



Opportunities for Bipartisan Consensus - 2007

What Both Republicans and Democrats
Want in US Foreign Policy

January 2007

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

STEVEN KULL

RESEARCH STAFF

CLAY RAMSAY

STEPHEN WEBER

EVAN LEWIS

MARY SPECK

MELANIE CIOLEK

MELINDA BROUWER

WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG IS A PROJECT OF
THE PROGRAM ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY ATTITUDES

PIPA Board of Advisors

I.M. Destler
University of Maryland

Catherine Kelleher
US Naval War College

Fred Steeper
Market Strategies

Gloria Duffy
Commonwealth Club

Anthony Lake
Georgetown University

Daniel Yankelovich
Public Agenda Foundation

Bill Frenzel
Brookings Institution

Benjamin Page
Northwestern University

Alan Kay
Americans Talk
Issues Foundation

Robert Shapiro
Columbia University

The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) is a joint program of the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland and the Center on Policy Attitudes. PIPA undertakes research on American attitudes in both the public and in the policymaking community toward a variety of international and foreign policy issues. It seeks to disseminate its findings to members of government, the press, and the public as well as academia.

WorldPublicOpinion.org is an online publication devoted to increasing understanding of public opinion in nations around the world and to elucidate the global patterns of world public opinion. It conducts its own studies of public opinion on international issues as well as analyzing and integrating polls from other organizations around the world. It is published by the staff of the Program on International Policy Attitudes.

Knowledge Networks is a polling, social science, and market research firm based in Menlo Park, California. Knowledge Networks uses a large-scale nationwide research panel which is randomly selected from the national population of households having telephones and is subsequently provided Internet access for the completion of surveys (and thus is not limited to those who already have Internet access).

The Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM), at the University of Maryland's School for Public Policy, pursues policy-oriented scholarship on major issues facing the United States in the global arena. Using its research, forums, and publications, CISSM links the University and the policy community to improve communication between scholars and practitioners.

Steven Kull, Clay Ramsay, Evan Lewis, Mary Speck, Stephen Weber, Melanie Ciolek, and Melinda Brouwer designed the questionnaires and wrote the analysis.

Abe Medoff and Melanie Ciolek managed the production of the report, with contributions from Mari Inoue.

PIPA and WorldPublicOpinion.org receive support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, the JEHT Foundation, and the Circle Foundation.

INTRODUCTION

Entering 2007, President Bush and Democratic leaders in the newly-elected US Congress have promised to try to work together in a bipartisan manner. But most observers are bracing for battles between Democratic and Republican lawmakers over contentious questions such as the conduct of the war in Iraq, the best way to contain Iran's nuclear ambitions and how to deal with the North Korean nuclear threat.

It is widely assumed that partisan differences within the government reflect deep divisions in the American public. But is this necessarily the case?

To find out, WorldPublicOpinion.org conducted a study of US public opinion on international issues, looking for areas of agreement among Republicans and Democrats. This included a new WorldPublicOpinion.org/Knowledge Networks poll (WPO/KN), as well as an analysis of numerous other polls conducted over the last year and a half.

The new WPO/KN poll was conducted December 6-11, 2006 with a nationwide sample of 1,004 Americans. As each question was administered to three-quarters of the sample, the margin of error was +/- 3.8 percent. The poll was designed by the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland and fielded by Knowledge Networks, using its nationwide panel, which is randomly selected from the entire adult population and subsequently provided internet access. For more information about this methodology, go to www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp. The questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/jan07/Bipartisan_Jan07_quaire.pdf

Other polls included in the analysis were:

- A poll of 1,227 American adults by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA), fielded by Knowledge Networks between June 23 and July 9, 2006 (margin of error +/-3%). Full text can be found at <http://www.thechicagocouncil.org/UserFiles/File/2006%20Comparative%20Topline.pdf>.
- Public Agenda's Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index, a poll of 1,001 American adults over September 5-18, 2006 (margin of error +/-3.2%). Full text can be found at http://www.publicagenda.org/foreignpolicy/pdfs/foreign_policy_index_fall06.pdf.
- A poll of 1,326 American adults for WorldPublicOpinion.org, conducted by PIPA and fielded by Knowledge Networks over November 21-29, 2006 (margin of error +/-2.9%; 3.8% for half-sampled questions). The full questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/dec06/USIntlStrategy_Dec06_quaire.pdf.
- A poll of 1,058 American adults for WorldPublicOpinion.org, conducted by PIPA and fielded by Knowledge Networks over October 6-15, 2006 (margin of error +/-3.1%). The full questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/oct06/SecurityFP_Oct06_quaire.pdf
- A poll of 1,059 American adults for WorldPublicOpinion.org, conducted by PIPA and fielded by Knowledge Networks from June 27 to July 2, 2006, (margin of error of +/- 3.1-4.3%)

depending on the sample size for each question). The full questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/jul06/TerrSuspect_Jul06_quaire.pdf.

- A poll of 1,023 American adults for WorldPublicOpinion.org, conducted by PIPA and fielded by Knowledge Networks over April 18-24 (margin of error +/-3.1). The full questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/may06/Tribunals_May06_quaire.pdf.
- A poll of 851 American adults for WorldPublicOpinion.org, conducted by PIPA and fielded by Knowledge Networks over March 1-6, 2006 (margin of error +/-3.4%). The full questionnaire can be found at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/mar06/USIraq_Mar06-quaire.pdf.

The following areas of consensus were found. In nearly every case a clear majority of both parties favored the position. In a few cases, only a plurality in one of the parties favored the policy or one of the parties was divided, with nearly half in favor.

MAKING FOREIGN POLICY

- Pursue a bipartisan approach in developing a US foreign policy that reflects the preferences of the public as a whole

US ROLE IN THE WORLD

- Stay engaged internationally
- Pursue a less domineering, more cooperative approach
- Put less emphasis on military methods, more on diplomacy and soft power
- Put more emphasis on cooperative approaches in dealing with terrorism
- Build goodwill toward the US
- Do not call for regime change in problem countries
- Do not try to impose democracy
- Pursue what is best for the world, not just for the United States

THE USE OF US MILITARY FORCE

- Be ready to use US military force to deal with a humanitarian crisis, especially to stop genocide, but not to install democracy
- Only use nuclear weapons in response to a nuclear attack

SPENDING PRIORITIES

- Do not increase defense spending
- Redistribute the foreign policy budget away from military spending

WMD PROLIFERATION

- Make preventing the spread of nuclear weapons a top foreign policy goal
- Raise the priority of securing nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union

- Maintain membership in the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and work toward the goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons
- Do not develop new types of nuclear weapons
- Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- Participate in the Biological Weapons Convention
- Seek to prevent non-nuclear weapon states from developing nuclear fuel
- Create a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Middle East

MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS

- Put more emphasis on working through the United Nations
- Strengthen the United Nations
- Have international courts and tribunals judge compliance with international treaties

HUMAN RIGHTS

- Participate in international agreements on the treatment of detainees and comply with UN Commission judgments about US detainee treatment
- Participate in and comply with treaties against torture, without making exceptions for the war on terrorism
- Have an international body judge compliance with human rights treaties without claiming a special exception for the United States

ENVIRONMENT

- Reduce US Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Join the Kyoto Treaty
- Pass the McCain-Lieberman Legislation
- Sharply Increase Spending on Energy Conservation and Alternative Fuels Research

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

- Work toward lowering trade barriers while also pursuing more trade adjustment assistance to help American workers adapt
- Include requirements for minimum labor and environmental standards in trade agreements
- Comply with adverse WTO decisions
- Do not enter into free trade agreements with China, India, and South Korea

REGIONAL ISSUES

IRAQ

- Substantially reduce the number of US troops in Iraq by early 2008
- Respect the wishes of the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people
- Clearly state that the United States does not plan to establish permanent bases in Iraq
- Talk with Iran and Syria
- Hold a major international conference on Iraq
- Do not interfere with amnesty proposals made by the Iraq government

- Work through the United Nations

IRAN

- Deal with Iran by trying to build better relations not by threatening military action
- Pressure Iran to stop enriching uranium through diplomacy or economic sanctions; do not launch military strikes against Iran's nuclear facilities
- Be willing to make a deal wherein Iran is allowed to enrich uranium to the low levels necessary for producing nuclear energy provided UN inspectors are allowed full access to verify that these levels are not exceeded

NORTH KOREA

- Be willing to enter into a non-aggression pact with North Korea and provide more aid to North Korea if it agrees to eliminate its nuclear weapons

ISRAEL-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

- Be even-handed when dealing with the Israel-Palestinian conflict

DARFUR

- Contribute US troops to an international peacekeeping force in Darfur

CHINA AND INDIA

- Work together with China and India to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, raise the standard of living in Asian countries, reduce competition over vital resources like energy and gas, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions


Funding for this research was provided by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Ford Foundation.

FINDINGS


MAKING FOREIGN POLICY

Pursue a bipartisan approach in developing a US foreign policy that reflects the preferences of the public as a whole.

Overwhelming majorities of Republicans and Democrats want their parties to work together on international affairs. In a poll by WorldPublicOpinion.org/Knowledge Networks (WPO/KN) taken in October 2006, respondents were given two options for how foreign policy could be developed. Only 7 percent chose the position that Democratic and Republican members of Congress should “fight for what they think is best and see which side prevails.” Nine out of ten Republicans (90%) and Democrats (93%) chose instead the position that “when it comes to developing foreign policy in Congress, the way to find the best foreign policy is for the Democrats and the Republicans to cooperate and try to find common ground that incorporates elements from both sides.”



Perhaps most telling, both Republicans and Democrats do not want to see the views of their party dominate policy. The October WPO/KN poll asked, “Which of the following would you prefer to have the most influence on US foreign policy: the majority of Republicans, the majority of Democrats, or the majority of the American public as a whole?” Three out of five Republicans (59%) and three out of four Democrats (76%) thought the majority of Americans as a whole should have the most influence. Only 20 percent of Democrats chose the majority of Democrats, and only 38 percent of Republicans chose the majority of Republicans, as the group they wanted to have most influence.



Most members of both parties believe that the American public is less partisan than Congress. Less than a third of Republicans (28%) and Democrats (27%) thought that “the partisan conflict in Congress is a good mirror of the attitudes of the American public. Instead, two-thirds (65%

Republicans, 68% Democrats) agreed that “the American public was fairly reasonable and if they had more influence, members of Congress would be more cooperative.”


US ROLE IN THE WORLD

Stay engaged internationally


Majorities in both parties have believed for decades that the United States should play an active role in world affairs. In a July 2006 poll by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, strong majorities of both Republicans (75%) and Democrats (68%) shared this view. Only 22 percent of Republicans and 30 percent of Democrats said the United States should “stay out” of world affairs. There is no sign that the U.S. public’s frustration with the war in Iraq has generated isolationist sentiments in either party.

Pursue a less domineering, more cooperative approach

Citizens of both parties want the United States to play a less dominant and hegemonic role in the world. The July Chicago Council poll asked respondents whether they thought “the US is playing the role of world policeman more than it should be.” Eighty-five percent of Democrats and 66 percent of Republicans said that it was. Only 31 percent of Republicans and 14 percent of Democrats disagreed. This view has remained fairly constant in recent years. In July 2004, the Chicago Council poll also found that 72 percent of Republicans and 86 percent of Democrats said they thought that the United States was too often playing the role of world policeman.



The clearest indication that Americans prefer a more cooperative approach to international affairs comes from a question in the October WPO/KN poll that asked which of three positions they would like their Congressional candidates to take on foreign policy: 1) “as the sole remaining superpower, the US should be the preeminent leader in solving world problems;” 2) “the US should do its share in efforts to solve international problems with other countries;” and, 3) “the US should withdraw from most efforts to solve




international problems.” Only 16 percent of Republicans and 5 percent of Democrats preferred the first, “preeminent leader,” approach. The third was also unpopular: only 11 percent of Republicans and 18 percent of Democrats favored an isolationist position. Instead, overwhelming majorities of both Republicans and Democrats chose the second position: 72 percent of Republicans and 77 percent of Democrats favored the more multilateralist position that the United States should work with other countries to solve problems.

Cooperation to address problems of the environment and disease gets overwhelming support. In a September 2006 Public Agenda poll, 95 percent of both Republican and Democrat respondents said that “cooperating with other countries on problems like the environment and control of diseases” was very or somewhat important.


Strong majorities in both parties also reject the idea that the United States should decide its own course, without paying much attention to the wishes of other countries. In October 2006 WPO/KN poll, six in

ten Republicans (62%) and eight in ten Democrats (81%) disagreed with the idea that “since the US is the most powerful nation in the world, we should go our own way in international matters, not worrying too much about whether other countries agree with us or not.”




Put less emphasis on military methods, more on diplomacy and soft power

When it comes to fighting terrorism, both Democrats and Republicans want the United States to rely less on military methods to fight terrorism. In the October 2006 WPO/KN poll, a very strong majority of Democrats (77%) and a smaller majority of Republicans (52%) said that “in the effort to fight terrorism, in the future, compared to what it has been doing, the Bush administration should put more emphasis on diplomatic and economic methods.” Only 19 percent of Democrats wanted the administration to “put more emphasis on military methods,” while 44 percent of Republicans preferred this view.



Americans of both parties also agreed that the difficulties the United States has faced in Iraq demonstrate the limits of a military approach towards dealing with “rogue states.” In the July Chicago Council poll, 75 percent of Democrats and 55 percent of Republicans said they agreed with the view that “the experience of the Iraq war should make nations more cautious about using military force to deal with rogue states.” A November WPO/KN poll found that overall 61 percent of respondents, including a majority of Democrats (61%) and a plurality of Republicans (49%), believed that the invasion of Iraq had made Iran “more likely to make weapons of mass destruction to deter the US from attacking.” This view has changed since an April 2003 PIPA poll found that 68 percent believed the invasion had made Iran “less likely to make weapons of mass destruction because it is more afraid that the US will attack.”

In various questions, respondents showed that they wanted the United States to pursue diplomatic approaches. Large majorities of Republicans and Democrats rejected the policy of isolating problem countries. Instead, majorities wanted the United States to be willing to negotiate. In the November WPO/KN poll, respondents were told, “there are debates about whether the US should have diplomatic talks with countries that are doing things that the US opposes” and offered two arguments: 1) that it is better not talk to such countries but “isolate them so as to pressure them to change their behavior,” and, 2) that it is better to talk to such countries because “isolating them often provokes them to increase the behavior the US opposes.” A very large 89 percent of Democrats and 71 percent of Republicans, favored the second position, that the United States should be willing to talk.




The poll also presented a second set of arguments about the same issue: 1) It is better not to talk to problem countries “because talking to them gives them recognition and effectively rewards their bad behavior,” and, 2) It is better to talk because “communication increases the chance of finding a mutually agreeable solution.” Again, overwhelming majorities of Republicans (79%) and Democrats (91%) preferred the position that it was better to talk.

Majorities of both Republicans and Democrats also agreed that US foreign policy should place higher priority on soft power approaches. In the WPO/KN October 2006 poll, majorities of both Republicans (56%) and Democrats (61%) believed the United States should put more emphasis on working to stabilize “countries at risk of conflict by helping them develop economically.” A large

majority of Democrats (80%) and a smaller majority of Republicans (52%) also said that a higher priority should be given to “fighting the global spread of HIV/AIDS.”

Put more emphasis on cooperative approaches in dealing with terrorism

The October 2006 WPO/KN poll asked, “Which is the most important lesson of September 11 for the US?” that the United States needs to “work more closely with other countries to fight terrorism” or that “the US needs to act on its own more to fight terrorism.” Seventy percent of Republicans and 79 percent of Democrats chose the position that the United States needs to pursue a more cooperative approach. Only 27 percent of Republicans and 17 percent of Democrats believed the lesson of 9/11 was that the United States needed to act on its own more.




Americans agree overwhelmingly that the United States’ battle against terrorism should be multilateral. The October WPO/KN poll asked about specific approaches to combat terrorism and found that large majorities favored cooperative efforts. Eighty-nine percent of Republicans and 86 percent of Democrats favored putting greater emphasis on “coordinating with intelligence and law enforcement agencies of other countries to track and capture members of terrorist groups.” Sixty-one percent of Republicans and 81 percent of Democrats favored putting a higher priority on “work[ing] through the UN to strengthen and enforce International laws against terrorism.” In the same poll, a near-unanimous 96 percent of Republicans and 94 percent of Democrats said that it was important “for the struggle against terrorism to be seen by the world as an effort of many countries working together, not just a US effort.”

Build goodwill toward the US

A central soft power approach that Americans endorse is building goodwill toward the United States abroad. Both Democrats and Republicans believe that such international goodwill is important. In the October WPO/KN poll, 91 percent of Democrats and 84 percent of Republicans said it was very or somewhat important “for people in other countries to feel goodwill toward the US.” Only 16 percent of Republicans and 8 percent of Democrats said it was not very or not at all important.


Americans overwhelmingly link the United States’ national security and international goodwill. The September 2006 Public Agenda poll asked, “How important to our national security is it that the rest of the world sees the United States positively?” Ninety percent of Democrats and 82 percent of Republicans said it was very or somewhat important; only 6 percent of Democrats and 17 percent of Republicans said it was not important.



Majorities of Democrats and Republicans think the Bush

Administration’s foreign policy has decreased goodwill toward the United States. Asked in the October WPO/KN poll whether they thought “the way the US has been conducting US foreign policy has, on balance, increased or decreased goodwill toward the US,” nearly nine in ten Democrats and (89%) nearly two-thirds of Republicans (64%) said it had decreased goodwill. Just 8 percent of Democrats and 31 percent of Republicans said it had increased goodwill.

Clear majorities of both Republicans and Democrats agreed that a greater effort should be made to provide the humanitarian assistance likely to increase goodwill towards the United States. In the October WPO/KN poll, 65 percent of Democrats and 51 percent of Republicans believed that more emphasis should be placed on “building goodwill toward the US by providing food and medical assistance to people in poor countries.” Public Agenda also found in September that nearly all Republicans (95%) and Democrats (94%) felt “assisting countries in developing clean water supplies” was important.



Americans also agree that it is important to promote understanding of the United States. In the October WPO/KN poll, Republicans (58%) and Democrats (61%) supported placing a higher priority on programs “to increase other countries’ understanding of US policies and the American people.”

Do not call for regime change in problem countries

Large majorities in both parties also agree that, as a general rule, the United States should not say publicly that it wants regime change in countries whose leaders' behavior is seen as hostile to US interests. In the November 2006 WPO/KN poll, respondents were presented the debate on this issue (see box). Sixty-seven percent of Republicans and 78 percent of Democrats thought it was a bad idea for the United States to announce the goal of regime change.

Do not try to impose democracy

There is wide bipartisan opposition to trying to impose democracy through military action. The July Chicago Council poll found that 69 percent of Democrats and 65 percent of Republicans opposed "the use of US troops to install democratic governments in states where dictators rule."


Majorities in both parties express skepticism that the United States can do very much to further democratic change in other countries. The September Public Agenda poll allowed respondents to choose between two views: "democracy is something that countries only come to on their own when they're ready for it" and the "US can effectively help other countries become more democratic." A strong majority of Democrats (70%) and a slim majority of Republicans (52%) chose the more skeptical view, 46 percent of Republicans 25 percent of Democrats were more optimistic.

The difference between the two parties on the question of democracy promotion abroad is almost certainly driven, at least in part, by respondents' support for or opposition to the war in Iraq. Nonetheless, majorities in both parties share some skepticism about the United States' ability to foster democratic change abroad.

Announcing Goal of Regime Change

Currently there is a debate about whether the US government should announce that it has the goal of removing the existing government of another country that it sees as a problem, such as the government of Iran. Some people say that this is a good idea because it creates moral clarity and strengthens opposition to the government both inside and outside that country. Others say it is a bad idea because it violates the principle of national sovereignty and when countries feel threatened they are less cooperative and more likely to use dangerous means to protect themselves. Do you think announcing that the US has the goal of removing an existing government that it sees as a problem, is

A good idea



A bad idea



WPO/KN 11/06


Democracy Promotion

Do you think that the U.S. can effectively help other countries become more democratic or is democracy something that countries only come to on their own when they're ready for it?

Democracy is something that countries only come to when ready



The U.S. can help other countries become democracies



Public Agenda, 9/06

Pursue what is best for the world, not just for the United States

There is a strong consensus among both Democrats and Republicans that the United States should generally pursue a foreign policy guided by what is best for the world, not just for the United States. Given two options in the October WPO/KN poll, 84 percent of Democrats and 75 percent of Republicans wanted the United States to “coordinate its power together with other countries according to shared ideas of what is best for the world as a whole.” Only 22 percent of Republicans and 13 percent of Democrats chose the alternative: “the US should use its power to make the world be the way that best serves US interests and values.”

Consistent with this view, very large majorities in both parties feel the United States should be willing to sacrifice for the good of the global community. The October WPO/KN poll presented respondents with two statements: “sometimes the US should be willing to make some sacrifices if this will help the world as a whole” and “the US should not make sacrifices in an effort to help the world as a whole.” More than seven in ten Republicans (77%) and Democrats (74%) believed that the United States should be willing to make such sacrifices. Only 20 percent of Republicans and 22 percent of Democrats thought it should not.

THE USE OF US MILITARY FORCE**Be ready to use US military force to deal with a humanitarian crisis, especially to stop genocide, but not to install democracy**

Strong majorities of both Republicans and Democrats favor using US troops to address humanitarian crises, especially genocide. The July Chicago Council poll suggested a number of possible uses of US troops, including to “deal with humanitarian crises” (favored by 65% of Republicans and 67% of Democrats) and “to stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people” (74% of Republicans and 72% of Democrats). The strong public support for intervening to stop genocide also shows up in questions about whether the United States should contribute troops to a peacekeeping force for Darfur, discussed below.

However, majorities of Republicans and Democrats firmly reject the use of US troops to replace dictatorships with democracy. The July Chicago Council poll found that 65 percent of Republicans and 69 percent of Democrats opposed the use of US troops “to install democratic governments in states where dictators rule.”

Only use nuclear weapons in response to a nuclear attack

There is a fairly strong consensus among Republicans and Democrats that the United States should never use nuclear weapons in a first strike. In the July Chicago Council poll, which presented three options, only 30 percent of Republicans and 14 percent of Democrats agreed that “in certain circumstances, the US should use nuclear weapons even if it has not suffered a nuclear attack.” The most common view, held by majorities of Republicans (57%) and Democrats (61%) was “the US should only use nuclear weapons in response to a nuclear attack.” The position that the United States should never use nuclear weapons was endorsed by 11 percent of Republicans and 25 percent of Democrats.

SPENDING PRIORITIES

Do not increase defense spending

A majority of both Republicans and Democrats oppose increasing the US defense budget. In the December WPO/KN poll, 61 percent of Republicans and 72 percent of Democrats said that the United States should either maintain spending at present levels or cut it back. Only 39 percent of Republicans and 12 percent of Democrats favored increased spending on defense. A February 2006 Gallup poll got similar results: 68 percent of Republicans and 74 percent of Democrats said either that the United States was spending about the right amount on the military or that it was spending too much.

Redistribute the foreign policy budget away from military spending

When presented the foreign policy budget Republicans and Democrats redistribute it dramatically. Majorities in both parties cut military spending deeply and increase spending on soft power and other nonmilitary foreign policy methods.

In the October WPO/KN poll, respondents were presented with a foreign policy budget that was broken into 15 line items, which they were given the opportunity to adjust. Majorities of Republicans and Democrats significantly reduced spending on defense and redistributed those funds to numerous non-military programs. Sixty-one percent of Republicans and 85 percent of Democrats chose to decrease defense spending. Overall the average allocation for defense spending represented a decrease of \$110 billion among Republicans and \$264 billion among Democrats.

Majorities of Republicans (53%) and Democrats (51%) also cut military aid to other countries. But overall average net spending on these items went up because those who increased foreign military aid did so quite a bit, especially Democrats. Majorities of Republicans (53%) and Democrats (55%) chose to cut spending for reconstruction in Iraq. Among Republicans the net average amount allocated for reconstruction remained unchanged, however, and among Democrats the average amount increased.

There was strong consensus in favor of spending increases in several areas. Sixty-seven percent of Republicans wanted to see spending increase on preparedness for disasters and outbreaks of disease in the United States (overall a net average increase of \$25 billion) as did 82 percent of Democrats (net average increase of \$54 billion). Sixty-two percent of Republicans thought spending on energy conservation and the development of renewable resources should go up, as did 82 percent of Democrats (for net average increases of \$22 billion and \$53 billion respectively). Fifty-eight percent of Republicans and 69 percent of Democrats wanted more funds for programs to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons (for net increases of \$10 billion and \$19 billion).

In some areas where majorities did not favor increased spending, the net average was positive because the overall increases outweighed the cuts. Humanitarian and disaster assistance was especially popular among members of both parties. Republicans on average increased such programs by \$13 billion and Democrats by \$32 billion. Initiatives to control the global spread of HIV/AIDS were increased an average of \$6 billion by Republicans and \$28 billion by Democrats. Homeland Security spending also went up overall (Republicans \$10 billion, Democrats \$15 billion), as did funding for helping poor countries to develop their economies (Republicans \$4 billion, Democrats \$29 billion).

Foreign Policy Budget Exercise

STATEMENT: As you may know, every year Congress passes a budget, part of which includes spending for US foreign policy, defense, and security. We would like to know how you think this part of the budget should be distributed. For this exercise, this part of the budget is divided into 15 areas. Please imagine that you have \$900 of your tax money to divide among these 16 areas. This is about how much of the average taxpayer's money goes to these 15 areas as a whole. For each area, you'll see how much of your \$900 goes to each of these areas in the current year's budget. Then you can indicate how many of your dollars you'd like to see go to that area next year. You'll be able to monitor how much of the \$900 you have left as you make decisions by scrolling down to the bottom of the page.

[Table shows respondents' mean choices converted back into actual federal budget amounts]

	2006 Appropriations (billions)	Republican Mean Preferences (billions)	Democrat Mean Preferences (billions)
Defense spending (does not include extra costs for operation in Iraq and Afghanistan)	\$555.30	\$445.11	\$291.72
Extra costs for Iraq military operation	\$66.69	\$62.59	\$39.54
Intelligence Costs	\$44.00	\$51.42	\$45.64
Homeland Security	\$33.30	\$43.75	\$47.94
Extra costs for Afghanistan	\$10.41	\$13.44	\$14.84
State Department: including diplomacy, policy development, cultural exchanges	\$8.20	\$12.43	\$23.33
Helping poor countries develop their economies	\$7.30	\$11.18	\$36.50
Reconstruction in Iraq	\$7.00	\$6.96	\$9.80
Military aid to foreign countries	\$5.30	\$6.41	\$16.68
Preparedness for disasters and outbreaks of disease in the US	\$3.00	\$28.43	\$57.02
Energy: conservation - developing renewable energy resources	\$2.80	\$24.68	\$55.89
UN and UN Peacekeeping	\$2.50	\$5.93	\$21.88
Initiatives to control the global spread of HIV/AIDS	\$2.00	\$7.65	\$30.22
Humanitarian and disaster assistance	\$1.40	\$14.70	\$33.11
Programs to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, such as helping other countries secure nuclear materials	\$0.90	\$10.63	\$19.53

WMD PROLIFERATION

Make preventing the spread of nuclear weapons a top foreign policy goal

There is a very strong bipartisan consensus that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons should be a top US objective. In the Chicago Council's July poll, 75 percent of Democrats and 78 percent of Republicans said that preventing the spread of nuclear weapons should be very important. Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons received the second highest rating among the 15 goals presented to respondents.

Raise the priority of securing nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union

In the October WPO/KN poll, respondents were presented a list of US foreign policy methods and asked whether they should be made a higher or lower priority than was presently the case. Three in four Republicans (75%) and two in three Democrats (66%) believed that "preventing the spread of nuclear weapons by securing nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union" should receive greater priority than at present.

Maintain membership in the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and work toward the goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons

Large majorities in both parties approve of US participation in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), even when told that this commits the United States to working for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. In the November WPO/KN poll, respondents were told that "according to this treaty, the countries that have nuclear weapons have agreed to actively work together toward eliminating their nuclear weapons" while "countries that do not have nuclear weapons...have agreed not to try to acquire them." Seventy-nine percent of Republicans and 85 percent of Democrats thought US participation in the NPT was a good idea. Nearly the same percentages also thought that the United States should continue to be a member of the NPT (76% of Republicans; 82% of Democrats).


In the same poll, large majorities in both parties (73% of Republicans, 87% of Democrats) specifically approved of the "goal of eventually eliminating all nuclear weapons, which is stated in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty."

Do not develop new types of nuclear weapons

At least half of respondents in both parties reject the view that the United States needs to develop new types of nuclear weapons. The December 2006 WPO/KN poll asked, "Do you think it is or is not necessary for the US to develop new types of nuclear weapons, beyond those that it already has?" A majority of Democrats (62%) said that developing such weapons was not necessary. Republicans were divided, however, with 49 percent saying that it was not necessary and 48 percent saying that it was. When asked the same question in the PIPA/KN December 2004 poll majorities in both parties (54% of Republicans, 71% of Democrats) said it was not necessary.

Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

Although US Congress refused in 1999 to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), there is a long-standing strong bipartisan consensus in favor of its ratification. Asked by the Chicago Council in July 2006 whether “US should or should not participate” in the treaty, 88 percent of Democrats and 86 percent of Republicans said that the United States should be part of the treaty. Support for the CTBT has remained high among both Democrats and Republicans since June 2002, when the Chicago Council inquired about the treaty for the first time.



Participate in the Biological Weapons Convention

There is overwhelming bipartisan support for US participation in treaties banning the use of biological weapons. This support holds even when respondents are informed that such treaties include provisions for intrusive inspections. The July Chicago Council poll found that 91 percent of Republicans and 89 percent of Democrats believed the United States should participate in an “agreement under the treaty banning biological weapons that would allow international inspectors to examine biological research laboratories to ensure that countries are not producing biological weapons.”

Seek to prevent non-nuclear weapon states from developing nuclear fuel

The concern that Iran’s capacity to develop nuclear fuel could lead to its having the capacity to produce nuclear weapons has prompted discussion of whether to go beyond the scope of the Nuclear Non-proliferation treaty and limit countries’ right to produce nuclear fuel. Republicans and Democrats are sympathetic to this idea. In the July 2006 Chicago Council poll respondents were told, “In the past, the international community has agreed that all countries have the right to produce nuclear fuel for peaceful purposes. Now it has been proposed that certain countries not be allowed to develop nuclear fuel out of concern they will use it to develop nuclear weapons.” They were then asked, “Do you think this proposal is a good idea or bad idea?” Sixty-three percent of Democrats and 73 percent of Republicans said that this was a “good idea.”

Create a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Middle East

Asked specifically about eliminating nuclear weapons in the Middle East, large majorities of both Republican and Democrats strongly favor this idea. The November WPO/KN poll found that 79 percent of Republicans and 75 percent of Democrats supported “the idea of having a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East that would include both Islamic countries and Israel.”

MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS



Put more emphasis on working through the United Nations

Majorities of Democrats and Republicans also agree that more emphasis should be placed on working with international institutions. In the October WPO/KN poll, 81 percent of Democrats and 61 percent of Republicans agreed that greater priority should be given to “working through the UN to strengthen international laws against terrorism and make sure UN members cooperate in enforcing them.”

When presented two arguments about the importance of working through international institutions that stressed both the difficulties of an inefficient bureaucracy as well as the imperatives of addressing international problems (see box), the idea that the United States should work through international institutions was preferred by 55 percent of Republicans and 81 percent of Democrats. Only two out of five Republicans (40%) and a small minority of Democrats (11%) endorsed the view that the United States should solve problems unilaterally.

Strengthen the United Nations

There is a strong consensus in favor of strengthening the United Nations. Large majorities (66% of Republicans, 91% of Democrats) said they saw strengthening the United Nations as an important foreign policy goal, the Chicago Council’s July poll found. An overwhelming majority of Democrats (84%) and about half of Republicans (53%) agreed that the United States should “invest in efforts to strengthen the UN’s ability to deal with potential conflicts” in order to “move away from its role as a world policeman and reduce the burden of its large defense budget,”




according to the October WPO/KN survey.

Majorities of both parties also endorse some bold measures to strengthen the United Nations, which were presented to them in the July Chicago Council poll. A large majority of Democrats (81%) and Republicans (64%) said they would support “having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations.” Majorities or pluralities in both parties also endorsed “giving the UN authority to go into countries to investigate violations of human rights” (74% of Republicans, 78% of Democrats); “creating an international marshals service that could arrest leaders responsible for genocide” (73% of Republicans, 77% of Democrats); and giving the United Nations power to regulate the international arms trade (50% of Republicans, 69% of Democrats).

Have international courts and tribunals judge compliance with international treaties

Americans from both parties believe that, as a general rule, international courts and tribunals should be given the power to judge each country’s compliance with international treaties. Two-thirds of Republicans (66%) and more than four-fifths of Democrats (88%) said that when the United States enters into international agreements, “there should be an independent international body, such as a court, to judge whether the parties are complying,” the April 2006 WPO/KN survey found.

Republicans and Democrats agree that international institutions should be able to judge disputes on a variety of specific issues governed by international agreements, according to the same poll. Majorities in both parties believe the United States should agree to have an international body rule on disputes over: “where the exact border is between two countries,” (64% of Republicans, 86% of Democrats); “whether countries are enforcing their environmental laws” (59% of Republicans, 80% of Democrats); “which countries have the right to fish in certain waters,” (59% of Republicans, 76% of Democrats); “whether countries are enforcing their labor laws,” (55% of Republicans, 75% of Democrats); and “what rights countries give to foreigners who are arrested and charged with a crime” (54% of Republicans, 74% of Democrats).



HUMAN RIGHTS

Participate in international agreements on the treatment of detainees and comply with UN Commission judgments about US detainee treatment


Americans, regardless of political party, believe overwhelmingly that the United States should participate in treaties that govern the treatment of individuals captured during international conflicts. Despite being told that such rules “limit what the US can do to detainees and what other countries can do when they detain Americans,” 85 percent of Republicans and 89 percent of Democrats said in the April PIPA/KN survey that the United States should be part of such treaties.

Americans of both parties also believe the United States should accept recommendations by the UN Commission on Human Rights regarding treatment of the detainees held at the US naval base at Guantánamo Bay in Cuba, the same survey found. Respondents were told that "the US participates in the UN Commission on Human Rights" and that the report "determined that the US has held certain individuals for interrogation for several years without charging them with a crime, contrary to international conventions." They were then asked whether the United States should follow the Commission's prescriptions to change these practices. A large majority of Democrats (76%) were in favor of the United States' complying with such prescriptions. Republicans were divided, however, with 49 percent saying the United States should comply and 47 percent saying it should not.

Participate in and comply with treaties against torture, without making exceptions for the war on terrorism

Bipartisan consensus also exists on the issue of whether the United States should subscribe to international agreements on the use of torture. The WPO/KN April 2006 poll showed that overwhelming majorities of both parties endorsed signing treaties that prohibit the use of torture (81% of Republicans, 90% of Democrats).

These views persisted even when respondents, in the July Chicago Council poll, were presented arguments for and against making an exception to such rules in the context of the war on terrorism: 1) governments should be allowed to use torture to gain information that could “save innocent lives;” and, 2) “torture is morally wrong and weakening the rules may lead to the torture of U.S. troops abroad.” Respondents from both parties chose the proposition that torture should be rejected (56% of Republicans, 76% of Democrats).



Have an international body judge compliance with human rights treaties without claiming a special exception for the United States

The bipartisan belief that the United States should support the rulings of international institutions on compliance with international treaties (discussed above) extends to agreements on human rights. In the April 2006 WPO/KN poll, a large majority of Republicans (68%) and Democrats (92%) said that there should be “an international body, such as a court” to judge whether countries are abiding by the human rights standards established in treaties. Only 30 percent of Republicans and 7 percent of Democrats disagreed.

Furthermore, both Republicans and Democrats reject insisting on a special exception for the United States to the authority of such an adjudicating body. When asked specifically about human rights treaties, a significant majority of Republicans (63%) as well as a large majority of Democrats (78%) said the United States should not “claim a special exception so that US compliance with the treaty is never subject to the judgment of an international body.” Only 32 percent of Republicans and 19 percent of Democrats thought that as a general rule the United States should claim such an exception.


ENVIRONMENT

Reduce US Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Majorities of Republican and Democrats favor legislation limiting US emissions of greenhouse gases. Asked by WPO/KN in December 2006 whether they would support “legislation limiting US emissions of greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming or climate change,” 61 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Democrats said that they would.

Concern that global warming has become a significant problem is widespread among members of both parties. In July, the Chicago Council found that a majority of Democrats

(87%) and Republicans (73%) said they believed action was needed to mitigate global warming. Only 24 percent of Republicans and 11 percent of Democrats said they opposed taking “any steps that would have economic costs.” However, Republicans and Democrats differ on whether the problem is severe enough to justify accepting “significant” costs. A majority of Democrats (56%) said that global warming posed a “serious and pressing problem” that required “taking steps now, even if this involves significant costs” but only 30 percent of Republicans held this view. Instead, a plurality of Republicans (43%) felt “the problem should be addressed, but its effects will be gradual, so we can deal with the problem gradually by taking steps that are low in cost.” Less than a third of Democrats (31%) were in favor of such a gradual approach.



The belief that global warming is serious enough to justify significant outlays, however, has gained adherents in both parties recently. In the June 2005 PIPA/KN poll, only 45 percent of Democrats and 21 percent of Republicans held this view. By July 2006, 56 percent of Democrats and 30 percent of Republicans did.

Democrats and Republicans agree on a number of policy measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The June 2005 poll showed large majorities of both Democrats and Republicans supporting emissions reductions strategies (see box).


Recent polls have also found broad support among members of both parties for legislation that would reduce emissions by toughening fuel efficiency standards for cars. In the WPO/KN December 2006 survey, strong majorities of Republicans and Democrats supported legislation requiring “car manufacturers to meet higher fuel efficiency standards even if this would increase the cost of buying or leasing a car.” Among Republicans, 71 percent supported such legislation while a strong majority of Democrats (86%) also favored such restrictions.

Americans are also fairly positive that addressing the problem of global warming will not be as costly as many policy makers have argued. Sixty percent of Republicans and 83 percent of Democrats believe that reducing greenhouse emissions will actually save money in the long run because of efficiency gains from reducing our reliance on imported oil. Only 13 percent of Democrats and 31 percent of Republicans believe such measures will cost too much and hurt the economy, the June 2005 PIPA/KN survey found.

According to a Public Agenda poll taken in September 2006, majorities of both parties believe international cooperation could prevent global warming. Fifty-two percent of Republicans and 64 percent of Democrats held this view.

Join the Kyoto Treaty

Americans express broad support for US participation “in the Kyoto agreement to reduce global warming.” In July 2006, the Chicago Council found that majorities in both parties favored participation in the Kyoto agreement, including 59 percent of Republicans and 79 percent of Democrats.



Pass the McCain-Lieberman Legislation

In the PIPA/KN June 2005 poll, majorities in both parties supported a version of the McCain-Lieberman Climate Stewardship Act, described as a bill introduced by “a Democratic and a Republican Senator” setting “specific limits on the amounts of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases that large companies can emit.” Seventy-nine percent of Republicans and 88 percent of Democrats supported such legislation. When told that an MIT study had estimated that implementing such legislation was likely to cost “\$15 dollars a month for an average household,” 67 percent of Republicans and 72 percent of Democrats still supported it.

Sharply Increase Spending on Energy Conservation and Alternative Fuels Research

The October 2006 WPO/KN poll, as discussed above, presented respondents with a foreign policy budget broken into 15 areas and allowed them to redistribute spending between the areas. One of the areas was energy conservation and research on alternative fuels. Among Republicans, 62 percent favored spending more on such programs, with the net average expenditures increasing by \$22 billion. Among Democrats, 82 percent favored spending more, with net average expenditures increasing by \$53 billion.

Additionally, overwhelming majorities of Republicans and Democrats believe that greater emphasis should be given to promoting international policies that would encourage research into alternative sources of fuel. In the same poll, 86 percent of Republicans and 87 percent of Democrats said that greater emphasis should be given to reducing US dependence on oil.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE**Work toward lowering trade barriers while also pursuing more trade adjustment assistance to help American workers adapt**

For some years now, there has been a bipartisan consensus that the United States should work toward lowering trade barriers provided the government has programs to help workers adapt to change (i.e. trade adjustment assistance). A number of recent survey findings show this consensus has continued, though one poll finding suggests it could be fraying.

A June 2005 PIPA/KN poll offered three positions on US trade policy. The most popular position, endorsed by 62 percent of Democrats and 48 percent of Republicans, was in favor of “agreements to lower trade barriers provided the government has programs to help workers who lose their jobs.” Only 25 percent of Democrats and 31 percent of Republicans simply opposed any agreement to lower trade barriers. And only 7 percent of Democrats and 16 percent of Republicans favored lowering trade barriers while opposing programs to help workers.

Consistent with the dominant position in favor of trade combined with worker assistance, 73 percent of Democrats and 50 percent of Republicans felt that “government efforts to help retrain workers who have lost jobs due to international trade” were inadequate

This general orientation was also expressed in a series of questions about the Central American Free Trade Area or CAFTA, the June 2005 poll found. Both Republicans and Democrats were initially

lukewarm when asked about CAFTA: 50 percent of Republicans and 51 percent of Democrats favored it and 41 percent of both parties opposed it. Support jumped to 61 percent among Republicans and 73 percent among Democrats, however, with the provision that the US government “commit to substantially increase federal spending on programs to help American workers who lose their jobs and to make sure that Central American countries enforce health and safety standards for their workers.”


But the July 2006 Chicago Council poll suggests this consensus may be weakening. When offered the same three options for US trade policy, the proportion endorsing lowering trade barriers in conjunction with programs to help unemployed workers dropped sharply compared to the June 2005 PIPA/KN poll: from 62 percent to 52 percent among Democrats and from 48 percent to 34 percent among Republicans. There was little increase, however in support for lowering trade barriers without such programs, which rose from 7 percent to 10 percent among Democrats and from 16 percent to 18 percent among Republicans. Instead there was significant migration to the position simply opposed to lowering trade barriers, which rose from 25 percent to 34 percent among Democrats, and from 31 percent to 43 percent among Republicans.

Include requirements for minimum labor and environmental standards in trade agreements

Polls have repeatedly found wide, bipartisan support for incorporating labor and environmental clauses into trade agreements. The Chicago Council’s July 2006 poll reaffirmed this: 92 percent of Republicans and 96 percent of Democrats said that “countries that are part of international trade agreements should be required to maintain minimum standards for working conditions.” In addition, 90 percent of Republicans and 94 percent of Democrats supported requiring minimum standards for the protection of the environment.

Comply with adverse WTO decisions

Majorities of both Republicans and Democrats support US compliance with rulings by the World Trade Organization. In the July 2006 Chicago Council poll, 67 percent of Republicans and 78 percent of Democrats believed that the US should comply with the WTO decisions even if they go against the United States



Do not enter into free trade agreements with China, India, and South Korea

Both Republicans and Democrats express reluctance about entering into free trade agreements with various countries. In the July 2006 Chicago Council poll, modest majorities of Republicans and Democrats opposed agreements that would lower trade barriers with China (60% of Republicans, 56% of Democrats), India (57% of Republicans, 54% of Democrats), and South Korea (51% of Republicans, 51% of Democrats).


Americans might respond differently, however, if these proposals were accompanied by provisions that would mitigate the effects on American workers. When such provisions are included, US support for trade agreements tends to rise sharply.

REGIONAL ISSUES

IRAQ

Substantially reduce the number of US troops in Iraq by early 2008

Republicans and Democrats agree with some key recommendations by the Iraq Study Group, headed by James Baker III, a former secretary of state and Lee H. Hamilton, a former Democratic congressman. Among the group’s most controversial proposals is that most US combat troops should be withdrawn by 2008. The December WPO/KN poll showed that nine in ten Democrats (88%) and three in five Republicans (62%) strongly or somewhat favored “withdrawing almost all US combat troops by 2008.”



This is consistent with findings from a March 2006 WPO/KN poll that found that 52 percent of Republicans and 80 percent of Democrats supported reducing or withdrawing US troops within the next six months. The survey also found a bipartisan consensus against increasing the number of troops (supported by just 12% of Republicans and 7% of Democrats) and withdrawing completely in the next six months (supported by just 13% of Republicans and 34% of Democrats).

It should be noted, however, that there is no consensus on the wisdom of establishing a fixed timetable for full withdrawal. Asked by Newsweek in October 2006 whether “the United States should set a timetable for withdrawal of US military forces in Iraq,” 58 percent of Republicans said it should not (39% said it should), while 75 percent of Democrats said that it should (17% said it should not). WPO/KN also asked about a timeline in its November 2006 poll: 78 percent of Democrats favored it (with variations regarding the time period), while 64 percent of Republicans said US-led forces should be withdrawn only “when the security situation improves.”

Respect the wishes of the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people


There are two conditions under which large majorities of both parties would favor the withdrawal of US troops within a relatively short time frame: if the Iraqi government requests foreign forces to withdraw or if a majority of the Iraqi people want them to leave.

The November WPO/KN poll asked respondents what the US should do “if the Iraqi government were to ask the United States to commit to withdraw US forces according to a timeline of no more than a year.” Seven in ten Republicans (73%) and nearly nine in ten Democrats (87%) said the United States should accommodate such a request.

The same poll asked what the United States should do “if the majority of the Iraqi people say they want the US to commit to withdraw US forces according to a timeline of no more than a year.” Sixty-seven percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Democrats said the US should withdraw under such circumstances.

However, there was disagreement between the parties as to whether this was what the Iraqi people wanted. While 75 percent of Democrats assumed that the majority of the Iraqi people wanted a US commitment to withdraw within a year, 59 percent of Republicans assumed that the majority of the Iraqi people wanted US forces to stay “longer than a year.” It appears that Democrats have a more accurate perception of Iraqi opinion on this issue: a September 2006 WPO poll in Iraq found that 71 percent favored US withdrawal according to a timeline of no more than a year.

Bipartisan consensus also breaks down on the issue of how the United States should respond if the Iraqi government and the Iraqi people disagree about when U.S. forces should leave. The November WPO/KN poll asked what the United States should do “if a large majority of the Iraqi people want the US to commit to withdraw within a year, but the Iraqi government wants the US to remain longer?” Sixty-five percent of Democrats favored following the will of the Iraqi public and withdrawing within a year, while 61 percent of Republicans favored following the will of



the government and remaining longer than a year. Americans overall (52%) favored obeying the will of the Iraqi people.

Although a large majority of both parties think the US government should withdraw troops if requested to do so by the Iraqi government, most do not think that the United States would do so. Eight in ten Democrats (83%) and seven in ten Republicans (70%) thought that the United States would not comply if “Iraqi government were to tell the US to withdraw all of its forces within six months,” according to the March 2006 WPO/KN poll.


Clearly state that the United States does not plan to establish permanent bases in Iraq

Majorities of both Republicans and Democrats also agree with another Iraq Study Group recommendation: that the president should publicly state the United States does not seek permanent bases in Iraq. In the December 2006 WPO/KN poll, 81 percent of Democrats and 65 percent of Republicans favored “the president making a public statement that the US does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq.” Only 12 percent of Democrats and 29 percent of Republicans were opposed to such a declaration.

In separate questions, members of both parties reject establishing permanent military bases in Iraq. WPO polls in November and March 2006 found that a majority of Republicans (53% and 60%) and Democrats (77% and 82%) thought the US should not have permanent military bases in Iraq.


A majority of Democrats and a plurality of Republicans correctly perceive that Iraqis oppose permanent US military bases in their country. The November 2006 WPO/KN poll found that most Democrats (77%) and about half of Republicans (48%) believed that the majority of the Iraqi people were opposed to such bases. This belief has decreased somewhat since March 2006, however, when another WPO/KN poll found that 90 percent of Democrats and 60 percent of Republicans assumed that most Iraqis opposed US bases. A September WPO poll conducted in

Iraq found overwhelming opposition to a permanent US military presence in their country: 91 percent of Iraqis wanted their government to ask the US to withdraw its forces within two years.



Talk with Iran and Syria

Another Iraq Study Group proposal favored by Americans from both parties is that of working with Iraq's neighbors. The November WPO/KN poll asked respondents whether the US government should negotiate with Iran and Syria, explaining that there was a debate about whether to work with Iraq's neighbors "with whom we have other disputes." Nonetheless, seven in ten Republicans (72%) and eight in ten Democrats (81%) said that the United States should have talks with Iran and nearly the exact same number in both parties said the United States should have talks with Syria.



Hold a major international conference on Iraq

The Iraq Study Group also proposed having a major conference that would allow key regional players to address the problem of Iraq. This idea received strong bipartisan support. In both the March and the November polls, WPO/KN asked whether respondents favored "having a major conference where leaders from the US, Europe, the UN, and various Arab countries would meet with leaders of the new Iraqi government to coordinate efforts to help Iraq achieve greater stability and economic growth" or whether they thought it would be "best for other countries to stay out of Iraq's affairs?" In both polls, eight in ten Republicans (79% in March and 81% in November) and eight in ten Democrats (78% and 80%) favored the idea.

Do not interfere with amnesty proposals made by the Iraq government

The Iraq Study Group also recommended the slightly more controversial proposal that the United States not object if the Iraqi government proposes an amnesty for insurgents. In the December WPO/KN poll, respondents were told that "the Iraq Study Group, a bipartisan commission created by Congress" had recommended "not interfering if the Iraqi government decides to offer amnesty to insurgents if they lay down their arms—even if the insurgents attacked US troops." A majority of Democrats (59%) supported this idea while Republicans were evenly divided (47% to 47%).


Work through the United Nations

Americans of both parties have strongly supported working through the United Nations to stabilize and reconstruct Iraq. In the March WPO/KN poll, majorities of Republicans (58%) and Democrats (92%) said they would prefer to have the United Nations, rather than the United States, take the lead in Iraq's economic reconstruction. Both parties also favored putting operations in Iraq under UN command if this meant "other countries would be willing to contribute more troops." Sixty percent of Republicans and 86 percent of Democrats indicated support for UN command of such a multilateral force.

IRAN

Deal with Iran by trying to build better relations not by threatening military action


Republicans and Democrats both strongly support an effort to build better relations with the Iranian government. In the November WPO/KN poll, a majority of Republicans (56%) and a large majority of Democrats (88%) said that the United States should deal with the government of Iran primarily by “trying to build better relations,” rather than “pressuring it with implied threats that the US may use military force against it.” This was roughly the same level of support found in the December 2004 PIPA/KN poll, when 61 percent of Republicans and 86 percent of Democrats supported trying to build better relations with Iran.



Majorities in both parties do not think threatening Iran with air strikes would cause Iran to stop enriching uranium. Most Republicans (77%) and Democrats (85%) also reject the idea that Iran would stop enriching uranium if the United States “threatens to use air strikes against its enrichment facilities.”

Pressure Iran to stop enriching uranium through diplomacy or economic sanctions; do not launch military strikes against Iran’s nuclear facilities

The Chicago Council asked in its July poll what the UN Security Council should do “if Iran continues to enrich uranium,” offering four options: authorize a military strike against Iran’s nuclear energy facilities, impose economic sanctions, continue diplomatic efforts to stop Iran from enriching uranium or not pressure Iran at all to stop its enrichment program. The least favored option among both Democrats (13%) and Republicans (26%) was authorizing a military strike. A large majority of Democrats (80%) and Republicans (72%) indicated that the Security Council should either continue diplomatic efforts (26% of Republicans, 41% of Democrats) or



impose economic sanctions (46% of Republicans, 39% of Democrats). Smaller numbers opted for not pressuring Iran.

One reason for the low level of support for military action may be respondents' very low level of confidence that air strikes would be effective in destroying Iran's uranium enrichment program. Asked in the November WPO/KN poll whether a "campaign of repeated air strikes" would succeed in destroying Iran's nuclear facilities, a majority of Democrats (71%) and half of Republicans (49%) said they would not. However, more Republicans (48%) than Democrats (27%) believed such strikes would be effective.

At the same time Americans do not categorically reject using military force against Iran if they were convinced that Iran was going to acquire nuclear weapons imminently. The July Chicago Council poll presented respondents with a number of different circumstances that "might justify" troop use. Seventy-three percent of Republicans and 57 percent of Democrats responded favorably to a scenario involving using US troops "to stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons." However, the public does not see this scenario as applying in the present. In the same poll, as discussed above, few supported taking military action against Iran,

Further, if the United States were to consider using military force against Iran, Americans from both parties believe it should be part of a multilateral effort. Only 29 percent of Republicans and 10 percent of Democrats said the US "should undertake a military strike even if the US has to act on its own." Bipartisan majorities (57% of Republicans, 65% of Democrats) favored such military action "only if the UN authorizes the strike and other allies participate." Even under these conditions, 11 percent of Republicans and 23percent of Democrats still opposed air strikes.

Be willing to make a deal wherein Iran is allowed to enrich uranium to the low levels necessary for producing nuclear energy provided UN inspectors are allowed full access to verify that these levels are not exceeded

Both Republicans and Democrats support a deal that would allow Iran to enrich uranium to the very low levels necessary to produce nuclear power. In return, Iran would have to give UN inspectors full access to the country's nuclear facilities in order to verify compliance with the deal. In the November 2006 WPO/KN poll, respondents were presented arguments providing both sides of this proposal (see box). A majority of Republicans (53%) and Democrats (62%) said it was a good idea.

Allowing Iran to Enrich Uranium


As you may know, the US and other countries have demanded that Iran stop enriching uranium out of concern that this could lead to Iran gaining the ability to develop nuclear weapons. However, Iran has refused, insisting that it is only enriching uranium for its nuclear energy program, not to build nuclear weapons. Here is a proposal some people have offered for resolving this impasse. Iran should be able to enrich uranium, but only on two conditions:

- 1) Enrichment must be limited to the low levels necessary for nuclear energy, while enrichment to higher levels needed for nuclear weapons would be forbidden.
- 2) Iran must fully cooperate with the UN inspectors, allowing full access to make inspections throughout the country, to make certain Iran is limiting its uranium enrichment to low levels.

Proponents of this idea say that this is a safe approach, because if Iran were to try to cheat, it would take them years to enrich uranium to the higher levels necessary for nuclear weapons, and with full access for UN inspectors they would be caught.

Critics of this idea say that Iran should not be allowed to enrich uranium at all, because doing so would give them technical experience that would put them in a strong position if they later decide to violate the agreement and build nuclear weapons.

Do you think it is a good idea or not a good idea to make an agreement whereby Iran would be allowed to enrich uranium, provided that this is limited only to low levels and UN inspectors would have full access to make sure that enrichment remained at low levels?



WPO/KN 11/06


NORTH KOREA

Be willing to enter into a non-aggression pact with North Korea and provide more aid to North Korea if it agrees to eliminate its nuclear weapons

Majorities in both parties are willing to make concessions to the government of Kim Jong Il in return for its commitment to abandon North Korea’s nuclear weapons program. The November 2006 WPO/KN poll asked respondents whether they thought the United States should be willing to accept two conditions in exchange for a North Korean agreement to give up its nuclear weapons program: that the United States and North Korea sign a “formal declaration that they will not attack each other” and that the United States increase “food aid to North Korea.”

Eight out of ten Democrats (82%) and six out of ten Republicans (61%) supported signing a formal non-aggression pact with North Korea. These are nearly the same percentages that favored such a concession in the December 2004 PIPA/KN poll (65% of Republicans, 82% of Democrats).


A large majority of Democrats (69%) said the US government should also be willing to provide food to North Korea. Republicans were evenly divided (48% to 49%). Again, support among the parties was nearly the same as in the December 2004 poll.



ISRAEL-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Be even-handed when dealing with the Israel-Palestinian conflict

A majority of Americans have long believed that the United States should not take sides in the Israel-Palestinian conflict. In the WPO/KN December 2006 poll, both Republicans (58%) and Democrats (80%) said that the United States should “not take either side” in the Middle East conflict. Only minorities favored taking Israelis’ side (40% of Republicans, 14% of Democrats) or the Palestinians’ side (1% of Republicans, 2% of Democrats).




DARFUR

Contribute US troops to an international peacekeeping force in Darfur

Sixty-four percent of Republicans and 68 percent of Democrats told the Chicago Council survey in July that that they would support the participation of US troops in “an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur.”


In the same Chicago Council poll, about two-thirds of Republicans (65%) and Democrats (69%) said they would favor “the use of U.S. troops to deal with humanitarian crises.” Nearly three-quarters of respondents in each party (74% of Republicans, 72% of Democrats) support sending US forces abroad to stop a government from “committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people.”



CHINA AND INDIA

Work together with China and India to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, raise the standard of living in Asian countries, reduce competition over vital resources like energy and gas, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions

In the July Chicago Council poll, respondents were asked how important it was that the United States, China and India work together to address a number of key problems. Large majorities of both parties agreed that it was somewhat or very important to work with these emerging powers to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, raise the standard of living in Asian countries, reduce competition over vital resources like energy and gas, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.



WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG

A PROJECT OF

THE PROGRAM ON INTERNATIONAL POLICY ATTITUDES

1779 MASSACHUSETTS AVE. NW, SUITE 510, WASHINGTON, DC 20036,

PHONE: 202-232-7500, FAX: 202-232-1159

INFO@PIPA.ORG

[HTTP://WWW.WORLDPUBLICOPINION.ORG](http://www.worldpublicopinion.org)