Supplementary Materials I: the empirical literature

Sustainability cannot be separated from individual and social choices related to environmental behaviour. Thus, my analysis will be performed in the context of empirical psychological and anthropological research to seek support for a reliable relationship between religious ethical precepts and environmentally sustainable behaviours. Psychology's contribution relies on its ability to identify both individual motivations that arise from experience and objectives (perhaps supported by incentives) that promote pro-environment behaviour. Psychology also identifies inborn attitudes, such as the common desire to increase consumption. In contrast, anthropology focuses on social values that arise from the interactions between a nation's traditions (including education) and an individual's perceptions. These interactions can also promote environmentally sustainable behaviour despite cultural factors such as the pressure to have a family and thereby increase the population.

In summary, I have assumed that psychology describes universal thought processes that are less strongly affected by cultural prescriptions and proscriptions, and that involve cognition that identifies relationships such as the connection between religious experiences and responses in the form of pro-environmental behaviour. In contrast, anthropology does not assume a distinction between how people think and what they think about. Instead, it identifies regular patterns such as how differences in religious culture can lead differences in a group's behaviours towards their environment.

The empirical literature on psychology has increasingly analysed the relationship between various features of a religion and the resulting pro-environmental behaviours. For example, Zaleha [65] found that veneration of nature in the United States predicted pro-environmental behaviour. Garfield et al. [66] described how a sense of spiritual oneness with God could predict donations to American environmental groups. Clements et al. [67] found Christian pro-environmental attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours in the United States. Gifford and Nilsson [68] reviewed the influences of religions on concerns related to environmental issues and on pro-environmental behaviour, while also reviewing pre-requisites for pro-environmental behaviour such as knowledge, experiences as a child, choices of activities, personality, and perceived control of one's behaviour. Peifer et al. [69] studied the relative impacts of American attendance at religious ceremonies and perceived self-identity and the impacts of belief in an involved God and Biblical literalism on consumption of environmental resources. Arli and Tjiptono [62] compared purchases of green products by Muslim and Christian consumers in Indonesia. Yang and Huang [63] examined the impacts of Chinese religious beliefs on both private and public environmental behaviours.

Other researchers who have studied the relationships between religious ethics and pro-environmental behaviour have examined this problem from an anthropological perspective. The empirical anthropological literature appears to be sceptical about how and whether religion—defined as beliefs, perceptions, and practices related to extraordinary, non-material divine beings or forces—affected perceptions, attitudes, and behaviours related to the environment. For example, Judaism tends to be more concerned than Christianity about the environment, particularly for Judaism's Reformed and Conservative branches. Nonetheless, these attitudes have different impacts that depend on various aspects of religious behaviour (e.g., regular attendance at a synagogue or church, the importance an individual places on religious activities in their daily life) and on environmental attitudes such as support for higher government environmental spending, a willingness to invest personally in activities that protect nature, and the individual's self-reported degree of concern for the environment [70].

Note that the anthropological literature provides some evidence that religions can lead to anti-environmental behaviour. Indeed, anti-environmental behaviour may arise from fatalistic perspectives [71]. For example, an individual who believes in God's sovereignty over nature may believe it is arrogant to think that humans can damage or protect nature. That perspective can lead to inaction or wrong action based on the perception that environmental responses are the consequences of divine favour or disfavour. Individuals with that attitude may be misled to adopt ineffective solutions, such as prayer or waiting passively for the world to end, rather than taking action to solve a problem [72].

Previous authors have emphasized the crucial importance of overpopulation (e.g., [73]) or overconsumption (e.g., [74]). Such authors have been sceptical about the ability of religious institutions to promote greener behaviour by their adherents [75]. They base this scepticism on three observations. First, they note the increasing number of people who claim no affiliation with any religion. Second, they highlight disagreements among religions on many of the points that must be considered to achieve sustainability. For

example, they may condemn greed and destruction of nature, and commend restraint and protection of nature, and they may command adherents to live in harmony with their natural world. They may also promote attitudes that contribute little or nothing to achieving sustainability, such as assuming that any belief that the natural world has value represents idolatry, or believing that prescriptions of justice, compassion, and reciprocity also apply to non-human beings, which represents a rejection of religious distinctions that suggest humans are in any way special. Third, they note that religious institutions change slowly, and may thus be unable to respond to the rapidly progressing environmental crisis.

In other words, these psychological and anthropological papers study the (direct) impacts of religions on observed pro-environmental behaviours. However, religious institutions can (indirectly) affect environmental behaviours by highlighting sacred texts (e.g., Christian leaders' impacts on recycling behaviors; Buddhist monks' effects on recycled garbage) or by introducing new precepts (e.g., Laudato Si by Pope Francis) as well as by relying on existence communities (e.g., donations to protect against biodiversity loss) or by creating new communities (e.g., youth movements to promote environmental literacy and activities).

Table S1 summarises the recent psychological and anthropological literature on direct and indirect impacts of religions on observed pro-environmental behaviours.

Table S1. The recent (2010-2020) empirical literature on factors that support a direct or indirect impact of religious precepts on observed pro-environmental behaviour.

	Psychology suggests a focus on	Anthropology suggests a focus on
direct	Yang and Huang (2018): effects of Christianity on private environmental behaviours in China Arli and Tjiptono (2017): Muslim and Christian intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivations in Indonesia Peifer et al. (2016): attendance at religious ceremonies vs. biblical literalism in US Clements et al. (2014): Christian environmental behavior in US Garfield et al. (2014): spiritual oneness in US Gifford and Nilsson (2014): pre-requisites of environmental behavior (e.g., knowledge, childhood experiences, activity choices, personality, and perceived behavioural control) Zaleha (2013): nature veneration in US	Taylor et al. (2016): synagogue or church attendance and the importance of religion in daily life in US
Indirect	Goldman et al. [76]: impacts of religious youth movements on environmental literacy and pro-environmental activities in Israel Lakhan (2018): during religious speeches support recycling behaviours in Christian ethnic minorities in Canada Clements (2018): religiously framed messages to increase donations to protect against biodiversity loss in US Intahphuak et al. (2017): teaching responsibility by Buddhist monks during religious ceremonies affect separation of recycled garbage in Thailand Clements (2016): messages based on religious messages to promote water conservation in US	Sponsel (2016): protect sacred places

In summary, the present study combines quantitative approaches on pro-environmental behaviors within the same mathematical framework at a country level (similar methodologies are used by other papers, singularly) and it provides insights about impacts of religions on pro-environmental behaviors (similar results are achieved by other papers, separately), by taking an anthropological perspective for direct impacts of religious precepts, to achieve insights on reliability, and by referring to indirect impacts of religious precepts within the psychological literature, to discuss the effectiveness of religious precepts as environmental policies.

Supplementary Materials II: the suggested methodology

Pro-environmental behaviours depend on individual feeling and social identity [45]. As for religions, the main factors determining pro-environmental behaviours are beliefs and communities, where the relative importance of religious communities is different for different religions [61].

Table S2 summarizes some recent empirical papers on the impacts of religious beliefs and/or communities on observed and self-stated pro-environmental behaviour, intention and attitude, by disregarding concern. Note that 2 papers consider both beliefs and community; 6 papers refer to observed pro-environmental behaviours; 1 paper uses longitudinal data.

Table S2. Some recent (2015-2020) empirical papers on factors that support a *direct* impact of religious precepts on observed and self-stated pro-environmental behaviour, intention and attitude. Papers in Table S1 are included in the first column.

	Observed behaviour	Self-stated behaviour	Intention	Attitude
Beliefs or Community	This study: impacts over time of 5 main religious traditions across 180 countries	Boto-Garcia and Bucciol (2020): religious people do not translate environmental concerns into energy saving action in EU countries	Sheng et al. (2019): Chinese cultural values (Doctrine of the Mean) impact on green purchasing in China	Konisky (2018) impacts over time of Jewish and Christian traditions in US
Beliefs	Garfield et al. (2014) Zaleha (2013)	Smith et al. (2017) in US		Village (2015) biblical interpretation, dominion and sacramentalism are uncorrelated with willingness to sacrifice to protect the environment in UK
Community	Yang and Huang (2018) Taylor et al. (2016)		Liao et al. (2018): Confucian culture impacts on food waste in China	
Beliefs and Community	Arli and Tjiptono (2017) Peifer et al. (2016)	Gutsche (2019) regional Christian religiosity impacts on ecological activities and purchases in Germany	Hwang (2017): community-based (Protestants and Catholics) religious groups show a greater intention to pay taxes and to lower their living standard to protect the environment than individual-based (Buddhist) religious groups in South Korea	

In summary, the present study refers to an original panel dataset (to account for dynamics of impacts) at a country level (to account for social interactions and to compare many religions in different contexts by relying on the same control variables) on observed (rather than self-stated) pro-environmental behaviours (to avoid the intention-action and attitude-action gaps) and the religions' majorities (to avoid the identification problems), by combining the most promising methodologies, separately suggested by other papers within the empirical literature. Indeed, papers (e.g., [60, 61]) that used both individual and community variables (i.e., individual religion's affiliation and community religions' percentages), although based on non-observed environmental behaviours, highlighted that impacts of community variables are significant, whereas impacts of individual variables are non-significant. This supports the present study in using an anthropological approach (i.e., social values that arise from the interactions between a nation's traditions and an individual's perceptions) rather than a psychological approach (i.e. individual motivations that arise from experience and objectives). Thus, errors in estimating the direct impacts of religions on pro-environmental behaviours are likely to be larger if self-stated behaviour, intention or attitude are used instead of observed behaviours than if religions' majorities are used instead of individual affiliations, since religions' majorities depict both beliefs and communities. Moreover, the conditions required to apply the representative individual at a country level

(i.e., the national-scale environmental ethics) are satisfied [45]. Finally, linking pro-environmental behaviours to religious precepts is mutuated from papers (e.g., [79, 82]) that used individual variables for non-observed behaviours, by suggesting a greater impact of some pro-environmental precepts in some religions than in other religions (e.g., water conservation in Islam; waste recycling in Buddhism; organic food in Hinduism). Evidently, if national or individual panel data on observed specific pro-environmental behaviours (e.g., water conservation, waste recycling, organic food, energy conservation) become available, the methodology suggested in this paper for generic pro-environmental behaviours could be replicated.

I will conclude this section with four methodological remarks. First, I used the names of the religions to refer to some *main* environmental precepts that can be found in (old) sacred (written) texts, for precepts that can be feasibly accepted by many people to achieve local or global sustainability. I chose these precepts because they were broadly representative of a range of religious precepts and of differences among religions rather than comparing the different schools of thought for each religion or using a wider sample of global religions. In future research, the model I developed could be productively applied to such intra-religion comparisons or to a wider range of world religions. This implies that the exclusion of Christianity, supported by the statistical analysis, amounts to the exclusion of "domination over nature" as a sustainable ethic, but it does not exclude the possibility that Christians could adopt the stewardship precept from Judaism or the frugality precept from Buddhism. Second, precepts in addition to "parsimony" might be found in a further detailed analysis of Islamic sacred texts. Third, the exclusion of oral or written recent precepts avoids comparisons between the many recent oral and written texts (e.g., a comparison of the Catholic Pope's encyclical texts vs. the oral tradition in Voodoo), but this does not exclude the possibility that some current religious institutions can orally teach different sustainability principles, as in the faith-based organisations discussed by Moyer et al. [81]. It also does not exclude the possibility that some current religious institutions can argue in writing for a form of ecology that integrates human and social dimensions, although the reference is to the same *main* sustainability principles discussed in this study (e.g., the Pope's encyclical "Laudato Si", which is discussed by [83]). Fourth, the main insight obtained from the theoretical framework is that the main religious environmental precepts cover all alternative analytical solutions of the inter-temporal sustainability problem: maximising current welfare subject to an inter-temporal constraint on resource uses in Judaism; a minimisation of current resources to achieve a given welfare level subject to an inter-temporal constraint on resource uses in Islam; and an equilibrium use of resources for each generation in Buddhism and Hinduism. However, the empirical methodology I adopted to compare feasibility, consistency, and replicability of these sustainability solutions required that the specified model be validated by using measured variables. Note that the tight consistency between the model I developed and the variables I used made it impossible to test the suggested model using other variables or a different model with the same variables. Instead, the current study found a consistent compromise between the selected variables and the model specifications. For example, the Cobb-Douglass utility function allows calibration of the model by using the percentages of GDP invested in single issues at a national level. Of course, alternative specifications could be adopted if other variables are chosen.

References

65. Zaleha, B.D. "Our only heaven": Nature veneration, quest religion, and pro-environmental behavior. *J. Study Relig. Nat. Cult.* **2013**, *7*, 131–153.

66. Garfield, A.M.; Drwecki, B.B.; Moore, C.F.; Kortenkamp, K.V.; Gracz, M.D. The oneness beliefs scale: Connecting spirituality with pro-environmental behavior. *J. Sci. Study Relig.* **2014**, *53*, 356–372.

67. Clements, J.M.; McCright, A.M.; Xiao, C. Green Christians? An empirical examination of environmental concern within the US general public. *Organ. Environ.* **2014**, *27*, 85–102.

68. Gifford, R.; Nilson, A. Personal and social factors that influence pro-environmental concern and behavior: A review. *Int. J. Psychol.* **2014**, *49*, 131–157.

69. Peifer, J.L.; Khalsa, S.; Howard Ecklund, E. Political conservatism, religion, and the environmental consumption in the United States. *Environ. Politics* **2016**, *25*, 661–689.

70. Taylor, B. The United Nations (via religion and its affiliated agencies) to the rescue in the cause of conservation? *J. Study Relig. Nat. Cult.* **2016**, *10*, 485–499.

71. Taylor, B. Religion to the Rescue (?) in an age of climate disruption. *J. Study Relig. Nat. Cult.* **2015**, *9*, 7–18.

72. Sponsel, L.E. Spiritual ecology, sacred places, and biodiversity conservation. In *Routledge Handbook of Environmental Anthropology*; Kopnina, H., Shoreman-Ouimet, E., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2016; pp. 132–143.

73. Crist, E. Choosing a planet of life. In *A Future Beyond Growth: Towards a Steady State Economy*; Washington, H., Twomey, P., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2016; pp. 43–55.

74. Twomey, P.; Washington, H. Relating the steady state economy to the green, circular and blue economies. In *A Future Beyond Growth: Towards a Steady State Economy*; Washington, H., Twomey, P., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2016; pp. 129–145.

75. Taylor, B.; Van Wieren, G.; Zaleha, B. The greening of religion hypothesis (part two): Assessing the data from Lynn White, Jr, to Pope Francis. *J. Study Relig. Nat. Cult.* **2016**, *10*, 306–378.

76. Goldman, D.; Pe'er, S.; Yavetz, B. Sociocultural anchors for incorporating sustainability in youth movements: Comparisons among secular, religious, and ultraorthodox movements. *J. Environ. Educ.* **2019**, 1–17, doi:10.1080/00958964.2019.1646203.

77. Boto-Garcia, D.; Bucciol, A. Climate change: Personal responsibility and energy saving. *Ecol. Econ.* **2020**, *169*, 106530.

78. Sheng, G.; Xie, F.; Gong, S.; Pan, H. The role of cultural values in green purchasing intention: Empirical evidence from Chinese consumers. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2019**, *43*, 315–326.

79. Smith, E.K.; Hempel, L.M.; MacIlroy, K. What's "evangelical" got to do with it? Disentangling the impact of evangelical Protestantism on environmental outcomes. *Environ. Politics* **2017**, *27*, 292–319.

80. Liao, C.; Hong, J.; Zhao, D.; Zhang, S.; Chen, C. Confucian culture as determinants of consumers' food leftover generation: Evidence from Chengdu, China. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2018**, *25*, 14919–14933.

81. Moyer, J.M.; Sinclair, A.J.; Diduck, A.P. Learning for sustainability among faith-based organisations in Kenya. *Environ. Manag.* **2014**, *54*, 360–372.

82. Village, A. Was white right? Biblical interpretation, theological stance and environmental attitudes among a sample of UK churchgoers. *J. Empir. Theol.* **2015**, *28*, 23–48.

83. Zsolnai, L. Frugality and the intrinsic value of nature. *Integral Ecol. Sustain. Bus.* **2017**, *26*, 67–76.

Supplementary Materials III: the applied datasets

Table S3. Per capita GDP (purchasing power parity basis, PPP) and population in 2012 were obtained from the World Bank's world development indicators database (http://data.worldbank.org). The per capita use of the environment for representative individuals in these countries (the ecological footprint, *EF*) was obtained from the Global Footprint Network (http://www.footprintnetwork.org). Religions (HIN/BUD, Hinduism or Buddhism; ISL, Islam; JUD, Judaism) that accounted for more than 50% of a country's population are designated "1"; those that accounted for less than 50% are designated "0". If the agriculture sector accounted for more than 16% of GDP, a country was defined as pre-industrial; if the industry sector accounted for more than 32% of GDP, the country was defined as industrial; and if the service sector accounted for more than 64% of GDP, the country was defined as post-industrial.

	Pre-industrial	Industrial	Post-industrial	JUD	ISL	HIN/BUD	GDP (PPP) in 2012	EF in 2012	Population in 2012
Afghanistan	1			0	1	0	1 899	0.8	29 726 803
Albania	1			0	1	0	9 791	2.2	2 900 489
Algeria		1		0	1	0	13 196	2.1	37 439 427
Azerbaijan		1		0	1	0	15 888	2.3	9 295 784
Bangladesh	1			0	1	0	2 715	0.7	155 257 387
Bhutan		1		0	0	1	7 120	4.8	743 711
Bosnia & Erzegovina			1	0	1	0	9 344	3.1	3 828 419
Burkina Faso	1			0	1	0	1 520	1.2	16 590 813
Cambodia	1			0	0	1	2 795	1.2	14 832 255
Chad	1			0	1	0	1 961	1.5	12 715 465
China		1		0	0	1	11 017	3.4	1 350 695 000
Comoros				0	1	0	1 355	1	733 661
Egypt		1		0	1	0	10 067	2.2	85 660 902
Eritrea				0	1	0	566	0.4	4 892 233
Gambia	1			0	1	0	1 570	1	1 807 108
Ghana	1			0	1	0	3 659	2	25 544 565
Guinea		1		0	1	0	1 197	1.4	11 628 767
Guinea-Bissau	1			0	1	0	1 349	1.5	1 714 620

	Pre-industrial	Industrial	Post-industrial	CHR	GDP (PPP) in 2012	EF in 2012	Population in 2012
India	1	0	0	1	4 861	1.2	1 263 589 639
Indonesia	1	0	1	0	9 283	1.6	248 037 853
Iran	1	0	1	0	16 549	2.8	76 156 975
Iraq		0	1	0	14 624	1.9	32 780 975
Israel		1	0	0	30 879	6.2	7 910 500
Japan		1	0	0	34 988	5	127 561 489
Jordan		1	0	1	0	11 340	2.1	6 318 000
Kyrgyz Republic		0	1	0	2 870	1.9	5 607 200
Lao PDR	1	0	0	1	4 498	1.2	6 473 050
Lebanon		1	0	1	0	16 574	3.8	4 440 728
Libya		0	1	0	22 560	3.7	6 283 403
Macedonia		1	0	1	0	11 569	3.3	2 069 270
Malaysia	1	0	1	0	22 706	3.7	29 021 940
Mali	1	0	1	0	1 484	1.5	16 112 333
Mauritania	1	0	1	0	3 488	2.5	3 777 067
Morocco	1	0	1	0	6 854	1.7	32 984 190
Niger		0	1	0	867	1.6	17 635 782
Nigeria	1	0	1	0	5 310	1.2	168 240 403
Oman	1	0	1	0	41 186	7.5	3 545 192
Pakistan	1	0	1	0	4 380	0.8	177 392 252
Senegal	1	0	1	0	2 184	1.2	13 780 108
Sierra Leone	1	0	1	0	1 550	1.2	6 043 157
Sri Lanka	1	0	0	1	9 981	1.3	20 424 000
Syria		0	1	0	5 436	1.5	21 427 155
Tajikistan	1	0	1	0	2 343	0.9	7 930 929
Thailand	1	0	0	1	14 597	2.7	67 164 130
Tunisia	1	0	1	0	10 535	2.3	10 777 500
Turkey	1	0	1	0	18 032	3.3	74 099 255
Turkmenistan		0	1	0	12 460	5.5	5 172 941
Uzbekistan	1	0	1	0	4 705	2.3	29 774 500
Yemen	1	0	1	0	3 609	1	24 882 792

Table S4. Per capita GDP (purchasing power parity basis, PPP) and population in 2012 were obtained from the World Bank's world development indicators database (http://data.worldbank.org). The per capita use of the environment for representative individuals in these countries (the ecological footprint, *EF*) was obtained from the Global Footprint Network (http://www.footprintnetwork.org). Religion: CHR, Christian. Sectors that accounted for more than 50% of GDP are designated "1"; those that accounted for less than 50% are designated "0". If the agriculture sector accounted for more than 16% of GDP, a country was defined as pre-industrial; if the industry sector accounted for more than 32% of GDP, the country was defined as industrial; and if the service sector accounted for more than 64% of GDP, the country was defined as post-industrial.

	Pre-industrial	Industrial	Post-industrial	CHR	GDP (PPP) in 2012	EF in 2012	Population in 2012
Argentina			1	1	12 034	3.1	42 095 224
Armenia	1			1	7 268	2.2	2 978 339
Australia			1	1	42 541	9.3	22 728 254
Austria			1	1	44 154	6.1	8 429 991
Belarus		1		1	16 907	5.1	9 464 000
Belgium			1	1	40 625	7.4	11 128 246
Benin	1			0	1 794	1.4	10 049 792
Bolivia		1		1	5 793	3	10 238 762

Country							
Botswana		1		1	14 004	3.8	2 132 822
Brazil			1	1	14 970	3.1	202 401 584
Bulgaria			1	1	15 731	3.3	7 305 888
Burundi	1			1	717	0.8	10 124 572
Cameroon	1			1	2 666	1.2	21 659 488
Canada			1	1	41 868	8.2	34 751 476
Central African Republic	1			1	913	1.2	4 619 500
Chile		1		1	21 142	4.4	17 388 437
Colombia		1		1	11 840	1.9	46 881 018
Congo		1		1	641	1.3	70 291 160
Congo Democratic Republic of	1			1	5 698	0.8	4 286 188
Costa Rica			1	1	13 589	2.8	4 654 148
Côte d'Ivoire				0	2 753	1.3	21 102 641
Croatia			1	1	20 183	3.9	4 267 558
Cuba			1	1	19 462	2	11 342 631
Cyprus			1	1	31 710	4.2	1 129 303
Czech Republic		1		1	28 307	5.2	10 510 785
Denmark			1	1	42 869	5.5	5 591 572
Dominican Republic			1	1	11 528	1.5	10 155 036
Ecuador		1		1	10 322	2.2	15 419 493
El Salvador			1	1	7 718	2.1	6 072 233
Estonia			1	1	25 287	6.9	1 322 696
Ethiopia	1			1	1 234	1.1	92 191 211
Fiji			1	1	7 550	2.9	874 158
Finland			1	1	39 489	5.9	5 413 971
France			1	1	37 224	5.1	65 639 975
Georgia			1	1	7 869	1.6	3 825 000
Germany			1	1	43 035	5.3	80 425 823
Greece		1		1	24 816	4.4	11 045 011
Guatemala			1	1	6 855	1.9	15 368 759
Guyana	1			1	6 349	3.1	758 410
Haiti				1	1 585	0.6	10 288 828
Honduras	1			1	4 548	1.7	7 736 131
Hungary			1	1	22 337	2.9	9 920 362
Ireland			1	1	45 642	5.6	4 586 897
Italy			1	1	34 796	4.6	59 539 717
Jamaica			1	1	8 405	1.9	2 707 805
Kenya	1			1	2 670	1.1	42 542 978
Korea Republic of		1		0	31 901	5.7	50 004 441
Latvia			1	1	20 482	6.3	2 034 319
Lesotho		1		1	2 384	1.7	2 057 331
Liberia	1			1	770	1.2	4 190 155
Lithuania			1	1	23 722	5.8	2 987 773
Luxembourg			1	1	88 159	15.8	530 946
Madagascar	1			0	1 374	1	22 293 720
Malawi	1			1	750	0.8	15 700 436
Mauritius			1	0	16 651	3.5	1 255 882
Mexico		1		1	16 136	2.9	122 070 963

Country							
Moldova			1	1	4 151	1.8	3 559 519
Mongolia		1		0	9 809	6.1	2 808 339
Montenegro			1	1	13 817	3.8	620 601
Mozambique	1			1	992	0.9	25 732 928
Nepal	1			0	2 115	1	27 500 515
Netherlands			1	0	45 728	5.3	16 754 962
New Zealand			1	0	32 806	5.6	4 408 100
Nicaragua	1			1	4 388	1.4	5 877 034
Norway		1		1	63 620	5	5 018 573
Panama			1	1	17 903	2.8	3 743 761
Papua New Guinea				1	2 480	1.9	7 154 870
Paraguay	1			1	7 312	4.2	6 379 162
Peru		1		1	10 851	2.3	30 158 768
Philippines		1		1	6 042	1.1	96 017 322
Poland		1		1	22 872	4.4	38 063 164
Portugal			1	1	25 953	3.9	10 514 844
Romania		1		1	17 817	2.7	20 058 035
Russia		1		1	23 299	5.7	143 201 676
Rwanda	1			1	1 483	0.9	10 817 350
Serbia		1		1	12 505	2.7	7 199 077
Singapore			1	0	75 630	8	5 312 437
Slovakia		1		1	25 507	4.1	5 407 579
Slovenia			1	1	27 680	5.8	2 057 159
South Africa			1	1	12 375	3.3	52 341 695
Spain			1	1	31 657	3.7	46 773 055
Sweden			1	1	43 263	7.3	9 519 374
Switzerland			1	1	54 582	5.8	7 996 861
Tanzania	1			1	2 248	1.3	48 645 709
Timor-Leste	1			0	2 038	0.5	1 148 958
Togo	1			0	1 294	1.1	6 745 581
Trinidad & Tobago		1		1	30 019	7.9	1 341 579
Uganda	1			1	1 666	1.2	35 400 620
Ukraine			1	1	8 319	2.8	45 593 300
United Kingdom			1	1	36 765	4.9	63 700 300
United States of America			1	1	50 549	8.2	314 112 078
Uruguay			1	1	18 439	2.9	3 396 753
Venezuela		1		1	17 702	3.6	29 854 238
Vietnam	1			0	4 910	1.7	88 809 200
Zambia	1			1	3 501	1.1	14 786 581
Zimbabwe			1	1	1 649	1.4	14 565 482