Multilateral comparisons are not straightforward. Therefore, I seek to represent this matrix visually, in an attempt to discern any clusters in the data—that is, observe whether some countries tend to cluster relative to other countries when the data is considered in the aggregate.

Multidimensional scaling (MDS) allows me to accomplish this goal, using the one-mode matrix as input data. It is a visualization technique which maps the countries in a n-dimensional plot where the analyst specifies n. The MDS algorithm minimizes the difference between the similarity measure of two countries—namely the correlation
coefficient—and their distance in the graph. In other words, the algorithm places countries with a high correlation coefficient closer together and those with a low correlation coefficient further apart. As a result, in the graphs generated by MDS and presented in the rest of this dissertation, a large relative distance between two given points translates a significant difference in the answers in a poll and suggests substantial differences in political culture. A shorter distance signals more proximity in terms of political culture, given the answers given to the same survey questions.

Typically, a two-dimension plot is easier to interpret. Therefore, analysts tend to prefer to associate 2 to the value $n$, where $n$ is number of dimensions in the plot as stated above. However, visualizing a one-mode matrix in a two-dimension plot involves some trade-offs with regards to the visualization’s accuracy. In fact, while it is easier to interpret the contents of the matrix by visualizing it in a two-dimension plot, one must be cautious about the stress that this visualization involves. The literature is indecisive on what is an “acceptable” level of stress. Previous studies have offered rules of thumb, pointing to a 15% or 20% threshold as the level of stress beyond which the graphs should not be considered as reliable.\textsuperscript{14} However, a more recent study by Sturrock and Rocha has provided a more systematic way of assessing the impact of the stress, accounting for both the number of dimensions and the number of objects represented in the graphs.\textsuperscript{15} In particular, their approach generates a table that provides a threshold of stress beyond which the probability that the objects—or countries in this case—are arranged randomly in the plot is greater than 1%. Subsequent studies that use MDS as a methodology have relied on this systematic approach to stress.\textsuperscript{16} I also use this approach each time I provide
an MDS plot. I do all the graphs and collect the stress data using the UCINet and NetDraw software.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Missing data}

In practice, there are cases in which the data is missing. More specifically, in the surveys and in the polls that I use in the next chapter, some questions were not administered in all countries. In other cases, while one set of questions was administered in some countries, another set of questions was administered in other countries. In those cases, I draw different samples of data from a given poll or a given set of polls. Each of these samples is constituted of a defined set of questions that were all administered in the countries included in the sample. By drawing different samples, I can observe whether or not there are substantial differences in the nature of the clusters that emerge. This procedure allows me to test how robust these results are across several samples drawn from a same poll or set of polls. The appendix of the next chapter discusses this procedure in even greater details.

\textit{Example 1: MDS provides unreliable results}

Appendix B of this chapter presents the mathematical details of this methodology. I consider two fictional and concrete examples below to provide the reader with a better intuition on how MDS works and on why the representations it generates can involve a level of stress that makes the results unreliable. In the first example, plotting the matrix in a two-dimension plot involves a high level of stress that makes results unreliable. In the second example, the stress involved is very low and results are reliable. While unreliable results are not common, one should be wary of possible distortions to guard against seeing patterns that do not exist in reality.
I consider the same framework as in Figure 1—a survey with nine countries and three questions offering three possible answers. The numbers provided by the survey generate the first matrix with the raw data in percentage (the reader can check that numbers add up to 1 for each question):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>0.3 0.5 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9 0 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 0.2 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>0.9 0 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 0.5 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 0.3 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>0.6 0.1 0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 0.5 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>0.2 0.8 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 0.5 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 0.4 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>0.1 0.7 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 0.5 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 0.4 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>0.2 0.8 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 0.5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0.6 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 8</td>
<td>0.8 0 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 0.5 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3 0.3 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 9</td>
<td>0.5 0.5 0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8 0.1 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 0.25 0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. An example of a two-mode matrix

Following the same procedure described above, UCINet provides the following similarity (correlation) matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>1 -0.038 -0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.208 0.313 -0.258</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.412 -0.268 0.993</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.513 -0.205 0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>-0.038 1 0.404</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.314 -0.162 0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.216 0.492 -0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>-0.045 0.404 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.129 0.193 -0.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 0.504 -0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>0.208 0.314 0.129</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.933 -0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.988 -0.22 0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>0.313 -0.162 0.193</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.933 1 -0.386</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.933 -0.48 0.442</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>-0.203 0.543 -0.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.08 -0.203 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.209 0.773 -0.298</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>0.412 0.216 0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.988 0.933 -0.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 -0.21 0.513</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 8</td>
<td>-0.038 0.592 0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.22 -0.48 0.773</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21 1 -0.206</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 9</td>
<td>0.513 -0.205 0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.29 0.442 -0.208</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.513 -0.205 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. An example of a one-mode, correlation matrix

This symmetric, one-mode, correlation matrix is the input matrix that UCINet uses to provide the MDS coordinates of each country according to the procedure described above. When I plug in these coordinates in NetDraw, I obtain figure 4.

The reader can note the high degrees of correlation between answers in countries 1 and 9 and between countries 4, 5 and 7 in figure 3. These results are not surprising
when one compares answers across countries of those two groups. Considering these observations, the reader should not be surprised to see two major clusters emerge in figure 4. In addition, answers in countries 3 and 6 uniformly display low levels of correlation with the answers of all the other countries. The fact that these countries are isolated is also not surprising in this context. From figure 4, one can conclude that countries 1 and 9, and countries 4, 5 and 7 share greater commonalities with each other relative to the rest of the countries sampled. One can also conclude that countries 3 and 6 display relatively unique features when compared to other countries included in the sample.\textsuperscript{18}

Table 5. An example of an MDS graph
UCINet indicates that the representation of the matrix in figure 3 involves a stress of 14%. This level is relatively low compared to one rule of thumb which points to 20% as the acceptable threshold and slightly below the 15% threshold defined by the most conservative rule of thumb. However, these thresholds are defined in the absolute, irrespective of the number of dimensions—two in this case—and the number of objects—countries in this case—that are represented in the graph. Sturrock and Rocha’s approach integrates those factors. According to their table, nine objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 10.4%. In this case, the probability that countries are randomly arranged is therefore above 1%. Although the results above are intuitive with regards to what could have been expected a priori, the distribution of similarities and differences is incompatible with an aggregate representation of bilateral distances.

In order to shed additional light on the mechanisms of this approach and the stress that a two-dimension plot involves, it is useful to compare the correlation matrix in figure 3—which the plot seeks to represent in two dimensions—with the distances that the algorithm was able to calculate. UCINet provides the coordinates for each of the points in the graph. In the previous example, the coordinates for each of the countries are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>-0.538</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 8</td>
<td>-0.573</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 9</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Dealing with country coordinates
I use these coordinates to calculate the Euclidean distance between each of the countries. I can represent these distances in a country-by-country matrix, that I compare to the correlation matrix that I provided in figure 3. Figure 6 presents the correlation matrix and the distance matrix. Since both of these matrices are symmetric, we can only consider the bottom half of each for the sake of clarity.

As underscored above, the MDS algorithm seeks to apply larger distances to countries with lower correlation coefficient and vice-versa. However, the reader will notice that the configuration of the data offered by the example does not allow the MDS algorithm to optimally represent it in a two-dimension plot. While the greatest correlation—between countries 1 and 9—is represented by the shortest distance (in red in both matrices), the smallest correlation—between countries 5 and 8—is not represented by the longest distance—which is between countries 1 and 6 in the plot. As the reader will notice throughout the rest of this dissertation, these pitfalls can occur when the number of questions and countries sampled is limited but are not common.
Table 7. Correlation and Euclidean distance matrices

Example 2: MDS is successful in providing reliable results

As the reader will observe in the next chapter, it is very rare that MDS provides unreliable results, so the case described above is more an exception than a rule. I now turn to the two-mode matrix in figure 7 to provide an example in which MDS is successful.
This matrix is the input data that I use to generate a correlation matrix, using UCINet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.601</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>-0.642</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.837</td>
<td>-0.699</td>
<td>-0.749</td>
<td>-0.821</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>-0.676</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
<td>-0.727</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Another example of a one-mode, correlation matrix

This one-mode matrix is the input that I use to generate the following MDS graph:

Table 10. Another illustration of an MDS graph
The emergence of two distinct clusters is not surprising in this case either given the correlation coefficients presented in figure 8 which suggest a high level of similarities between countries 1 through 5 on one hand and between 7 through 9 on the other. In addition, UCINet indicates that mapping the one-mode matrix in two-dimension plot involves a stress of 3.2% which is not only below the conservative rule of thumb of 15% but also below the threshold provided by Sturrock and Rocha. In this case—and in many other cases as the reader will see in the next chapter—MDS succeeds in providing a reliable, two-dimensional representation of the correlation matrix. The figure below compares the correlation matrix and the Euclidean distance matrix that I calculate using the coordinates that UCINet provides.

**Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.601</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>-0.642</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.937</td>
<td>-0.699</td>
<td>-0.749</td>
<td>-0.821</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 8</td>
<td>-0.676</td>
<td>-0.962</td>
<td>-0.727</td>
<td>-0.715</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Euclidean Distance Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>0.131867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>0.135595</td>
<td>0.126574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 3</td>
<td>0.087207</td>
<td>0.072911</td>
<td>0.068622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 4</td>
<td>0.092763</td>
<td>0.118119</td>
<td>0.195972</td>
<td>0.128561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 5</td>
<td>0.913906</td>
<td>1.037139</td>
<td>0.949733</td>
<td>0.969025</td>
<td>0.988434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 6</td>
<td>1.009095</td>
<td>1.133011</td>
<td>1.046377</td>
<td>1.065169</td>
<td>1.082502</td>
<td>0.096747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 7</td>
<td>1.015833</td>
<td>1.135325</td>
<td>1.041048</td>
<td>1.065643</td>
<td>1.093999</td>
<td>0.12474</td>
<td>0.094021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 8</td>
<td>0.995018</td>
<td>1.122377</td>
<td>1.043943</td>
<td>1.056845</td>
<td>1.063136</td>
<td>0.132439</td>
<td>0.093059</td>
<td>0.186387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11. Another illustration of correlation and Euclidean distance matrices**

In this case, there is not an exact match between the highest correlation—countries 2 and 4—and the shortest Euclidean distance—countries 3 and 4. The same is
true regarding the lowest correlation—between countries 2 and 8—and the longest distance—between countries 2 and 9. However, these discrepancies are much smaller compared to the previous example. The UCINet algorithm therefore manages the distortion involved in representing these sets of bilateral distances in a two-dimension plot far better. This explains why the level of stress is below the threshold at which we can consider the results as reliable.

Limitations

As hinted above, there are admittedly some limitations with this approach. By no means is it designed to provide the same information as an anthropological study would about national cultures and political cultures. This approach is design to inform about commonalities and differences between countries, rather than about the actual contents of identities and political cultures. In addition, it assumes that different political cultures within a country can be accurately aggregated in the form of a unique national political culture. While this is often the case, some instances such as Belgium, Colombia and Iraq may disprove this assumption. The real advantage of this approach is that it offers an alternative way to account for the role of culture and identity in international relations. Chapters 5 and 6 present the findings of the research.
CHAPTER V—ANALYSIS (PART 2)
RE-ASSESSING THE TRANS-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP

Characterizing the Trans-Atlantic Partnership

The contradictory assessments of the current state of the trans-Atlantic partnership and the conflicting judgments regarding the long term prospects of this particular alliance and regarding alliances in general suggest that the evidence on this topic is at best inconclusive and at worse inappropriately collected to reach founded conclusions. In particular, there are three, mutually exclusive interpretations of the evidence.

*An irrelevant legacy, a community or a natural alliance?*

The most pessimistic argue that what is commonly referred to as the trans-Atlantic community is merely a set of countries that were once united in the struggle against Communism. According to this view, this “community” bears no strategic relevance beyond the past history of these ties and perhaps the tactical considerations that can lead any country to work with another to reach a short term goal. More generally, this view regards long term alliances as anomalies that cannot persist without an overriding threat.

A more optimistic view contends that the trans-Atlantic partnership is indeed a community because it involves countries that share commonalities in political culture and constructed identity. The cumulative process that the previous chapters discussed has allowed actors to construct a common identity that is based on significant commonalities in political culture. While more optimistic, this view remains skeptical regarding the actual implications of these commonalities: This common identity has no real effect in foreign policy processes that are designed to preserve state interests and which are not
meant to be influenced by cultural considerations. In this view, the trans-Atlantic partnership is a community of values but not a strategic alliance that is different from other strategic partnerships.

The natural alliance hypothesis provides the most optimistic scenario regarding the current state of the partnership as well as its future prospects. This view considers that the trans-Atlantic partnership is not only a community but is also an alliance because commonalities in political culture and a common constructed identity lead the countries to react in similar ways to international crises. In other words, these commonalities in political culture have, at the very least, the potential to play a role in foreign policy processes if that is not already the case.

**Evolving definitions of and approaches to the partnership**

In addition to the contradictions that arise with these three mutually-exclusive scenarios, a major challenge associated with this assessment is the evolving composition of the trans-Atlantic partnership. Prior to the end of the Cold War, the definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership is straightforward, as it includes the members of NATO as well as non-Communist Europe. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the political willingness on the part of Western decision-makers to include Eastern European countries in NATO and in the European Union introduced some complexity in the definition. In fact, it can be argued that the weight of history made the differences in terms of political culture and identity so substantial that it profoundly modified the terms of the partnership. The latter became more instrumental than it was cohesive, and served the purpose of political unification rather than the objective of preserving a shared sense of community. Conversely, the failure of the communist system and the seeming complete adherence of
Eastern European countries to free markets and political liberalism may hint to the political willingness of these latecomers to reunite with a common past. It may be interpreted as a sign of continued trans-Atlantic cohesiveness. This evolving definition will be particularly informative of the contours and the identity of the potential natural alliance between the two Northern sides of the Atlantic.

An additional challenge lies in the fact that this re-assessment can never be absolute and will always require a benchmark. Indeed, commonalities in political culture and in constructed identity can only be assessed relative to the rest of the world. However, this challenge can also be considered as a crucial asset for the current analysis. A better understanding of the natural alliance concept requires a thoughtful consideration of conceptual and operational differences between natural alliances and other alliances. It will therefore be useful to understand how potential natural partners of the United States compare to other allies.

*A two-step approach*

Therefore, there are three levels to the assessment of the trans-Atlantic partnership that I propose to provide in this chapter. Is this partnership merely a legacy of the Cold War? Is it a community? Or is it a natural alliance? My first research question—To what extent do the United States and Europe share a common political culture and constructed identity?—seeks to determine whether the partnership is “just” a legacy or if it can be considered as a community. This is the necessary condition and starting point to the re-assessment of the partnership. It will be the focus of the first part of this chapter. My second research question—To what extent do countries belonging to a same community react in similar ways to international crises and issues?—is designed to determine if the
partnership is a natural one. This question will be at the heart of the second section of this chapter. The next chapter will concentrate on the third research question and explore the operational consequences of the conclusions of the current chapter.

**Is the Trans-Atlantic Partnership a Community?**

*Research question and hypotheses*

The first step of this assessment consists in addressing the first research question: To what extent do the United States and Europe share a common political culture and constructed identity? Answering this first question involves testing the following pairs of hypotheses:

- Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:
  - The United States is more like Europe than like other countries
  - Similarities between the United States and Europe are no greater
- Similarities between some European countries and the United States:
  - There is greater homogeneity among European countries than among some countries and the United States
  - Some European states share greater values, beliefs and perceptions with the United States than with other European states
- Stability over time
  - Variables measured display some inertia over time
  - Variables are very volatile over time
A rejection of each of the second hypotheses in favor of the first ones would lead me to conclude that the trans-Atlantic partnership is a community.

In order to address this question, I rely on the World Values Survey data since 1981. Because the data is not systematically available for all countries and for all waves of the survey, I draw different samples out of each wave of the survey and test how robust the results are across these different samples. Appendix E provides more information regarding the countries and the questions selected for each graph.

**Overall evolution since 1981: World Values Survey**

The evidence for this section is presented in appendix H. The analysis of the data since 1981 suggests that there is strong evidence favoring the trans-Atlantic partnership as a community in spite of some exceptions and caveats.

The availability of the data as well as the number of non-trans-Atlantic benchmark countries for the first wave of the survey are fairly limited. Figure 1 relies on a sample that maximizes the number of countries and non-trans-Atlantic benchmark countries. With the notable exception of Australia, the distinction between the trans-Atlantic community and the rest of the world is striking. In addition, Western European countries and the United States occupy a continuous and identifiable space on the graph when compared to the rest of the world as figure 1b suggests. Admittedly, the United States shares greater commonalities with Northern Ireland, Canada, Great Britain and Australia than with France. The same holds true for Scandinavian countries, namely Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Iceland, which display greater commonalities between themselves than with the United States or Malta. But at the aggregate level, when I consider this community as a whole, the trans-Atlantic community displays cohesiveness,
Australia aside. The second sample maximizes the number of questions and thereby limits the set of countries to the trans-Atlantic community, data availability being greatly limited for other countries. Figure 2 provides results. It does not allow for a comparison for the rest of the world, but we notice similar clusters forming. The United States shares greater commonalities with Northern Ireland, Ireland and to a lesser extent Great Britain relative to its other trans-Atlantic partners. Great Britain occupies an “in-between” spot, also displaying commonalities with Scandinavian and Protestant countries, such as Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, the Netherlands, and West Germany. Italy, Spain and Belgium form a third cluster of countries sharing commonalities with West Germany and the Netherlands, and to a lesser extent, France, which remains at the outskirt of the group, as it was the case previously. The two samples provide robust results across the two samples.

The second wave of the survey includes a greater set of questions and a greater number of countries from both the trans-Atlantic partnership and from the rest of the world. Figure 3 relies on a sample that maximizes the number of countries represented in the graph. Admittedly, there are greater similarities between some countries taken bilaterally (like Italy and Mexico compared to Italy and Finland). In addition, Australia was not included in this wave of the survey so there is no way to assess whether the same phenomenon identified above occurs again here. However, at the aggregate level, there is a clear distinction between the space that the trans-Atlantic partnership occupies relative to the rest of the world. I reach the very same conclusions when I analyze results in Figure 4 which relies on a sample that maximizes the number of questions included in the graph. These results are therefore robust across the two samples. Finally, in Figure 5, I
observe the same type of clustering among Anglo-Saxon countries, Scandinavian countries and Continental European countries as it was the case in the first wave. This phenomenon suggests that in spite of displaying some cohesiveness relative to the rest of the world, the trans-Atlantic partnership is made up of different sub-identities and political cultures.

The analysis of the third wave data is more challenging because results are not robust across samples. I start with a sample which includes Great Britain, for which data is very limited. I end up with a large sample in terms of number of countries but small in terms of questions considered. Figure 6 presents results and confirms the trend of the first two survey waves. However, when I increase the number of questions included in the sample and therefore take out countries for which data is limited, I obtain figure 7 which suggests different results. In particular, the United States is now surrounded by the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Australia and New Zealand. When I maximize the number of questions included in the survey, I can only include the United States and Spain in the sample along with non-trans-Atlantic partnership countries. As Figure 8 shows, the United States and Spain display greater commonalities relative to the rest of the world but the number of countries is limited in this case. Results for the third wave are therefore inconclusive.

Greater data availability and more robust results characterize wave four. A challenge in this case is that while data is available for several European countries, comparisons are not always possible because different questions were administered in different countries. I therefore draw four samples, each of which includes one or more major trans-Atlantic partner, to test robustness across samples. The appendix presents
additional details. Figures 9 through 12 confirm the trend identified in the first two waves: Countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership share greater commonalities in political culture relative to the rest of the world. This result is robust across the four samples which include different questions and different countries. In this wave, the case of Turkey, the only Muslim country in this partnership, stands out as an exception, as the evidence shows in Figure 13. In this graph, I include all Muslim countries of the sample—in which the data is therefore limited to the questions that were administered in all Muslim countries. The evidence suggests that Turkey (in grey) shares much greater commonalities with other Muslim countries (in black) than with countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership. It is noteworthy, however, that the closest trans-Atlantic partnership country to Turkey is the United States. Finally, in comparison to the last three waves, Figures 9 and 10 suggest that Japan is not as far from the trans-Atlantic cluster as it was at the beginning of the 1980s. Commonalities between Japan and the United States may have increased with time, at the turn of the century.

The fifth wave of the World Values Survey was the first one to have been administered after the integration of the Eastern European nations in NATO and in the European Union. The enlargement of both regional institutions call for the reconsideration of the definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership. Let us consider an updated definition which includes these newest members. As for the previous wave, I consider three different samples that each include one or several major European countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership. Figures 14 through 16 provide results. The existence of a specific community relying on commonalities in political culture is far less clear-cut than it was previously the case, in particular because the data suggests that the
newest additions to NATO and the European Union do not share commonalities in political culture to the same extent as the traditional trans-Atlantic partners did. To make this point even clearer, I provide three additional figures—Figures 17 through 19—which are the same graphs but which rely on the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership—and therefore does not include the newcomers in the partnership. These figures suggest that previous results are robust. Commonalities in terms of political culture between the United States and its traditional European Cold War allies are greater than the commonalities between the United States and the rest of the world, with the notable exception of Australia. Turkey continues to stand out as an outlier in this sample, as Figure 20 shows, though its closest trans-Atlantic partner remains the United States. In addition, as the previous wave began to suggest, Japan and now South Korea display greater proximity with the trans-Atlantic cluster than in the past. The last sample that I draw is particularly illustrative of this greater proximity—which is actually more salient in the case of South Korea. Future waves of the survey could confirm how durable and robust this trend is.

This initial analysis of the data suggests that the United States and some of its European partners form a community and that has been the case since prior to the Cold War. In particular, when I consider the traditional Cold War partners of the United States—that is, those countries that joined NATO at the beginning or during the Cold War and/or the members of the European Union—I find that in the aggregate, they share greater commonalities with the United States relative to the rest of the world. When Australia and New Zealand are included in the sample, I find that these two countries stand out as major exceptions, as countries outside the trans-Atlantic partnership but that
are members of this community. I also find that Turkey, which is a historical member of this partnership, is not part of this community. In addition, although the evidence suggesting the existence of this community is strong, I still find that there are some differences between the members of this community—namely between Anglo-Saxon countries, Continental European countries and Scandinavian countries. Finally, during the last two waves of the survey—namely since the beginning of the 21st century—I observe greater proximity between Japan and especially South Korea and the trans-Atlantic cluster. This suggests that similarities in economic development and in regime type, or at least that greater economic growth in South Korea involving societal and identity changes, may also be driving these numbers. I leave this discussion for the next chapter.

**A political community with strong divergences on religion**

The previous chapter has argued that there are different components to a political culture and to a country’s constructed identity. It is therefore useful to unpack these two notions and to consider the different categories of variables in the World Values Survey—namely to do the same analysis as previously, but to consider variables of categories E (Politics and Society) and F (Religion and Morale) separately.

When I include in the sample of questions variables from the category E only, I find that the conclusions outlined above remain valid. The evidence suggests that the trans-Atlantic partnership is, in particular, a political community. When Australia and New Zealand are sampled, the evidence continues to suggest that those two countries share greater commonalities with countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership—Anglo-Saxon countries in particular—relative to the rest of the world. Figures 21 through 23
illustrate these results for the first three waves of the survey and display homogeneous clusters when Australia and New Zealand are not sampled, and relatively homogeneous clusters that include the latter two countries when they are sampled. Figures 24 through 27 illustrate similar results, relying on four different samples drawn from the fourth wave. The analysis of the fifth wave of the data provides even more insightful results given the fact that the survey was administered after the integration of the Eastern European nations in the European Union and in NATO. Figures 28 and 30 hint to a possible convergence of the Western and the Eastern countries that the aggregate data failed to display. In contrast, Figure 29 suggests that the political culture commonalities that characterize the political community that unites Western Europe and the United States are not shared by the Eastern newcomers. The actual status of these Eastern European countries is therefore ambiguous. Figures 31 through 33, which rely on the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership, confirm the existence of a strong political community which also includes Australia. Finally, I observe that when I only consider variables from category, South Korea continues to display commonalities with the trans-Atlantic cluster, as the evidence suggested in the previous section. The trend is therefore persistent.

Religion and morale constitute a second component to a country’s political culture and identity that I analyze separately also. Analysis of the data of the first wave suggests that there is less homogeneity among countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership when variables of category F only are included in the sample pictured in Figure 34. The cluster appears more stretched out and countries like France, Northern Ireland and the United States move away from the cluster that Figure 1 displayed. Similarly, the analysis
of the second wave of the data suggests a much lesser degree of consistent views regarding religion and morale in countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership, as Figure 35 suggests. While the United States and Northern Ireland remain close to one another, they move away from the rest of the cluster and from Great Britain in particular, which seems to display greater commonalities with some Continental European countries, such the Netherlands, Germany and Norway. Analysis of the third wave points to the fact that this trend persists beyond the end of the Cold War. Figure 36 suggests that the United States shared by far greater commonalities with South Africa, Puerto Rico, Venezuela and Lithuania compared to the countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership that were included in the sample—namely Spain, Norway, Finland, Sweden and Germany.

Figures 37 through 40 suggest that this trend persists in the fourth wave of the survey. The United States displays greater commonalities with Argentina than with Canada or Italy, as Figures 37 and 38 demonstrate. In addition, the analysis of the fourth wave of the survey also suggests that the United States shares greater commonalities with Mexico, Chile and South Africa compared to other countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership, France, Germany and Great Britain in particular. The proximity that I observed previously between Anglo-Saxon countries is not verified in this case. Figures 41 and 42 provide results of the analysis of the data of the fifth wave of the survey, relying on the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership and confirm the trend suggested above, as the degree of homogeneity within the trans-Atlantic partnership drops. The boundaries between the trans-Atlantic partnership and the rest of the world are in effect much more blurry than they were when all of the data or when variables of category E were used. When I consider the new definition of the trans-Atlantic
partnership and include in it the Eastern European nations that joined NATO and/or the European Union, not only do these boundaries become blurry compared to above, but Figure 43 also suggests the existence of two separate clusters of trans-Atlantic partnership countries. One in particular includes the older countries of the partnership with the exception of the United States, which seems to share greater commonalities with those Eastern European countries. I also note that while Japan displays greater differences with the trans-Atlantic community compared to what I observed above, as figures 38 and 39 suggest. South Korea, on the contrary, displays the same proximity with the trans-Atlantic cluster, as Figures 41 and 43 suggest. This additional information hints to possible differences in identity and political culture between South Korea and Japan especially relative to the trans-Atlantic community.

One variable in the Religion and Morale category, F025, which asks respondents to provide their specific religious denomination, may be having a disproportionate effect on results. While there were nine available choices in the first wave of the survey, respondents provided forty-eight different types of responses. This inflation in the number of possible responses can artificially inflate differences among countries because multidimensional scaling will treat a difference between the number of people belonging to the Church of Sweden and the number of Catholics as the same difference than between the number of people adhering to the Church of Sweden and the number of Muslims. To guard against this, I reproduce the same graphs without including variable F025. The analysis of the data suggests greater homogeneity among countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership as shown in figures 45 to 54. Slovenia remains a notable and
undeniable outlier. In addition, the United States maintains a significant distance with the rest of the trans-Atlantic countries.

**Other Samples**

In spite of the missing data and the unavailability of some questions in some waves, the World Values Survey database offers the most comprehensive set of variables on a country’s political culture and identity. However, a look at other samples may also provide additional insights and may allow me to guard against overreliance on the World Values Survey dataset to verify previous results.

In 2001, the Pew Research center created the Pew Global Attitudes Project which started to administer cross-country surveys on all continents. An ancestor of these polls was administered in 1991, just after the fall of the Soviet Union. The center administered and released more systematic data as soon as it was created, in 2001. The data that the center provides is mostly related to international issues and current affairs—and will therefore be central in the analysis of the second part of this chapter. However, several questions administered in these surveys are not directly linked to international issues and relate to a country’s political culture, accepted practices and openness towards the outside world. Appendix G lists these political culture-related questions administered in these surveys. The data is available for three different periods: 1991, 2002-2004, and 2007-2009.

Results for ten questions of this 1991 Pulse of Europe Survey that were administered in the United States, in Western Europe, and in Eastern Europe were re-published in two cross-country survey reports in 2002 and 2003. A total of seven questions related to national political cultures and identities, as appendix G shows. The
number of questions and countries is considerably smaller and the likelihood for distortion is therefore higher. I draw two samples from this dataset: one includes all seven questions but excludes Slovakia where the last question was not administered, and the other includes six of the seven questions and samples Slovakia. Figures 55a and 55b illustrate results. However, using the same benchmark as previously, I note that the likelihood that the countries are randomly arranged is greater than 1%, contrary to all previous figures. These results are therefore not reliable.

The expansion of the trans-Atlantic partnership to Eastern Europe is finalized at the end of the first period. For that period, I therefore consider the older definition of the partnership and draw three samples from the data. Figures 56 through 58 provide results. Figures 56 and 57 rely on a limited set of questions and countries and do not provide reliable results because they involve too much stress. I note that both suggest the existence of clusters that include countries of the trans-Atlantic partnership that were sampled, with the exception of Turkey, as the World Values Survey suggested. By contrast, Figure 58 offers reliable results, which rely on a greater number of questions and countries. It suggests the existence of a cluster which includes all of the trans-Atlantic partnership countries with the exception of Turkey. Japan, South Korea and the Czech Republic also display greater commonalities with these countries relative to nations of the rest of the world. While South Korea was not sampled in the fourth wave (1999-2002) of the World Values Survey, Japan and the Czech Republic appeared as the two most proximate countries to the trans-Atlantic partnership nations as Figure 9 suggests. In addition, in the same figure, I note that the United States is the trans-Atlantic country that displays the most distance with Japan. Turkey was not sampled in the fourth
wave of the survey, but when the country was, it systematically appeared to be an outlier of the trans-Atlantic partnership. The current results from Figure 58 verify these previous findings.

I then consider the second period for which the data is available. As early as 2007, both Romania and Bulgaria became the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh members of the European Union. The integration process of the latest European elements is therefore achieved at the beginning of the period. The new definition of the trans-Atlantic community therefore seems more relevant. Indeed, Figures 59 through 62, which provide results for four samples that I draw from the data available for this period, confirm the existence of a trans-Atlantic cluster made up of both Western and Eastern European countries as well as the United States and Canada. In fact, this dataset suggests greater congruence between former Communist Europe, Western European nations and the United States than the World Values Survey data suggested. The reader should take note of the fact that some of the surveys were administered after the latest wave of the World Values Survey. One should also keep in mind that the questions were administered in polls which also tackled current affairs issues and which therefore provided perhaps additional context relative to the World Values surveys. With those two caveats in mind, the conclusions from this particular dataset is in fact more optimistic regarding similarities between Eastern Europe and the historical trans-Atlantic cluster. By contrast, these results confirm some of the previous conclusions. For instance, Turkey continues to stand out as an exception and as an outlier. In addition, Japan and South Korea display proximity with the trans-Atlantic cluster and with the United States.
in particular. The same holds true for Israel, for which the data was very limited previously.

**Conclusions**

When I consider the aggregate data and variables of category E, I conclude that at least until the new century, the United States is more like Western European countries—with the notable exclusion of Turkey—than like any other country, with the exception of Australia and New Zealand. South Korea and to a lesser extent Japan also seem to increasingly share commonalities with the traditional trans-Atlantic cluster, though this trend is relatively new and would need to be confirm.

I also observe some sub-clusters within this trans-Atlantic community, among Anglo-Saxon countries, Scandinavian countries and Continental European countries. These results are consistent over time. This leads me to conclude that the United States shares greater commonalities in terms of political culture with some European countries relative to others.

The analysis of the most documented dataset, the World Values Survey, suggests that the integration of Eastern European countries in NATO and in the European Union does not seem to entail greater commonalities in terms of political culture and constructed identity with the older members of the trans-Atlantic partnership. However, when I rely on the PEW data, which is more limited but slightly more recent, I find that there exists a trans-Atlantic cluster which includes both Western and Eastern European nations. Results regarding the political culture and the identity of the former Communist countries are therefore inconclusive, perhaps because we lack sufficient distance to the end of the Cold War to assess the long term societal trends in these countries.
When I consider variables of category F only, I fail to reject the hypothesis that similarities between the United States and Europe are no greater relative to other countries of the rest of the world. I do observe greater homogeneity among some European countries, including Great Britain, France and Germany, on issues related to Religion and Morale.

The previous analysis suggests that the trans-Atlantic partnership—at least when the old definition is applied—is indeed a community, and especially a political community. Indeed, the separate analysis of variables from categories E and F suggest that while commonalities in political values drive this community closer together, different perceptions of religion—or, in other words, different expressions of religiosity—harms the overall homogeneity of this community.

It is also noteworthy that on a majority of the graphs, the United States remains at the margin of the cluster rather than at the center of it. The evolution of the position of the United States vis-à-vis the rest of its partners is likely to be a significant stakes for the future of the trans-Atlantic community. In the next section, I explore the extent to which the trans-Atlantic community is a natural alliance.

Is the Trans-Atlantic Partnership a Natural Alliance?

Research question and hypotheses

The second step of this assessment consists in addressing the second research question: To what extent do countries belonging to a same community react in similar ways to international crises and issues? The objective of this section is to assess whether
there is a correlation between the clusters observed previously and the clusters of countries that react to international issues and share outlook about the future.

This second research question involves testing the following pairs of hypotheses:

- **Similarities between the United States and Europe compared to other countries:**
  - The United States reacts more like Europe than like other countries
  - Similarities in reactions between the United States and Europe are no greater

- **Similarities between some European countries and the United States:**
  - There is greater homogeneity in reactions among European countries than among some countries and the United States
  - Some European states react in more similar terms to the United States than to other European states

- **Stability over time**
  - Commonalities in reactions display some inertia over time
  - Commonalities in reactions are very volatile over time

A rejection of each of the second hypotheses in favor of the first ones would mean that the trans-Atlantic community is a natural alliance.

In order to address this second research question, I rely on data from cross-country polls of the Pew Global Attitudes Project. Appendix I provides the list of questions that I draw from these polls to conclude. As suggested above, the data is mostly related to international issues and current affairs and will be central in this section. While the ancestor of these polls was first administered in 1991, the project started to
administer cross-country surveys in 2001. Therefore, I will be able to test the first two hypotheses only for the period of the immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War. Starting after 9-11, I will be able to test all the hypotheses associated to the natural alliance theory—and include an assessment of the stability of the results over time.

The immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War

Appendix J presents results. In total, data for ten questions from the 1991 “Pulse of Europe” survey were made public by two polls administered by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press in 2002 and 2003. As appendix I suggests, three questions allows me to assess the reaction of the United States’, Western and Eastern Europe’s publics to the radical changes in international politics. Figure 63 in the appendix provides results and hints to a clear fracture between countries of the trans-Atlantic community and countries of the Eastern bloc. One notable exception is East Germany—which was about to be reunited with its western counterpart—which already displays greater commonalities in outlook with the West than with the former Soviet bloc. The evidence suggests that the trans-Atlantic community constituted a natural alliance in the immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War and the German reunification. As it was the case for the first part of the analysis, I observe that the United States’ position remains at the fringe of the cluster rather than at the center.

The 21st Century and after the 9-11 attacks

One of the first surveys administered by the newly launched Pew Global Attitudes Project, “America Admired, Yet Its New Vulnerability Seen As Good Thing, Say Opinion Leaders,” was atypical and unique since it sampled regions (West Europe, East Europe and Russia, Latin America, Asia, the Islamic World, and the United States) and
not countries, and relied on the opinion of elites, not a representative sample of a country’s population. Figure 64 suggests that the Western Europe is the region with which the United States shares the greater commonalities in terms of reactions to current international affairs. However, graphing these results in two dimensions as the figure does involves too much of a stress and therefore does not lead to reliable results.

The 2002 Pew Survey “What the World Thinks” relies on a much larger sample of countries and questions. I draw two samples from this poll, one which maximizes the number of questions and the other which relies on a smaller amount of questions but includes four additional countries, including China. Figures 65 and 66 display the results. Both confirm the existence of a trans-Atlantic cluster which includes Canada, the United States and its traditional Western European allies—namely France, Germany, Italy, and Great Britain—as well as the Czech Republic, one of the newest members of the trans-Atlantic partnership after its entrance in NATO in 1999. By contrast, the inclusion of Poland, which also entered NATO in 1999, is far less obvious—relative to a country like Slovakia for instance, which was not a member of NATO or the European Union at the time. As it was the case for the period after 2000 in the first section of this chapter, I continue to observe that Japan and South Korea share significant commonalities with the trans-Atlantic community relative to the rest of the world. Both figures also confirm that Turkey is an outlier in the trans-Atlantic community and does not share greater commonalities with countries of the community relative to the rest of the world.

The 2003 Pew Survey “Views of a Changing World” as well as the follow-up survey administered in the same year offers a similar scope in terms of questions and countries. I draw three different samples from these two surveys and obtain Figures 67,
68 and 69. Results confirm the existence of a trans-Atlantic cluster which includes the newly integrated member of NATO of the time, the Czech Republic. As previous results suggested, Slovakia also displays greater commonalities with this cluster relative to the rest of the world. Poland and Turkey, in spite of their NATO membership, remain outliers. I also continue to observe that South Korea and Japan also display significant commonalities with the trans-Atlantic community, though Figure 67 suggests that these may be less salient than the data from 2002 hinted.

The integration of seven new members in NATO and ten new members in the European Union in 2004 leads me to consider a wider definition of the trans-Atlantic community. I draw two samples from two 2005 Pew Surveys, “U.S. Image slightly up but still negative,” and “Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics,” and two other samples from two 2006 Pew Surveys: “America's Image Slips, But Allies Share U.S. Concerns Over Iran, Hamas,” and “The Great Divide: How Westerners and Muslims View Each Other.” Figures 71 through 74 illustrate results. They suggest that the focus on differences between the Islamic and the non-Islamic world drove Russia and the United States closer together, in contrast with previous results, and widened the perception gap between Muslim and non-Muslim countries. The United States appears more isolated then previously in Figures 71 and 72 but this position may also be explained by the additional focus on the perception of the United States as a power and may be indicative of different perceptions across the Atlantic. Although it seems more stretched out than previously, the trans-Atlantic cluster, in which Poland now appears to find a central spot in contrast with Turkey which remains a clear outlier, remains highly relevant. In the 2006 surveys, there are no Eastern European nations
included in any of these two samples, but data for Japan is available. I observe that this trans-Atlantic cluster, which also includes Japan but excludes Turkey, is persistent.

I obtain very similar results when I consider data from three 2007 Pew Surveys: “Global Unease with Major World Powers,” “A Rising Tide Lifts Mood in the Developing World,” and “World Publics Welcome Global Trade—But Not Immigration”. Figure 75 provides results. Bulgaria’s entrance into NATO leads me to broaden the definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership again. However, the newest member is not included in the trans-Atlantic cluster. By contrast, there appears to be no significant differences between countries that entered NATO between 1999 and 2004 and the European Union in 2004—namely Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic—and the other traditional trans-Atlantic allies. Japan and South Korea continue to display greater commonalities in terms of reactions to current international affairs with the trans-Atlantic cluster relative to the rest of the world. A sample drawn from two 2008 Pew Surveys, “Global Economic Gloom—China and India Notable Exceptions” and “Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe,” leads to results that are indicative of how previous findings are robust as Figure 76 exists. The trans-Atlantic cluster, according to this figure, can only be considered if Australia, South Korea and Japan—with which the United States shares greater commonalities in terms of reactions to international crises relative to the rest of the world—are included and Turkey excluded.

Finally, I rely on a 2009 Pew Survey, “Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World,” to obtain Figure 77. Since the data is available for all countries and questions listed in appendix I, I use all of the data and do not need to draw any samples.
Figure 77 provides results that are consistent with previous findings, though Japan and South Korea appear to display greater distance with the United States than previous results suggested. The Figure is also illustrative of the persistence of the trans-Atlantic cluster which does not include Turkey. Countries like Japan, South Korea, and Israel also share greater commonalities in terms of reactions to current international affairs relative to the rest of the world.

**Conclusions**

The previous analysis suggests that the data provides robust findings across a wide set of country and question samples and over an extended period of time ranging from 1981 to 2009. Apart from two caveats—which respectively concern Australia and New Zealand for the first one and South Korea and Japan for the second one—that I discuss below, this section sheds light on two major findings:

First, the evidence points to the existence of a political community and a natural alliance that includes the United States, Canada and their traditional Western European allies of NATO—Germany, France, Britain and Italy being the major ones. The only notable exception is Turkey, which emerges as a historical ally of the trans-Atlantic partnership rather than a natural one. In addition, in spite of the commonalities in terms of political culture and identity between countries of this partnership, I still find persistent sub-clusters of countries that follow traditional cultural and geographic lines—namely the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Catholic subgroups that have been identified in the past. The earliest evidence of the existence of a political community dates back to 1981—the year of the first World Values Survey wave. The earliest evidence of the existence of a
natural alliance dates back to 1991—the year of the first cross-country poll. These results are stable over time when I consider the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.

Second, the fall of the Soviet Union and the subsequent process of NATO and EU enlargement had ambiguous effects on this natural partnership. While the World Values Survey data seems to indicate that societal changes in Eastern European countries are still slow and have not brought these nations closer to the views of their new NATO and European partners, other samples drawn from the Pew data suggests the opposite. These inconclusive results may be related to our difficulties to measure and to assess the changes induced by the fall of the Soviet Union. Some evidence, in particular with regards to the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland to a lesser extent, suggests that these countries are now part of this natural alliance.

The first caveat is related to the positions of Australia and New Zealand. When these two countries are included in the samples, they display greater similarities with the trans-Atlantic alliance—and more specifically with Anglo-Saxon countries—relative to the rest of the world. In fact, these commonalities echo the commonalities between the United States and Great Britain as they relate to a common language and a common civilizational identity. Therefore, the challenge that this caveat sets is more a geographic one than a major limitation to the natural alliance theory. The implications of this caveat are discussed in the next section.

The second caveat, which relates to Japan’s and South Korea’s increasing closeness to the trans-Atlantic countries, is more puzzling for the natural alliance theory. This trend is more volatile, since it does not emerge with the first wave of the World Values Survey, in 1981 but with the fourth one, in 1999. It is therefore more recent. This trend also
appears to be more volatile, since some figures, such as Figures 66 (based on the 2002 Pew Survey “What the World Thinks) and 67 (based on the 2003 Pew Survey “Views of a Changing World), suggest a greater difference in terms of reactions to current international affairs than other results. What this analysis shows is that Japan and South Korea are not part of the political community that the trans-Atlantic partnership forms between 1981 and 1999. The more recent trend suggests that the evidence is more ambiguous in the new century. The implication of this caveat is also discussed in the next section.
CHAPTER VI—ANALYSIS (PART 3)
OPERATIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF NATURAL ALLIANCES

Results from the previous chapter are twofold. The first set of conclusions regard the nature of the trans-Atlantic relationship. The evidence suggests that, relative to almost all of the rest of the world, significant commonalities in political culture and identity is a salient feature of the relationship between the United States and Western Europe since 1981 at least—with the notable exception of Turkey. This led me to characterize the trans-Atlantic relationship as a community. In addition, significant commonalities in the reactions to current international affairs, crises and in outlook between the United States and Western Europe since at least 1991, led me to characterize this relationship as a natural alliance, while recognizing that this conclusions was mitigated by two factors. First, the evidence is inconclusive with regards to the effects of end of the Cold War and the subsequent integration of the former communist bloc in NATO and in the European Union. Future research will need to assess whether this integration has in fact led to discernable shifts in the political culture of these Eastern European nations. Second, it is virtually impossible to exclude Australia and New Zealand from this community and this natural alliance between Northern America and Western Europe. While it is tempting and historically convenient to reduce this relationship to the trans-Atlantic community, ignoring the roles and positions of Australia and New Zealand could unnecessarily limit the concept of natural alliances and unjustifiably characterize the trans-Atlantic community as unquestionably unique.

The second set of conclusions regard the most recent trends involving South Korea and Japan. The data suggests that since the new century, these two Asian nations
have not only displayed increasing commonalities in reactions to current international affairs and crises but even more surprisingly perhaps, increasing commonalities in political culture and identity. Because these trends are much more recent, drawing specific conclusions from this specific finding is premature. However, discussing the potential implications of these trends, should they persist in the future, is a crucial exercise in understanding their practical implications.

These two sets of conclusions suggest that while the evidence points to the existence of a relatively atypical relationship between countries of the trans-Atlantic community, it does not offer sufficient insights with regards to the operational consequences of the existence of this relationship. This chapter is designed to address this specific question and the meaning of these commonalities for policymakers. In particular, the objective of this chapter is to test the following pairs of hypotheses:

- Agreement on how to proceed on a given issue:
  - An agreement is more likely between natural allies
  - Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement

- Agreement on how to proceed over time
  - An agreement is more likely between natural allies on long term questions
  - Commonalities in identity and political culture do not increase the likelihood of an agreement on long term questions

The first section of this chapter explores the extent to which political culture is a relevant indicator to analyze the patterns that I observed in the data in the previous
chapter. The second section discusses the reasons for the resilience of the partnership and the role that these commonalities potentially play in strengthening it. The third section considers the forces that could weaken the community’s resilience and overcome its over-determination.

**Political Culture and Rival Indicators**

Before actually assessing the operational character of natural alliances, it is useful to assess the extent to which commonalities in political culture and in identity are driving the patterns that I observed in the previous chapter. In particular, are other indicators better suited to explain the emergence of specific patterns in the data? Is political culture a confounding variable which is hiding the effect of a more straightforward indicator? In this section, I consider four indicators that may rival with political culture in explaining those patterns and the position of a country in the graph: wealth, the degree of political freedom, OECD membership and religion.

**Wealth**

Wealth is the first indicator that I consider, specifically because differences in wealth among countries could be driving the responses in the surveys. In particular, I look to test the extent to which an indicator of wealth that is comparable across countries can better explain the patterns observed in the previous chapter. Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita, in purchasing power parity—which accounts for differences in price levels across countries—is therefore the most appropriate indicator in this context.

The World Bank’s online data catalog provides a time series on GDP per capita in current U.S. dollars since 1960. I consider the data for 1989, 1995, 1999 and 2005—the
first years of the second, third, fourth and fifth waves of the World Values Survey respectively. I sort the data and divide all the countries of the world into four quartiles. Then I assign to each country of the World Values Survey sample its quartile as the indicator of wealth for that country. For instance, in 1989, most Western European states, Japan, Canada and the United States are in the top quartile while Nigeria and India are the only two countries of the sample that belong to the poorest quartile. More broadly, blue, yellow, green and red are assigned the first, second, third and last quartile respectively. I use this indicator and reproduce some of the graphs provided in appendix H. Appendix K below provides results.

While GDP per capita clearly explains patterns in the second wave of the survey, it seems to perform poorly for the subsequent waves. In figure 78, which presents results for the second wave of the survey, there are two, clearly distinguishable clusters of countries, representing the first and second quartiles. India and Nigeria, the two poorest countries included in the sample, stand at the periphery of the graph. The indicator therefore emerges as a solid predictor of a country’s cluster.

The indicator becomes increasingly unreliable when I consider the data for the subsequent waves. In the third wave, the indicator fails to explain for instance the proximity between Uruguay on the one hand and the United States, Puerto Rico, Argentina, and Spain on the other in figure 79. Uruguay was nearly 25% poorer in terms of GDP per capita relative to Argentina, the poorest nation of the countries that surrounds on the graph and 20% poorer than Antigua and Barbuda, the poorest country of the first quartile. Similarly, it fails to explain Slovenia’s position relative to Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Croatia, and the Czech Republic in the same graph. Slovenia’s GDP per capita
was greater than the average GDP per capita of Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Croatia, and the Czech Republic by a factor of more than two and half. This indicator also fails to explain the structure of the data in the right of the graph, where countries from the second, third and fourth quartile coexist while not displaying any particular pattern. In figure 79, which is also based on the third wave of the survey, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay, and Croatia find themselves in the middle of a cluster essentially made up of the richest countries of the world, while their average GDP per capita is more than 70% lower than the poorest country of the first quartile.

In 1999, Japan was nearly six times richer than the Czech Republic in terms of GDP per capita, questioning the latter as a reliable indicator given the proximity of the two countries in figure 80, representing results for the fourth wave of the World Values Survey. Similarly, Vietnam appears distant from the rest of the poorest nations of the world. In addition, the Philippines display substantial differences with countries that have a comparable level of wealth in terms of GDP per capita, whereas it shares greater commonalities with Mexico, which was five times richer and Zimbabwe, which was two times poorer. Evidence for the most recent wave, illustrated in figure 81, suggests that GDP per capita is a good predictor of a country’s group for the richest countries only and except for Cyprus, but performs very poorly for the other quartiles.

Wealth, and in particular when it is measured by GDP per capita in purchasing power parity, therefore performs particularly poorly in predicting a country’s position on the graphs. The indicator proposed in chapter 5—whether or not a country belongs to the trans-Atlantic community—clearly outperforms it.
**Political freedom**

The second factor that I consider is the state of political liberties and democracy in a country. I use the Freedom House terminology as an indicator of the state of democracy, as it relies on an assessment of both political rights and civil liberties. This indicator distinguishes between countries that are “free” (blue dots), “partly free” (yellow dots) and “not free” (red dots) as the reader can see in the graphs generated in the appendix. I use the first year of the World Values Survey wave as the reference for the Freedom House indicator. Appendix L provides results.

The analysis of the second wave of the World Values Survey data generates figure 82 which suggests no clear pattern with regards to democratic and non-democratic states. The same result holds true when I use the data from the third wave of the survey, as figure 83 suggests. Results for the fourth wave of the data are arguably more conclusive as figure 8 shows. There is a large cluster of democratic nations but that fails to include two democratic states: Lithuania and the Philippines. This makes the frontier between democratic and partly democratic states more difficult to grasp. I use a sample which includes a wider variety of countries in terms of democracy status for the fifth wave. As figure 84 shows, I find no particular pattern as it was the case previously.

Therefore, this indicator, relating to the state of political liberties and democracy, performs poorly in identifying a political community in comparison to the one proposed by the natural alliance theory.

**OECD membership**

Given the fact that wealth and political freedom do not emerge as convincing indicators, I consider a third factor, namely OECD membership. This indicator could
provide interesting insights because membership in the OECD involves both economic and political dimensions—and therefore includes aspects of both of the previous indicators. This indicator is therefore even narrower than wealth measured by GDP per capita or political freedom. It entails that a given country both respects a certain set of standards in terms of accountability and transparency and has achieved a given level of economic development. Appendix M provides results.

I first consider data from the second wave. Figure 85 provides results. There is a clear frontier between the two clusters of OECD members and non-OECD members. Therefore, OECD membership performs reasonably well compared to the previous chapter’s indicator in explaining patterns in the data. In reality, the only change that occurs is the inclusion of Japan in the trans-Atlantic cluster. In contrast, when I consider the third wave of the World Values Survey, illustrated in figure 86, I find that the cluster of countries that belong to the OECD is slightly more homogeneous than when I considered the natural alliance hypothesis only if I exclude the three OECD newcomers—namely Mexico, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. In figure 87, which is another illustration of the third wave of the survey, OECD membership does not perform better than the natural alliance explanation, as it fails to explain Uruguay and Croatia’s proximity with OECD members as well as Mexico, Spain, and Hungary’s proximity with non-OECD members.

Figure 88, which is based on the fourth wave of the survey, presents an expanded cluster which includes the Czech Republic and Japan but not Mexico, which remains an outlier. This cluster is therefore less homogeneous than the one generated by the natural alliance theory. Finally, I consider the fifth wave of the survey. Figure 89 presents a
larger and more homogeneous cluster. But the frontier, between Poland and Chile, still appears arbitrary in terms of distances between countries compared to when I rely on the traditional definition of the trans-Atlantic community.

There is, therefore, no evidence that OECD membership performs better as an indicator than the one proposed by the natural alliance theory to identify the contours of a political community, let alone a natural alliance. It does provide some additional insights but does not solve the issues of the boundaries of the clusters that emerge repeatedly in the graphs. By contrast, this indicator clearly outperforms wealth and political freedom as a predictor for a country’s cluster.

*Religion*

Lastly, I consider religion as a final indicator. The work of Samuel Huntington, which chapter 3 reviewed, as well as the finding that religion may be acting as a separating force within the trans-Atlantic community, suggests that this indicator is a relevant one to consider. I rely on the CIA World Factbook and use a country’s dominant religious affiliation as the indicator. This procedure allows me to divide countries into several religious affiliations shown in appendix N:

- a Roman Catholic group (in red);
- a Protestant group, in which I include Evangelical Lutheran countries (in black);
- an Orthodox group, which includes all countries listed under Eastern, Armenian, Greek, Ukrainian, Georgian, Romanian, and Russian Orthodox affiliations (in blue);
- a Muslim group, including both Sunni and Shiite countries (in dark green);
- a Hindu group, which only includes India (in yellow);
- other Asian religions, including Japan (in light green).
Beyond these groups, this approach emerged as problematic because of an even-split between major religious denominations or because the CIA World Factbook did not offer further specification of the denomination beyond “Christian.” For instance, the data for Australia in 1995 reflected a quasi even-split between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, even if a later census indicated that the latter had become the predominant religious denomination. Australia is therefore coded differently in 1995 and in 2005. In addition, several African countries are listed as “Christian.” Similarly, in 1995, the share of each religious denomination in the Baltic states is not provided, though we know that Christian denominations are by far predominant. I include these countries in another group of “other Christian states” when the information is not precise enough. This group is represented in light blue in the graphs in appendix N.

Other countries, still, provide an atypical combination of religions. Japan is an example from this standpoint, but the religious structure has remained relatively stable since 1989. South Korea is perhaps even more atypical with a strong Confucian tradition coexisting with a significant Christian minority. In 2005, according to the CIA World Factbook, the most predominant group in South Korea was the atheist current, while Christians and Buddhists both represented 26% of the population. The increasing share of the Christian population could therefore be one dynamic driving South Korea closer to the Western cluster, in which Christianity is by far the predominant current. It is notable, however, that the same explanation does not hold for Japan, where similar shifts have not occurred. South Korea is coded in pink in appendix N.

In figure 90, when I apply this indicator to the second wave of the survey, I find that there is a Roman Catholic cluster but which excludes the Netherlands—where
Roman Catholics and Protestants represented 36 and 27% of the population respectively in 1989. The indicator also explains the proximity between Russia and Bulgaria. However, there is no clear Protestant cluster in this figure. The analysis of the structure of the survey’s third wave, which is illustrated in figure 91, suggests that religion performs even more poorly as a predictor of a country’s cluster. The Roman Catholic cluster is divided in two, with Latin American nations on the top of the graph and Eastern European countries on the bottom. As it was the case previously, there is no clearly-defined Protestant cluster, as the United States and Estonia emerge as notably different compared to other Protestant countries that cluster together—namely Germany and Scandinavian nations. Similarly, there does not seem to be a Muslim cluster regrouping the four Muslim countries of the sample—namely Azerbaijan, Bosnia, Albania, and Nigeria. Figure 92, which also relies on the third wave of the survey, provides very similar insights and does not suggest that religion adequately defines the boundaries between countries.

I observe very similar results when I consider the fourth and fifth waves of the survey. In Figure 93, which relies on the fourth wave of the survey, the Roman Catholic cluster is divided in four parts, with Western European nations to the right of the graph, Latin American nations and the Philippines to the left and the Czech Republic and Lithuania alone. In fact, Lithuania shares greater commonalities with a majority of Orthodox countries, with the notable exception of Greece which stands alone in the bottom of the graph, relative to the other countries sampled. Kyrgyzstan, Albania and Bosnia display greater commonalities between themselves as Muslim countries compared to Bangladesh, which emerges as isolated. Results are slightly more convincing when
applied to the fifth world of the survey, as figure 94 suggests. The difference between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant clusters remains indiscernible. The Orthodox cluster is easier to identify. The same holds true for the Muslim cluster, with the major exception of Ghana.

These results strongly suggest that religion is not a good predictor for a country’s cluster. As discussed above, the case of South Korea, where the share of the population which identifies with Christianity as a whole has been growing, is perhaps an exception. Beyond this case, religion does not offer additional insights relative to the indicator offered by the natural alliance hypothesis.

**Conclusion**

The consideration of these four indicators leads me to believe that none of them outperform the explanation provided by the natural alliance hypothesis, and that only OECD membership provides additional insights. The other indicators provide some insights for some of the periods considered, but do not emerge as satisfactory indicators when I consider all of the periods together. Political culture and constructed identity are therefore very relevant indicators relative to the others that I have considered, especially in predicting a country’s cluster given the responses of the population to the survey’s questions. In the next section, I consider how these commonalities in political culture can explain the resilience of the trans-Atlantic partnership.

**Explaining the Resilience of the Partnership**

The notion that commonalities in political culture and in identity are relevant in the strategic landscape of the 21st century is far from being a consensual claim. In fact, a
recurring and legitimate question that emerged in many of my interviews is the extent to which this cultural proximity actually generates strategic value for the members of an alliance. As one interviewee puts it, like-mindedness is nothing more than declaratory if there are no strategic steps that are undertaken to make the relationship work. Another interlocutor insists that the future of the trans-Atlantic partnership lies in the ability of European countries to be more pragmatic about the alliance and take note of the community of interests that unites them with the United States rather than systematically refer to a so-called community of values and obscure the actual strategic stakes of trans-Atlantic cooperation.

There is, however, an alternative view that argues that accounting for commonalities in political culture is not necessarily incompatible with a pragmatic and reactive approach to international issues. Central to this view is the notion that the trans-Atlantic partnership forms a unique axis in international relations and relies on a wide set of pillars. As one senior European Commission official puts it, “Europe does not have a partner that is more similar [than the United States].” Another official of the same organization points to the U.S. DNA that is at the heart of the European project and the European construction. Conversely, as a French historian notes, the European DNA is at the heart of the United States’ construction in which immigration waves played a major role. In NATO, one official considered that the political and social relationship between Western Europe and the United States had been “immortalized.” “This unity,” in turn, “produced a narrative” that finds its roots in the 1941 Atlantic Charter but that has been continuously updated since, concludes another NATO senior official. This view suggests that there is a correlation between cultural proximity and the expression of
strategic interests. According to this point of view, greater awareness of these commonalities in political culture can help allies maintain a high degree of cohesiveness and allow them to better coordinate their reactions.10

The narrative of NATO’s persistence beyond the Cold War

NATO, as one of the many manifestations of the trans-Atlantic community, provides an interesting case study to explore the question of the partnership’s resilience further. In particular, what does this resilience, in spite of the disappearance of the threat it was initially designed to counter, say about the nature of the trans-Atlantic partnership? I offered my interlocutors with three possibilities: inertia that applies to international and regional institutions in general, reactivity and adaptability to new strategic landscapes allowing NATO to reinvent its mission in a post-Cold War period, and like-mindedness among nations which considered that the alliance was valuable in itself in spite of the collapse of the Soviet Union. I also left respondents with the option to provide an alternative explanation, though most provided a narrative that was based on one or a combination of the previous possibilities.

Out of thirty-five respondents,11 twenty-one agreed with the statement that some form of inertia was driving NATO’s resilience, because international and regional organizations “never die” or do so “very slowly” when they actually disappear.12 However, only seven respondents of the sample argued that this was the most fundamental dynamic explaining NATO’s persistence beyond the Cold War. Thirteen respondents believed that the explanation based on like-mindedness was not incompatible with inertia, and that in fact, like-mindedness was just another manifestation of inertia. A significant majority of respondents pointed to NATO’s new mission and role after the
end of the Cold War. Only a minority—eight respondents out of thirty-five—seemed more inclined to favor like-mindedness as the most determining factor over the other explanations.

Eighteen respondents—that is, more than half of the sample—also noted that these three explanations are not incompatible. An organization like NATO never dies because its members are like-minded and are therefore able to redefine the organization’s mission. Alternatively, because a regional organization never dies, a powerful bureaucracy with its own interests can emerge and contribute to the reinvention of its mission in order to justify the persistence and the funding of the organization. In addition, as one respondent put it, the fact that NATO was able to reinvent its mission and re-demonstrate its purpose was more of an enabler than a cause. These explanations tend to point to the complex set of drivers behind the organization’s and the partnership’s persistence. As most respondents believe, these explanations are actually interdependent and that none is exhaustive enough to explain alone the organization’s resilience, which is often considered as over-determined.

**Managing the trans-Atlantic narrative …**

The results of this poll suggest that a significant share of people believe that NATO’s resilience is more about ‘managed inertia’ rather than about accidental persistence of an organization. The drivers of the resilience of NATO—which, again, is only one manifestation of the trans-Atlantic community—are in fact far more ambiguous and far-reaching than the explanations merely related to strategic interests and pragmatism. When seeking to draw all the advantages from this common intellectual software, the challenge becomes managing, updating and tailoring the partnership’s
raison d’être and narrative to the changing international landscape in order to maintain the strategic value of the alliance.

As a result, not only is there no necessary contradiction or incompatibility between pragmatism and awareness of these commonalities in political culture, but it also seems that the combination of both of these components has always been at the heart of bargaining processes within NATO. The instance of France’s withdrawal from NATO’s military integrated command is noteworthy in this context and is illustrative of the need to manage these commonalities. Chapter 2 reviewed the historical context in which de Gaulle took his distances with NATO, just after having offered the United States and Great Britain a plan to manage the countries’ nuclear capabilities that would have involved an unprecedented degree of political intimacy between international powers. This instance is often used to illustrate the lack of cohesion of the alliance. But the story may actually be pointing to diametrically opposed lessons. As explained in the second chapter, France could be considered as a “swing vote” in the context of the Cold War, given its concomitant presence in NATO and in the Western world on the one hand, and the importance of the state in the country’s economic and the significant presence of the communist party in the country’s political landscape on the other hand. In spite of its limited power in military and economic terms, France might have been the actor with the most leverage since the prospect of its “defection” from the Western world would have constituted a major victory for the Soviet Union and a major blow to the United States’ containment strategy. De Gaulle may have recognized his country’s unique position in the Cold War strategic landscape and may have sought to maximize France’s leverage by withdrawing it from the integrated military command. In other words, France never left
NATO, let alone the West. It placed itself in a position in which it could better carry out its own Western foreign policy.

More broadly, it is also noteworthy that NATO has experienced crises in the past but that no member-country has actually “left” the organization. Chapter 2 has documented the numerous crises that have occurred within the trans-Atlantic community over time, but none of these countries have ever “left” the West. Many interlocutors used a metaphor with marriage to characterize this relationship. As it is the case of a marriage, an enduring alliance is constraining to all parties but institutionalization has virtues, in particular in terms of predictability and knowledge of the other. This would suggest that the swing of the pendulum that has characterized modern European history is a movement that may have ended.

... Beyond the history of the Cold War

But how has the new strategic landscape, characterized by more diffuse risks rather than a unique and existential threat, affected the terms of the partnership and determined a new course of action for the trans-Atlantic partnership, beyond its principal feature, the military component? The collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent end of the Cold War sparked a debate in the West regarding the future of NATO and its relevance given that the threat that it has been designed to counter had disappeared. The notion that NATO could play a fundamental role in helping the United States and its traditional Western European allies address new types of threats beyond its historical boundaries—reflected in the organization’s new motto, “out of business, out of area”—received increasing attention from policymakers who found all other alternatives—namely creating a new institution—much too costly.
Initially, this debate focused on the appropriate architecture of the partnership, on the existing and potential security cooperation mechanisms and on the need to adapt the relationship to the new challenges of the new era. The proponents of “building a new NATO” provided a roadmap for the organization in a post-Cold War strategic landscape and pointed to the practical implications of the collapse of the Soviet Union. In particular, they focused on the need to adapt an alliance framework that resembled in many ways the security partnership of the Cold War era. One proponent of the idea at the time now argues that the German unification, within NATO in particular, set in motion the enlargement of the organization, as the goal was to secure all of Europe, not just Western Europe. In particular, the end of the war in the Balkans led NATO members to explore the future architecture of the organization as well as the nature of its potential missions—a process consisting in a “double enlargement,” with its frontiers going beyond the Atlantic and its strategic concept focusing on international rather than regional issues.

Today, another one of these proponents argues that the steps that have been taken since the middle of the 1990s by the organization have allowed it to adapt to the new strategic landscape. However, debates regarding the organization’s next strategic concept suggest that NATO still lacks the strategic vision that these same proponents identified as a crucial component of the organization’s future relevance and efficiency. As the first proponent put it, the process of double enlargement has an ultimate objective: making the U.S.-European axis so strong and its narrative so attractive that both will magnetize new members beyond the traditional frontiers and missions of NATO per se. In this context, concludes this proponent, the real stake is whether this trans-Atlantic axis
will have the ability and the willingness to envision a new strategic concept, since such achieving such an objective would require more than a “15 or 20% rewrite.”18 Another observer notes that such a rewrite would need to go far beyond the traditional realms of NATO and address the management of global commons such as the cyber domain, space and the transit of goods.19

The trans-Atlantic narrative going global?

In this sense, the debate surrounding the future of the trans-Atlantic relationship has transcended NATO and the military aspect of the cooperation between both sides of the Atlantic. In fact, this debate has led to a second generation of proposals that are broader and perhaps more ambitious in nature and that would involve NATO “going global.” These second-generation models consider the potential role of the organization in a way that goes far beyond the traditional definitions of alliances and would involve a greater integration of long term strategies between current and potential members. This suggests that instead of NATO “going global,” it is the trans-Atlantic narrative that could go global and attract an increasing number of international partners.20

From this standpoint, the suggestion of several interviewees that this integration does not solely depend on strategic and military considerations is particularly striking. Three interlocutors in particular suggested that societal integration also remains an open question, and that domestic debates occurring in a given country could shape and be shaped by the perception of other countries. This could explain the international attention that the debate on Guantanamo and on health care reform received abroad.21 A French observer of these questions posits that Europe and the United States—and arguably other developed countries in Asia—face similar challenges and long term structural trends in
sustaining their societal models. In addition, in addressing these challenges, the policy options that they can choose from are increasingly similar. He believes however that these similar challenges and policy alternatives can sometimes lead to a reactionary backlash because some in the United States do not want to look like the Europeans and vice-versa. Addressing these similar issues can sometimes challenge traditional cultural bearings and therefore trigger reactions that are constructed in opposition to other models that a people knows best—and therefore models of other allies rather than other foreign models. This is the interpretation that this observer provides to explain the resurgence of the neoconservative movement under President George W. Bush that he equates with an assertion of the United States’ specificity against any potential movement towards greater societal integration. He notes that a similar interpretation can help understand some of the opposition to health care reform in the United States.\textsuperscript{22} Another observed noted that tensions within the trans-Atlantic community during George W. Bush’s tenure as President were not only triggered by different views of foreign issues, but also by diverging opinions regarding key societal questions such as the death penalty, taxes and homeland security—issues on which the debate has been made easier in the absence of an overriding and existential threat such as the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{23}

These observations suggest that if societal integration has or is not yet occurring, discussions regarding the optimal governance models at the international and domestic levels are indeed “going global.” These debates and disagreements are shaping the trans-Atlantic narrative as they did in the past, during and in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War when policy discussions regarded security issues as well as domestic and international economic challenges to modes of governance. For instance, the
resonance that 1941 Beveridge report had in the Western world, as one of the foundations of the modern-day welfare state and in spite of the persistence of the ongoing and persistent Second World War, displayed the striking interactions between policymakers’ domestic and the international preoccupations. Currently, because a growing number of state-actors are facing similar challenges, the narrative that is being shaped is not exclusive to the trans-Atlantic partnership and can potentially attract other actors which can adhere to it and in turn contribute to its shaping. As one interviewee puts it, the trans-Atlantic partnership bears a striking contrast in this context with alliances and rivalries involved in 19th century politics.24

That is why the narrative and the axis must remain open in order to fully bear its fruits and to be truly effective in generating stability and predictability.25 This explanation is one possible interpretation of the most recent trends observed in chapter 5. In fact, the ability of a natural alliance to generate a narrative that it seeks to defend and promote can potentially go hand in hand with the ability to shape similar narratives and to attract other nations. This long term mechanism explains the persistent proximity of Australia and New Zealand with the trans-Atlantic cluster. It also offers some insights regarding the emerging and growing commonalities between the trans-Atlantic cluster, Japan and South Korea. The latter two nations are not trivial countries in the Asian strategic landscape and have always occupied a significant spot in the U.S. foreign strategy. While the evidence remains slim, these most recent trends may hint that the narrative of the trans-Atlantic community is indeed internationalizing itself and may emerge as a decisive strategic asset for countries of the trans-Atlantic community.
An over-determined relation

In spite of repeated tensions throughout the modern era, the accumulation of cooperative experiences and collaborative exchanges through official and unofficial channels has strengthened the resilience of the trans-Atlantic partnership. While it appeared in the second chapter that until the end of the 20th century, the experience accumulation and the notion of the swing of the pendulum were complementary—as the times of cooperation laid the ground of the subsequent backlash, and the violent times laid the grounds for new paradigms of cooperation—these two dynamics may have become contradictory. The accumulation of experience and the over-determination of the relationship have the potential of becoming key strategic assets for the West to manage the relationship and to avoid durable estrangement.

As a result, while there is therefore very little evidence against the existence of this core axis uniting the United States and its European allies, its future contours and missions are open questions. But more profoundly, the adaptation of its strategic and moral narrative will be key in the ability of the West to reach a new consensus on crisis management and to strengthen the coherence of its missions and actions. This explains the need for a clarification of the narrative of the trans-Atlantic alliance that will allow for a clarification of the trans-Atlantic project. This does not exclude the possibilities of lasting disagreements among trans-Atlantic partners, but could substantially limit the prospects of durable and harmful misunderstandings between parties. The final section of this chapter explores the nature of and the likelihood of lasting misunderstandings occurring.
Scenarios for Durable Estrangement

To determine the extent to which past resilience of the trans-Atlantic relationship represents a potential driver of its future resilience—a major feature of natural alliances—I asked my interlocutors to describe possible scenarios of a durable rupture between the United States and its European allies. My exchanges led me to find three possible scenarios with unequal levels of likelihood.

Diverging views regarding religion

The first scenario is the most ambiguous and less detailed and defined of the three. It revolves around the idea that different interpretations of secularism and diverging views regarding the role and the place of religion in public life could durably affect trans-Atlantic relations. The previous chapter pointed to these diverging views of religion across Western societies, and between the United States and European countries, including Great Britain. These divergences are not new, and are the by-product of different historical experiences. One interlocutor summed it up best: The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was designed to protect religion from the state whereas the Europeans, following the lead of France’s Third Republic, designed the separation of Church and State as a protector of the state against the clergy.26

These divergences have recurrently been expressed by intellectuals and top officials, especially in the aftermath of the 9-11 attacks. In the United States, laws in France, Belgium, and Turkey limiting the ability of Muslim women to wear the Islamic veil in public schools and universities and laws that could prohibit the niqab in public places were the target of criticism. Government officials, editorials and analyses of major newspapers have argued that there is a striking contrast between the human rights
tradition in Europe and the limitations in terms of individual and religious freedoms that these laws impose on the citizens. The most illustrative piece of criticism against those laws came from President Obama in the speech he addressed to the Muslim World in Cairo in June 2009. Conversely, many Europeans tend to consider these laws as safeguards intended to protect the continent’s secular traditions. Some point to the propensity of U.S. politicians to openly talk about and use their faith for political reasons and express difficulty in understanding the predominant role of religion in the United States’ political life.

There is therefore evidence that religion could be a factor of misunderstanding that would affect the relevance and cohesion of the common intellectual software and therefore the prospects of the trans-Atlantic partnership as a natural alliance. While the practice of religion is considered as a founding freedom in the United States—which uses this domestic grid to assess the relevance of policies regarding the practice of religion in the rest of the world—the place that religion occupies in the public sphere in Europe is considered to be a political question. Both analyses rely on a very different logic.

Most interviewees recognized the existence of these diverging views, but a majority believed that the likelihood of a durable estrangement because of these differences was very low. In fact, some noted that, while salient, these differences remained relatively minor compared to differences between the United States and other regions of the world.

The end of formal multilateralism between the United States and Europe

When asked to consider scenarios of possible durable estrangement between the United States and European countries, other participants focused on the difficulties that
multilateral consultation has suffered within NATO and within the European Union. Two interviewees agreed that the current financial turmoil in the European Union proved to be as much the manifestation of a German crisis than a Greek one.\textsuperscript{31} Similarly, another interviewee pointed to the difficulties that the coalition was experiencing in Afghanistan and suggested, in an extrapolation, the possibility of a collapse of NATO and the end of formal multilateralism.\textsuperscript{32} As another observer noted, if NATO and the European Union continue to be the “hate objects” of the political discourse, the durable discredit that these institutions would suffer could severely undermine their mandate.\textsuperscript{33}

The collapse of NATO, the only trans-Atlantic organization in which the United States “has a seat at the table,” would require Washington to deal with “the other side of Brussels,” that is to say the European Commission, with which the relationship is tenuous at best.\textsuperscript{34} Conversely, the current institutional crisis of the European Union has the potential to durably affect policymakers’ expectations regarding the virtues and the efficiency of multilateral consultation. The return of 19\textsuperscript{th} century politics, which was pointed to earlier as the counter-example of the current trans-Atlantic relationship, would have durable consequences on the partnership.

It is noteworthy that this scenario does not point to an additional source of potential misunderstanding between the United States and European countries. Interviewees also experienced difficulties in providing hedging strategies against this contingency. A possible institutionalization of the partnership, which chapter 2 already discussed, beyond military cooperation, emerged as the ideal strategy. The question of the political willingness to implement it emerged as far more complex.
A drift into irrelevance

The prospect that a durable rupture would occur between the United States and European countries because their partnership would have drifted into irrelevance, emerged as the most likely scenario of the three. While a large majority of interviewees rejected the idea that hostilities could drive the two continents apart, many wondered whether failure to cooperate and to solve the most pressing international issues would lead the trans-Atlantic partnership to become “an empty and hallow shell.” This would constitute the most negative effect of inertia discussed above—a situation in which a partnership persists because it exists through a regional organization—but would involve a failure on the part of the alliance to reinvent its purpose and its mission.

Interviewees disagreed on the prospects and likelihood of this scenario. The most skeptical regarding the future of the trans-Atlantic partnership pointed to the very limited institutional capacity of the European Union as well as the willingness of its members to engage in a more fruitful and constructive multilateral dialogue. As one official put it, “We need a shared strategy, with a United States ready to listen and a Europe ready to act.” Nevertheless, the same official pointed to the extent to which the relationship was far more “networked” than the U.S.-Japanese or the U.S.-Saudi partnerships. More broadly, interviewees suggested that we have a good knowledge of the signposts that would suggest that a drift into irrelevance is materializing. In the long run, hedging against this scenario is less a matter of avoiding misunderstandings a more an issue related to the willingness of decision-makers to act and to maintain a dialogue.
Conclusion

One of the major insights of my conversations is that while I am able to demonstrate the existence of a natural alliance and while a large number of interlocutors did not deny the potential operational consequences of such an alliance, the potential for disagreements between trans-Atlantic partners remains quite high. In fact, the evidence does not suggest that in the short run, on a given issue, an agreement between two natural allies is more likely and more feasible than an agreement between tactical or historical allies. However, it appeared very difficult for most interviewees, even those that are most skeptical about the future of the relationship, to think about a scenario of durable estrangement, beyond the “drift into irrelevance” scenario discussed above. In addition, the combination of the findings of the previous chapter and this chapter suggest that there exists a real and evolving narrative of the trans-Atlantic partnership that forms the basis of a common intellectual software.

This evidence leads me to conclude that while an agreement is not more likely between natural allies than between allies facing a current and overriding threat, a durable misunderstanding between natural allies is far less likely. It is therefore not necessarily true that considering the common sense of history and the commonalities in constructed identity is a necessarily unpragmatic approach to managing an alliance portfolio. The two components can constitute additional strategic assets that policymakers should be more aware of. The next chapter, which concludes this dissertation, explores the policy implications of this finding.
CHAPTER VII—CONCLUSION (PART 4)
THE FUTURE OF A NATURAL ALLIANCE

The objective of this dissertation was to explore the possibility that commonalities in political culture and in identity could help alliances persist through time and to determine the operational and strategic value of such ‘natural alliances.’ In particular, I explored whether or not the trans-Atlantic partnership could be considered as ‘natural’ and what these commonalities in terms of constructed identity meant for the future of the partnership in the absence of an overriding threat. I sought to test the existence and the relevance of a common intellectual software shared by trans-Atlantic partners and the extent to which it allowed for a better integration of governance models and consultation mechanisms. I was looking to determine whether these shared historical experiences and this common intellectual software constituted additional forces that pushed some countries closer together and made some allies more obvious or more natural than others, especially in dealing with long term issues.

This dissertation’s findings point to the existence of such a common intellectual software, which is itself a by-product of an accumulation of shared historical experiences leading to a sense of a common constructed identity and which has strengthened the overall resilience of the partnership. A major conclusion of this dissertation is therefore that far from being unpragmatic, greater awareness of these commonalities can allow policymakers to address international issues more efficiently, especially by accounting for the different natures of the partnerships in their alliance portfolio. This final chapter concludes this dissertation by summarizing its major findings and implications. The first section reviews the major results of the study. The second section discusses the policy
implications of these findings. The final section of this chapter explores the broader consequences for alliance theory and for the trans-Atlantic partnership in practice.

**Findings**

This study was divided in four specific parts. The first part introduced the concept of natural alliances. It provided the reader with a set up of the theoretical issue and the policy questions associated with this concept. The second part reviewed the appropriate literature and discussed the relevance of the concept in the light of previous findings. The third and core part of the dissertation provided an analysis of the concept. It first offered a framework for ‘natural alliances,’ a taxonomy for alliances showing the diverse manifestations of what is aggregated under a single construct, and provided a methodology to determine whether an alliance is natural or not. I applied this methodology to the case of the trans-Atlantic partnership and discussed results. This conclusion corresponds to the fourth and final part of this dissertation. In this section, I concentrate on and summarize the major findings of the second and third parts of the dissertation.

**Literature review**

The dissertation’s literature review pointed to both the historical relevance and the theoretical insights that a theory on natural alliances provides. In chapter 2, I reviewed the historical literature and pointed to the existence of two central forces at work in Western history until the end of the Second World War: one is cohesive and pushes countries closer together, as policymakers seek to organize their coexistence and find an optimal paradigm of governance; the other is divisive and exacerbates rivalries between
states seeking to maintain a strategic edge or a balance of power to contain the most threatening countries of the region. World War II made the political collapse of the European system and the marginalization of the balance-of-power model official within the trans-Atlantic community. It also laid the grounds for an integrative paradigm which not only focused on economics, trade and security cooperation, but also for the construction and the shaping of a shared trans-Atlantic narrative and identity. NATO along with the European construction which provided the war-torn continent with a road map to achieve lasting peace and emerge as the United States’ global partner, constituted the two primary vectors of this integrative paradigm. This new and unprecedented paradigm did not put an end to rivalry and confrontation. But it seems to have provided the trans-Atlantic partnership with a historical and intellectual capital that is at the heart of its resilience. I concluded chapter 2 by observing that one open question in the ongoing debate regarding NATO’s persistence concerns the appropriate framework for alliances in the 21st century strategic landscape. In subsequent chapters, I provide the insights of a theory on natural alliances on this specific issue.

Chapter 3 focused on the theoretical discussions regarding the sources of individual and state identities, strategic interactions, coordination, cooperation and alliances. In particular, while the Darwinian metaphor which depicts states as involved in a struggle for resources and survival is convenient to explain wars, rivalries and short-term, instrumental alliances, it fails to explain why countries do not always react in a quasi-Pavlovian or linear way to international challenges. In the chapter, I speculated on the possible existence of intellectual software that can lead a state to identify some of its own features as well as some characteristics of the international system as vital. This
process involves a broader definition of state survival. I also showed that while some models cannot conceive an alliance without the existence of a threat, other models have sought to explain the persistence of alliances by exploring their intrinsic value and their role in reproducing familiar patterns. These observations suggested that international chaos is not necessarily a systematic feature of international relations because states can seek to introduce some predictability in order to hedge against international uncertainty. This chapter concluded by pointing to the possible drivers of state alignments, namely tactics, history and commonalities in regime type as well as cultural focal points. I observed that while constructivism and the literature on strategic culture has laid the grounds for a theory on the role of commonalities in political culture and identity, the notion that a common intellectual software could bring states closer in a persisting manner is still very much missing in the literature.

**Analysis**

The core analysis of the dissertation was divided into three parts. The first part—namely chapter 4—sought to develop a broad framework for natural alliances. In doing that, I found it useful to first develop a taxonomy reflecting the diversity of alliances as well as their different drivers and objectives. Specifically, I found notable differences between tactical, historical and natural alliances. Tactical alliances are instrumental in nature and are the most straightforward and documented types of state alignments. They are best described as short-lived “marriages of convenience” and seek to counter a specific power or an immediate and overriding threat or to achieve a predatory goal. Historical alliances are enduring partnerships that sustain in spite of significant ruptures or structural changes in the international system. In this type of relationship, one of the
partners can potentially accept policies that are not necessarily fully congruent with its short term interests, with the expectation of future gratifications. Natural alliances do not only rely on a shared sense of common history but also on commonalities in political culture and constructed identity, and therefore on a similar intellectual software. As a result, in the long run, when they consider the most salient features of their identity as well as the most vital characteristics of the international system, states may find some allies more obvious or natural than others as they seek to build or maintain a healthy international system.

The rest of chapter 4 developed a methodology which can help identify natural allies. In particular, given the definition that I offer previously in the dissertation, I expect natural allies to share greater commonalities in terms of political culture and identity relative to other countries of the world, and to react in similar terms to current international affairs. A practical approach to identifying natural allies therefore consists in considering a wide sample of countries and in making multilateral comparison of: (a) their political culture and identity and (b) their reactions to international crises and current events as well as their outlook. The ultimate objective is to determine whether there is a correlation between these two components. Therefore, I focus less on the substance of the countries’ political culture and reactions and more on how they compare. The World Values Survey and the Pew Global Attitudes project provide the data and multidimensional scaling the tool to carry out this comparison.

Chapter 5 presents the results of this approach for the case of the trans-Atlantic partnership. Since 1981, I observe greater commonalities in terms of political culture and identity between Western European countries (except Turkey), Canada and the United
States relative to almost all of the rest of the world. This leads me to conclude that the trans-Atlantic partnership is a community since 1981 at the very least. In particular, I find greater commonalities in the realms of politics and society than in the realm of religious culture. This leads me to characterize the trans-Atlantic partnership as a political community with notable religious differences.

The publication of a first cross-country poll in 1991, and the subsequent polls of the Pew Global Attitudes project allowed me to test the natural alliance hypothesis for the previous two decades. I found that the United States, Canada and their traditional allies of Western Europe do constitute a natural alliance. However, it is inaccurate to exclude New Zealand and Australia from this natural alliance, although they do not belong to the geographic entity that the Trans-Atlantic community represents. In addition, I observed that at the turn of the century, significant societal shifts may be occurring in Japan and in South Korea, two Asian nations that are displaying increasing commonalities in terms of political culture and constructed identity as well as in terms of reactions to current international affairs. Taken together, these four states of the Asian region are increasingly challenging the uniqueness of the trans-Atlantic partnership and its geographical denomination in particular.

Chapter 6 explored the operational value and consequences of natural alliances, especially in the light of these limitations. First, it discussed the extent to which political culture was a good predictor and a relevant indicator of the proximities observed in the previous chapter. I studied four alternative predictors: wealth, political freedom, OECD membership and religion. Comparing these indicators to the natural alliance hypothesis, I found that wealth, political freedom, and religion perform quite poorly in explaining in a
systematic way the patterns observed in chapter 5—though some explain some patterns for a given year. OECD membership offers additional insights but does not outperform the natural alliance hypothesis—and in predicting a country’s position in the graph.

Then, I explored the extent to which these commonalities in political culture explain the resilience of the partnership, which interviewees often depicted as over-determined and solidly networked. In particular, I found that while the debate during the 1990s concerned the ways in which Cold War security arrangements could be adopted to the new strategic landscape, the question has now become the extent to which this trans-Atlantic narrative is attracting new powers beyond its traditional geographic sphere of influence. The current debate should not only be about out-of-area missions but also about the potential partners of the trans-Atlantic community. I concluded the chapter with the observation that the major threat against the alliance’s over-determination is a drift into irrelevance rather than the outbreak of hostility or durable tensions. This scenario, along with the previous findings of this chapter, suggest that the trans-Atlantic partnership and narrative need to be managed so that it does not become a hallow shell. In addition, this common narrative could therefore become a strategic asset as important as security and economic arrangements, given its potential to shape the international system and to preserve the characteristics that trans-Atlantic partners consider as vital.

**Policy Implications for Trans-Atlantic Partners**

Greater awareness and consideration of this narrative could indeed provide trans-Atlantic partners with greater leverage within the community and the alliance with
greater leverage at the international level. This section develops the policy implications associated with the existence of a natural alliance.

Finding the right alliance mix

Policymakers are often faced with contradictory objectives. Economic policy is a revealing instance. Maintaining a dynamic growth while keeping inflation in check is, for instance, a well-documented policy dilemma. These two distinct objectives require, in theory at least, two distinct tools, namely the use of a budgetary and a monetary policy—that is, what economists usually refer to as a “policy mix.” The notion that an appropriate mix of tools can allow policymakers to better address a complex and potentially contradictory set of policy objectives can shed light on the advantages of accounting for the diversity of alliances in an alliance portfolio. In particular, myopic and political considerations often drive decisions which only account for the short term strategic landscape and prohibit policymakers from considering the more systemic issues which necessarily affect the policy environment. Finding the right “alliance mix,” akin to a “policy mix” in the economic realm, has the potential to solve this tension between the realist and the liberal imperatives that chapter 4 identified, especially when we are in the presence of an issue that has multiple time dimensions.

The sobering size of the interdependence between the U.S. and Chinese economies is an instance that fits this description well. In the introduction of this study, I observed the extent to which the U.S.-Chinese condominium may have replaced the trans-Atlantic community in the psyche of some U.S. policymakers, in spite of other objective economic indicators that point to the significant integration of trans-Atlantic economy. The explanation for this shift in the psyche of U.S. policymakers is intuitive
and straightforward: the potential for this interdependence to shape the future financial architecture of the international system as well as the geopolitical relationship between Beijing and Washington is significant in the short run. The threats associated with a failure to efficiently manage this extreme state of interdependence override other considerations, in particular those that relate to adapting the international financial system to the new economic and financial landscape.

In fact, in the medium and in the long run, calls for a “Bretton Woods II” proposal suggest that while there are ways for China and the United States to manage this interdependence bilaterally, the long term and sustainable solution lies in the establishment of a multilateral system that would provide the international economy with a new organizing framework. It seems very hard to conceive that a G2, composed merely of China and the United States—and whose existence and relevance is put into question by Chinese authorities themselves—would be able to generate an agreement and the adherence of the rest of the world. In particular, the United States would strongly increase its leverage and the credibility of its bargaining position towards Beijing if it includes its natural European allies in the negotiations. Joint pressures and incentives from the United States and European countries will constitute a far more efficient strategy to convince Beijing to adapt the current international system along the lines of the current system based on free markets and political liberalism.

It is noteworthy that this path is not the one by the Obama administration during the summit of Copenhagen or during other U.S.-European summits. The significance of Asia in the agenda of the current administration is also justified in many respects, most notably because of the size of the stakes involved in the short run in the region. But
striking the right “alliance mix” would mean for Washington considering the diversity of the alliances that the United States maintains so as to gain greater leverage and credibility. In other words, a strategy based on the combination of a tactical alliance with Beijing to manage this extreme interdependence in the short run and a natural alliance with European countries to redefine the international financial architecture is likely to yield greater benefits than a strategy based on either one of these relationships exclusively. This observation is particularly true in the framework of negotiations regarding a “Bretton Woods II” agreement but is also applicable to issues that relate to the management of global commons, such as the environment, access to space and free transit in the seas and the cyber domain.

Finding the relevant denominator

Greater awareness of commonalities in political culture and constructed identity can also be associated with some challenges that policymakers should not overlook. In particular, institutionalizing a partnership on the basis of those commonalities can easily lead to the exclusion of some countries or at least convey the impression that the partnership seeks to leave out some members. In turn, such exclusions or impressions have the potential to exacerbate tensions even among partners with a strong sense of shared history, and to yield counterproductive results.

The case of Turkey’s application to and relationship with the European Union is a particularly interesting example in this context, especially when one considers the traditional position of the United States on this issue. Turkey is a very atypical partner in the current strategic landscape. It is a country that shares significant historical ties with Europe and the United States—especially through though not limited to its membership
in NATO and its role during the Cold War. But, at the same time, results from chapter 5 suggest that Turkey shares greater commonalities in terms of political culture and reactions to current international affairs with other Muslim countries relative to other trans-Atlantic countries. Turkey and the United States have often adopted the view that Ankara is a bridge to the Middle East and that its historical ties with the West were a strategic asset for the latter to gain leverage in a particularly complex region. In contrast with this position, countries of the European Union have pointed to the differences in political culture to promote the idea of a privileged partnership with Turkey and to reject the possibility of Turkish membership to the European Union. These differences of views have the potential to durably shape Turkish foreign policy and to limit the trans-Atlantic community’s leverage and credibility, in the Middle East in particular.

More broadly, since 2005 and the failure of the European Constitutional Treaty, it appears that the European Union is experiencing an institutional crisis and perhaps an identity crisis. The Constitutional Treaty had sought to provide the Union with a better defined long-term organization and thus to put an end to the constructive ambiguity that surrounded the European construction since its inception. One interpretation of its failure is that a major driver in the European construction was historical and the political culture component remained an underlying factor in the process. The Second World War had revealed the collapse of the European political system. Its horrendous consequences led European leaders to focus on the need to avoid a new war and to organize the coexistence of Western European states. The construction process was mainly economic in nature until the end of the century and the creation of the euro. In this process, the political model was present but only as an underlying component, not as an organizing force.
When European leaders sought to change this situation and move away from a model based on a network of cooperating states, the question of European identity and in particular the issue of the European Union’s political identity in the strategic landscape of the 21st century became a central and defining debate in the construction process. The current institutional crisis stems from the disagreements that emerged in this debate. This crisis has further weakened the European Union.

In this context, the United States and Turkey focused on the historical process of the European construction, because the European Union itself had been content to leave the political component of the construction ambiguous for a long time. Talking at cross-purposes served its role while the political component remained underlying but has now proven its limits. The United States, Turkey, and the European Union in particular cannot knowingly ignore the confusion anymore. In this three-way conversation and in the wake of the European institutional crisis, the temptation to ask whether the EU is the right unit of analysis is great. A theory on natural allies points to the potential strategic advantage that policymakers can draw from greater awareness of commonalities in political culture, but does not intend to suggest that these commonalities need to be too narrowly defined. The latter case would lead to institutional instability if these commonalities are conceived as one of the common denominators for a political and enduring partnership.

As a result, a second set of policy implications that can be drawn from the application of the theory on natural alliances to the trans-Atlantic partnership concerns the common denominator that is chosen as the pillar of the partnership. In particular, one solution to the current institutional crisis in the European Union lies in enlarging the
common denominator so as to avoid making it too narrow and to improve the likelihood of broader adherence by European countries. In fact, a larger common denominator is likely to generate a more solid and stable pillar. But if one pushes that logic one step further, the enlargement of this common denominator would allow the Europeans to consider their identity in broader terms and, in particular, in a way which could integrate countries beyond its traditional borders. The United States and Canada are the most obvious candidates. The institutionalization of this partnership would therefore emerge as an open axis and provide it with the ability to attract other countries.

This institutionalization could also help the trans-Atlantic partners to address the wide set of challenges that they face today, in particular those that relate to the management of the global commons and that the previous section mentioned. It would help them go beyond the mere military considerations on which NATO is founded and let them consider the realms in which broader security cooperation is possible. In the context of a profound economic and systemic crisis, this same institutionalized partnership would also have the ability to re-demonstrate and reaffirm the virtues of an international system based on multilateralism, free markets and political freedom. It would also provide trans-Atlantic partners with the ability to manage their relationships with their fellow partners. In particular, if European countries want to bind the United States to multilateralism and push Washington to pay greater attention to European points of views, it is in their interest to join a multilateral forum or consultation mechanism in which the United States will participate and in which they will have greater bargaining power. Conversely, U.S. policymakers often point to Europe’s lack of strategic though and consistency across a wide set of issues. The United States will have greater leverage
to ameliorate the burden sharing in exchange for greater consultation. More profoundly, such a forum can help participants to develop a more precise and better defined strategic vision for the future. Such a vision will allow them to better coordinate and to better manage their disagreements.

An institutionalized EU-US partnership need not be an exclusive club seeking to balance non-Western countries, and it need not be formal either. The common British view of the European Union, that Mark Leonard best described as “a decentralized network that exists to serve its member-states,” could suffice in generating a strategic vision that would make the overlap of the partners’ intellectual software official. If this network is successful in generating an alternative that other countries of the world can subscribe to, there is no evidence that its creation would result in a confrontation with emerging political powers from Latin America, Asia or the Middle East. This open-ended, non-exclusive club will be best fit to preserve model of cooperation and consultation at a time at which the temptation to revert to the 19th century system of organized rivalries is high.

The Future of Alliances in Theory and In Practice

The trans-Atlantic partnership is perhaps one of the most documented alliance in the literature. It is therefore paradoxical that one of its major manifestations, namely NATO, is still considered as a puzzle because of its persistence and unprecedented resilience. In addition, in spite of the fact that it is widely documented, calls for the trans-Atlantic partnership to adapt to the strategic landscape of the new century are persisting and therefore seem unresolved. If we accept the trans-Atlantic partnership as it is and see
in the fact that it is widely documented a major reason to leave new models of cooperation unexplored, we are at risk of missing a new framework or model to organize this partnership in ten to twenty years. This would leave a significant intellectual vacuum in a realm in which there are many opportunities to seize. In this sense, the work published on the trans-Atlantic community also addresses a generational issue that has not yet been resolved.

In particular, in the analysis of the current state of the partnership and its future prospects, it seems particularly challenging to understand the dynamics of the European construction without understanding the relationship between this construction and NATO persistence and enlargement. It also appears difficult to understand the stakes of the bilateral relationships that European countries maintain between themselves without a focus on the bilateral relationships between the United States and individual European countries or between Washington and the European Commission. Similarly, it is inconceivable to understand these bilateral relationships without accounting for their more informal channels and networks which strengthen these relationships. Finally, it is most challenging to best understand each of these items separately without an aggregate look at these set of relationships.

In short, we were missing a systemic theory to analyze this set of complex dynamics which affected the way we thought about alliances as a whole. This dissertation was not designed to challenge the previous frameworks regarding alliances, but to point to their diverse nature and to offer one possible way of thinking about the phenomenon in a systematic way.
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Appendix B. Mathematical Addendum on Multidimensional Scaling

The following appendix aims at providing a mathematical explanation of multidimensional scaling.¹

Let $x_i$ be the vector of responses to questions administered in country $i$. In the example developed in chapter 4, $x_1$ is the first line of the two-mode matrix in tables 3 and 8, $x_2$ is the second line of the matrix, and so on. Let $\text{corr}(x_i, x_j)$ be the correlation coefficient between vector $x_i$ and $x_j$ and $d(i,j)$ the Euclidean distance between points representing countries $i$ and $j$ in the two-dimension plot generated by MDS.

From a mathematical point of view, the relation between the correlation coefficient and the distance between two points is inverse—when one is high, the other is low and vice-versa. In particular, a positive correlation, even one that is close to 0, is considered as a greater correlation than one that is negative. Therefore, the algorithm minimizes all of the squared difference between the Euclidean distance of any two given countries on the graph and the following value: $1 - \text{correlation coefficient}$. This procedure can therefore be thought of as the following optimization problem:

$$\min \sum_i \sum_j \left( (1 - \text{corr}(x_i, x_j)) - d(i,j) \right)^2$$

The target function—the expression within the brackets—will only be equal to 0 in the ideal scenario in which the algorithm is able to represent in exact terms the correlation in the two-dimension plot. When there is a discrepancy, the value of this target function constitutes one measure of raw stress.
Appendix C. World Values Survey—Waves and Countries

First Wave: 1981-1984


Second Wave: 1989-1993

Argentina (1991), Austria (1990), Belarus (1990), Belgium (1990), Brazil (1991), Bulgaria (1990), Canada (1990), Czech Republic (1990 and 1991), Chile (1990), China (1990), Denmark (1990), Estonia (1990), Finland (1990), France (1990), Germany (1990), Great Britain (1990), Hungary (1991), Iceland (1990), India (1990), Ireland (1990), Italy (1990), Japan (1990), Latvia (1990), Lithuania (1990), Malta (1991), Mexico (1990), Netherlands (1990), Nigeria (1990), Northern Ireland (1990), Norway (1990), Poland (1989 and 1990), Portugal (1990), Romania (1993), Russian Federation (1990), Slovakia (1990 and 1991), Slovenia (1992), South Africa (1990), South Korea (1990), Spain (1990), Sweden (1990), Switzerland (1989), Turkey (1990), United States (1990).

Third Wave: 1995-1998

Fourth Wave: 1999-2002


Fifth Wave: 2005-2008

Appendix D. Pew Global Attitudes Project—Polls and Countries

The Pulse of Europe Survey—1991

Bulgaria, Czech Republic, East Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Russia, Slovak Republic, Ukraine, United States (1989), West Germany.

America Admired, Yet Its New Vulnerability Seen As Good Thing—2001

Asia, Eastern Europe and Russia, Islamic region, Latin America, Middle East/Conflict Area, United States, Western Europe.

What the World Thinks—2002

Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, United States, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam.

Views of a Changing World—2002

Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian Authority, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, United States, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam.

A Year after the Iraq War—2004

France, Germany, Great Britain, Jordan, Morocco, Pakistan, Russia, Turkey, United States.

U.S. Image Slightly Up But Still Negative—2005

Canada, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United States.

Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics—2005

Canada, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United States.
America's Image Slips, But Allies Share U.S. Concerns Over Iran, Hamas—2006

China, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United States.

The Great Divide: How Westerners and Muslims View Each Other—2006

China, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United States.

Muslims in Europe: Economic Worries Top Concerns About Religious and Cultural Identity—2006

China, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, Spain, Turkey, United States.

Global Unease with Major World Powers—2007

Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Peru, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States, Venezuela.

A Rising Tide Lifts Mood in the Developing World—2007

Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Peru, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States, Venezuela.

World Publics Welcome Global Trade, But Not Immigration—2007

Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Peru, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States, Venezuela.
Global Economic Gloom, China and India Notable Exceptions—2008

Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Tanzania, Turkey, United States.

Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe—2008

Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Tanzania, Turkey, United States.

Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image around the World—2009

Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Poland, Russia, South Korea, Spain, Turkey, United States.
Appendix E. Data Availability and Samples

The availability of the data varies from country to country, from wave to wave and from poll to poll, making comparisons sometimes challenging. In order to make these comparisons relevant and sensible, I construct samples of countries for which the data is available for a large set of questions. Then, I compare results across samples that I drew from one same wave. This procedure allows me to assess how robust these results are in each of the waves.

Constructing samples involves a trade-off: Increasing the number of countries in a sample involves reducing the number of questions, since the data is likely to be missing for at least one country of the sample. I rely on three different approaches to deal with this trade-off. One approach consists in maximizing the number of countries in a sample, and relying on a smaller number of questions. An alternative consists in maximizing the number of questions and including less countries in the sample. A third and mixed approach is to select a country of particular importance and to add in the sample all of the countries in which the same questions were administered. This is the approach I take when I analyze the fourth and fifth waves of the survey.

The complete list of questions and countries and years in which they were administered can be found in the World Values Survey codebooks for 1981-2002 and for 2005-2008, and on the Pew Global Attitudes Project Survey reports page. Appendices F and G also list all of the variables (from the World Values Survey and the Pew Global Attitudes Project polls respectively) that I use to address the first research question on commonalities in political culture. Appendix I also lists the variables from the Pew Global Attitudes Project polls that I use to address the second research question on commonalities in reactions to international crises.

In the following pages, when I present the graphs, I list all of the questions and countries that I included in the samples that I consider. In all of the samples I select, all of the data must be available for all of the countries. I do not consider a very limited set of questions administered in the World Values Surveys. In particular, I exclude survey questions which offered country-specific answers exclusively. In waves one through four, possible answers to questions E179 through E183, and in wave five, possible answers to questions V231 through V233A only included domestic political parties. Because these answers are not comparable across countries, including them in the sample would artificially increase differences among countries. Similarly, questions G005 and G015 through G018 in the first four waves of the survey, as well as question V222 in the fifth wave of the survey, are highly dependent on the language and the geography of the country in question. In order to avoid introducing these artificial distortions, I take out these variables when the data is available.
Appendix F. World Values Survey Questions and Samples

The following questions were administered by the various World Values Survey waves from 1981 to 2005. The first question number (starting with an E, F or a G) corresponds to the variable number for the first four waves of the survey. The wording of the questions in the fifth wave of the survey is the same, though the variable names change as the reader will see in the World Values Survey codebook for this particular wave. This appendix also provides the possible answers that the respondents were offered. The reader should also note that the respondents were given the opportunity to state that they “did not know” the answer to the question or to refuse to answer the question.

E. Politics and Society

E001  Aims of country: first choice. People sometimes talk about what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years. On this card are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority. Would you please say which one of these you, yourself, consider the most important? First choice.

1. A high level of economic growth
2. Strong defense forces
3. People have more say about how things are done
4. Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful

E002  Aims of country: second choice. People sometimes talk about what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years. On this card are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority. Would you please say which one of these you, yourself, consider the most important? Second choice.

1. A high level of economic growth
2. Strong defense forces
3. People have more say about how things are done
4. Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful

E003  Aims of respondent: first choice. If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? And which would be the next most important? First choice.

1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Give people more say
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech
E003a Aims of respondent: first choice (Great Britain only, five categories). If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? And which would be the next most important? First choice.

1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Give people more say
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech
5. Improving the standard of living

E004 Aims of respondent: second choice. If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? And which would be the next most important? Second choice.

1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Give people more say
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech

E004a Aims of respondent: second choice (Great Britain only, five categories). If you had to choose, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? And which would be the next most important? Second choice.

1. Maintaining order in the nation
2. Give people more say
3. Fighting rising prices
4. Protecting freedom of speech
5. Improving the standard of living

E005 Most important: first choice. Here is another list. In your opinion, which one of these is most important? And what would be the next most important? First choice.

1. A stable economy
2. Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society
3. Ideas count more than money
4. The fight against crime

E006 Most important: second choice. Here is another list. In your opinion, which one of these is most important? And what would be the next most important? Second choice.

1. A stable economy
2. Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society
3. Ideas count more than money
4. The fight against crime

**E007 National goals: Maintaining order in the nation.** I will read you some goals which different people consider more or less important for this country. Could you please tell me how important you consider each one of these goals to be: would you say it is very important, important, not very important or not at all important for this country?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important

**E008 National goals: Giving people more say.** I will read you some goals which different people consider more or less important for this country. Could you please tell me how important you consider each one of these goals to be: would you say it is very important, important, not very important or not at all important for this country?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important

**E009 National goals: Fighting rising prices.** I will read you some goals which different people consider more or less important for this country. Could you please tell me how important you consider each one of these goals to be: would you say it is very important, important, not very important or not at all important for this country?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important

**E010 National goals: free speech.** I will read you some goals which different people consider more or less important for this country. Could you please tell me how important you consider each one of these goals to be: would you say it is very important, important, not very important or not at all important for this country?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
The main aim of imprisonment. When a person is sentenced by a court of law, what should be the main aim of imprisonment?

1. To re-educate the prisoner
2. To make those who have done wrong pay for it
3. To protect other citizens
4. To act as a deterrent to others

Willingness to fight for country. Of course, we all hope that there will not be another war, but if it were to come to that, would you be willing to fight for your country?

1. No
2. Yes
3. Depends

Will there be war in your country in the next 5 years. How likely do you think it is that there will be another major war in which your country will be involved in the next five years?

1. Not at all likely
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Very likely

Future changes: less emphasis on money and material possessions. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing
Future changes: Less importance placed on work. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

Future changes: More emphasis on technology. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

Future changes: More emphasis on individual. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

Future changes: Greater respect for authority. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

Future changes: More emphasis on family life. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing
E020  Future changes: A simple and more natural lifestyle. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

E021  Future changes: More power to local authorities. I’m going to read out a list of various changes in our way of life that might take place in the near future. Please tell me for each one, if it were to happen, whether you think it would be a good thing, a bad thing, or don’t you mind?

1. Good thing
2. Don’t mind
3. Bad thing

E022  Opinion about scientific advances. In the long run, do you think the scientific advances we are making will help or harm mankind?

1. Will help
2. Will harm
3. Some of each

E023  Interest in politics. How interested would you say you are in politics?

1. Very interested
2. Somewhat interested
3. Not very interested
4. Not at all interested

E024  Interest in politics (ii). Which of these statements comes nearest to describing your interest in politics?

1. Active interest
2. Interest but inactive
3. Not greater than other
4. Not at all interested
Political action: signing a petition. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

Political action: joining in boycotts. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

Political action: attending lawful demonstrations. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

Political action: joining unofficial strikes. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do
E029 Political action: occupying buildings or factories. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you might do it or would never, under any circumstances, do it.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

E030 Political action: damaging things, breaking windows, street violence. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you would do it, might do it, or would never, under any circumstances, do any of them.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

E031 Political action: personal violence. Now I’d like you to look at this card. I’m going to read out some different forms of political action that people can take, and I’d like you to tell me, for each one, whether you have actually done any of these things, whether you would do it, might do it, or would never, under any circumstances, do any of them.

1. Have done
2. Might do
3. Would never do

E032 Freedom or equality. Which of these two statements comes closest to your own opinion? A. I find that both freedom and equality are important. But if I were to choose one or the other, I would consider personal freedom more important, that is, everyone can live in freedom and develop without hindrance. B. Certainly both freedom and equality are important. But if I were to choose one or the other, I would consider equality more important, that is, that nobody is underprivileged and that social class differences are not so strong.

1. Freedom above equality
2. Equality above freedom
3. Neither
E033 Self positioning in political scale. In political matters, people talk of "the left" and "the right." How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking?

1. Left
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Right

E034 Basic kinds of attitudes concerning society. On this card are three basic kinds of attitudes concerning the society we live in. Please choose the one which best describes your own opinion.

1. Society must be radically changed
2. Society must be gradually improved by reforms
3. Society must be valiantly defended

E035 Income equality. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Incomes should be made more equal vs. We need larger income differences as incentives.

1. Incomes should be made more equal
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. We need larger income differences as incentives
Private vs. state ownership of business. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Private ownership of business should be increased vs. Government ownership of business should be increased.

1. Private ownership of business should be increased
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Government ownership of business should be increased

Government responsibility. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: People should take more responsibility to provide for themselves vs. The government should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for.

1. People should take more responsibility
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. The government should take more responsibility
Job taking of the unemployed. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: People who are unemployed should have to take any job available or lose their unemployment benefits vs. People who are unemployed should have the right to refuse a job they do not want.

1. Unemployed should take any job
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Unemployed have a right to refuse a job

Competition good or harmful. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Competition is good. It stimulates people to work hard and develop new ideas vs Competition is harmful. It brings the worst in people.

1. Competition is good
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Competition is harmful
E040 Hard work brings success. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can chose any number in between.

1. In the long run, hard work usually brings a better life
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Hard work doesn’t generally bring success - it’s more a matter of luck and connections

E041 Wealth accumulation. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can chose any number in between.

1. People can only get rich at the expense of others
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Wealth can grow so there’s enough for everyone
E042 Firms and freedom. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: The state should give more freedom to firms vs. The state should control firms more effectively.

1. State should give more freedom to firms
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. State should control firms more effectively

E043 Responsibility pension. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Each individual should be responsible for arranging his or her own pension vs. The state should be responsible for everyone’s pension.

1. Individual responsibility for pension
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. State responsibility for pension
Responsibility housing. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Each individual should be responsible for arranging his or her own housing vs. The state should be responsible for everyone’s housing.

1. Individual responsibility for housing
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. State responsibility for housing

Major changes in life. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: One should be cautious about making major changes in life vs. You will never achieve much unless you act boldly.

1. One should be cautious about major changes in life
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. One should act boldly to achieve
New and old ideas. Now I’d like you to tell me your views on various issues. How would you place your views on this scale? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left; 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right; and if your views fall somewhere in between, you can choose any number in between. Sentences: Ideas stood test of time better vs. New ideas better.

1. Ideas that stood test of time are generally best
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. New ideas are generally better than old ones

Personal characteristics: changes, worry or welcome possibility. Now I want to ask you some questions about your outlook on life. Each card I show you has two contrasting statements on it. Using the scale listed, could you tell me where you would place your own view? 1 means you agree completely with the statement on the left, 10 means you agree completely with the statement on the right, or you can choose any number in between.

1. I worry about difficulties changes may cause
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. I welcome possibilities that something new is beginning

Personal characteristics: I usually count on being successful in everything I do. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I usually count on being successful in everything I do.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned
E049  Personal characteristics: I enjoy convincing others of my opinion. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I enjoy convincing others of my opinion.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E050  Personal characteristics: I serve as a model for others. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I often notice that I serve as a model for others.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E051  Personal characteristics: I am good at getting what I want. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I am good at getting what I want.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E052  Personal characteristics: I own many things others envy me for. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I own many things others envy me for.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E053  Personal characteristics: I like to assume responsibility. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I like to assume responsibility.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E054  Personal characteristics: I am rarely unsure about how I should behave. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I am rarely unsure about how I should behave.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned
E055  Personal characteristics: I often give others advice. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? I often give others advice.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E056  Personal characteristics: None of the above. A variety of characteristics are listed here. Could you take a look at them and select those which apply to you? None of the above.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

E057  The economic system needs fundamental changes. I am going to read out some statements about the government and the economy. For each one, could you tell me how much you agree or disagree? Please use the responses on this card. This country’s economic system needs fundamental changes.

1. Agree completely
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree completely

E058  Our government should be made much more open to the public. I am going to read out some statements about the government and the economy. For each one, could you tell me how much you agree or disagree? Please use the responses on this card. Our government should be made much more open to the public.

1. Agree completely
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree completely
E059 Allow more freedom for individuals. I am going to read out some statements about the government and the economy. For each one, could you tell me how much you agree or disagree? Please use the responses on this card. We are more likely to have a healthy economy if the government allows more freedom for individuals to do as they wish.

1. Agree completely
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree completely

E060 I could do nothing about an unjust law. I am going to read out some statements about the government and the economy. For each one, could you tell me how much you agree or disagree? Please use the responses on this card. If an unjust law were passed by the government I could do nothing at all about it.

1. Agree completely
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree completely

E061 Political reform is moving too rapidly. I am going to read out some statements about the government and the economy. For each one, could you tell me how much you agree or disagree? Please use the responses on this card. Political reform in this country is moving too rapidly.

1. Agree completely
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree completely

E062 Importation of goods. Do you think it is better if: A.) Goods made in other countries can be imported and sold here if people want to buy them. B.) There should be stricter limits on selling foreign goods here, to protect the jobs of people in this country.

1. Import goods
2. Limit imports
3. Other answers
Current society: egalitarian vs. competitive society. Now I’m going to read you some pairs of contrasting statements. For each pair, do you think that the first statement or the second one best describes the CURRENT SITUATION in this country? First statement: An egalitarian society where the gap between rich and poor is small, regardless of achievement. Second statement: A competitive society, where wealth is distributed according to ones achievement.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second

Current society: extensive welfare vs. low taxes. Now I’m going to read you some pairs of contrasting statements. For each pair, do you think that the first statement or the second one best describes the CURRENT SITUATION in this country? First statement: A society with extensive social welfare, but high taxes. Second statement: A society where taxes are low and individuals take responsibility for themselves.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second

Current society: regulated vs. responsible society. Now I’m going to read you some pairs of contrasting statements. For each pair, do you think that the first statement or the second one best describes the CURRENT SITUATION in this country? First statement: A society that assures safety and stability through appropriate regulations. Second statement: A deregulated society where people are responsible for their own actions.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second
Society aimed: egalitarian vs. competitive. And now, could you please tell me which type of society this country you think this country SHOULD aim to be in the future. For each pair of statements, would you prefer being closer to the first or to the second alternative? First statement: An egalitarian society where the gap between rich and poor is small, regardless of achievement. Second statement: A competitive society, where wealth is distributed according to ones achievement.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second

Society aimed: extensive welfare vs. low taxes. And now, could you please tell me which type of society this country you think this country SHOULD aim to be in the future. For each pair of statements, would you prefer being closer to the first or to the second alternative? First statement: A society with extensive social welfare, but high taxes. Second statement: A society where taxes are low and individuals take responsibility for themselves.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second

Society aimed: regulated vs. responsible society. And now, could you please tell me which type of society this country you think this country SHOULD aim to be in the future. For each pair of statements, would you prefer being closer to the first or to the second alternative? First statement: A society that assures safety and stability through appropriate regulations. Second statement: A deregulated society where people are responsible for their own actions.

1. First
2. Somewhat closer to first
3. Can’t say
4. Somewhat closer to second
5. Second
Confidence: Churches. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The churches.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: Armed Forces. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Armed Forces.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: Education System. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The education system.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The Press. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The press.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E073  Confidence: Labor Unions. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Labor unions.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E074  Confidence: The Police. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The police.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E075  Confidence: Parliament. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Parliament.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E076  Confidence: The Civil Services. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Civil Service.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E077 Confidence: Social Security System. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Social Security system.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E078 Confidence: Television. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Television.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E079 Confidence: The Government. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The government.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E080 Confidence: The Political Parties. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Political parties.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E081  Confidence: Major Companies.  I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Major companies.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E082  Confidence: The Environmental Protection Movement.  I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Environmental Protection movement.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E083  Confidence: The Women’s Movement.  I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The women’s movement.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E084  Confidence: Health Care System.  I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The health care system.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E085  Confidence: Justice System. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Justice system.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E086  Confidence: The European Union. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The European Union.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E087  Confidence: NATO. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E088  Confidence: The United Nations. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? United Nations.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
Confidence: The Arab League. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Arab league.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The Organization for African Unity (OAU). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Organization for African Unity (OAU).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The NAFTA. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Nafta.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E093  Confidence:  The Andean pact. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Andian Pact.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E094  Confidence: The Mercosur. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Mercosur.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E095  Confidence: The SAARC. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Saarc.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E096  Confidence: The ECO. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The ECO.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
Confidence: The APEC. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The APEC.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The Free Commerce Treaty (Tratado de libre comercio). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Tratado de Libre Comercio.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The United American States Organization (Organización de Estados Unidos Americanos-OEA). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Organización de Estados Unidos Americanos (OEA).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

Confidence: The “Movimiento en pro de Vieques”(Puerto Rico). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? The Movimiento en Pro de Vieques (Puerto Rico).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all
E101 Confidence: Local/Regional Government. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? Local/Regional Government.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E102 Confidence: SADC/SADEC. I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? SADC/SADEC.

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E103 Confidence: East African Cooperation (EAC). I am going to name a number of organizations. For each one, could you tell me how much confidence you have in them: is it a great deal of confidence, quite a lot of confidence, not very much confidence or none at all? East African Cooperation (EAC).

1. A great deal
2. Quite a lot
3. Not very much
4. None at all

E104 Approval: Ecology movement or nature protection. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Ecology movement or nature protection.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove
E105 Approval: Anti-nuclear energy movement. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Anti-nuclear energy movement.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove

E106 Approval: Disarmament movement. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Disarmament movement.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove

E107 Approval: Human rights movement. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Human rights movement at home or abroad.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove

E108 Approval: Women’s movement. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Women’s movement.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove
E109 Approval: Anti-apartheid movement. There are a number of groups and movements looking for public support. For each of the following movements, which I read out, can you tell me whether you approve or disapprove of this movement? (Read out and code one answer for each) Please use the responses on this card! Anti-apartheid movement.

1. Strongly approve
2. Somewhat approve
3. Somewhat disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove

E110 Satisfaction with the way democracy develops. On the whole are you very satisfied, rather satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the way democracy is developing in our country?

1. Very satisfied
2. Rather satisfied
3. Not very satisfied
4. Not at all satisfied

E111 Rate political system for governing country. People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating how well things are going: 1 means very bad; 10 means very good. Where on this scale would you put the political system as it is today?

1. Bad
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Very good
E112  Rate political system as it was before. People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating how well things are going: 1 means very bad. 10 means very good. Where on this scale would you put the political system as it was ... [in former communist countries: under communist regime], [in countries where recently a change of regime xx has taken place: under xx regime], [in countries where no regime change has taken place: ten years ago].

1.  Bad
2.  2
3.  3
4.  4
5.  5
6.  6
7.  7
8.  8
9.  9
10. Very good

E113  Rate political system in ten years. People have different views about the system for governing this country. Here is a scale for rating how well things are going: 1 means very bad; 10 means very good. Where on this scale would you put the political system as you expect it will be ten years from now?

1.  Bad
2.  2
3.  3
4.  4
5.  5
6.  6
7.  7
8.  8
9.  9
10. Very good

E114  Political system: Having a strong leader. I’m going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country? Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections.

1.  Very good
2.  Fairly good
3.  Bad
4.  Very bad
E115 Political system: Having experts make decisions. I’m going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country? Having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country.

1. Very good
2. Fairly good
3. Bad
4. Very bad

E116 Political system: Having the army rule. I’m going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country? Having the army rule.

1. Very good
2. Fairly good
3. Bad
4. Very bad

E117 Political system: Having a democratic political system. I’m going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, fairly good, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country? Having a democratic political system.

1. Very good
2. Fairly good
3. Bad
4. Very bad

E118 Firm party leader vs. cooperating party leader. In politics, different parties often hold different views. Which do you think is better? A.) A party leader should stand firm for what he or she believes, even if others disagree. B.) A party leader should be prepared to cooperate with other groups, even if it means compromising some important beliefs.

1. Firm party leader
2. Cooperative party leader
E119 Government order vs. freedom. If you had to choose, which would you say is the most important responsibility of government? A.) To maintain order in society. B.) To respect freedom of the individual.

1. To maintain order in society
2. To respect freedom of the individual
3. Other answer

E120 In democracy, the economic system runs badly. I’m going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, after I read each one of them? In democracy, the economic system runs badly.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E121 Democracies are indecisive and have too much squabbling. I’m going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, after I read each one of them? Democracies are indecisive and have too much quibbling.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E122 Democracies aren’t good at maintaining order. I’m going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, after I read each one of them? Democracies aren’t good at maintaining order.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
Democracy may have problems but is better. I’m going to read off some things that people sometimes say about a democratic political system. Could you please tell me if you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly, after I read each one of them? Democracy may have problems but its better than any other form of government.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Respect for individual human rights nowadays. How much respect is there for individual human rights nowadays (in our country)? Do you feel there is (Read out):

1. There is a lot of respect for individual human rights
2. There is some respect
3. There is not much respect
4. There is no respect at all

Satisfaction with the people in national office. How satisfied are you with the way the people now in national office are handling the country’s affairs? Would you say you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied?

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. Fairly dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

Free market economy right for country future. Do you personally feel that the creation of a free market economy that is one largely free from state control, is right or wrong for your country’s future?

1. Right
2. Wrong

Country is run by big interest vs. for all peoples benefit. Generally speaking, would you say that this country is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

1. Run by a few big interests
2. Run for all the people
E129 Economic aid to poorer countries. Some people favor, and others are against, having this country provide economic aid to poorer countries. Do you think that this country should provide more or less economic aid to poorer countries? Would you say we should give:

1. A lot more than we do now
2. Somewhat more than we do now
3. About the right amount/same
4. Somewhat less than we do now
5. A lot less than we do now

E130 Poverty compared to 10 years ago. Would you say that today a larger share, about the same share, or a smaller shares of the people in this country are living in poverty than were ten years ago?

1. Larger share
2. Same share
3. Smaller share

E131 Why are people in need. Why, in your opinion, are there people in this country who live in need? Here are two opinions: Which comes closest to your view?

1. Poor because of laziness and lack of will power
2. Poor because of an unfair society
3. Other answer

E132 Chance to escape from poverty. In your opinion, do most poor people in this country have a chance of escaping from poverty, or is there very little of chance escaping?

1. They have a chance
2. There is very little chance
3. Other answer

E133 How much is the government doing against poverty. Do you think that what the government is doing for people in poverty in this country is about the right amount, too much, or too little?

1. Too much
2. About the right amount
3. Too little
4. Other answer
E134 Amount of help for less developed countries. In some economically less developed countries, many people are living in poverty. Do you think that what the other countries of the world are doing to help them is about right, too much or too little?

1. Too much
2. About the right amount
3. Too little
4. Other answer

E135 Who should decide: international peacekeeping. Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? International peacekeeping.

1. National governments
2. United Nations
3. National governments, with UN coordination
4. Regional organizations

E136 Who should decide: protection of the environment. Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? Protection of the environment.

1. National governments
2. United Nations
3. National governments, with UN coordination
4. Regional organizations
Who should decide: aid to developing countries. Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? Aid to developing countries.

1. National governments  
2. United Nations  
3. National governments, with UN coordination  
4. Regional organizations

Who should decide: refugees. Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? Refugees.

1. National governments  
2. United Nations  
3. National governments, with UN coordination  
4. Regional organizations

Who should decide: human rights. Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I’m going to mention some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? Human Rights.

1. National governments  
2. United Nations  
3. National governments, with UN coordination  
4. Regional organizations
E140 Country cannot solve environmental problems by itself. For the following problems, do you agree that this country can not solve problems by itself, but needs to collaborate with international organizations? This country can not solve its environmental problems by itself, but needs to collaborate with international environmental organizations.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E141 Country cannot solve crime problems by itself. For the following problems, do you agree that this country can not solve problems by itself, but needs to collaborate with international organizations? This country can not solve its crime problems by itself, but needs to collaborate with international police organizations.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E142 Country cannot solve employment problems by itself. For the following problems, do you agree that this country can not solve problems by itself, but needs to collaborate with international organizations? This country can not solve its problems of unemployment by itself, but needs to collaborate with international economic organizations.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E143 Immigrant policy. How about people from other countries coming here to work. Which one of the following do you think the government should do?

1. Let anyone come
2. As long as jobs available
3. Strict limits
4. Prohibit people from coming
E144 Living day to day because of uncertain future. Do you tend to agree or disagree with the following statement: The future is so uncertain that it is best to live from day to day.

1. Tend to agree
2. Tend to disagree

E145 Immigrants and their customs and traditions. Which of these statements is the nearest to your opinion? A.) For the greater good of society it is better if immigrants maintain their distinct customs and traditions. B.) For the greater good of society it is better if immigrants do not maintain their distinct customs and traditions but take over the customs of the country.

1. Maintain distinct customs and traditions
2. Take over the customs of the country

E146 Importance of eliminating big income inequalities. In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important; 5 means not important at all. Eliminating big inequalities in income between citizens.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E146a Importance of eliminating big income inequalities (4 categories). In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important; 5 means not important at all. Eliminating big inequalities in income between citizens.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important
E147 Importance of guaranteeing basic needs for all. In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Guaranteeing that basic needs are met for all, in terms of food, housing, cloths, education, health.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E147a Importance of guaranteeing basic needs for all (4 categories). In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Guaranteeing that basic needs are met for all, in terms of food, housing, cloths, education, and health.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E148 Importance of recognizing people on their merits. In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Recognizing people on their merits.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E148a Importance of recognizing people on their merits (4 categories). In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Recognizing people on their merits.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important
E149 Importance of equalizing chances for education. In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Giving young people equal opportunity to pursue their education irrespective of family income.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E149a Importance of equalizing chances for education (4 categories). In order to be considered "just", what should a society provide? Please tell me for each statement if it is important or unimportant to you. 1 means very important. 5 means not important at all. Giving young people equal opportunity to pursue their education irrespective of family income.

1. Very important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. Not at all important

E150 How often follows politics in the news. How often do you follow politics in the news on television or on the radio or in the daily papers?

1. Every day
2. Several times a week
3. Once or twice a week
4. Less often
5. Never

E151 Give authorities information to help justice. Can you tell me your opinion on each of the following statements? If someone has information that may help justice be done, generally he or she should give it to authorities.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
Stick to own affairs. Can you tell me your opinion on each of the following statements? People should stick to their own affairs and not show too much interest in what others say or do.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Concerned with immediate family. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of your immediate family?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with people in the neighborhood. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of people in your neighborhood?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with people in the region. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of the people of the region you live in?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with fellow countrymen. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of your fellow countrymen.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all
Concerned with Europeans. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of Europeans?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with human kind. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of human kind?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with elderly people. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of elderly people in your country?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with unemployed people. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of unemployed people in your country?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Concerned with immigrants. To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of immigrants in your country?

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all
E162 Concerned with sick and disabled people: To what extent do you feel concerned about the living conditions of sick and disabled people in your country?

1. Very much  
2. Much  
3. To a certain extent  
4. Not so much  
5. Not at all

E163 Prepared to help immediate family. Would you be prepared to actually do something to improve the conditions of your immediate family?

1. Absolutely yes  
2. Yes  
3. Maybe yes/Maybe no  
4. No  
5. Absolutely no

E164 Prepared to help people in the neighborhood. Would you be prepared to actually do something to improve the conditions of people in your neighborhood/community?

1. Absolutely yes  
2. Yes  
3. Maybe yes/Maybe no  
4. No  
5. Absolutely no

E165 Prepared to help elderly people. Would you be prepared to actually do something to improve the conditions of elderly people in your country?

1. Absolutely yes  
2. Yes  
3. Maybe yes/Maybe no  
4. No  
5. Absolutely no

E166 Prepared to help immigrants. Would you be prepared to actually do something to improve the conditions of immigrants in your country?

1. Absolutely yes  
2. Yes  
3. Maybe yes/Maybe no  
4. No  
5. Absolutely no
E167 Prepared to help sick and disabled people. Would you be prepared to actually do something to improve the conditions of sick and disabled people in your country?

1. Absolutely yes
2. Yes
3. Maybe yes/Maybe no
4. No
5. Absolutely no

E168 Reason to help: Moral duty to help elderly people. There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you feel you have a moral duty.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

E168a Reason to help: Moral duty to help elderly people (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you feel you have a moral duty.

1. Yes
2. No

E169 Reason to help: sympathize with old people. There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you sympathize with them.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all
Reason to help: Sympathize with old people (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you sympathize with them.

1. Yes
2. No

Reason to help: In the interest of society. There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in the interest of society.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Reason to help: In the interest of society (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in the interest of society.

1. Yes
2. No

Reason to help: Own interest. There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in your own interest.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Reason to help: Own interest (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in your own interest.

1. Yes
2. No
Reason to help: Do something in return for old people. There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. To do something in return.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Reason to help: Do something in return for old people (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help the elderly people your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. To do something in return.

1. Yes
2. No

Reason to help: Moral duty to help immigrants. There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you feel you have a moral duty.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

Reason to help: Moral duty to help immigrants (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you feel you have a moral duty.

1. Yes
2. No
E174 Reason to help: Sympathies with immigrants. There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you sympathize with them.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

E174a Reason to help: Sympathize with immigrants (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because you sympathize with them.

1. Yes
2. No

E175 Reason to help: In the interest of society. There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in the interest of society.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

E175a Reason to help: In the interest of society (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in the interest of society.

1. Yes
2. No
E176 Reason to help: Own interest. There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in your own interest.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

E176a Reason to help: Own interest (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. Because it is in your own interest.

1. Yes
2. No

E177 Reason to help: Do something in return for immigrants. There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. To do something in return.

1. Very much
2. Much
3. To a certain extent
4. Not so much
5. Not at all

E177 Reason to help: Do something in return for immigrants (2 categories). There can be several reasons to do something to help immigrants in your country. Please tell me for each of the reasons I am going to read out, if they apply to you or not. To do something in return.

1. Yes
2. No

E178 Close to any particular party. Do you consider yourself to be close or not to any particular party?

1. Close to a party
2. Not close to any party
E179 Which party would you vote for: first choice. WVS2000: If there were a national election tomorrow, for which party on this list would you vote? Just call out the number on this card. If DON’T KNOW: Which party appeals to you most? EVS1999: If there was a general election tomorrow, which party would you vote for? WVS1995: If there were a [COUNTRY] election tomorrow, for which party on this list would you vote? Just call out the number on this card.

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

E180 Which party would you vote for: second choice. WVS2000: If there were a national election tomorrow, for which party on this list would you vote? Just call out the number on this card. If DON’T KNOW: Which party appeals to you most? EVS1999: If there was a general election tomorrow, which party would you vote for? WVS1995: If there were a [COUNTRY] election tomorrow, for which party on this list would you vote? Just call out the number on this card.

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

E181 If don’t know, which party appeals to you most. If don’t know in (a) or (b), which party appeals to you most?

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

E182 Party that would never vote. And is there any party on this list that you would never vote for?

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

E183 Are you close to this party. Are you close to this party?

1. Very close
2. Fairly close
3. Sympathiser
4. Not close to a party
E184 Aggression from neighboring country. Every country faces a number of regional and international problems, which are the problems you consider very important (very serious), important, somewhat important, less important or not important? Aggression from a neighboring country.

1. Very serious
2. Serious
3. Somewhat serious
4. Less serious
5. Not serious

E185 Exploitation of local resources. Every country faces a number of regional and international problems, which are the problems you consider very important (very serious), important, somewhat important, less important or not important? Exploitation, by force, of the [nation] natural resources by a powerful country.

1. Very serious
2. Serious
3. Somewhat serious
4. Less serious
5. Not serious

E186 Cultural invasion by the west. Every country faces a number of regional and international problems, which are the problems you consider very important (very serious), important, somewhat important, less important or not important? Western cultural imperialism.

1. Very serious
2. Serious
3. Somewhat serious
4. Less serious
5. Not serious

E187 Regularly read a daily newspaper. Do you regularly read a daily newspaper? That is, at least four out of every six issues?

1. No
2. Yes
E188 Frequency watches TV. Do you ever watch television? If yes: How much time do you usually spend watching television on an average weekday (NOT WEEKENDS)?

1. Do not watch TV
2. 1-2 Hours per day
3. 2-3 Hours per day
4. More than 3 hours per day

E189 TV most important entertainment. Do you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly with the following statement: Television is my most important form of entertainment.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E190 Why are there people living in need: first. Why are there people in this country who live in need? Here are four possible reasons. Which one reason do you consider to be most important? First choice.

1. Unlucky
2. Laziness or lack of willpower
3. Injustice in society
4. Part modern progress
5. None of these

E191 Why are there people living in need: second. Why are there people in this country who live in need? Here are four possible reasons. Which one reason do you consider to be most important? Second choice.

1. Unlucky
2. Laziness or lack of willpower
3. Injustice in society
4. Part modern progress
5. None of these
Least liked group in society. I’d like to ask you some groups that some people feel are threatening to the social political order in this society. Would you please select from the following list the one group or organization that you like least?

1. Jews
2. Capitalists
3. Stalinist/Hard line Communists
4. Immigrants
5. Homosexuals
6. Criminals
7. Neonazis/Right extremists
8. ETA Terrorists
9. Anarchists/Terrorists
10. Members of new religious movements
11. Influential people occupying positions nepotism ridden areas
12. The para-military
13. Guerrilla
14. Narcotraficants/Drug traficants
15. Muslims
16. Shiv sena/VHP/Bajrang Dal
17. People from other states/Foreigners
18. Radical Maori activists
19. Christian Organization Council
20. Socialists
21. Human Right activists
22. Mulsim Organisation Council
23. Leftists
24. Sendero Luminoso y el MRTA
25. Independentists
26. Dominicans
27. Atheists
28. Christian fundamentalist
29. Non-christian fundamentalist
30. Racists
31. Gypsies
32. Turks
33. Kurds/Esids
34. Christians
35. Arabs/Fundamentalists
36. Serbs
37. Other
38. None
E193  Least liked allow: hold office. Do you think that [least liked group] should be allowed to: Hold public office?

1. No
2. Yes

E194  Least liked allow: teach. Do you think that [least liked group] should be allowed to: Teach in our schools?

1. No
2. Yes

E195  Last liked allow: demonstrate. Do you think that [least liked group] should be allowed to: Hold public demonstrations?

1. No
2. Yes

E196  Extent of political corruption. How widespread do you think bride taking and corruption is in this country?

1. Almost no public officials engaged in it
2. A few are
3. Most are
4. Almost all public officials are engaged in it

E197  Opinion on terrorism. Terrorism is everyday news. In principle, most people are against it, but there is still room for differences of opinion. Which of these two statements do you tend to agree with? A.) There may be certain circumstances where terrorism is justified. B.) Terrorism for whatever motive must always be condemned.

1. Agree with A
2. Agree with B
3. Neither

E198  Using violence for political goals not justified. Here’s one more statement. How strongly do you agree or disagree with it? Using violence to pursue political goals is never justified.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
E203  Rapid implementation of market reforms have negative impact on national stability. Do you agree or disagree that the rapid implementation of market economic reforms will have a negative impact on national stability?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E204  Effect of market economic reforms. Which of the following statements best expresses your opinion about market economic reforms? 1.) The implementation of market economic reforms will increase the gap between rich and poor. 2.) The implementation of market economic reforms will improve the lives of most [country] people. 3.) The implementation of market economic reforms will not change [country] economic situation very much.

1. Increase gap between rich and poor
2. Improve lives of most people
3. Would not change economic situation very much

E205  Political parties serve the social and political needs of people. Do you agree or disagree that [country] political parties serve the social and political needs of the [country] people?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E206  Free and fair elections will reduce terrorism. Do you believe that free and fair elections will reduce terrorism?

1. No
2. Yes

E207  [Country] should have close relations with France. Indicate whether you agree or disagree that [country] should have very close relations with each of the following. France.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
E208 [Country] should have close relations with United States. Indicate whether you agree or disagree that Algeria should have very close relations with each of the following. United States.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

E209 Would persist to immigrate abroad if R’s economic situation was better. If your economic situation gets better, would you persist to immigrate abroad?

1. No
2. Yes

E211 Opinion about the problem of Palestine and Israel. Which of the following best expresses your opinion about the problem of Palestine and Israel? 1.) Peace requires that there be an independent Palestinian state alongside the Jewish state of Israel. 2.) Peace requires that the Jewish state of Israel cease to exist and that Jews live as a minority in a Palestinian Arab state. 3.) Peace requires that the Jewish state of Israel cease to exist and that Jews resettled in North America or Europe.

1. Independent Palestinian state alongside with Israel
2. Israel cease to exist, Jews live as minority in Palestine
3. Israel cease to exist, Jews resettled North America and Europe

E212 Opinion about 11th September airliners crash action by religious fundamentalists. As you know, a group of religious fundamentalists hijacked four civilian airliners in September and crashed them into buildings in New York and Washington, D.C. killing several thousand people. What is your opinion of this action?

1. Strongly approve
2. Approve
3. Disapprove
4. Strongly disapprove
E213 Woman should not work outside unless forced to do so. Do you agree or disagree that a married woman should not work outside the home unless forced to do so by economic circumstances?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

E214 Western democracy is the best political system for country. Do you agree or disagree that Western democracy is the best political system for Algeria?

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

E215 It is necessary to fight terrorism by military means. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about terrorism: It is necessary to fight terrorism by military means.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

E216 [Country] needs foreign military cooperation to combat terrorism. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about terrorism: [Country] needs foreign military cooperation to combat terrorism.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
F. Religion and Morale

F001 Thinking about meaning and purpose of life. How often, if at all, do you think about the meaning and purpose of life? (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts).

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never

F002 Feeling that life is meaningless. How often, if at all, do you have the feeling that life is meaningless?

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never

F003 Thinking about death. Do you ever think about death? Would you say:

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never

F004 Life is meaningful because God exists. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). Life is meaningful only because God exists.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither

F005 Try to get the best out of life. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). The meaning of life is that you try to get the best out.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither
F006  Death is inevitable. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). Death is inevitable, it is pointless to worry about.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither

F007  Death has meaning if you believe in God. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). Death has a meaning only if you believe in God.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither

F008  Death is a natural resting point. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). If you have lived your life, death is a natural resting point.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither

F009  Sorrow has meaning if you believe in God. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). In my opinion, sorrow and suffering only have meaning if you believe in God.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither

F010  Life has no meaning. I am going to read out a list of statements about the meaning of life. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of them. (Read out in reverse order for alternate contacts). Life has no meaning.

1. Agree
2. Disagree
3. Neither
F011 Is there good and evil in everyone. Some say that there is good and evil in everyone. Others say that everyone is basically good. Which point of view do you agree with?

1. Good and evil
2. Basically good

F012 Do you ever regret having done something? Does it ever happen that you regret having done something you felt was wrong? Is that:

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Rarely
4. Never

F014 Worth risking life for: my country. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? My country, nation.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F015 Worth risking life for: another’s life. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? To save another’s life.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F016 Worth risking life for: justice. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Justice.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F017 Worth risking life for: freedom. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Freedom.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned
F018 Worth risking life for: peace. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Peace.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F019 Worth risking life for: religion. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Religious beliefs, God.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F020 Worth risking life for: other. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Other.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F021 Worth risking life for: don’t know. Apart from your family, in your opinion, is there anything that you would consider worth sacrificing everything for, even risking your life if necessary? Don’t know.

1. Not mentioned
2. Mentioned

F022 Statement: good and evil. Here are two statements which people sometimes make when discussing good and evil. Which one comes closest to your own point of view? A.) There are absolutely clear guidelines about what is good and evil. These always apply to everyone, whatever the circumstances. B.) There can never be absolutely clear guidelines about what is good and evil. What is good and evil depends entirely upon the circumstances at the time.

1. Clear guidelines about what is good and evil
2. Depends upon circumstances at the time
3. Disagree with both
4. Other answer

F023 Statement: religion and truth. These are statements one sometimes hears. With which would you tend to agree?

1. 1 Truths and meanings in all religions
2. 2 Only one true religion
3. 3 None has any truths
Belong to religious denomination. Do you belong to a religious denomination?

1. Yes
2. No

Religious denomination. WVS: Do you belong to a religious denomination? In case you do, answer which one. EVS: Which one?

1. "Aglipayan"
2. "Al-Hadis"
3. "Alliance"
4. "Ancestral worshipping"
5. "Anglican"
6. "Armenian Apostolic Church"
7. "Assembly of God"
8. "Bahai"
9. "Baptist"
10. "Born again"
11. "Brgy. Sang Birhen"
12. "Buddhist"
13. "C & S Celestial"
14. "Cao dai"
15. "Catholic: doesn’t follow rules"
16. "Charismatic"
17. "Christian"
18. "Christian Fellowship"
19. "Christian Reform"
20. "Church of Christ"
21. "Confucianism"
22. "Druse"
23. "El Shaddai"
24. "Essid"
25. "Evangelical"
26. "Faith in god"
27. "Filipinista"
28. "Free church/Non denominational church"
29. "Greek Catholic"
30. "Gregorian"
31. "Hindu"
32. "Hoa hao"
33. "Hussite"
34. "Iglesia ni Cristo (INC)"
35. "Independent African Church (e.g. ZCC, Shembe, etc.)"
36. "Independent Church"
37. "Israelita Nuevo Pacto Universal (FREPAP)"
38. "Jain"
39. "Jehovah Witnesses"
40. "Jesus is Lord (JIL)"
41. "Jesus Miracle Crusade"
42. "Jew"
43. "Ka-a Elica"
44. "Lutheran"
45. "Mennonite"
46. "Methodists"
47. "Mita"
48. "Mormon"
49. "Muslim"
50. "Native"
51. "New Testament Christ/Biblist"
52. "Orthodox"
53. "Other"
54. "Other: Brasil: Espirit,candomblé,umbanda,esoterism,occultism"
55. "Other: Christian com"
56. "Other: Oriental"
57. "Other: Philippines (less 0.5%)"
58. "Other: Taiwan (taoism, protestant fundam., ancient cults)"
59. "Paganism"
60. "Pentecostal"
61. "Presbyterian"
62. "Protestant"
63. "Qadiani"
64. "Roman Catholic"
65. "Rosacruz"
66. "Salvation Army"
67. "Self Lealisation Fellowship"
68. "Seven Day Adventist"
69. "Shenism (Chinese Religion)"
70. "Shia"
71. "Sikh"
72. "Sisewiss"
73. "Spiritista"
74. "Spiritualists"
75. "Sunni"
76. "Tac"
77. "Taoist"
78. "The Church of Sweden"
79. "The Worldwide Church of God"
80. "Theosophists"
81. "Unitarian"
82. "United"
83. "United Church of Christ in the Philippines (UCCP)"
84. "Wicca"
85. "Zionist"
86. "Zoroastrian"

F026 Former religious denomination. Were you ever a member of a religious denomination? Interviewer instruction: if respondent is currently a member, please ask: Where you ever a member of another religious denomination?

1. No
2. Yes

F027 Which former religious denomination. Which one is your former religious denomination?

1. "Aglipayan"
2. "Al-Hadis"
3. "Alliance"
4. "Ancestral worshipping"
5. "Anglican"
6. "Armenian Apostolic Church"
7. "Assembly of God"
8. "Bahai"
9. "Baptist"
10. "Born again"
11. "Brgy. Sang Birhen"
12. "Buddhist"
13. "C & S Celestial"
14. "Cao dai"
15. "Catholic: doesn't follow rules"
16. "Charismatic"
17. "Christian"
18. "Christian Fellowship"
19. "Christian Reform"
20. "Church of Christ"
21. "Confucianism"
22. "Druse"
23. "El Shaddai"
24. "Essid"
25. "Evangelical"
26. "Faith in god"
27. "Filipinista"
28. "Free church/Non denominational church"
29. "Greek Catholic"
30. "Gregorian"
31. "Hindu"
32. "Hoa hao"
33. "Hussite"
34. "Iglesia ni Cristo (INC)"
35. "Independent African Church (e.g. ZCC, Shembe, etc.)"
36. "Independent Church"
37. "Israelita Nuevo Pacto Universal (FREPAP)"
38. "Jain"
39. "Jehovah Witnesses"
40. "Jesus is Lord (JIL)"
41. "Jesus Miracle Crusade"
42. "Jew"
43. "Ka-a Elica"
44. "Lutheran"
45. "Mennonite"
46. "Methodists"
47. "Mita"
48. "Mormon"
49. "Muslim"
50. "Native"
51. "New Testament Christ/Biblist"
52. "Orthodox"
53. "Other"
54. "Other: Brasil: Espirit,candomblé,umbanda,esoterism,occultism"
55. "Other: Christian com"
56. "Other: Orienta´"
57. "Other: Philippines (less 0.5%)"
58. "Other: Taiwan (taoism, protestant fundam., ancient cults)"
59. "Paganism"
60. "Pentecostal"
61. "Presbyterian"
62. "Protestant"
63. "Qadiani"
64. "Roman Catholic"
65. "Rosacruz"
66. "Salvation Army"
67. "Self Lealisation Fellowship"
68. "Seven Day Adventist"
69. "Shenism (Chinese Religion)"
70. "Shia"
71. "Sikh"
72. "Sisewiss"
73. "Spiritista"
74. "Spiritualists"
75. "Sunni"
76. "Tac"
77. "Taoist"
78. "The Church of Sweden"
79. "The Worldwide Church of God"
80. "Theosophists"
81. "Unitarian"
82. "United"
83. "United Church of Christ in the Philippines (UCCP)"
84. "Wicca"
85. "Zionist"
86. "Zoroastrian"

F028 How often do you attend religious services. Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often do you attend religious services these days?

1. More than once a week
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Only on special holy days/Christmas/Easter days
5. Other specific holy days
6. Once a year
7. Less often
8. Never practically never

F029 Raised religiously. Were you brought up religiously at home?

1. No
2. Yes

F030 Attendance religious services 12 years old. Apart from weddings, funerals and christenings, about how often did you attend religious services when you were 12 years old?

1. More than once a week
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Christmas/Easter days
5. Other specific holy days
6. Once a year
7. Less often
8. Never practically never

F031 Important: Religious service birth. Do you personally think it is important to hold a religious service for any of the following events? Birth.

1. No
2. Yes
F032  Important: Religious service marriage. Do you personally think it is important to hold a religious service for any of the following events? Marriage.

1. No
2. Yes

F033  Important: Religious service death. Do you personally think it is important to hold a religious service for any of the following events? Death.

1. No
2. Yes

F034  Religious person. Independently of whether you go to church or not, would you say you are:

1. A religious person
2. Not a religious person
3. A convinced atheist
4. Other answer

F035  Churches give answers: moral problems. Generally speaking, do you think that the churches in your country are giving adequate answers to: The moral problems and needs of the individual?

1. No
2. Yes

F036  Churches give answers: the problems of family life. Generally speaking, do you think that the churches in your country are giving adequate answers to: The problems of family life?

1. No
2. Yes

F037  Churches give answers: people’s spiritual needs. Generally speaking, do you think that the churches in your country are giving adequate answers to: Peoples spiritual needs?

1. No
2. Yes
F038 Churches give answers: the social problems. Generally speaking, do you think that the churches in your country are giving adequate answers to: The social problems facing our country today?
1. No
2. Yes

F039 Importance of religion in the future. Do you think that religion in the future will be more important, less important, or equally important for people in this country?
1. More important
2. Less important
3. Equally important

F040 Churches speak out on: disarmament. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Disarmament.
1. No
2. Yes

F041 Churches speak out on: abortion. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Abortion?
1. No
2. Yes

F042 Churches speak out on: third world problems. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Third World problems?
1. No
2. Yes

F043 Churches speak out on: extramarital affairs. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Extramarital affairs?
1. No
2. Yes

F044 Churches speak out on: unemployment. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Unemployment?
1. No
2. Yes
F045 Churches speak out on: racial discrimination. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Racial discrimination?

1. No
2. Yes

F046 Churches speak out on: euthanasia. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Euthanasia?

1. No
2. Yes

F047 Churches speak out on: homosexuality. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Homosexuality?

1. No
2. Yes

F048 Churches speak out on: ecology and environmental issues. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Ecology and environmental issues?

1. No
2. Yes

F049 Churches speak out on: government policy. Do you think it is proper for churches to speak out on: Government policy?

1. No
2. Yes

F050 Believe in: God. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? God.

1. No
2. Yes

F051 Believe in: life after death. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Life after death.

1. No
2. Yes

F052 Believe in: people have a soul. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? People have a soul.

1. No
2. Yes
F053  Believe in: hell. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Hell.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F054  Believe in: heaven. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Heaven.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F055  Believe in: sin. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Sin.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F056  Believe in: telepathy. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Telepathy.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F057  Believe in: re-incarnation. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Re-incarnation.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F058  Believe in: angels. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Angels.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F059  Believe in: devil. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Do you believe the Devil exists.
   1. No
   2. Yes

F060  Believe in: resurrection of the dead. Which, if any, of the following do you believe in? Resurrection of the dead.
   1. No
   2. Yes
Stick to religion vs. Explore different traditions. Which is the most important for you? A.) To stick to a particular faith. B.) To explore teachings of different religious traditions.

1. To stick to a particular faith
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. To explore teachings of different religious traditions

Personal God vs. Spirit or Life Force. Which of these statements comes closest to your beliefs?

1. Personal God
2. Spirit or life force
3. Don’t know what to think
4. No spirit God or life force

How important is God in your life. How important is God in your life? Please use this scale to indicate-10 means very important and 1 means not at all important.

1. Not at all important
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Very important

Get comfort and strength from religion. Do you find that you get comfort and strength from religion?

1. No
2. Yes
Moments of prayer, meditation. Do you take some moments of prayer, meditation or contemplation or something like that?

1. No
2. Yes

Pray to God outside of religious services (i). How often do you pray to God outside of religious services? Would you say:

1. Every day
2. More than once a week
3. Once a week
4. At least once a month
5. Several times a year
6. Less often
7. Never

Pray to God outside of religious services (ii). How often do you pray to God outside of religious services? Would you say:

1. Often
2. Sometimes
3. Hardly ever
4. Only in times of crisis
5. Never

1st commandment applies for myself. (SHOW CARD M) Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods before me.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

2nd commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy-God in vain.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply
3rd commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt keep the Sabbath holy.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

4th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt honor thy mother and thy father.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

5th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not kill.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

6th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply
7th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not steal.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

8th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

9th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors wife.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

10th commandment applies for myself. Here is a card on which are the Ten Commandments. Please look at them and tell me, for each one, whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent, or no longer really applies today for yourself. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbors goods.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply
F078 1st commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods before me.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

F079 2nd commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy-God in vain.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

F080 3rd commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt keep the Sabbath holy.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

F081 4th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt honor thy mother and thy father.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

F082 5th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not kill.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply
6th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not commit adultery.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

7th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not steal.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

8th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

9th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply

10th commandment applies to most people. And what about for most people, tell me whether it still applies fully today, whether it applies today to a limited extent or no longer applies today? Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s goods.

1. Applies fully
2. To limited extent
3. Does not apply
F088  Felt in touch with someone far away. Did you ever have any of the following experiences? Felt as though you were in touch with someone when they were far away from you.

1. No, never
2. Yes

F089  Seen events that happened far away. Did you ever have any of the following experiences? Seen events that happened at a great distance as they were happening.

1. No, never
2. Yes

F090  Felt in touch with someone dead. Did you ever have any of the following experiences? Felt as though you were really in touch with someone who had died.

1. No, never
2. Yes

F091  Felt close to a powerful life force. Did you ever have any of the following experiences? Felt as though you were close to a powerful, spiritual life force that seemed to lift you out of yourself.

1. No, never
2. Yes

F092  Experience altered outlook on life. Has the experience altered your outlook on life in any way? Would you say:

1. Not at all
2. Slightly
3. A fair amount
4. Quite a lot
5. A great deal
F093 Relationship between your parents. I’d now like to ask a few questions about your childhood. During the time you were growing up, would you say that your father and mother were very close to each other, quite close to each other, not very close or not at all close?

1. Very close
2. Quite close
3. Not very close
4. Not at all close

F094 Relationship between you and your mother. I’d now like to ask a few questions about your childhood. How about you and your mother? During the time that you were growing up, were you very close to each other, quite close, not very close or not at all close?

1. Very close
2. Quite close
3. Not very close
4. Not at all close

F095 Relationship between you and your father. I’d now like to ask a few questions about your childhood. And you and your father? During the time that you were growing up, were you very close to each other, quite close, not very close or not at all close?

1. Very close
2. Quite close
3. Not very close
4. Not at all close

F096 How strict were your parents. Some parents are quite strict with their children telling them clearly what they should do or should not do, what is right and wrong, while others do not think they can or should do so (are less strict). How strict were your parents?

1. Very strict
2. Quite strict
3. Not very strict
4. Not at all strict
F097 Believe in: supernatural forces. Do you believe in supernatural forces, which may be expressed in terms like a Life Force, a Mighty Power, God, a Spirit, a Universal Law, a Cosmic Conscience or a Source of all creation?

1. Yes, absolutely
2. Yes, somewhat
3. No, not so much
4. No, not at all

F098 Do you have a lucky charm? Do you have a lucky charm such as a mascot or a talisman?

1. No
2. Yes

F099 Lucky charm protects. Do you believe that a lucky charm such as a mascot or a talisman can protect or help you?

1. Definitely not
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Definitely yes

F100 Consult horoscope. How often do you consult your horoscope to know about your future?

1. Every day
2. Once a week
3. Once a month
4. Less often
5. Never

F101 Taking horoscope into account in daily life. How often do you take this into account in your daily life?

1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Sometimes
4. Not very often
5. Never
F102 Politicians who Don’t believe in God are unfit for public office. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? Politicians who do not believe in God are unfit for public office.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F103 Religious leaders should not influence how people vote. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? Religious leaders should not influence how people vote in elections.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F104 Better if more people with strong religious beliefs in public office. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? It would be better for [this country] if more people with strong religious beliefs held public office.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F105 Religious leaders should not influence government. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? Religious leaders should not influence government.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
F106 Nurse refusing legal abortion on religious grounds. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? If a nurse were asked to help perform a legal abortion, she should be allowed to refuse on religious grounds.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F107 Time for prayer and meditation in all schools. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? In my opinion, some time should be set aside for prayer, meditation or contemplation in all schools.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F108 Government protects freedom. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? The government protects personal freedom.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F109 Government protects religion. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? The government protects religious freedom.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
F110  Laws: peoples wishes. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? It should make laws according to the people’s wishes.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F111  Only laws of the Shari’a. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statement? It should implement only the laws of the shari’a.

1. Agree strongly
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F112  Prohibiting or allowing books that attack religion. Should books and films that attack religions be prohibited by law or should they be allowed?

1. Definitely should be banned
2. Probably should be banned
3. Probably should be allowed
4. Definitely should be allowed
5. Can’t choose

F113  Church(es) influence on national politics. Do you think that the church(es) have an influence on national politics or not?

1. Yes, absolutely
2. Yes, think so
3. No, I Don’t think they have
4. No, absolutely not
F114 Justifiable: claiming government benefits. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Claiming government benefits to which you are not entitled.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F115 Justifiable: avoiding a fare on public transport. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Avoiding a fare on public transport.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F116 Justifiable: cheating on taxes. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Cheating on taxes if you have a chance.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F117 Justifiable: someone accepting a bribe. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. (Read out statements. Code one answer for each statement). Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F118 Justifiable: homosexuality. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Homosexuality.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F119 Justifiable: prostitution. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Prostitution.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F120 Justifiable: abortion. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Abortion.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F121 Justifiable: divorce. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Divorce.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F122 Justifiable: euthanasia. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Euthanasia ending the life of the incurably sick.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F123  Justifiable: suicide. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Suicide.

1. Never justifiable
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. Always justifiable

F124  Justifiable: drinking alcohol. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Drinking alcohol.

1. Never justifiable
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. Always justifiable

F125  Justifiable: joyriding. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Taking and driving away a car belonging to someone else (joyriding).

1. Never justifiable
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. Always justifiable
F126  Justifiable: taking soft drugs. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Taking the drug marijuana or hashish.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F127  Justifiable: lying. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Lying in your own interest.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F128  Justifiable: adultery. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Married men/women having an affair.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F129  Justifiable: throwing away litter. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Throwing away litter in a public place.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F130  Justifiable: driving under influence of alcohol. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Driving under the influence of alcohol.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F131  Justifiable: paying cash. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Paying cash for services to avoid taxes.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F132 Justifiable: having casual sex. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Having casual sex.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F133 Justifiable: smoking in public places. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Smoking in public buildings.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F134 Justifiable: speeding over the limit. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Speeding over the limit in built-up areas.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F135 Justifiable: sex under the legal age of consent. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Sex under the legal age of consent.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F136 Justifiable: political assassination. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Political assassinations.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F137 Justifiable: experiments with human embryos. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Scientific experiments on human.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F138 Justifiable: manipulation of food. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Genetic manipulation of food stuffs.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F139 Justifiable: buy stolen goods. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F140 Justifiable: keeping money that you have found. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Keeping money that you have found.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable
F141 Justifiable: fighting with the police. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Fighting with the police.

1. Never justifiable
2.
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F142 Justifiable: failing to report damage you’ve done accidentally to a parked vehicle. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Failing to report damage you’ve done accidentally to a parked vehicle.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F143 Justifiable: threatening workers who refuse to join a strike. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Threatening workers who refuse to join a strike.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F144 Justifiable: killing in self-defense. Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. Killing in self-defense.

1. Never justifiable
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. Always justifiable

F145 Compatriots do: claiming state benefits. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Claiming state benefits to which they are.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F145a Compatriots do: claiming state benefits (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Claiming state benefits to which they are.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F146 Compatriots do: cheating on taxes. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Cheating on tax if they have the chance.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F146a Compatriots do: cheating on taxes (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Cheating on tax if they have the chance.
1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F147 Compatriots do: paying in cash. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Paying cash for services to avoid taxes.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F147a Compatriots do: paying in cash (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Paying cash for services to avoid taxes.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F148 Compatriots do: taking soft drugs. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Taking the drug marijuana or hash.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F148a Compatriots do: taking soft drugs (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Taking the drug marijuana or hash.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F149 Compatriots do: throwing away litter. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Throwing away litter in a public place.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F149a Compatriots do: throwing away litter (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Throwing away litter in a public place.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F150 Compatriots do: speeding over the limit in built up areas. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Speeding over the limit in built-up areas.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F150a Compatriots do: speeding over the limit in built up areas (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Speeding over the limit in built-up areas.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F151 Compatriots do: driving under the influence of alcohol. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Driving under the influence of alcohol.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F151a Compatriots do: driving under the influence of alcohol (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Driving under the influence of alcohol.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F152 Compatriots do: having casual sex. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Having casual sex.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F152a Compatriots do: having casual sex (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Having casual sex.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F153 Compatriots do: avoiding a fare on public transport. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Avoiding a fare on public transport.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F153a Compatriots do: avoiding a fare on public transport (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Avoiding a fare on public transport.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F154 Compatriots do: lying in own interest. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Lying in their own interest.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
F154a Compatriots do: lying in own interest (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Lying in their own interest

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F155 Compatriots do: accepting a bribe. According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none

F155a Compatriots do: accepting a bribe (5 categories). According to you, how many of your compatriots do the following? Accepting a bribe in the course of their duties.

1. Almost all
2. Many
3. Some
4. Almost none
5. No one

F156 How often do you drink alcohol. Do you consider yourself as a total abstainer, occasional drinker, do you drink rather often or do you consider yourself as a regular drinker?

1. Regular drinker
2. Drink rather often
3. Occasional drinker
4. Total abstainer

F157 Do you drink more or less than others. Generally speaking do you, yourself, drink less alcoholic drinks than most people, the same or more alcoholic drinks than most people?

1. Less than most
2. Same as others
3. More than most

1. Very serious
2. Quite serious
3. Not very serious
4. Not at all serious

F159 How serious is alcoholism. How serious a problem do you think is illegal drug-taking and alcoholism? Alcoholism.

1. Very serious
2. Quite serious
3. Not very serious
4. Not at all serious

F160 Stealing food punished less: young thief. Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the thief is young.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F160a Stealing food punished less: young thief (4 categories). Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the thief is young.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

F161 Stealing food punished less: poor thief. Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the thief is poor.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F161a Stealing food punished less: poor thief (4 categories). Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the thief is poor.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

F163 Stealing food punished less: shop part of a supermarket chain. Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the shop is part of a supermarket chain.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F163a Stealing food punished less: shop part of a supermarket chain (4 categories). Do you fully agree, agree, disagree, fully disagree with the following statements? Stealing food in a shop should be punished less severely if: the shop is part of a supermarket chain.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

F164 Islam requires woman to dress modestly but does not require cover face with. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Islam requires woman to dress modestly but does not require cover face with veil.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F165 Violation of Islam for male and female university students to attend classes together. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and juristssometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that
is presented? It is a violation of Islam for male and female university students to attend classes together.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F166 By requiring man treat all wives equally, Islam true intent is prohibit taking more than one wife. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? By requiring that a man treat all of his wives equally, the true intent of Islam is to prohibit a man from taking more than one wife.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F167 Monarchy is a form of government that is compatible with Islam. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Monarchy is a form of government that is compatible with Islam.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F168 Democracy is a Western form of government that is not compatible with Islam. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Democracy is a Western form of government that is not compatible with Islam.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F169 Nationalism is incompatible with Islam because Islam requires ‘ummah’. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Nationalism is incompatible with Islam because Islam requires that Muslims be united in a single political community (the ummah) rather than be citizens of different states and loyal to different governments.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F170 If Palestinian state established and peace with Israel, Islam would not oppose existence of Israel. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? If a Palestinian state is established and makes peace with Israel, Islam would not oppose the existence of Israel.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F171 If country pursues policies harmful to Muslims, Islam permits killing civilians in that country. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? If a country pursues policies that are harmful to Muslims, Islam permits the killing of civilians (including women and children) in that country.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F172 A truly Islamic country should not have a parliament with the right to pass laws. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? A country that is truly Islamic should not have a parliament with the right to pass laws (or do anything more than advice the rulers).

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F173 Islam requires that political rights of non Muslims should be inferior to those of Muslims. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Islam requires that in a Muslim country the political rights of non-Muslims should be inferior to those of Muslims.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F174 Islam requires country with majority of Muslims be governed by men of Islamic learning. Today as in the past, Muslim scholars and jurists sometimes disagree about the proper interpretation of Islam in response to present-day issues. For each of the statements listed below, would you please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree, or disagree strongly with the interpretation of Islam that is presented? Islam requires that a country with a majority of Muslims be governed by men of Islamic learning.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree or disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

F175 Religions limit democratic processes. Do you agree or disagree that religions limit democratic processes?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

F176 Some U.S policies toward other countries are good and some U.S policies toward other countries are bad.

1. Agree
2. Disagree, almost all US policies are good
3. Disagree, almost all US policies are bad
4. Disagree

F177 While U.S. policies toward other countries are often bad, most ordinary Americans are good people.

1. Agree
2. Disagree, almost all US policies are good
3. Disagree, almost all US policies are bad
4. Disagree

F178 The culture of U.S. and other Western countries has many positive attributes.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

F179 Exposure to the culture of the U.S. and other Western countries harmful effect on our country.

1. Agree
2. Disagree

F186 Religion is a cause of terrorism. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about terrorism? Religion is a cause of terrorism.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

F187 The content of [Country] education contributes to religious extremism. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about terrorism? The content of [Country] education contributes to religious extremism.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree  
3. Disagree  
4. Strongly disagree

F188 Which is more important as a basis for marriage: parents’ approval or love?  
1. Parent’s approval  
2. Love

F189 When you were growing up, did your father or mother have more influence in the affairs of the house?  
1. Father  
2. Mother  
3. Other

F190 How frequently do you perform the five prescribed prayers?  
1. Five times a day  
2. Everyday  
3. One or two times a week  
4. One or two times a month  
5. At no time

F191 How frequently do you perform in the mosque?  
1. Five times a day  
2. Everyday  
3. One or two times a week  
4. One or two times a month  
5. At no time

F192 If you feel sad and want to talk to someone, to whom do you usually turn to?  
1. Parents  
2. Friends  
3. Spouse  
4. Others

F193 Civil marriage is very important because it helps maintain the family.  
1. Very important  
2. Important  
3. Somewhat important  
4. Not important  
5. Not at all important
F194  How important: daily prayer?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Not important
5. Not at all important

F195  How important: building a prosperous society?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. A little important
5. Not at all important

F196  How important: forming a happy secure family?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. A little important
5. Not at all important

F197  How important: building a successful professional future?

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. A little important
5. Not at all important

G. National Identity

G001  Geographical groups belonging to first. To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all?. And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? First.

1. Locality
2. Region
3. Country
4. Continent
5. The world
G001 CS Geographical groups belonging to first (country specific). To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? First.

[Wide set of country-related answers available]

G002 Geographical groups belonging to second. To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? Second.

1. Locality
2. Region
3. Country
4. Continent
5. The world

G002 CS Geographical groups belonging to second (country specific). To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? Second.

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

G003 Geographical groups belonging to least of all. To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? Least of all.

1. Locality
2. Region
3. Country
4. Continent
5. The world

G003 CS Geographical groups belonging to least of all (country specific). To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all? And the next? And which do you belong to least of all? Least of all.

[Wide set of political parties from the countries surveyed available]

G005 Citizen of [country]. Are you a citizen of [Country]?

1. No
2. Yes

G006 How proud of nationality. How proud are you to be [Nationality]?

1. Very proud
2. Quite proud
3. Not very proud
4. Not at all proud

G007 Trust: Other people in country. Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust [Nationality] people in general?

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 A Trust: French Canadians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: French Canadians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AA Trust: Nepalis. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Nepalis.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AB Trust: Korean residents in Japan. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Korean residents in Japan.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AC Trust: Chinese residents in Japan. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Chinese residents in Japan.
1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AD Trust: Mestizo. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Mestizo.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AE Trust: Indians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Indians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AF Trust: Central Americans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Central Americans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AG Trust: Hausas. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Hausas.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all
G008 AH Trust: Igbos. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Igbos.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AI Trust: Yorubas. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Yorubas.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AJ Trust: Ghanaians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Ghanaians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AK Trust: Czechs. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Czechs.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AL Trust: East Germans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: East Germans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AM Trust: Hungarians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Hungarians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AN Trust: West Germans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: West Germans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AO Trust: Your friends. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Your friends.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AP Trust: Your neighborhood. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Your neighborhood.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all
G008 AQ Trust: White South Africans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: White South Africans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AR Trust: Black South Africans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Black South Africans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AS Trust: Colored South Africans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Colored South Africans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AT Trust: Asian South Africans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Asian South Africans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AU Trust: Zulus. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Zulus.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AV Trust: Xhosas. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Xhosas.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AW Trust: Greeks. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Greeks.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AX Trust: Iranians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Iranians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 AY Trust: Europeans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Europeans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all
AZ Trust: Moroccans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Moroccans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

B Trust: Immigrants. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Immigrants.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

BA Trust: Portuguese. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Portuguese.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

BB Trust: Koreans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Koreans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

BC Trust: Soviet Union people. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Soviet Union people.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust  
4. Not trust very much  
5. Not trust at all

G008 C Trust: Americans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Americans.

1. Trust completely  
2. Trust a little  
3. Neither trust or distrust  
4. Not trust very much  
5. Not trust at all

G008 D Trust: Mexicans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Mexicans.

1. Trust completely  
2. Trust a little  
3. Neither trust or distrust  
4. Not trust very much  
5. Not trust at all

G008 E Trust: Russians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Russians.

1. Trust completely  
2. Trust a little  
3. Neither trust or distrust  
4. Not trust very much  
5. Not trust at all

G008 F Trust: Chinese. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Chinese.

1. Trust completely  
2. Trust a little  
3. Neither trust or distrust  
4. Not trust very much  
5. Not trust at all
G008 G Trust: Italians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Italians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 H Trust: Latin Americans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Latin Americans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 I Trust: Japanese. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Japanese.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 J Trust: Blacks. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Blacks.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 K Trust: Germans. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Germans.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008  L Trust: Arabs. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Arabs.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008  M Trust: Jews. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Jews.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008  N Trust: Mapuche Indians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Mapuche Indians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008  O Trust: Pascuences. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Pascuences.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all
G008 P Trust: Argentines. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Argentines.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 Q Trust: Peruvians. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Peruvians.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 R Trust: Chinese Zhuan Nationality. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Chinese Zhuan Nationality.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 S Trust: Chinese Hui Nationality. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Chinese Hui Nationality.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 T Trust: English. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: English.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 U Trust: Slovaks. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Slovaks.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 V Trust: Gypsies. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Gypsies.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 W Trust: Poles. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Poles.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 X Trust: Indian Hindus. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Indian Hindus.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all
G008 Y Trust: Indian Non-Hindus. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Indian Non-Hindus.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G008 Z Trust: Pakistanis. I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people: Using the responses on this card, could you tell me how much you trust: Pakistanis.

1. Trust completely
2. Trust a little
3. Neither trust or distrust
4. Not trust very much
5. Not trust at all

G014 Opinion European union. There is much talk about what the individual member states of the European Community Union have in common and what makes each one distinct. A. Some people say: If the European member states were truly to be united, this would mean the end of their national, historical and cultural identities. Their national economic interests would also be sacrificed. B. Others say: Only a truly united Europe can protect its states national, historical and cultural identities and their national economic interests from the challenges of the superpowers. Which opinion is closest to your own opinion, the first one or the second one? Please use the scale listed. 1 would mean that you agree completely with A and 7 would mean that you agree completely with B. The numbers in between allow you to show which of the opinions you tend to agree with, whether you tend to agree more with the one or with the other.

1. End of national identity
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. Protect national identity

G015 Which of the following best describes you. Which of the following best describes you? Just call out one of the letters on this card.

[Wide set of country-related answers available]
G016 Language at home. What language do you normally speak at home?

[Wide set of country-related answers available]

G017 Born in this country: birth country. Where you born in [COUNTRY]?

1. Yes
2. Latino America
3. USA/Canada
4. Asian
5. Europe
6. African
7. Other
8. Oceania

G018 When came to country. In what year did you come to [COUNTRY]?

1. Within past 2 years
2. Within past 3-5 years
3. 6-10 years ago
4. 11-15 years ago
5. More than 15 years ago

G024 What thing are you proud of in your country: First choice. On this card are listed some things people have said make them proud of your country. Do any of these things make you proud of your country?...Is there anything else?...And is there anything else? First choice.

1. Science
2. Politics
3. Sports
4. Culture
5. Economy
6. Health
7. Long history
8. Language
9. None

G025 What thing are you proud of in your country: Second choice. On this card are listed some things people have said make them proud of your country. Do any of these things make you proud of your country?...Is there anything else?...And is there anything else? Second choice.

1. Science
2. Politics
3. Sports
4. Culture
5. Economy
6. Health
7. Long history
8. Language
9. None
Appendix G. PEW Global Attitudes Survey Questions on Political Culture (Research Question 1)\textsuperscript{22}

1991 Pulse

Q17 Please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements:

Q17b Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.

Q34 What's more important in (survey country) society – that everyone be free to pursue their life's goals without interference from the (state or government) OR that the (state or government) play an active role in society so as to guarantee that nobody is in need?

Q37 Here is a list of statements. For each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with it:

Q37a The (state or government) controls too much of our daily lives.
Q37b It is the responsibility of the (state or government) to take care of very poor people who can't take care of themselves.
Q37c When something is run by the (state or government), it is usually inefficient and wasteful.
Q37d Generally, the (state or government) is run for the benefit of all the people.

Q38 What kind of marriage do you think is the more satisfying way of life, one where the husband provides for the family and the wife takes care of the house and children, or one where the husband and wife both have jobs and both take care of the house and children?

What the World Thinks, 2002

Q56 Where do you most often turn to get news about national and international issues—television, newspapers, radio, magazines, or the Internet?

Q57 And what is your next most frequent source of news about national and international issues—television, newspapers, radio, magazines, or the Internet?


Q17 Please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements:

Q17a Most people are better off in a free market economy, even though some people are rich and some are poor.
Q17b Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.
Q17c Children need to learn English (other language) to succeed in the world today.

Q18 Please tell me which of the following statements is closest to your own opinion: The closing of large inefficient factories (enterprises) is a hardship, but it is necessary for economic improvement, OR large inefficient factories (enterprises) should not be allowed to close because it is too great a hardship for people.

Q19 Which of the following comes closer to your view? I like the pace of modern life, OR I do not like the pace of modern life.

Q20 And which of these comes closer to your view? Our traditional way of life is getting lost, OR our traditional way of life remains strong.

Q21 And finally, which comes closer to your view? Consumerism and commercialism are a threat to our culture, OR consumerism and commercialism are not a threat to our culture.

Q22 I’m going to read a list of some changes that have taken place. Please tell me if you think each one has been a change for the better, a change for the worse, or hasn’t it made much difference:

Q22a Television.
Q22b The Internet.
Q22c Cellular phones.
Q22d Birth control or family planning.
Q22e Fast food or convenience food.

Q34 What’s more important in (survey country) society – that everyone be free to pursue their life’s goals without interference from the (state or government) OR that the (state or government) play an active role in society so as to guarantee that nobody is in need?

Q36 Some say that most people who don't succeed in life fail because of society's failures. Others say that most people who don't succeed do so because of their own individual failures. Which comes closer to your point of view?

Q37 Here is a list of statements. For each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with it:

Q37a The (state or government) controls too much of our daily lives.
Q37b It is the responsibility of the (state or government) to take care of very poor people who can't take care of themselves.
Q37c When something is run by the (state or government), it is usually inefficient and wasteful.
Q37d Generally, the (state or government) is run for the benefit of all the people.
Q37e Religion is a matter of personal faith and should be kept separate from government policy.
Q37f Our people are not perfect, but our culture is superior to others.
Q37g Our way of life needs to be protected against foreign influence.
Q37h There are parts of neighboring countries that really belong to (survey country).
Q37i We should restrict and control entry of people into our country more than we do now.

Q38 What kind of marriage do you think is the more satisfying way of life, one where the husband provides for the family and the wife takes care of the house and children, or one where the husband and wife both have jobs and both take care of the house and children?

Q39 Which one of these comes closest to your opinion: it is not necessary to believe in God to be moral and have good values, or is it necessary to believe in God to be moral and have good values?

Q40 And which one of these comes closer to your opinion: homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society, or homosexuality is a way of life that should not be accepted by society?

Q56 Where do you most often turn to get news about national and international issues—television, newspapers, radio, magazines, or the Internet?

Q57 And what is your next most frequent source of news about national and international issues—television, newspapers, radio, magazines, or the Internet?

Q58 Do you use a computer at your workplace, at school, at home, or anywhere else on at least an occasional basis?

Q59 Do you ever go online to access the Internet or World Wide Web or to send and receive email?

Q60a Do you own a computer?

Q60b Do you own a cell phone?

Q60c Do you watch an international news channel such as (give example specific to country)?

Views of a Changing World (Update Survey), 2003

Q6 I’m going to read you some statements. Please tell me if you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with each of these statements:
Q6a I don't have much in common with people of other ethnic groups and races.
Q6b The best way to ensure peace is through military strength.
Q6c It is sometimes necessary to use military force to deal with threats to world peace.

Q21 Do you think that using military force against countries that may seriously threaten our country, but have not attacked us, can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?

A Year After Iraq War, 2004

Q7 Do you think (survey country) should have U.N. approval before it uses military force to deal with an international threat or do you think that would make it too difficult for our country to deal with international threats?

World Publics Welcome Global Trade—But Not Immigration, 2007

Q18 Please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements:

Q18a Most people are better off in a free market economy, even though some people are rich and some are poor.
Q18b Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.
Q18c Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs.

Q19 Which of these comes closer to your view? Our traditional way of life is getting lost, OR our traditional way of life remains strong.

Q22 As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with it:

Q22a The (state or government) controls too much of our daily lives.
Q22b It is the responsibility of the (state or government) to take care of very poor people who can't take care of themselves.
Q22c Religion is a matter of personal faith and should be kept separate from government policy.
Q22d Our people are not perfect, but our culture is superior than others.
Q22e Our way of life needs to be protected against foreign influence.
Q22f We should restrict and control entry of people into our country more than we do.
Q22g It is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.
Q33 Where do you most often turn to get news about national and international issues (television, newspaper, radio, magazines, or the internet)?

Q35 Which of the following two statements best describe you: 'I follow international news closely ONLY when something important is happening' or 'I follow international news closely most of the time, whether or not something important is happening.'

Q36 Do you use a computer at your workplace, at school, at home, or anywhere else on at least an occasional basis?

Q37 Do you use the Internet, at least occasionally?

Q38 Do you send or receive email, at least occasionally?

Q39a Do you own a computer?

Q39b Do you own a cell phone?

Q40 Thinking now about your personal life, which of these is MOST important to you? Being free to say whatever you want in public? Being free to practice your religion? Being free from hunger and poverty? Being free from crime and violence?

Q42 Which one of the following statements comes closest to your opinion about educating children: It is more important for boys than for girls OR It is more important for girls than for boys OR it is equally important.

Q43 Which one of the following statements comes closest to your opinion about men and women as political leaders? Men generally make better political leaders, Women make better political leaders, They are equally good.

Q45 Which one of these comes closest to your opinion? It is not necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values or it is necessary to believe in God to be moral and have good values.

Q46 And which one of these comes closer to your opinion: homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society, or homosexuality is a way of life that should not be accepted by society.

Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe, 2008

Q83 How important is religion in your life - very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not all important?
Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image around the World, 2009

Q12 Please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements:

Q12a Most people are better off in a free market economy, even though some people are rich and some are poor.
Q12b Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.
Q12c Protecting the environment should be given priority, even if it causes slower economic growth and some loss of jobs.

Q18 As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statement:

Q18a Our way of life needs to be protected against foreign influence.
Q18b We should restrict and control entry of people into our country more than we do now.
Q18c The state should take steps to protect [survey country] economically, even if other friendly nations object to it.

End of Communism Cheered but Now with More Reservations, 2009

Q36 What's more important in your society that everyone be free to pursue their life's goals without interference from the state or that the state play an active role in society so as to guarantee that nobody is in need?

Q40 Please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree or completely disagree with the following statements:

Q40d Success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our control.
Q40e Generally, the state is run for the benefit of all the people.
Q40h We should restrict and control entry into our country more than we do now.
Q40l It is a good thing for any society to be made up of people from different races, religions, and cultures.

Q43 If you had to choose between a good democracy and a strong economy, which would you say is more important?

Q58 How important is religion in your life - very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not all important?

Q59 Aside from weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services... more than once a week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, seldom or never?
Appendix H. Commonalities in Political Culture and in Constructed Identity

Figure 1. World Values Survey, 1981-1984

Figure 1 includes the following 33 questions:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>F001</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E085</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td>F123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 21% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is
therefore below 1%. It is possible to identify a continuous surface in this graph that only includes countries of the trans-Atlantic community as I do for figure 1b.

Figure 1b. World Values Survey, 1981-1984 (2)
Figure 2. World Values Survey, 1981-1984 (Trans-Atlantic countries only)

Figure 2 includes the following 123 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E014</th>
<th>E085</th>
<th>E013</th>
<th>F064</th>
<th>F096</th>
<th>F092</th>
<th>F078</th>
<th>F118</th>
<th>F141</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E032</td>
<td>E011</td>
<td>F015</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F079</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td>F142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td>F016</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F081</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td>F143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E017</td>
<td>E024</td>
<td>E187</td>
<td>F017</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F081</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td>F144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E189</td>
<td>F018</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F068</td>
<td>F082</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td>F156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>F001</td>
<td>F019</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F069</td>
<td>F083</td>
<td>F123</td>
<td>F157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>F002</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F070</td>
<td>F084</td>
<td>F125</td>
<td>F158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E071</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>F003</td>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F057</td>
<td>F071</td>
<td>F085</td>
<td>F126</td>
<td>F159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>F011</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>F072</td>
<td>F087</td>
<td>F127</td>
<td>G001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E030</td>
<td>F012</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F062</td>
<td>F073</td>
<td>F086</td>
<td>F128</td>
<td>G002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E031</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F065</td>
<td>F088</td>
<td>F074</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F135</td>
<td>G006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E178</td>
<td>F023</td>
<td>F093</td>
<td>F089</td>
<td>F075</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E144</td>
<td>F039</td>
<td>F094</td>
<td>F090</td>
<td>F076</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F095</td>
<td>F091</td>
<td>F077</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 14 items (countries) involves a 14.8% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 14 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 21.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 3. World Values Survey, 1989-1993

Figure 3 includes the following 135 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 31 items (countries) involves a 21.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 33%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 4. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (2)

Figure 4 includes the following 142 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves a 20.7% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 5. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (Trans-Atlantic countries only)

Figure 5 includes the following 145 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 17 items (countries) involves a 17.9% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 17 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 25.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E001</th>
<th>E036</th>
<th>E076</th>
<th>E033</th>
<th>E060</th>
<th>F034</th>
<th>F054</th>
<th>F045</th>
<th>F126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E002</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E077</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E061</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F046</td>
<td>F127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E003</td>
<td>E038</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E190</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F057</td>
<td>F047</td>
<td>F128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E085</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E191</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>F048</td>
<td>F129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E005</td>
<td>E040</td>
<td>E032</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F060</td>
<td>F049</td>
<td>F130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E006</td>
<td>E041</td>
<td>E047</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F062</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E045</td>
<td>E048</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>F001</td>
<td>F027</td>
<td>F031</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E046</td>
<td>E049</td>
<td>E105</td>
<td>F003</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F032</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E050</td>
<td>E106</td>
<td>F004</td>
<td>F065</td>
<td>F033</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E017</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E051</td>
<td>E107</td>
<td>F005</td>
<td>F067</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td>F141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E071</td>
<td>E052</td>
<td>E108</td>
<td>F006</td>
<td>F029</td>
<td>F040</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td>F142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E053</td>
<td>E109</td>
<td>F007</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F041</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td>F143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E020</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E054</td>
<td>E057</td>
<td>F008</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F042</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td>F144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E034</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E055</td>
<td>E058</td>
<td>F009</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F043</td>
<td>F123</td>
<td>G006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E056</td>
<td>E059</td>
<td>F010</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F044</td>
<td>F125</td>
<td>G007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6 includes the following 17 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E014</th>
<th>E018</th>
<th>E036</th>
<th>E115</th>
<th>E025</th>
<th>F063</th>
<th>F119</th>
<th>F121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E196</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 46 items (countries) involves a 19.2% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 46 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 36.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 7. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (2)

Figure 7 includes the following 97 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E001</th>
<th>E034</th>
<th>E072</th>
<th>E085</th>
<th>E118</th>
<th>E123</th>
<th>E198</th>
<th>F029</th>
<th>F117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E002</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E128</td>
<td>E196</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E003</td>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E129</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E130</td>
<td>E188</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E005</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E111</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E131</td>
<td>F001</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E006</td>
<td>E040</td>
<td>E078</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E132</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E041</td>
<td>E079</td>
<td>E113</td>
<td>E119</td>
<td>E133</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E045</td>
<td>E080</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E125</td>
<td>E134</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>G001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E046</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E062</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>G002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E082</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E083</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 41 items (countries) involves a 25.7% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 41 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 8. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (3)

Figure 8 includes the following 106 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves a 23.9% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 26 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 9 includes the following 68 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E069</th>
<th>E033</th>
<th>E026</th>
<th>E123</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F035</th>
<th>F114</th>
<th>F123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>G001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>G002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E150</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>G006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F105</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 35 items (countries) involves a 20.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 35 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 34.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 10. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Sample build around France)

Figure 10 includes the following 73 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E037</th>
<th>E081</th>
<th>E025</th>
<th>E123</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F036</th>
<th>F116</th>
<th>G006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E150</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F105</td>
<td>F123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>G001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>G002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 21.2% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 35 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 11. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Sample build around Germany)

Figure 11 includes the following 75 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 19.5% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 12. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Sample build around Great Britain)

Figure 12 includes the following 74 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E014</th>
<th>E069</th>
<th>E088</th>
<th>E026</th>
<th>E143</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F036</th>
<th>F116</th>
<th>G002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>G006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E150</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>F001</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F105</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E087</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E123</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>G001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 20.2% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 13. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Muslim countries)

Figure 13 includes the following 33 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E037</th>
<th>E120</th>
<th>E124</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F051</th>
<th>F036</th>
<th>F120</th>
<th>G006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>G001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E123</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>G002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 47 items (countries) involves a 23% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 47 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 36.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 14. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Great Britain, France and Germany)

Figure 14 includes the following 90 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 27 items (countries) involves a 21.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 27 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 15. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Sample build around Italy)

Figure 15 includes the following 114 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V69</th>
<th>V96</th>
<th>V135</th>
<th>V148</th>
<th>V93</th>
<th>V226</th>
<th>V191</th>
<th>V204</th>
<th>V211</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V70</td>
<td>V97</td>
<td>V136</td>
<td>V149</td>
<td>V94</td>
<td>V227</td>
<td>V192</td>
<td>V205</td>
<td>V212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71</td>
<td>V98</td>
<td>V140</td>
<td>V150</td>
<td>V99</td>
<td>V228</td>
<td>V193</td>
<td>V206</td>
<td>V214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>V114</td>
<td>V141</td>
<td>V151</td>
<td>V123</td>
<td>V229</td>
<td>V194</td>
<td>V207</td>
<td>V215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73</td>
<td>V116</td>
<td>V134</td>
<td>V64</td>
<td>V162</td>
<td>V230</td>
<td>V195</td>
<td>V122</td>
<td>V216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74</td>
<td>V117</td>
<td>V138</td>
<td>V179</td>
<td>V163</td>
<td>V234</td>
<td>V196</td>
<td>V208</td>
<td>V217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>V118</td>
<td>V139</td>
<td>V180</td>
<td>V165</td>
<td>V184</td>
<td>V197</td>
<td>V209</td>
<td>V218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>V119</td>
<td>V142</td>
<td>V181</td>
<td>V166</td>
<td>V185</td>
<td>V198</td>
<td>V126</td>
<td>V219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V77</td>
<td>V120</td>
<td>V143</td>
<td>V182</td>
<td>V167</td>
<td>V186</td>
<td>V199</td>
<td>V127</td>
<td>V220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V78</td>
<td>V121</td>
<td>V144</td>
<td>V183</td>
<td>V178</td>
<td>V187</td>
<td>V200</td>
<td>V128</td>
<td>V221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V79</td>
<td>V131</td>
<td>V137</td>
<td>V124</td>
<td>V223</td>
<td>V188</td>
<td>V201</td>
<td>V129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V90</td>
<td>V132</td>
<td>V147</td>
<td>V191</td>
<td>V224</td>
<td>V189</td>
<td>V202</td>
<td>V130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V95</td>
<td>V133</td>
<td>V145</td>
<td>V92</td>
<td>V225</td>
<td>V190</td>
<td>V203</td>
<td>V210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves a 20.7% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 26 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 16. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Sample build around the Netherlands)

Figure 16 includes the following 89 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 29 items (countries) involves a 19.8% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 29 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 32.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 17 is the same as Figure 14 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 18. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Sample build around Italy)

Figure 18 is the same as Figure 15 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 19. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Sample build around the Netherlands)

Figure 19 is the same as Figure 16 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 20. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Muslim countries)

Figure 20 includes the following 36 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V71</th>
<th>V77</th>
<th>V118</th>
<th>V149</th>
<th>V153</th>
<th>V157</th>
<th>V161</th>
<th>V188</th>
<th>V192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>V78</td>
<td>V134</td>
<td>V150</td>
<td>V154</td>
<td>V158</td>
<td>V184</td>
<td>V189</td>
<td>V201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>V95</td>
<td>V147</td>
<td>V151</td>
<td>V155</td>
<td>V159</td>
<td>V185</td>
<td>V190</td>
<td>V205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>V117</td>
<td>V148</td>
<td>V152</td>
<td>V156</td>
<td>V160</td>
<td>V187</td>
<td>V191</td>
<td>V209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 44 items (countries) involves a 24% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 44 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 21 includes the following 12 questions:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 19.6% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 22. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (E category only)

Figure 22 includes the following 67 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E001</th>
<th>E016</th>
<th>E037</th>
<th>E070</th>
<th>E081</th>
<th>E052</th>
<th>E026</th>
<th>E108</th>
<th>E191</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E002</td>
<td>E017</td>
<td>E038</td>
<td>E071</td>
<td>E085</td>
<td>E053</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E109</td>
<td>E012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E003</td>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E032</td>
<td>E054</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E057</td>
<td>E022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E040</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E047</td>
<td>E055</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E005</td>
<td>E020</td>
<td>E041</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E048</td>
<td>E056</td>
<td>E104</td>
<td>E059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E006</td>
<td>E034</td>
<td>E045</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E049</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E105</td>
<td>E060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E046</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E050</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E106</td>
<td>E061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E077</td>
<td>E051</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E107</td>
<td>E190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 30 items (countries) involves a 24.4% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 30 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 32.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 23. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (E category only)

Figure 23 includes the following 69 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E001</th>
<th>E016</th>
<th>E040</th>
<th>E074</th>
<th>E083</th>
<th>E114</th>
<th>E028</th>
<th>E128</th>
<th>E143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E002</td>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E041</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E085</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E129</td>
<td>E012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E003</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E045</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E119</td>
<td>E130</td>
<td>E198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E034</td>
<td>E046</td>
<td>E078</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E125</td>
<td>E131</td>
<td>E022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E005</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E079</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E118</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E132</td>
<td>E188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E006</td>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E080</td>
<td>E111</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>E133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>E134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E082</td>
<td>E113</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E123</td>
<td>E062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 43 items (countries) involves a 26.2% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 43 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 24. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (E category only)

Figure 24 includes the following 36 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E018</th>
<th>E072</th>
<th>E088</th>
<th>E115</th>
<th>E027</th>
<th>E121</th>
<th>E150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 35 items (countries) involves a 19.9% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 35 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 34.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 25. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (E category only) (2)

Figure 25 includes the following 41 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E018</th>
<th>E039</th>
<th>E074</th>
<th>E033</th>
<th>E116</th>
<th>E028</th>
<th>E122</th>
<th>E150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 20.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 28 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 26. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (E category only) (3)

Figure 26 includes the following 41 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E003</th>
<th>E018</th>
<th>E070</th>
<th>E076</th>
<th>E023</th>
<th>E117</th>
<th>E029</th>
<th>E123</th>
<th>E150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E004</td>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>E143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E087</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>E124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>E022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 20.4% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 27. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (E category only) (4)

Figure 27 includes the following 40 questions:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E014</td>
<td>E035</td>
<td>E070</td>
<td>E076</td>
<td>E023</td>
<td>E117</td>
<td>E029</td>
<td>E123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E015</td>
<td>E036</td>
<td>E072</td>
<td>E081</td>
<td>E112</td>
<td>E025</td>
<td>E110</td>
<td>E143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E016</td>
<td>E037</td>
<td>E073</td>
<td>E087</td>
<td>E114</td>
<td>E026</td>
<td>E120</td>
<td>E124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E018</td>
<td>E039</td>
<td>E074</td>
<td>E088</td>
<td>E115</td>
<td>E027</td>
<td>E121</td>
<td>E022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E019</td>
<td>E069</td>
<td>E075</td>
<td>E033</td>
<td>E116</td>
<td>E028</td>
<td>E122</td>
<td>E150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 20.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 28. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only)

Figure 28 includes the following 68 questions:
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 27 items (countries) involves a 20.4% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 27 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 29. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only) (2)
Figure 29 includes the following 71 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V69</th>
<th>V77</th>
<th>V114</th>
<th>V132</th>
<th>V139</th>
<th>V149</th>
<th>V183</th>
<th>V162</th>
<th>V225</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V70</td>
<td>V78</td>
<td>V116</td>
<td>V133</td>
<td>V142</td>
<td>V150</td>
<td>V124</td>
<td>V163</td>
<td>V226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71</td>
<td>V79</td>
<td>V117</td>
<td>V135</td>
<td>V143</td>
<td>V151</td>
<td>V191</td>
<td>V165</td>
<td>V227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>V90</td>
<td>V118</td>
<td>V136</td>
<td>V144</td>
<td>V64</td>
<td>V92</td>
<td>V166</td>
<td>V228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73</td>
<td>V95</td>
<td>V119</td>
<td>V140</td>
<td>V137</td>
<td>V179</td>
<td>V93</td>
<td>V167</td>
<td>V229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74</td>
<td>V96</td>
<td>V120</td>
<td>V141</td>
<td>V147</td>
<td>V180</td>
<td>V94</td>
<td>V178</td>
<td>V230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>V97</td>
<td>V121</td>
<td>V134</td>
<td>V145</td>
<td>V181</td>
<td>V99</td>
<td>V223</td>
<td>V234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>V98</td>
<td>V131</td>
<td>V138</td>
<td>V148</td>
<td>V182</td>
<td>V123</td>
<td>V224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves a 22.6% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 26 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 30. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only) (3)

Figure 30 includes the following 67 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V69</th>
<th>V77</th>
<th>V101</th>
<th>V131</th>
<th>V138</th>
<th>V148</th>
<th>V154</th>
<th>V162</th>
<th>V229</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V70</td>
<td>V78</td>
<td>V98</td>
<td>V132</td>
<td>V139</td>
<td>V149</td>
<td>V155</td>
<td>V163</td>
<td>V230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V71</td>
<td>V79</td>
<td>V114</td>
<td>V133</td>
<td>V142</td>
<td>V150</td>
<td>V156</td>
<td>V223</td>
<td>V234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V72</td>
<td>V90</td>
<td>V116</td>
<td>V135</td>
<td>V143</td>
<td>V151</td>
<td>V157</td>
<td>V224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V73</td>
<td>V95</td>
<td>V118</td>
<td>V136</td>
<td>V144</td>
<td>V102</td>
<td>V158</td>
<td>V225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V74</td>
<td>V96</td>
<td>V119</td>
<td>V140</td>
<td>V137</td>
<td>V099</td>
<td>V159</td>
<td>V226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V75</td>
<td>V100</td>
<td>V120</td>
<td>V141</td>
<td>V147</td>
<td>V152</td>
<td>V160</td>
<td>V227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V76</td>
<td>V97</td>
<td>V121</td>
<td>V134</td>
<td>V145</td>
<td>V153</td>
<td>V161</td>
<td>V228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 29 items (countries) involves a 20.7% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 29 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 32.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 31. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only) (4)

Figure 31 is the same as Figure 28 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 32. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only) (5)

Figure 32 is the same as Figure 29 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 33. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (E category only) (6)

Figure 33 is the same as Figure 30 but adopts the older definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 34 includes the following 20 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F001</th>
<th>F051</th>
<th>F059</th>
<th>F120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 19.5% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 35 includes the following 71 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F001</th>
<th>F010</th>
<th>F028</th>
<th>F054</th>
<th>F033</th>
<th>F043</th>
<th>F115</th>
<th>F123</th>
<th>F136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F003</td>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F065</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F044</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F125</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F004</td>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F067</td>
<td>F057</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F045</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F126</td>
<td>F140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F005</td>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F029</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F046</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td>F127</td>
<td>F141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F006</td>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F060</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F047</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td>F128</td>
<td>F142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F007</td>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F062</td>
<td>F040</td>
<td>F048</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td>F129</td>
<td>F143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F008</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F031</td>
<td>F041</td>
<td>F049</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td>F130</td>
<td>F144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F009</td>
<td>F027</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F032</td>
<td>F042</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td>F135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 20.4% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 28 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 36. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (F category only)

Figure 36 includes the following 24 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F001</th>
<th>F025</th>
<th>F053</th>
<th>F115</th>
<th>F120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F029</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F055</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F059</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td>F139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F052</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 43 items (countries) involves a 23.3% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 43 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 35.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 37. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F category only)

Figure 37 includes the following 29 questions:

```
F034  F025  F053  F038  F114  F120  
F063  F028  F054  F102  F115  F121  
F064  F066  F035  F103  F116  F122  
F022  F050  F036  F104  F117  F123  
F024  F051  F037  F105  F118
```

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 35 items (countries) involves a 19.4% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 35 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 34.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 38. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F category only) (2)

Figure 38 includes the following 29 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F034</th>
<th>F025</th>
<th>F053</th>
<th>F038</th>
<th>F114</th>
<th>F120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F024</td>
<td>F051</td>
<td>F037</td>
<td>F105</td>
<td>F118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 18.9% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 28 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 39. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F category only) (3)

Figure 39 includes the following 31 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F01</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F051</th>
<th>F037</th>
<th>F105</th>
<th>F118</th>
<th>F123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 18% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

![Figure 40. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F category only) (4)](image)

Figure 40 includes the following 31 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F001</th>
<th>F024</th>
<th>F051</th>
<th>F037</th>
<th>F105</th>
<th>F118</th>
<th>F123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F034</td>
<td>F025</td>
<td>F053</td>
<td>F038</td>
<td>F114</td>
<td>F119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F063</td>
<td>F028</td>
<td>F054</td>
<td>F102</td>
<td>F115</td>
<td>F120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F064</td>
<td>F066</td>
<td>F035</td>
<td>F103</td>
<td>F116</td>
<td>F121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F022</td>
<td>F050</td>
<td>F036</td>
<td>F104</td>
<td>F117</td>
<td>F122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 17% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 41. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (F category only)

Figure 41 includes the following 16 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V184</th>
<th>V198</th>
<th>V203</th>
<th>V208</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V185</td>
<td>V199</td>
<td>V204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V186</td>
<td>V200</td>
<td>V205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V187</td>
<td>V201</td>
<td>V206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V192</td>
<td>V202</td>
<td>V207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 27 items (countries) involves a 22.6% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 27 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 31.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 42. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (F category only) (2)

Figure 42 includes the following 26 questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V184</th>
<th>V189</th>
<th>V194</th>
<th>V199</th>
<th>V204</th>
<th>V208</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V185</td>
<td>V190</td>
<td>V195</td>
<td>V200</td>
<td>V205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V186</td>
<td>V191</td>
<td>V196</td>
<td>V201</td>
<td>V206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V187</td>
<td>V192</td>
<td>V197</td>
<td>V202</td>
<td>V207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V188</td>
<td>V193</td>
<td>V198</td>
<td>V203</td>
<td>V122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves a 20% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 26 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when
stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 43. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (F category only) (3)

Figure 43 is the same as Figure 41 but adopts the more recent definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 44 is the same as Figure 42 but adopts the more recent definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 45 includes the same questions as Figure 35 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 20.7% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 28 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 46. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (F only, without question F025)

Figure 46 includes the same questions as Figure 36 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 43 items (countries) involves a 23.5% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 43 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 47 includes the same questions as Figure 37 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 35 items (countries) involves a 18.6% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 35 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 34.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 48. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F only, without question F025) (2)

Figure 48 includes the same questions as Figure 38 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 28 items (countries) involves a 20.3% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 28 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 49. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (F only, without question F025) (3)

Figure 49 includes the same questions as Figure 39 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 18% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%. 
Figure 50 includes the same questions as Figure 40 except for question F025. It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 21 items (countries) involves a 17% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 21 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 28.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 51 includes the same questions as Figure 41 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 29 items (countries) involves a 19.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 29 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 32.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 52. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (F only, without question F025) (2)

Figure 52 includes the same questions as Figure 42 except for question F025.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 26 items (countries) involves of 20.5%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 26 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 31.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 53 is the same as Figure 51 but adopts the more recent definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 54 is the same as Figure 52 but adopts the more recent definition of the trans-Atlantic partnership.
Figure 55a includes all the 1991 Pulse of Europe Survey questions listed in appendix G. This figure does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 12 items (countries) involves a 25.5% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 12 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 18.3%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore above 1%.
Figure 55b includes the same questions as 55a except for question 38 which was not administered in Slovakia.

As it was the case above, it does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 13 items (countries) involves a 23.2% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 13 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 19.9%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore above 1%.
Figure 56 includes questions 56 and 57 from the survey “What the World Thinks in 2002,” question 7 from the March 2004 poll “A Year After the Iraq War,” question 21 from the 2003 Pew update survey, as well as the following questions from the 2003 “Views of a Changing World” survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17a</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Q22e</th>
<th>Q37c</th>
<th>Q37h</th>
<th>Q57</th>
<th>Q60c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17b</td>
<td>Q22a</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q37d</td>
<td>Q37i</td>
<td>Q58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17c</td>
<td>Q22b</td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Q37e</td>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Q59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22c</td>
<td>Q37a</td>
<td>Q37f</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Q60a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q22d</td>
<td>Q37b</td>
<td>Q37g</td>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>Q60b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This figure does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 8 items (countries) involves a 8.8% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 8 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged...
when stress reaches 7.1%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore slightly above 1%.

Figure 57. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2002-2004 (2)

Figure 57 includes questions 56 and 57 from the survey “What the World Thinks in 2002,” question 7 from the March 2004 poll “A Year After the Iraq War,” question 21 from the 2003 Pew update survey, questions 6a, 6b and 6c from a follow-up survey of the 2003 “Views of a Changing World” survey, as well as the following questions from the 2003 “Views of a Changing World” survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17a</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Q22e</th>
<th>Q37c</th>
<th>Q37h</th>
<th>Q56</th>
<th>Q60b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17b</td>
<td>Q22a</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q37d</td>
<td>Q37i</td>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>Q60c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17c</td>
<td>Q22b</td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Q37e</td>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Q58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22c</td>
<td>Q37a</td>
<td>Q37f</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Q59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q22d</td>
<td>Q37b</td>
<td>Q37g</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Q60a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This figure does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 6 items (countries) involves a 3.8% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 6 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 0.2%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore above 1%.

Figure 58. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2002-2004 (3)

Figure 58 includes questions 56 and 57 from the survey “What the World Thinks in 2002,” as well as the following questions from the 2003 “Views of a Changing World” survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q17a</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Q22e</th>
<th>Q37c</th>
<th>Q37h</th>
<th>Q56</th>
<th>Q60b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17b</td>
<td>Q22a</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q37d</td>
<td>Q37i</td>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>Q60c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17c</td>
<td>Q22b</td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Q37e</td>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>Q58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22c</td>
<td>Q37a</td>
<td>Q37f</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Q59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q22d</td>
<td>Q37b</td>
<td>Q37g</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Q60a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 39 items (countries) involves of 19.1%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 39 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 34.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 59. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2007-2009

Figure 59 includes the following questions from the 2007 PEW Survey “World Publics Welcome Global Trade – But Not Immigration”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18a</th>
<th>Q22b</th>
<th>Q22g</th>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>Q43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18b</td>
<td>Q22c</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q39a</td>
<td>Q45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18c</td>
<td>Q22d</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q39b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22e</td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22a</td>
<td>Q22f</td>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 46 items (countries) involves of 20.6%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 46 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 36.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 60. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2007-2009 (2)

Figure 60 includes the following questions from the 2007 PEW Survey “World Publics Welcome Global Trade – But Not Immigration”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18a</th>
<th>Q22b</th>
<th>Q22g</th>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>Q43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18b</td>
<td>Q22c</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q39a</td>
<td>Q45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18c</td>
<td>Q22d</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q39b</td>
<td>Q46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22e</td>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22a</td>
<td>Q22f</td>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And the following questions from the 2009 PEW Survey “Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World”: Q12a, Q12b, Q12c, Q18a, Q18b, and Q18c

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 24 items (countries) involves of 17.7%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 24 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 30.2%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 61. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2007-2009 (3)

Figure 61 includes the following questions from the 2007 PEW Survey “World Publics Welcome Global Trade—But Not Immigration”: 
And the following questions from the 2009 PEW Survey “End of Communism Cheered but Now with More Reservations”: Q36, Q40d, Q40e, Q40h, Q40l, Q43, Q58 and Q59.

Figure 62. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2007-2009 (4)

Figure 62 includes question 83 from the 2008 PEW Survey “Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe,” the following questions from the 2007 PEW Survey “World Publics Welcome Global Trade—But Not Immigration”: 

Q18a  Q22b  Q22g  Q38  Q43
Q18b  Q22c  Q33  Q39a  Q45
Q18c  Q22d  Q35  Q39b  Q46
Q19  Q22e  Q36  Q40
Q22a  Q22f  Q37  Q42
And the following questions from the 2009 PEW Survey “Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World”: Q12a, Q12b, Q12c, Q18a, Q18b and Q18c.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 19 items (countries) involves of 16.7%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 19 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 26.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Appendix I. PEW Global Attitudes Survey Questions (Research Question 2)²⁴

1991 Pulse

Q2 Here is a ladder representing the "ladder of life." Let's suppose the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you; and the bottom, the worst possible life for you. On which step of the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present?

Q3 On which step would you say you stood five years ago?

Q4 Just your best guess, on which step do you think you will stand in the future, say five years from now?

America Admired, Yet Its New Vulnerability Seen As Good Thing

Q1 Has the terrorist attack in the US and subsequent war opened up a new chapter in world history or do you think this will not turn out to be such a significant event?

Q2 Do you think the terrorist attacks are the start of a major conflict between the West and Islam, or will it remain only a conflict between the West and al Qaeda (bin Laden's network)?

Q4 If it turns out that other regimes such as Iraq and Somalia have supported terrorism, should the United States and its allies attack them or should the war be confined to Afghanistan?

Q5 How do you see the conflict do you think the US is taking into account the interests of its partners in the fight against terrorism or do you think the US is acting mainly on its own interests?

Q6 Do you think the coalition of major countries formed to combat terrorism will lead to closer relations between the US, Russia, and China in the long term, or do you think that newly improved relations will only be temporary?

Q7 Do you think the war on terrorism is worth the risk of destabilizing the governments of the Muslim states supporting the coalition or isn't it worth that risk?

Q8 Has the United States been too supportive of Israel or don't you think so?

Q12 In order to curb terrorism, would you be willing or unwilling to accept less personal freedom?

Q13 Do you think there should be stricter limits on immigration in our country or not?
Q14 We're interested in what ordinary people think about the attacks in the US. Do most people, many people, only some or hardly any ordinary people think that:

Q14a US policies in the world cause of the attack.
Q14b The US is over reacting.

Q17 The next two questions are about why people dislike and like the United States. Do you think each of the following is a major reason, a minor reason, or not much of a reason that some people in our country dislike the US:

Q17a US support for Israel.
Q17b Spread of American Culture through movies, …
Q17c Growing power of American Multinationals.
Q17d US support for authoritarian regimes.
Q17e US policies leading to a growing gap between Rich and Poor.
Q17f Resentment of US power.

Q18 Do you think each of the following is a major reason, a minor reason, or not much of a reason that some people in our country like the US:

Q18a US does good around the world.
Q18b American Ideals are appealing.
Q18c America is the Land of Opportunity.
Q18d US led tech and innovation.
Q18e American Consumer Goods.

Q19 Do you think that the pace of globalization has recently been slowed a lot, a little, hardly any, or not at all?

Q22 Is globalization a cause of terrorism?

Q23 In our country, will the following be helped or hurt in the coming year by the war on terrorism:

Q23a Will the sale of consumer produced be helped or hurt in the coming year by the GWOT?
Q23b Popularity of American culture.
Q23c Tourism to our country.
Q23d Airline Travel.
Q23e Use of Internet.
Q23f Population migration.
Q23g Exports from our country.
Q23h FDIs.
Q23i Personal Freedoms.
Q23j Privacy.
Q24 What about the strengthening of democratic institutions in transitional countries will it be helped or hurt in the coming year by the war on terrorism?

What the World Thinks, 2002

Q2 Here is a ladder representing the "ladder of life." Let's suppose the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you; and the bottom, the worst possible life for you. On which step of the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?

Q3 On which step would you say you stood five years ago?

Q4 Just your best guess, on which step do you think you will stand in the future, say five years from now?

Q6 As I read each of the following, please tell me whether you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with this aspect of your life.

Q6a Your household income.

Q6b Your family life.

Q7 Now thinking about our country, overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q9 And turning to the situation in the world overall, would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in the world right now?

Q10 Here is a list of five dangers in the world today. In your opinion, which one of these poses the greatest threat to the world – the spread of nuclear weapons, religious and ethnic hatred, AIDS and other infectious diseases, pollution and other environmental problems, or the growing gap between the rich and poor?

Q11 And which of these poses the second greatest threat to the world?

Q12 Now thinking about our economic situation, how would you describe the current economic situation in (survey country) – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q13 And over the next 12 months do you expect the economic situation in our country to improve a lot, improve a little, remain the same, worsen a little or worsen a lot?

Q14 When children today in (survey country) grow up, do you think they will be better off or worse off than people are now?
Q15 Here is a list of things that may be problems in our country. As I read each one, please tell me if you think it is a very big problem, a moderately big problem, a small problem or not a problem at all.

Q15a Crime.
Q15b Conflict between (ethnic/racial/nationality/religious/tribal) groups.
Q15c Corrupt political leaders.
Q15d Moral Decline.
Q15e Poor quality of drink water.
Q15f Terrorism.
Q15g The spread of HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases.
Q15h Poor quality public schools.
Q15i Immigration.
Q15j People leaving our country for jobs in other countries.

Q35 Here is a list of groups, organizations and institutions. For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of (read name of organization) very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in (survey country).

Q35a Our national government.
Q35b The Prime Minister/President (specific to each country).
Q35c The military.
Q35d News organizations (in the west, the media elsewhere) – such as television, radio, newspapers and magazines.
Q35f Religious leaders.
Q35g Immigrants.
Q35j European Union.

Q62 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or not at all?

Q63 Do you think the world would be a safer place or a more dangerous place if there was another country that was equal in military power to the United States?

Q64 When there are differences between our country and the United States (Europe), do you think these differences occur because we have different values then the United States or because we have different policies than the United States?

Q65 In your opinion, do United States policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries?

Q66 In terms of solving world problems, does the United States do too much, too little, or the right amount in helping solve world problems?
Q67 Which of the following phrases comes closer to your view? It’s good that American ideas and customs are spreading here, OR it’s bad that American ideas and customs are spreading here.

Q68 And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy.

Q69 Which comes closer to describing your view? I like American ways of doing business, OR I dislike American ways of doing business.

Q70 Which is closer to describing your view—I like American music, movies and television, OR I dislike American music, movies and televisions?

Q71 And which comes closer to describing your view? I admire the United States for its technological and scientific advances, OR I do not admire the United States for its technological and scientific advances.

Q72 And which comes closer to describing your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q75 In the last five years have you traveled to another country, or not?

Q77 Do you have friends or relatives who live in another country that you write to, telephone or visit regularly?

Q87 Have there been times during the last year when you did not have enough money…?

Q87a To buy food your family needed.
Q87b To pay for medical and health care your family needed.
Q87c To buy clothing your family needed.


Q16 For each item on this list, tell me if you think it is happening a lot more, somewhat more, only a little more or not more these days than five years ago.

Q16a Trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries.
Q16b Communication and travel between the people of (survey country) and people in other countries.
Q16c Availability of movies, TV and music from different parts of the world.
Q16d Influence of international investors, banks, and financial organizations on our country’s economic policies.
Q24 What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q25 And what about the faster communication and greater travel between the people of (survey country) and people in other countries – do you think this is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q26 What about the way movies, TV and music from different parts of the world are now available in (survey country) – do you think this is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q27 And what about the different products that are now available from different parts of the world – do you think this is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q28 All in all, how do you feel about the world becoming more connected through greater economic trade and faster communication – do you think this is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q29 Now thinking about you and your family – do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad for you and your family?

Q30 And do you think that having the opportunity to watch movies and TV and listen to music from different parts of the world is very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad for you and your family?

Q31 Has each of the following gotten better or worse over the last five years in our country?

Q31a The availability of good-paying jobs.
Q31b The working conditions for ordinary workers.
Q31c The spread of diseases.
Q31d The availability of modern medicines and treatments.
Q31e The availability of food in stores.
Q31f The gap between the rich and the poor.
Q31g The affordability of health care.
Q31h The ability of people to provide for themselves in their old age.

Q32 Do you think this change is largely because of the way the world has become more connected or mostly for other reasons?

Q32b The working conditions for ordinary workers.
Q32c The availability of modern medicines and treatments.
Q32d The availability of food in stores.
Q32e The gap between the rich and the poor.

Q33 There has been a lot of talk about globalization these days. Do you think that globalization is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing?

Q35 Here is a list of groups, organizations and institutions. For each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of (read name of organization) very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in (survey country)?

Q35e The trade unions.
Q35g Immigrants.
Q35i Large companies from other countries.
Q35j The European Union.
Q35k The United Nations.
Q35l International organizations like the World Bank, IMF and World Trade Organization.
Q35m Anti-globalization protestors.
Q35n NGOs, that is non-governmental organizations such as (give examples specific to country).


Q2 Thinking about the United Nations, what kind of influence is the UN having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of the UN very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad in (survey country)?

Q3 Did the international dispute about the war in Iraq show that the United Nations still plays an important role in dealing with international conflicts or does it show that the United Nations is not so important any more?

Q4 All in all, how do you feel about the world becoming more connected through greater economic trade and faster communication– do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q10 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or not at all?

Q17 What’s your opinion: Is the U.S. too religious a country or not religious enough?

Q18 Some people have considered not buying American (French and German) products to protest U.S. (French and German) policies. Have you seriously considered not buying American products or haven’t you given it serious thought?
Q20 How much of a danger is the current government in (Insert) and world peace? A great danger, moderate danger, small danger, or no danger at all?

Q20a Syria to stability in the Middle East.
Q20b North Korea to stability in Asia.
Q20c Iran to stability in the Middle East.

Q24 Did the U.S. and its allies try very hard to avoid civilian casualties in Iraq or didn’t they try hard enough?

Q25 And do you think the people of Iraq will be better off or worse off in the long run than they were, now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power by the U.S. and its allies?

Q26 Now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power by the U.S. and its allies, do you think the Middle East region will become much more democratic, somewhat more democratic, or will there be no change in the region?

Q27 In rebuilding Iraq, how good a job are the U.S. and its allies doing in taking into account the needs and interests of the Iraqi people? Is the coalition doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job in taking into consideration the interests and needs of the Iraqi people?

Q28 Do you think U.S. policies in the Middle East make the region more stable or less stable?

Q29 What’s your opinion of U.S. policies in the Middle East – would you say they are fair, or do they favor Israel too much, or do they favor the Palestinians too much?

Q30 Which statement comes closest to your opinion? A way can be found for the state of Israel to exist so that the rights and needs of the Palestinian people are taken care of, OR The rights and needs of the Palestinian people cannot be taken care of as long as the state of Israel exists.

Q31 Do you think the partnership between the U.S. and Western Europe should remain as close as it has been or do you think that Western Europe should take a more independent approach to security and diplomatic affairs than it has in the past?

Q34 As you may know, people in several countries in Asia and Canada have recently died from a new disease known as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, or SARS. How worried are you that you or someone in your family will be exposed to SARS—very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried or not worried at all?
A Year After Iraq War, 2004

Q1 Now thinking about our country, overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q2 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q2c The European Union.
Q2d The United Nations.
Q2e Jews.
Q2f Christians.
Q2g Muslims.

Q3 From what you know, do people from our country who move to the U.S. have a better life there, a worse life there, or is life neither better nor worse there?

Q4 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

Q5 Do you think the partnership between the U.S. and Western Europe should remain as close as it has been or do you think that Western Europe should take a more independent approach to security and diplomatic affairs than it has in the past?

Q6 In your opinion, would it be a good thing or a bad thing if the European Union becomes as powerful as the U.S.?

Q8 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of (insert).

Q8a Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf.
Q8b French President Jacques Chirac.
Q8c U.S. President George W. Bush.
Q8d British Prime Minister Tony Blair.
Q8f U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan.

Q9 Which of the following phrases comes closer to your view? I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the US-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q10 Which of the following phrases comes closer to your point of view? The U.S. is right to be so concerned about the threat of international terrorism OR the U.S. is over reacting to the threat of international terrorism.

Q11 Do you think the U.S. led war on terrorism is a sincere effort to reduce international terrorism or don’t you believe that?
Q16  Do you think the world would be a safer place or more dangerous place if there was another country that was equal in power to the United States?

Q19  Do you think the people of Iraq will be better off or worse off in the long run than they were, now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power by the U.S. and its allies?

Q20  In rebuilding Iraq, how good a job are the U.S. and its allies doing in taking into account the needs and interests of the Iraqi people? Is the coalition doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job in taking into consideration the interests and needs of the Iraqi people?

Q21  In the next 12 months do you believe that a stable government will be established in Iraq or do you think it will take longer than that?

Q22  Who do you think could do the best job at helping the Iraqi people form a stable government—the United States and its allies or the United Nations?

Q23  Did the U.S. military show itself to be stronger or weaker than you expected?

Q24  As a consequence of the war, do you have more confidence or less confidence that the U.S. is trustworthy?

Q25  And, as a consequence of the war, do you have more confidence or less confidence that the U.S. wants to promote democracy all around the world?

Q26  Do you think the war in Iraq has helped the war on terrorism, or has it hurt the war on terrorism?

Q27  Before the war, the U.S. and Britain claimed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. These weapons have yet to be found. Why do you think they made this claim? Was it mostly because U.S. and British leaders were themselves misinformed by bad intelligence, or was it mostly because U.S. and British leaders lied to provide a reason for invading Iraq?

Q28  Now thinking about the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians, which side do you sympathize with more, Israel or the Palestinians?

Q29b Now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power by the U.S. and its allies, do you think the Middle East region will become much more democratic, somewhat more democratic, or will there be no change in the region?
U.S. Image slightly up but still negative, 2005

Q4 Now thinking about (survey country), overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q5 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q5a The United States.
Q5b Americans.
Q5c China.
Q5d Germany.
Q5e France.
Q5f Japan.

Q6 How do you think people in other countries of the world feel about (survey country)? Is (survey country) generally liked or disliked?

Q8 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

Q9 Which of the following phrases comes closer to your view? I favor the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q11 What’s your opinion: Is the U.S. too religious a country or not religious enough?

Q12 Which of these characteristics do you associate with Americans? The first is (insert). Do you associate (insert) with Americans, or not?

Q12a Rude.
Q12b Honest.
Q12c Violent.
Q12d Hardworking.
Q12e Greedy.
Q12f Immoral.
Q12g Inventive.

Q13 Right now, the U.S. has the most powerful military capability in the world. Would you like to see the U.S. remain the only military superpower or would it be better if [Europe (ask in all countries outside of Europe) | the EU (ask in Europe)], China or another country became as powerful as the U.S.?

Q28 Now I’m going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs– a
lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all?

Q28a French President Jacques Chirac.
Q28b U.S. President George W. Bush.
Q28c British Prime Minister Tony Blair.

Q33 Overall, do you think the war with Iraq that removed Saddam Hussein from power made the world a safer place or a more dangerous place?

Q34 All in all, do you think the January elections in Iraq will lead to a MORE stable situation, a LESS stable situation, or will the situation in Iraq not change much?

Q36/37 Do you think the partnership between the U.S. and Western Europe should remain as close as it has been or do you think that Western Europe should take a more independent approach to security and diplomatic affairs than it has in the past?

Q38 If an innocent people were being killed by the army, the police or another tribe, in another country, who would you trust most to do something to stop the killings?

Q39 Which of the following countries would you trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world’s environment?

Q40 Overall do you think that China’s growing economy is a good thing or a bad thing for our country?

Q41 Overall do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing if China were to become as powerful militarily as the US?

Q42 I will now read a list of groups. Which one do you think has the most influence on American policy toward other countries?

Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics, 2005

Q5 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q5g Jews.
Q5h Christians.
Q5i Muslims.

Q17 Which statement comes closer to your own views even if neither is exactly right? Some religions are more prone to violence than others; OR All religions are about the same when it comes to violence.
Q19 Do you think most Muslims coming to our country today want to adopt (survey country) customs and way of life or do you think that they want to be distinct from the larger (survey country) society?

Q20 Some countries have decided to ban the wearing of head scarves by Muslim women in public places including schools. Do you think this is a good idea or a bad idea?

Q21 In your opinion, how strong a sense of Islamic identity do Muslims in our country have – very strong, fairly strong, not too strong, or not strong at all?

Q22 In your opinion, these days do you think there is a growing sense of Islamic identity among Muslims in our country or don’t you think so?

Q26 How concerned, if at all, are you about the rise of Islamic extremism in our country these days? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned or not at all concerned about the rise of Islamic extremism in our country these days?

Q27 How concerned, if at all, are you about the rise of Islamic extremism around the WORLD these days? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned or not at all concerned about the rise Islamic extremism around the world these days?

America's Image Slips, But Allies Share U.S. Concerns Over Iran, Hamas, 2006

Q1 Now thinking about (survey country), overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q2 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q2a The United States.
Q2b Americans.
Q2c China.
Q2d Germany.
Q2e France.
Q2f Japan.
Q2g Iran.
Q2h The United Nations.

Q3 Which of the following phrases comes closer to describing your view? I favor the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q40 Now I’m going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs– a
lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all?

Q40a French President Jacques Chirac.
Q40b U.S. President George W. Bush.
Q40c British Prime Minister Tony Blair.
Q40e Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Q41 How much of a danger is the (INSERT) and world peace? A great danger, moderate danger, small danger, or no danger at all?

Q41a Current government in North Korea to stability in Asia.
Q41b Current government in Iran to stability in the Middle East.
Q41c American presence in Iraq to stability in the Middle East.
Q41d Israeli-Palestinian conflict to stability in the Middle East.

Q42 Now I will read a list of some things that have happened in the world recently. For each one, please tell me if you’ve heard of it or not. The first is [INSERT ITEM]. Have you heard of it or not?

Q42a The dispute about Iran’s nuclear program.
Q42b The Hamas Party’s victory in the Palestinian elections.
Q42c Reports about abuses in American run prisons at Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo and elsewhere.
Q42d U.S. aid to Pakistan following the October earthquake.
Q42e The disease called bird flu found in many countries around the world.
Q42f The environmental problem of global warming.

Q44 Overall, do you think the war with Iraq that removed Saddam Hussein from power made the world a safer place or a more dangerous place?

Q45 Regardless of what you think about the original decision to use military force in Iraq, do you now believe that efforts to establish a stable democratic government in Iraq will definitely succeed, probably succeed, probably fail, or definitely fail?

Q46 Now thinking about the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians, which side do you sympathize with more, Israel or the Palestinians?

Q49 Should countries that now do not have nuclear weapons be stopped from developing them, or don’t you think so?

Q51 Would you favor or oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons?

Q52 If Iran were to develop nuclear weapons, do you think they would be likely to [INSERT ITEM, RANDOMIZE] or not? Would Iran be likely to [NEXT ITEM], or not?
Q52a Attack the U.S. or European nations.
Q52b Attack Israel.
Q52c Provide nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations.
Q52d Attack another Muslim country.
Q52e Use them for defensive purposes only.

*The Great Divide: How Westerners and Muslims View Each Other, 2006*

Q2 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q2g Jews.
Q2h Christians.
Q2i Muslims.
Q2l Arabs.

Q7 Do you think that relations these days between Muslims around the world and people in Western countries such as the United States and Europe are generally good or generally bad?

Q10 All things considered, do you think that Muslim nations should be more economically prosperous than they are today, or don’t you think so?

Q13 Do you think there is a natural conflict between being a devout Muslim and living in a modern society, or don’t you think so?

Q21 How concerned, if at all, are you about the rise of Islamic extremism around the WORLD these days? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned or not at all concerned about the rise Islamic extremism around the world these days?

Q34 Have you heard about the dispute about the publication of cartoons with the image of the prophet Muhammad?

*Muslims in Europe: Economic Worries Top Concerns About Religious and Cultural Identity, 2006*

Q20 How concerned, if at all, are you about the rise of Islamic extremism in our country these days? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned or not at all concerned about the rise of Islamic extremism in our country these days?

Q32 Have you heard about last year’s riots by youths from immigrant and working class suburbs in France and elsewhere?
Q46 Now thinking about the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians, which side do you sympathize with more, Israel or the Palestinians?

Q51 Would you favor or oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons?

Global Unease With Major World Powers, 2007

Q8 Now turning to the world situation, here is a list of five dangers in the world today. In your opinion, which one of these poses the greatest threat to the world...?

Q16 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

   Q16a The United States.
   Q16b Americans.
   Q16c China.
   Q16d Iran.
   Q16e The United Nations.
   Q16f Russia.
   Q16g The European Union.

Q17 Now thinking about the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians, which side do you sympathize with more, Israel or the Palestinians?

Q23 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think the United States takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or not at all?

Q24 In your opinion, do United States policies increase the gap between rich and poor countries, lessen the gap between rich and poor countries, or do United States policies have no effect on the gap between rich and poor countries?

Q25 Which of the following phrases comes closer to your view? It’s good that American ideas and customs are spreading here, OR it’s bad that American ideas and customs are spreading here.

Q26 And which of these comes closer to your view? I like American ideas about democracy, OR I dislike American ideas about democracy.

Q27 Which comes closer to describing your view? I like American ways of doing business, OR I dislike American ways of doing business.

Q28 Which is closer to describing your view? I like American music, movies and television, OR I dislike American music, movies and television.
Q29 And which comes closer to describing your view? I admire the United States for its technological and scientific advances, OR I do not admire the United States for its technological and scientific advances.

Q30 And which comes closer to describing your view? I favor the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q31 From what you know, do people from our country who move to the U.S. have a better life there, a worse life there, or is life neither better nor worse there?

Q32 And which comes closer to describing your view? The United States promotes democracy wherever it can, OR the United States promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests?

Q56 Now I’m going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs– a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all?

Q56a U.S. President George W. Bush.
Q56b Russian President Vladimir Putin.
Q56c German Chancellor Angela Merkel.
Q56e Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.
Q56f Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.
Q56g Chinese President Hu Jintao.

Q57 Do you think the U.S. should keep military troops in Iraq until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the U.S. should remove its troops as soon as possible?

Q58 Do you think the U.S. and NATO should keep military troops in Afghanistan until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the U.S. and NATO should remove their troops as soon as possible?

Q59 What’s your opinion of U.S. policies in the Middle East – would you say they are fair, or do they favor Israel too much, or do they favor the Palestinians too much?

Q60 Which statement comes closest to your opinion? A way can be found for the state of Israel to exist so that the rights and needs of the Palestinian people are taken care of, OR The rights and needs of the Palestinian people cannot be taken care of as long.

Q61 Who is mostly responsible for the fact that the Palestinians do not have a state of their own – Israelis or the Palestinians themselves?

Q62 Now thinking about Iran, would you favor or oppose Iran acquiring nuclear weapons?
Q63 If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons, would this represent a very serious threat to our country, a somewhat serious threat, a minor threat, or no threat at all?

Q64 Turning to China, overall do you think that China’s growing economy is a good thing or a bad thing for our country?

Q65 And overall do you think that China’s growing military power is a good thing or a bad thing for our country?

Q92 In your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem?

Q93 Which of the following, if any, is hurting the world’s environment the most?

A Rising Tide Lifts Mood in the Developing World, 2007

Q2 Here is a ladder representing the "ladder of life." Let’s suppose the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you; and the bottom, the worst possible life for you. On which step of the ladder do you feel you stand at the present time?

Q3 And on which step would you say you stood five years ago?

Q4 Just your best guess, on which step do you think you will stand in the future, say five years from now?

Q5 What do you think is the most important problem facing you and your family today?

Q6 As I read each of the following, please tell me whether you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with this aspect of your life.

Q6a Your household income.
Q6b Your family life.

Q7 Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q11 Now thinking about our economic situation, how would you describe the current economic situation in (survey country) – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q13 When children today in (survey country) grow up, do you think they will be better off or worse off than people are now?
Q14 Now I am going to read you a list of things that may be problems in our country. As I read each one, please big problem, a small problem or not a problem at all:

Q14a Crime.
Q14b Conflict between (ethnic/racial/nationality/religious/tribal) groups.
Q14c Corrupt political leaders.
Q14d Poor quality of drink water.
Q14e Terrorism.
Q14f The spread of HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases.
Q14g Poor quality public schools.
Q14h Immigration.
Q14j Illegal drugs.
Q14k Pollution.

Q15 Is there any area within a kilometer of your home where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?

Q16 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q16g The European Union.

Q21 As I read a list of groups and organizations, for each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of (read name) very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, very bad in (survey country)?

Q21a Our national government.
Q21b The Prime Minister/President.
Q21c The military.
Q21d News organizations/the media, such as television, radio, newspapers and magazines.
Q21e Religious leaders.
Q21f Immigrants.
Q21g Large companies from other countries?

Q56 Now I’m going to read a list of political leaders. For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs– a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all?

Q56f Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.

Q111 Have there been times during the last year when you did not have enough money…?
Q111a to buy food your family needed.
Q111b to pay for medical and health care your family needed.
Q111c to buy clothing your family needed.

World Publics Welcome Global Trade—But Not Immigration, 2007

Q20 What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q21 As I read a list of groups and organizations, for each, please tell me what kind of influence the group is having on the way things are going in (survey country). Is the influence of (read name) very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, very bad in (survey country)?

Q21g Large companies from other countries.

Global Economic Gloom - China and India Notable Exceptions, 2008

Q2 Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q4 Now thinking about our economic situation, how would you describe the current economic situation in (survey country) – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q5 And over the next 12 months do you expect the economic situation in our country to improve a lot, improve a little, remain the same, worsen a little or worsen a lot?

Q6 Now thinking about your personal economic situation, how would you describe it – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q10 On a different topic, please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of:

Q10a The United States.
Q10b Americans.
Q10c China.
Q10d Iran.
Q10h The Chinese.
Q10i Japan.
Q10l India.
Q10n Pakistan.
Q10o South Korea.
Q14 What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q15 Now thinking about you and your family – do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad for you and your family?

Q16 When foreigners buy (survey country) companies, do you think this has a very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or a very bad impact on our country?

Q17 Today, which ONE of the following do you think is the world’s leading economic power?

Q18 Which comes closest to your view – China will eventually replace the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower; China has already replaced the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower; or will never replace the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower?

Q21 For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs – a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all:

Q21a U.S. President George W. Bush.
Q21b Russian President Vladimir Putin.
Q21c German Chancellor Angela Merkel.
Q21g French President Nicolas Sarkozy.
Q21h U.S. Presidential candidate Barack Obama.
Q21i U.S. Presidential candidate John McCain.
Q21j U.S. Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton.

Q26 How much influence do you think China is having on the way things are going in our country? Would you say it is having a great deal of influence, a fair amount, not too much, or no influence at all?

Q32a How closely have you been following news about the U.S. presidential race – very closely, somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all?

Q33 On another topic, in your view, is global warming a very serious problem, somewhat serious, not too serious, or not a problem?

Q34 Which one of the following countries would you trust most to do the right thing in protecting the world’s environment?

Q35 Which ONE of the following, if any, is hurting the world’s environment the most?
Q36 Regardless of what you think about the original decision to use military force in Iraq, do you now believe that efforts to establish a stable democratic government in Iraq will definitely succeed, probably succeed, probably fail, or definitely fail?

Q37 Do you think the U.S. and NATO should keep military troops in Afghanistan until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the U.S. and NATO should remove their troops as soon as possible?

Q39 Turning to China, all things considered, was the decision to hold the 2008 Summer Olympics in China a good or bad decision?

Q44 In making international policy decisions, to what extent do you think China takes into account the interests of countries like (survey country) – a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or not at all?

Q47 Overall do you think that China’s growing economy is a good thing or a bad thing for our country?

Q48 And overall do you think that China’s growing military power is a good thing or a bad thing for our country?

Q49 Do you think products made in China are as safe as products made in other countries, or do you think they are less safe than products made in other countries?

Q50 How much, if anything, have you read or heard about the recalls of food and goods manufactured in China over the past year – a lot, a little, not much, or nothing at all?

Q57 Overall, do you think of China as more of a partner of (survey country), more of an enemy of (survey country), or neither?

Q59 Do you think the government of (INSERT) respects the personal freedoms of its people, or don’t you think so?

Q59a Iran.
Q59b China.
Q59c The United States.
Q59d Saudi Arabia.
Q59e Russia.
Q59f France.

Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe, 2008

Q10 On a different topic, please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable or very unfavorable opinion of:
Q10e Jews.
Q10f Christians.
Q10g Muslims.

**Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World, 2009**

Q2 Next, please tell me how satisfied you are with your life overall -- would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied.

Q3 As I read each of the following, please tell me whether you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with this aspect of your life.

Q3a Your household income.
Q3b Your family life.

Q4 Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in our country today?

Q5 Now thinking about our economic situation, how would you describe the current economic situation in (survey country) – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q6 And over the next 12 months do you expect the economic situation in our country to improve a lot, improve a little, remain the same, worsen a little or worsen a lot?

Q7 Now thinking about your personal economic situation, how would you describe it – is it very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad?

Q8 When children today in (survey country) grow up, do you think they will be better off or worse off than people are now?

Q11 Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of (insert)?

Q11a The United States.
Q11b Americans.
Q11c China.
Q11e Russia.
Q11f The European Union.
Q11j The United Nations.
Q13 What do you think about the growing trade and business ties between (survey country) and other countries – do you think it is a very good thing, somewhat good, somewhat bad or a very bad thing for our country?

Q14 Now thinking about you and your family – do you think the growing trade and business ties between our country and other countries are very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad for you and your family?

Q15 Today, which ONE of the following do you think is the world’s leading economic power?

Q16 Which comes closest to your view – China will eventually replace the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower; China has already replaced the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower; or will never replace the U.S. as the world’s leading superpower?

Q21 For each, tell me how much confidence you have in each leader to do the right thing regarding world affairs – a lot of confidence, some confidence, not too much confidence, or no confidence at all:

Q21a U.S. President Barack Obama.
Q21b Russian President Dmitri Medvedev.
Q21d German Chancellor Angela Merkel.
Q21h French President Nicolas Sarkozy.

Q26 And which comes closer to describing your view? I favor the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism, OR I oppose the U.S.-led efforts to fight terrorism.

Q32 Which of the following is taking the best approach to fixing the global economic crisis – the United States, China, or the European Union?

Q37 Which one of the following countries would you trust most to do the right thing in dealing with the problem of global warming?

Q38 Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: People should be willing to pay higher prices in order to address global climate change?

Q39 Now thinking about the situation in Iraq, do you believe that efforts to establish a stable government in Iraq will definitely succeed, probably succeed, probably fail, or definitely fail?

Q40 Do you think the U.S. and NATO should keep military troops in Afghanistan until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the U.S. and NATO should remove their troops as soon as possible?
Q47 Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the international policies of President Barack Obama?

Q48 Now I’m going to read you some statements about what President Obama might do. Please tell me whether you think this is something he will or will not do.

Q48a Be fair in dealing with the Israelis and the Palestinians?
Q48c Get the United States to take significant measures to control global climate change?
Appendix J. Commonalities in Reactions to International Crises

Figure 63. Pulse of Europe, 1991

Figure 63 includes questions 2, 3 and 4 of the 1991 Pulse of Europe Survey. It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 12 items (countries) involves a stress of 13.5%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 12 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 18.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 64 includes all of the questions administered in the 2001 Pew Survey, “America Admired, Yet Its New Vulnerability Seen As Good Thing, Say Opinion Leaders,” and listed in appendix I. It does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 7 items (countries) involves a stress a 13.9% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 7 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 2.4%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore above 1%.
Figure 65 includes the following questions from the 2002 Pew Survey “What the World Thinks”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q15d</th>
<th>Q15i</th>
<th>Q35d</th>
<th>Q64</th>
<th>Q69</th>
<th>Q77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q15e</td>
<td>Q15j</td>
<td>Q35f</td>
<td>Q65</td>
<td>Q70</td>
<td>Q87a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q15a</td>
<td>Q15f</td>
<td>Q35a</td>
<td>Q35g</td>
<td>Q66</td>
<td>Q71</td>
<td>Q87b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6a</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q15b</td>
<td>Q15g</td>
<td>Q35b</td>
<td>Q62</td>
<td>Q67</td>
<td>Q72</td>
<td>Q87c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6b</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q15c</td>
<td>Q15h</td>
<td>Q35c</td>
<td>Q63</td>
<td>Q68</td>
<td>Q75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 39 items (countries) involves a stress of 24.4%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 39 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 34.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 66 includes the following questions from the 2002 Pew Survey “What the World Thinks”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q15h</th>
<th>Q69</th>
<th>Q87a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q15i</td>
<td>Q70</td>
<td>Q87b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q15a</td>
<td>Q15j</td>
<td>Q71</td>
<td>Q87c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6a</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q15e</td>
<td>Q35d</td>
<td>Q75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6b</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q15g</td>
<td>Q35g</td>
<td>Q77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 43 items (countries) involves a stress of 23%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 43 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.7%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%. 
Figure 67. Views of a Changing World, 2003

Figure 67 includes the following questions from the 2003 Pew Survey “Views of a Changing World”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16a</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>Q31e</th>
<th>Q32c</th>
<th>Q35g</th>
<th>Q35n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16b</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q31a</td>
<td>Q31f</td>
<td>Q32d</td>
<td>Q35i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16c</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Q31b</td>
<td>Q31g</td>
<td>Q32e</td>
<td>Q35k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16d</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q31c</td>
<td>Q31h</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q35l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Q31d</td>
<td>Q32b</td>
<td>Q35e</td>
<td>Q35m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 42 items (countries) involves a stress of 23.2%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 42 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.6%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 68 includes the following questions from the 2003 Pew Survey “Views of a Changing World”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q18</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q20a</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q20b</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q20c</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 20 items (countries) involves a stress of 14.5%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 20 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 27.9%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%. 
Figure 69 includes the following questions from the 2003 Pew Survey “Views of a Changing World”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16a</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>Q31e</th>
<th>Q32c</th>
<th>Q35g</th>
<th>Q35n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16b</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q31a</td>
<td>Q31f</td>
<td>Q32d</td>
<td>Q35i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16c</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Q31b</td>
<td>Q31g</td>
<td>Q32e</td>
<td>Q35k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16d</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q31c</td>
<td>Q31h</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q35l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>Q31d</td>
<td>Q32b</td>
<td>Q35e</td>
<td>Q35m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the following questions from the 2003 update survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q20a</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q27</th>
<th>Q30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q20b</td>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q20c</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 15 items (countries) involves a stress of 14.2%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 15 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 22.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 70. A year After Iraq, 2004

Figure 70 includes the following questions from the 2004 Pew Survey “A Year After Iraq”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q8b</th>
<th>Q8f</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q29b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2c</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q8c</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2d</td>
<td>Q8a</td>
<td>Q8d</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It does not offer reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 9 items (countries) involves a stress a 12.1% stress. According to Sturrock and Rocha
(2000), 9 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 10.4%. Therefore, the probability that that country positions are random is therefore above 1%.

Figure 71. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2005

Figure 71 includes the following questions from the 2005 Pew Survey “U.S. Image slightly up but still negative”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5d</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q12b</th>
<th>Q12f</th>
<th>Q28b</th>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>Q42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5a</td>
<td>Q5e</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q12c</td>
<td>Q12g</td>
<td>Q28c</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5b</td>
<td>Q5f</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q12d</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5c</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q12a</td>
<td>Q12e</td>
<td>Q28a</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the following questions from the 2005 Pew Survey “Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics”: Q5g, Q5h, Q5i and Q17.
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 15 items (countries) involves a stress of 13.3%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 15 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 22.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 72. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2005 (2)

Figure 72 includes the following questions from the 2005 Pew Survey “U.S. Image slightly up but still negative”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5d</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q12d</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5a</td>
<td>Q5e</td>
<td>Q12a</td>
<td>Q12e</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5b</td>
<td>Q5f</td>
<td>Q12b</td>
<td>Q12f</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5c</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q12c</td>
<td>Q12g</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And the following questions from the 2005 Pew Survey “Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics”: Q5g, Q5h and Q5i.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 17 items (countries) involves a stress of 18%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 17 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 25.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

Figure 73. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2006

Figure 73 includes the following questions from the 2006 Pew Survey “America's Image Slips, But Allies Share U.S. Concerns Over Iran, Hamas”: 
It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 15 items (countries) involves a stress of 14.9%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 15 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 22.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

---

**Figure 74. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2006 (2)**

Figure 74 includes the following questions from the 2006 Pew Survey “America's Image Slips, But Allies Share U.S. Concerns Over Iran, Hamas”:  

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2d</th>
<th>Q2k</th>
<th>Q40c</th>
<th>Q41c</th>
<th>Q42c</th>
<th>Q44</th>
<th>Q52a</th>
<th>Q52e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2a</td>
<td>Q2e</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q40e</td>
<td>Q41d</td>
<td>Q42d</td>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>Q52b</td>
<td>Q52l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2b</td>
<td>Q2f</td>
<td>Q40a</td>
<td>Q41a</td>
<td>Q42a</td>
<td>Q42e</td>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>Q52c</td>
<td>Q21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2c</td>
<td>Q2j</td>
<td>Q40b</td>
<td>Q41b</td>
<td>Q42b</td>
<td>Q42f</td>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>Q52d</td>
<td>Q34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And the following questions from “The Great Divide: How Westerners and Muslims View Each Other:” Q2g, Q2h, Q2i, Q2l, Q21, Q32 and Q34.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 14 items (countries) involves a stress of 12%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 14 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 18.3%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.

![Figure 75. Pew Global Attitudes Project Data, 2007](image-url)
Figure 75 includes the following questions from the 2007 Pew Survey “Global Unease With Major World Powers”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q16e</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q29</th>
<th>Q56b</th>
<th>Q57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16a</td>
<td>Q16f</td>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>Q56c</td>
<td>Q58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16b</td>
<td>Q16g</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Q56e</td>
<td>Q64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16c</td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>Q56f</td>
<td>Q65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16d</td>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>Q56a</td>
<td>Q56g</td>
<td>Q21e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions from the 2007 Pew Survey “A Rising Tide Lifts Mood in the Developing World”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q6b</th>
<th>Q14b</th>
<th>Q14g</th>
<th>Q16g</th>
<th>Q21f</th>
<th>Q111c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Q14c</td>
<td>Q14h</td>
<td>Q21a</td>
<td>Q21g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q14d</td>
<td>Q14j</td>
<td>Q21b</td>
<td>Q56f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14e</td>
<td>Q14k</td>
<td>Q21c</td>
<td>Q111a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6a</td>
<td>Q14a</td>
<td>Q14f</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Q21d</td>
<td>Q111b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It also includes questions Q20 and Q21g.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 41 items (countries) involves a stress of 25.2%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 14 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 35.4%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 76 includes the following questions from the 2008 Pew Surveys “Global Economic Gloom - China and India Notable Exceptions”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q10b</th>
<th>Q10l</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q21c</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q36</th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q59b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q10c</td>
<td>Q10n</td>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q21g</td>
<td>Q32a</td>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>Q59c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q10d</td>
<td>Q10o</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q21h</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>Q59d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Q10h</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q21a</td>
<td>Q21i</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>Q59e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10a</td>
<td>Q10l</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Q21b</td>
<td>Q21j</td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>Q59a</td>
<td>Q59f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And questions Q10e, Q10f and Q10g from “Unfavorable Views of Jews and Muslims on the Increase in Europe.” It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 23 items (countries) involves a stress of 20.4%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 23 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 30.1%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Figure 77. “Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World,” 2009

Figure 77 includes all of the questions listed in appendix I included from the 2009 Pew survey “Confidence in Obama Lifts U.S. Image Around the World” since all of the data was available for all of the countries of the sample.

It offers reliable results. It is two-dimension mapping of this data which includes 25 items (countries) involves a stress of 21%. According to Sturrock and Rocha (2000), 25 objects scaled in two dimensions have a 1% chance of being randomly arranged when stress reaches 30.8%. In this case, the probability that country positions are random is therefore below 1%.
Appendix K. Testing other indicators: Wealth

In the following graphs, I use GDP per capita as a proxy for a country’s wealth. I assign to each country of the World Values Survey sample its quartile as the indicator of wealth for that country. Blue, yellow, green and red are assigned to the first, second, third and last quartile respectively.

Figure 78. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (Wealth)

Figure 78 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 3 in appendix H. Data for the Czech Republic and for Slovenia was unavailable.
Figure 79. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (Wealth)

Figure 79 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 6 in appendix H. Data for Taiwan and for Serbia was unavailable.
Figure 80. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (Wealth) (2)

Figure 80 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 7 in appendix H. Data for Taiwan and for Serbia was unavailable.
Figure 81 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 9 in appendix H.
Figure 82. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Wealth)

Figure 82 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as figure 20 in appendix H. Data for Taiwan and for Iraq was unavailable.
Appendix L. Testing other indicators: Freedom

In the following graphs, blue is associated with countries that Freedom House describes as free, yellow with countries that are partly free and red with countries that are not free.

Figure 83. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (Freedom)

Figure 83 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 3. Freedom House does not provide data for Russia, Slovenia, Slovakia and Northern Ireland for this period.
Figure 84. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (Freedom)

Figure 84 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 6. Freedom House does not provide data for Serbia and Puerto Rico for this period.
Figure 85. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Freedom)

Figure 85 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 9. Freedom House does not provide data for Serbia.
Figure 86 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 20.
Appendix M. Testing other indicators: OECD Membership

In the following graphs, blue is associated to members of the OECD while red is associated to countries that are not members of the organization.

Figure 87. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (OECD Membership)

Figure 87 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 3.
Figure 88. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (OECD Membership)

Figure 88 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 6.
Figure 89. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (OECD Membership) (2)

Figure 89 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 7.
Figure 90. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (OECD Membership)

Figure 90 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 9.
Figure 91. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (OECD Membership)

Figure 91 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as figure 14.
Appendix N. Testing other indicators: Religion

The CIA World Factbook provides each a country’s dominant religious affiliation that I use as an indicator in the following graphs. In particular, I divide countries into several religious affiliations: Roman Catholics (in red), Protestants (in black), Orthodox (in blue), Hindu (in yellow), Muslim (in dark green), other Christian (in light blue) and other Asian religions (in light green). See chapter 6 for additional details on the methodology.

Figure 92. World Values Survey, 1989-1993 (Religion)

Figure 92 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 3.
Figure 93. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (Religion)

Figure 93 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 6.
Figure 94. World Values Survey, 1995-1998 (Religion) (2)

Figure 94 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 7.
Figure 95. World Values Survey, 1999-2002 (Religion)

Figure 95 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 9.
Figure 96. World Values Survey, 2005-2008 (Religion)

Figure 96 includes the same questions and involves the same stress as Figure 20.
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Chapter 1

1 Ghez Interviews, Brussels, Belgium, September 2009.
3 This assertion should not exclude the possibility of a natural alliance between non-democratic states. Because of significant ideological differences between China and North Korea, major and persisting rivalries between Muslim countries, and Sunni and Shiite countries in particular, these relationships are unlikely to be natural. Efforts on the part of the League of Arab states to forge a common Arab identity and to ameliorate policy coordination could make the institution a possible candidate for a natural alliance, in spite of the limited political and economic integration of these countries. I leave this question open for future research.
13 See for instance Bill Powell’s comment on the relationship between Washington and Beijing in the wake of the Copenhagen Summit and the Google crisis in December 2009 and January 2010: “We were supposed to be entering the era when there would be just a party of two at the grown-ups' table: the place where the real power lies and where the key decisions get made. The U.S. and China—the world's strongest
developed nation and the world's fastest-growing major developing economy—were going to partner quietly to resolve some of the world's biggest ills. Climate change. Rebalancing the global economy. Reworking the world's financial architecture. No one ever called it the G-2 in public — why insult Europe, Japan, India and everyone else? But every time a senior U.S. official went to Beijing for meetings, the point was pretty clear: Now, the important business gets done. [...] That era is on hold.” Powell, B., “The China vs. Google Dispute: Hold Fire,” Time, January 28, 2010.


20 Stephen Walt argues for instance that Europe is “a set of stable, democratic, market-based societies facing no external threats that it lacks the wherewithal to handle, including the overblown threat of a resurgent Russia. So if the United States is looking for places where it can reduce its current commitments without imperiling global stability, surely Europe is the place to start.” In Walt’s framework, the United States should only concentrate on problematic regions and not consider how stable regions could help Washington solve the most pressing international issues. An alternative framework would consist in assessing the United States’ strengths and the extent to which those can help the country address international issues. These two conflicting approaches are at the heart of the debate on alliances in the new century. See Walt, S., “Reports of a transatlantic rift have been greatly exaggerated,” Foreign Policy Blog, February 3, 2010, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com (as of February 4, 2010); Gelb, L., “It’s Time to ‘Go to Strength’ on Foreign Policy,” Wall Street Journal, March 21, 2009.


25 Sarkozy, N., “Respecter ceux qui arrivent, respecter ceux qui accueillent [Respect those arriving, respect those hosting],” Le Monde, December 8, 2009; Godin, S., “The Tribes We Lead,” TED Community, 464


32 Aymeric Chauprade’s case is quite illustrative. Chauprade considers tensions between the United States and Europe and violence between Shiites and Sunnis as evidence of this clash whereas these confrontations were clearly not the focus of Huntington’s theory. See Chauprade, Aymeric, Chronique du choc des civilisations, Paris, France: Editions Chronique-Dargaud, 2009.
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12 Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 147.
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26 For further discussion of the contribution of Enlightenment to the theory of balance of power, see Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 21 and p. 67.


30 Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 56.


32 Heine, *De la France*, pp. 121-123.

33 Heine later adds about republicans: “It is not a petty-minded love for equality that leads these men to hate great names. Not at all: they fear that these citizens that hold these names will use them against liberty, or, because of weakness or condescension, allow others to take advantage of these names to the detriment of liberty.” Heine, *De la France*, pp. 163-167.


35 A recurring argument between proponents and critics of the Democratic Peace Theory is the extent to which nineteenth century Great Britain was more liberal than Germany. Heine’s analysis suggests that the difference may lie beyond the degree of freedom in both societies and concern the legacies of the successful revolution and Great Britain and the failed one in Germany.


37 Kant, Immanuel, *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, 1795.

38 Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 45.


42 Kissinger, *Diplomacy*, p. 54.


Adler for instance documents the role of national epistemic communities, such as the RAND Corporation, in the implementation of international standards and “prudential” regimes. These communities, argues Adler, allow shared understanding and provide a set of best practices to facilitate coordination in the international arena. Today, international forums such as Davos and the Social Forums of Latin America constitute arenas for ideological exchanges, and allow communities and analysts to gauge the evolution of ideas across the globe. Weidenfeld identifies the creation of a trans-Atlantic “learning community” as a key challenge in the future that would improve strategies addressing key issues on both sides of the Atlantic. Similarly, at a more macro level, the international arena that the UN Security Council provides allows for states to make public declarations and allow their stances to become official. International institutions are often seen as providing guidelines and a “covenant” for state interactions, and most notably, a “promise of formal equality” and systematic consultation on various topics. See Goertz, Gary, International Norms and Decision-making: A Punctuated Equilibrium Model, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003; Weidenfeld, America and Europe: Is the Break Inevitable?, p.125; Adler, E., “The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control,” International Organization, Vol. 46, No.1, 1992, pp. 101-145; Rothstein, Robert L., Alliances and Small Powers, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1968, pp.39-40.

For instance, Asmus, Blinken and Gordon argue that: “Uncomfortable with the compromises inherent in alliances and international institutions, the Bush administration has focused on "key allies" and "coalitions of the willing." Although this approach has maximized flexibility, its many downsides are now becoming apparent. Far from winning over support of a broad, institutionalized – and thus durable – coalition, the United States is bearing the overwhelming burden of stabilizing Iraq (and, to a lesser extent, Afghanistan). Some leaders (such as the United Kingdom’s Tony Blair and Italy’s Silvio Berlusconi) who have stood by the United States are less popular at home because of it, and others (such as Spain's Jose Maria Aznar) have lost power and seen their countries tip in an anti-U.S. direction. Because Spain's contribution to Iraq was not institutionalized or part of a formal alliance, it ended the moment the government changed. Contrary to the Atlanticist evolution of Europe and revitalization of NATO that was a signal achievement of the late 1990s, resistance to U.S. leadership is now growing among democratic populations whose support
Washington needs as much as it does that of their leaders.” See Asmus, R., A. Blinken and P. Gordon, “Nothing to Fear,” Foreign Affairs, January/February, 2005. See also Weidenfeld, America and Europe: Is the Break Inevitable?, pp. 114-117.

57 This does not prevent Balladur, like many others in Europe, to express his frustration with U.S. foreign policy, which is described as puzzling at best, and nefarious at worse. See Balladur, Pour une Union occidentale entre l’Europe et les Etats-Unis.


60 The President of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, made a very similar argument in a speech in Harvard, linking past successes to the potential of the partnership: “It is a relationship that has achieved great things in the past. But set on the road of modernization and engagement with the wider world, it has the potential to achieve even greater things in the future. It is obviously in the interests of both the EU and the US to deepen their partnership further.” See Barroso, J.M., “A Letter from Brussels to the Next President of the United States of America,” 2008 Paul-Henri Spaak Lecture, Speech delivered at the University of Harvard, Cambridge, M.A., September 24, 2008; Weidenfeld, America and Europe: Is the Break Inevitable?, p.17.


68 With the exception of the Jeffersonian tradition, Joseph Nye notices, all of these trends have been represented by one or several American policymaker in the most recent period. It is also noteworthy that American expansiveness or even foreign political aggressiveness is compatible with most trends of these traditions of foreign policies. Most traditions have preferred “a preponderance of power” to a “balance of power,” motivated by the conviction that the United States has a unique role in the world. Even if, in theory, the United States could consider becoming a “normal nation” by renouncing to their global role, it is likely that it will seek to reconcile its willingness to shape the international system with the associated political, economic, military and moral costs. See Kagan, Robert, The Return of History and the End of Dreams, New York, NY: Knopf, April 2008; Nye, Joseph, Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, New York: Public Affairs, 2004, pp. 139-140; Leffler, Melvyn P., A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

69 Many versions of this map are available. The most recent one is Inglehart, R. and W. Baker, “Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values,” American Sociological Review, Vol. 65, No. 1, February 2000, p. 29. It is noteworthy that there appears to have been no comparative analysis of all of the World Values Survey waves before.
More specifically, they contend that “the distinctive worldviews that were originally linked with religious traditions have shaped the cultures of each nation in an enduring fashion; today these distinctive values are transmitted to the citizens even if they never set foot in a church, temple, or mosque. Thus, although only about 5% of the Swedish public attends church weekly, the Swedish public as a whole manifests a distinctive Protestant value system that they hold in common with the citizens of other historically Protestant societies such as Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands. Today, these values are not transmitted primarily by the church, but by the educational system and the mass media, with the result that although the value systems of historically Protestant countries differ markedly and consistently from those of historically Catholic countries – the value systems of Dutch Catholics are much more similar to those of Dutch Protestants than to those of French, Italian, or Spanish Catholics. Even in highly secular societies, the historical legacy of given religions continues to shape worldviews and to define cultural zones.” Norris, Inglehart, Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide, p. 17.


More specifically, they contend that “the distinctive worldviews that were originally linked with religious traditions have shaped the cultures of each nation in an enduring fashion; today these distinctive values are transmitted to the citizens even if they never set foot in a church, temple, or mosque. Thus, although only about 5% of the Swedish public attends church weekly, the Swedish public as a whole manifests a distinctive Protestant value system that they hold in common with the citizens of other historically Protestant societies such as Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands. Today, these values are not transmitted primarily by the church, but by the educational system and the mass media, with the result that although the value systems of historically Protestant countries differ markedly and consistently from those of historically Catholic countries – the value systems of Dutch Catholics are much more similar to those of Dutch Protestants than to those of French, Italian, or Spanish Catholics. Even in highly secular societies, the historical legacy of given religions continues to shape worldviews and to define cultural zones.” Norris, Inglehart, Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide, p. 17.


Chapter 3


3 See writings reviewed in chapter 2 and in particular: Bobbitt, Philip, Terror and Consent: The Wars for the Twenty-First Century; Balladur, Edouard, Pour une Union occidentale entre l’Europe et les Etats-Unis.

4 When asked about the potential role of French armed forces in the nation-wide debate about national identity, the soon-to-retire French Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff Jean-Louis Georgelin argued that “in every country, the army is at the heart of the national identity. Machiavelli said that the first responsibility of the Prince was defense, and I think that this is an eternal proof. There is no nation, no state that cannot do without its armed forces. In history, the military has been the tool thanks to which the French nation was built. Through war, we built our state and we provided it with frontiers. It is relying on arms that we defended its values, form Valmy to Strasburg. During the peace times that our armed forces preserved, our country soared from an intellectual, cultural, social, commercial and industrial point of view. The military defends this state’s integrity et this will always be true, even if we live in times at which we may not sense the threats against our identity.” General Georgelin provides a must broader definition of survival than its traditional sense. See Georgelin, J., “En Afghanistan, nous ne recherchons pas une victoire militaire [In Afghanistan, we are not looking for a military victory],” Le Figaro, January 31, 2010, p. 16.


This led to a second generation of models that were deterministic in nature and that exaggerated, according to Snyder himself, the actual differences between actors. A third generation of models sought to modify the intellectual framework of the concept. See Johnston, Alastair Iain, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995, Chapters 1 and 2; Snyder, J., “The Concept of Strategic Culture: Caveat Emptor,” Carl Jacobsen, Carl, ed., *Strategic Power: USA/USSR*, New York, NY: St. Martin's, 1990, pp. 3-9.


It is interesting to note that the main challengers of the realist current, namely the liberal school of international relations and constructivism, have often adopted a similar framework for alliances and have sought to question the mechanisms of alliance formation as they were described by realism. It is therefore by far the most dominant framework. See in particular the comments regarding Risse-Kappen and Barnett on page 80.


37 Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*.


40 This argument is at the heart of one interpretation of the 2008-2009 international financial crisis. The decompartmentalization of financial markets in the 1980s allowed different agents on financial markets to make increasingly similar types of operations. This was a source of homogeneity. Combined with the increased interconnexions of financial markets as a result of globalization, the system became interconnected and homogeneous, leading to high instability according to this view. See for instance Orlean, André, *De L’Euphorie à la panique: Penser la crise financière*, Paris, France: Editions Rue d’Ulm, 2009.


48 The most obvious instance is Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the New World Order*.


472


58 It is often argued that the European construction best exemplifies this logic. Some would also point to NATO.


62 Gill, Power and resistance in the new world order, p. 95.


69 Risse-Kappen chooses two case studies: the Suez crisis and the Cuban Missile crisis. He claims that in the first, “norm violation challenging the sense of community among the allies provide the key to understating” the final confrontation among allies. The second case study, says Risse-Kappen, ‘shows the collective identity of the security community in action.” However, both instances are examples of profound crises and deep disagreements regarding the right path the follow. Risse-Kappen’s framework is unable to explain why one crisis lead to “norm violation” and why the other lead to “cooperation” among the same set of allies. His claim that the U.S.-France partnership never recovered from the Suez crisis also seems quite contradictory with his analysis of the successful cooperation during the Cuban Missile crisis.


Chapter 4

1 As early as 1989, President George H. W. Bush gave the status to three Pacific states (Australia, Japan and South Korea) and two Middle Eastern states (Egypt and Israel). After the end of the Cold War, this list has expanded to include nine other nations from Latin America, Maghreb and the Middle East and Asia and the Pacific.


6 This point is inspired from a question at a seminar in Brussels in December 2009. The participant asked me whether I believed a natural alliance was about marriage – in which case infidelity is forbidden – or about friendship – in which case multiple partners is usually an accepted norm. This is a first attempt to answer that question.


9 Huntington states that “of all the objective elements which define civilizations (…) the most important usually is religion, as the Athenians emphasized. To a very large degree, the major civilizations in human history have been closely identified with the world’s great religions; and people who share ethnicity and language but differ in religion may slaughter each other, as happened in Lebanon, the former Yugoslavia and the Subcontinent.” Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the New World Order, p. 42.


80 Samuel Huntington also made his views on bloodlines and kinship explicit in Huntington, Who Are We: The Challenges to America’s National Identity.

81 This reasoning is completely absent in Huntington’s theory which solely focuses on bloodlines and kinship. French philosopher André Glucksmann noted the problem with this focus: While cities in Ancient Greece all agreed that Good, Beauty and Truth should be fundamental objectives of human beings, disagreements often emerged on the very definitions of those concepts. It is therefore not sufficient to allegedly belong to the same bloodlines in the absence of a common constructed identity. See Glucksmann, André, Ouest Contre Ouest, Paris, France: Plon, August 2003, p.12-13.

12 I use correlation as a measure of similarity between countries.
18 More generally, the reader should note that the distance is defined as the length of a straight line separating the two points and that the axes do not necessarily reflect specific variables contrary to what intuition might suggest. In addition, because I seek to compare different countries simultaneously, what should be most striking is the clustering of some countries and the possibility to draw some frontiers on these graphs between these different clusters. An MDS algorithm will always find clusters even among homogeneous groups, so one should be cautious and always remember that these frontiers point to relative differences and similarities. But this is the best we can achieve in comparing different countries in the world.

Chapter 6

3 At that point, the OECD included the following countries that are also sampled in the second wave of the survey: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Great Britain and the United States.
5 Ghez interview, Brussels, Belgium, September 16, 2009.
7 Ghez interview, Brussels, Belgium, September 16, 2009.
9 Ghez interview, Brussels, Belgium, September 17, 2009.
11 This poll was based on an unscientific sample which included former ambassadors, high ranking officials of NATO and international policy analysts. The individuals that participated in the survey can be found in appendix A.
12 Ghez email exchange, April 23, 2010; Ghez interview, Brussels, Belgium, September 16, 2009.
Chapter 7


Appendix


These questions are directly drawn from the Pew Global Attitudes Project polls. See Pew Global Attitudes Project, Survey Reports, http://pewglobal.org/category/survey-reports (as of May 25, 2010).

These questions are directly drawn from the Pew Global Attitudes Project polls. See Pew Global Attitudes Project, Survey Reports, http://pewglobal.org/category/survey-reports (as of May 25, 2010).
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