

Most EU Residents Support Rights of Nature Laws

Yaffa Epstein, José Vicente López-Bao** and Jeremy Bruskotter****

Abstract

Rights of nature laws have been enacted in a growing number of countries, but the extent to which they are supported by public opinion has been unclear. We report the results of a survey in which over 11,000 participants across the EU were asked ‘Would you support or oppose policy that would give legal rights to forests or rivers – such as the right to exist free from destruction or pollution’. Most respondents said they would support such a policy: 62% would support, 28% were neutral or not sure, and 10% were opposed. We discuss some implications and limitations of the survey. The main implications are first, that majority support among respondents indicates that further rights of nature laws or policies could be enacted in the EU, and second, that a majority of respondents (68%) fell outside the most extreme categories (i.e., strongly support, strongly oppose) suggests there is also opportunity for advocates or opponents of rights of nature laws to shift public opinion. The main limitations are that the survey does not indicate what types of rights of nature laws respondents preferred, what types of trade-offs respondents would accept, that respondents may have limited knowledge or understanding of rights of nature, and that limited inferences can be drawn about whether public support for rights of nature will in fact lead to policy changes. More complex studies are needed to make more precise inferences.

Introduction

Rights of nature laws – laws that assign explicit legal rights to nature as a whole, or to particular categories of non-human natural entities such as ecosystems or rivers, or to specific non-human natural entities such as the Whanganui River – have been enacted in a growing number of countries over the last 20 years. One important question for understanding whether these laws will be successfully implemented or continue to spread is whether they have public support. Af-

ter all, laws in a democracy ostensibly reflect the views of the people.

Rights of nature laws have been passed in a growing number of jurisdictions worldwide. They have been most successful in terms of implementation in Latin America, particularly in Ecuador, and in New Zealand. In terms of number of enactments, the United States leads with rights of nature laws enacted at city, county or tribal levels in dozens of jurisdictions, although thus far many of these laws have not been legally effective and some have been overturned by courts or invalidated by state legislatures. To date, however, there have been few rights of nature laws passed in European Union (EU) countries. Spain enacted the first European rights of nature law in 2022, recognizing the legal personhood of the Mar Menor saltwater lagoon and its basin, which had experienced severe environmental degradation. Local jurisdictions in Ire-

* Associate Professor of Environmental Law, Uppsala University, Faculty of Law, Sweden. Pro Futura Scientia fellow, Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies, Sweden.

** Senior Research Scientist, Biodiversity Research Institute (CSIC – Oviedo University – Principality of Asturias), Spanish National Research Council, Spain.

*** Professor, School of Environment & Natural Resources, Ohio State University, USA.

land and the Netherlands have also endorsed rights of nature, and several other initiatives are being contemplated across Europe.¹ Even amongst those who advocate for rights of nature, though, it is sometimes claimed that enacting these laws would require a paradigm shift in current views of the relationship between humans and nature, suggesting that even these advocates do not believe that most humans currently support the legal rights of nature.² In any case, the extent to which these enactments do in fact reflect the current views of the broader population, rather than merely the efforts of interest groups, is unclear.

We assessed public support for rights of nature in the EU. In the next section, we describe the study design. We then present the results of the survey, which, in brief, showed that far more respondents support rights of nature than oppose them in every country and demographic group included in the survey. Finally, we discuss what these survey results may mean for the continued enactment and implementation of rights of nature laws.

The survey

Data were collected as part of a broad-scale assessment of the EU publics' views about nature and wildlife. We designed a self-administered questionnaire and contracted with the well-regarded survey research firm Qualtrics³ to col-

lect data across 23 EU countries between 2022 and 2024. Overall, Qualtrics received completed questionnaires from approximately 11,000 respondents who were invited to participate in an online survey administered via the Qualtrics platform. We initially aimed to collect 500 answers from each country, except for Germany, where we stratified sampling in order to aim to collect 500 answers from both the former East and former West Germany.⁴ On average, we collected 480 answers (sd:142) per country (a mean of 460 answers – sd:106 – excluding Germany; see Table 1 for actual number of respondents per country). There were only 4 countries below the estimated ideal sample size of 370 answers per country to get representative results from the target population, providing a minimum of +/- 5% margin of error at the 95% confidence level (Table 1).

Respondents were asked for their opinions on a broad range of environmental and related policy issues.⁵ One question specifically concerned rights of nature: **'Would you support or oppose policy that would give legal rights to forests or rivers – such as the right to exist free from destruction or pollution.'**⁶ Participants responses were recorded using a five-point scale including: strongly oppose, oppose, neutral or not sure, support, or strongly support.

One aim of our larger survey was to determine the extent to which people residing in urban and rural areas differed with respect to their opinions, which could be relevant with respect

¹ Jenny García Ruales, Katarina Hovden, Helen Kopnina, Colin D. Robertson, and Hendrik Schoukens, eds. *Rights of Nature in Europe: Encounters and Visions* (Taylor & Francis 2024), 9–10.

² See for example, Pella Thiel, 'Moral Imagination for the Rights of Nature: An Embassy of the Baltic Sea' *Nordic Environmental Law Journal* (Special Issue 2024), 154. Thiel claims that '[t]he way law currently treats nature is a manifestation of a cultural understanding of human separation and supremacy.'

³ Taylor C. Boas, Dino P. Christenson, and David M. Glick, 'Recruiting Large Online Samples in the United States and India: Facebook, Mechanical Turk, and Qual-

trics' *Political Science Research and Methods* (2020) 8:232.

⁴ To ensure a broad geographical distribution, Qualtrics was instructed to collect 500 combined answers from the Länder Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt and Thüringen, and 500 answers from other Länder.

⁵ We and colleagues expect to address the responses to other questions in several other papers.

⁶ See Annex 2 for this question in other languages.

to rights of nature laws, since rural populations may be more directly impacted by additional laws. This objective required oversampling rural areas. This was accomplished by the use of quotas that attempted to cap responses from urban residents at 50%. This creates potential bias in the response. For instance, if a country's population was 70% urban and 30% rural, our 50/50 urban/rural quota means that the rural population is overrepresented.⁷ In addition to the urban/rural quota, two additional quotas were enforced in survey administration – a 50/50 male/female quota and an age quota (i.e., 50% of responses from adults under the median age, 50% from those over the median age⁸). As opposed to the urban/rural quota, these other quotas were designed to increase the representativeness of the sample. To account for biases associated with these quotas we report responses according to age, sex and rural/urban identification in Annex 1.

Results

Across all survey respondents, 62% supported rights of nature, 10% opposed, and 28% were neutral or not sure. That is, of those with an opinion, participants supported granting rights of nature at a ratio of more than 6:1 (support and strongly support responses and oppose and strongly oppose responses pooled together). The country with the highest support for rights of nature was Bulgaria, with 79% supporting and only 7% opposing, and 14% neutral or not

sure; that is a ratio of 11:1 in support of rights of nature. Sweden had the lowest support for rights of nature laws, with 49% supporting, 11% opposing, and 39% neutral or unsure; but still almost a ratio of 5:1 in support of rights of nature. Portugal had the highest opposition to rights of nature, with 23% opposing, but 51% supporting, and the rest neutral. That is, in the country with the highest level of opposition, support for rights of nature still exceeded 2:1. Remarkably, in no country did opposition exceed 23%. See Table 1 and Annex 1.

A clear majority of our respondents stated that they would support or strongly support some type of legal rights for forests or rivers. This suggests that, in contrast to a few studies of attitudes of people working in forestry and other areas likely to be impacted by rights of nature, there is broader support amongst the general public for rights of nature laws.⁹ We had hypothesized that there may be lower support for rights of nature amongst rural populations because they might be more directly impacted by additional nature protections. This turned out to be true to a small degree, though overall rural residents also were far more likely to support than to oppose rights of nature. It should be noted that because rural residents were intentionally overrepresented in our study, the national levels of support may be even higher than the levels reported. Notably, there were only small differences in the level of support between younger and

⁷ The EU population is estimated to be more than 70% urban. See Greg Clark, Tim Moonen, and Jake Nunley, *The Story of your City: Europe and its Urban Development, 1970 to 2020* (European Investment Bank 2019) at 6. We note that despite efforts to include 50% rural participants, it proved so difficult to recruit participants from rural areas in some countries that this was not fully achieved. See Annex 1.

⁸ The quota was based on the median age in each country, but to simplify our tables, we have reported results using the single median age of 44 in all countries.

⁹ Seth Epstein and Anton Andersen, 'Contemplating Rights of Nature in Sweden: Democratic Legitimacy, Conflict, and Centralization of Power' *Nordic Journal of Environmental Law* (Special Issue 2024); Eija Meriläinen and Ari A. Lehtinen, 'Re-articulating Forest Politics Through "Rights to Forest" and "Rights of Forest"' *Geoforum* (2022) 133:89. Another recent survey of G-20 countries, however mirrors our survey results of about 60% support for RoN. See "Earth for All Survey 2024," G20+ Global Report: Attitudes to Political and Economic Transformation, Earth4All and the Global Common Alliance (June 2024): 32–33.

older participants. Females, however, were quite a bit more likely to support rights of nature than males, and particularly more likely to strongly support them. In every demographic and geo-

graphical area surveyed, though, and contrary to our expectations, support for rights of nature was much higher than opposition.

Table 1: 'Would you support or oppose policy that would give legal rights to forests or rivers – such as the right to exist free from destruction or pollution.'

Country	Number of Respondents	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Austria	506	5	6	28	32	29
Belgium	510	4	7	30	33	26
Bulgaria	569	5	2	14	34	45
Croatia	327	4	5	29	38	25
Czech Republic	509	4	5	30	34	28
Denmark	508	6	7	36	28	23
Estonia	299	2	6	29	45	18
Finland	500	4	10	35	34	16
France	494	2	7	29	34	28
Germany	927	6	5	31	32	26
Greece	499	2	5	18	40	35
Hungary	521	3	6	23	35	33
Italy	499	2	5	20	37	36
Latvia	110	3	6	30	46	15
Lithuania	380	2	4	26	41	28
Netherlands	499	6	9	34	31	19
Poland	496	5	11	35	31	19
Portugal	501	12	10	26	28	23
Romania	558	3	4	17	35	41
Slovakia	500	3	5	39	37	17
Slovenia	334	2	6	28	34	29
Spain	498	8	7	24	27	34
Sweden	498	5	7	39	28	21
Overall	11042	4	6	28	34	28

(Due to rounding, some lines do not add up to 100%)

Discussion

As examined by political scientists including Craig Kauffman, Pamela Martin, and Mihnea Tănăsescu, NGOs have often worked with local communities to advocate for the enactment of rights of nature at the local, national and international levels. This advocacy and assistance of

NGOs has been demonstrably important to the successful legal recognition of these rights.¹⁰ It

¹⁰ Craig M. Kauffman and Pamela L. Martin. *The Politics of Rights of Nature: Strategies for Building a More Sustainable Future* (MIT Press 2021), see especially chapter 2; Mihnea Tănăsescu 'The Rights of Nature in Ecuador: The Making of an Idea' *International Journal of Environmental Studies* (2013) 70:846.

was not clear, however, the extent to which the success of these interest groups in facilitating the legal recognition of rights for nature reflected the desire for these laws amongst the public in those jurisdictions or simply the prowess of the interest groups.

One indication that legal rights of nature may also have broad public support is that they have been enacted through direct elections or other public initiatives in several instances. The Mar Menor Lagoon Personhood law was approved by the national legislature at the behest of a popular legislative initiative that collected nearly 640,000 signatures.¹¹ In the United States, some cities and states allow members of the public to propose and enact laws through ballot measures. Proponents of these measures must collect a certain number of signatures to qualify a measure to appear on the ballot. A couple such ballot measures passed with large margins. The 2019 Lake Erie Bill of Rights, for example, was enacted in Toledo, Ohio with 61% of the vote. A similar ballot measure in Orange County, Florida passed with 89% of the vote in 2020. The representativeness of this election data is unclear however, as there was fairly low voter turnout in both cases and rights of nature have been on the ballot in only a small portion of the country. In any case, the state legislatures of both Ohio and Florida responded to these local laws by passing state laws prohibiting the legal recognition of any type of nature's rights within the states, and these local laws are no longer valid.¹²

¹¹ Teresa Vicente Giménez and Eduardo Salazar Ortuño. 'An Ecological Citizenship's Triumph: From the Popular Legislative Initiative to the Rights Granted for the Mar Menor.' In *Rights of Nature in Europe* (Jenny García Ruales, Katarina Hovden, Helen Kopnina, Colin D. Robertson, and Hendrik Schoukens, eds.) (Routledge 2024) 83.

¹² A court also held the Lake Erie law to be invalid on constitutional grounds. *Dreves Farms P'ship v. City of Toledo*, 441 F.Supp.3d 551, 2020.

This survey found similar levels of support amongst EU residents for rights of nature as there was in the two elections in US jurisdictions. The survey results thus both tend to support the idea that there may be broad public support for these laws in Europe, as well as to an extent corroborate the election evidence of public support in the US even if there have been few true success stories on either continent. This strong support suggests that if the political systems work to reflect the desires of the populace, rights of nature laws will continue to be democratically enacted in these regions. Further studies should examine and propose legal pathways to effective rights of nature laws within the European Union and United States, as well as examine the potential harm that could result from poorly formulated rights of nature laws.

Still, only limited conclusions about public support for rights of nature laws, or the likelihood that this support will lead to the widespread enactment of rights of nature laws, can be drawn from our survey results. First, the question posed asked whether respondents supported or opposed some type of legal rights for forests or rivers. The responses might have been different if the question had used different examples. Rights of nature laws take many forms and recognize rights for many types of natural entities. For example, Ecuador's well-known constitutional provision recognizes the rights of 'nature or Pacha Mamma' as a whole. Types of rights recognized have ranged from fundamental substantive rights to property rights, to personhood and to procedural rights. Notably, the example stated in the question, 'the right to exist free from destruction or pollution' is a negative right, one that would maintain a status quo, as opposed to one that would require positive actions from humans such as a right to be restored. The question used does not indicate what types of rights of nature laws people may prefer.

Second, our results do not indicate how the public may weigh potential trade-offs that may result from enacting legal rights of nature laws. People may support legal rights for some natural entities in principle, yet not be willing to pay any costs that would result if, for example, a forest's right to exist led to an increase in the price of paper products. They may support rights of nature in the abstract, but balk at any concrete rights that would have to be weighed against human rights and interests.

Third, members of the general public may have limited knowledge about rights of nature, or different interpretations of what they would entail. Indeed, a substantial percentage of respondents expressed no opinion on the topic. As comedians such as Jay Leno and Stephen Colbert have repeatedly demonstrated, people on the street often do not give astute answers to public policy questions.¹³ Still, people generally have some idea of what legal rights are, even if that idea may not fully reflect a lawyer's idea of what rights are. People know what forests and rivers are. They may not fully understand the consequences of endowing forests, rivers or other natural entities with legal rights, but no one does. In our opinion, the survey responses reflect a genuine desire amongst the general public to better protect nature. They would support doing so through rights of nature laws even if the trade-offs and consequences are yet unknown.¹⁴

¹³ For a description of so-called 'man on the street' humor, see Matt Sienkiewicz and Nick Marx, 'Appropriating Irony: Conservative Comedy, Trump-era Satire, and the Politics of Television Humor' *JCMS: Journal of Cinema and Media Studies* (2021) 60:85, 94.

¹⁴ In fact, from the polling instrument used by the European Commission (i.e., Eurobarometer) to monitor regularly the state of public opinion on issues related to the European Union, such as attitudes of Europeans towards the environment, it can be observed an increasing concern with environmental issues among European citizens. According to the 2024 survey, 84% of citizens agreed about the importance of environmental legis-

Finally, while high public support for rights of nature laws suggests that they may be enacted by direct democracy, as they have been in a few jurisdictions in the United States, opportunities to enact laws by direct democracy are rare. The European Union and its Member States are representative democracies, in which elected representatives pass laws after a deliberative process.¹⁵ It may be that these representatives, when considering the various interests and potential trade-offs at stake, would make different decisions than might be made through a direct vote. The general public is often thought to be particularly ill-equipped to make decisions concerning the rights of others.¹⁶ Another possible explanation is that bans on rights of nature laws like those in some US states, and failure to enact rights of nature laws, may reflect the over-influence special interests and elites.¹⁷ In any case, the apparent public preference for recognizing the rights of natural entities is a factor that deserves consideration by elected representatives.

There is a need for more complex surveys in order to make more precise inferences. Our survey results do however imply some courses of action to both advocates and adversaries of rights of nature laws. Changing the culture is very difficult; changing the law is relatively easy. Survey results suggest that the cultural conditions may already exist. Sixty percent or more of respondents stated that they would sup-

lation to protect the environment in their country. See European Commission, *Attitudes of Europeans towards the Environment* (2024), available at <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/3173>.

¹⁵ E.g., Treaty on European Union, Article 10.

¹⁶ Anna Forgács, *Referendum Authorization Procedures in Europe* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2023), 11.

¹⁷ See Martin Gilens and Benjamin I. Page, 'Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens' Perspectives on Politics (2014) 12:564, arguing that economic elites and groups representing business interests have had outsized influence on US policies.

port rights of nature laws in Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Hungary, Slovenia, Estonia, Croatia, France, Austria, Czech Republic, Latvia, Spain and Belgium. High public support in these countries highlights the potential to seek to enact rights of nature laws at the national or regional levels in these countries, perhaps even through direct democratic procedures where available,¹⁸ although advocates should take careful consideration of other legal and political factors that may be in play. On the other hand, a large percentage of respondents were neutral

or undecided, and only a minority of voters felt strongly either way. This suggests there is also opportunity for advocates or opponents of rights of nature laws to shift public opinion.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge funding from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet) for projects 2018-05203 and 2020-04973. Epstein also received funding from Riksbankens Jubeliumsfond. Thank you to Kimberley Graham for comments on a draft.

Annex 1: 'Would you support or oppose policy that would give legal rights to forests or rivers – such as the right to exist free from destruction or pollution.'

RURAL/ URBAN							
Country	Number of respondents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Austria	202	rural	4	4	28	33	31
Austria	304	urban	6	7	28	31	28
Belgium	255	rural	4	6	27	36	27
Belgium	255	urban	3	9	33	29	26
Bulgaria	82	rural	5	4	15	40	37
Bulgaria	487	urban	5	2	14	33	47
Croatia	82	rural	4	6	30	41	18
Croatia	245	urban	4	4	29	36	27
Czech Republic	131	rural	3	7	37	27	26
Czech Republic	378	urban	5	4	28	36	28
Denmark	253	rural	5	7	39	28	21
Denmark	255	urban	7	8	33	27	25
Estonia	134	rural	1	6	34	45	14
Estonia	165	urban	3	5	25	45	22
Finland	244	rural	5	10	39	36	10
Finland	256	urban	3	9	32	33	22
France	244	rural	2	6	26	36	30
France	250	urban	2	8	32	32	26

¹⁸ Ibid. at 24.

RURAL/ URBAN							
Country	Number of respon- dents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Germany	424	rural	7	5	25	32	30
Germany	503	urban	5	5	35	32	22
Greece	245	rural	2	6	20	38	35
Greece	254	urban	2	4	17	43	35
Hungary	260	rural	2	5	26	36	32
Hungary	261	urban	5	7	20	34	35
Italy	244	rural	2	3	19	39	38
Italy	255	urban	2	6	21	35	35
Latvia	28	rural	7	11	25	43	14
Latvia	82	urban	1	5	32	48	15
Lithuania	125	rural	2	3	28	42	25
Lithuania	255	urban	2	4	24	40	29
Nether- lands	245	rural	6	11	36	30	17
Nether- lands	254	urban	6	8	33	32	21
Poland	242	rural	5	11	38	31	15
Poland	254	urban	5	11	32	30	22
Portugal	244	rural	11	8	25	31	25
Portugal	257	urban	13	12	28	26	20
Romania	90	rural	2	3	16	33	46
Romania	468	urban	3	4	17	36	40
Slovakia	245	rural	3	7	43	33	14
Slovakia	255	urban	3	2	35	40	20
Slovenia	154	rural	2	7	29	34	27
Slovenia	180	urban	3	6	26	34	31
Spain	244	rural	9	7	27	24	33
Spain	254	urban	7	6	21	29	36
Sweden	243	rural	6	5	39	28	23
Sweden	255	urban	4	10	38	29	19
Overall	4660	rural	5	6	30	33	26
Overall	6382	urban	4	6	27	34	29

Yaffa Epstein, José Vicente López-Bao and Jeremy Bruskotter:
Most EU Residents Support Rights of Nature Laws

MALE/ FEMALE							
Country	Number of respondents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Austria	254	female	7	6	29	28	30
Austria	252	male	4	6	27	35	28
Belgium	255	female	4	7	29	32	28
Belgium	255	male	3	8	31	34	25
Bulgaria	292	female	5	3	12	34	47
Bulgaria	277	male	5	2	16	34	44
Croatia	168	female	4	2	21	40	32
Croatia	159	male	4	7	37	35	17
Czech Republic	255	female	3	4	27	36	31
Czech Republic	254	male	6	6	33	31	24
Denmark	252	female	4	4	40	27	23
Denmark	256	male	7	11	32	28	23
Estonia	165	female	3	5	25	45	22
Estonia	134	male	1	7	34	45	14
Finland	251	female	3	7	35	33	22
Finland	249	male	5	12	35	36	11
France	246	female	1	6	31	33	29
France	248	male	4	8	27	35	27
Germany	486	female	6	6	29	30	29
Germany	441	male	5	5	32	35	23
Greece	249	female	2	5	17	40	36
Greece	250	male	2	4	20	40	34
Hungary	262	female	4	4	22	35	36
Hungary	259	male	3	8	24	35	31
Italy	250	female	2	4	25	32	36
Italy	249	male	2	5	15	41	37
Latvia	55	female	2	0	33	53	13
Latvia	55	male	4	13	27	40	16
Lithuania	243	female	2	4	21	44	28
Lithuania	137	male	1	4	33	34	27
Netherlands	264	female	5	11	34	25	25
Netherlands	235	male	8	8	34	37	12
Poland	247	female	4	7	34	34	22
Poland	249	male	5	15	37	28	16
Portugal	250	female	13	13	29	23	22
Portugal	251	male	12	8	24	34	23

MALE/ FEMALE							
Country	Number of respondents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Romania	274	female	3	3	14	36	43
Romania	284	male	2	5	20	35	38
Slovakia	250	female	3	3	42	32	20
Slovakia	250	male	3	6	36	41	14
Slovenia	177	female	2	3	28	33	33
Slovenia	157	male	3	10	27	36	25
Spain	248	female	12	6	21	27	35
Spain	250	male	5	8	28	27	33
Sweden	250	female	4	7	39	28	22
Sweden	248	male	6	7	38	28	21
Overall	5643	female	4	5	28	33	30
Overall	5399	male	5	7	29	35	25

YOUNG/ OLD							
Country	Number of respondents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Austria	274	young	5	5	30	30	29
Austria	232	old	5	6	25	34	29
Belgium	270	young	3	6	30	35	26
Belgium	240	old	5	9	29	30	27
Bulgaria	352	young	4	3	13	33	47
Bulgaria	217	old	6	1	15	35	43
Croatia	200	young	4	4	30	36	25
Croatia	127	old	3	6	28	39	24
Czech Republic	262	young	5	4	26	33	32
Czech Republic	247	old	4	5	34	34	23
Denmark	266	young	6	8	34	26	26
Denmark	242	old	5	7	38	29	21
Estonia	191	young	3	7	28	46	16
Estonia	108	old	0	4	31	44	22
Finland	273	young	5	10	36	34	16
Finland	227	old	3	10	35	35	17
France	272	young	3	7	28	31	30
France	222	old	1	7	30	37	25

Yaffa Epstein, José Vicente López-Bao and Jeremy Bruskotter:
Most EU Residents Support Rights of Nature Laws

YOUNG/ OLD							
Country	Number of respondents	Group Type	% Strongly Oppose	% Oppose	% Neutral	% Support	% Strongly Support
Germany	513	young	8	6	29	31	26
Germany	414	old	4	4	32	34	26
Greece	322	young	2	5	20	38	35
Greece	177	old	1	4	16	44	35
Hungary	290	young	5	6	24	32	33
Hungary	231	old	2	5	20	39	34
Italy	212	young	3	7	21	36	33
Italy	287	old	1	3	19	38	39
Latvia	70	young	1	4	33	46	16
Latvia	40	old	5	10	25	48	12
Lithuania	233	young	2	5	27	40	26
Lithuania	147	old	2	3	22	42	31
Netherlands	249	young	7	11	30	31	21
Netherlands	250	old	5	8	39	31	18
Poland	315	young	5	11	34	32	18
Poland	181	old	4	10	37	29	20
Portugal	248	young	13	12	29	27	19
Portugal	253	old	12	8	24	30	26
Romania	380	young	3	5	18	33	41
Romania	178	old	2	2	16	41	39
Slovakia	318	young	3	4	36	36	20
Slovakia	182	old	2	5	43	38	12
Slovenia	181	young	3	8	22	29	38
Slovenia	153	old	1	5	34	41	19
Spain	299	young	10	7	21	25	36
Spain	199	old	6	6	28	29	32
Sweden	282	young	4	8	41	25	22
Sweden	216	old	6	6	35	32	20
Overall	6272	young	5	7	28	33	28
Overall	4770	old	4	6	29	35	27

Annex 2: Other languages

Bulgarian

Подкрепяте или сте против политика, която ще даде законни права на горите или реките, например правото да не да бъдат унищожавани или замърсявани?

Czech

Podporujete nařízení, které by přiznávalo lesům nebo řekám zákonná práva – například právo na existenci bez ničení nebo znečišťování, nebo mu oponujete?

Danish

Vil du støtte eller modsætte dig en politik, der ville give juridiske rettigheder til skove eller floder – såsom retten til at eksistere fri for ødelæggelse eller forurening?

German

Würden Sie eine Politik unterstützen oder ablehnen, die den Wäldern oder Flüssen Rechte einräumt – beispielsweise das Recht, frei von Zerstörung oder Verschmutzung zu existieren?

Greek

Θα ήσασταν υπέρ ή κατά μιας πολιτικής που θα έδινε νομικά δικαιώματα σε δάση ή ποτάμια – όπως το δικαίωμα να υπάρχουν χωρίς να τα καταστρέφουν ή να τα ρυπαίνουν?

Spanish

¿Apoyaría o se opondría a una política que otorgara derechos legales a los bosques o ríos, como el derecho a existir libres de destrucción o contaminación?

Estonian

Kas te toetaksite või oleksite selliste reeglite vastu, mis annab metsadele või jõgedele seaduslikud õigused – nt õiguse mitte hävitatud või reostatud saada?

Finnish

Kannattaisitko vai vastustaisitko politiikkaa, jossa metsille tai joille annettaisiin lailliset oikeudet – kuten oikeus olemassaoloon ilman tuhoa tai saastumista?

French

Seriez-vous favorable ou opposé à une politique qui donnerait des droits légaux aux forêts ou aux rivières – comme le droit d'exister sans destruction ou pollution?

Croatian

Biste li podržali ili se protivili politici koja bi dodijelila zakonska prava šumama ili rijekama – poput prava na slobodu bez uništavanja ili zagađenja?

Hungarian

Támogatná vagy ellenezné azt a politikát, amely törvényi jogokat adna az erdőknek vagy folyóknak – például a pusztítástól és szennyezéstől mentes létezéshez való jogot?

Italian

Sarebbe favorevole o contrario a politiche che attribuiscono diritti legali alle foreste o ai fiumi, come il diritto di esistere senza distruzione o inquinamento?

Lithuanian

Ar pritariate politikai, kuri suteiktų įstatymines teises miškams ar upėms, pavyzdžiui, teisę egzistuoti nesunaikinant ar neteršiant?

Latvian

Vai Jūs atbalstītu vai būtu pret politiku, saskaņā ar kuru mežiem un upēm tiktu piešķirtas likumīgas tiesības, piemēram, tiesības eksistēt bez iznīcināšanas vai piesārņošanas?

Dutch

Zou je voor of tegen beleid zijn dat bossen of rivieren wettelijke rechten geeft, zoals het recht om vrij van vernietiging of vervuiling te bestaan?

Polish

Czy poparłbyś lub sprzeciwiłbyś się polityce, która nadawałaby prawa lasom lub rzekom – takie jak prawo do istnienia wolnego od zniszczenia lub zanieczyszczenia?

Portuguese

Diria que apoia ou que se opõe a políticas que concederiam direitos legais às florestas e aos rios – tal como o direito à existência livre de quaisquer destruição ou poluição?

Romanian

Ați sprijini sau v-ați opune unei politici care ar da drepturi legale pădurilor sau râurilor – cum ar fi dreptul de a exista fără a fi distruse sau poluate?

Slovak

Podporili by ste túto politiku alebo by ste boli proti tomu, aby sa poskytli zákonné práva na lesy alebo rieky – ako napríklad právo na existenciu bez ničenia alebo znečistenia?

Slovenian

Bi podprli politiko, ki bi gozdom ali rekam dala zakonske pravice – na primer pravico do obstoja brez uničevanja ali onesnaževanja, ali bi ji nasprotovali?

Swedish

Skulle du stödja eller motsätta dig en politik som skulle ge skogarna eller älvarna juridiska rättigheter – t.ex. rätten att existera utan att förstöras eller förorenas?

