

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOR RELEASE: MONDAY, JUNE 11, 2001, 1:00 P.M.

Public Behind Bush On Key Foreign Issues **MODEST SUPPORT FOR MISSILE DEFENSE, NO PANIC ON CHINA**

*Also Including:
An Opinion on Opinions
Commentary by Morton H. Halperin, Senior Fellow
Council on Foreign Relations*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Kohut, Director
Carroll Doherty, Editor
Kimberly Parker, Research Director
Pew Research Center for The People & The Press
202/293-3126
<http://www.people-press.org>

Morton H. Halperin, Senior Fellow
Council on Foreign Relations
202/518-3400
<http://www.cfr.org>

Public Behind Bush on Key Foreign Issues

MODEST SUPPORT FOR MISSILE DEFENSE, NO PANIC ON CHINA

As George W. Bush makes his first overseas trip as president, he has the backing of the American public on a pair of high-profile security and foreign policy issues. The public favors his call for developing a national missile defense system and feels he is taking the right tack in handling relations with China. And most Americans like the tone of his foreign policy so far.

The latest nationwide poll by the Pew Research Center, which was conducted in collaboration with the Council on Foreign Relations, finds modest support for Bush's proposed missile defense system. The 51%-38% margin in favor of missile defense is comparable to results from two other Center surveys over the past year. The current survey also found no significant change in support for the system when the concept was retested after respondents were exposed to arguments for and against missile defense.

Consistent Public Support for National Missile Defense*

	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Undec</u>
May 2001	%	%	%
Initial opinion	51	38	11=100
Informed opinion	49	41	10=100
Feb 2001	54	32	14=100
May 2000	52	37	11=100

* See topline (p. 27) for alternate question wordings.

The survey shows a greater level of public awareness of arguments opposing missile defense than those favoring it. Fully 60% have heard that the program might be too costly, and nearly half are aware of concerns that building a missile defense system could trigger a new arms race and damage relations with Russia and China.

Fewer have heard the arguments, made by missile defense proponents, that such a system would protect the United States from attacks by rogue nations and accidental launches and could also be used to defend American allies. Despite the gap in awareness, however, majorities see these as important reasons to support the program; in contrast, no argument against the proposal draws majority support.

Still, Americans by an overwhelming 77%-10% margin express more concern about a terrorist bringing weapons into the United States than about the possibility of a missile attack by an unfriendly nation. Moreover, a 53% majority still believes the nation is best protected by treaties aimed at limiting the arms race, while just 34% say that missile defense provides the best protection.

Republicans, especially conservatives, are core supporters of missile defense and they favor it to a greater extent than liberal Democrats oppose it. In fact, on balance, Democrats lean toward favoring the system with liberal Democrats evenly divided over it.

The telephone survey of 1,468 adults, conducted May 15-28, also found generally moderate views about China. Public alarm about China has not increased in spite of the recent rise in bilateral tensions over the spy plane incident. As in previous surveys, most see China as at least a serious problem, but only one-in-five call it an adversary. Similarly, even though as many as 40% recognize that relations between the two countries have worsened, the proportion who see China's emergence as a world power as a threat to the United States has not increased over the past two years.

	Sept 1997	March 1999	June 1999	March 2000	May 2001
<i>View of China ...</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Adversary	14	20	18	17	19
Serious problem	46	48	53	44	51
Not a problem	32	25	22	26	22
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100	100

At the same time, Americans are broadly skeptical that China is becoming more democratic, or even more free market oriented. The public is also pessimistic that U.S. foreign policy can have much of an impact on what goes on inside China. More than half in the survey said that it is simply not possible for the United States' policies to make a difference in that area. In turn, 59% say maintaining good relations with the world's most populous nation is more important than promoting democracy and human rights there. And there is scant support for pledging to come to Taiwan's defense in the event of an attack by the mainland. A solid majority — including 53% of Republicans — oppose such a U.S. commitment.

Overall, a 46% plurality believe that Bush is taking the right approach with China, while 34% say he has been too soft. In this regard, Bush's marks are not dramatically different than those his predecessor, Bill Clinton, received in March 2000. As one might expect, a strong element of partisanship is evident in these measures. Still, fewer Democrats say that Bush has not been tough enough on China, compared to the number of Republicans who felt that way about Clinton when he was president.

	July 1999	May 2001
<i>China's emergence as a world power ...</i>	%	%
Major threat	53	51
Minor threat	33	30
Not a threat	10	10
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
	100	100

Overall, Bush's foreign policy gets fair grades from the public. Most (54%) say they disagree with critics who feel the new president's policies are too aggressive, and 51% say he is working hard enough to have a peaceful relationship with other countries.

Following the Center's analysis of the survey findings is an opinion on opinions by Morton H. Halperin, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Halperin's views are his own and do not represent those of the Pew Research Center or the Council on Foreign Relations.

Partisan Gap on Missile Defense

Opinions on missile defense have remained fairly consistent as the debate has heated up over the past few months. The 51%-38% margin of support for the idea is similar to the results of a survey in February, when a comparable question was asked. In the current poll, nearly one-in-three Americans (29%) think the country has a pressing need for this system right now, while 19% support the idea, but say it should be put off into the future.

Attitudes toward missile defense remained largely unchanged even after respondents were asked to consider several arguments for and against the proposal. After being informed of those arguments, supporters still outnumbered opponents by a margin of 49%-41%.

Not surprisingly, given Bush’s strong support for missile defense, there is a significant partisan gap on this issue. Republicans strongly back the development of a missile shield (63% in favor vs. 27% opposed), while Democrats and independents are more evenly split.

Southerners, white evangelical Protestants and conservative Republicans are among the strongest backers of a national missile defense system. Opposition runs highest among college graduates and liberal Democrats.

Partisan Gap on Missile Defense						
		<i>-- Rep --</i>			<i>-- Dem --</i>	
<i>Should U.S. develop a missile defense system?</i>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Cons</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Ind</u>	<u>Mod</u>	<u>Lib</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	51	70	55	47	48	45
No	38	22	34	44	41	47
Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Those who closely followed Bush’s announcement of support for a missile defense system favor it in greater numbers than those who did not follow this news story (62% vs. 49%, respectively). The small minority of Americans who see a possible missile attack by a rogue nation as an even greater threat than a potential terrorist attack overwhelmingly endorse the development of a missile defense system: Roughly 71% say the U.S. should put such a system into effect, and 38% say we need it right now.

Education Levels Key

As is often the case on questions involving military defense and the use of force, there is a significant gender gap on this issue. Men strongly favor putting in place a national missile defense system (56%-38%), while women are more closely divided, with many undecided on the issue (46% in favor, 38% opposed, 16% undecided).

But education is an even more important factor influencing attitudes about missile defense. Those who never attended college strongly support the development of a missile shield (53% vs. 33% who oppose it). Those who attended some college but did not graduate also support the proposal, though more narrowly (52%-40%). College graduates, on the other hand, oppose the development of a missile defense system by a margin of 51%-41%.

When gender and education are both taken into account, the gender gap among college graduates virtually disappears while the gender gap among those without a college degree is magnified. Men who did not graduate from college are among the strongest backers of a national missile defense system (61% in favor and 33% opposed). And they differ markedly from men who did graduate from college, a narrow majority of whom oppose the idea.

	---- Men ----			---- Women ----		
	No			No		
	Coll.	Coll.	Degree	Coll.	Coll.	Degree
<i>Should U.S. develop a missile defense system?</i>	<u>All</u>	<u>Grad.</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Grad.</u>	<u>Degree</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	56	44	61	46	38	48
No	38	52	33	38	50	35
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>17</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Public support for a missile defense system remained largely unchanged even after the major arguments for and against such a system were laid out and evaluated. The survey measured attitudes on the issue in two ways. Respondents were asked early on in the interview whether or not they thought the U.S. should put into effect a national missile defense system. Subsequently, they were asked to evaluate various arguments both for and against a missile defense system. Finally, they were asked how they felt in light of those arguments. Very few respondents changed their minds as a result of this process.

Most Aware of Cost Concerns

Arguments for and against the creation of a national missile defense system have penetrated the public's consciousness to only a limited degree. Among all the reasons presented in favor and opposition to such a system, the claim that it would be too costly is the most widely known. Six-in-ten Americans say they have heard about this argument. But that is the only argument — pro or con — that was familiar to a majority of the public.

	<u>Have Heard</u>	<u>Have not Heard</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
<i>Reasons to oppose missile defense:</i>	%	%	%
Too costly	60	39	1=100
Could trigger new arms race	49	50	1=100
Could damage relations with Russia & China	47	52	1=100
There's no real threat	37	62	1=100
Technology isn't available	34	65	1=100
<i>Reasons to favor missile defense:</i>			
Could protect against accidental launches	44	55	1=100
Current defenses are inadequate	40	59	1=100
Could protect our allies	35	64	1=100

Nearly half have heard the contention that building this system could trigger a new arms race among countries who feel threatened by this policy (49%), or more specifically, that this system could damage U.S. relations with Russia and China (47%). Less well known are the arguments that there is no real threat that would justify building this system (37% have heard about this) or that the technology is not yet available for such a system to work (34%). Not surprisingly, those who oppose a missile defense system are somewhat more likely than those who support one to have heard these arguments, though the differences are not dramatic.

The major arguments in *favor* of the development of a missile defense have connected with even fewer people. Roughly four-in-ten have heard that the system could protect the U.S. against missiles that are accidentally launched (44%); nearly as many (40%) were aware of the argument that current defense systems do not adequately protect against attack from smaller, unfriendly nations such as Iraq and North Korea. Even fewer (35%) have heard the argument that the system would allow us to protect our allies without fear of being attacked ourselves. As opposed to the arguments against a missile defense system, the arguments in favor are no more well known by supporters of the proposal than they are by the program’s opponents.

Advocates Make a Stronger Argument

Overall, the arguments in favor of the creation of a national missile defense system, though less well known by the public, are regarded as somewhat more compelling than the arguments against the creation of such a system. The three major arguments in support of a national missile defense system laid out in the poll are all viewed, on balance, as important reasons to support the creation of such a system. None of the arguments against a missile defense system is viewed by a majority of the public as an important reason to oppose its creation.

Nearly six-in-ten Americans (58%) say the idea that a missile defense system could protect the U.S. against missiles that are accidentally launched is an important reason to favor the creation of such a system, 34% do not consider this an important reason. Roughly half of the public accepts the notion that a missile defense system would allow us to protect our allies without fear of being attacked ourselves — 51% say this is an important reason to favor the creation of a missile defense system. A similar proportion (50%) endorse the argument that our current defense systems do not adequately protect against attack by unfriendly nations.

	Pros Trump Cons		
	<u>Imp.</u>	<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>
	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Imp.</u>	<u>Know</u>
	%	%	%
<i>Reasons to favor missile defense:</i>			
Could protect against accidental launches	58	34	8=100
Could protect our allies	51	41	8=100
Current defenses are inadequate	50	42	8=100
<i>Reasons to oppose missile defense:</i>			
Too costly	41	52	7=100
Could trigger new arms race	39	52	9=100
Technology isn't available	37	54	9=100
Could damage relations with Russia & China	34	57	9=100
There's no real threat	31	59	10=100

Supporters of a missile defense system strongly endorse these arguments in favor of its creation. At least 70% of those who believe the U.S. should put such a system in place consider each of these arguments to be important reasons to favor the proposed system. But opponents do not reject these arguments out of hand. Fully one-third (34%) of those who oppose the development of a national missile defense system say the argument that such a system could protect the U.S. against accidental missile attacks is an important reason to support it. Nearly three-in-ten opponents endorse the argument that a missile defense system would allow us to safely protect our allies.

The arguments against the creation of a national missile defense system are less compelling on several levels. None of the five counter-arguments included in the poll is considered by a majority of Americans to be an important reason to oppose the program. The two which gain the most support are the arguments that such a system would be too costly and that building a missile defense system could trigger a new arms race—roughly four-in-ten say each is an important reason to oppose the proposal. Fewer accept the arguments that the technology is not yet available for such a system to work (37% say this is an important reason) or that building such a system could damage U.S. relations with Russia and China (34%). And only three-in-ten (31%) say the notion that there is no real threat to justify building the system is an important reason to oppose its creation.

Even those who oppose the development of a national missile defense system are less than enthusiastic about the leading arguments which underpin their side of the debate. A strong majority (63%) say the contention that a missile defense system would be too costly is an important reason to oppose it, and 59% endorse the argument that building this system could trigger a new arms race. Beyond that bare majorities or minorities sign on to the major arguments laid out in the poll.

Those who favor the development of a missile shield are not swayed by the arguments against it. No more than 27% view any one argument as an important reason to oppose a missile defense system, with as few as 19% agreeing with the notion that there is no real threat that would justify building this system.

Perhaps more importantly, the arguments against a missile defense system are less convincing to those who are unfamiliar with them than are the arguments in favor of such a system. For example, only 32% of those who have never heard the argument that a missile defense system would be too costly see this as an important reason to oppose its creation. Alternatively, more than half (52%) of those who have never heard the argument that the system could protect the U.S. against an accidentally missile launch say this is an important reason to support the proposal.

Pros and Cons Have Limited Impact

Ultimately, neither set of arguments succeeded in converting a large number of respondents from one point of view to another. Fully 80% of those who supported a national missile defense system initially maintained that position after considering the arguments for and against such a system. Similarly, 80% of those who opposed the system initially remained opposed at the end of the interview. Overall, 71% of respondents remained consistent in their views on the issue. Roughly four-in-ten (41%) supported the development of such a system initially and maintained that position. Three-in-ten consistently opposed the proposal.

<i>Opinion after hearing arguments for/against</i>	<i>Initial Opinion on Missile Defense</i>		
	<u>Support</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %
Support	80	14	25
Oppose	14	80	28
Don't know	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>47</u>
	100	100	100

The remaining 29% of respondents either changed their view on the issue after considering the pros and cons or remained undecided. Women were more likely than men to change their views on the issue, especially women over the age of 65. Non-whites were more likely than whites to change their position. Those who never attended college were much less wedded to their position on missile defense than were those who did attend college — 30% vs. 17%, respectively, changed their views on the issue after hearing the arguments for and against. And those who have not followed recent news about missile defense were also more prone to changing their views.

Looking at various political and ideological groupings, conservative Republicans appear to be the most consistent in their views on this issue. Nearly two-thirds (63%) consistently supported missile defense and only 16% changed their views over the course of the interview. Moderate to liberal Republicans were much less steadfast in their views. Only 44% consistently supported missile defense, 28% consistently opposed it, and nearly a quarter (23%) changed their opinions on the issue.

<i>Should U.S. develop a missile defense system?</i>	<u>Total</u> %	<i>-- Rep --</i>			<i>-- Dem --</i>	
		<u>Cons</u> %	<u>Mod</u> %	<u>Ind</u> %	<u>Mod</u> %	<u>Lib</u> %
Consistently YES	41	63	44	36	38	29
Consistently NO	30	16	28	36	33	40
Changed views after pros/cons	24	16	23	24	26	29
From YES/DK to NO	11	5	10	11	12	17
From NO/DK to YES	8	9	8	8	8	8
From YES/NO to DK	5	2	5	5	6	4
Consistently undecided	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Two Points for Opponents

While support for missile defense remains consistent, the public also believes, by an overwhelming margin, that terrorists pose a greater threat to the United States than missile attacks. Indeed, more than three-quarters of Americans (77%) say terrorism is the greater threat, 10% point to a missile attack by a rogue nation.

Moreover, while the public favors the creation of a national missile defense system, most Americans believe there's ultimately a better way to protect the U.S. Fully 53% say having treaties that would limit the arms race and help control the spread of nuclear weapons is the best way to protect the U.S. Given this tradeoff, only 34% opt for building a missile defense system that would protect us from attack.

A significant number of Americans hold seemingly contradictory views on these issues. Nearly one-in-five (18%) say arms control treaties are the best way to insure peace, yet they nonetheless favor the creation of the missile defense system. Democrats are slightly more likely than Republicans or independents to fall into this category.

Bush Foreign Policy Criticisms Don't Stick

In spite of much debate in the media and elsewhere about the president's approach to foreign policy, the public is not receptive to criticisms that Bush is too aggressive in his dealings with other countries or that he is not working cooperatively with our allies and others around the world. A majority of Americans (53%) disagree with the contention that Bush's foreign policies are too aggressive, only 31% agree. And, on balance, the public says that Bush is working hard enough to have a peaceful relationship with other countries in the world — 51% hold this view, while 28% say he is not working hard enough.

Not surprisingly, partisanship is strongly linked to views about Bush's foreign policy. Even so, Democrats are evenly split over Bush's stance toward other countries: 40% say he is being too aggressive and 40% disagree. Furthermore, more than a third (35%) of those who disapprove of the way Bush is handling his job overall, reject the criticism that he is being too hard on other countries. These Bush critics are much more likely to accept the argument that the president is not adequately engaged with other countries in the world. Fully 60% of those who disapprove of the way Bush is handling his job as president say he is not working hard enough to have a peaceful relationship with other nations.

Partisan Views on Bush Foreign Policy				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
<i>Policies too aggressive?</i>	%	%	%	%
Yes	31	15	40	36
No	53	74	40	52
Don't know	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>12</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Working hard enough for peace w/other countries?</i>				
Yes	51	77	32	49
No	28	10	46	32
Too hard	1	*	*	*
Don't know	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>19</u>
	100	100	100	100

China's Not Changing

As in past surveys, relatively few Americans see much progress toward political or economic reform in China. Just 21% believe China is becoming more democratic; three times as many (62%) believe China is not making progress in this regard.

The public has a somewhat better view of China's efforts at creating a free-market economy. Slightly more than one-third (34%) say Beijing is making progress, but a plurality (47%) thinks it is not. On both of these fronts, Americans have become, if anything, less optimistic over the past three years. In August 1998, 35% saw China becoming more democratic and 41% believed it was making free-market reforms.

More importantly, from a policy perspective, Americans have little expectation that either trade with the West or U.S. influence will have much of an impact on China. By 47%-37%, the public rejects the notion that trade with China promotes democracy there. And when it comes specifically to American efforts, only about one-in-three (34%) think it is possible for the United States, through its policies, to have much of an effect on making China more Democratic, while 56% think it is not possible to do so.

Pessimism on Two Fronts			
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK</u>
<i>Is China becoming more ...?</i>	%	%	%
Democratic	21	62	17=100
Free-market oriented	34	47	19=100
<i>What can affect China?</i>			
Trade with West	37	47	16=100
U.S. policies	34	56	10=100

More educated Americans have greater optimism on these issues than those with less education. Nearly half (47%) of college graduates think trade with China will lead to democratization, compared to just one-third of those without college degrees. College graduates also have more hope in the effectiveness of U.S. policies in bringing about democratic change in China. Men are more optimistic than women about both current trends in China and the possibility that more involvement in the world market will lead to democratic changes.

Younger Americans Less Worried

The predominant view of China as a serious problem for the United States, but not an adversary, has changed little in recent years. But there are differences in how demographic groups come down on this question.

More highly educated people, for instance, see China in more a negative light than those with less education. Better than three-quarters (78%) of those who attended college see China as an adversary or a major problem, compared to 63% of those never attended college.

And younger people are less concerned over China than Americans who came of age in the Cold War. More than three-in-ten (31%) of those age 18-29 say China does not present much of a problem for the United States. By contrast, only 10% of those over age 65 don't see China as a problem.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>18-29</u>	<u>30-49</u>	<u>50-64</u>	<u>65+</u>
<i>View of China:</i>	%	%	%	%	%
An adversary	19	14	18	25	19
A serious problem	51	47	50	51	61
Not much of a problem	22	31	24	18	10
Don't know	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
	100	100	100	100	100

Global Concerns Most Threatening

Though concern about U.S. relations with China runs fairly high, it is not seen as serious a threat as other global problems such as the spread of weapons of mass destruction, international drug cartels, infectious diseases and terrorism. Saddam Hussein's continued rule in Iraq, and the threat of missile attacks against the U.S. from countries such as Iraq, Iran or North Korea also rank higher in the public's assessment of serious threats.

The emergence of China as a world power is rated a major threat by just over half of the public (51%), and 36% see the possibility of military conflict between China and Taiwan as a serious worry for the United States. Older Americans are significantly more concerned about China than younger generations. Fully 44% of Americans age 50 and older see conflict between China and Taiwan as a major threat to U.S. interests, compared to 34% of those age 30-49 and 26% of those under 30.

	<u>Major Threat</u>	<u>Minor Threat</u>	<u>Not a Threat</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
	%	%	%	%
Weapons of mass destruction	74	15	5	6=100
International drug cartels	68	24	3	5=100
Spread of infectious diseases	66	26	3	5=100
International terrorism	64	27	4	5=100
Hussein's rule in Iraq	58	29	6	7=100
Missile attack/rogue states	55	34	5	6=100
Global environment	53	32	6	9=100
China a world power	51	30	10	9=100
Intl. financial instability	47	33	9	11=100
China/Taiwan conflict	36	37	11	16=100
Instability in Russia	27	46	12	15=100
Castro's rule in Cuba	20	43	26	11=100
Conflict in the Balkans	19	38	17	26=100
Sectional warfare in Africa	14	42	25	19=100

The bottom of the list of international concerns is dominated by regional issues. Barely one-in-four Americans (27%) view political and economic instability in Russia as a major

threat to the United States, a significant drop from 40% just two years ago. And relatively few people view Fidel Castro's rule in Cuba (20%), ethnic conflict in the Balkans (19%) and sectional or tribal warfare in Africa (14%) as major threats to the United States.

Avoid Problems

While a slim majority of Americans see China as a major threat, it is a threat that few want the United States to confront. The public generally wants to pursue a course of moderation when dealing with the world's most populous nation, and this position crosses partisan lines.

For most Americans, maintaining a good relationship with China is a more important foreign policy priority than promoting democracy and human rights there. Nearly six-in-ten (59%) Americans prefer pursuing a friendly relationship with China, while about one-third (32%) would rather promote democracy and human rights.

This preference for maintaining amicable relations with China is consistent across party lines. Republicans, Democrats

and independents all rate this a significantly higher priority than promoting democracy. Six-in-ten Democrats and independents, and about as many Republicans (58%) favor a friendly relationship to an antagonistic one.

Overall, only 26% of Americans believe the United States should commit to defending Taiwan, compared to 64% who think the U.S. should not make such a commitment at this time. There are partisan differences on this question, but majorities of Republicans, Democrats and independents believe the United States should not make such a pledge to Taiwan.

Republicans are more closely divided on committing to Taiwan's defense, with 36% favoring this view and 53% opposed. Seven-in-ten Democrats and independents are against the idea of promising to come to Taiwan's defense if China were to attack the island.

Partisan Agreement on China Policy				
	--- Party ID ---			
<i>What's more important for U.S.-China policy?</i>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
	%	%	%	%
Maintain good relationship	59	58	60	60
Promote democracy	32	35	31	32
Both/Don't know	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Should U.S. commit to defending Taiwan?</i>				
Yes	26	36	21	24
No	64	53	70	70
Don't know	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>
	100	100	100	100

No One Priority

When it comes to specific priorities for U.S. policy toward China, no clear consensus exists. Half say that making sure that China does not become a military threat to Japan and South Korea should be a top priority, and nearly as many (48%) say the same about promoting human rights in China.

Although there is an unwillingness to commit to defending Taiwan against Chinese aggression, four-in-ten people rate

assuring a peaceful relationship between the two as a top priority. The same number believes that promoting fair trade between the United States and China should be a top priority.

The partisan differences over these issues are fairly small. The 11-point gap between Democrats and Republicans over promoting a cleaner environment in China (35% Democrats, 24% Republicans) probably has more to do with fundamental differences over the environment than policy toward China.

Bush About Right

The public generally endorses the Bush administration’s China policy, with 46% saying the administration’s approach is about right. Bush is viewed about the same as Clinton in this area, although fewer say Bush has been insufficiently tough on China.

In March 2000, the public was evenly divided in assessing the Clinton administration’s dealings

with China with 42% thinking it was about right and 42% saying it was not tough enough. Partisanship is an obvious factor in the public’s view of each administration’s China policy. Four-in-ten Democrats believe Bush has not been tough enough on the Chinese, compared to 32% of Republicans. Last year, a majority of Republicans (52%) criticized Clinton for being too weak in relations with China, while just 34% of Democrats held that view.

<i>Top priority:</i>	--- Party ID ---			
	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Rep</u> %	<u>Dem</u> %	<u>Ind</u> %
Assure China doesn’t become threat to Japan or S. Korea	50	55	50	51
Promote human rights in China	48	45	52	50
Assure China-Taiwan peace	40	40	44	42
Promote U.S.-China fair trade	40	35	43	43
Promote better environmental policies in China	30	24	35	32
Assure Hong Kong independence from China	29	34	28	28

	<u>Clinton</u>	<u>GW Bush</u>
	<u>March 00</u>	<u>May 01</u>
<i>How tough on China ...</i>	%	%
Too tough	2	8
Not tough enough	42	34
About right	42	46
Don’t know	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>
	100	100

Seeing China as an Adversary

Clearly, people’s views of China — whether they see China as an adversary or not — influence their policy preferences. Indeed, those who regard China as an adversary are far more likely than others to favor confronting China over human rights and pledging to come to Taiwan’s defense in the event of an attack by China.

Nearly half (48%) of those who believe China is an adversary say it is more important for the United States to press for democracy and human rights, compared to 41% in this group who say maintaining good relations is more important. By contrast, those who see China as a serious problem but not an adversary say it is more important to maintain friendly relations by nearly two-to-one (60%-32%).

Similarly, those who consider China an adversary are more supportive of a U.S. policy of defending Taiwan against Chinese military action. More than four-in-ten (41%) people who view China as an adversary believe the United States should commit to defending Taiwan at this time compared to only one-quarter of those who see China as a problem.

<i>What's more important for U.S.-China policy?</i>	<i>View of China ...</i>		
	<u>Adversary</u>	<u>Problem</u>	<u>Not Prob</u>
	%	%	%
Maintain good relationship	41	60	70
Promote Democracy	48	32	24
Both/Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>
	100	100	100
<i>Should U.S. commit to defending Taiwan ?</i>			
Yes	41	25	17
No	52	67	76
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>
	100	100	100

In addition, those who consider China to be an adversary have different policy priorities than those who do not. A solid majority (55%) of those who regard China as an adversary rate ensuring peace between China and Taiwan as a top policy priority, compared to 40% among those who see China as a problem. A similar split exists over promoting human rights and democracy, with more of those who consider China an adversary rating this a top priority.

MODERATE PUBLIC VIEWS GIVE OFFICIALS GREAT LATITUDE

Policy analysts and politicians generally believe that elections are not won or lost on foreign policy issues any more. Interest groups of one kind or another – economic, ethnic, ideological – may have strong feelings on particular issues, but the general public usually does not. When there is strong presidential leadership the public follows; when there is no such leadership the public is usually indifferent.

The latest nationwide poll by the Pew Research Center, conducted in collaboration with the Council on Foreign Relations, focused on two foreign policy issues which have generally been considered, and for many years almost certainly were, exceptions to this rule. On both national missile defense and China there is a long, if episodic, history of intense partisan debate and at least the perception of strongly held positions by the public.

The results of this poll suggest that, whatever may have been true in the past, these two issues are not now of intense concern to the public. This means that the Bush administration and its critics, particularly in the new, Democratically-controlled Senate, may be free to stake out positions with less fear of retribution at the polls.

Conflicting Positions on National Missile Defense

The political pressure to deploy a national missile defense began in the mid-1960s as the Soviets' missile deployments increased and China began to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) armed with nuclear warheads. By 1968, Lyndon Johnson decided that he would not go into a presidential election open to the charge that he was leaving the United States unprotected and therefore announced the deployment of a modest anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system. Three decades later, with still no missile defense of the United States and a Nixon administration-negotiated ABM Treaty prohibiting national missile defenses in force, the same calculations led President Clinton to move close to announcing a deployment. Congressional Democrats, also fearful of retribution at the polls, voted for resolutions calling for missile defense deployments as soon as the technology permitted. In the end, President Clinton put off a decision on deployment, citing failed tests. Despite the focus which candidate Bush tried to put on the issue, it did not play a significant role in the campaign. This survey may help to explain why.

Since the Reagan administration national missile defense has been and remains a partisan issue. For reasons that no one has ever satisfactorily explained, almost all Republican politicians and foreign policy analysts are passionate supporters of national missile defense and this view is reflected in the public as well. While, on balance, the American public supports missile defense deployment (by 51%-38%), more than six-in-ten Republicans (63%) and 70% of conservative Republicans favor it. Only a slim plurality of Democrats and independents agree.

However, closer examination of the data suggests that even some Republican support is relatively soft. The public is not following the issue closely and is not familiar with most of the arguments for or against deployment. Paradoxically, Americans are more familiar with the arguments against deployment, but are more persuaded by the arguments for. Exposure to arguments for and against the program produces little change in opinion, the survey found.

Ultimately, Americans are much more concerned about the possibility of a terrorist group bringing weapons of mass destruction into the United States than they are about a possible missile attack by an unfriendly nation (77%-10%). This suggests that there is support for the argument Democrats are beginning to make that priority should be given to improving the capacity of the nation to prevent the smuggling of weapons of mass destruction into the country and to respond effectively should such an attack occur. The Bush administration is actively considering proposals to reorganize governmental agencies to better deal with terrorist threats and this may soon become the center of the security debate, diverting attention from national missile defense and fully reflecting public concerns.

When confronted with the either-or choice between national missile defense and arms control treaties that limit the arms race, Americans, on balance, favor treaties. Roughly half the public (53%) says the nation is best protected by such treaties, while about a third (34%) opts for building missile defenses. Nearly one-in-five Americans (18%) support national missile defense while at the same time expressing the belief that treaties are a better way to protect our security. This suggests that their support is for a national missile defense that is consistent with maintaining existing treaties.

President Clinton always conditioned his support for national missile defense with the caveat that it could not be deployed in a way that destroyed the ABM Treaty, which he described as the cornerstone of international security. President Bush came into office committed to withdrawing from the ABM Treaty if necessary and the administration has not said anything favorable about the treaty. Nonetheless, those in the administration who were pressing for an early withdrawal from the treaty have at least for the moment been held at bay, reflecting not only allied opposition but also an understanding of the views of the American people.

In contrast to the pressure from congressional Republicans the past four years to begin deploying a national missile defense immediately so that a system would be in place by 2004, the Bush administration has not set any deadlines and has not expressed an urgency about beginning a deployment. The survey data show that a majority of Americans support this position, but only 29% say "we have a pressing need for this system now."

Thus, congressional Democrats, who are arguing that the deployment decision should be delayed, may find significant support for their position even as a majority of Americans reject most arguments against deployment in the long run. Congressional Republicans can point to majority backing for missile defense in principle, but that support is qualified by the public's preference for arms control treaties and its strong belief that terrorism presents a far greater threat to the nation than missile strikes by unfriendly nations.

China Policy No Longer a Partisan Issue

In contrast to national missile defense, China policy is not now a deeply partisan issue. Republicans and Democrats hold similar views. That was not always the case.

Indeed, for many years in the period after World War II, China policy was deeply divisive and stood in marked contrast to the efforts to develop and maintain a bipartisan foreign policy. Republicans bitterly accused the Truman Administration of having “lost” China to the Communists and no administration, Republican or Democratic, could do anything but seek to isolate “Red” China – as the People’s Republic of China was then called by all American politicians – while at the same time supporting the Nationalist government in Taiwan as the legitimate government of China. Lyndon Johnson was haunted by the image of what the Republican Party was able to do with the “who-lost-China” issue and many believe his Vietnam policy was guided by the fear that his opponents would accuse him of losing Vietnam.

It is not an accident that doing a “Nixon to China” has entered the American political vocabulary. What Nixon did seemed to go against the basic tenets of Republican policy. However, it reflected the changing mood of the American people.

The survey shows that this transformation is almost complete. There is remarkably little partisan difference. A majority of both Republicans (51%) and Democrats (53%) say that China is a “serious problem” rejecting both the view that it is not a problem or that it is an adversary. To be sure, more Republicans (23%) than Democrats (16%) think of China as an adversary. Nor is there any significant difference on the question of what is more important — maintaining good relations with China or promoting democracy. Again a majority of both Republicans (58%) and Democrats (60%) take the same position, giving priority to maintaining good relations. Interestingly, the alliance of liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans in the Congress that supports greater attention to promoting democracy is not reflected in the public. Conservative Republicans are no more likely to take this position than are moderate Republicans, and liberal Democrats are only somewhat more likely to give priority to the development of democracy than are more moderate Democrats.

Responses to other questions reinforce the view that the president is likely to meet with significant skepticism from the public if he adopts the advice of some of his advisers and paints China as the primary enemy of the United States. While a majority of Americans say that the emergence of China as a world power poses a major threat to the United States, more Americans identify many other threats, both traditional and new, as major threats, including Saddam Hussein’s continued rule in Iraq, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, new missile threats, international terrorism, global environmental problems, and the rapid spread of infectious diseases.

What is perhaps most surprising is that there is little change in these numbers from previous surveys. Despite the fact that the poll was taken in a period in which some conservatives, on Capitol Hill and elsewhere, were suggesting that China might well be the main enemy of the United States, and soon after the so-called spy plane incident in which an American reconnaissance airplane flying in international waters was harassed by a Chinese fighter jet and forced to make a crash landing, slightly fewer Americans describe China as a major threat now than did so in July 1999.

More Americans recognize that relations are getting worse, but this has not altered their view of the threat nor of how trade-offs should be made among objectives.

One of the most important and most controversial shifts in China policy came when President Bush indicated that the United States would use military force if necessary to defend Taiwan against a Chinese attack. Despite the general tendency of the public to support the president, only slightly more than one-quarter of Americans (26%) express approval of this approach compared to 64% who think such a commitment should not be made. While more Republicans than Democrats follow the president's lead, a majority in both parties did not.

The American people express support for President Bush's China policy as they do for his overall conduct of American foreign policy, rejecting the view of many critics that he was being too tough. The public also give Republicans an edge over Democrats in dealing with China. However, it remains to be seen how much support the president can count on if he chooses greater confrontation with China.

OPINION OF NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

	<i>Support Missile Defense System</i>			<i>Which is more important?</i>			<i>(N)</i>
	<u>Support</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Missile Defense</u>	<u>Both/ Treaties</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	51	38	11=100	34	53	13=100	(1468)
Sex							
Male	56	38	6	42	47	11	(688)
Female	46	38	16	26	58	16	(780)
Race							
White	51	38	11	34	52	14	(1179)
Non-White	50	38	12	33	56	11	(266)
Black	51	37	12	33	61	6	(144)
Hispanic*	55	37	8	32	54	14	(101)
Race and Sex							
White Men	57	37	6	43	46	11	(553)
White Women	46	38	16	27	58	15	(626)
Age							
Under 30	54	37	9	34	60	6	(312)
30-49	50	41	9	33	54	13	(616)
50-64	49	40	11	37	49	14	(309)
65+	53	29	18	34	44	22	(209)
Sex and Age							
Men under 50	58	37	5	41	51	8	(463)
Women under 50	45	43	12	25	62	13	(465)
Men 50+	54	40	6	44	41	15	(219)
Women 50+	48	32	20	29	52	19	(299)
Education							
College Grad	41	51	8	28	62	10	(458)
Some College	52	40	8	36	53	11	(394)
High School Grad	53	33	14	35	52	13	(511)
<H.S. Grad	61	23	16	39	39	22	(96)
Family Income							
\$75,000+	50	41	9	38	52	10	(287)
\$50,000-\$74,999	52	43	5	33	58	9	(234)
\$30,000-\$49,999	51	38	11	34	53	13	(353)
\$20,000-29,999	55	33	12	34	52	14	(201)
<\$20,000	52	35	13	35	51	14	(206)

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

Question: Do you think the U.S. should put into effect a national missile defense system, or don't you think so? In the future, how do you think the U.S. would be best protected... Building a national missile defense system that would protect us from attack OR Having treaties that would limit the arms race and help control the spread of nuclear weapons?

Continued...

	<i>Support Missile Defense System</i>			<i>Which is more important?</i>			<i>(N)</i>
	<u>Support</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	<u>Missile Defense</u>	<u>Both/Treaties</u>	<u>Both/DK/Ref</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	51	38	11=100	34	53	13=100	(1468)
Region							
East	48	42	10	27	58	15	(266)
Midwest	46	42	12	31	57	12	(342)
South	60	28	12	39	47	14	(561)
West	43	45	12	34	53	13	(299)
Religious Affiliation							
Total White Protestant	55	32	13	37	49	14	(640)
White Protestant Evangelical	63	26	11	44	40	16	(290)
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	48	38	14	32	56	12	(350)
White Catholic	52	37	11	31	55	14	(271)
Secular	40	51	9	25	60	15	(145)
Community Size							
Large City	45	43	12	31	56	13	(300)
Suburb	47	44	9	31	57	12	(365)
Small City/Town	54	34	12	36	50	14	(501)
Rural Area	56	32	12	36	49	15	(293)
Party ID							
Republican	63	27	10	48	38	14	(436)
Democrat	47	42	11	25	63	12	(407)
Independent	47	44	9	30	59	11	(543)
Party and Ideology							
Conservative Republican	70	22	8	53	33	14	(260)
Moderate/Liberal Republican	55	34	11	43	46	11	(163)
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	48	41	11	23	66	11	(255)
Liberal Democrat	45	47	8	28	61	11	(130)
Bush Approval							
Approve	62	28	10	44	44	13	(798)
Disapprove	37	54	9	23	68	9	(457)
2000 Presidential Vote							
Bush	69	23	8	51	34	15	(495)
Gore	38	51	11	20	71	9	(415)
Labor Union							
Union Household	51	45	4	40	53	7	(178)
Non-Union Household	51	37	12	33	53	14	(1270)

OPINION ON CHINA

	<i>Think of China As ...</i>				<i>What's More Important ...</i>		
	<u>Adver-</u> <u>sary</u> %	<u>Serious</u> <u>Problem</u> %	<u>Not a</u> <u>Problem</u> %	<u>DK/Ref</u> %	<u>Maintain</u> <u>Relationship</u> %	<u>Promote</u> <u>Democracy</u> %	<u>Both/</u> <u>DK/Ref</u> %
Total	19	51	22	8=100	59	32	9=100
Sex							
Male	22	52	23	3	59	32	9
Female	17	50	21	12	58	32	10
Race							
White	19	54	20	7	58	33	9
Non-White	19	39	31	11	60	30	10
Black	19	38	31	12	61	29	10
Hispanic*	19	50	25	6	60	31	9
Race and Sex							
White Men	22	54	21	3	59	33	8
White Women	17	53	19	11	57	33	10
Age							
Under 30	14	47	31	8	64	32	4
30-49	18	50	24	8	57	35	8
50-64	25	51	18	6	56	31	13
65+	19	61	10	10	61	27	12
Sex and Age							
Men under 50	20	51	26	3	60	34	6
Women under 50	14	46	28	12	59	33	8
Men 50+	25	53	18	4	57	29	14
Women 50+	21	56	11	12	60	29	11
Education							
College Grad	22	56	18	4	56	37	7
Some College	26	51	18	5	53	40	7
High School Grad	15	50	24	11	63	26	11
<H.S. Grad	14	43	32	11	63	24	13
Family Income							
\$75,000+	19	61	17	3	59	33	8
\$50,000-\$74,999	20	53	23	4	54	38	8
\$30,000-\$49,999	20	51	23	6	59	34	7
\$20,000-29,999	16	51	25	8	61	29	10
<\$20,000	18	45	25	12	64	26	10

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

Question: All things considered, which of these descriptions comes closest to your view of China today... Do you think China is an adversary, a serious problem, but not an adversary, OR not much of a problem? All in all, in deciding U.S. policy about China, what's more important... Maintaining a good and friendly relationship between the U.S. and China OR The U.S. promoting democracy and human rights in China?

Continued ...

	<i>Think of China As ...</i>				<i>What's More Important ...</i>		
	<u>Adver-</u> <u>sary</u> %	<u>Serious</u> <u>Problem</u> %	<u>Not a</u> <u>Problem</u> %	<u>DK/Ref</u> %	<u>Maintain</u> <u>Relationship</u> %	<u>Promote</u> <u>Democracy</u> %	<u>Both/</u> <u>DK/Ref</u> %
<i>Total</i>	19	51	22	8=100	59	32	9=100
<i>Region</i>							
East	17	53	24	6	59	31	10
Midwest	19	52	20	9	61	30	9
South	20	49	24	7	58	32	10
West	19	52	19	10	57	34	9
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>							
Total White Protestant	19	55	19	7	61	30	9
White Protestant Evangelical	22	56	15	7	58	33	9
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	16	54	23	7	64	27	9
White Catholic	19	55	18	8	57	35	8
Secular	20	50	25	5	56	36	8
<i>Community Size</i>							
Large City	16	47	29	8	60	32	8
Suburb	22	52	21	5	54	39	7
Small City/Town	18	53	20	9	63	28	9
Rural Area	22	50	19	9	56	32	12
<i>Party ID</i>							
Republican	23	51	19	7	58	35	7
Democrat	16	53	22	9	60	31	9
Independent	18	51	25	6	60	32	8
<i>Party and Ideology</i>							
Conservative Republican	30	50	15	5	59	36	5
Moderate/Liberal Republican	14	55	25	6	57	37	6
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	17	55	21	7	66	29	5
Liberal Democrat	16	51	24	9	47	39	14
<i>Bush Approval</i>							
Approve	22	49	23	6	62	33	5
Disapprove	17	54	22	7	55	33	11
<i>2000 Presidential Vote</i>							
Bush	26	51	17	6	59	34	7
Gore	17	54	21	8	57	35	8
<i>Labor Union</i>							
Union Household	21	55	20	4	55	36	9
Non-Union Household	19	51	22	8	59	32	9

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

Results for the *main* survey are based on telephone interviews conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates among a nationwide sample of 1,468 adults, 18 years of age or older, during the period May 15-28, 2001. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For results based on either Form 1 (N=759) or Form 2 (N=709), the sampling error is plus or minus 4 percentage points.

Results for the *Foreign Threats* survey are based on telephone interviews conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates among a nationwide sample of 1,587 adults, 18 years of age or older, during the period May 11-20, 2001. For results based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For results based on either Form 1 (N=770) or Form 2 (N=817), the sampling error is plus or minus 4 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 one 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 5 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 Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (March 2000). 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.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS
MAY 2001 NEWS INTEREST INDEX
— FINAL TOPLINE —
May 15-28, 2001
N=1,468

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>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
May, 2001	53	32	15=100
April, 2001	56	27	17=100
February, 2001	53	21	26=100

ASK ALL:

Q.4 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; ROTATE]**

	<u>Very Closely</u>	<u>Fairly Closely</u>	<u>Not too Closely</u>	<u>Not at all Closely</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a. George W. Bush's announcement of support for a national missile defense system	14	26	26	33	1=100

Q.11 Please tell me if you think the REPUBLICAN Party or the DEMOCRATIC Party could do a better job in each of the following areas... (First,) which party could do a better job of...**(READ AND ROTATE, EXCEPT ITEM i)**

	<u>Republican Party</u>	<u>Democratic Party</u>	<u>(VOL) Both Equally</u>	<u>(VOL) Neither</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
i. Dealing with China	39	30	9	5	17=100
June, 1999	37	30	6	6	21=100

ASK ALL:

Q.14 In the future, how do you think the U.S. would be best protected... **(READ AND ROTATE)?**

34	Building a national missile defense system that would protect us from attack [OR]
53	Having treaties that would limit the arms race and help control the spread of nuclear weapons
6	(DO NOT READ) Both equally important
<u>7</u>	(DO NOT READ) Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK ALL:

And now a few questions on China...

Q.19 All things considered, which of these descriptions comes closest to your view of China today... Do you think China is **(READ):**

	<u>March 2000</u>	<u>June 1999</u>	<u>March 1999</u>	<u>Sept 1997</u>
19	17	18	20	14
51	44	53	48	46
22	26	22	25	32
<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
100	100	100	100	100

Q.20 What is your impression... These days are relations between the U.S. and China improving, getting worse, or staying about the same?

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

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=759]:

Q.21F1 From what you know or have read, do you think that China's government is becoming more democratic and is allowing more freedoms for Chinese citizens, or do you think this is not happening?

		June <u>1999</u>	March <u>1999</u>	Early Aug <u>1998</u>	<i>Gallup</i> <u>Oct 1997</u>
21	Becoming more democratic	26	23	35	26
62	Not happening	60	65	51	64
<u>17</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>14</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>
100		100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=709]:

Q.22F2 Do you think that China's economy is becoming more like the kind of free-market system found in the United States and other Western countries, or do you think this is not happening?

		March <u>1999</u>	Early Aug <u>1998</u>	<i>Gallup</i> <u>Oct 1997</u>
34	More free-market	34	41	34
47	Not happening	47	44	55
<u>19</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>11</u>
100		100	100	100

ASK ALL:

Q.23 In your opinion, is the Bush administration being too tough, not tough enough, or about right in its dealings with China?

		----- Clinton -----		
		March <u>2000</u>	June <u>1999</u>	March <u>1999</u>
8	Too tough	2	1	2
34	Not tough enough	42	51	44
46	About right	42	35	43
<u>12</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11</u>
100		100	100	100

Q.24 Do you think that trade between China and Western nations will lead to China becoming more democratic, or don't you think so?

		<u>May 2000</u>	<u>June 1999</u>
37	Yes	32	39
47	No	47	47
<u>16</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>
100		100	100

Q.25 In deciding U.S. policies toward China, how much priority should be given to each of the following. First, **(INSERT ITEM; ROTATE)**. Do you think this should be A top priority, have some priority or have no priority at all?

		Top Priority	Some Priority	No Priority	DK/Ref
a.	Promoting fair trade between the U.S. and China	40	45	11	4=100
b.	Promoting and defending human rights in China	48	34	13	5=100
c.	Promoting better environmental policies and practices in China	30	45	18	7=100
d.	Trying to assure a peaceful relationship between China and Taiwan	40	40	12	8=100
e.	Trying to assure that China does not become a military threat to Japan and South Korea	50	34	10	6=100
f.	Trying to assure that Hong Kong continues to have some independence from China	29	46	17	8=100

Q.26 All in all, in deciding U.S. policy about China, what's more important... **(READ AND ROTATE)**?

59 Maintaining a good and friendly relationship between the U.S. and China [OR]
 32 The U.S. promoting democracy and human rights in China
 4 **(DO NOT READ)** Both are equally important
5 **(DO NOT READ)** Don't know/Refused
 100

Q.27 Do you think it is possible for the U.S., through its policies, to have much of an effect on making China more democratic, or don't you think so?

34 Yes, it is possible
 56 No, it is not possible
10 Don't know/Refused
 100

Q.28 As you may know, the issue of tensions between China and Taiwan has been in the news recently. In your opinion, should the U.S. now COMMIT to defending Taiwan if China were to use military force against Taiwan, or should the U.S. NOT commit to such a position at this time?

		March 2000 ¹
26	U.S. should commit to defending Taiwan	31
64	U.S. should not commit at this time	53
<u>10</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>16</u>
100		100

¹ In March 2000 the question was worded slightly different: "As you may know, there have been renewed tensions about when and how to bring Taiwan back under Chinese control. If China were to use military force against Taiwan over this, should the United States use military force to defend Taiwan, or not?"

Now thinking about America's place in the world ...

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=759]:

B.1F1 Some people say George W. Bush's policies are too aggressive regarding other countries. Do you agree or disagree?

31 Agree
 53 Disagree
16 Don't know/Refused
 100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=709]:

B.2F2 Is George W. Bush working hard enough to have a peaceful relationship with other countries in the world, or not?

51 Yes, hard enough
 28 No, not hard enough
 1 Too hard (VOL)
20 Don't know/Refused
 100

ASK ALL:

Q.33 What's the greater threat to the United States at this point: The possibility of a missile attack by an unfriendly nation OR a terrorist group bringing weapons of mass destruction into the U.S.?

10 Possibility of missile attack
 77 Terrorist bringing weapons into the U.S.
 6 About the same (VOL)
7 Don't know/Refused
 100

Q.34 Do you think the U.S. should put into effect a national missile defense system, or don't you think so?

IF YES "1" ASK:

Q.35 Do we have a pressing need for this system right now or is this something we should put off into the future?

		Feb ² <u>2001</u>	<i>Alternate Wording</i> ³ <u>Feb 2001</u>	<u>May 2000</u>
51	Yes, U.S. should put into effect a national missile defense system	54	49	52
	29 Need the system right now	n/a	n/a	n/a
	19 Should put it off into the future	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3 Don't know/Refused	n/a	n/a	n/a
38	No, U.S. should not	32	40	37
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>
100		100	100	100

² In February 2001 question was worded slightly different: "Do you favor or oppose the development of a national missile defense system?"

³ In February 2001 and May 2000 question was worded differently: "Some people feel the U.S. should try to develop a ground- and space-based missile defense system to protect the U.S. from missile attack. Others oppose such an effort because they say it would be too costly and might interfere with existing arms treaties with the Russians. Which position comes closer to your view?"

ASK ALL:

ROTATE Q.36/37 AND Q.38/39

Q.36 I'm going to read a few reasons why some people OPPOSE the creation of a national missile defense system. Please tell me whether you have heard about each, or not. (First,) **(READ AND ROTATE ITEMS. ASK Q.37 BEFORE PROCEEDING TO NEXT ITEM)**. Have you heard about this, or not? (Next,)

		Have Heard <u>About</u>	Have Not <u>Heard about</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	The technology is not yet available for such a system to work	34	65	1=100
b.	A missile defense system would be too costly	60	39	1=100
c.	There is no real threat that would justify building this system	37	62	1=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=759]:

d.F1	Building this system could damage U.S. relations with Russia and China	47	52	1=100
------	--	----	----	-------

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=709]:

e.F2	Building this system could trigger a new arms race among countries who feel threatened by this policy	49	50	1=100
------	---	----	----	-------

Q.37 Do you think this is an important reason to oppose the creation of a national missile defense system, or not? **(GO TO NEXT ITEM IN Q.36)**

		Important Reason <u>To Oppose</u>	NOT Important Reason <u>To Oppose</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	The technology is not yet available for such a system to work	37	54	9=100
b.	A missile defense system would be too costly	41	52	7=100
c.	There is no real threat that would justify building this system	31	59	10=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=759]:

d.F1	Building this system could damage U.S. relations with Russia and China	34	57	9=100
------	--	----	----	-------

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=709]:

e.F2	Building this system could trigger a new arms race among countries who feel threatened by this policy	39	52	9=100
------	---	----	----	-------

Q.38 I'm going to read a few reasons why some people FAVOR the creation of a national missile defense system. Please tell me whether you have heard about each, or not. (First,) **(READ AND ROTATE ITEMS. ASK Q.39 BEFORE PROCEEDING TO NEXT ITEM)** Have you heard about this, or not? (Next,)

		Have Heard <u>About</u>	Have Not <u>Heard about</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	The system would allow us to protect our allies without fear of being attacked ourselves	35	64	1=100
b.	The system could protect the U.S. against missiles that are ACCIDENTALLY launched	44	55	1=100
c.	Our current defense systems do not adequately protect against attack from smaller, unfriendly nations such as Iraq and North Korea	40	59	1=100

Q.39 Do you think this is an important reason to favor the creation of a national missile defense system, or not? **(GO TO NEXT ITEM IN Q.38)**

		Important Reason <u>To Favor</u>	NOT Important Reason <u>To Favor</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	The system would allow us to protect our allies without fear of being attacked ourselves	51	41	8=100
b.	The system could protect the U.S. against missiles that are ACCIDENTALLY launched	58	34	8=100
c.	Our current defense systems do not adequately protect against attack from smaller, unfriendly nations such as Iraq and North Korea	50	42	8=100

Q.40 Now, after considering these reasons to favor and oppose the creation of a national missile defense system, what's your opinion? Do you think the U.S. should now put into effect a national missile defense system, or don't you think so?

49 Yes, U.S. should put into effect a missile defense system
 41 No, U.S. should not
10 Don't know/Refused
 100

PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESS
MAY 2001 FOREIGN THREATS
— FINAL TOPLINE —
May 11-20, 2001
N=1,587

Q.1 I'd like your opinion about some possible international concerns for the U.S. Do you think that **(INSERT ITEM; ROTATE)** is a major threat, a minor threat or not a threat to the well being of the United States? What about **(INSERT ITEM)**?

		<u>Major Threat</u>	<u>Minor Threat</u>	<u>Not a Threat</u>	(VOL) <u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	China's emergence as a world power	51	30	10	9=100
	July, 1999	53	33	10	4=100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=770]:

b.F1	Political and economic instability in Russia	27	46	12	15=100
	July, 1999	40	42	14	4=100
c.F1	International financial instability	47	33	9	11=100
	July, 1999	52	35	7	6=100
d.F1	Ethnic conflict in the Balkans	19	38	17	26=100
	July, 1999	24	49	17	10=100
e.F1	Saddam Hussein's continued rule in Iraq	58	29	6	7=100
	July, 1999	56	33	8	3=100
f.F1	Fidel Castro's continued rule in Cuba	20	43	26	11=100
	July, 1999	17	51	28	4=100
g.F1	Sectional or tribal warfare in Africa	14	42	25	19=100
	July, 1999	11	46	35	8=100
h.F1	The spread of weapons of mass destruction	74	15	5	6=100
	July, 1999	82	12	4	2=100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=817]:

i.F2	International drug cartels	68	24	3	5=100
	July, 1999	68	25	5	2=100
j.F2	Military conflict between China and Taiwan	36	37	11	16=100
	July, 1999	38	44	10	8=100
k.F2	International terrorism	64	27	4	5=100
l.F2	Global environmental problems	53	32	6	9=100
m.F2	The rapid spread of infectious diseases from country to country	66	26	3	5=100
n.F2	The ability of countries such as North Korea, Iraq and Iran to launch missile attacks against the United States	55	34	5	6=100