



THE PEW RESEARCH CENTER
For The People & The Press

NEWS Release
1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 975
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel (202) 293-3126
Fax (202) 293-2569

FOR RELEASE: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 2004, 12:00 NOON

Eroding Respect for America Seen as Major Problem
FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDES NOW DRIVEN BY 9/11 AND IRAQ

A Survey Conducted In Association With:
COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Also Including:
Commentary by Lee Feinstein, James M. Lindsay, and Max Boot
Council on Foreign Relations

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Kohut, Director
Scott Keeter, Director of Survey Research
Carroll Doherty, Associate Director
Michael Dimock, Associate Director
Nilanthi Samaranayake, Peyton Craighill and Nicole Speulda, Project Directors
Jason Owens, Research Assistant
Kate DeLuca, Courtney Kennedy, Staff Assistants
Pew Research Center for The People & The Press
202/293-3126
<http://www.people-press.org>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview:	FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDES NOW DRIVEN BY 9/11 AND IRAQ	1
Part One:	THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC	5
Part Two:	AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE WORLD	8
Part Three:	FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES	17
Part Four:	BELIEFS ABOUT FOREIGN POLICY	23
Part Five:	OPINION ABOUT THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S STEWARDSHIP	30
Part Six:	OTHER ISSUES: MIDEAST, CHINA, TRADE	32
	SURVEY METHODOLOGY	36
	COMMENTARY	38
	DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES	40
	QUESTIONNAIRES	52

Eroding Respect for America Seen as Major Problem
FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDES NOW DRIVEN BY 9/11 AND IRAQ

For the first time since the Vietnam era, foreign affairs and national security issues are looming larger than economic concerns in a presidential election. The Sept. 11 attacks and the two wars that followed not only have raised the stakes for voters as they consider their choice for president, but also have created deep divisions and conflicting sentiments over U.S. foreign policy in a troubled time.

Dissatisfaction with Iraq is shaping opinions about foreign policy as much, if not more than, Americans’ continuing concerns over terrorism. Both attitudes now inform the public’s point of view of the U.S. role in the world. Tellingly, the poll finds about as many respondents favoring a *decisive* foreign policy (62%) as supporting a *cautious* approach (66%). And reflecting an ever-widening partisan gap on foreign policy issues, Republicans assign higher priority to decisiveness than to caution, while Democrats do just the opposite.

Americans are acutely aware of – and worried about – the loss of international respect for the United States given disillusionment over Iraq. Two-thirds say the U.S. is less respected by other countries than in the past, and this opinion is particularly prevalent among opponents of the Iraq war. Nearly nine-in-ten (87%) of those who think the war was the wrong decision say the U.S. is less respected internationally, compared with 53% who say the war was the right decision. And by roughly two-to-one, this loss of respect is viewed as a major – not minor – problem for the U.S.

Yet it also is clear that the constant threat of terrorism continues to influence public attitudes toward the use of force in the post-Sept. 11 era. Fully 88% of Americans rate “taking measures to protect the U.S. from terrorist attacks” as a top foreign policy priority. And while the public has deep reservations about the war in Iraq, there is sustained support for the doctrine of preemption. A 60% majority believes that the use of military force can at least be sometimes justified against

America and the World	
<i>Most important problem facing the nation...</i>	
War/Foreign policy/	%
Terrorism	41
Economic issues	26
Other domestic issues	26
<i>The U.S. is...</i>	
Less respected	67
Major problem	43
Minor/no problem/DK	24
More respected	10
No change	20
Don't know	3
	100
<i>Foreign policy should...</i>	
Be based mostly on	
U.S. interests	37
Take allies' interests	
into account	49
Both/Neither	8
Don't know	6
	100
<i>Bush administration...</i>	
Tries hard for diplomacy	33
Too quick to use force	59
Don't know	8
	100
<i>Top priority for U.S. foreign policy to (be)...</i>	
Follow moral principles	72
Cautious	66
Decisive	62
Practical	58
Compassionate	54
Flexible	40
Follow religious principles	33
Idealistic	25
Forceful	23

countries that may seriously threaten the U.S., but have not attacked. This is only a slight decline from the 67% that expressed that view in May 2003, when most Americans judged the war in Iraq a success.

Nonetheless, the public supports a cooperative stance toward America's allies. Overall, a majority of Americans – and nearly half of Republicans – rate improving relations with U.S. allies as a top foreign policy priority. The nationwide survey of foreign policy attitudes by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press,

conducted in association with the Council on Foreign Relations, also finds that by 49%-37%, the public believes that the nation's foreign policy should strongly take into account the interests of U.S. allies, rather than be based mostly on the national interests of the United States.

	May 2003	Aug 2003	July 2004
<i>Preemptive force can be justified...</i>	%	%	%
Often	22	20	20
Sometimes	45	43	40
Rarely	17	19	22
Never	13	13	14
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100	100

Continuing discontent with the way things are going in Iraq underlies public criticism of the Bush administration's overall approach to national security. The survey of foreign policy attitudes, conducted July 8-18 among 2,009 adults nationwide, finds a solid 59% majority faulting the Bush administration for being too quick to use force rather than trying hard enough to reach diplomatic solutions. A growing minority (37%) believes the administration pays too little attention to the interests and views of U.S. allies in conducting foreign policy, while 15% say it pays too much attention and 38% say the administration pays the right amount of attention to allied interests.

Moreover, evaluations of President Bush's handling of Iraq itself remain critical. An update of public opinion on Iraq, conducted August 5-10 among 1,512 adults, shows that more than a month after the transfer of sovereignty to the new Iraqi government, 52% disapprove of the way Bush is managing that situation. And almost six-in-ten (58%) continue to say that the president does not have a clear plan for bringing the situation in Iraq to a successful conclusion.

At the same time, there are also expressions of support for hardline antiterrorism measures both domestically and overseas. By a significant margin (49%-29%), more Americans are concerned that the government has not gone far enough to protect the country than are concerned that the government has gone too far in restricting civil liberties. The poll also finds that while a narrow majority of Americans (53%) believe that torture should rarely or never be used to gain important information from suspected terrorists, a sizable minority (43%) thinks torture can at least sometimes be justified.

Republicans and Democrats now hold sharply divergent views on a range of foreign policy attitudes, including the use of torture, the proper balance between fighting terrorism and protecting civil liberties, and even the root causes of the 9/11 attacks. Since late September 2001, a growing number of Democrats (51%) and independents (45%) believe that U.S. wrongdoing in dealings with other countries might have motivated the 9/11 attacks. Republicans reject that view even more decisively than three years ago (76% now, 65% in late September 2001).

Might U.S. Wrongdoing Have Motivated 9/11 Attacks?				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
<i>July 2004</i>	%	%	%	%
Yes	38	17	51	45
No	51	76	37	44
Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Late Sept 2001</i>				
Yes	33	27	40	34
No	55	65	48	59
Don't know	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Change</i>	+5	-10	+11	+11

Nowhere is the partisan divide more evident than in views of America's global standing. Fully 80% of Democrats and 74% of independents say the U.S. is less respected by other countries than in the past. Only about half of Republicans (47%) believe the U.S. has lost respect. At the same time, an increasing number of Republicans and independents – but not Democrats – believe the United States is more powerful than it was a decade ago. Democratic perceptions of U.S. power have not changed at all from a survey conducted just prior to the 9/11 attacks: 32% of Democrats saw the U.S. growing in power then, and the same number do so today.

Partisan gaps also are seen in differing visions of the nation's long-term foreign policy goals. Democrats rate protecting the jobs of American workers and combating terrorism as about equal in importance, and at the top of their scale of foreign policy priorities (89% cite jobs, 86% terrorism). For Republicans, by

Conflicting Priorities for Partisans			
	<u>Republicans</u>	<u>Democrats</u>	<u>Independents</u>
(1)	Terrorism	U.S. jobs	Terrorism
(2)	WMDs	Terrorism	U.S. jobs
(3)	U.S. jobs	AIDS	AIDS
(4)	Energy supplies	Drug trafficking	Energy supplies
(5)	Foreign oil	Energy supplies	WMDs

comparison, combating terrorism is by far the most important policy objective. Beyond that, many more Republicans than Democrats view preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction as a top priority, while Democrats attach greater urgency to strengthening the U.N., dealing with world hunger and reducing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases.

The public's overall priorities are significantly different now than they were in October 2001. In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, concern over many objectives unrelated to terrorism – especially reducing the spread of AIDS and dealing with hunger – fell sharply. But those concerns have

rebounded in the current survey, in some cases to pre-9/11 levels.

By contrast, the public attaches somewhat less importance than it has in the past to finding a solution to the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. Overall, the public sympathies in that conflict still lie with Israel rather than the Palestinians (by 40%-13%). Yet there has been a sharp decline in the percentage of Americans who regard U.S. policies in the Middle East as fair – 35% say they are fair, down from 47% in May 2003. While the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has barely been mentioned in the presidential campaign, public opinion about the region has become more polarized as well, with Democrats increasingly skeptical that the U.S. is fair in its policies.

Public opinion on other international issues unrelated to terrorism and Iraq – such as China and the impact of NAFTA and other trade agreements – has been fairly stable in recent years. On balance, a plurality of Americans (40%) characterize China as “a serious problem, but not an adversary,” while 36% think China “is not much of a problem.” The latter figure is little changed from two years ago (33%). Prior to the Sept. 11 attacks, just 23% thought that China was not much of a problem for the U.S.

Finally, the public remains divided over the impact of free trade. A 47% plurality believes NAFTA and other free trade agreements have been a good thing for the United States, while 34% say they have been a bad thing. Yet Americans are far less positive about the *personal* impact of such trade deals – 34% say their financial situation has been helped, compared with 41% who say they have been hurt by free trade agreements. Further, protecting jobs now ranks as highly as a foreign policy priority as it did in the early 1990s.

Part One:

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

Barring a sizable shift in public opinion over the next few months, the 2004 election will be the first since the Vietnam era in which foreign affairs and national security issues are a higher public priority than the economy. Currently, four-in-ten Americans (41%) cite international and defense issues such as the Iraq war and terrorism as the most important problems facing the country, while just a quarter of the public (26%) offers economic concerns. And both Pew Research Center and Gallup surveys show that, if anything, the public's focus on foreign and security issues is increasing as the campaign progresses.

	Feb 2003	April 2003	Jan 2004	July 2004
War/Foreign policy/ Terrorism (Net)	%	%	%	%
Terrorism (Net)	54	29	37	41
Iraq war	34	14	16	25
Terrorism	16	9	14	8
Economic (Net)	29	41	35	26
Economy	21	28	20	14
Unemployment	6	10	13	8

An analysis of Gallup Poll data from 1948 through 2004 shows that foreign policy and international security issues dominated elections during the early part of this period (1948-1972). On average, foreign and security concerns were cited as the most important national problem at least twice as often as economic concerns during these seven presidential elections – peaking in 1968 when foreign and security concerns were

Years	Ratio of Economic to Foreign & Security Issues
2004	1:1
2000	4:1
1996	8:1
1992	18:1
1988	4:1
1984	2:1
1980	5:1
1976	9:1
1972	1:2
1968	1:9
1964	1:3
1960	1:4
1956	1:2
1952	1:2
1948	1:5

Analysis based on Gallup Poll data yearly averages of foreign and economic issues that were cited as “the most important problem facing this country today” and were summed independently.

mentioned nine times for every single mention of the economy.¹

This changed markedly beginning with the election of 1976. From that point through the election of 2000, economic issues were, on average, cited as the most important problem facing the nation at least twice as often as international and security issues. This ratio peaked in 1992, when there were fully 18 mentions of the economy as the most important problem facing the nation for every one mention of foreign, defense, or security issues.

In the current campaign, however, foreign policy is once again assuming much greater importance. Taking the average of Gallup surveys conducted between January and July, about as many respondents have identified foreign and security issues as have mentioned economic concerns as the most important problem facing the nation. Moreover, the proportion citing foreign and security problems has been rising. In a January Pew Research Center survey, 37% cited international or security problems, while 35% listed economic concerns. But by July, the number citing international or security problems – most notably Iraq (25%) and terrorism (8%) – rose to 41%, while a net of 26% cited any kind of economic concerns.

Foreign News Interest

The increased importance of international and security issues following Sept. 11 and the U.S. military action in Iraq coincided with a spike in public attention to foreign news. The proportion who say they follow international affairs “very closely” rose from 14% to 21% from 2000 to 2002 in Pew’s Biennial Media Consumption study, and inched even higher to 24% in April of this year. Moreover, asked whether they follow international news closely *most of the time* or *only* when something important is happening a majority (52%) this year say the former. In 2000, more said they followed only when something important is happening by a 64% to 33% margin.

	April 2000	April 2002	April 2004
	%	%	%
<i>Follow international news...</i>			
Most of the time	33	37	52
Only when something important is happening	64	61	47
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100
Very closely	14	21	24
Somewhat closely	45	44	44
Not very closely	24	18	16
Not at all closely	17	17	16
Don't know	*	*	*
	100	100	100

An analysis of the Center’s monthly measure of public news interests bears out the increased attention to news about international events and national security. In the five years prior to the 9/11 attacks, the average news story that involved

¹ Data generously provided by the Gallup Organization.


events overseas and international affairs was followed closely by just 19% of Americans. This rose to 34% in the year following the attacks, and reached as much as 38% during the buildup to military action in Iraq.

Not surprisingly, most of this increased attention has been focused on news about Iraq and issues related to terrorism. In the year following the attacks, news about U.S. military action in Afghanistan and other terrorist incidents were followed very closely by, on average, 41% of Americans. Public attention to foreign news *not* related to terrorism during this period was not substantially different from what it was before the attacks.

Iraq dominated the public's news attention from October 2002 through April 2003, with half of Americans following news about the situation in Iraq very closely in a typical month. News interest in Iraq has dipped somewhat over the past year, but roughly four-in-ten (39% in the current survey) say they are following news about Iraq very closely.

The Center's news interest database shows that the public's appetite for overseas news that is *not* related to terrorism or Iraq remains somewhat limited, however. For example, in both 1994 and again a decade later, violence and civil unrest in Haiti drew little public attention (14% in 1994, 15% in 2004). Only after U.S. forces were sent to Haiti late in 1994 did a sizable proportion (31%) turn their attention to the situation.

The same pattern is evident regarding news about ethnic violence in Africa. In 1994, only 12% followed news about ethnic violence in Rwanda very closely. This is virtually identical to public attention to news from Sudan in July of this year (14% following very closely). Taking the average from all types of overseas news stories that are not linked to Iraq or terrorism together over the past two years reveals that roughly a quarter of Americans follow such news very closely. This is up only



slightly from the overall foreign news average of 19% prior to the 9/11 attacks.

Part Two:

AMERICA'S PLACE IN THE WORLD

Three years after the Sept. 11 attacks, and more than a year after the start of the war in Iraq, the public takes a paradoxical view of America's place in the world. Nearly half of Americans (45%) say the United States plays a more important and powerful role as world leader than it did 10 years ago – the largest percentage expressing that opinion in the three decades that this question has been asked.

Yet Americans – in greater numbers – also believe that the United States is less respected by other countries than it has been in the past. Two-thirds (67%) say the U.S. is less respected, as opposed to just 20% who say the U.S. retains as much respect around the world as in the past.

The percentage saying that the U.S. is less respected internationally is higher than the number who expressed this opinion in May 1987, during the Iran-contra hearings, and nearly double the number who felt this way in January 1984, at the start of President Ronald Reagan's second term. Furthermore, more than four-in-ten Americans (43%) see the declining respect for the U.S. around the world as a major problem, double the number who believe it is a minor problem or not a concern (23%).

Partisan Perceptions

Partisanship is by far the most important factor shaping these attitudes. In previous surveys, Republicans, Democrats and independents all shared similar perceptions of U.S. power around the world. In early September 2001 (just prior to the 9/11 attacks), about four-in-ten Republicans (38%) and about a third of independents (34%) and Democrats (32%) felt the United States played a more important role as world leader than it did a decade earlier.

U.S. Seen as More Powerful...

	<i>Global role vs. ten years ago</i>			
	<u>More Important</u>	<u>Less Important</u>	<u>As Important</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
	%	%	%	%
July 2004	45	20	31	4=100
Early Sept 2001	33	26	38	3=100
Sept 1997	35	23	40	2=100
Dec 1994	40	27	29	4=100
Sept 1993	37	30	31	2=100
Nov 1990	37	35	24	4=100
Nov 1986	41	26	29	4=100

...But Less Respected

	<i>U.S. as respected as in past?*</i>			
	<u>More Respected</u>	<u>Less Respected</u>	<u>As Respected</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
	%	%	%	%
July 2004	10	67	20	3=100
May 1987*	19	55	23	3=100
Jan 1984*	27	36	29	8=100

* May 1987 asked "Compared to five years ago...".
Jan 1984 asked "Compared to four years ago..."

Today, the dominant view among Republicans is that the U.S. is more important and powerful than it was a decade ago: 63% of Republicans express that view, an increase of 25 points compared with three years ago. By contrast, Democrats regard U.S. global power in the same way as before the Sept. 11 attacks – the same number regard the U.S. as more powerful as did so three years ago (32%).

	Sept 1997	Sept* 2001	July 2004
	%	%	%
Total	35	33	45
Republican	30	38	63
Democrats	41	32	32
Independents	33	34	44

* 2001 Figures from prior to 9-11 attacks.

U.S. Less Respected

The belief that the United States is now less respected by other countries is widely shared across the demographic spectrum. There are no significant differences in this attitude by gender, age, race or education.

Yet there are sharp political differences, with far more Democrats and independents than Republicans saying that other countries accord the U.S. lower levels of respect than in the past. And this gap is as large, if not larger, when vote preference is considered. Among swing voters, 69% think the U.S. is less respected than it has been, while just 26% say it is as respected or more respected than in the past.

Opinions about the war in Iraq also are closely related to perceptions of America’s global standing. Nearly nine-in-ten of those who think the war was the wrong decision (87%) say the United States is less respected than it once was; just 13% of war opponents believe the U.S. is as respected or more respected. About half of war supporters (53%) think the U.S. is less respected, while 44% think other countries respect the U.S. as much or more than in the past.

In addition to believing that the U.S. has lost respect around the world, most Americans also believe it is losing popularity. About six-in-ten (59%) believe the U.S. is liked less by other countries than in the past, about twice the number who think America’s

	<i>U.S. as respected as in past?</i>			
	<u>More Respected</u>	<u>Less Respected</u>	<u>As Respected</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
	%	%	%	%
Total	10	67	20	3=100
<i>Party ID</i>				
Republican	16	47	34	3=100
Democrat	8	80	11	1=100
Independent	7	74	17	2=100
<i>Vote intentions</i>				
Certain Bush	13	48	36	3=100
Certain Kerry	6	85	8	1=100
Swing voter	5	69	21	5=100
<i>Iraq war was...</i>				
Right decision	15	53	29	3=100
Wrong decision	4	87	8	1=100

popularity is unchanged (29%). Fewer than one-in-ten think the United States is liked more than it was in the past.

Assessing the Consequences

By roughly two-to-one (43%-23%), Americans say the decline in respect for the U.S. from other countries represents a major problem. Partisanship is a key factor in shaping opinion on this issue, but education is a factor as well.

About half of college graduates (51%) view declining respect for the U.S. as a major problem, a view shared by 41% of those with a high school education. Slightly more women than men see this as a major problem.

Politically, Republicans (and Bush voters) are divided over whether the decline in America’s respect is a major problem, while solid majorities of Democrats (and Kerry voters) believe that it is. Swing voters, by a two-to-one margin (44%-22%), view America’s lower level of respect as a significant concern. Nearly two-thirds of those who believe the Iraq war was the wrong decision (65%) say the loss of respect from other countries is a major problem for the U.S.; just 28% of those who feel the war was the right decision agree.

America Less Respected – How Big a Problem?				
	<i>U.S. less respected</i>		<i>U.S. not less respected**</i>	<i>DK</i>
	<i>Major problem</i>	<i>Not major*</i>		
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Total	43	24	30	3=100
Men	41	25	31	3=100
Women	46	23	29	2=100
College grad	51	19	29	1=100
H.S. or less	41	25	31	3=100
Republican	22	24	50	4=100
Democrat	56	24	19	1=100
Independent	49	25	24	2=100
<i>Vote...</i>				
Certain Bush	24	24	49	3=100
Certain Kerry	64	21	14	1=100
Swing voter	44	24	27	5=100
<i>Iraq war was...</i>				
Right decision	28	25	44	3=100
Wrong decision	64	23	12	1=100

* Respondents who say loss of respect is only “a minor problem,” “not a problem” or don’t have an opinion.
 ** Respondents who say the U.S. is “more respected” or “as respected as in the past.”

State of the World

In general, Americans offer a negative assessment of the way things are going in the world, with just 21% expressing satisfaction with global conditions. That is in line with previous surveys dating back to 1993; even prior to Sept. 11, less than three-in-ten ever expressed a positive view of the way things are going in the world.

Attitudes toward the state of the world are divided by partisanship. More than three times as many Republicans as Democrats express satisfaction with global conditions (37% vs. 11%). Prior

to 9/11 the gap was smaller, with 31% of Republicans expressing satisfaction compared with 22% of Democrats.

Public satisfaction with the state of the *nation*, while not very high at 38%, still exceeds positive opinion of global conditions by a wide margin. African Americans, in particular, express overwhelming dissatisfaction with the way things are going both in the U.S. and in the world. Just 16% of blacks have a positive opinion of national conditions, while just 6% say they are satisfied with the way things are going in the world.

	Satis- fied %	Dissat- isfied %	Neither/ DK %
July 2004	21	74	5=100
Sept 2002	17	79	4=100
Early Sept 2001	27	64	9=100
Sept 1997	29	65	6=100
Oct 1993	12	81	7=100
Sept 1993	28	66	6=100

Between Empire and Isolation

Americans continue to reject the role of single world leader for the United States, yet they also resist the pull of isolationism. Roughly three-quarters (74%) say the U.S. should play a *shared* leadership role, while 11% say the United States should be the *single* world leader and 9% think the U.S. should play *no* leadership role in the world.

While these broad judgments about America’s place in the world have remained fairly stable for more than a decade, there has been movement on the issue of whether the U.S. – while sharing the leadership role with other nations – should be the *most active* of leading nations or *about as active* as others.

In the aftermath of the Sept. 11 attacks, there was a notable rise in the percentage who said the U.S. should be most active among leading nations – from 25% in early September 2001 to 33% in mid-October of that year. That was the highest percentage expressing that sentiment in the 11 years this question has been asked. When combined with the 12% who believed the U.S. should assume the role of “single world leader,” nearly half of Americans (45%) favored the U.S. becoming the world’s leading nation or at least the most active among leading countries.

	Oct 2001 %	July 2004 %	Change
Total	45	38	-7
Men	45	45	0
Women	44	32	-12
White	45	40	-5
Black	38	26	-12
College Grad	46	43	-3
H.S. or less	44	35	-9
Republican	53	54	+1
Democrat	38	29	-9
Independent	46	35	-11

* Total percent who think the U.S. should *either* be the single world leader or the most active among nations sharing leadership.

But the number who favor the U.S. being most active among leading nations has declined to 30% in June 2003 and 27% today. Currently, just 38% want the U.S. to be either the single world leader (11%) or most active among leading nations (27%). More (44%) favor the U.S. being only about as active as other leading nations.

The decrease since then has been most pronounced among women, minorities and people with a high school education. Notably, Republicans remain as supportive of an assertive global role for the U.S. as they were in October 2001 (54% now, 53% then). By comparison, there has been a significant falloff in the number of independents (down 11 percentage points) and Democrats (down nine percentage points) favoring this approach.

Multilateral Foreign Policy Favored

In general, the public favors giving the interests of U.S. allies strong consideration in the conduct of foreign policy. About half of Americans (49%) say the U.S. should strongly take allied interests into account in determining the nation’s foreign policy, while 37% believe America’s foreign policy should be based mostly on U.S. national interests.

The public’s preferences in this regard are virtually unchanged from early September 2001, prior to the Sept. 11 attacks. At that time, 48% said the U.S. should pay heed to allied concerns and 38% favored determining foreign policy mostly on the basis of national interests.

Allies Should Matter in Foreign Policy, Less So Terrorism Policy					
	Sept 2001*	Oct 2001	Aug 2002	Aug 2003	July 2004
<i>Foreign Policy</i>					
U.S. interests	38	--	--	--	37
Allies’ interests	48	--	--	--	49
Both/DK	<u>14</u>	--	--	--	<u>14</u>
	100				100
<i>Terrorism Policy</i>					
U.S. interests	--	30	45	48	43**
Allies’ interests	--	59	35	35	35
Both/DK	--	<u>11</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>22</u>
		100	100	100	100

* 2001 figures from before Sept 11th.
 ** Figures from supplemental survey conducted July 30-August 12, 2004 of 1,057 adults.

Following the 9/11 attacks, this question was modified to ask specifically about the conduct of the war on terrorism. Initially, the public decisively supported giving strong consideration to allied interests in the war on terror. In October 2001, most (59%) said the U.S. should strongly take allied interests into account. But opinion shifted dramatically – in favor of basing policy mostly on national interests – in subsequent surveys. By August 2002, a plurality (45%) said national interests should predominate with respect to the war on terrorism. Views have remained largely unchanged since that time; currently 43% believe national interests should take precedence in the war on terrorism, while 35% say the U.S. should strongly take into account the views of allies.

Education is a more important factor than partisanship in shaping people’s views about working with allies. Many more college graduates than those with a high school education favor giving allies’ interests strong consideration when making foreign policy decisions (56% vs. 36%). At the same time, the partisan differences on this issue are much narrower than over questions relating to U.S. power and prestige.

By nearly two-to-one (57%-29%), people who see declining respect as a major problem for the U.S. favor giving allied interests heavy consideration when determining foreign policy. Those who view declining respect as less of a problem are evenly divided over whether allied interests (42%), or national interests (45%), should be more of a consideration.

Amicable Toward the Allies			
<i>U.S. foreign policy based mostly on...</i>			
	Allies’ <u>Interests</u>	U.S. <u>Interests</u>	Other/ <u>DK</u>
	%	%	%
Total	49	37	14=100
Men	47	39	14=100
Women	50	35	15=100
Men 50+	39	45	16=100
Women 50+	50	30	20=100
College grad	56	30	14=100
H.S. or less	36	48	16=100
Republican	46	44	10=100
Democrat	49	38	13=100
Independent	54	32	14=100
<i>U.S. is respected...</i>			
Less	52	33	15=100
More/same	48	40	12=100
<i>Less respect for U.S. is ...</i>			
Major problem	57	29	14=100
Minor/no problem	42	45	16=100

Most Favor Strong Ties with W. Europe


Despite the strains in U.S. relations with Western Europe, the public has remained supportive of continued close ties with countries in that region. A 56% majority believes the partnership between the U.S. and Western Europe should remain as close as it has been in the past, while just 33% think the U.S. should pursue a more independent course.

Opinion in this matter has changed only modestly since February 2003, prior to the start of the war in Iraq. At that time, somewhat more Americans (62%) backed a close relationship with Western Europe. Since then, smaller majorities have supported a continuing partnership with Western Europe.

There are no partisan differences on this issue – nearly identical numbers of independents, Republicans and Democrats want relations with Western Europe to remain as close as in the past. But there are significant differences on the basis of race and education. About six-in-ten whites believe the transatlantic partnership should remain close; barely a third of African Americans (34%) agree. And many more college graduates than those with a high school education support a close relationship with Western Europe (66% vs. 49%).

Mixed Views on War; Skepticism about Iraqi Government

Public views of the war in Iraq are nuanced and ambivalent, but the long-term trend is clearly negative. A narrow majority of Americans (53%) continue to believe it was the “right decision” to use military force in Iraq, but this figure is down from the 74% who held that view during the height of major combat last year. And more Americans now disapprove (52%) than approve (43%) of the way Bush is handling the situation in Iraq. This approval rating is down from a peak of 77% during the major combat phase in April 2003.




Moreover, the formal transfer of power in Iraqi at the end of June from the United States to a new interim Iraqi government has not triggered any significant improvement in the way Americans view the situation there. By a ratio of more than three-to-one, the percentage of Americans (19%) who say the new Iraqi government is doing an “excellent” or “good” job is outnumbered by the percentage of Americans (65%) who say it is doing an “only fair” or “poor” job.

Performance of New Iraq Government

	July %	Aug %
Excellent/good	23	19
Only Fair/Poor	55	65
Don't know	22	16
	100	100

In addition, although news media coverage of Iraq dropped sharply following the transfer of power, many Americans apparently have been following events there closely enough to know that the casualties suffered by American forces did not decline in the month following the transfer. Roughly three-in-ten (31%) say the number of U.S. military casualties has been higher in the past month compared with recent months; 42% say casualties have remained about the same; and just 18% say they have dropped. (The number of U.S. military deaths in Iraq was 54 in July and 42 in June, according to the Defense Department.)




The erosion in public support for the war in Iraq over the past year is best illustrated by a

sharp increase in the percentage of Americans who question whether the war has helped the war on terrorism. Just 45% now say it has “helped,” while 44% say it has “hurt.” The public has been evenly divided on this question since June, whereas 15 months ago, following the fall of Baghdad, just 22% said it had hurt and nearly two-thirds (63%) said it had helped. As recently as February of this year, 62% said the war in Iraq had helped the war on terror, and only 28% said it had hurt.

On this question, as on virtually every other assessment of the Iraq war, attitudes divide starkly along partisan lines. Americans who say they intend to vote for Bush say the war in Iraq has helped the war on terrorism by a margin of 82%-10%. Americans who say they plan to vote for Kerry say the war in Iraq has hurt the war on terrorism by a margin of 74%-17%. Swing voters mirror the nation as a whole, with 42% saying it has helped and 44% saying it has hurt.

Despite the public’s growing doubts on this question, there has not been an equivalent spike in support for a quick pullout of U.S. troops from Iraq. Just four-in-ten Americans (42%) favor withdrawing U.S. troops as soon as possible, while 54% say troops should remain in Iraq until the situation there has stabilized. These numbers have been fairly constant over the past year.

On the question of when to withdraw, Americans are separated not just by partisanship (61%



of Kerry supporters favor a quick pullout, as opposed to 16% of Bush supporters who hold that

view) but also by their level of education. Two-thirds of all Americans who graduated from college favor keeping troops in Iraq long enough to bring stability, while more than half (61%) of Americans with less than a high school degree favor a quick pullout.

Nearly six-in-ten Americans (58%) say Bush does not have a clear plan to bring the situation in Iraq to a successful conclusion, while 36% say he does. These figures have been stable for the past year, and they remain strongly influenced by partisanship. Eight-in-ten Bush supporters (79%) say he has a clear plan, while 94% of Kerry supporters and 62% of swing voters say he does not.

Part Three:

FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES

Sept. 11 changed the public’s foreign policy priorities. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, concern over future terrorist attacks dominated public concerns and many traditional foreign policy goals assumed a lower priority. Now, nearly three years later, the public’s priorities have shifted again. While protecting the U.S. from terrorist attacks remains the top priority, other issues have rebounded in importance. The biggest changes over this time period are a renewed focus on global social problems (such as AIDS, international drug trafficking and world hunger), and a more intense concern about protecting the jobs of American workers.

Currently, nearly nine-in-ten Americans (88%) say taking measures to protect the U.S. from terrorist attacks should be a top foreign policy priority. Even before 9/11, this issue rated as the public’s leading priority. But its importance increased markedly after the attacks (93% said this was a top priority) and has fallen only marginally since then.

Yet the public now attaches nearly as much importance to the goal of protecting the jobs of American workers – 84% say this should be a top foreign policy priority. This is up from 74% in October 2001 and comparable to the level of concern expressed in September 1993, when jobs and the domestic economy were in the forefront of Americans’ minds.

More than seven-in-ten Americans (72%) view reducing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases as a top foreign policy priority. Prior to Sept. 11, public concern over this issue was equally high (73% said this should be a top priority), but it declined as a priority after the attacks (59% in October 2001). The increase since that time

Foreign Policy Priorities			
	<i>--2001--</i>		
	Early	Late	July
<i>Percent considering each a “top priority”</i>	<u>Sept</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>2004</u>
	%	%	%
Protect against terrorist attacks	80	93	88
Protect jobs of American workers	77	74	84
Reduce spread of AIDS & other diseases	73	59	72
Stop spread of weapons of mass destruction	78	81	71
Insure adequate energy supplies	74	69	70
Reduce dependence on foreign oil	--	--	63
Combat international drug trafficking	64	55	63
Distribute costs of maintaining world order	56	54	58
Improve relationships with allies	--	--	54
Deal with problem of world hunger	47	34	50
Strengthen the United Nations	42	46	48
Protect groups threatened with genocide	49	48	47
Deal with global warming	44	31	36
Reduce U.S. military commitments	26	--	35
Promote U.S. business interests abroad	37	30	35
Promote human rights abroad	29	27	33
Solve Israeli/ Palestinian conflict	--	--	28
Promote democracy abroad	29	24	24
Improve living standards in poor nations	25	20	23

has been most pronounced among whites, middle-aged Americans, college graduates, Republicans and independents. College graduates, in particular, rate reducing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases as a more important objective; 67% rate it a top priority, up from just 43% in October 2001. Reducing the spread of AIDS remains a higher priority for women, blacks and liberals, but the gaps along demographic and party lines have narrowed substantially in recent years.

Increased Partisan Differences

The shift in public priorities since the fall of 2001 is largely a consequence of growing divisions along partisan lines. While Republicans and Democrats had similar lists of foreign policy priorities in October 2001, they are increasingly focused on different issues today.

Protecting the U.S. against terrorism is by far the leading priority among Republicans, with more than nine-in-ten (93%) rating that goal a top priority. By comparison, about as many Democrats cite protecting U.S. jobs as a major priority as mention terrorism (89% vs. 86%). And while Republicans are more focused on preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and reducing America’s dependence on imported oil, Democrats are more concerned about reducing the spread of AIDS and combating international drug trafficking.

Looking at partisanship across a range of policy issues, the gaps between Republicans and Democrats have grown wider on those issues that have been politicized since 9/11 and the beginning of the Iraq war – namely preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, insuring adequate energy supplies and reducing U.S. military commitments overseas.

Widening Partisan Gaps on Key Issues			
<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<i>R-D Gap</i>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	
<i>Preventing spread of weapons of mass destruction</i>			
Early Sept 2001	78	82	-4
July 2004	82	63	+19
<i>Reducing U.S. military commitments</i>			
Early Sept 2001	29	24	+5
July 2004	26	39	-13
<i>Insuring adequate energy supplies</i>			
Early Sept 2001	76	76	0
July 2004	77	65	+12

WMD Less Important

While still among the public's top foreign policy priorities, preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction rates somewhat lower than it has in the past, and has become much more politicized. In early Sept. 2001, 78% of Americans said preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction should be a top foreign policy priority. In mid-October 2001, that number rose slightly to 81%.

Since then, however, the percentage saying this issue should be a top priority has fallen to 71%. It is now comparable to the level of concern expressed in the early to mid-1990s. The falloff since Oct. 2001 has been

most pronounced among whites, those with at least some college education, and, as with many other issues, reflects a growing political divide. There has been no change in opinions on this issue among Republicans or conservatives. But significantly fewer Democrats and independents rate preventing the spread of WMD as a top priority today than following the 9/11 attacks.

WMD a More Politicized Topic			
<i>Percent rating</i>	Oct	July	
<i>preventing the spread of WMD as top priority...</i>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2004</u>	<i>Change</i>
Total	81	71	-10
White	84	72	-12
Black	72	70	-2
College grad	80	66	-14
Some college	86	69	-17
High school grad	82	74	-8
Less than high school	75	70	-5
Republican	82	82	0
Democrat	81	63	-18
Independent	88	69	-19
Conservative	81	80	-1
Moderate	81	68	-13
Liberal	86	61	-25

Energy and Oil

Ensuring adequate energy supplies for the U.S. continues to rank among the public's leading long-term policy goals. Seven-in-ten Americans say this should be a top priority, virtually unchanged from Oct. 2001 (69%) and down slightly from early Sept. 2001 (74%). Energy security has assumed somewhat greater importance since the mid-1990s, when roughly six-in-ten said this should be a top priority.

This issue is especially important to Republicans. More than three-quarters of Republicans (77%) place a high priority on ensuring adequate energy supplies. By contrast, 65% of Democrats – and just half of liberal Democrats – say energy should be a top priority. Otherwise, there are few notable demographic differences on this issue.

Reducing U.S. dependence on imported oil rates somewhat lower on the public's list of priorities. Roughly six-in-ten Americans (63%) cite this as a top objective. Nearly equal proportions of Republicans, Democrats and independents say reducing the nation's dependence on foreign oil

should be a top priority.

Combating international drug trafficking is one of the policy goals that was viewed as less important after 9/11, but has rebounded. Today 63% of the public says this should be a top foreign policy priority, up from 55% in October 2001 and comparable to the 64% who expressed this view in early September 2001. The number was marginally higher in September 1997 (67%).

Improve Relations With Allies

A 58% majority rates as a top priority the goal of getting other nations to assume more of the costs of keeping world order. This view has changed little in the past few years, and is fairly consistent across most demographic and political groups. However, the goal of persuading other nations to share international burdens is much more important to older Americans than it is to younger people: 68% of those age 50 and older say this should be a top priority, compared with 51% of those under age 50.

The related issue of improving relations with U.S. allies is slightly more divisive from a political standpoint. Overall, 54% of the public says improving relationships with U.S. allies should be a top foreign policy priority. But Republicans are significantly less likely to hold this view than are Democrats or independents (47% vs. 58% and 59%, respectively).

Working With Allies a Priority			
<i>Improving relations with our allies should be given...</i>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
	%	%	%
Top priority	47	58	59
Some priority	48	37	38
No priority	4	4	2
Don't know	$\frac{1}{100}$	$\frac{1}{100}$	$\frac{1}{100}$

'Compassion Agenda'

Several of the remaining foreign policy priorities relate to providing assistance – material, security or other forms – to countries in need. Half of the public says dealing with the problem of world hunger should be a top priority. This issue, like preventing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases, faded somewhat in the immediate post-9/11 period (34% said it should be a top priority in October 2001), but has since assumed more urgency.

Addressing the problem of world hunger is given much higher priority by Democrats, liberals, women, blacks and the less affluent.

By comparison, there has been little change in public attitudes toward preventing genocide, despite the ongoing tragedy in Sudan. Roughly half of the public (47%) rates “protecting groups or nations that are threatened with genocide” as a top policy priority; prior to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, 49% held this view.

There are no major differences in this view demographically or politically, but this is a higher priority for those who have followed the situation in Sudan very closely (59% top priority) than for those who have paid less attention to the story (45%).

A third of the public believes promoting and defending human rights in other countries should be a top foreign policy priority. This number has increased steadily since 1993, when 22% viewed human rights as a top priority and an equal percentage said it should have no priority at all. In the pre-9/11 poll, Democrats placed more importance on this issue than did Republicans (32% vs. 24%, respectively). Today Republicans feel more strongly about the issue (38% vs. 30% of Democrats).

Spreading Democracy a Low Priority

Despite President Bush’s goal of a more democratic Mideast, only about a quarter of Americans (24%) believe that promoting democracy in other nations should be a top priority. There has been no increase in support for this objective since October 2001.

There is no significant partisan division on this question – just 27% of Republicans and 22% Democrats rate this as a top priority. Those who feel the war in Iraq was the right decision are more likely to rate this an important objective. Still, just three-in-ten war supporters call this a top priority, compared with 18% of those who feel the war was the wrong decision.

Evangelicals Back Promoting Democracy				
	White Evangel Protestant	White Non-evangel Protestant	White Catholic	Secular
<i>Promoting democracy should be given...</i>	%	%	%	%
Top priority	30	20	22	19
Some priority	59	62	64	51
No priority	9	13	11	28
Don't know	2	5	3	2
	100	100	100	100

In addition, white evangelical Protestants are stronger proponents of promoting democracy than are non-evangelical Protestants or Catholics (30% vs. 20% and 22%, respectively, say this should be a top foreign policy priority).

Waning Support for Addressing Global Warming

Global warming is a much less important issue to most Americans than it was prior to 9/11. Just 36% rate it a top priority, and while this represents a small rise in importance since the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks (31%) it is still far below previous levels. In early Sept. 2001, 44% of Americans said global warming should be a top priority, and as recently as 1995, fully 56% of the public held this view.

Republicans and Democrats are worlds apart when it comes to global warming. While 44% of Democrats say this issue should be a top priority, only 22% of Republicans agree. Independents are much closer to Democrats on this issue (42% say top priority). There was a similar partisan gap in the pre-9/11 survey, when 51% of Democrats but just 30% of Republicans gave global warming top billing.

Defense Spending

The public is somewhat more supportive of reducing U.S. military commitments abroad than it was in early September 2001; 35% now rate that objective as a top priority, compared with 26% three years ago. For the most part, however, public attitudes on defense issues are now similar to where they were prior to the attacks.

Overall, 53% think the U.S. should keep defense spending at about the same level, 25% believe it should be increased while 18% think it should be cut back. Public support for increased defense spending rose sharply between early September 2001 and the survey conducted just six weeks later, after the 9/11 attacks (from 32% to 50%). The current balance of opinion is much closer to measures taken prior to Sept. 11. In August 1999, for instance, 54% backed maintaining the current level of defense spending, 27% favored increased spending, and 16% supported a cut in defense expenditures.

Americans are somewhat more supportive of increasing the *size* of the military. About a third (34%) express that opinion, while a majority (54%) favors keeping the military the same size and just 8% support a cut back. Since the Sept. 11 attacks, the gender gap on many defense issues has disappeared, and in the current survey nearly as many women as men are supportive of increasing the defense budget. However, men are significantly more likely than women to favor increasing the size of the military (40% vs. 29%).

Gender Gap Over Size of the Military		
	<u>Increase Defense Spending</u> %	<u>Increase Military Size</u> %
Total	25	34
Men	27	40
Women	23	29

Part Four:

BELIEFS ABOUT FOREIGN POLICY

Americans today believe the guiding principles of U.S. foreign policy should be morality, caution and decisiveness. Fully 72% of the public says following moral principles should be a top priority in the way the U.S. conducts foreign policy. Roughly two-thirds (66%) say being cautious should be a top priority and 62% place equal importance on being decisive. Smaller majorities say being practical and compassionate should be part of the equation as well.

While Americans view morality as a key foreign policy value, they place less emphasis on following religious principles. And though decisiveness is valued, being forceful is among the public’s lowest priorities (23% say it should be a top priority). Being flexible in the conduct of foreign policy is valued by four-in-ten Americans, and idealism is a top priority for just 25% of the public.

<i>How much priority should be given to...?</i>	<u>Top priority</u> %	<u>Some priority</u> %	<u>No priority</u> %	<u>DK</u> %
Following moral principles	72	23	3	2=100
Being cautious	66	31	2	1=100
Being decisive	62	30	3	5=100
Being practical	58	37	2	3=100
Being compassionate	54	39	4	3=100
Being flexible	40	52	4	4=100
Following religious principles	33	42	21	4=100
Being idealistic	25	56	13	6=100
Being forceful	23	59	14	4=100

Proponents and opponents of the use of force in Iraq agree that following moral principles and caution are important priorities in U.S. foreign policy. However, those who favor the decision to go to war place much greater importance on decisiveness than do those who oppose this policy (70% vs. 51%). In addition, those who support the use of force in Iraq are much more likely than those who oppose it to say religious principles should come into play in formulating foreign policy (42% vs. 25%). And nearly twice as many war supporters as war opponents rate “being forceful” as a top priority (29% vs. 16%).

<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	<i>Use of force in Iraq</i>	
	<u>Right decision</u>	<u>Wrong decision</u>
Being decisive	70	51
Following religious principles	42	25
Being forceful	29	16

Demographic Fault Lines

While men and women agree on the importance of morality, decisiveness and following religious principles in the conduct of foreign policy, women place more importance on caution, practicality and compassion than do men.

Education and income are also strongly linked to values about foreign policy. Nearly three-quarters (74%) of those who never attended college are advocates for using caution in the conduct of foreign policy, compared to 54% of college graduates who say this should be a top priority. Those who never attended college are much more likely than college graduates to say following religious principles should be a top priority. They also value moral principles and idealism more than do college graduates. A similar pattern can be seen across income groups – with less affluent Americans placing more emphasis on caution, religious principles and idealism.

<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	College	H.S.	<i>Gap</i>
	<u>grads</u>	<u>or less</u>	
Being cautious	54	74	+20
Following religious principles	24	39	+15
Following moral principles	68	75	+9
Being idealistic	21	28	+7
Being forceful	19	25	+6
Being practical	58	61	+3
Being decisive	61	62	+1
Being compassionate	55	55	0
Being flexible	44	39	-5

Partisanship and Ideology

Republicans and Democrats generally agree on the importance of being practical, compassionate and idealistic. The biggest gap between the two major party groups is on the importance of being decisive. Fully 75% of Republicans say this should be a top priority in conducting foreign policy, only 56% of Democrats agree. The parties are also divided over how much priority should be given to following religious principles – 43% of Republicans say this should be a top priority, compared to 29% of Democrats. Following moral principles is the Republicans’ leading foreign policy value – 79% say this should be a top priority. For Democrats, caution and morality share the top ranking – 69% say each are top priorities.

There are important divisions *within* the two political parties as well. Republicans are more deeply divided than Democrats over the importance of caution, decisiveness and religious

<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	<i>---Republican---</i>		<i>--Democrat--</i>	
	<i>Conserv- ative</i>	<i>Mod/ Liberal</i>	<i>Conlib- Mod</i>	<i>Lib- eral</i>
Following religious principles	49	32	32	22
Being decisive	80	64	59	49
Being cautious	58	72	73	62
Being compassionate	54	53	51	67
Being flexible	32	41	39	52

principles. For moderate or liberal Republicans, being cautious in foreign policy is given the highest priority (72% say this should be a top priority). By comparison, 58% of conservative Republicans say caution should be a top priority. Conservative Republicans value decisiveness more than moderate or liberal members of their party (80% vs. 64% say this should be a top priority). The deepest division within the GOP is on the importance of following religious principles in conducting foreign policy – 49% of conservative Republicans vs. 32% of moderate or liberal Republicans say this should be a top priority.

Within the Democratic Party, there are disagreements between the conservative or moderate wing of the party and liberals over the importance of compassion and flexibility. To liberal Democrats, compassion should be the guiding principle of foreign policy. Fully 67% say this should be a top priority. Only 51% of conservative or moderate Democrats share this view. Liberal Democrats also value flexibility more than their conservative or moderate counterparts – 52% vs. 39% say this should be a top priority.

Religion and Policy Values

Evangelical Christians have a unique perspective on what values should guide U.S. foreign policy. They are more likely than any other major demographic or political group to believe that following moral principles should be a top priority – 86% of white evangelical Protestants hold this view. And they are by far the biggest proponents of following religious principles. Fully 55% of evangelicals say this should be a top priority. This compares with 33% of the general public and 27% of non-evangelical Protestants.

Evangelical Protestants place a great deal of importance on a compassionate approach: 62% say this should be a top priority in conducting foreign policy, compared with 54% of the general public and only 48% of non-evangelical Protestants.

How Religion Informs Foreign Policy Preferences				
<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	White	White	White	
	evangelic	mainline	Catholic	Secular
	<u>Prot</u>	<u>Prot</u>	<u>Catholic</u>	<u>Secular</u>
Following religious principles	55	27	26	13
Following moral principles	86	70	70	56
Being compassionate	62	48	50	58
Being practical	63	52	64	60
Being decisive	73	63	64	48
Being cautious	69	60	63	61

Evangelical Protestants are those who consider themselves to be “born again or evangelical.” Mainline Protestants are all others. Seculars are those who say they have no religion when asked.

Support for Preemptive War

Opinion about the acceptability of preemptive military action has been fairly consistent for more than a year. Support for preemptive military action peaked in May 2003 at 67%, after the president declared the end of major combat military operations, and now stands at 60%.


Yet partisan views on this subject have shifted significantly. Republicans are now more supportive of the idea of striking at adversaries that have threatened – but not attacked – the United States. Nearly nine-in-ten Republicans (88%) support taking preemptive action against such countries, up from 79% last May.

<i>Preemptive force often or sometimes justified...</i>	<u>May 2003</u>	<u>Aug 2003</u>	<u>July 2004</u>	<u>May 03-July 04</u>
Total	67	63	60	-7
Republican	79	82	88	+9
Democrat	58	52	44	-14
Independent	66	62	54	-12

Democrats, and to a lesser extent independents, have become more skeptical of taking preemptive military action. Consequently, the divide between Democrats and Republicans over this issue, which was already sizable in May 2003 (19 points), has ballooned to 44 points today.

Civil Liberties and Terrorism

Public perceptions regarding the tradeoff between fighting terrorism and retaining civil liberties have changed gradually, but substantially, over the past three years. In the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, and as late as January 2002, majorities believed it would be necessary to sacrifice some personal freedoms to fight terrorism effectively. Today, just 38% take this view, while 56% say it is not necessary for the average person to give up civil liberties in order to curb terrorism.



The decline in the belief that it is necessary to give up liberties to reduce terrorism has been uniform across most demographic groups. Only among Republicans and people in upper-income brackets does a majority continue to say it is necessary to give up civil liberties. In all other groups, most say it is not.

Ideological differences on this issue have grown substantially. Two-and-a-half years ago, liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans largely agreed that giving up some civil liberties would be necessary. Today, most conservative Republicans (54%) still believe this, but just 24% of liberal Democrats agree. People under age 30 also are among the most likely to say it is not necessary to sacrifice civil liberties, by a 70% to 29% margin.

	Jan 2002	July 2004	Change
<i>Necessary to give up civil liberties...</i>	%	%	
Total	56	38	-18
Conserv Republican	63	54	-9
Mod/Lib Republican	59	41	-18
Independent	54	38	-16
Conserv/Mod Dem	53	33	-20
Liberal Democrat	54	24	-30
18-29	47	29	-18
30-49	59	38	-21
50-64	61	43	-18
65+	51	41	-10

Bigger Concern: Govt. Inaction on Terror

This turnaround in public attitudes about the need to sacrifice civil liberties does not reflect a belief that the government has gone too far in restricting civil liberties.

In fact, by a 20-point margin, more Americans worry that the U.S. government has not gone far enough to adequately protect the country from terrorism (49%) than say the government has excessively restricted civil liberties in the war on terror (29%).

There is a significant political division on this question. Committed Bush voters say the government has not gone far enough to adequately protect the country by a 56% to 12% margin. Swing voters largely agree, with 54% saying the government has not gone far enough and 26% worrying about civil liberties. But Voters who are committed to Kerry are divided on this question (42% say the government has not gone far enough and 43% say it has gone too far).

Vote Preference and Anti-Terrorism Policies				
<i>What concerns you more about terror policy?</i>	--- Vote Choice ---			
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Bush</u>	<u>Kerry</u>	<u>Swing Voters</u>
	%	%	%	%
Not gone far enough to protect country	49	56	42	54
Gone too far restricting liberties	29	12	43	26
Neither (Vol.)	11	24	5	9
Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
	100	100	100	100

Torture Justifiable?

Despite revelations of prison abuse at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, a sizable minority of Americans believe that the use of torture against suspected terrorists can be justified under certain circumstances. Overall, 43% believe such tactics are often (15%) or sometimes justified (28%) to gain important information, while a majority (53%) say torture is rarely (21%) or never (32%) justified.

Roughly half of men (48%) see the use of torture as often or sometimes justified, compared with 36% of women. There is a significant generation gap among men on this issue. Fully 54% of men under age 50 see justification for the use of torture in cases of suspected terrorism, compared with only 37% of men age 50 and older. Women of all ages are about equally likely to say torture is rarely or never justified.

	<u>Often/</u>	<u>Rarely/</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Know</u>
	%	%	%
Total	43	53	4=100
Men	48	50	2=100
Women	36	59	5=100
Men 18-49	54	44	2=100
Men 50+	41	56	3=100
Women 18-49	37	58	5=100
Women 50+	34	62	4=100
Republican	52	46	2=100
Democrat	38	59	3=100
Independent	38	57	5=100
Bush voter	58	40	2=100
Kerry voter	32	65	3=100
Swing voter	42	53	5=100
Iraq right decision	53	44	3=100
Iraq wrong decision	32	65	3=100

Republicans are more likely to see torture as at least sometimes warranted (52%) than are Democrats and independents (38% each). Similarly, more Bush voters (58%) than Kerry voters (32%) or swing voters (42%) view torture as justifiable.

Attitudes toward the Iraq war also are strongly linked to attitudes on this question. Nearly

two-thirds (65%) of those who think the war in Iraq was the wrong decision believe torture is rarely or never justified as an interrogation technique. A slim majority (53%) of the people who support the Iraq war see torture as at least sometimes justifiable.

Most Reject U.S. Blame in 9/11

By a 51% to 38% margin, most Americans do not believe that “there is anything that the U.S. did wrong in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the 9/11 terrorist attacks.” This is largely unchanged from how the public viewed this question in the weeks following the attacks themselves, nearly three years ago.

Even fewer (28%) believe there is any way that the U.S. was “unfair” in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the terrorist attacks, though this percentage has risen from 23% two years ago, and 21% in late September 2001.

The overall stability in these figures belies a growing ideological and generational divide in perceptions of U.S. wrongdoing prior to the attacks. In the wake of the attacks, about a third in all age groups said U.S. actions may have been a motivating factor. Today, nearly half of people under age 30 (46%) hold that view, while just 19% of those 65 and older continue to say so.

Similarly, views of Republicans and Democrats are increasingly split. Republicans are less likely to see any U.S. culpability today than they were in September 2001 (17% now, down from 27%). By comparison, a narrow majority of Democrats (51%) believe U.S. wrongdoing in dealings with other nations may have motivated the terrorists, up from 40% three years ago. The proportion of independents who now point to problems in U.S. foreign policy prior to the attacks has also risen – to 45%, up from 34% immediately after the attacks.

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2004</u>
	%	%	%
Total	33	38	38
Men	33	42	39
Women	33	34	36
Republican	27	31	17
Democrat	40	33	51
Independent	34	50	45
Con/Rep	28	30	13
Mod/Lib Rep	28	32	23
Con/Dem	35	29	46
Lib/Dem	54	42	67
18-29	28	48	46
30-49	37	43	40
50-64	34	35	39
65+	32	15	19

Fully two-thirds (67%) of liberal Democrats say U.S. wrongdoing in its dealings with other countries may have motivated the 9/11 attacks, while 46% of moderate and conservative Democrats agree. Just 13% of conservative Republicans, and a somewhat higher proportion of moderate and liberal Republicans (23%), say there are things the U.S. did wrong that might have motivated the terrorists.

OPINION ABOUT THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S STEWARDSHIP

President Bush still receives fairly strong marks for his handling of terrorism, particularly when compared with his low ratings on other key components of foreign policy. In the July 8-18 survey, conducted prior to the Democratic convention and the government's announcement of elevated terrorism alert, a 54% majority approve of Bush's performance in handling terrorist threats. This rose slightly to 58% in the August 5-10 survey, conducted after the government's Code Orange announcement.

<i>Approve of Bush handling...</i>	Late			
	<u>April</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug</u>
	%	%	%	%
Terrorist threats	55	56	54	58
Overall job	48	48	46	46
Situation in Iraq	44	42	42	43
Foreign policy	--	--	40	42
Economy	42	43	42	42
Intl. trade issues	--	--	33	--

But Bush's handling of the situation in Iraq, and his foreign policy in general, continue to receive more negative reactions from the public. Just 42% approve of Bush's overall handling of foreign policy and roughly the same number (43%) approve of the way he is handling the war in Iraq. Bush's ratings on Iraq, like his measures on terrorism, have been fairly consistent over the past few months. And when it comes to how the president has handled international trade issues, just one-in-three approve, with 45% disapproving and a relatively high number (22%) declining to offer an opinion.

Bush Seen as Quick to Use Force

Overall, about six-in-ten Americans (59%) say the president is too quick to use military force, while only a third believe he tried hard enough to reach diplomatic solutions. That is consistent with measures taken in the fall of 2002 and in January 2003. But in April 2003, during the major combat phase of the war on Iraq, a majority (58%) felt he worked hard enough to reach diplomatic outcomes.

There is a vast partisan divide on this question: Democrats, by more than eight-to-one (84%-10%), say Bush is too quick to resort to force, while Republicans by a somewhat less sizable margin (70%-24%) believe the president works hard to find diplomatic solutions. Two-thirds of independents (66%) say the president is too quick to use force.

<i>On international problems Bush...</i>	Oct*	Jan	April*	July
	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>
	%	%	%	%
Tries hard enough on diplomacy	40	41	58	33
Is too quick to involve military	50	56	36	59
Don't know	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100

* October 2002 to April 2003 trend from CBS/NY Times.

The public takes a more balanced view of Bush's handling of the allies, with 38% saying he takes allied interests into account the right amount, and 37% saying he gives them too little consideration. However, the number who believe Bush gives short shrift to allied concerns has grown, from 30% in January to 37% currently. Half of Democrats, and nearly as many independents (45%), believe the president gives too little consideration to the concerns of the allies. Republicans, by five-to-one (70%-14%), say he gives appropriate attention to allied interests.

<i>Bush admin taking account allies views...</i>	EarlyMid-		
	Sept 2001	Jan 2004	July 2004
	%	%	%
Too much	19	18	15
Too little	22	30	37
Right amount	42	46	38
Don't know	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
	100	100	100

Swing Voters' Priorities

With foreign policy and defense issues at the forefront of the presidential campaign this year, swing voters' views on a range of these issues take on added importance. On eight of the 11 foreign policy issues in the poll on which there are significant partisan gaps, opinions of swing voters are closer to those of Kerry supporters than to those of Bush voters.

<i>Percent considering each a top priority...</i>	Certain Bush %	Certain Kerry %	Swing Voters %
Strengthening UN	35	56	53
Dealing with world hunger	37	57	47
Dealing with global warming	18	46	35
Improving relationship with allies	42	61	55
Reducing spread of AIDS	61	78	73
Protecting American jobs	76	84	88
Reducing military commitments	24	37	35
Insuring energy supplies	80	65	70
Protecting against terrorism	95	82	90
Preventing weapons proliferation	84	59	73
Promoting U.S. economic interests	42	26	35

On several issues, the differences between swing voters and committed Bush voters is substantial. More than half of swing voters (53%) regard strengthening the United Nations as a top priority compared with 35% of Bush voters who have this view. And about twice as many swing voters as Bush supporters view global warming as a major concern (35% vs. 18%).

On two major foreign policy issues – preventing terrorist attacks and preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction – swing voters fall between Bush and Kerry supporters. This also is the case on promoting U.S. economic interest abroad.

Part Six:

OTHER ISSUES: MIDEAST, CHINA, TRADE

Middle East Policies

A growing number of Americans believe the United States is not doing enough to bring about a peace settlement between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Current opinion is now nearly evenly divided, with 46% saying the U.S. is doing all it can, and 42% saying it is not. In April 2002 a majority (53%) felt America was making its best efforts to bring peace to the region, while only a third (34%) said it was not. Democrats have become more skeptical of U.S. efforts to forge peace, increasing the partisan gap on this issue.

In addition, a declining percentage of the public believes that American policies in the region are fair to both sides. The percent saying U.S. policies are fair has dropped from 47% in May 2003 to 35% today. Nearly a third (32%) say American policies favor Israel too much, up slightly from 27% just over a year ago. Just 5% think the policies are overly favorable toward the Palestinians, down slightly from 8%.

Republicans are nearly twice as likely as Democrats to say America's policies in the Middle East treat both sides fairly (49% vs. 26%). Four-in-ten Democrats say U.S. policies favor Israel; just 22% of Republicans agree. Independents fall squarely between partisans on this issue (34% say policies are fair, 34% say they favor Israel).

Despite these shifting views of American policies in the region, there is little change in public sympathies in the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. A plurality of Americans (40%) continue to say they sympathize with Israel, while just 13% side with the Palestinians. These attitudes have remained very consistent in polls dating back a decade and longer.

A majority of Republicans (57%) say they side with Israel, while only a third of Democrats and independents agree. While both groups are somewhat more supportive than Republicans are of the Palestinians, Democrats and independents are also less inclined to take sides. Fully 28% of both

Middle East Opinions

Sympathize more with ...

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
	%	%	%	%
Israel	40	57	33	33
Palestinians	13	9	15	18
Both/Neither	25	17	28	28
DK/Refused	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>21</u>
	100	100	100	100

U.S. Mideast policies are ...

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
	%	%	%	%
Fair	35	49	26	34
Favor Israel	32	22	40	34
Favor Palestinians	5	5	7	5
DK/Refused	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>
	100	100	100	100

U.S. doing all it can for peace?

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
	%	%	%	%
Yes	46	68	32	42
No	42	23	57	45
DK/Refused	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>
	100	100	100	100

Democrats and independents say they sympathize with both or neither side of the conflict.

China

American opinions of China have remained stable in the last two years, and most see America’s relationship with China neither improving nor deteriorating. A small minority (14%) of Americans still see China as an adversary; four-in-ten consider China to be a serious problem but not an adversary; and 36% think China is not much of a problem. More Republicans than Democrats continue to see China as an adversary, a difference between the parties that has persisted since 1997. Today, 17% of Republicans and 9% of Democrats see China as an adversary; in 1997, 19% of Republicans and 12% of Democrats held that view. Those who believe the U.S. made the right decision to go to war in Iraq are more likely to see China as an adversary than those who don’t approve of the decision to use force.

Trade Good for Country, Hurts at Home	
<i>Trade agreements’ effect on...</i>	
<i>The country</i>	%
Good thing	47
Bad thing	34
Don’t know	<u>19</u>
	100
<i>Your own family’s financial situation</i>	
Helped	34
Hurt	41
Neither/DK	<u>25</u>
	100

Views of the Sino-American relationship have gone almost unchanged over the past two years. A majority (58%) continues to say that relations between the two countries are staying the same, while 18% say relations are improving and only 13% believe things are getting worse.

Mixed Feelings about Free Trade

Americans have mixed views about the impact of free trade agreements like NAFTA and the WTO. While a plurality (47%) says these agreements are generally good for the U.S. overall, 34% say they are a bad thing. When it comes to the impact on their own financial situation, more say free trade has probably hurt (41%) rather than helped (34%).

These divisions are not new – public evaluations of the impact of free trade agreements on the nation have held steady since the question was first asked in 1997. But there has been a notable switch in the political dimensions of the issue.

Today, Republicans feel more favorably toward free trade than do Democrats. By nearly two-to-one (52% to 28%) Republicans say free trade agreements are good for the nation,

Parties Trade Places on Free Trade			
	Sept 1997	Sept 2001*	July 2004
<i>Free trade is a...</i>	%	%	%
Good thing	47	49	47
Bad thing	30	29	34
Don’t know	<u>23</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>19</u>
	100	100	100
Republicans			
Good thing	45	54	52
Bad thing	35	7	28
Democrats			
Good thing	52	47	43
Bad thing	25	28	39
Independents			
Good thing	46	48	48
Bad thing	33	32	36

*2001 survey conducted before 9/11 attacks

while Democrats are divided almost evenly (43% good thing, 39% bad). Seven years ago, when Bill Clinton was in office and supportive of free trade, these figures were reversed, with most Democrats viewing free trade positively (52% good thing, 25% bad) and Republicans more divided (45% to 35%).

However, the issue of free trade does not appear to be having a significant impact on the 2004 election. Just 2% of Americans cite trade and jobs moving overseas as the most important problems facing the nation.

Income Matters

Wealthier people tend to have a favorable impression of free trade, both in terms of its impact on themselves and the nation. A majority of those earning less than \$30,000 annually agree that free trade may be good for the nation, but most in this income category feel it has either definitely or probably hurt their personal financial situation.

Younger people also take a decidedly favorable view of free trade agreements, when compared with older Americans. Fully 68% of those under age thirty say free trade is good for the country, and half say it has definitely or probably helped their own financial situation. By comparison, people age 50-64 are divided over whether it is good for the country (36% say yes, 43% no) and most say they have been hurt by NAFTA and other free trade agreements.

	Poor, Less-Educated Dubious about Free Trade					
	<i>For the nation</i>			<i>Personal finances</i>		
	<u>Good thing</u>	<u>Bad thing</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Prob. helped</u>	<u>Prob. hurt</u>	<u>Neith/DK</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
White	46	35	19=100	34	39	27=100
Black	48	36	16=100	27	61	12=100
18-29	68	22	10=100	50	30	20=100
30-49	46	36	18=100	34	44	22=100
50-64	36	43	21=100	26	52	22=100
65+	39	32	29=100	24	33	43=100
H.S. or less	44	34	22=100	27	49	24=100
Some college	49	36	15=100	37	38	25=100
College grad	52	32	16=100	43	29	28=100
<\$30,000	52	34	14=100	28	53	19=100
\$30-49,999	38	39	23=100	32	46	22=100
\$50-74,999	43	41	16=100	30	45	25=100
\$75,000+	54	32	14=100	48	27	25=100
East	46	34	20=100	33	34	33=100
Midwest	45	40	15=100	30	53	17=100
South	48	32	20=100	34	43	23=100
West	49	30	21=100	38	33	29=100
Large city	48	32	20=100	30	38	32=100
Suburb	51	33	16=100	45	36	19=100
Small town	51	32	17=100	34	44	22=100
Rural area	34	42	24=100	22	49	29=100
Union household	39	44	17=100	27	52	21=100
Non-union	49	32	19=100	35	40	25=100

ABOUT THE SURVEYS

Results for the August 2004 Foreign Policy Attitudes report are based on three independent surveys, using telephone interviews of nationwide samples of adults, 18 years of age or older, conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates International. The primary survey consists of a nationwide sample of 2,009 adults during the period July 8-18, 2004. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 2.5 percentage points. For results based on either Form 1 (N=1003) or Form 2 (N=1006), the sampling error is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

The second survey used in this report is based on a nationwide sample of 1,512 adults, during the period August 5-10, 2004. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For results based on either Form 1 (N=739) or Form 2 (N=773), the sampling error is plus or minus 4 percentage points.

The third supplemental survey is based on a nationwide sample of 1,057 adults, during the period July 30-August 12, 2004. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY IN DETAIL

The sample for this survey is a random digit sample of telephone numbers selected from telephone exchanges in the continental United States. The random digit aspect of the sample is used to avoid "listing" bias and provides representation of both listed and unlisted numbers (including not-yet-listed). The design of the sample ensures this representation by random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange, and bank number.

The telephone exchanges were selected with probabilities proportional to their size. The first eight digits of the sampled telephone numbers (area code, telephone exchange, bank number) were selected to be proportionally stratified by county and by telephone exchange within county. That is, the number of telephone numbers randomly sampled from within a given county is proportional to that county's share of telephone numbers in the U.S. Only working banks of telephone numbers are selected. A working bank is defined as 100 contiguous telephone numbers containing three or more residential listings.

The sample was released for interviewing in replicates. Using replicates to control the release of sample to the field ensures that the complete call procedures are followed for the entire sample. The use of replicates also insures that the regional distribution of numbers called is appropriate. Again, this works to increase the representativeness of the sample.

At least 10 attempts were made to complete an interview at every sampled telephone number. The calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chances of making a contact with a potential respondent. All interview breakoffs and refusals were re-contacted at least once in order to attempt to convert them to completed interviews. In each contacted household, interviewers asked to speak with the "youngest male 18 or older who is at home." If there is no eligible man at home, interviewers asked to speak with "the oldest woman 18 or older who is at home." This systematic respondent selection technique has been shown empirically to produce samples that closely mirror the population in terms of age and gender.

Non-response in telephone interview surveys produces some known biases in survey-derived estimates because participation tends to vary for different subgroups of the population, and these subgroups are likely to vary also on questions of substantive interest. In order to compensate for these known biases, the sample data are weighted in analysis.

The demographic weighting parameters are derived from a special analysis of the most recently available Annual Social & Economic Supplement data from the Census Bureau (March 2003). This analysis produced population parameters for the demographic characteristics of households with adults 18 or older, which are then compared with the sample characteristics to construct sample weights. The analysis only included households in the continental United States that contain a telephone. The weights are derived using an iterative technique that simultaneously balances the distributions of all weighting parameters.

*Commentary By Lee Feinstein, James M. Lindsay, and Max Boot
Council on Foreign Relations*

On Foreign Policy, Red and Blue Voters Are Worlds Apart

Sixteen months after the Iraq invasion, the red-state, blue-state divide has bled into foreign policy. A new poll by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, in association with the Council on Foreign Relations, shows that Bush and Kerry voters see the world differently. Most significantly for the November elections, on several key issues, swing voters are more likely to see blue than red.

Americans are often accused of being oblivious to events beyond their borders. In this election year, however, events overseas have eclipsed events at home as the most important issue to the voting public for the first time since Vietnam. For most of the 1990s, fewer than 10% of Americans rated foreign policy as the most important problem facing the nation. Today, 41% cite defense, terrorism, or foreign policy as the most important national problem, compared with 26% who mention economic issues.

As Americans pay more attention to the world around them, they continue to agree on many basic views about the U.S. role abroad. They want the U.S. to be involved in the world, but not too involved. They want it to lead, but they do not want to foot the bill or shoulder the burden alone. Roughly three-quarters of Americans (74%) believe the United States should play a “shared leadership role” in the world, compared with 11% who say the U.S. should be the “single world leader.” In short, Americans believe the U.S. should play a global leadership role in concert with others.

Isolationism holds little appeal. Despite the tribulations in Iraq, only 9% of Americans think the U.S. should play no leadership role. Continued fighting in Iraq also has not persuaded Americans to embrace calls for an early withdrawal of U.S. troops. A majority of Americans (54%) continue to favor remaining in Iraq until the situation has stabilized, a number that has remained relatively constant over the course of the war.

Realpolitik does not play well with the American public, either. Americans overwhelmingly believe that morality should influence foreign policy decisions. Roughly three-quarters of the public say that “moral principles” should be the guiding light in U.S. foreign policy.

*Commentary By Lee Feinstein, James M. Lindsay, and Max Boot
Council on Foreign Relations*

Despite these many points of agreement, Americans have grown increasingly divided on fundamental foreign policy questions. Not surprisingly, the Iraq war drives many of the divisions. Nine-in-ten Kerry voters, for example, say President Bush does not have a clear plan to bring the situation in Iraq to a successful conclusion, while eight-in-ten Bush supporters say he does. A similar lopsided majority of Bush supporters (82%) say the Iraq war has helped the war on terror, mirror imaging the Kerry supporters (74%) who say the Iraq war has hurt.

But the Iraq war has exposed a deeper rift, highlighting and hardening differences about the kind of foreign policy Americans want their president to conduct. Take three examples:

- About half of Republicans (47%) believe the U.S. is less respected in the world than in the past, but just 22% say America's global reputation is a major issue. On the other hand, eight-in-ten Democrats say America's reputation has declined, and 56% say this is a major problem.
- Republicans by a 70%-24% margin say President Bush works hard to find diplomatic solutions. Democrats, by a margin of eight-to-one, say he is too quick to resort to force.
- Roughly six-in-ten Republicans say the United States is more important and powerful than ten years ago, compared to one-in-three Democrats.

These disparities suggest something deeper than divisions over the Iraq war are at work. Bush supporters and Kerry supporters are taking sides in the longstanding debate over the relative importance of "hard" versus "soft" power. Will the U.S. be safer and more prosperous if it is feared, or if it is loved? Are America's military strength, and the willingness to use it, what count most, or is America's reputation abroad equally important?

For now, swing voters may be leaning toward Kerry's side of the debate. They accord much higher importance to strengthening the United Nations and improving America's relationship with its allies than Bush supporters do. This suggests that the task facing the president is either to persuade these voters that hard power is what will keep them safe or convince them that he too understands the importance of soft power.

America's Leadership Role

--Play a shared leadership role--

	Single World <u>leader</u>	Most <u>Active</u>	About as <u>active</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	No <u>leadership</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	11	27	44	3	9	6=100	(2009)
Sex							
Male	15	30	40	2	9	4	(948)
Female	8	24	49	3	9	7	(1061)
Race							
White	11	29	44	3	7	6	(1655)
Non-white	11	21	44	3	15	6	(331)
Black	8	18	46	4	15	9	(221)
Hispanic*	14	29	40	2	14	1	(140)
Race and Sex							
White Men	15	32	39	2	8	4	(788)
White Women	8	26	49	3	7	7	(867)
Age							
Under 30	11	28	41	3	13	4	(336)
30-49	12	25	45	2	10	6	(751)
50-64	10	29	48	3	7	3	(532)
65+	12	28	40	3	6	11	(375)
Sex and Age							
Men under 50	15	30	39	2	11	3	(535)
Women under 50	9	22	49	3	10	7	(552)
Men 50+	15	32	40	2	6	5	(409)
Women 50+	7	26	48	5	6	8	(498)
Education							
College Grad.	11	32	47	3	5	2	(767)
Some College	11	29	47	1	8	4	(504)
High School Grad.	11	24	44	4	10	7	(604)
<H.S. Grad.	16	20	34	2	15	12	(127)
Family Income							
\$75,000+	12	34	45	2	4	3	(518)
\$50,000-\$74,999	8	29	48	3	9	3	(329)
\$30,000-\$49,999	13	27	48	1	7	4	(435)
\$20,000-\$29,999	11	19	53	4	7	6	(209)
<\$20,000	12	24	33	3	18	10	(274)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization.

Question: What kind of leadership role should the United States play in the world? Should it be the single world leader, or should it play a shared leadership role, or shouldn't it play any leadership role?
 IF "SHARED LEADERSHIP ROLE" ASK:
 Should the United States be the most active of the leading nations, or should it be about as active as other leading nations?

Continued on next page...

	--Shared Leadership Role--						(N)
	Single leader	Most Active	About as active	DK/Ref	No leadership	DK/Ref	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	11	27	44	3	9	6=100	(2009)
Region							
East	10	29	43	4	9	5	(342)
Midwest	11	26	47	3	9	4	(522)
South	13	28	41	2	8	8	(717)
West	10	26	47	3	9	6	(428)
Religious Affiliation							
Total White Protestant	12	30	43	3	6	6	(905)
- Evangelical	13	35	38	4	4	6	(463)
- Non-Evangelical	11	26	48	2	7	6	(442)
White Catholic	13	26	47	1	8	5	(376)
Secular	10	21	47	4	13	5	(210)
Community Size							
Large City	11	23	46	3	12	5	(422)
Suburb	11	30	47	2	6	4	(522)
Small City/Town	12	26	43	3	9	7	(669)
Rural Area	10	28	41	4	9	8	(379)
Party ID							
Republican	14	40	33	3	5	5	(612)
Democrat	8	21	53	2	10	6	(657)
Independent	13	22	47	3	11	4	(626)
Party and Ideology							
Conservative Republican	17	41	30	4	3	5	(413)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	7	40	39	2	7	5	(190)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	10	22	53	2	8	5	(411)
Liberal Democrat	3	21	55	2	12	7	(225)
Bush Approval							
Approve	16	35	38	3	3	5	(466)
Disapprove	6	21	55	2	11	5	(461)
Force in Iraq							
Right Decision	16	32	38	3	6	5	(1015)
Wrong Decision	6	21	53	2	13	5	(893)
Labor Union							
Union Household	9	26	51	3	9	2	(253)
Non-Union Household	12	27	43	3	9	6	(1741)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)							
Bush/Lean Bush	16	36	35	3	4	6	(693)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	6	24	55	2	9	4	(723)
Battleground States							
Republican States	14	28	41	2	8	7	(627)
Democratic States	10	25	49	3	8	5	(552)
Battleground States	10	27	44	3	10	6	(830)

U.S. Less Respected By Other Countries

					-----If "Less respected"-----				(N)
	More respected	Less respected	As respected	DK/Ref	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	DK/Ref	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	10	67	20	3=100	43	19	4	1=67	(1003)
Sex									
Male	12	66	19	3	41	19	5	1	(491)
Female	9	68	21	2	46	19	2	1	(512)
Race									
White	9	66	22	3	42	20	3	1	(835)
Non-white	15	71	11	3	46	18	7	*	(158)
Black	16	72	12	0	49	18	5	0	(95)
Hispanic*	20	55	22	3	34	18	3	0	(66)
Race and Sex									
White Men	10	65	22	3	41	20	4	*	(408)
White Women	8	67	23	2	44	20	2	1	(427)
Age									
Under 30	10	66	21	3	42	19	5	0	(163)
30-49	12	64	22	2	40	20	4	*	(398)
50-64	8	71	18	3	44	25	1	1	(275)
65+	7	70	18	5	50	12	5	3	(160)
Sex and Age									
Men under 50	12	65	21	2	39	19	7	0	(284)
Women under 50	12	64	22	2	43	19	1	1	(277)
Men 50+	11	66	17	6	44	19	2	1	(206)
Women 50+	5	75	18	2	49	20	3	3	(229)
Education									
College Grad.	8	69	21	2	51	17	1	0	(388)
Some College	8	68	21	3	40	24	3	1	(262)
High School Grad. or Less	12	66	19	3	41	19	5	1	(350)
Family Income									
\$75,000+	8	64	25	3	45	16	2	1	(272)
\$50,000-\$74,999	9	72	17	2	43	25	4	0	(171)
\$30,000-\$49,999	10	71	18	1	49	19	2	1	(210)
\$20,000-\$29,999	12	63	25	0	43	18	1	1	(112)
<\$20,000	15	69	14	2	37	23	8	1	(123)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization. Note small sample size.

Question: Compared with the past, would you say the U.S. is MORE respected by other countries these days, LESS respected by other countries, or AS respected as it has been in the past?

ASK IF LESS RESPECTED: Do you think less respect for America is a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem at all?

Continued on next page...

	-----If "Less respected"-----								
	More	Less	As		Major	Minor	Not a		(N)
	<u>respected</u>	<u>respected</u>	<u>respected</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>problem</u>	<u>problem</u>	<u>problem</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	
	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	
Total	10	67	20	3=100	43	19	4	1=67	(1003)
Region									
East	9	68	21	2	45	21	2	*	(174)
Midwest	9	70	17	4	45	21	4	*	(264)
South	12	65	21	2	39	21	4	1	(343)
West	10	66	21	3	47	13	4	2	(222)
Religious Affiliation									
Total White Protestant	11	63	22	4	38	21	3	1	(451)
- Evangelical	14	58	24	4	34	21	2	1	(239)
- Non-Evangelical	7	70	20	3	44	21	4	1	(212)
White Catholic	6	64	27	3	44	17	2	1	(185)
Secular	8	76	15	1	45	26	5	0	(119)
Community Size									
Large City	10	69	20	1	47	19	2	1	(217)
Suburb	8	67	22	3	44	19	4	*	(264)
Small City/Town	12	68	17	3	41	22	4	1	(329)
Rural Area	11	61	24	4	41	17	3	0	(182)
Party ID									
Republican	16	47	34	3	22	19	5	1	(301)
Democrat	8	80	11	1	56	21	2	1	(345)
Independent	7	74	17	2	49	21	4	*	(296)
Party and Ideology									
Conservative Republican	14	45	37	4	20	20	4	1	(210)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	20	48	31	1	25	16	7	0	(87)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	11	76	13	*	53	21	2	0	(218)
Liberal Democrat	3	88	6	3	64	19	3	2	(117)
Bush Approval									
Approve	15	51	30	4	25	21	4	1	(466)
Disapprove	5	83	12	*	61	18	4	*	(461)
Labor Union									
Union Household	13	68	18	1	44	22	2	0	(134)
Non-Union Household	10	67	20	3	44	18	4	1	(859)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)									
Bush/Lean Bush	13	49	35	3	25	19	4	1	(352)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	4	85	9	2	63	20	2	*	(356)
Battleground States									
Republican States	13	63	20	4	41	18	3	1	(309)
Democratic States	9	68	21	2	46	19	3	*	(294)
Battleground States	9	69	20	2	43	21	4	1	(400)

Bush Administration Foreign Policy

	<i>-Taking into account views of allies-</i>				<i>--Handling International Problems--</i>			
	<u>Too much</u>	<u>Too little</u>	<u>Right amount</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Tries diplomacy</u>	<u>Too quick to involve military</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total	15	37	38	10=100	33	59	8=100	(1006)
Sex								
Male	18	36	38	8	40	51	9	(457)
Female	13	37	38	12	28	65	7	(549)
Race								
White	14	34	41	11	38	54	8	(820)
Non-white	21	45	24	10	13	77	10	(173)
Black	25	42	23	10	8	86	6	(126)
Hispanic*	18	41	35	6	29	65	6	(74)
Race and Sex								
White Men	16	34	42	8	45	46	9	(380)
White Women	12	34	41	13	33	61	6	(440)
Age								
Under 30	13	37	40	10	28	65	7	(173)
30-49	19	35	39	7	36	57	7	(353)
50-64	13	38	37	12	39	55	6	(257)
65+	12	39	34	15	28	59	13	(215)
Sex and Age								
Men under 50	21	34	39	6	40	52	8	(251)
Women under 50	14	37	40	9	27	67	6	(275)
Men 50+	14	38	38	10	39	51	10	(203)
Women 50+	11	38	35	16	30	61	9	(269)
Education								
College Grad.	9	46	40	5	38	56	6	(379)
Some College	12	38	43	7	36	59	5	(242)
High School Grad. or Less	20	32	34	14	30	60	10	(381)
Family Income								
\$75,000+	14	40	42	4	42	53	5	(246)
\$50,000-\$74,999	19	32	39	10	47	47	6	(158)
\$30,000-\$49,999	16	39	38	7	32	65	3	(225)
\$20,000-\$29,999	8	35	45	12	29	59	12	(97)
<\$20,000	19	39	30	12	19	68	13	(151)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization. Note small sample size.

Question: In formulating U.S. foreign policy, is the Bush administration taking into account the interests and views of our allies... Too much, too little, or about the right amount?

In its dealings with foreign countries and its handling of international problems, do you think the Bush administration tries hard enough to reach diplomatic solutions, or is it too quick to get American military forces involved?

	<i>-Taking into account views of allies-</i>				<i>----Reaching diplomatic solutions----</i>			
	<u>Too much</u>	<u>Too little</u>	<u>Right amount</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Tries hard enough</u>	<u>Too quick to involve military</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	15	37	38	10=100	33	59	8	(1006)
Region								
East	16	40	35	9	29	65	6	(168)
Midwest	16	35	40	9	36	57	7	(258)
South	17	32	40	11	35	56	9	(374)
West	10	44	35	11	32	59	9	(206)
Religious Affiliation								
Total White Protestant	14	32	41	13	42	48	10	(454)
- Evangelical	12	26	49	13	49	41	10	(224)
- Non-Evangelical	17	38	32	13	36	54	10	(230)
White Catholic	14	32	47	7	37	57	6	(191)
Secular	12	44	31	13	22	73	5	(91)
Community Size								
Large City	14	44	33	9	30	62	8	(205)
Suburb	15	39	35	11	34	61	5	(258)
Small City/Town	15	36	39	10	34	58	8	(340)
Rural Area	15	29	45	11	36	53	11	(197)
Party ID								
Republican	11	14	70	6	70	24	6	(311)
Democrat	18	50	21	11	10	84	6	(312)
Independent	15	45	30	10	26	66	8	(330)
Party and Ideology								
Conservative Republican	7	13	77	3	79	17	4	(203)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	18	18	58	6	57	37	6	(103)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	21	40	26	13	12	82	6	(193)
Liberal Democrat	13	72	9	6	4	89	7	(108)
Force in Iraq								
Right Decision	16	17	58	9	59	32	9	(491)
Wrong Decision	15	61	15	9	7	89	4	(468)
Labor Union								
Union Household	16	35	39	10	33	56	11	(119)
Non-Union Household	15	37	38	10	34	59	7	(882)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)								
Bush/Lean Bush	14	15	65	6	73	21	6	(341)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	14	59	19	8	6	88	6	(367)
Battleground States								
Republican States	16	35	40	9	36	55	9	(318)
Democratic States	15	40	34	11	30	62	8	(258)
Battleground States	14	36	39	11	34	59	7	(430)

Impact of Free Trade Agreements

	<i>--Effect on the Nation--</i>			<i>--Personal Financial Situation--</i>				(N)
	<u>Good thing</u>	<u>Bad thing</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Helped</u>	<u>Hurt</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	47	34	19=100	34	41	12	13=100	(1003)
Sex								
Male	46	40	14	36	43	12	9	(491)
Female	48	28	24	32	40	11	17	(512)
Race								
White	46	35	19	34	39	13	14	(835)
Non-white	53	32	15	33	50	7	10	(158)
Black	48	36	16	27	61	6	6	(95)
Hispanic*	62	26	12	47	31	13	9	(66)
Race and Sex								
White Men	45	41	14	37	39	15	9	(408)
White Women	47	29	24	31	39	11	19	(427)
Age								
Under 30	68	22	10	50	30	7	13	(163)
30-49	46	36	18	34	44	11	11	(398)
50-64	36	43	21	26	52	9	13	(275)
65+	39	32	29	24	33	23	20	(160)
Sex and Age								
Men under 50	52	38	10	39	42	11	8	(284)
Women under 50	55	24	21	39	38	8	15	(277)
Men 50+	35	44	21	30	44	15	11	(206)
Women 50+	38	34	28	21	45	14	20	(229)
Education								
College Grad.	52	32	16	43	29	16	12	(388)
Some College	49	36	15	37	38	14	11	(262)
High School Grad. or Less	44	34	22	27	49	9	15	(350)
Family Income								
\$75,000+	54	32	14	48	27	14	11	(272)
\$50,000-\$74,999	43	41	16	30	45	14	11	(171)
\$30,000-\$49,999	38	39	23	32	46	9	13	(210)
\$20,000-\$29,999	57	30	13	31	48	10	11	(112)
<\$20,000	48	37	15	25	57	9	9	(123)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization. Note small sample size.

Question: In general, do you think that free trade agreements like NAFTA, and the World Trade Organization, have been a good thing or a bad thing for the United States?

Thinking about the financial situation of you and your family... Do you think these free trade agreements (like NAFTA and the WTO) have definitely helped, probably helped, probably hurt, or definitely hurt the financial situation of you and your family?

Continued on next page...

	<i>--Effect on the Nation--</i>			<i>--Personal Financial Situation--</i>				(N)
	<u>Good thing</u>	<u>Bad thing</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Helped</u>	<u>Hurt</u>	<u>Neither</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	
	%	%	%	%		%	%	
Total	47	34	19=100	34	41	12	13=100	(1003)
Region								
East	46	34	20	33	34	17	16	(174)
Midwest	45	40	15	30	53	8	9	(264)
South	48	32	20	34	43	9	14	(343)
West	49	30	21	38	33	14	15	(222)
Religious Affiliation								
Total White Protestant	45	35	20	32	41	12	15	(451)
- Evangelical	45	33	22	32	42	10	16	(239)
- Non-Evangelical	46	36	18	32	40	14	14	(212)
White Catholic	46	39	15	36	40	13	11	(185)
Secular	48	32	20	35	31	19	15	(119)
Community Size								
Large City	48	32	20	30	38	18	14	(217)
Suburb	51	33	16	45	36	9	10	(264)
Small City/Town	51	32	17	34	44	9	13	(329)
Rural Area	34	42	24	22	49	11	18	(182)
Party ID								
Republican	52	29	20	43	30	12	15	(301)
Democrat	43	39	18	30	47	10	13	(345)
Independent	48	36	16	31	47	13	9	(296)
Party and Ideology								
Conservative Republican	50	32	18	44	30	14	12	(210)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	59	21	20	43	30	10	17	(87)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	46	38	16	28	49	9	14	(218)
Liberal Democrat	38	42	20	33	40	15	12	(117)
Bush Approval								
Approve	51	31	18	39	34	14	13	(466)
Disapprove	45	38	17	31	48	9	12	(461)
Labor Union								
Union Household	39	44	17	27	52	11	10	(134)
Non-Union Household	49	32	19	35	40	12	13	(859)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)								
Bush/Lean Bush	45	35	20	38	34	14	14	(352)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	43	38	19	30	45	12	13	(356)
Battleground States								
Republican States	45	33	22	32	44	9	15	(309)
Democratic States	51	33	16	36	32	17	15	(294)
Battleground States	46	36	18	33	46	10	11	(400)

The Use of Torture

	<u>Often justified</u> %	<u>Sometimes justified</u> %	<u>Rarely justified</u> %	<u>Never justified</u> %	<u>DK/Ref</u> %	<u>(N)</u> %
Total	15	28	21	32	4	(1006)
Sex						
Male	20	29	20	29	2	(457)
Female	10	26	23	36	5	(549)
Race						
White	15	27	22	32	4	(820)
Non-white	12	33	16	34	5	(173)
Black	12	30	13	40	5	(126)
Hispanic*	15	29	26	25	5	(74)
Race and Sex						
White Men	21	28	21	28	2	(380)
White Women	10	26	23	36	5	(440)
Age						
Under 30	21	24	26	26	3	(173)
30-49	14	31	20	31	4	(353)
50-64	15	23	24	34	4	(257)
65+	8	28	17	44	3	(215)
Sex and Age						
Men under 50	24	30	18	26	2	(251)
Women under 50	10	27	25	33	5	(275)
Men 50+	14	27	22	34	3	(203)
Women 50+	10	24	21	41	4	(269)
Education						
College Grad.	13	24	25	34	4	(379)
Some College	15	30	23	30	2	(242)
High School Grad. or Less	15	28	19	33	5	(381)
Family Income						
\$75,000+	18	32	25	23	2	(246)
\$50,000-\$74,999	21	20	27	31	1	(158)
\$30,000-\$49,999	12	31	20	34	3	(225)
\$20,000-\$29,999	11	24	21	43	1	(97)
<\$20,000	13	29	18	32	8	(151)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization. Note small sample size.

Question: Do you think the use of torture against suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?

Continued on next page...

	<u>Often justified</u>	<u>Sometimes justified</u>	<u>Rarely justified</u>	<u>Never justified</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	15	28	21	32	4	(1006)
Region						
East	19	23	24	31	3	(168)
Midwest	15	25	24	34	2	(258)
South	13	32	16	34	5	(374)
West	12	27	26	31	4	(206)
Religious Affiliation						
Total White Protestant	14	28	21	34	3	(454)
- Evangelical	14	26	18	37	5	(224)
- Non-Evangelical	14	29	24	31	2	(230)
White Catholic	20	28	19	30	3	(191)
Secular	14	27	29	28	2	(91)
Community Size						
Large City	10	24	26	37	3	(205)
Suburb	13	30	22	32	3	(258)
Small City/Town	16	30	18	31	5	(340)
Rural Area	20	23	23	31	3	(197)
Party ID						
Republican	22	30	20	26	2	(311)
Democrat	10	28	22	37	3	(312)
Independent	13	25	23	35	4	(330)
Party and Ideology						
Conservative Republican	23	31	20	24	2	(203)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	19	29	21	29	2	(103)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	11	31	21	35	2	(193)
Liberal Democrat	8	23	24	41	4	(108)
Force in Iraq						
Right Decision	21	32	20	24	3	(491)
Wrong Decision	8	24	23	42	3	(468)
Labor Union						
Union Household	16	28	25	27	4	(119)
Non-Union Household	15	27	21	33	4	(882)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)						
Bush/Lean Bush	21	33	21	23	2	(341)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	11	24	23	39	3	(367)
Battleground States						
Republican States	14	29	23	30	4	(318)
Democratic States	15	24	22	36	3	(258)
Battleground States	15	29	20	32	4	(430)

Sacrificing Civil Liberties

	-----January 2002-----			-----July 2004-----			Change in Necessary	(N)
	<u>Necessary</u>	<u>Not necessary</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Necessary</u>	<u>Not necessary</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>		
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Total	55	39	6=100	38	56	6=100	-17	(1003)
Sex								
Male	55	42	3	41	55	4	-14	(491)
Female	56	36	8	35	57	8	-21	(512)
Race								
White	57	38	5	39	54	7	-18	(835)
Non-white	50	43	7	32	62	6	-18	(158)
Black	42	49	9	33	62	5	-9	(95)
Hispanic*	51	42	7	40	59	1	-11	(66)
Race and Sex								
White Men	55	42	3	43	53	4	-12	(408)
White Women	58	35	7	36	55	9	-22	(427)
Age								
Under 30	47	50	3	29	70	1	-18	(163)
30-49	59	37	4	38	55	7	-21	(398)
50-64	61	35	4	43	50	7	-18	(275)
65+	51	35	14	41	47	12	-10	(160)
Sex and Age								
Men under 50	54	44	2	37	60	3	-17	(284)
Women under 50	56	38	6	33	61	6	-23	(277)
Men 50+	57	38	5	48	46	6	-9	(206)
Women 50+	56	33	11	36	52	12	-20	(229)
Education								
College Grad.	64	33	3	44	53	3	-20	(388)
Some College	61	34	5	43	52	5	-18	(262)
High School Grad. or Less	48	45	7	32	59	9	-16	(350)
Family Income								
\$75,000+	65	32	3	53	45	2	-12	(272)
\$50,000-\$74,999	66	33	1	39	58	3	-27	(171)
\$30,000-\$49,999	58	40	2	34	61	5	-24	(210)
\$20,000-\$29,999	49	42	9	31	63	6	-18	(112)
<\$20,000	42	47	11	28	60	12	-14	(123)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization. Note small sample size.

Question: In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it is necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties, or not?

Continued on next page...

	-----January 2002-----			-----July 2002-----			<i>Change in Necessary</i>	<i>(N)</i>
	<u>Necessary</u>	<u>Not</u>		<u>Necessary</u>	<u>Not</u>			
		<u>necessary</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>		<u>necessary</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>		
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Total	55	39	6=100	38	56	6=100	-17	(1003)
Region								
East	57	38	5	34	56	10	-23	(174)
Midwest	55	40	5	40	56	4	-15	(264)
South	53	40	7	38	55	7	-15	(343)
West	59	36	5	38	57	5	-21	(222)
Religious Affiliation								
Total White Protestant	58	36	6	41	51	8	-17	(451)
- Evangelical	57	35	8	39	52	9	-18	(239)
- Non-Evangelical	58	37	5	43	50	7	-15	(212)
White Catholic	58	36	6	41	52	7	-17	(185)
Secular	53	44	3	35	65	0	-18	(119)
Community Size								
Large City	52	43	5	34	60	6	-18	(217)
Suburb	64	32	4	44	52	4	-20	(264)
Small City/Town	53	40	7	35	57	8	-18	(329)
Rural Area	56	41	3	40	52	8	-16	(182)
Party ID								
Republican	60	35	5	50	43	7	-10	(301)
Democrat	52	41	7	30	65	5	-22	(345)
Independent	54	41	5	38	58	4	-16	(296)
Party and Ideology								
Conservative Republican	63	32	5	54	39	7	-9	(210)
Moderate/Liberal Rep.	59	37	4	41	51	8	-18	(87)
Conservative/Mod. Dem.	53	40	7	33	62	5	-20	(218)
Liberal Democrat	54	43	3	24	72	4	-30	(117)
Bush Approval								
Approve	58	37	5	47	47	6	-11	(466)
Disapprove	48	47	5	30	65	5	-18	(461)
Labor Union								
Union Household	58	40	2	48	46	6	-10	(134)
Non-Union Household	55	39	6	36	58	6	-19	(859)
2004 Vote Preference (RVs)								
Bush/Lean Bush	--	--	--	49	44	7	--	(352)
Kerry/Lean Kerry	--	--	--	29	65	6	--	(356)
Battleground States								
Republican States	--	--	--	35	56	9	--	(309)
Democratic States	--	--	--	39	56	5	--	(294)
Battleground States	--	--	--	39	55	6	--	(400)

**PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS
JULY 2004 FOREIGN POLICY AND PARTY IMAGES SURVEY**

FINAL TOPLINE

July 8 - 18, 2004

Total N=2009

Form 1=1003 Form 2=1006

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.1F1 Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? **[IF DK ENTER AS DK. IF DEPENDS PROBE ONCE WITH: Overall do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? IF STILL DEPENDS ENTER AS DK]**

SEE AUGUST TOPLINE FOR LATEST RESULTS

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.2F2 All in all, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in this country today?

	<u>Sat- isfied</u>	<u>Dis- satisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>		<u>Sat- isfied</u>	<u>Dis- satisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
July, 2004	38	55	7=100	Early August, 1998	50	44	6=100
May, 2004	33	61	6=100	February, 1998	59	37	4=100
Late February, 2004	39	55	6=100	January, 1998	46	50	4=100
Early January, 2004	45	48	7=100	September, 1997	45	49	6=100
December, 2003	44	47	9=100	August, 1997	49	46	5=100
October, 2003	38	56	6=100	January, 1997	38	58	4=100
August, 2003	40	53	7=100	July, 1996	29	67	4=100
April, 2003 ²	50	41	9=100	March, 1996	28	70	2=100
January, 2003	44	50	6=100	October, 1995	23	73	4=100
September, 2002 ³	41	55	4=100	June, 1995	25	73	2=100
Late August, 2002	47	44	9=100	April, 1995	23	74	3=100
May, 2002	44	44	12=100	July, 1994	24	73	3=100
March, 2002	50	40	10=100	March, 1994	24	71	5=100
Late September, 2001	57	34	9=100	October, 1993	22	73	5=100
Early September, 2001	41	53	6=100	September, 1993	20	75	4=100
June, 2001	43	52	5=100	May, 1993	22	71	7=100
March, 2001	47	45	8=100	January, 1993	39	50	11=100
February, 2001	46	43	11=100	January, 1992	28	68	4=100
January, 2001	55	41	4=100	November, 1991	34	61	5=100
September, 2000	51	41	8=100	<i>Late Feb, 1991 (Gallup)</i>	66	31	3=100
June, 2000	47	45	8=100	August, 1990	47	48	5=100
April, 2000	48	43	9=100	May, 1990	41	54	5=100
August, 1999	56	39	5=100	January, 1989	45	50	5=100
January, 1999	53	41	6=100	September, 1988 (RVs)	50	45	5=100
November, 1998	46	44	10=100	May, 1988	41	54	5=100
Early September, 1998	54	42	4=100	January, 1988	39	55	6=100
Late August, 1998	55	41	4=100				

² Asked April 8, 2003 only; N=395.

³ The September 2002 trend is from a Pew Global Attitudes Project survey, fielded August 19 to September 8, 2002 and released December 4, 2002.

ASK ALL:

Q.3 Now I will read a list of some stories covered by news organizations this past month. As I read each item, tell me if you happened to follow this news story very closely, fairly closely, not too closely, or not at all closely. [INSERT ITEM; RANDOMIZE WITH ITEM a. AND b. FIRST, FOLLOWED BY RANDOMIZED ITEMS c. THRU i; OBSERVE FORM SPLITS]

		Very Closely	Fairly Closely	Not too Closely	Not at all Closely	DK/Ref
a.	News about candidates for the 2004 presidential election					
	August, 2004	32	38	16	14	*=100
	July, 2004	29	37	18	15	1=100
	<i>Full trend shown in previous release</i>					
b.	News about the current situation in Iraq					
	August, 2004	39	42	12	6	1=100
	July, 2004	43	40	11	6	*=100
	<i>Full trend shown in previous release</i>					

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

c.F1	John Edwards, the Democratic vice presidential candidate					
	July, 2004	24	30	21	23	2=100
d.F1	Ethnic violence in Sudan					
	July, 2004	14	22	27	35	2=100
e.F1	Saddam Hussein's recent court appearance in Iraq					
	July, 2004	26	32	21	20	1=100
f.F1	The release of Michael Moore's movie "Fahrenheit 9/11"					
	July, 2004	20	25	16	36	3=100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

g.F2	The transfer of power to a newly established Iraqi government					
	July, 2004	29	37	19	14	1=100
h.F2	The publication of Bill Clinton's book about his life					
	July, 2004	8	14	21	55	2=100
	Early July, 2003 (<i>Hillary Clinton's book</i>)	8	14	25	52	1=100
i.F2	The high price of gasoline these days					
	August, 2004	52	29	10	8	1=100
	July, 2004	56	25	11	7	1=100
	<i>Full trend shown in previous release</i>					

QUESTIONS 4 THROUGH 11 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.12F2 What do you think is the most important problem facing the country today? **[RECORD VERBATIM RESPONSE. PROBE FOR CLARITY – DO NOT PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL MENTIONS. IF MORE THAN ONE MENTION, RECORD ALL IN ORDER OF MENTION]**

		Mid-						July	July
		Jan	Apr	Feb	Mar	May	Feb	1996	1992
		<u>2004</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>		
25	War/War in Iraq	16	14	34	10 [▲]	--	--	--	--
14	Economy (general)	20	28	21	8	7	7	4	27
8	Terrorism	14	9	16	24	1	*	--	--
8	Unemployment/Lack of jobs	13	10	6	4	5	6	7	25
7	Dissatisfaction with govt/politics	5	3	5	4	2	5	8	2
5	Health care/costs	5	3	2	2	6	7	4	3
4	Morality/Ethics/Family values	3	4	5	8	6	12	13	3
4	Education	3	4	1	4	8	11	6	4
4	U.S. foreign policy/Intl affairs	2	--	--	--	2	2	*	--
	Defense issues/Military spending/								
3	National & homeland security	3	2	2	5	1	1	--	--
2	Energy crisis/Rising gas/heating prices	--	--	1	1	22	4	--	--
2	Poverty/Hunger/Starvation	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	4
2	Trade/Jobs moving overseas	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1	Issues related to elderly	2	1	--	1	2	2	2	--
	Inflation/Difference								
1	between wages/costs	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	--
1	Immigration	3	1	--	1	1	2	--	--
1	Crime/Gangs/Justice system	1	1	1	4	4	8	19	4
1	Peace in the world/Peace	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--
1	Homelessness	1	1	--	1	1	2	2	7
1	Uneven distribution of wealth	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--
1	Deficit/National debt/Balanced budget	2	2	--	1	1	1	7	7
1	Taxes	1	1	--	1	3	3	3	2
1	Drugs/Alcohol	1	1	2	4	4	6	8	4
1	Social Security	--	1	--	--	3	1	--	--
1	Abortion	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--
9	Other								
1	None	1	1	1	1	*	2	*	--
6	Don't know/No answer	4	9	4	8	8	7	6	3
	(NET) DEFENSE/TERRORISM/								
41	INTERNATIONAL	37	29	54	39	3	5	1	--
26	(NET) ECONOMIC	35	41	29	16	40	26	18	63

▲ War in Afghanistan in March 2002

QUESTIONS 13 THROUGH 29 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Thinking now about the president...

Q.30F2 Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling [INSERT ITEM; RANDOMIZE]?
 [IF DK ENTER AS DK. IF "DEPENDS" PROBE ONCE WITH: Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling [ITEM]? IF STILL DEPENDS ENTER AS DK]

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>DK/Ref.</u>
a.F2 The economy			
b.F2 The situation in Iraq	SEE AUGUST TOPLINE FOR LATEST RESULTS		
c.F2 Terrorist threats			
d.F2 The nation's foreign policy			
e.F2 International trade issues	33	45	22=100
Early September, 2001	38	34	28=100
Clinton: September, 1997	44	38	18=100
Clinton: September, 1993	38	39	23=100
Clinton: August, 1993	49	25	26=100

ASK ALL:

Thinking about what's going on in the world more generally...

Q.31 All in all, would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in the WORLD these days?

		Early				
		Sept	Sept	Sept	Oct	Sept
		<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1993</u>
21	Satisfied	17	27	29	12	28
74	Dissatisfied	79	64	65	81	66
2	Neither satisfied/dissatisfied (VOL)	--	6	4	4	*
<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100

Q.32 What kind of leadership role should the United States play in the world? Should it be the single world leader, or should it play a shared leadership role, or shouldn't it play any leadership role?

IF "SHARED LEADERSHIP ROLE" (2 IN Q.32), ASK:

Q.33 Should the United States be the most active of the leading nations, or should it be about as active as other leading nations?

		Mid-		Early				
		June	Oct	Sept	Sept	June	Oct	Sept
		<u>2003</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1995⁴</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1993</u>
11	Be the single world leader, or	13	12	13	12	13	9	10
74	Should it play a shared leadership role	76	79	75	73	74	78	81
27	Most active	30	33	25	22	25	23	27
44	About as active	44	45	49	50	47	53	52
3	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
9	Shouldn't it play any leadership role	7	3	8	11	9	9	7
<u>6</u>	Don't know (VOL)	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100

⁴ In 1995 and earlier, the answer categories were "...most active, or should it be no more or less active than other leading nations?"

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.34F1 All in all, how should the U.S. determine its foreign policy? Should it be based mostly on the national interests of the U.S., or should it strongly take into account the interests of its allies?

		Early Sept <u>2001</u>
37	National interests of the U.S.	38
49	Interests of its allies	48
7	Both (VOL)	7
1	Neither (VOL)	1
<u>6</u>	Don't Know (VOL)	<u>6</u>
100		100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.35F2 In formulating U.S. foreign policy, is the Bush administration taking into account the interests and views of our allies... Too much, too little, or about the right amount?

		Mid-Jan <u>2004</u>	Early Sept <u>2001</u>
15	Too much	18	19
37	Too little	30	22
38	Right amount	46	42
<u>10</u>	Don't Know/Refused	<u>6</u>	<u>17</u>
100		100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.36F2 Do you think the partnership between the US and Western Europe should remain as close as it has been or do you think that the U.S. should take a more independent approach to security and diplomatic affairs than it has in the past?

		Late Feb <u>2004</u>	May <u>2003</u>	Feb <u>2003</u>
56	Remain as close	55	53	62
33	More independent	36	39	29
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
100		100	100	100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.37F1 Do you think that using military force against countries that may seriously threaten our country, but have not attacked us, can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?

		Aug <u>2003</u>	May <u>2003</u>
20	Often justified	20	22
40	Sometimes justified	43	45
22	Rarely justified	19	17
14	Never justified	13	13
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
100		100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.38F2 In its dealings with foreign countries and its handling of international problems, do you think the Bush administration tries hard enough to reach diplomatic solutions, or is it too quick to get American military forces involved?

--- CBS/NY Times Poll ---

		April <u>2003</u>	Jan <u>2003</u>	Oct <u>2002</u>
33	Tries to reach diplomatic solutions	58	41	40
59	Too quick to get military involved	36	56	50
<u>8</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>
100		100	100	100

ASK ALL:

Q.39 As I read a list of possible LONG-RANGE foreign policy goals which the United States might have, tell me how much priority you think each should be given. First, **[READ AND ROTATE; OBSERVE FORM SPLITS; ITEM a FULL FORM]**, do you think this should have top priority, some priority, or no priority at all:

		Top <u>Priority</u>	Some <u>Priority</u>	No <u>Priority</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	Taking measures to protect the U.S. from terrorist attacks	88	10	1	1=100
	Mid-October, 2001	93	6	*	1=100
	Early September, 2001	80	16	3	1=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

b.F1	Preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction	71	23	4	2=100
	Mid-October, 2001	81	14	2	3=100
	Early September, 2001	78	16	5	1=100
	September, 1997	70	23	6	1=100
	June, 1995	68	21	9	2=100
	September, 1993	69	24	5	1=100
c.F1	Insuring adequate energy supplies for the U.S.	70	25	2	3=100
	Mid-October, 2001	69	29	1	1=100
	Early September, 2001	74	23	2	1=100
	September, 1997	58	36	3	3=100
	June, 1995	59	34	3	4=100
	September, 1993	60	34	4	2=100
d.F1	Promoting democracy in other nations	24	57	15	4=100
	Mid-October, 2001	24	61	12	3=100
	Early September, 2001	29	52	16	3=100
	September, 1997	22	57	18	3=100
	June, 1995	16	57	24	3=100
	September, 1993	22	52	24	2=100
e.F1	Finding a solution to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians	28	46	22	4=100
	January, 2003 ⁵	38	40	19	3=100
	March, 1999	35	42	19	4=100
	September, 1993	34	45	19	2=100

⁵ In January 2003 and earlier the question was worded "Bringing about a permanent settlement between Israel and the Arabs."

Q.39 CONTINUED...

		Top Priority	Some Priority	No Priority	DK/Ref
f.F1	Promoting U.S. business and economic interests abroad	35	51	10	4=100
	Mid-October, 2001	30	63	4	3=100
	Early September, 2001	37	53	8	2=100
	September, 1997 ⁶	16	62	20	2=100
	June, 1995	26	50	20	4=100
	September, 1993	27	51	19	3=100
g.F1	Strengthening the United Nations	48	38	11	3=100
	Mid-October, 2001	46	46	7	1=100
	Early September, 2001	42	43	13	2=100
	September, 1997	30	53	14	3=100
	June, 1995	36	45	17	2=100
	September, 1993	41	46	11	2=100
h.F1	Reducing the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases	72	25	2	1=100
	Mid-October, 2001	59	38	2	1=100
	Early September, 2001	73	23	3	1=100
i.F1	Protecting groups or nations that are threatened with genocide	47	40	5	8=100
	Mid-October, 2001	48	43	3	6=100
	Early September, 2001	49	41	5	5=100
j.F1	Reducing U.S. military commitments overseas	35	51	10	4=100
	Early September, 2001	26	58	14	2=100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

k.F2	Improving relationships with our allies	54	40	4	2=100
l.F2	Helping improve the living standards in developing nations	23	63	12	2=100
	Mid-October, 2001	20	67	12	1=100
	Early September, 2001	25	61	12	2=100
	September, 1997	23	63	13	1=100
	June, 1995	16	59	22	3=100
	September, 1993	19	60	20	1=100
m.F2	Protecting the jobs of American workers	84	13	2	1=100
	Mid-October, 2001	74	24	1	1=100
	Early September, 2001	77	19	3	1=100
	September, 1997	77	20	2	1=100
	June, 1995	80	17	2	1=100
	September, 1993	85	13	2	*=100
n.F2	Promoting and defending human rights in other countries	33	53	12	2=100
	Mid-October, 2001	27	61	10	2=100
	Early September, 2001	29	54	14	3=100
	September, 1997	27	56	15	2=100
	June, 1995	21	56	20	3=100
	September, 1993	22	54	22	2=100

⁶ In September 1993, June 1995 and September 1997 the item was worded "Aiding the interests of US businesses abroad."

Q.39 CONTINUED...

		Top Priority	Some Priority	No Priority	DK/Ref
o.F2	Combating international drug trafficking	63	29	7	1=100
	Mid-October, 2001	55	38	5	2=100
	Early September, 2001	64	26	9	1=100
	September, 1997	67	24	7	2=100
p.F2	Getting other countries to assume more of the costs of maintaining world order	58	34	5	3=100
	Mid-October, 2001	54	41	3	2=100
	Early September, 2001	56	35	6	3=100
q.F2	Dealing with the problem of world hunger	50	43	6	1=100
	Mid-October, 2001	34	59	6	1=100
	Early September, 2001	47	44	7	2=100
r.F2	Dealing with global warming	36	46	12	6=100
	Mid-October, 2001	31	51	13	5=100
	Early September, 2001	44	39	12	5=100
	September, 1997 ⁷	50	42	6	2=100
	June, 1995	56	36	6	2=100
s.F2	Reducing our dependence on imported oil sources	56	37	6	1=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.40F1 Do you think the United States plays a more important and powerful role as a world leader today compared to ten years ago, a less important role, or about as important a role as a world leader as it did ten years ago?

		Early					<i>Chicago Council on Foreign Relations</i>				
		Sept	Sept	Dec	Oct	Sept	Nov	Nov	Nov	Nov	Dec
		<u>2001</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1974</u>
45	More important	33	35	40	37	37	37	41	27	29	28
20	Less important	26	23	27	26	30	35	26	25	41	39
31	As important	38	40	29	33	31	24	29	44	24	27
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.41F2 Do you think the United States plays a more important and powerful role as a world leader these days, a less important role, or about as important a role as a world leader as it did in the past?

41	More important
18	Less important
35	As important
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused [VOL.]
100	

⁷

In September 1993, June 1995 and September 1997 the item was worded "Improving the global environment."

ASK ALL:

Q.42 As I read a phrase, tell me how much priority it should have in the way we conduct our foreign policy. First, **[INSERT ITEM; RANDOMIZE; OBSERVE FORM SPLITS]**, do you think this should be a top priority, some priority, or no priority at all in the way we conduct our foreign policy? [How about **[NEXT ITEM]**?]

		<u>Top</u> <u>Priority</u>	<u>Some</u> <u>Priority</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Priority</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
ASK FORM 1 ONLY:					
a.F1	Being compassionate	54	39	4	3=100
b.F1	Being practical	58	37	2	3=100
c.F1	Being decisive	62	30	3	5=100
d.F1	Being cautious	66	31	2	1=100
e.F1	Following moral principles	72	23	3	2=100
ASK FORM 2 ONLY:					
f.F2	Being idealistic	25	56	13	6=100
g.F2	Being flexible	40	52	4	4=100
h.F2	Being forceful	23	59	14	4=100
i.F2	Following religious principles	33	42	21	4=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.43F1 Compared with the past, would you say the U.S. is MORE respected by other countries these days, LESS respected by other countries, or AS respected as it has been in the past?

ASK IF LESS RESPECTED (2 IN Q.43):

Q.43a Do you think less respect for America is a major problem a minor problem or not a problem at all?

		<u>May 1987⁸</u>	<i>Newsweek</i> <u>Jan 1984</u>
10	More respected	19	27
67	Less respected	55	36
43	Major problem	--	--
19	Minor problem	--	--
4	Not a problem	--	--
1	Don't know/Refused	--	--
20	As respected as in the past	23	29
<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>
100		100	100

⁸ In May 1987 the question was worded "Compared to five years ago, would you say the U.S. is more respected by other countries, less respected by other countries, or as respected as it was five years ago by other countries?" In January 1984 the question was worded "Compared to four years ago..."

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.44F2 Compared with the past, would you say the U.S. is liked MORE by other countries these days, liked LESS by other countries, or is the U.S. viewed about the same as it has been in the past?

ASK IF LIKED LESS (2 IN Q.44):

Q.44a Do you think this is a major problem a minor problem or not a problem at all?

8	Liked more
59	Liked less
42	Major problem
13	Minor problem
4	Not a problem
*	Don't know/Refused
29	About the same as in the past
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.45F1 Do you think that we should increase our spending on national defense, keep it about the same, or cut it back?

		Mid-	Early	(RVs)											
		Oct	Sept	Sept	Aug	June	Sept	Feb	Oct	Sept	Nov	Nov	Nov	Nov	Dec
		2001	2001	2000	1999	1999	1997	1995 ⁹	94+	1993	90+	86+	82+	78+	74+
25	Increase	50	32	34	27	31	17	19	18	10	12	21	22	32	13
53	Keep same	41	44	48	54	47	57	56	53	52	53	55	52	45	47
18	Cut back	7	20	14	16	19	24	24	26	36	32	23	24	16	33
<u>4</u>	DK/Ref.	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

+ Chicago Council on Foreign Relations

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.46F2 Do you think the U.S. should increase the size of the military, keep it about the same, or reduce the size of the military?

34	Increase
54	Keep same
8	Cut back
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused [VOL.]
100	

⁹ In 1995 and previous years, the question was worded: "Do you think that we should expand our spending on national defense, keep it about the same or cut it back?"

ASK ALL:

Q.47 In the dispute between Israel and the Palestinians, which side do you sympathize with more, Israel or the Palestinians?

	<u>Israel</u>	<u>Palestinians</u>	<u>Both (VOL.)</u>	<u>Neither (VOL.)</u>	<u>Don't know Refused</u>
July, 2004	40	13	7	18	22=100
Late February, 2004	46	12	8	15	19=99
Mid-July, 2003	41	13	8	18	20=100
April, 2002	41	13	6	21	19=100
Mid-October, 2001	47	10	8	18	17=100
Early September, 2001	40	17	6	23	14=100
September 1997	48	13	5	16	18=100
September 1993	45	21	3	18	12=100
<i>Chicago CFR</i> 1990	34	13	7	26	20=100
<i>Chicago CFR</i> 1978	38	12	8	15	13=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.48F1 What's your opinion of US policies in the Middle East – would you say they are fair or do they favor Israel too much or do they favor the Palestinians too much?

	<u>May 2003</u>
35 Fair	47
32 Favor Israel	27
5 Favor Palestinians	8
<u>28</u> Don't know/Refused	<u>18</u>
100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.49F2 Do you think the US is doing as much as it can to bring about a peace settlement between the Israelis and the Palestinians, or don't you think so?

	<u>Early April 2002</u>
46 Yes	53
42 No	34
<u>12</u> Don't know/Refused	<u>13</u>
100	100

NO QUESTIONS 50 OR 51

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Thinking about China for a moment...

Q.52F2 All things considered, which of these descriptions comes closest to your view of China today. . . Do you think China is (**READ**):

	<u>Early</u>						
	<u>Feb 2002</u>	<u>Sept 2001</u>	<u>May 2001</u>	<u>March 2000</u>	<u>June 1999</u>	<u>March 1999</u>	<u>Sept 1997</u>
14 An adversary	17	23	19	17	18	20	14
40 A serious problem, but not an adversary	39	48	51	44	53	48	46
36 OR, Not much of a problem	33	23	22	26	22	25	32
<u>10</u> Don't know/Refused (DO NOT READ)	<u>11</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.53F2 What is your impression... These days are relations between the U.S. and China improving, getting worse, or staying about the same?

		Feb <u>2002</u>	May <u>2001</u>	March <u>2000</u>	June <u>1999</u>	March <u>1999</u>	Aug <u>1995</u>
18	Improving	16	6	13	7	13	16
13	Getting worse	14	40	19	35	19	22
58	Staying about the same	61	48	55	50	60	53
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Thinking about trade for a moment...

Q.54F1 In general, do you think that free trade agreements like NAFTA, and the World Trade Organization, have been a good thing or a bad thing for the United States? **[INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT ASKS WHAT NAFTA IS, "The North American Free Trade Agreement"]**

		March <u>2004</u>	Dec ¹⁰ <u>2003</u>	Early Sept <u>2001</u>	Nov <u>1997</u>	Sept <u>1997</u>
47	Good thing	44	34	49	45	47
34	Bad thing	37	33	29	34	30
<u>19</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>19</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>23</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.55F1 Thinking about the financial situation of you and your family... Do you think these free trade agreements (like NAFTA and the WTO) have definitely helped, probably helped, probably hurt, or definitely hurt the financial situation of you and your family? **[INTERVIEWER: READ OUT FULL NAMES ONLY IF RESPONDENT IS UNCERTAIN]**

		Dec <u>2003</u>
3	Definitely helped	2
31	Probably helped	25
25	Probably hurt	24
16	Definitely hurt	14
12	Neither (VOL.)	15
<u>13</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>20</u>
100		100

NO QUESTIONS 56 THROUGH 59

QUESTIONS 60-64 RESULTS UPDATED IN QUESTIONS 51-55 IN AUGUST TOPLINE

¹⁰ In December 2003 the question's wording and interviewer instructions were: "...free trade agreements like NAFTA, (the North American Free Trade Agreement) and the WTO (World Trade Organization)... [INTERVIEWER: READ OUT FULL NAMES ONLY IF RESPONDENT IS UNCERTAIN]. In Early September 2001 and earlier the question was worded: "So far, do you think that NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, has been a good thing or a bad thing from a U.S. point of view?"

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.65F1 In rebuilding Iraq, how good a job are the U.S. and its allies doing in taking into account the needs and interests of the Iraqi people? Is the coalition doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job or a poor job in taking into consideration the interests and needs of the Iraqi people?

		Late Feb <u>2004</u>	Dec <u>2003</u>	Sept <u>2003</u>	May <u>2003</u>
11	Excellent	13	11	9	18
33	Good	37	35	36	41
35	Only fair	31	27	35	26
13	Poor	9	16	11	6
<u>8</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>
100		100	100	100	100

QUESTIONS 66 RESULTS UPDATED IN QUESTION 57 IN THE AUGUST TOPLINE

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.67F2 How much longer do you think United States troops will have to remain in Iraq – for less than a year, one to two years, two to five years, or will the U.S. troops have to stay in Iraq for longer than five years?

		June <u>2004</u>	April <u>2004</u>	March <u>2004</u>	Dec <u>2003</u>	July <u>2003</u>
17	Less than a year	17	8	8	15	13
31	One to two years	33	27	22	34	31
27	Two to five years	26	33	35	31	31
17	Longer than five years	16	25	26	12	18
<u>8</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100

NO QUESTIONS 68 OR 69

ASK ALL:

Thinking about the issue of terrorism for a moment...

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.70F2 In general, how well do you think the U.S. government is doing in reducing the threat of terrorism? **[READ]**

		<i>(RVs)</i>					
		Aug	Early	June	Early	Oct	Oct
		<u>2003</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
18	Very well	19	15	16	35	38	48
53	Fairly well	56	54	60	46	46	40
17	Not too well, OR	16	19	16	9	9	6
8	Not at all well	7	8	4	5	4	2
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.71F1 Overall, do you think the ability of terrorists to launch another major attack on the U.S. is greater, the same, or less than it was at the time of the September 11th terrorist attacks?

		Late Aug
		<u>2002</u>
24	Greater	22
39	The same	39
34	Less	34
<u>3</u>	Don't know/refused (VOL.)	<u>5</u>
100		100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.72F1 Thinking back...Do you think there is anything that the U.S. did wrong in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the 9/11 terrorist attacks, or not?

		Late Aug	Late
		<u>2002¹¹</u>	<u>Sept 2001</u>
38	Yes, U.S. dealings may have motivated attacks	38	33
51	No	49	55
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>
100		100	100

¹¹ In 2002 and 2001 the item was worded: "Do you think there is anything that the U.S. did wrong in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the terrorist attacks, or not?"

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.73F2 Thinking back...Do you think there is any way that the U.S. was unfair in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the 9/11 terrorist attacks, or not?

		Late Aug <u>2002</u> ¹²	Late Sept <u>2001</u>
28	Yes, unfair dealings may have motivated attacks	23	21
58	No	64	70
<u>14</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>
100		100	100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY:

Q.74F1 In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it is necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties, or not?

		Aug <u>2003</u> ¹³	June <u>2002</u>	Jan <u>2002</u>	Mid-Sept <u>2001</u>	April <u>1997</u>	March <u>1996</u>	<i>L.A. Times</i> <u>April 1995</u>
38	Yes, it is necessary	44	49	55	55	29	30	49
56	No, it is not necessary	50	45	39	35	62	65	43
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.75F2 What concerns you more about the government's anti-terrorism policies? **[READ AND ROTATE]**

- 49 That they have not gone far enough to adequately protect the country
- OR--
- 29 That they have gone too far in restricting the average person's civil liberties
- 11 Neither / Approve of policies (VOL.)
- 11 Don't know/Refused
- 100

NO QUESTION 76

ASK FORM 2 ONLY:

Q.77F2 Do you think the use of torture against suspected terrorists in order to gain important information can often be justified, sometimes be justified, rarely be justified, or never be justified?

- 15 Often justified
- 28 Sometimes justified
- 21 Rarely justified
- 32 Never justified
- 4 Don't know/Refused
- 100

¹² In 2002 and 2001 the item was worded: "Do you think there is any way that the U.S. was unfair in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the terrorist attacks, or not?"

¹³ In 2003 and earlier the question was worded: "In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it will be necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties, or not?"

PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS
AUGUST 2004 NEWS INTEREST INDEX
FINAL TOPLINE
August 5 - 10, 2004
N=1512

Q.1 Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? **[IF DK ENTER AS DK. IF DEPENDS PROBE ONCE WITH: Overall do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? IF STILL DEPENDS ENTER AS DK]**

	<u>Approve</u>	Dis- approve	Don't know		<u>Approve</u>	Dis- approve	Don't know
August, 2004	46	45	9=100	June, 2002	70	20	10=100
July, 2004	46	46	8=100	April, 2002	69	18	13=100
June, 2004	48	43	9=100	Early April, 2002	74	16	10=100
May, 2004	44	48	8=100	February, 2002	78	13	9=100
Late April, 2004	48	43	9=100	January, 2002	80	11	9=100
Early April, 2004	43	47	10=100	2001			
Late March, 2004	47	44	9=100	Mid-November, 2001	84	9	7=100
Mid-March, 2004	46	47	7=100	Early October, 2001	84	8	8=100
February, 2004	48	44	8=100	Late September, 2001	86	7	7=100
Mid-January, 2004	56	34	10=100	Mid-September, 2001	80	9	11=100
Early January, 2004	58	35	7=100	Early September, 2001	51	34	15=100
2003				August, 2001	50	32	18=100
December, 2003	57	34	9=100	July, 2001	51	32	17=100
November, 2003	50	40	10=100	June, 2001	50	33	17=100
October, 2003	50	42	8=100	May, 2001	53	32	15=100
September, 2003	55	36	9=100	April, 2001	56	27	17=100
Mid-August, 2003	56	32	12=100	March, 2001	55	25	20=100
Early August, 2003	53	37	10=100	February, 2001	53	21	26=100
Mid-July, 2003	58	32	10=100				
Early July, 2003	60	29	11=100				
June, 2003	62	27	11=100				
May, 2003	65	27	8=100				
April 10-16, 2003	72	22	6=100				
April 9, 2003	74	20	6=100				
April 2-7, 2003	69	25	6=100				
March 28-April 1, 2003	71	23	6=100				
March 25-27, 2003	70	24	6=100				
March 20-24, 2003	67	26	7=100				
March 13-16, 2003	55	34	11=100				
February, 2003	54	36	10=100				
January, 2003	58	32	10=100				
2002							
December, 2002	61	28	11=100				
Late October, 2002	59	29	12=100				
Early October, 2002	61	30	9=100				
Mid-September, 2002	67	22	11=100				
Early September, 2002	63	26	11=100				
Late August, 2002	60	27	13=100				
August, 2002	67	21	12=100				
Late July, 2002	65	25	10=100				
July, 2002	67	21	12=100				

QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 17 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=773]:

Thinking now about the president...

Q.18F2 Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling [INSERT ITEM; RANDOMIZE]?
[IF DK ENTER AS DK. IF "DEPENDS" PROBE ONCE WITH: Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling [ITEM]? IF STILL DEPENDS ENTER AS DK]

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>DK/Ref.</u>
a.F2 The economy			
August, 2004	42	52	6=100
July, 2004	42	52	6=100
June, 2004	43	50	7=100
Late April, 2004	42	51	7=100
Early April, 2004	39	53	8=100
Mid-January, 2004	47	47	6=100
September, 2003	43	48	9=100
February, 2003	43	48	9=100
January, 2003	47	45	8=100
Early October, 2002	49	40	11=100
June, 2002	53	36	11=100
January, 2002	60	28	12=100
Early September, 2001	47	44	9=100
February, 2001	50	22	28=100
Clinton: Early September, 1998	71	23	6=100
Clinton: September, 1997	60	34	6=100
Clinton: January, 1996	50	42	8=100
Clinton: June, 1995	46	46	8=100
Clinton: October, 1994	45	46	9=100
Clinton: July, 1994	38	56	6=100
Bush, Sr.: August, 1990	40	52	8=100
Bush, Sr.: May, 1990	42	47	11=100
b.F2 The situation in Iraq			
August, 2004	43	52	5=100
July, 2004	42	53	5=100
June, 2004	42	51	7=100
Late April, 2004	44	48	8=100
Early April, 2004	40	53	7=100
Mid-January, 2004	59	37	4=100
September, 2003	52	40	8=100
April 10-16, 2003 ¹⁴	77	17	6=100
April 8-9, 2003	71	23	6=100
--April 9, 2003	76	18	6=100
--April 8, 2003	65	28	7=100
April 2-7, 2003	73	21	6=100
March 28-April 1, 2003	69	26	5=100
March 25-27, 2003	73	23	4=100
March 23-24, 2003	72	22	6=100
March 20-22, 2003	70	23	7=100

¹⁴ From March to April 2003 the item was worded: "... dealing with the war in Iraq?" The 1991 Gallup trend was worded "...George Bush is handling the situation in the Persian Gulf region."

Q.18F2 CONTINUED...

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>DK/Ref.</u>
February, 2003	56	37	7=100
January, 2003	56	36	8=100
Early October, 2002	56	34	10=100
c.F2 Terrorist threats			
August, 2004	58	37	5=100
July, 2004	54	40	6=100
June, 2004	56	35	9=100
Late April, 2004	55	36	9=100
Early April, 2004	53	38	9=100
Gallup/CNN/USA Today: 12/03	65	33	2=100
September, 2003	64	28	8=100
February, 2003	67	25	8=100
January, 2003	69	23	8=100
Early October, 2002	71	22	7=100
June, 2002	74	18	8=100
Mid-September, 2001 ¹⁵	85	6	9=100
Clinton: Early September, 1998	72	20	8=100
d.F2 The nation's foreign policy			
August, 2004	42	49	9=100
July, 2004	40	48	12=100
Mid-January, 2004	53	36	11=100
March, 2003	53	36	11=100
Early April, 2002	69	20	11=100
Gallup: October, 2001	81	14	5=100
Early September, 2001	46	34	20=100
August, 2001 ¹⁶	45	32	23=100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=773]:

Q.19F2 As you may know, a commission known as the 9-11 Commission recently finished its investigation into the events that led up to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the job this commission did?

<u>Aug</u> <u>2004</u>		<u>July</u> <u>2004</u>
62	Approve	61
21	Disapprove	24
<u>17</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>15</u>
100		100

**QUESTIONS 20 THROUGH 45 HELD FOR RELEASE
QUESTIONS 46 THROUGH 50 PREVIOUSLY RELEASED**

¹⁵ In Mid-September, 2001 the question was worded: "...dealing with the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington." In Early September 1998 the question was worded: "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bill Clinton is handling current threats from international terrorist groups?"

¹⁶ In August 2001 roughly half of the U.S. sample was asked about Bush's handling of international policy, while the other half was asked about the handling of the nation's foreign policy. Results did not differ between question wordings.

Now thinking about Iraq...

Q.51 Do you think the U.S. made the right decision or the wrong decision in using military force against Iraq?

	<u>Right decision</u>	<u>Wrong decision</u>	<u>Don't know/ Refused</u>
August, 2004	53	41	6=100
July, 2004	52	43	5=100
June, 2004	55	38	7=100
May, 2004	51	42	7=100
Late April, 2004	54	37	9=100
Early April, 2004	57	35	8=100
Mid-March, 2004	55	39	6=100
Late February, 2004	60	32	8=100
Early February, 2004	56	39	5=100
Mid-January, 2004	65	30	5=100
Early January, 2004	62	28	10=100
December, 2003	67	26	7=100
October, 2003	60	33	7=100
September, 2003	63	31	6=100
August, 2003	63	30	7=100
Early July, 2003	67	24	9=100
May, 2003	74	20	6=100
<i>April 10-16, 2003</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>7=100</i>
<i>April 8-9, 2003</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>7=100</i>
<i>April 2-7, 2003</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>8=100</i>
<i>March 28-April 1, 2003</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>6=100</i>
<i>March 25-27, 2003</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>5=100</i>
<i>March 23-24, 2003</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>5=100</i>
<i>March 20-22, 2003</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>7=100</i>
Late January, 1991	77	15	9=100

Q.52 How well is the U.S. military effort in Iraq going? **[READ IN ORDER]**

	<u>Very well</u>	<u>Fairly well</u>	<u>Not too well</u>	<u>Not at all well</u>	<u>Don't know/ Refused</u>
August, 2004	12	41	28	16	3=100
July, 2004	13	42	26	16	3=100
June, 2004	16	41	25	14	4=100
May, 2004	10	36	32	19	3=100
Late April, 2004	12	43	26	15	4=100
Early April, 2004	14	43	26	13	4=100
Mid-March, 2004	16	45	26	11	2=100
Early February, 2004	17	46	23	11	3=100
Mid-January, 2004	22	51	18	6	3=100
Early January, 2004	23	47	18	7	5=100
December, 2003	28	47	16	6	3=100
October, 2003	16	44	25	11	4=100
September, 2003	15	47	26	9	3=100
August, 2003	19	43	24	11	3=100
Early July, 2003	23	52	16	5	4=100
<i>April 10-16, 2003</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3=100</i>
<i>April 8-9, 2003</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2=100</i>
<i>April 2-7, 2003</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3=100</i>
<i>March 25-April 1, 2003</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>5=100</i>
<i>March 23-24, 2003</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>6=100</i>
<i>March 20-22, 2003</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>7=100</i>

Q.53 Do you think the U.S. should keep military troops in Iraq until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the U.S. should bring its troops home as soon as possible?

Aug <u>2004</u>		July <u>2004</u>	June <u>2004</u> ¹⁷	May <u>2004</u>	Late April <u>2004</u>	Early April <u>2004</u>	Early Jan <u>2004</u>	Oct <u>2003</u>	Sept <u>2003</u>
54	Keep troops in Iraq	53	51	53	53	50	63	58	64
42	Bring troops home	43	44	42	40	44	32	39	32
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.54 Do you think George W. Bush has a clear plan for bringing the situation in Iraq to a successful conclusion, or don't you think so?

Aug <u>2004</u>		July <u>2004</u>	June <u>2004</u>	Late April <u>2004</u>	Early April <u>2004</u>	Dec <u>2003</u>	Oct <u>2003</u>	Sept <u>2003</u>
36	Has a clear plan	34	37	36	32	44	35	32
58	Doesn't have a clear plan	59	55	54	57	45	54	58
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.55 Do you think the war in Iraq has helped the war on terrorism, or has it hurt the war on terrorism?

Aug <u>2004</u>		July <u>2004</u>	June <u>2004</u>	Mid- March <u>2004</u>	Late Feb <u>2004</u>	Early Feb <u>2004</u>	Dec <u>2003</u>	Sept <u>2003</u>	May <u>2003</u>	April <u>2003</u> ¹⁸	Early Oct <u>2002</u>
45	Helped	43	43	50	62	55	59	54	65	63	52
44	Hurt	45	44	37	28	32	26	31	22	22	34
4	No effect (VOL)	5	4	5	3	7	6	7	6	--	--
<u>7</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>14</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

¹⁷ In June 2004 and earlier, the question was worded: "Do you think the U.S. should keep military troops in Iraq until a stable government is established there, or do you think the U.S. should bring its troops home as soon as possible?"

¹⁸ In April 2003, the question was worded: "Do you think the war in Iraq will help the war on terrorism, or will it hurt the war on terrorism?" In Early October 2002 the question was worded: "If the U.S. uses military force in Iraq, do you think this will help the war on terrorism, or will it hurt the war on terrorism?"

Q.56 Thinking about the people you know, would you say they are becoming LESS emotionally involved in the news from Iraq than they were, MORE emotionally involved, or are the people you know about as involved as they had been?

Aug <u>2004</u>		June <u>2004</u>	May <u>2004</u>
36	Less emotionally involved	35	26
19	More emotionally involved	23	33
41	About as involved as they have been	37	36
*	Mixed / Some more, some less (VOL.)	1	1
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
100		100	100

Q.57 From what you've seen and read, how good a job is the new Iraqi government doing running the country? Is it doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job?

Aug <u>2004</u>		July <u>2004</u>
2	Excellent	4
17	Good	19
47	Only fair	41
18	Poor	14
<u>16</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL.)	<u>22</u>
100		100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=739]:

Q.58F1 What's your impression about what's happened in Iraq over the past month. Has the number of American military casualties been higher, lower, or about the same as in other recent months?

31	Higher
18	Lower
42	About the same
<u>9</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=773]:

Q.59F2 What's your impression about what's happened in Iraq over the past month. Has the number of Iraqi people killed in violent incidents been higher, lower, or about the same as in other recent months?

51	Higher
7	Lower
31	About the same
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK ALL:

Q.60 How worried are you that there will soon be another terrorist attack in the United States? **[READ]**

	<u>Very worried</u>	<u>Somewhat worried</u>	<u>Not too worried</u>	<u>Not at all worried</u>	<u>Don't know/ Refused</u>
August, 2004	20	44	25	10	1=100
July, 2004	17	41	26	15	1=100
June, 2004	25	42	20	12	1=100
Mid-March, 2004	20	42	25	12	1=100
Early February, 2004	13	42	28	16	1=100
Mid-January, 2004	20	45	24	10	1=100
August, 2003	13	45	29	12	1=100
March, 2003	22	42	20	14	2=100
February, 2003	34	41	17	7	1=100
January, 2003	18	50	23	8	1=100
December, 2002	31	42	18	8	1=100
Early October, 2002	20	46	22	11	1=100
Late August, 2002	16	46	25	12	1=100
June, 2002	32	44	17	7	*=100
January, 2002	20	42	28	9	1=100
December, 2001	13	39	27	19	2=100
October 15-21, 2001	29	42	18	10	1=100
October 10-14, 2001	27	40	19	12	2=100
Early October, 2001	28	45	15	11	1=100

PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS
AUGUST 2004 FOREIGN POLICY OMNIBUS
FINAL TOPLINE
July 30 - August 12, 2004
N=1,057

QUESTIONS 1 AND 2 HELD FOR FUTURE RELEASE

Q.3 How should the U.S. determine its policy with regard to the war on terrorism? Should it be based mostly on the national interests of the U.S., or should it strongly take into account the interests of its allies?

Early Aug <u>2004</u>		Aug <u>2003</u>	Late Aug <u>2002</u>	Mid- Oct <u>2001</u>
43	National interests of the U.S.	48	45	30
35	Interests of its allies	35	35	59
14	Both (VOL)	9	10	7
*	Neither (VO\L)	1	1	*
<u>8</u>	Don't Know (VOL)	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>
100		100	100	100