

Public Opinion on Legitimacy of UN Sanctions

PAKISTAN REPORT (ENGLISH)

In this survey that aimed to assess public opinion on the legitimacy of UN Sanctions, Pakistan's overall average for the net averages of all six sanctions is 25 %, which is 14 % above the global average of the net averages for these six sanctions (11 %). The 1st sanction, which is imposed by the UN in case of unprovoked military attacks on other nations, has relatively strong support at a net score of 46 %. The reasons for a positive support for this type of sanction among the Pakistani public can be effectively traced to Pakistan's history as well as its geo-political location. Since its inception, Pakistan has always had to contend with a hostile neighbor in the form of India, a state which has been involved in three full-scale wars with Pakistan. Furthermore, the threat of terrorism posed by the Taliban along Pakistan's western border with Afghanistan and the ravages that it has wrought within Pakistan in the immediate past also serve to justify a strong support for this sanction. The 2nd sanction that is implemented in circumstances of genocide or systematic killing of groups within the country has gotten the highest individual net score of 48%, and with good reason. In recent years, particularly in the aftermath of the wave of terrorism that has swept across Pakistan after the events of 9/11, the incidences of sectarian terrorism in Pakistan have risen alarmingly in both proportion and magnitude. Not only have the Hazara Community, a predominantly Shia minority belonging to the Baluchistan province suffered grievously at the hands of organized killings by terrorists, the other religious minorities of Pakistan, the Hindus and the Christians, have also been attacked on many occasions, either by violent mobs or by terrorists. Establishing peace and security within Pakistan has become a major priority concern for the state. The Pakistani public is also in line with achieving this aim and is also aware of the need to make Pakistani society a tolerant one, as can be seen by the high score achieved by this type of sanction.

There is also comparatively low national, but nevertheless positive approval (10 %) for the 3rd punishment that the UN enforces in situations when a country violates its nuclear non-proliferation treaty obligations or prevents nuclear arms inspections. Being a nuclear power, the public may feel strict regulation may limit progress in this domain. People may also feel that

unrestricted expansion and development of nuclear energy in the nation, is a necessity for defense purposes, particularly in light of the seeming threat posed by India on Pakistan's eastern border. Therefore, a majority of the population sees Pakistan's nuclear weapons as the most effective deterrent against a war with India and does not want sanctions to be imposed as a result of a technology that it feels is essential to Pakistan's lasting security. However, there are others that will assess the situation rationally, and understand that such regulation is beneficial not only on a global but also a national level, due to the immense destruction that this kind of energy can cause.

The 4th sanction has a net approval of 23 % in Pakistan, since these sanctions would create obstacles to the funding and support that aids terrorists in undertaking their activities. There is slightly negative net support for UN Sanctions imposed on the removal of democratically elected governments (-1%). This opposition may be attributed to the lack of trust that people have in their leaders, due to the prevalence of rigging and corruption in the nation. It may also be down to the fact that military dictators have ruled in Pakistan for a combined number of 33 years, coming into power often on the pretext of saving Pakistan from the corruption and greed of the politicians. As a result of recurring impediments in Pakistan's democratic process, coinciding with the popularization of 'Saving Pakistan from the Politicians' narrative by military rulers over the years, the Pakistani public has reported low scores for this sanction. Support for the 6th sanction on violation of agreements on environmental protection is positive at 22 %, as the people have become more aware of the national and global implications of pollution for human health and safety, the eco system and natural resources. Pakistan also has ratings that are higher than those for the West Asian region in general (20 %). Having become a member of the United Nations just a month into independence, Pakistan has played an active role in the activities of the UN, maintaining regular participation in a number of specialized agencies of the UN and lobbying extensively in the General Assembly over various international causes over the years. Pakistan is also the largest contributor of soldiers to the peacekeeping forces of the UN. This healthy relationship with the United Nations helps boost public support for the different measures that the UN takes to ensure and enhance global harmony.

COUNTRY-WISE (RANK ORDER RESULTS-HIGH TO LOW)

GLOBAL PUBLIC OPINION ON LEGITIMACY OF INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS (June 2015)

Q19. Sometimes the United Nations (UN) imposes sanctions or punishments against a country by banning other countries to trade with certain individuals, groups or businesses in that country. For each of the following, do you strongly support, support, oppose or strongly oppose such punishment by the United Nations if a country?

		Average of Net Averages of 6 Type of Sanction
Global average		11
Rank Order Results (High to Low)	Armenia	89
	Korea, Rep (South)	77
	Finland	68
	Austria	66
	Vietnam	64
	Portugal	60
	Lebanon	59
	Italy	53
	Ukraine	53
	Germany	51
	Netherlands	51
	Latvia	48
	Iceland	48
	Australia	48
	Sweden	47
	Fiji	45
	Canada	45
	Czech Republic	44
	Switzerland	43
	Ireland	42
	Bulgaria	41
	India	40
	Kenya	39
	Turkey	39
	Nigeria	39
	United Kingdom	39
	Spain	38

United States	35
Bangladesh	34
Kazakhstan	31
Mexico	30
Belgium	30
Ecuador	29
Greece	27
Japan	26
Poland	26
Afghanistan	26
Bosnia and Herzegovina	25
Pakistan	25
Brazil	24
Algeria	24
Russian Federation	23
France	21
Peru	21
Hong Kong	20
Romania	17
Malaysia	14
Kosovo	9
Georgia	8
Macedonia	0
South Africa	-3
Serbia	-5
Palestinian territories (West Bank and Gaza)	-11
Philippines	-12
Colombia	-15
Argentina	-16
Panama	-16
Morocco	-25
China	-39
Indonesia	-46
Thailand	-52

Weighted according to total national population of each country in the sample
SOURCE: WIN Gallup International Annual Global Poll/ EOY, December 2014

NATIONAL SPOKESPERSON (PAKISTAN):

Dr. Ijaz Gilani

Email: gilani@gallup.com.pk



METHODOLOGY:

Country	Firm	Email	Methodology	Sample	Coverage	Population	Pop. represented by sample	Field Dates	Age Brackets	Weighting factors
PAKISTAN	Gallup Pakistan	gilani@gallup.com.pk	Face to Face	2000	National	180,000,000	92,000,000	October 19th–October 30th, 2014	18+	Yes-province Urban, Rural (PRU) method.

Please Note: In case of any unintended error, misrepresentation or omissions please write to Maham Saleem (maham.saleem@gallup.com.pk) and CC to Natacha Vanasse (nvanasse@wingia.com).



Disclaimer: Gallup International Association or its members are not related to Gallup Inc., headquartered in Washington D.C which is no longer a member of Gallup International Association. Gallup International Association does not accept responsibility for opinion polling other than its own. We require that our surveys be credited fully as Gallup International (not Gallup or Gallup Poll). For further details see website: www.Gallup-international.com

In no event shall WIN Gallup International Association, its Member Companies, or its agents or officers be liable for any damages whatsoever (including, without limitation, damages for loss of profits, business interruption) arising out of the use of or inability to use the materials. As a user of this report, you acknowledge and agree that any reliance upon, or use of any information made available through this report shall be entirely at your own risk. Subject to any implied terms which cannot be excluded by law, WIN Gallup International Association and its related entities (including any directors, officers, employees and agents) shall not be liable for any loss or damage, whether direct or indirect, and however caused, to any person arising from the use of (or reliance upon) information provided on and made available through this report.