

**Americans And The World Around Them:
A Nationwide Poll**

Submitted to:
Noel Lateef, President
Foreign Policy Association
470 Park Ave. South
New York, N.Y.

Submitted by:
John Zogby, President and CEO
John Bruce, Vice President and Systems Administrator
Rebecca Wittman, Vice President and Managing Editor

Will Daley, Writer

September 19, 2003

© 2003 Zogby International

Table of Contents

I. Methodology and Sample Characteristics	2
II. Executive Summary	4
III. Narrative Analysis	8
Rating Nations as Allies of the United States	8
<i>Table 1. Rating Foreign Countries as Allies</i>	8
Role of the United States in the World	10
<i>Table 2. Describing the Present Role of the US in the World</i>	10
Confronting Issues on the Global Agenda	12
<i>Table 3. The Proper Role of the US in Global Issues</i>	12
<i>Table 4. Preference for Multilateral Approaches to World Issues by Party Affiliation</i>	13
Choosing Between Multilateralism and Unilateralism	14
<i>Table 5. Choosing Multilateralism by Key Demographic Subgroup</i>	15
Relevance of the United Nations.....	16
Evaluating Relations with France	17
<i>Table 6. Evaluating Relations with France</i>	17
Views on U.S. Participation in the Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court	18
<i>Table 7. U.S. Participation in the Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court</i>	18
Views on NAFTA	20
U.S. Trade with Latin America	22
Prioritizing International Issues	23
<i>Table 8. Rating International Issues as Priorities</i>	23
Rating the Importance of International Treaties	25
<i>Table 9. Rating the Importance of International Treaties</i>	25
Greatest Challenges Facing the U.S.-China Relationship.....	27
Credibility if U.S. Announced Evidence of Iranian WMDs	27
Importance of Mending the Transatlantic Relationship.....	28
Media Habits and Sources of Information about International Affairs.....	29

II. Methodology and Sample Characteristics

Methodology

Zogby International conducted interviews of 1,000 likely voters chosen at random nationwide. All calls were made from Zogby International headquarters in Utica, N.Y., from Friday, September 5 to Tuesday, September 9, 2003. The margin of error is +/- 3.2%. Slight weights were added to region, party, age, race, religion, and gender to more accurately reflect the voting population. Margins of error are higher in sub-groups.

Sample Characteristics	Frequency	Valid Percent*
Sample size	1,000	100
East	230	23
South	260	26
Central/Great Lakes	310	31
West	200	20
Very likely to vote	943	94
Somewhat likely to vote	57	6
Democrat	390	39
Republican	350	35
Independent/Minor party	255	26
Libertarian	5	1
18-29	119	12
30-49	396	40
50-64	277	28
65+	198	20
18-24	50	5
25-34	129	13
35-54	439	44
55-69	223	23
70+	150	15
Less than high school	21	2
High school graduate	150	15
Some college	325	33
College graduate+	504	50
White	770	78
Hispanic	79	8
African American	99	10
Asian/Pacific	14	1
Other/mixed	30	3

Sample Characteristics (continued)	Frequency	Valid Percent
Live in large city	338	34
Live in small city	237	24
Live in suburbs	197	20
Live in rural area	225	23
Progressive/very liberal	99	10
Liberal	203	20
Moderate	286	29
Conservative	305	31
Very conservative	55	6
Libertarian	23	2
Roman Catholic	278	28
Protestant	456	46
Jewish	30	3
Muslim	2	0
Other (religion)	226	23
Born-again	246	54
Not born-again	210	46
Did not answer religion	8	--
Member of union	220	22
Not member of union	780	78
Parent of child under 17	303	30
Not parent of child under 17	697	70
Member of Armed Forces	194	19
Not member of Armed Forces	806	81
Own stock personally	367	26
Own stock through 401(k)	349	25
Own stock / other pension plan	262	19
No stocks	397	29
Investor class	322	32
Not investor class	674	68
Less than \$15,000	61	7
\$15,000-\$24,999	83	9
\$25,000-\$34,999	114	13
\$35,000-\$49,999	172	19
\$50,000-\$74,999	202	22
\$75,000 or more	277	31
Male	480	48
Female	520	52

* Numbers have been rounded to the nearest percent and might not total 100.

II. Executive Summary

Zogby International asked American voters to offer their opinions on a wide range of issues concerning the role of the U.S. in the world. The results consistently show that Americans prefer engaging the world in cooperative multilateral diplomacy rather than with blunt, unilateral force. This and other key results follow.

A Conflicted View of America's Role in the World

Americans are conflicted in how they view their nation's current role in world affairs. Americans widely accept descriptions of their country as a benevolent, multilateral force in the world. Yet, majorities also view America as a unilateralist power whose pursuit of self-interest too often contradicts democracy and human rights.

Among several statements tested, those that characterize America as a benevolent force in world affairs are widely viewed as accurate, especially the idea that America is a "good friend and ally of people who desire freedom and individual human rights" (65% very accurate; 28% somewhat accurate). However, Americans also widely accept the notion that America is an imperialist power that acts on its own, regardless of world opinion (59% very/ somewhat accurate; 40% not accurate).

A Strong Preference for Multilateralism

In several places in this research, Americans express considerable preference for multilateralism and international cooperation to unilateralist foreign policy. In choosing between broad descriptions of multilateralism and unilateralism, two-thirds of Americans choose multilateral policy versus three in ten who favor unilateral policy.

When considering the two most publicized and potentially dangerous global issues—the prospect of nuclear weapons development in North Korea (68%) and securing the peace in Iraq (67%)—Americans are three times more likely to say the U.S. should confront these issues with the United Nations rather than alone.

Three in five Americans say the United Nations is needed now more than ever in world affairs, while 34% say the world body is less relevant and less influential today in global matters.

Americans Favor Participation in International Treaties

Americans are much more likely to consider U.S. participation in international treaties to be important rather than unimportant. The highest levels of importance are assigned to treaties that deal with the regulation of nuclear weapons, while lower levels of importance are assigned to treaties that deal with environmental issues.

At least seven in ten Americans assign high importance to four of seven treaties tested (three of which deal with the regulation of nuclear weapons), including:

- The Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
- The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

Elsewhere, Americans are at least twice as likely to agree as to disagree that the United States should participate in the International Criminal Court (53%-22%) and in the Kyoto Protocol (44%-22%).

However, margins of support for international treaties soften considerably when Americans learn more about them.

Given more information, Americans are more likely to say the United States should *not* participate in the Kyoto Protocol (48%) than to say we should participate (41%). Support for the International Criminal Court Treaty (48%) still remains higher than the opposition (38%) after hearing arguments for and against the treaty.

Evaluating International Relationships

Americans most often view the United Kingdom (90%), Canada (73%), Israel (57%) and Mexico (56%) as “good” allies of the United States. France (40%), Saudi Arabia (46%) and China (51%) are least often associated as U.S. allies.

Americans are particularly sour on France. A significant majority says that France has never been a good U.S. ally, and that the Bush administration was wise to act in the Iraq situation without France’s help (57% agree).

Despite this, seven in ten Americans view improving the U.S. relationship with Europe as important. This includes over half who consider improving relations with Europe *very* important.

Considering the U.S.-China relationship, Americans most often choose human rights (28%) as the most challenging issue. More generally, 22% say differences in political views form the key challenge facing the U.S.-China relationship.

It is worth noting that trade issues (17%) are chosen as the key challenge in the U.S. relationship with China much more often than military competition (7%). This suggests that Americans now view China more as an economic competitor in the era of globalization, than as the stark threat from the Cold War era.

Prioritizing International Issues

When prioritizing several actual and possible international situations, Americans view a potential nuclear crisis in Iran as the highest priority (64%). Fighting between Israel and the Palestinians rates a close second on the list of priorities (57%). Fewer than half of Americans assign a high priority to rebuilding Afghanistan (43%).

Other world situations rate considerably lower as priorities. One in five consider a financial collapse in Brazil or instability and war in Indonesia (18%) as high priority. Just one in ten view war in the Congo as high priority.

It is not surprising that the inherent dangers of nuclear crisis in Iran, or the historical, religious and emotional significance of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would rate as high priorities. Nor is it unfounded that relatively unfamiliar developments in Brazil, Indonesia or the Congo would rate as lower priorities.

But it does seem remarkable that a majority of Americans do not view rebuilding Afghanistan as a top priority, given the frequent and in-depth news exposure and overall significance of events in that nation leading up to and following the September 11 attacks.

Still Divided over NAFTA

Americans remain divided when asked whether the North American Free Trade Agreement has been a good or bad thing for the United States. While 37% say NAFTA has benefited the United States, 34% say it has been bad for the United States.

When asked whether they believe NAFTA has created more or fewer jobs in the United States, Americans are nearly three times as likely to say NAFTA has resulted in fewer jobs (55%) as to say it has created more jobs (19%).

The lackluster support for NAFTA translates into a low level of Americans saying that they would favor an expansion of the treaty to include not only Mexico, but other Latin American nations as well. Overall, 31% say they would favor such an expansion of NAFTA, while 50% say they would oppose it. An additional 19% are unsure.

Americans are Watching the News

Three in four Americans say they watch, read or listen to information about international affairs on a daily basis, while an additional 23% say they do so a few times a week.

Nearly half of Americans (48%) say television is the source which they most often rely on for foreign affairs information. Newspapers trail behind at 21%, followed more distantly by radio (11%) and online (9%) as the most significant sources of international affairs information.

Key Demographic Distinctions

Views of America's current role in the world turn most sharply on party affiliation. Whereas three in four Republicans say America is *very* accurately described as a good friend and ally of people who desire freedom and human rights, Democrats (47%) and Independents (50%) are much less likely to say this *very* accurately describes America's present role in the world.

Conversely, Democrats (42%) and Independents (41%) are much more likely than Republicans (13%) to say America is very accurately described as a nation whose self-interests too often conflict with espoused ideals of freedom and democracy.

Traditional Democratic constituencies (Easterners and Westerners, minorities, women, middle-income, etc.) are consistently *more* likely to choose multilateralism than traditional Republican constituencies (Southerners, whites, men, higher income), who are significantly more likely to prefer unilateral approaches.

III. Narrative Analysis

Rating Nations as Allies of the United States

5 – 16. Let me begin by reading you a list of countries. As I read each, please tell me if you think of it as a good ally, a so-so ally, or not an ally on most issues.

Table 1. Rating Foreign Countries as Allies (ranked by % good ally)

	Good ally	So-so ally	Not an ally	Not sure
Positive Perceptions				
United Kingdom	90	7	1	2
Canada	73	25	2	1
Israel	57	25	13	4
Mexico	56	36	6	2
Neutral Perceptions				
South Korea	46	25	25	4
Brazil	35	34	8	23
Germany	32	46	19	3
Egypt	21	45	26	9
Russia	14	65	18	3
Negative Perceptions				
France	22	36	40	2
Saudi Arabia	8	41	46	5
China	8	38	51	3

Among the 12 nations tested, Americans most often view the United Kingdom (90%), Canada (73%), Israel (57%) and Mexico (56%) as **good** allies of the United States. In each case, Americans are much less likely to say these nations are not allies of the United States.

Other nations are viewed more **neutrally** in terms of their alliance with the United States. These nations include South Korea (46%), Brazil (35%), Germany (32%), Egypt (21%) and Russia (14%). Among these nations, South Korea and Brazil are more often viewed as good allies. Germany, Russia and Egypt are most often seen as middling allies of the United States (especially Russia, 65% so-so). Among the more neutrally perceived nations, Egypt suffers the highest negative perceptions (26% rating as not an ally). Twenty-five percent also say South Korea is not an ally, although this is most likely driven higher by confusion with North Korea.

Three nations suffer from **negative** perceptions as allies of the United States, France (40% not an ally), Saudi Arabia (46%) and China (51%). When combined, those who say France is either a good (22%) or so-so ally of the United States (36%) significantly outnumber those who say the country is not an ally. Those who say Saudi Arabia is a good (8%) or so-so (41%) ally only slightly outnumber those who do not consider this

nation an ally. Those who do not consider China an ally outnumber those who consider this nation a good (8%) or so-so (38%) ally.

Demographic Distinctions

There are generally few significant demographic distinctions when considering the United Kingdom, Canada, Russia, Saudi Arabia, China, Egypt, South Korea, Mexico and Brazil.

Israel is most often viewed as a *good ally* by Easterners (68%), Republicans (69%) older respondents (65 and over: 64%), Protestants (63%), men (68%) and higher income earners (\$75,000 and more annually: 66%).

Not surprisingly, ratings of France (and to a lesser extent, Germany) resemble positions towards the war in Iraq. Subgroups less likely to support the war on Iraq are more likely to describe France as a *good ally*, including:

- Democrats (29%) and Independents (27%)
- College-educated respondents (27%)
- African Americans (48%)

Conversely, those more likely to support the war on Iraq are more likely to say they do *not* consider France an ally of the U.S. These respondents include:

- Republicans (52%)
- Those with lower levels of education (high school graduates: 54%)
- Catholics (46%)
- Born-again Christians (49%).

Role of the United States in the World

17 – 23. I am going to read you a list of descriptions that may be used by some people to describe the role of the United States in the world. As I read each, please tell me if you feel the term is very accurate, somewhat accurate, or not accurate in describing how the U.S. presently acts.

Table 2. Describing the Role of the US in the World (ranked by % very accurate)

	Very accurate	Somewhat accurate	Not accurate	Not sure
A good friend and ally of people who desire freedom and individual human rights	65	28	7	1
A force to promote the values of freedom and democracy everywhere in the world	58	29	12	1
A genuine superpower, but one that actively seeks out allies in dealing with global issues	51	34	15	1
An imperialist power that acts on its own, regardless of what the rest of the world thinks	32	27	40	1
A nation with self-interests that too often conflict with our espoused ideals of freedom and democracy	32	36	29	3
A reluctant sheriff with responsibility to police the world and regional trouble spots	31	44	23	2
A selfish power that is willing to sell out those who want our freedoms when those desires conflict with our own needs as a nation	16	27	56	2

Americans were asked to evaluate the accuracy of several statements that could describe how the United States *presently* acts in the world. For each statement, respondents were asked whether they view the statement to be very accurate, somewhat accurate or not accurate.

Reactions to the statements tested show that Americans are conflicted in how they view their nation’s current role in world affairs. Americans widely accept descriptions of their country as a benevolent, multilateral force in the world. Yet, majorities also view America as a unilateralist power whose pursuit of self-interest too often contradicts democracy and human rights.

Among the statements tested, those that characterize America as a benevolent force in world affairs are widely viewed as accurate, especially the idea that America is a “good friend and ally of people who desire freedom and individual human rights” (65% very accurate; 28% somewhat accurate). A majority also says America is very accurately described as “a force to promote the values of freedom and democracy everywhere in the world” (58% very accurate; 29% somewhat accurate).

Americans also widely view their country as multilateralist, accepting the depiction of America as “a genuine superpower ... that actively seeks out allies in dealing with global issues” (51% very accurate; 34% somewhat accurate).

At the same time that Americans widely accept the ideal descriptions of America's role in the world, they are also more likely to accept than reject the notion that America is an imperialist power that acts on its own, regardless of world opinion (59% very/ somewhat accurate; 40% not accurate). Similarly, Americans are more likely to consider accurate the idea that America's self-interests too often conflict with its ideals of freedom and democracy (68% very/somewhat accurate; 29% not accurate).

Americans are also significantly more likely to view their nation's role in the world as that of a "reluctant sheriff" responsible for policing the world and regional trouble spots (75% very/somewhat accurate; 23% not accurate).

Americans are most likely to reject the description of their nation as a "selfish power that is willing to sell out those who want our freedoms when those desires conflict with our own needs as a nation" (43% very/somewhat accurate; 56% not accurate).

Demographic Distinctions

Views of America's current role in the world turn most sharply on party affiliation. Whereas three in four Republicans (76%) say America is *very* accurately described as a good friend and ally of people who desire freedom and human rights, Democrats (47%) and Independents (50%) are much less likely to say this very accurately describes America's present role in the world.

Conversely, Democrats (42%) and Independents (41%) are much more likely than Republicans (13%) to say America is very accurately described as a nation whose self-interests too often conflict with espoused ideals of freedom and democracy.

Confronting Issues on the Global Agenda

24 – 28. I am now going to read you a list of issues currently on the global agenda. As I read each, please tell me if the proper role of the U.S. should be to “Seek help from the United Nations or other allies, and intervene,” OR “Do whatever it takes, even if it means acting alone,” OR “Simply leave it alone to work itself out.”

Table 3. The Proper Role of the US in Global Issues (ranked by seek help %)

	Seek help from UN or other allies	Do whatever it takes	Leave alone to work itself out	Not sure
Handling the nuclear weapons development in North Korea	68	23	7	2
Securing peace and a transition to local leadership in Iraq	67	22	9	2
Reducing violence and facilitating a leadership change in Liberia	60	11	23	7
Negotiating peace and stability in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute	56	18	25	2
Reducing the power of the drug cartel in Colombia	41	36	19	5

Americans were read descriptions of several issues on the global agenda and asked whether the proper role of the United States is:

- To seek help from the United Nations or other allies, and intervene,
- Do whatever it takes, even if it means acting alone, or,
- Simply leave [the issue] alone to work itself out.

Provided these choices, Americans are most likely to say the United States should seek help from the United Nations and other allies when read descriptions of each global issue tested.

The two most publicized and potentially dangerous global issues tested – the prospect of nuclear weapons development in North Korea and securing the peace in Iraq – are the ones Americans most often say their government should approach in concert with the United Nations or other allies.

Americans are three times more likely to say their government should seek help from the United Nations or other allies in dealing both with nuclear weapons development in North Korea (68%) and securing the peace in Iraq (67%) than to say the United States should adopt a whatever-it-takes, go-it-alone policy (North Korea: 23%; Iraq: 22%).

Most Americans also say the United States should work with the United Nations and others in reducing violence and facilitating leadership change in the African nation Liberia (60%) as well as negotiating for peace and stability in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute (56%).

Interestingly, Americans are most likely to say Liberia (23%) and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (25%) should be left alone to sort out on their own; this may signal a sense of exhaustion or hopelessness among Americans when considering issues confronting African nations like Liberia or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Americans are less likely to suggest a multilateral approach in reducing the power of the drug cartel in Columbia. Still, 41% suggest working with the United Nations and other allies in solving this problem, as opposed to adopting the unilateralist posture of doing whatever it takes (36%).

Demographic Distinctions

As with evaluations of statements describing the U.S. role in the world today, party affiliation yields the most pronounced differences among the demographic subgroups. Partisan distinctions are most pronounced when considering issues in North Korea, Iraq and the Israeli-Palestinian dispute.

While Republicans are less likely than Democrats or Independents to choose working with the United Nations and other allies in dealing with the issues tested, they are still more likely to choose this approach than to suggest that the U.S. go it alone or ignore the global issues.

Table 4. Preference for Multilateral Approaches to World Issues by Party

Affiliation (% indicates those who say U.S. should seek help from the U.N., other allies)

	Democratic	Republican	Independent
Handling the nuclear weapons development in North Korea	76%	59%	70%
Securing peace and a transition to local leadership in Iraq	75	57	68
Reducing violence and facilitating a leadership change in Liberia	64	57	59
Negotiating peace and stability in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute	63	45	60
Reducing the power of the drug cartel in Colombia	48	36	36

Among other sub-groups, younger, more highly educated, female and liberal respondents are more likely to choose the multilateral approach. Born-again Christians, conservatives and libertarians – tracking closely with Republicans— are notably *less* likely to prefer the multilateral approach to the tested international issues.

Choosing Between Multilateralism and Unilateralism

29. I am going to read to you two policies. Please tell me which policy comes closer to your own view – A or B? **Policy A** favors diplomacy over strategic power in international disputes, and actively seeks out the assistance of international bodies like the United Nations and NATO to work together with the U.S. in crisis areas. **Policy B** favors the U.S. acting alone if necessary, and playing the role of both moral force and superpower in such disputes, all with the intention of protecting U.S. interests.

Policy A Multilateralism	66%
Policy B Unilateralism	29
Neither/Not sure	5

30. Much has been reported about ongoing disputes in the Bush Administration between Secretary of State Colin Powell, who wants to cooperate more with other countries through the UN and NATO, and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who believes that the U.S. has the moral authority to act alone if it is in the interest of the United States. Generally speaking, which side do you feel agrees with your position more – those supporters of Powell or supporters of Rumsfeld?

Powell	71%
Rumsfeld	21
Neither/Not sure	8

In two different questions, Americans were asked to choose between multilateralism and unilateralism. In the first question, Americans were read descriptions of multilateral policy (actively seeking international cooperation) and unilateral policy (U.S. has the moral authority to act alone when necessary to protect U.S. interests) and asked to choose which policy most closely reflects their views.

In the second question, Americans are asked whether they agree more with Secretary of State Colin Powell or Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld after being told that Powell supports multilateral cooperation and that Rumsfeld supports unilateral action by the United States in pursuing its international interests.

The results of both questions show that Americans overwhelmingly prefer multilateralism and international cooperation to unilateralist action and a solitary approach to confronting international issues impacting U.S. interests.

In choosing between descriptions of multilateralism and unilateralism, two thirds of Americans (66%) choose multilateralism over three in ten (29%) who favor unilateralism.

In choosing between multilateralism and unilateralism when associated with Powell and Rumsfeld, respectively, the margin favoring multilateralism over unilateralism grows wider. Seven in ten choose Powell's multilateralism (71%) over one in five (21%) opting for Rumsfeld's unilateralism.

Demographic Distinctions

As with other areas in this research, Democrats and Independents are much more likely than Republicans to choose multilateralism over unilateralism.

In choosing between the policy descriptions, 83% of Democrats and 68% of Independents choose multilateralism over unilateralism. Republicans are evenly divided between the two policies, as described (45% each).

Traditional Democratic constituencies (Easterners and Westerners, minorities, women, middle-income, etc.) are consistently *more* likely to choose multilateralism than traditional Republican constituencies (Southerners, whites, men, higher income) who are much less likely to choose multilateralism.

Table 5. Choosing Multilateralism by Key Demographic Subgroup
(% rating as important)

More Likely		Less Likely	
Democrats	83%	Republicans	45%
Easterners	70	Southerners	63
Westerners	75	Midwesterners	59
College graduates	70	High School graduates	35
African Americans	70	Whites	66
Urban	70	Rural	62
Women	71	Men	60
Non-investors	68	Investors	60
Upper-middle income (\$50-\$75k)	70	Upper income (\$75k-plus)	64
Liberals	88	Conservatives	43

In the question linking multilateralism with Powell and unilateralism with Rumsfeld, Democrats (89%) and Independents (75%) are much more likely to choose Powell and multilateralism. Republicans are also more likely to favor Powell's multilateralism (47%), although they are more divided with 40% siding with Rumsfeld and unilateralism.

Relevance of the United Nations

31. Some argue that the United Nations has been reduced in its influence and is less relevant today in global matters. Others say that the UN is needed now more than ever to represent a global perspective in issues that arise. Which of those statements comes closer to your own views?

UN needed more than ever	59%
UN is less relevant	34
Neither/Not sure	6

Just as Americans are more likely to choose multilateralism and international cooperation, they are also much more likely to consider the United Nations to be as relevant and necessary as ever in approaching international issues with a global perspective.

Three in five Americans (59%) say the United Nations is needed now more than ever in world affairs, while 34% say the world body is less relevant and less influential today in global matters.

Demographic Distinctions

Those more likely to view the United Nations as more necessary and relevant than ever include:

- Westerners (65%)
- Democrats (81%)
- Younger respondents (18-29 years old: 66%)
- Union members (65%)
- Women (65%)
- Moderates (65%), Liberals (83%) and Progressives (80%)

Republicans (37%), men (53%), very conservative (19%) and libertarian (18%) respondents are much less likely to view the United Nations as relevant and necessary in today's global climate.

Evaluating Relations with France

32 – 34. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements, or you are not familiar enough to make a judgment.

Table 6. Evaluating Relations with France

	Agree*	Disagree	Not familiar	Not sure
France has never been a good ally of the U.S., and the Bush administration was wise to act in the Iraq situation without France’s help	57	37	4	3

(*Agree combines strongly and somewhat agree; disagree combines strongly and somewhat disagree.)

Americans were asked whether they agree or disagree with the statement that “France has never been a good ally of the U.S., and the Bush administration was wise to act in the Iraq situation without France’s help.”

Americans agree by a wide margin that France has never been a good U.S. ally, and that the Bush administration was wise to act in the Iraq situation without France’s help (57% agree; 37% disagree).

As with other areas of this research, party affiliation marks the sharpest distinctions: Republicans (79%) are most likely to agree that France has never been a good ally, while Democrats (40%) and Independents (51%) are much less likely to say so.

Views on U.S. Participation in the Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court

33– 34. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements, or you are not familiar enough to make a judgment.

Table 7. U.S. Participation in the Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court

	Agree*	Disagree*	Not familiar	Not sure
The U.S. should sign on as a participant in the International Criminal Court	53	22	23	2
The U.S. should sign the Kyoto Global Warming Treaty	44	22	31	4

(*Agree combines strongly and somewhat agree; disagree combines strongly and somewhat disagree.)

Americans were asked whether they agree or disagree that the U.S. should participate in the International Criminal Court or in the Kyoto Global Warming Treaty.

Americans are at least twice as likely to agree as to disagree that the United States should participate in the International Criminal Court (53% agree; 22% disagree) and the Kyoto Protocol (44% agree; 22% disagree). In both cases, however, there are significant levels of unfamiliarity with the treaties (I.C.C.: 23%; Kyoto: 31%).

Demographic Distinctions

In a familiar pattern, the sharpest distinctions among demographic subgroups when considering U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court and Kyoto Global Warming treaties fall along party lines.

Democrats and Independents are much more likely to support U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court (59% each) than Republicans (43%). Likewise, Democrats (56%) and Independents are much more likely than Republicans (28%) to encourage U.S. participation in the Kyoto Protocol.

College graduates, African Americans, urban residents, higher income respondents and liberal-to-progressive respondents are more likely to support U.S. participation in both treaties. Less educated, lower income and more conservative respondents are less likely to support U.S. participation in the treaties.

Interestingly, Hispanics are significantly less likely to support participation in either the Kyoto Protocol (31%) or the International Criminal Court treaties (34%). Born-again Christians are much less likely to support joining the Kyoto Protocol (26%), however, they are only somewhat less likely than average to support participation in the International Criminal Court (46%).

I am now going to read you a series of statements. As I read each, please tell me if you are more in agreement with Statement A or Statement B.

35. **Statement A** says that the US should ratify the Kyoto Global Warming Treaty it has already signed to reduce the emission of industrial pollutants in the atmosphere. While the treaty reduces U.S. and European emissions at a faster rate than those for countries like China and India, it is only fair that these nations have the opportunity to catch up in industrial development. **Statement B** says that the U.S. should not sign the treaty because it unfairly punishes the U.S. and Europe, and makes them reduce emissions at a faster rate than developing nations and puts the U.S. economy at a severe disadvantage. It is also questionable how serious the problem of global warming really is.

Statement A: U.S. should ratify the Kyoto Protocol	41%
Statement B: U.S. should not ratify the Kyoto Protocol	48
Neither/Not sure	11

36. **Statement A** says the U.S. should ratify the creation of the International Criminal Court that enforces a set of standards against war criminals. By signing on, the U.S. brings its moral voice to this court and takes a strong stand against serious violations of human rights, as in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Rwanda. **Statement B** argues that U.S. participation in the International Court ties the hands of the U.S. on matters that it should be free to decide upon unilaterally. In addition, the Court could be used against U.S. interests or allies, and thus could be a detriment against U.S. peace efforts.

Statement A: U.S. should ratify the International Criminal Court Treaty	48%
Statement B: U.S. should not ratify the International Criminal Court Treaty	38
Neither/Not sure	15

When Americans are given more information about both the Kyoto Protocol and International Criminal Court, in the form of arguments for and against participation in the treaties, support for participation in both treaties is lower than that expressed above.

Considering the Kyoto Protocol, Americans are most likely to say the United States should *not* participate (48%) in the treaty when told that emissions limitations within the treaty unfairly punish the U.S. and Europe by requiring steeper emissions reductions than developing nations. Two in five (41%) Americans say the United States should still join the treaty when told that the emissions reductions within the Kyoto Protocol are set lower for developing nations to allow these nations to “catch up” to the economic progress of the industrialized world.

Considering the International Criminal Court Treaty, Americans remain more likely to agree (48%) that the United States should sign on to the treaty in order to lend its moral authority to the court and to take a strong stand against serious violations of human rights. Just fewer than two in five (38%) say the United States should not ratify the treaty, when told it may impede the ability of the United States to pursue its foreign policy on a unilateral basis, and that the court may be used against U.S. interests and allies.

Demographic Distinctions

After hearing the additional information, Democrats and Independents remain much more likely to support both the Kyoto Protocol (54% and 43% respectively) and the International Criminal Court Treaty (54% and 59% respectively) than Republicans (Kyoto: 24%; I.C.C.: 32%).

Others more likely to support Kyoto include:

- Westerners (50%)
- College graduates (49%)
- African Americans (55%)
- Liberals (57%) and progressives (75%)

Others more likely to support ratification of the International Criminal Court include:

- Easterners (51%) and Westerners (54%)
- Younger respondents (18-29 years old: 57%)
- College graduates (55%)
- African Americans (62%)

It is worth noting that members of the armed forces (42%) are only somewhat less likely than members of the general public (49%) to support ratification of the International Criminal Court.

Views on NAFTA

37. NAFTA has been in effect now for ten years. Do you believe NAFTA has been a good thing or a bad thing for the U.S.?

Good	37%
Bad	33
Not sure	15
No opinion	15

38. Do you believe NAFTA has created more jobs or that it has led to a net loss of jobs for the U.S.?

Less jobs	55%
More jobs	19
Not sure	26

Ten years on, Americans are divided when asked whether the North American Free Trade Agreement has been a good or bad thing for the United States. While 37% say NAFTA has benefited the United States, 34% say it has been bad for the United States. An additional 30% are either unsure (15%) or have no opinion (15%) about the impact of NAFTA on the United States.

When asked whether they believe NAFTA has created more or fewer jobs in the United States, Americans are nearly three times as likely to say NAFTA has resulted in fewer jobs (55%) as to say it has created more jobs (19%). One in four (26%) are unsure whether NAFTA has created more or less employment in the United States.

Demographic Distinctions

Unlike other areas of this research, party affiliation matters less when Americans consider the impact of NAFTA. Democrats (38%), Republicans (37%) and Independents (38%) are equally likely to consider NAFTA beneficial to the United States.

Those more likely to view NAFTA as beneficial include:

- Southerners (good 43%; bad 31%)
- Younger respondents (18-29 years old: good 50%; bad 21%)
- College graduates (good 42%; bad 32%)
- Investors (good 44%; bad 33%)
- Higher income earners (\$75,000-plus: good 48%; bad 29%)
- Liberals (good 41%; bad 27%)

Those more likely to say NAFTA has been bad for the United States include:

- Midwesterners (bad 38%; good 35%)
- Older respondents (50-64: bad 42%; good 30%)
- Less educated respondents (high school respondents: bad 35%; good 28%)
- Rural respondents (bad 46%; good 29%)
- Born-again Christians (bad 40%; good 32%)
- Those who describe themselves as very conservative (bad 55%; good 24%)

There is a general consensus across demographic groups that NAFTA has resulted in fewer jobs in the United States. Significant majorities within nearly all subgroups (with the notable exception of younger respondents) say that NAFTA has resulted in fewer jobs.

Those particularly likely to say NAFTA has resulted in fewer U.S. jobs include:

- Middle-aged respondents (35-54: 60%)
- Rural residents (65%)
- Born-again Christians (60%)
- Those who say they are very conservative (62%)

U.S. Trade with Latin America

39. *The government is considering expanding NAFTA to include not just Mexico, but some other Latin American nations as well. Do you favor or oppose expanding NAFTA?*

Favor	31%
Oppose	50
Not sure	19

The lackluster support for NAFTA translates into a low level of Americans saying that they would favor an expansion of the treaty to include not only Mexico, but other Latin American nations as well. Overall, 31% say they would favor such an expansion of NAFTA, while 50% say they would oppose it. An additional 19% are unsure.

As with overall support for NAFTA, party affiliation tends to matter less when considering whether to expand NAFTA to more Latin American nations. Younger respondents, college graduates and investors are more likely to favor expanding NAFTA to other Latin American nations. However, among the major demographic subgroups only younger respondents are more likely to favor than oppose expanding NAFTA (50% favor; 39% oppose).

It is worth noting that Hispanics, presumably with greater personal interest in U.S.-Latin American relations, are no more likely than average to favor expanding NAFTA (32%), and are, in fact, significantly more likely to oppose an expansion to Latin American countries other than Mexico (56%)¹.

40. *Do you favor or oppose ending the embargo on Cuba?*

Favor	56%
Oppose	32
Not sure	12

Unlike the questions about NAFTA, there is much more support – and greater differences in opinion among demographic subgroups – for the idea of re-opening trade with Cuba. In total, 56% favor ending the embargo against Cuba, while 12% oppose the idea.

Unlike the questions about NAFTA, support for ending the Cuban embargo *does* tend to turn more sharply on party affiliation, with 59% of Democrats and 66% of Independents saying the embargo should end compared to 45% of Republicans who say this.

Surprisingly, older respondents—presumably more familiar with the Cold War experience – are more likely than younger respondents to favor ending the embargo (65 and older: 57% compared to those 18-29: 51%).

¹ This could possibly be the result of significant numbers of Mexican respondents with an interest in preserving their home country advantage in trade with the U.S. It is worth noting that when asked (below) whether to make Mexico-U.S. relations a priority, 70% of the Hispanics interviewed encourage the idea.

Others more likely to favor ending the embargo include: college graduates (62%), African Americans (61%), higher income respondents (\$75,000-plus: 61%).

Hispanics (45%) Born-again Christians (43%) and conservatives (47%) are significantly less likely to favor ending the embargo.

41. Prior to the September 11th attacks, the United States made strengthening its relationship with Mexico a high priority. Since the attacks, the relationship seems to have become a low priority. Do you think the United States government should make our relationship with Mexico a high priority, or do you think there are other countries which are more important?

Make Mexico a priority	50%
Other countries more important	42
Not sure	8

Americans are somewhat more likely to say that U.S.-Mexico relations should be made a high priority (50%) than to say there other, more important countries should be the priority (42%).

The generally divided result seems to echo the lower level of enthusiasm Americans express when considering Mexico as an ally of the U.S. (56% good ally compared to 73% considering Canada).

Democrats (57%), urban residents (59%) and Hispanics (70%) are most likely to encourage prioritizing the U.S.-Mexico relationship.

Prioritizing International Issues

42 – 47. Now, I'm going to read to you a list of possible situations around the world. One a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being a low priority, 3 being a medium priority, and 5 being a high priority, please tell me for each how much of a priority each one is for United States foreign policy.

Table 8. Rating International Issues as Priorities (ranked by % higher priority)

	Higher priority (4 + 5)	Neutral (3)	Lower priority (1 + 2)	Not sure
Nuclear crisis in Iran	64	19	15	2
Fighting between Israel and Palestinians	57	22	20	2
Rebuilding Afghanistan	43	33	22	1
A Brazilian financial collapse	19	47	28	5
Instability and war in Indonesia	18	41	36	5
War in the Congo	11	36	48	6

Americans were asked to rate the priority of several situations around the world (some actual, some hypothetical) on a five-point scale, where one indicates lower priority and five indicates a higher level of priority.

Among the tested issues, Americans view a potential nuclear crisis in Iran as the highest priority (64% rating as 4 or 5 on the scale). Fighting between Israel and the Palestinians rates a close second on the list of priorities (57%). Remarkably, fewer than half of Americans assign a high priority to rebuilding Afghanistan (43%).

Other world situations rate considerably lower as priorities. Less than one in five consider a financial collapse in Brazil (19%) or instability and war in Indonesia (18%) as high priority. Just one in ten (11%) view war in the Congo as high priority.

Demographic Distinctions

Those more likely to rate fighting between Israel and the Palestinians as high priority include:

- Easterners (68%)
- Republicans (62%; compared to 52% among Democrats and 53% among Independents)
- Older respondents (50-64: 60%)
- College graduates (63%)
- Whites (59% compared to 45% among African Americans)
- Jews (82%)

Interestingly, both liberals (61%) and progressives (63%) as well as conservatives (59%) and those who say they are very conservative (62%) are more likely to assign high priority to the Israel-Palestinian conflict.

There are generally few significant demographic distinctions are when assigning priority to rebuilding Afghanistan. Only among Hispanics (54%) and Jews (51%) do majorities assign high priority to rebuilding Afghanistan. Easterners (50%), college graduates (49%) and higher income earners (\$50,000 and over: 49%) are also more likely to prioritize the rebuilding of Afghanistan.

There are relatively few significant demographic distinctions when considering a nuclear crisis in Iran, possible financial collapse in Brazil, instability and war in Indonesia or war in the Congo.

Rating the Importance of International Treaties

48 – 55. Now I am going to lead to you a list of international treaties or agreements. Please tell me, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important it is for the U.S. to actively join and enforce each treaty.

Table 9. Rating the Importance of International Treaties (ranked by % high importance)

	High importance (4 + 5)	Neutral (3)	Low importance (1 + 2)	Not sure
Treaty on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (will not develop nuclear weapons)	77	14	7	2
ABM Treaty (will not develop nuclear weapons)	73	16	9	2
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (no testing of nuclear weapons)	71	18	8	2
CEDAW (prevent discrimination against women)	70	16	12	2
CITES (prohibits the sale or trade of endangered species or products from endangered species)	53	25	20	2
The Kyoto Protocol (fights global warming by curbing carbon dioxide emissions)	52	23	22	3
ICRW (ban on commercial whaling)	43	30	24	4

Americans were introduced to seven international treaties and asked to rate how important consider the participation of the United States to actively join and enforce each treaty. The ratings occur on a five-point scale, where one indicates the lowest importance and five indicates the highest importance.

Americans are much more likely to consider U.S. participation in the international treaties tested to be important rather than unimportant. The highest levels of importance are assigned to treaties that deal with the regulation of nuclear weapons, while lower levels of importance are assigned to treaties that deal with environmental issues.

At least seven in ten Americans assign high importance to four of the seven treaties (three of which deal with the regulation of nuclear weapons), including:

- The Treaty on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (77% rating 4 or 5 on the scale)
- The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty (73%)
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

- Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW; 70%)

Over half of Americans view U.S. participation in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES; 53%) and the Kyoto Protocol (52%) as important. Fewer than half (43%) view the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) as important.

Demographic Distinctions

In rating the importance of participating in the three treaties on the regulation of nuclear weapons, there is a high degree of consensus among the demographic sub-groups. Democrats and Independents are, however, more likely than Republicans to emphasize the importance of participation in these treaties (considering the importance of the ABM treaty, rated as important by 81% of Democrats compared to 66% of Republicans).

Traditional Democratic constituencies (Easterners, minorities, women, middle-income) are generally more likely to emphasize the importance U.S. participation in each of the three environmental treaties tested (Kyoto Protocol, CITES and the ICRW), than traditional Republican constituencies (Southerners, whites, men, higher income) who are less likely to consider U.S. participation important.

In evaluating the importance of participation in CEDAW (the treaty on eliminating discrimination of women) differences by region, age, and education are generally slight. Interestingly, so is the difference between men (67% important) and women (73%).

Among other sub-groups, party affiliation yields the sharpest distinctions: Democrats (79%) and Independents (76%) are much more likely than Republicans (55%) to consider U.S. participation in CEDAW to be important. It is also worth noting that upper-middle income respondents (\$50,000-\$75,000: 78%) are much more likely than high income respondents (\$75,000 or more: 65%) to assign high importance to U.S. participation in CEDAW.

Greatest Challenges Facing the U.S.-China Relationship

56. Which of the following do you think is the greatest challenge facing the relationship between China and the United States?

Human rights	28%
Differences in political views	22
North Korea	21
Trade	17
Military competition	7
Other*	2
Not sure	4

When asked to identify the greatest challenge facing the relationship between China and the United States from a list of issues, Americans most often choose human rights (28%) as the most challenging issue. More generally, 22% say differences in political views form the key challenge facing the Sino-American relationship. North Korea (21%) is also mentioned as a significant issue.

It is worth noting that trade issues (17%) are chosen as the key challenge in the U.S. relationship with China much more often than military competition (7%), which is chosen least among the issues tested. This suggests that Americans now view China more as an economic competitor in the era of globalization, than as the stark threat from the Cold War era.

The demographic distinctions in identifying the major challenges facing U.S.-China relations are generally mild.

Credibility If U.S. Announced Evidence of Iranian WMDs

57. If the United States were to announce that it possesses evidence that Iran has weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or has the means to develop WMD, how credible do you think this claim would be – very credible, somewhat credible, not very credible, or not at all credible?

Very credible	31%	Credible	69%
Somewhat credible	38		
Not very credible	16	Not credible	28
Not at all credible	12		
Not sure			3

* **Other responses** (Number in parentheses denotes frequency of similar response)

All of the above (4); Cultural differences (3); Economic competition (3); Taiwan (2); China wants to be a superpower and we are the only one; Formosa Island; Honesty; Lack of communication

Seven in ten Americans (69%) say U.S. claims that Iran has weapons of mass destruction would be either very (31%) or somewhat (38%) credible. Fewer than three in ten (28%) say such claims would not be credible.

As with other areas in this research, party affiliation offers the sharpest contrast among demographic subgroups, with 85% of Republicans saying claims of Iranian WMDs would be credible, compared to 59% of Democrats and 64% of Independents. Among other subgroups, African Americans (56%) are less likely than Whites to say the claim of Iranian WMDs would be credible (69%).

Importance of Mending the Transatlantic Relationship

58. *On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, how important is it for the United States make the effort to mend its relationship with Europe?*

1 Not at all important	5%	Low importance (1 + 2)	8%
2	3		
3	20		
4	18	High importance (4 + 5)	71
5 Extremely important	53		
Not sure	1		

Americans were asked how important it is for the United States to mend its relationship with Europe. The rating of importance occurs on a five-point scale, where one indicates least important and five indicates most important.

Seven in ten Americans rate mending the transatlantic relationship as important (71% rating 4 or 5). This includes over half (53%) who consider improving relations with Europe *very* important (5 on the scale).

Fewer than one in ten Americans do not consider mending the transatlantic relationship important (8% rating 1 or 2 on the scale).

Among the demographic subgroups, Democrats (79%) and Independents (79%) are much more likely than Republicans (58%) to emphasize the importance of improving the U.S. relationship with Europe. There are few other significant demographic distinctions.

Media Habits and Sources of Information about International Affairs

Finally, a few questions about where you get your information about international affairs.

59. Which of the following best describes how you get most of your information about international affairs or foreign policy?

Television	48%
Newspaper	21
Radio	11
Online	9
Magazines	4
Family and friends	3
Books	1
School	1
Other*	3

Nearly half (48%) say television is the source from which they most often receive foreign affairs information. Newspaper trails behind at 21%, followed more distantly by radio (11%) and online (9%) as the most significant sources of international affairs information. Other sources tested are mentioned by fewer than 5% of respondents.

Older, more highly educated Americans are more likely than average to mention the newspaper as their primary source of international affairs information, although the order of importance assigned to each of the information sources is consistent across nearly all of the major subgroups.

* **Other responses** (Number in parentheses denotes frequency of similar response)
All/combination of above (16); Travel (3); Mail; Work in the news industry

60. Which of the following best describes how often you watch, read or listen to information about international affairs?

Daily	73%
A few times a week	23
Once a month	1
Rarely	2
Never	0
Not sure	1

Three in four Americans (73%) say they watch, read or listen to information about international affairs on a daily basis, while an additional 23% say they do so a few times a week.

Those more likely to say they follow international affairs on a daily basis include:

- Republicans (77%)
- Older respondents (65-plus: 85%)
- College graduates (77% compared to high school graduates, 68%)
- Higher income earners (\$75,000-plus: 82%)

61. When watching television for information about international affairs, which of the following stations do you turn to most often for information?

CNN	28%
Fox News	22
NBC News	13
ABC News	8
CBS News	7
MSNBC	5
Local news	4
C-Span	2
Other*	7
Do not watch TV/Not sure	4

Americans were read a list of broadcast and cable television news networks and asked which of these they turned to most often for international affairs information. Among those tested, CNN is mentioned most often (28%), followed by Fox News (22%). NBC (13%), ABC (8%) CBS (7%) and MSNBC (5%) trail behind.

Among the demographic subgroups, those more likely to turn to CNN include:

- Democrats (38%)

* **Other responses** (Number in parentheses denotes frequency of similar response)
 PBS (34); BBC (10); All of the above (7); *One response*: British and Russian Independent Channel TV; CNNFN; DW-World News from Berlin; Free Speech Network; International News from Europe, Mid-East, Foreign News; The National Education Television Network

- Younger respondents (18-29: 41%)
- African Americans (44%)
- Catholics (35%)
- Middle income earners (\$35,000-\$50,000: 34%)
- Progressives (41%) and moderates (35%)

Those more likely to say they rely on Fox News most often for international affairs information include:

- Republicans (44%)
- Rural residents (26%)
- Protestants (27%)
- Born-again Christians (35%)
- Investors (26%)
- Higher income earners (\$75,000: 28%)
- Conservative (37%) and very conservative (66%) respondents

62. When reading newspapers for information about international affairs, which of the following do you turn to most often for information?

The New York Times	19%
The Wall Street Journal	9
The Washington Post	4
The Christian Science Monitor	2
The Los Angeles Times	2
The Washington Times	1
Other domestic paper*	45
International newspaper ⁺	1
Do not read newspapers/Not sure	16

Among the tested newspapers, *The New York Times* (19%) is mentioned most often, followed by *The Wall Street Journal* (9%). Over two in five Americans (45%) say they turn to their local newspaper for international affairs information.

* **Other domestic** (Number in parentheses denotes frequency of similar response):

Local newspapers – specified (372); Local newspapers – unspecified (66); USA Today (16)

+ **Other international:** *One response:* Arguments and Facts Russian newspaper; British independent newspaper; Moscow Times; The World News

63. When reading magazines for information about international affairs, which of the following do you turn to most often for information?

Newsweek	24%
Time	21
US News and World Report	14
Business Week	3
Forbes	2
Fortune	1
Other*	9
Do not read magazines/Not sure	26

Among the tested magazines, *Newsweek* is mentioned most often, by about one in four Americans (24%), followed closely by *Time* magazine (21%). U.S. News and World Report (14%) trails behind, while an additional 26% say they do not read magazines or are unsure which one they read most often.

* **Other** (Number in parentheses denotes frequency of similar response): The Economist (13); The Nation (6); New Yorker (5); Atlantic Monthly (4); Read magazines online (4); World magazines (4); National Review (3); Mother Jones (2); Reader's Digest (2); Time and Newsweek (2) *One each*: AARP; Christian publication; Coal Age; Daily Breeze; Family Fun; Filed and Stream; Good Housekeeping; Harpers; Money; National Geographic; National Rifle Assoc.; Playboy; Prophecy in the News; Reason; Spectator; Sporting News; The Week; VSW Magazine; Z Magazine.