



Americans on the Iran Nuclear Issue

March 3, 2015

Questionnaire

Dates of Survey: February 19 – 25, 2015
Sample Size: 710

Margin of Error: 3.7%
MoE w/design effect of 1.2365: 4.1%

[DISPLAY]

Q1. The main focus of this survey will be what the United States should do about Iran's nuclear program.

As you may know, the United States is currently in negotiations with Iran and will soon reach a point where it needs to make a key decision. We would like to know your recommendation about what the US should do. But first we need to give you some background.

The US, Iran, and most other countries are members of the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty that aims to prevent new countries from acquiring nuclear weapons.

How much have you heard about the Non-Proliferation Treaty or NPT?

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Nothing at all..... | 46% |
| Republicans..... | 40 |
| Democrats | 49 |
| Independents | 52 |
| Just a little | 31 |
| Republicans..... | 31 |
| Democrats | 29 |
| Independents | 33 |
| Some | 18 |
| Republicans..... | 23 |
| Democrats | 17 |
| Independents | 12 |
| A lot | 5 |
| Republicans..... | 6 |
| Democrats | 5 |
| Independents | 3 |

Don't know/Refused*

[DISPLAY]

Q2. In establishing the NPT, all members that did not already have nuclear weapons agreed not to develop them. Iran is one of those members that has agreed not to develop nuclear weapons.

Did you know that Iran, as a member of the NPT, has agreed not to develop a nuclear weapon, or had you not heard this?

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| I knew this..... | 34% |
| Republicans..... | 40 |
| Democrats | 30 |
| Independents | 29 |
| | |
| I had not heard this..... | 65 |
| Republicans..... | 59 |
| Democrats | 69 |
| Independents | 71 |
| | |
| Don't know/Refused | 1% |

[DISPLAY]

As a Member of the NPT, Iran can have a nuclear energy program. However, the NPT requires that Iran provide information about its nuclear energy programs and allow inspections by a UN agency called the IAEA, to ensure that it is not trying to develop nuclear weapons.

A sensitive issue arises when a country enriches uranium. Enriched uranium can be used for producing nuclear energy, but can also be used for developing nuclear weapons. For the purposes of nuclear energy, it is only necessary to enrich uranium to the level of 5%. For nuclear weapons, it is usually necessary to enrich it to around 90%. One of the key purposes of IAEA inspections is to ensure that the enrichment being done by non-nuclear weapons states is only for peaceful purposes.

In 2002, the IAEA determined that Iran had been building an enrichment facility without telling the IAEA, and doing some other activities that might be related to developing nuclear weapons. The IAEA did not conclude that Iran was trying to produce nuclear weapons, but its secrecy raised questions about Iran's intentions. In negotiations with three European countries in 2003, Iran agreed to suspend enrichment-related activities temporarily and cooperate with the IAEA to resolve these suspicions. However, when these negotiations did not produce a final agreement, in 2006, Iran resumed its enrichment and reduced cooperation with the IAEA. The UN Security Council subsequently demanded that Iran suspend its uranium enrichment activities for a period. Iran refused, saying that it has a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes under the NPT. The UN then imposed some economic sanctions on Iran.

The US has imposed additional sanctions on Iran to get it to stop enriching. However, since the US stopped virtually all its trade with Iran some time ago, the only way that it has been able to

impose new sanctions is by getting other countries to stop doing business with Iran. This means that the US has needed to threaten these other countries with penalties. As a result, many countries have reduced their business relations with Iran.

Despite the sanctions, Iran has persisted in enriching uranium and has substantially increased its capacity to do so.

[DISPLAY]

In February 2013, the US, Germany, and other key members of the UN Security Council entered into a new round of negotiations with Iran to ensure that its nuclear program is only for strictly peaceful purposes.

In November 2013, they reached a temporary agreement that allowed greater international scrutiny, and also moderated some sanctions on Iran during the negotiating period.

A primary focus of negotiations is to create a system for **limiting** Iran's enrichment activity. This would ensure that it does not rise above the **5% level** needed for nuclear energy. This would be addressed by having **intrusive inspections** of all nuclear facilities.

Although some progress has been made in these negotiations, and Iran has cooperated in its short-term obligations, a long-term agreement has not been reached.

The temporary agreement has been extended twice by the consent of all the negotiating countries. Its current extension runs out on June 30 of this year.

These negotiations are controversial. Some members of Congress think that the US should not try to negotiate **limits** on Iran's enrichment program, but rather impose new sanctions to try to get Iran to **completely stop** enriching uranium.

If Congress were to impose new sanctions, this would make the continuation of the negotiations extremely unlikely because the temporary agreement says that the US will not impose new sanctions during the negotiations.

So, right now there are two major options being considered for the US:

- Continue to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran's enrichment of uranium: Iran would accept intrusive inspections of their program, while the US would accept Iran enriching to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, and would gradually ease some sanctions provided that Iran sticks to the agreement.
- Do not negotiate an agreement that includes Iran having limited enrichment, but rather impose new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran to pressure Iran to agree to completely stop all uranium enrichment.

[DISPLAY – Q3 AND Q4 ON SAME SCREEN ALONG WITH INTRO]

Based on what you have heard so far, please give us your initial response to each of these options. At this point, we are not asking you to choose between them. We just want to know how you would feel about each of them.

Q3. How would you feel if the US were to continue to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran’s enrichment of uranium, where Iran would accept intrusive inspections of their program, while the US would accept Iran enriching to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, and would gradually ease some sanctions provided that Iran sticks to the agreement? Would this be:

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Not Acceptable (0-4)..... | 21% |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 16 |
| Independents | 25 |
| Just tolerable (5)..... | 31 |
| Republicans..... | 30 |
| Democrats | 25 |
| Independents | 44 |
| Acceptable (6-10)..... | 47 |
| Republicans..... | 45 |
| Democrats | 59 |
| Independents | 30 |
| Don’t know/Refused | 1 |
| Mean | 5.7 |
| Republicans..... | 5.6 |
| Democrats | 6.3 |
| Independents | 5.1 |

Q4. How would you feel if the US were not to negotiate an agreement that includes Iran having limited enrichment, but rather impose new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran to pressure Iran to agree to completely stop all uranium enrichment? Would this be:

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Not Acceptable (0-4)..... | 39% |
| Republicans..... | 35 |
| Democrats | 46 |
| Independents | 35 |
| Just tolerable (5)..... | 27 |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 25 |
| Independents | 38 |
| Acceptable (6-10)..... | 33 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Republicans..... | 42 |
| Democrats | 28 |
| Independents | 27 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |
| Mean | 4.9 |
| Republicans..... | 5.4 |
| Democrats | 4.4 |
| Independents | 4.7 |

[DISPLAY – Q5-Q7 ON SAME SCREEN ALONG WITH INTRO]

Now, we would like you to evaluate a series of arguments in favor of the idea of continuing to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran's enrichment of uranium. For each argument, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing.

Q5. The only real option is to make a deal with the Iranian government. We have been applying sanctions for years now and yet Iran's uranium enrichment program has only grown. Bombing Iran's nuclear facilities would just lead Iran to kick out the IAEA inspectors and rebuild the program underground. Invading and occupying is completely unrealistic given that Iran is a huge country, with a substantial military, and a large population that would likely be very hostile. Given that the Iranian government says that it is ready to make a deal based on a commitment not to build nuclear weapons, we should give this option a chance.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 12% |
| Republicans..... | 10 |
| Democrats | 15 |
| Independents | 10 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 47 |
| Republicans..... | 45 |
| Democrats | 52 |
| Independents | 41 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 24 |
| Republicans..... | 26 |
| Democrats | 22 |
| Independents | 25 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 17 |
| Republicans..... | 19 |
| Democrats | 11 |
| Independents | 22 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

Q6. No matter what happens, making a deal with Iran to limit its enrichment will put us ahead of where we are now. If Iran sticks with the deal, we'll know they aren't making a nuclear weapon. If they try to break out of the deal, with more intrusive inspections, we will have much better means to spot it immediately and it will be so completely clear that we will be better able to mobilize the world against them. Either way we come out ahead.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 14% |
| Republicans..... | 11 |
| Democrats | 17 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 50 |
| Republicans..... | 50 |
| Democrats | 53 |
| Independents | 47 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 22 |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 21 |
| Independents | 20 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 12 |
| Republicans..... | 15 |
| Democrats | 6 |
| Independents | 16 |
| Don't know/Refused..... | 2 |

Q7. Getting Iran to limit its enrichment is the only reasonable goal. As a Member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran agreed not to have nuclear weapons, but it never agreed not to enrich uranium. The Treaty even recognizes all nations' right to a nuclear energy program. We would never let other countries tell us whether or not we can make our own nuclear fuel.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 23% |
| Republicans..... | 19 |
| Democrats | 26 |
| Independents | 24 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 41 |
| Republicans..... | 44 |
| Democrats | 44 |
| Independents | 31 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 24 |
| Republicans..... | 27 |
| Democrats | 21 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Independents | 22 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 11 |
| Republicans..... | 11 |
| Democrats | 8 |
| Independents | 18 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

[DISPLAY – Q8-Q10 ON SAME SCREEN ALONG WITH INTRO]

Now, we would like you to evaluate a series of arguments against the idea of continuing to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran's enrichment of uranium.

Q8. The UN Security Council told Iran to stop enrichment. But Iran has been defiant. We should not reward Iran's defiance by giving in and letting it go ahead and enrich. This will lead others to defy international rules to extract concessions. We need to set an example and make it clear that countries that defy the international system will eventually regret it. The international community needs to stick to its guns.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 21% |
| Republicans..... | 25 |
| Democrats | 17 |
| Independents | 20 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 41 |
| Republicans..... | 45 |
| Democrats | 38 |
| Independents | 37 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 27 |
| Republicans..... | 23 |
| Democrats | 30 |
| Independents | 26 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 10 |
| Republicans..... | 6 |
| Democrats | 13 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

Q9. If we have an agreement that lets Iran enrich to the 5% level, it does not mean that their progress toward a nuclear weapon will be completely stopped. They will be able to continually refine their know-how on enrichment. Thus, should they decide to break out of the agreement, they will be able to move toward getting a nuclear weapon even faster than they could now. The only way to stop their movement toward a nuclear weapon is to stop all enrichment.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 14% |
| Republicans..... | 18 |
| Democrats | 11 |
| Independents | 15 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 39 |
| Republicans..... | 45 |
| Democrats | 34 |
| Independents | 36 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 30 |
| Republicans..... | 28 |
| Democrats | 35 |
| Independents | 28 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 15 |
| Republicans..... | 9 |
| Democrats | 20 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

Q10. Giving up the international sanctions that have been so difficult to put in place is very risky. If the international sanctions are dismantled, at some point Iran could decide it is safe to break out of the treaty and race for nuclear weapons. Then it could take so long to reassemble the international system of sanctions that Iran could make so much progress that we could end up facing a nuclear-armed Iran.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 22% |
| Republicans..... | 26 |
| Democrats | 19 |
| Independents | 20 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 40 |
| Republicans..... | 44 |
| Democrats | 38 |
| Independents | 36 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 25 |
| Republicans..... | 21 |
| Democrats | 29 |
| Independents | 23 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 12 |
| Republicans..... | 8 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Democrats | 13 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

[DISPLAY Q11-Q13 ON SAME SCREEN ALONG WITH INTRO]

Now, we would like you to evaluate a series of arguments in favor of the idea of not continuing to negotiate an agreement with Iran, but rather imposing new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran.

Q11. Clearly we need to stick with sanctions and ratchet them up higher. We can see they are working. The Iranian economy is suffering and the Iranian people have had enough. That is why they elected a new president that was willing to come to the table. Eventually, the Iranian people are going to get tired of the economic pain that comes from the sanctions, and this will lead them to demand that Iran give up its enrichment program. We should stick with the sanctions until Iran gives up enrichment entirely.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 14% |
| Republicans..... | 16 |
| Democrats | 12 |
| Independents | 13 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 45 |
| Republicans..... | 46 |
| Democrats | 45 |
| Independents | 42 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 28 |
| Republicans..... | 29 |
| Democrats | 27 |
| Independents | 27 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 12 |
| Republicans..... | 8 |
| Democrats | 14 |
| Independents | 16 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

Q12. Given how hard the Iranian leadership resists giving up enrichment, despite all of the sanctions so far, they must really be motivated by a desire for nuclear weapons. Negotiating limits on their enrichment will not make this desire go away among the Iranian leadership. Our only hope is to ratchet up the sanctions until they are painful enough that the leaders will finally give up that desire.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 14% |
| Republicans..... | 15 |
| Democrats | 13 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 38 |
| Republicans..... | 43 |
| Democrats | 36 |
| Independents | 34 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 32 |
| Republicans..... | 33 |
| Democrats | 31 |
| Independents | 31 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 14 |
| Republicans..... | 8 |
| Democrats | 19 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Don't know/Refused..... | 2 |

Q13. We have the international sanctions in place now, along with the UN Security Council resolutions calling for Iran to stop its enrichment. It's no time to ease off and accept limited enrichment. We need to keep this momentum going and get other countries to cut their business ties to Iran until it complies with the UN resolutions. And we have to keep ramping up these sanctions until the Iranians scrap their enrichment program.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 17% |
| Republicans..... | 19 |
| Democrats | 17 |
| Independents | 15 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 43 |
| Republicans..... | 50 |
| Democrats | 39 |
| Independents | 37 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 25 |
| Republicans..... | 25 |
| Democrats | 26 |
| Independents | 25 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 13 |
| Republicans..... | 6 |
| Democrats | 17 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Independents | 18 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

[DISPLAY Q14-Q16 ON SAME SCREEN ALONG WITH INTRO]

Now, we would like you to evaluate a series of arguments against the idea of not continuing to negotiate an agreement with Iran, but rather imposing new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran.

Q14. We need to really face the fact that sanctions have not worked to get Iran to give up enriching. Even as countries imposed more and more sanctions on Iran, it increased its level of enrichment activities, building more and better centrifuges and even enriching somewhat above the 5% level. On the other hand, the sanctions *have* helped to bring Iran to the table to negotiate limits on its enrichment and have led Iran to already accept some limits. We need to be realistic, take advantage of what has worked, and stop pursuing approaches that do not work.

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Very convincing..... | 19% |
| Republicans..... | 19 |
| Democrats | 19 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 48 |
| Republicans..... | 47 |
| Democrats | 50 |
| Independents | 46 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 21 |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 18 |
| Independents | 20 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 11 |
| Republicans..... | 9 |
| Democrats | 12 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

Q15. Because the US has already stopped its trade with Iran, the only way Congress has been able to impose new sanctions is by threatening other countries, some of them allies, with sanctions unless they stop their business relations with Iran. Sometimes, we have actually punished their companies with fines. Many countries resent this. Cutting off trade with Iran hurts other countries' economy and they do not like being pushed around. This harms our relations with other countries, including friends and allies.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Very convincing..... | 22% |
| Republicans..... | 21 |
| Democrats | 25 |
| Independents | 22 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 44 |
| Republicans..... | 44 |
| Democrats | 45 |
| Independents | 40 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 21 |
| Republicans..... | 26 |
| Democrats | 16 |
| Independents | 20 |
| Very unconvincing..... | 11 |
| Republicans..... | 8 |
| Democrats | 12 |
| Independents | 15 |
| Don't know/Refused..... | 2 |

Q16. We need to remember that the system of sanctions on Iran requires the cooperation of other countries, who want the US to negotiate a deal with Iran so that we limit their nuclear program, allowing us to move away from the sanctions that harm their own economies too. If the US ramps up sanctions and pulls out of the negotiations now, when Iran says it is ready to make a deal, other countries will get annoyed and probably resume trading with Iran. The whole system of sanctions on Iran may well unravel, and then it will be even harder to get a deal with Iran. But if we show we would accept a deal that can be fully verified, these other countries are more apt to stick with us.

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Very convincing..... | 19% |
| Republicans..... | 17 |
| Democrats | 21 |
| Independents | 18 |
| Somewhat convincing..... | 46 |
| Republicans..... | 48 |
| Democrats | 47 |
| Independents | 40 |
| Somewhat unconvincing..... | 23 |
| Republicans..... | 26 |
| Democrats | 20 |
| Independents | 24 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Very unconvincing..... | 10 |
| Republicans..... | 9 |
| Democrats | 9 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

[DISPLAY- SHOW Q17 AND Q18 ON SAME SCREEN]

Q17. Now, having assessed these arguments, we would like to know how would you feel if the US were to continue to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran's enrichment of uranium: Iran would accept intrusive inspections of their program, while the US would accept Iran enriching to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, and would gradually ease some sanctions provided that Iran sticks to the agreement? Would this be:

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Not acceptable (0-4)..... | 21% |
| Republicans..... | 23 |
| Democrats | 17 |
| Independents | 24 |
| Just tolerable (5)..... | 29 |
| Republicans..... | 27 |
| Democrats | 23 |
| Independents | 43 |
| Acceptable (6-10)..... | 49 |
| Republicans..... | 49 |
| Democrats | 60 |
| Independents | 31 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |
| Mean | 5.8 |
| Republicans..... | 5.6 |
| Democrats | 6.4 |
| Independents | 5.1 |

Q18. How would you feel if the US were not to negotiate an agreement that includes Iran having limited enrichment, but rather impose new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran to pressure Iran to agree to completely stop all uranium enrichment? Would this be:

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Not acceptable (0-4)..... | 44% |
| Republicans..... | 39 |
| Democrats | 52 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Independents | 41 |
| Just tolerable (5)..... | 28 |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 27 |
| Independents | 40 |
| Acceptable (6-10)..... | 26 |
| Republicans..... | 36 |
| Democrats | 21 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |
| Mean | 4.4 |
| Republicans..... | 5.0 |
| Democrats | 4.0 |
| Independents | 4.2 |

[DISPLAY]

Q21. So, now, we would like to know which approach you think would be best. Please select which approach you would recommend to the US government:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Continue to pursue a long-term agreement that limits Iran's enrichment of uranium: Iran would accept intrusive inspections of their program, while the US would accept Iran enriching to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, and would gradually ease some sanctions provided that Iran sticks to the agreement..... | 61% |
| Republicans..... | 61 |
| Democrats | 66 |
| Independents | 54 |
| Do not negotiate an agreement that includes Iran having limited enrichment, but rather impose new sanctions on other countries to get them to cut their economic relations with Iran to pressure Iran to agree to completely stop all uranium enrichment. | 36 |
| Republicans..... | 35 |
| Democrats | 32 |
| Independents | 42 |
| Don't know/Refused | 3 |
| Republicans..... | 4 |
| Democrats | 2 |
| Independents | 4 |

[DISPLAY]

[STATEMENT] Here are a few other questions.

Q22. Do you believe that a deal with Iran on its nuclear program would help or hurt in the fight against the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL?

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Help a lot..... | 5% |
| Republicans..... | 3 |
| Democrats | 6 |
| Independents | 7 |
| Help some | 18 |
| Republicans..... | 20 |
| Democrats | 19 |
| Independents | 14 |
| Make no difference | 63 |
| Republicans..... | 60 |
| Democrats | 62 |
| Independents | 67 |
| Hurt some..... | 8 |
| Republicans..... | 10 |
| Democrats | 8 |
| Independents | 6 |
| Hurt a lot | 5 |
| Republicans..... | 6 |
| Democrats | 4 |
| Independents | 5 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

[DISPLAY]

Q23. I would like you to give your opinion of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on a scale of 0-10, where 0 is very unfavorable and 10 is very favorable:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Unfavorable (0-4)..... | 18% |
| Republicans..... | 10 |
| Democrats | 26 |
| Independents | 21 |
| Neither favorable nor unfavorable (5) | 41 |
| Republicans..... | 30 |
| Democrats | 47 |

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Independents | 53 |
| Favorable (6-10)..... | 30 |
| Republicans..... | 52 |
| Democrats | 16 |
| Independents | 14 |
| No opinion/Refused | 11 |
| Mean | 5.5 |
| Republicans..... | 6.8 |
| Democrats | 4.6 |
| Independents | 4.8 |

[DISPLAY Q24 AND Q25 ON SAME SCREEN]

Q24. As you may know, there is substantial controversy over the fact that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is scheduled to speak in Congress on March 3 in opposition to the current deal being negotiated for Iran’s nuclear program. Netanyahu was invited to speak by House Speaker John Boehner, not the State Department.

Critics—including the White House, some Members of Congress, and some Israelis—say that it is inappropriate for a head of state to go around the normal diplomatic channels and try to exert political influence on the US when it is in the midst of sensitive negotiations with Iran.

Defenders—including Netanyahu, Boehner, some Members of Congress and some Israelis—say that the decision about Iran is so important that it is appropriate for Israel to have its voice heard before Congress, as the outcome effects Israel too.

Do you believe that it is appropriate or inappropriate for Netanyahu to give such a speech to Congress without a diplomatic invitation?

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Very appropriate | 18% |
| Republicans..... | 31 |
| Democrats | 8 |
| Independents | 11 |
| Somewhat appropriate | 30 |
| Republicans..... | 34 |
| Democrats | 25 |
| Independents | 29 |
| Somewhat inappropriate | 30 |
| Republicans..... | 24 |
| Democrats | 34 |
| Independents | 31 |

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Very inappropriate | 21 |
| Republicans..... | 10 |
| Democrats | 31 |
| Independents | 24 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

Q25. Some Members of Congress, as an expression of their disapproval, have stated they plan not to attend the speech. Do you believe not attending the speech is appropriate or inappropriate?

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Very appropriate | 16% |
| Republicans..... | 9 |
| Democrats | 23 |
| Independents | 17 |
| Somewhat appropriate | 25 |
| Republicans..... | 21 |
| Democrats | 27 |
| Independents | 31 |
| Somewhat inappropriate | 31 |
| Republicans..... | 34 |
| Democrats | 31 |
| Independents | 25 |
| Very inappropriate | 25 |
| Republicans..... | 36 |
| Democrats | 16 |
| Independents | 22 |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 |

[DISPLAY]

D1. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a:

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Republican | 29% |
| Independent..... | 21 |
| Democrat..... | 31 |
| Other | 3 |
| No preference..... | 16 |
| Don't know/Refused | 1 |

[DISPLAY]

[IF D1 = 2, 4, 5, OR REFUSED]

D1a. Do you think of yourself as closer to the:

Republican Party27%
 Democratic Party17
 Neither.....55

 Don't know/Refused2

D1-D1a. Overall party identification combined

Republican Party/Lean Republican..... 40%
 Democratic Party/Lean Democrat.....37
 Independent.....23

[DISPLAY]

D2. What best characterizes your voter participation during elections?

I usually vote only in the general election24%
 I usually vote in both the party primary and the general election.....55
 I usually don't vote in elections20

 Don't know/Refused1

[DISPLAY]

D3. How sympathetic are you to the Tea Party movement?

Very sympathetic9
 Somewhat sympathetic32
 Somewhat unsympathetic21
 Very unsympathetic34

 Don't know/Refused4

[DISPLAY]

D4. Please select how often you get news and opinion from each of the following sources.

| | Almost every day | About 2-3 times a week | About once a week | Rarely | Never | Don't know/Refused |
|---|------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--------|-------|--------------------|
| D4a. Newspapers and news magazines (in print or online) | 26% | 12% | 18% | 25% | 17% | 1% |
| D4b. Public broadcasting (NPR or PBS) | 9 | 9 | 16 | 34 | 30 | 2 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| D4c. Network TV news broadcasts (For example: ABC, NBC, or CBS) | 34 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 12 | 1 |
| D4d. CNN | 9 | 8 | 17 | 33 | 30 | 2 |
| D4e. Fox News | 13 | 11 | 13 | 27 | 34 | 2 |
| D4f. MSNBC | 6 | 6 | 14 | 33 | 39 | 2 |
| D4g. A Christian news network (For example: TBN or CBN) | 3 | 3 | 7 | 20 | 66 | 2 |

DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| Male | 48% |
| Female..... | 52 |

Age

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| 18-29 | 21% |
| 30-44 | 25 |
| 45-59 | 27 |
| 60+ | 26 |

Education

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Less than high school..... | 12% |
| High school | 30 |
| Some college..... | 29 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 29 |

Region

| | |
|----------------|-----|
| Northeast..... | 18% |
| Midwest..... | 21 |
| South | 37 |
| West | 23 |

Race

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| White, Non-Hispanic | 66% |
| Black, Non-Hispanic..... | 12 |
| Other, Non-Hispanic..... | 5 |

Hispanic15
2+ Races, Non-Hispanic3