



Americans on International Trade Policy

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough **Fielding Dates:** April 10 – May 13, 2019

Total Sample: 2,993 registered voters; **Sample Size:** Sample A: 1,498; Sample B: 1,495

Margin of Error: Sample A+B: +/- 1.8%; Sample A/B: +/- 2.5%

Today we are going to do a survey on America's role in the world. This survey will take about 20 minutes to answer. Since you have taken a survey with us before, you know that we will make no effort to sell anything to you and your answers will remain confidential. If at any time you find that you do not want to answer a question, feel free to skip it and move on to the next one.

***Note: Text in brackets was not shown to the respondents.**

[SAMPLE DRAWN AND DIVIDED INTO THIRD SAMPLES A,B,C]

[FULL SAMPLE]

As you may know, after World War II, the United States together with most of the major countries in the world set up a number of international agreements and institutions. The aim was to enable countries to cooperate in an effort to preserve peace, promote international trade, lessen poverty through economic development, reduce hunger, respond to disasters, help refugees, promote health, and further human rights and democracy.

The most prominent institution has been the United Nations and its related global agencies, such as the World Food Program and, more recently, the World Trade Organization.

But such agreements and institutions also include regional alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO and regional trade agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement or NAFTA.

Many people think that these agreements and institutions are still valuable and important, have served the U.S. well, and should be maintained even if they require some cost. But, other people think they are no longer useful and the U.S. should disengage from them so that the U.S. is freer to pursue its interests independently.

In this survey, we will give you some background on some of the guiding principles of these agreements and institutions, and have you evaluate arguments for the U.S. maintaining or disengaging from them.

[International Trade]

[SAMPLE A,B]

A key goal that the US and other countries pursued in the post-war period was to promote greater international trade by agreeing on a set of rules that seek to lower barriers to trade and ensure trade is done fairly. To this end they created what is called the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (or GATT).

The most important barriers to trade are tariffs. Tariffs are like a tax that is charged on imported goods. For example, if a pair of imported shoes costs a shoe store \$50 and a 10% tariff is imposed on the shoes when they enter the US, the shoe store must pay \$55. Usually the shoe store adds some if not all of the \$5 to the price of the shoes, so in the end it is the consumer that pays more.

When tariffs are high, countries are less apt to trade with each other because it makes imported goods more expensive. When tariffs are low it makes imported goods more attractive. Thus, the GATT agreement encouraged countries to negotiate to lower their tariffs. It also discouraged countries from raising tariffs without serious justification.

An example of another type of trade barrier is highly specific national regulations that are hard for companies in other countries to meet. For example, if a country makes a regulation that says a specific license is needed to sell a product, and that license is very difficult or expensive to get for producers outside of the country, then they will have a very hard time selling their products there. Thus, the GATT encouraged countries to not have these kinds of regulations.

The GATT also established rules to ensure that trade was done fairly. For example, the GATT established that no product should be discriminated against due to the country it came from. It also prohibited countries from trying to dominate a market by selling products below their cost of production, widely known as 'dumping.'

Q1. How familiar are you with the idea of promoting international trade by countries agreeing on a set of international rules that seek to lower barriers to trade and to ensure trade is done fairly?

	Very	Somewhat	Only a little	Not at all	Ref. / DK
National	16.2%	50.0%	24.3%	9.2%	0.4%
GOP	15.4%	51.2%	25.2%	7.9%	0.4%
Dem.	17.6%	50.1%	22.8%	9.1%	0.4%
Indep.	14.2%	47.4%	26.0%	12.1%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	12.9%	52.7%	22.3%	10.8%	1.3%
Somewhat red	15.6%	52.7%	23.0%	8.4%	0.3%
Lean red	16.8%	49.2%	24.8%	8.8%	0.4%
Lean blue	14.8%	49.4%	28.0%	7.7%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	18.0%	45.7%	25.5%	10.8%	0.0%
Very blue	19.7%	48.7%	22.7%	8.8%	0.1%

Besides the general international agreements, specific groups of countries went further in making additional agreements to lower their tariffs and other trade barriers. The countries of Western Europe gradually eliminated all of the tariffs between them, finally joining together in the European Union.

The US has agreements to mutually lower tariffs and other trade barriers with numerous countries. One of the best known agreements is the North American Free Trade Agreement (or NAFTA) between the US, Canada and Mexico, which was recently renegotiated.

Partly as a result of these trade agreements there has been a substantial growth in international trade. According to the World Bank, trade has grown much faster than the economy overall.

As you may know, there is some discussion these days about what the US should do in regard to international trade. Some people think the US should continue to seek to promote the growth of

international trade through international agreements. Others think that trade has many negative effects and they oppose the growth of trade.

Here is an argument in favor of the US continuing to seek to further the growth of international trade through international agreements.

Q2. International trade has played a key role in the growth of the American economy and the world economy. It has been a major factor in the unprecedented rise in the standard of living over the last 70 years. With foreign markets more open, US producers can increase their production to sell to them. When markets are more open to imported goods, consumers benefit from lower prices. Often there are foreign producers that can produce things at a lower cost because they have lower production costs, or they are simply better at making them. Putting up tariffs to keep out these goods is not fair to consumers who have to pay higher prices. It is really a hidden tax on consumers which is especially tough for low income people. Furthermore, with imports, consumers get more choice and often better quality for certain goods. This encourages greater innovation.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	23.6%	50.6%	74.2%	18.8%	5.6%	24.4%	1.3%
GOP	14.3%	50.9%	65.2%	26.6%	7.1%	33.7%	1.0%
Dem.	35.1%	49.4%	84.5%	11.7%	2.5%	14.2%	1.2%
Indep.	15.6%	52.6%	68.2%	19.3%	10.2%	29.5%	2.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	21.6%	48.2%	69.8%	20.7%	8.1%	28.8%	1.4%
Somewhat red	21.2%	54.5%	75.7%	19.2%	4.5%	23.7%	0.6%
Lean red	24.2%	51.1%	75.3%	18.8%	5.1%	23.9%	0.7%
Lean blue	24.4%	49.5%	73.9%	18.3%	5.4%	23.7%	2.4%
Somewhat blue	19.1%	54.6%	73.7%	19.8%	5.5%	25.3%	1.0%
Very blue	33.2%	43.5%	76.7%	16.1%	5.2%	21.3%	2.0%

Here is a counter argument.

Q3. While trade may be good for investors and high skilled workers, and can lower consumer prices, it comes at a great cost for many American workers and businesses. As the US market gets opened up to cheap imports from low-wage countries, this undercuts American companies producing the same products, driving them out of business and throwing employees out of work. It also makes it easier for American companies to move overseas so as to access low-wage workers, putting more Americans out of work. This creates a widening gap between low and high skilled workers, while concentrating economic power in a handful of large multinational corporations who can afford to operate globally.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	30.1%	42.7%	72.8%	20.6%	6.0%	26.6%	0.4%
GOP	41.9%	40.7%	82.6%	13.3%	3.8%	17.1%	0.3%
Dem.	19.0%	44.2%	63.2%	28.5%	8.0%	36.5%	0.3%
Indep.	31.7%	43.7%	75.4%	17.3%	6.2%	23.5%	1.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	36.2%	40.9%	77.1%	15.8%	7.1%	22.9%	0.0%
Somewhat red	30.7%	44.3%	75.0%	17.7%	6.8%	24.5%	0.5%
Lean red	29.9%	46.5%	76.4%	17.8%	5.5%	23.3%	0.3%
Lean blue	28.5%	40.5%	69.0%	25.2%	5.2%	30.4%	0.6%
Somewhat blue	31.8%	39.6%	71.4%	23.9%	4.2%	28.1%	0.5%
Very blue	22.1%	44.1%	66.2%	25.6%	7.3%	32.9%	0.9%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q4. When trade barriers are lower, this makes it more possible for American companies to sell their products in foreign markets. International trade has been a major growth area for the US economy and is credited with boosting US output by more than a trillion dollars a year. Many of the products that the US sells abroad—like hi tech or heavy industrial goods—are ones that the US is particularly efficient at making and for which the US gets a good profit margin. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers are outside US borders. If US companies were restricted to the US, these strong US companies would be producing much less and hiring fewer workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	29.6%	49.7%	79.3%	16.4%	3.1%	19.5%	1.1%
GOP	23.9%	51.9%	75.8%	19.3%	3.9%	23.2%	1.0%
Dem.	37.1%	47.1%	84.2%	13.4%	1.4%	14.8%	0.9%
Indep.	23.4%	51.5%	74.9%	17.2%	5.7%	22.9%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	26.4%	47.4%	73.8%	20.5%	4.5%	25.0%	1.3%
Somewhat red	31.0%	48.9%	79.9%	16.2%	2.1%	18.3%	1.8%
Lean red	36.4%	46.8%	83.2%	11.6%	4.8%	16.4%	0.5%
Lean blue	27.4%	52.4%	79.8%	18.0%	2.0%	20.0%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	26.3%	53.0%	79.3%	16.0%	3.0%	19.0%	1.7%
Very blue	29.6%	50.1%	79.7%	16.6%	2.2%	18.8%	1.5%

Here is a counter argument.

Q5. When other countries have access to US markets their companies can come in and undercut our domestic companies because some of these companies are from countries with lower labor costs and lower environmental standards. Some countries, like China, give financial aid to their companies, making it possible for them to sell their products at such a low price that it undercuts our companies. As a result, some US companies cannot compete and end up going out of business. These companies are often smaller, local ones and, when they close, this can devastate a community.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	33.8%	41.7%	75.5%	19.0%	4.6%	23.6%	1.0%
GOP	45.9%	37.2%	83.1%	13.0%	2.9%	15.9%	1.0%
Dem.	23.8%	43.6%	67.4%	25.9%	6.2%	32.1%	0.6%
Indep.	31.7%	47.0%	78.7%	15.3%	4.0%	19.3%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	35.7%	44.1%	79.8%	16.1%	4.0%	20.1%	0.1%
Somewhat red	34.6%	39.9%	74.5%	17.7%	5.4%	23.1%	2.3%
Lean red	35.0%	41.1%	76.1%	18.5%	5.0%	23.5%	0.5%
Lean blue	32.1%	42.9%	75.0%	22.3%	2.5%	24.8%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	35.0%	43.4%	78.4%	15.8%	3.8%	19.6%	2.0%
Very blue	29.2%	39.3%	68.5%	23.7%	7.0%	30.7%	0.8%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q6. When the US can sell products abroad this creates many jobs for Americans. In 2016, exports of goods and services supported an estimated 10.7 million US jobs all across the country. And these are good jobs because our exports tend to focus on products that command a high price abroad because they simply can't be made anywhere else with the same efficiency and high quality. Research shows that export oriented industries pay 10-16% more than other jobs and this is especially true for blue-collar jobs. If we were to slow down trade, many people would be thrown out of work. While some jobs may be lost as a result of more trade, many well-paying jobs are created and the economy grows as a result, which benefits everyone.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	25.5%	51.2%	76.7%	17.5%	3.7%	21.2%	2.1%
GOP	19.0%	52.2%	71.2%	22.2%	4.9%	27.1%	1.6%
Dem.	34.5%	49.3%	83.8%	11.7%	1.7%	13.4%	2.8%
Indep.	17.3%	53.4%	70.7%	21.6%	5.9%	27.5%	1.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.1%	51.7%	76.8%	18.6%	4.1%	22.7%	0.6%
Somewhat red	24.5%	52.2%	76.7%	18.0%	3.1%	21.1%	2.2%
Lean red	24.9%	56.2%	81.1%	14.2%	3.8%	18.0%	0.9%
Lean blue	27.6%	46.8%	74.4%	18.4%	3.2%	21.6%	4.1%
Somewhat blue	24.4%	48.8%	73.2%	19.9%	3.9%	23.8%	2.9%
Very blue	26.4%	50.7%	77.1%	16.2%	4.2%	20.4%	2.4%

Here is a counter argument.

Q7. When cheap imported goods come into the US, some domestic companies cannot compete and end up laying off their workers. Other US companies move their factories to another country where they can pay lower wages. According to a World Bank study, the rise of Chinese imports into the US has led to the loss of about 2.4 million US jobs. It is easy to say that the affected American workers should simply change to some other line of work, or move to a different city with more job opportunities, but it is not easy for workers to learn new skills or uproot their lives, especially older or less-skilled workers. Also, research shows that when they do find new jobs they tend to be lower-paid.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	32.6%	41.1%	73.7%	18.4%	6.1%	24.5%	1.7%
GOP	41.8%	37.9%	79.7%	15.1%	4.3%	19.4%	0.9%
Dem.	23.9%	44.6%	68.5%	21.3%	8.2%	29.5%	2.0%
Indep.	33.8%	39.7%	73.5%	18.5%	5.0%	23.5%	3.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	37.0%	37.9%	74.9%	16.5%	6.3%	22.8%	2.3%
Somewhat red	31.1%	44.5%	75.6%	16.3%	6.1%	22.4%	2.0%
Lean red	39.1%	37.2%	76.3%	18.0%	5.2%	23.2%	0.4%
Lean blue	29.1%	39.0%	68.1%	25.1%	5.0%	30.1%	1.7%
Somewhat blue	34.7%	42.5%	77.2%	15.7%	4.3%	20.0%	2.7%
Very blue	22.8%	46.7%	69.5%	18.8%	10.4%	29.2%	1.4%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q8. When we lower our trade barriers and have more economic engagement with people from different countries we get to know each other better, which helps us understand our differences. More significant, it also creates greater incentives to keep our relations harmonious and cooperative. The costs of going to war go up and more businesses became advocates for good relations. All of this helps create a more stable and more peaceful world.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	24.2%	41.6%	65.8%	23.6%	9.6%	33.2%	1.0%
GOP	13.9%	38.1%	52.0%	31.7%	15.2%	46.9%	1.1%
Dem.	36.1%	43.6%	79.7%	15.4%	3.9%	19.3%	0.9%
Indep.	17.4%	44.3%	61.7%	26.2%	11.3%	37.5%	0.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	20.0%	40.6%	60.6%	26.4%	12.8%	39.2%	0.1%
Somewhat red	22.3%	46.1%	68.4%	20.6%	9.5%	30.1%	1.5%
Lean red	24.9%	43.6%	68.5%	22.3%	8.9%	31.2%	0.3%
Lean blue	28.0%	39.7%	67.7%	23.5%	7.3%	30.8%	1.5%
Somewhat blue	21.4%	41.8%	63.2%	23.2%	12.5%	35.7%	1.1%
Very blue	30.1%	37.7%	67.8%	25.1%	5.7%	30.8%	1.3%

Here is a counter argument.

Q9. If our economy becomes very dependent on international trade we have the potential to lose our independence and sovereignty. When we buy a lot of our products from other countries and stop producing those goods here, those countries can threaten to withhold the products we need. If we get used to selling our products abroad, countries can threaten to stop buying them, putting our companies at risk of bankruptcy. Furthermore, we should not be part of an international system in which foreigners judge whether we are following the rules or not. We need to maintain our independence to pursue our interests as we see fit.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	25.4%	34.6%	60.0%	25.5%	13.6%	39.1%	1.0%
GOP	39.0%	36.2%	75.2%	18.2%	5.9%	24.1%	0.7%

Dem.	13.3%	32.0%	45.3%	31.9%	21.8%	53.7%	0.9%
Indep.	25.2%	37.5%	62.7%	25.5%	9.9%	35.4%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	32.3%	34.2%	66.5%	22.3%	10.6%	32.9%	0.7%
Somewhat red	19.9%	37.2%	57.1%	27.3%	14.1%	41.4%	1.5%
Lean red	24.8%	33.5%	58.3%	28.6%	12.3%	40.9%	0.7%
Lean blue	23.8%	33.8%	57.6%	27.0%	14.6%	41.6%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	27.9%	36.8%	64.7%	21.8%	12.2%	34.0%	1.3%
Very blue	23.6%	32.0%	55.6%	25.4%	18.0%	43.4%	1.1%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q10. Trade has been essential to growing economies around the world, and this growth has in turn helped lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. When a country opens up its economy, it expands the amount of markets available to its businesses which gives them more customers to sell to, allowing them to grow and hire more people. Also, more imports lowers the price of common products, which means a person's wages will go farther. A recent study comparing many countries found that for every one percent decrease in a country's tariffs that country's poverty rate declined by about half a percentage point.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	23.9%	50.8%	74.7%	19.4%	4.0%	23.4%	1.9%
GOP	16.3%	50.7%	67.0%	25.8%	5.2%	31.0%	1.9%
Dem.	33.1%	49.7%	82.8%	13.5%	2.0%	15.5%	1.8%
Indep.	17.5%	53.7%	71.2%	20.3%	6.2%	26.5%	2.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	20.3%	50.0%	70.3%	21.6%	6.9%	28.5%	1.2%
Somewhat red	23.7%	53.4%	77.1%	15.9%	3.3%	19.2%	3.7%
Lean red	24.7%	52.8%	77.5%	17.8%	3.7%	21.5%	1.1%
Lean blue	27.5%	49.8%	77.3%	19.6%	1.1%	20.7%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	21.4%	51.4%	72.8%	20.9%	4.2%	25.1%	2.1%
Very blue	25.7%	47.1%	72.8%	20.8%	4.8%	25.6%	1.6%

Here is a counter argument.

Q11. When international companies are able to come into developing countries they are able to exploit those countries. They seek out countries where labor standards are low or nonexistent so they can hire workers at low wages, have them work under exploitive and unsafe conditions, and not allow them to form unions; they may even use children or forced labor. They seek out countries that will let them pollute the environment so as to keep their production costs low. If local governments resist, the international companies either bribe them or threaten to go to another country that will not impose any limits on their exploitive behavior.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	29.1%	39.5%	68.6%	23.0%	6.6%	29.6%	1.7%
GOP	33.0%	38.4%	71.4%	20.6%	5.9%	26.5%	2.0%
Dem.	25.9%	39.3%	65.2%	25.2%	7.9%	33.1%	1.7%
Indep.	28.5%	42.3%	70.8%	22.8%	5.2%	28.0%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							

Very red	31.9%	42.4%	74.3%	18.8%	6.2%	25.0%	0.6%
Somewhat red	21.1%	43.4%	64.5%	24.5%	7.6%	32.1%	3.4%
Lean red	28.1%	38.1%	66.2%	27.8%	5.0%	32.8%	1.0%
Lean blue	32.6%	35.2%	67.8%	24.7%	6.2%	30.9%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	33.2%	38.7%	71.9%	20.1%	6.3%	26.4%	1.7%
Very blue	27.4%	39.7%	67.1%	21.5%	8.9%	30.4%	2.5%

[INTERNATIONAL TRADE – FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q12. So now, do you approve or disapprove of the US, together with other countries, promoting international trade, through a set of agreed-on rules that seek to lower barriers to trade and to ensure trade is done fairly?

	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Total approve	Strongly disapprove	Somewhat disapprove	Total disapprove	Ref / DK
National	38.9%	48.5%	87.4%	9.7%	2.4%	12.1%	0.5%
GOP	31.3%	52.3%	83.6%	13.0%	3.2%	16.2%	0.2%
Dem.	50.4%	42.4%	92.8%	5.6%	0.9%	6.5%	0.6%
Indep.	27.0%	55.3%	82.3%	12.5%	4.2%	16.7%	1.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	35.4%	52.3%	87.7%	9.6%	2.1%	11.7%	0.6%
Somewhat red	37.3%	49.3%	86.6%	10.9%	2.3%	13.2%	0.3%
Lean red	38.9%	49.7%	88.6%	8.4%	2.9%	11.3%	0.1%
Lean blue	44.6%	44.5%	89.1%	7.9%	2.5%	10.4%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	38.7%	47.0%	85.7%	10.8%	3.1%	13.9%	0.4%
Very blue	40.0%	46.4%	86.4%	10.7%	1.6%	12.3%	1.3%

As we have seen, there are concerns about some negative effects of international trade. We are now going to explore to explore some proposals for reducing some of these negative effects.

The increase in international trade has led to the gain of many jobs across the country, but it has also led to the loss of jobs. This can happen when American workers lose their job when the company that they worked for goes out of business due to being undercut by a foreign competitor. Or when the company they work for moves overseas.

[SAMPLE A]

Right now the government has a program that provides financial assistance to people who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. These are called unemployment benefits. In 2009, during the peak of the Great Recession, the US spent \$75 billion on these benefits, but, with the recovery this has decreased steadily to \$28 billion this past year.

Naturally, not all of the people who lose their jobs have lost them due to the effects of international trade. In many cases, it is hard to determine whether trade did or did not play a role as trade affects so many areas of the economy indirectly and directly.

There is some debate about whether or not these unemployment benefits should be higher.

Here is some background.

Unemployment benefits are funded by state as well as federal taxes on employers, and those taxes vary by state. Thus, benefits vary by state as well.

The average amount of time that an unemployed person is allowed to collect unemployment benefits is 26 weeks, with some states only allowing 12 weeks while others allow as many 30 weeks. When the unemployment rate goes up a lot, these periods are sometimes temporarily extended like they were during the Great Recession of 2008-09.

Most people do not stay on for the maximum period. Currently, the average amount of time that people are on unemployment benefits is about 15 weeks.

The amount that a person collects also varies by state. People receive from about a quarter of their previous earnings to a little over half, with the average worker receiving 39% of their previous earnings.

However, each state has a maximum amount that people get. The average maximum amount is \$472 a week, but this ranges from \$240 to \$1,153 a week depending on the state and the size of their family.

Here is an argument for increasing unemployment benefits.

Q13. The growth of trade benefits all consumers who get lower-priced products. So do broader changes brought about by technological innovation. But too often in the course of change, good hardworking people lose their jobs through no fault of their own. The current level of unemployment benefits is not enough. Just think what it would be like to have your income go down by more than half--especially when you have a family. When this happens to a whole community it can start a real negative spiral. Raising benefits is the only fair thing to do and would help everyone who lost their jobs and their community make it through the period of adjustment.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	22.1%	44.4%	66.5%	23.7%	8.8%	32.5%	1.0%
GOP	10.5%	38.8%	49.3%	33.3%	16.3%	49.6%	1.1%
Dem.	32.6%	50.1%	82.7%	15.1%	1.4%	16.5%	0.7%
Indep.	21.5%	42.0%	63.5%	24.0%	10.5%	34.5%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	22.4%	41.9%	64.3%	23.0%	10.3%	33.3%	2.5%
Somewhat red	28.2%	40.0%	68.2%	23.4%	8.1%	31.5%	0.2%
Lean red	17.9%	51.9%	69.8%	21.0%	8.9%	29.9%	0.3%
Lean blue	26.7%	37.3%	64.0%	23.8%	10.2%	34.0%	2.1%
Somewhat blue	16.6%	44.5%	61.1%	28.9%	8.9%	37.8%	1.2%
Very blue	22.4%	49.8%	72.2%	21.4%	6.2%	27.6%	0.2%

Here is a counter argument.

Q14. Increasing unemployment benefits can encourage people to take a lot of time in finding a new job. Often there are many jobs out there not being filled, but people won't take them because they can live on their unemployment benefits. It can make them too fussy about what jobs they will accept. Remember too that it is employers who pay the taxes that support unemployment benefits and when those taxes get too high employers will not be able to hire new workers. Rather than creating this self-defeating spiral it is better to prod people to get back into the job market as soon as possible and to ease the pressure on employers so that they can hire those workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	23.1%	41.3%	64.4%	22.3%	12.3%	34.6%	0.9%
GOP	37.1%	43.6%	80.7%	13.7%	5.3%	19.0%	0.2%
Dem.	12.9%	37.1%	50.0%	29.8%	19.0%	48.8%	1.2%
Indep.	17.5%	46.7%	64.2%	22.9%	11.1%	34.0%	1.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.9%	37.8%	65.7%	19.3%	14.9%	34.2%	0.0%
Somewhat red	22.1%	43.3%	65.4%	19.3%	14.4%	33.7%	1.0%
Lean red	23.6%	42.5%	66.1%	25.5%	8.1%	33.6%	0.3%
Lean blue	26.3%	36.5%	62.8%	25.4%	11.4%	36.8%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	26.0%	40.8%	66.8%	18.9%	11.7%	30.6%	2.6%
Very blue	12.4%	46.4%	58.8%	25.5%	14.4%	39.9%	1.3%

[UNEMPLOYMENT FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS]

So now, we would like to know what you think unemployment benefits should be.

Q15a. As mentioned, the average amount of time that an unemployed person is allowed to collect unemployment benefits is 26 weeks (or six months). For an ordinary period, when the economy is growing and unemployment is not unusually high, what do you think the maximum number of weeks should be? _____ weeks

	Median	Decrease	Keep the same (Average of 26 weeks)	Increase	Dk / Ref
National	26	33.4%	36.6%	28.1%	1.9%
GOP	26	48.8%	35.1%	14.6%	1.5%
Dem.	26	21.1%	37.9%	39.1%	1.9%
Indep.	26	29.8%	36.4%	30.8%	3.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	26	42.2%	31.5%	24.2%	2.1%
Somewhat red	26	33.7%	35.5%	29.4%	1.5%
Lean red	26	35.8%	41.8%	21.5%	0.9%
Lean blue	26	28.2%	40.9%	26.5%	4.3%
Somewhat blue	26	30.9%	39.0%	27.9%	2.2%
Very blue	26	27.0%	30.3%	41.7%	1.0%

Q15b. As mentioned, the amount that a person collects varies by state. On average, people receive about 39% of their previous earnings. What percentage of their prior earnings do you think people should get? _____

	Mean	Median	Decrease	Keep the same (Average of 39%)	Increase	Dk / Ref
National	50.0	50	8.2%	10.5%	78.4%	3.0%
GOP	46.3	45	13.2%	15.4%	70.3%	1.2%
Dem.	52.3	50	4.4%	6.8%	85.2%	3.6%
Indep.	50.6	50	6.3%	8.6%	79.0%	6.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)						
Very red	48.7	50	8.3%	12.4%	75.8%	3.5%
Somewhat red	50.4	50	10.7%	7.1%	80.8%	1.3%
Lean red	50.3	50	6.7%	7.7%	84.4%	1.2%
Lean blue	49.1	50	5.9%	16.9%	73.5%	3.7%
Somewhat blue	49.4	50	10.9%	11.1%	76.3%	1.7%

Very blue 49.8 50 5.4% 8.2% 78.9% 7.5%

Q15c. As mentioned in each state there is a maximum amount a person can get. The maximum amount is on average \$472 a week. How much do you think this maximum should be per week?
\$_____

	Median	Decrease	Keep the same (Average of \$472 a week)	Increase	Dk / Ref
National	500	16.6%	11.6%	68.5%	3.3%
GOP	500	23.2%	14.0%	60.4%	2.4%
Dem.	500	11.2%	10.5%	75.1%	3.2%
Indep.	500	15.7%	8.8%	70.1%	5.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)					
Very red	500	18.0%	13.4%	65.8%	2.7%
Somewhat red	500	18.4%	9.5%	68.1%	4.0%
Lean red	500	15.0%	12.6%	69.4%	3.0%
Lean blue	500	14.0%	13.4%	70.1%	2.6%
Somewhat blue	500	17.2%	13.5%	65.3%	4.1%
Very blue	500	16.9%	7.0%	72.6%	3.5%

[WORKER RETRAINING]

Another way that the government can address some of the negative effects of trade is to invest resources in:

- retraining workers whose skills are no longer in demand so they can get a new job
- educational programs that prepare both students and people already working with new skills that are needed in the global economy
- there is a large demand for skilled workers in the US from companies who need their workers to be located here (such as solar panel installers or physician assistants)

Currently, the US government spends about \$6 billion for employment training programs. This includes educational and training programs for people of all ages, as well as apprenticeships and help with finding jobs.

There are a number of debates about these programs. One of the debates is about how much responsibility the government has in providing job training to unemployed workers so they can find a new job.

Here is an argument in favor of the US spending more on those types of training programs.

Q16. If we have an economy that is increasingly engaged with the global economy, many people will get better jobs, but others will lose their jobs because they will be competing with workers in low-wage countries. Thus, the government has a responsibility to help unemployed workers as quickly as possible. The economy is changing faster than ever and yet we are spending less on job training than we have historically. The growth of trade has resulted in better lives for most Americans and it is only fair that some of those resources get directed to helping people who have been hurt by these changes.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	31.0%	46.5%	77.5%	16.3%	5.1%	21.4%	1.0%
GOP	18.4%	48.8%	67.2%	23.5%	8.6%	32.1%	0.7%
Dem.	44.4%	44.5%	88.9%	9.0%	1.0%	10.0%	1.2%
Indep.	25.3%	46.8%	72.1%	19.0%	7.5%	26.5%	1.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.8%	47.6%	76.4%	16.2%	7.4%	23.6%	0.0%
Somewhat red	30.7%	50.2%	80.9%	13.0%	5.7%	18.7%	0.4%
Lean red	32.1%	47.2%	79.3%	14.3%	4.8%	19.1%	1.6%
Lean blue	31.0%	40.9%	71.9%	21.9%	4.4%	26.3%	1.8%
Somewhat blue	28.1%	50.2%	78.3%	14.7%	5.8%	20.5%	1.2%
Very blue	36.7%	43.1%	79.8%	16.5%	2.2%	18.7%	1.5%

Here is a counter argument.

Q17. Getting people into new jobs is the responsibility of workers and companies, not the government. Taxpayers should not be footing the bill for a service that will benefit companies - they are the ones that need the skilled workers. Helping unemployed people stay afloat while they try to find new jobs is something the government is in a good position to do, but teaching people new skills and finding them jobs should be left to the private sector where workers and employers know what is best.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	22.2%	33.3%	55.5%	27.6%	16.5%	44.1%	0.3%
GOP	33.2%	36.4%	69.6%	23.6%	6.8%	30.4%	0.0%
Dem.	11.2%	31.6%	42.8%	31.2%	25.6%	56.8%	0.4%
Indep.	25.8%	30.7%	56.5%	27.4%	15.2%	42.6%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	26.2%	31.4%	57.6%	23.2%	19.1%	42.3%	0.2%
Somewhat red	21.9%	33.2%	55.1%	27.2%	17.7%	44.9%	0.0%
Lean red	18.5%	29.3%	47.8%	34.8%	17.4%	52.2%	0.0%
Lean blue	24.2%	30.9%	55.1%	29.7%	15.2%	44.9%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	25.0%	37.9%	62.9%	21.5%	14.3%	35.8%	1.2%
Very blue	16.1%	39.9%	56.0%	27.8%	15.8%	43.6%	0.4%

Another debate is about how much responsibility the government has in providing education and training for skills that are currently in demand, or are likely to be in the future. This includes programs for students, as well as people already in the workforce, to teach them skills that are needed in the global economy.

Here is an argument in favor of the US spending more on those types of training programs.

Q18. Investing in our workforce is a smart decision. Due to globalization the demand for unskilled work is going down, and the US needs to take the steps to prepare its workforce. Having more programs to give workers the skills that industries need will help ensure that we have good, well-paying jobs in this country and that the US remains ahead of the curve in the global economy. Having a large supply of skilled workers makes US companies stay here, and other companies move here. But right now, other countries are putting much more money into developing their workforces -

around four times as much. We do not want to be left in a position where millions of American workers are no longer useful in the world economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	34.6%	44.7%	79.3%	14.6%	4.8%	19.4%	1.3%
GOP	21.0%	50.6%	71.6%	19.5%	8.2%	27.7%	0.7%
Dem.	48.6%	39.3%	87.9%	8.6%	1.4%	10.0%	2.0%
Indep.	29.5%	45.2%	74.7%	19.3%	5.5%	24.8%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.9%	44.5%	73.4%	18.2%	6.7%	24.9%	1.7%
Somewhat red	37.9%	41.6%	79.5%	12.5%	6.8%	19.3%	1.2%
Lean red	34.6%	50.7%	85.3%	11.1%	3.3%	14.4%	0.3%
Lean blue	37.4%	42.7%	80.1%	14.1%	4.0%	18.1%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	36.8%	40.0%	76.8%	17.2%	4.8%	22.0%	1.2%
Very blue	32.5%	49.1%	81.6%	13.7%	3.2%	16.9%	1.5%

Here is a counter argument.

Q19. This type of planning goes against the free market policies that made the US a global economic power. The government should not try to direct the economy - picking winners and losers, and forcing its own vision of the economy onto workers and businesses. Businesses who need skilled workers are best able to know what training is required, and to provide that training. Let's not waste more resources on this this type of government planning, but leave it to market forces to decide what type of retraining is best.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	19.8%	36.7%	56.5%	27.9%	14.9%	42.8%	0.7%
GOP	31.6%	42.0%	73.6%	20.9%	4.6%	25.5%	0.9%
Dem.	10.0%	30.5%	40.5%	34.1%	24.8%	58.9%	0.6%
Indep.	18.2%	40.5%	58.7%	27.8%	12.8%	40.6%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	22.6%	41.8%	64.4%	22.7%	12.9%	35.6%	0.0%
Somewhat red	19.7%	32.7%	52.4%	27.1%	18.6%	45.7%	2.0%
Lean red	21.1%	32.8%	53.9%	31.5%	14.6%	46.1%	0.0%
Lean blue	18.9%	37.0%	55.9%	31.5%	11.8%	43.3%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	20.6%	39.0%	59.6%	25.2%	14.1%	39.3%	1.2%
Very blue	15.0%	37.5%	52.5%	30.3%	16.9%	47.2%	0.4%

[SPENDING RECOMMENDATION]

Q20. As mentioned above, the US government spends about \$6 billion on:

- retraining workers whose skills are no longer in demand so they can re-enter the workforce
- educational programs that prepare both students and people already in the workforce with new skills that are needed in the global economy

How much do you think the US should spend on these types of programs? (Type your answer in billions of dollars. If you want to put millions, please use a decimal. For example, for \$250 million, type 0.25) _____

	Median	Ref./DK
National	6.0	6.1%
GOP	5.0	4.3%
Dem.	9.0	6.3%
Indep.	6.0	9.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)		
Very red	5.0	4.8%
Somewhat red	6.0	7.4%
Lean red	6.0	2.4%
Lean blue	7.0	8.8%
Somewhat blue	5.0	7.7%
Very blue	7.5	6.1%

[RETRAINING RECOMMENDATION]

We will now look at some specific proposals for job training and education programs under consideration in Congress. These programs are for students, as well as people already in the workforce, to teach them skills that are needed in the global economy.

One proposal is to train more Americans for skilled jobs in the growing field of cybersecurity, to protect computer systems from various types of online attacks.

Q21. Do you favor or oppose increasing spending on programs to train more Americans in cybersecurity?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	80.9%	18.5%	0.6%
GOP	74.0%	25.3%	0.6%
Dem.	90.2%	9.4%	0.5%
Indep.	72.2%	26.9%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	81.6%	17.8%	0.6%
Somewhat red	80.1%	19.3%	0.6%
Lean red	82.0%	17.4%	0.6%
Lean blue	83.6%	15.5%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	75.9%	23.3%	0.7%
Very blue	83.3%	16.4%	0.2%

Another proposal is to train more Americans for skilled jobs in the energy industry.

Q22. Do you favor or oppose increasing spending on programs to train more Americans in the energy industry?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	81.9%	17.5%	0.7%
GOP	71.9%	27.9%	0.2%
Dem.	93.0%	6.5%	0.5%
Indep.	75.5%	22.3%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	81.1%	18.5%	0.4%

Somewhat red	81.7%	17.9%	0.3%
Lean red	81.3%	17.1%	1.6%
Lean blue	84.2%	15.7%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	79.9%	19.1%	1.0%
Very blue	84.4%	15.1%	0.5%

Q23. Another proposal is to encourage employers to provide more job training to new and current employees. A specific proposal is to give employers a tax credit of up to \$5,000 to cover the costs of training a qualified individual in an apprenticeship program. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	82.7%	16.3%	1.0%
GOP	81.2%	18.3%	0.5%
Dem.	87.4%	11.3%	1.3%
Indep.	73.7%	24.8%	1.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	79.0%	20.6%	0.4%
Somewhat red	83.9%	15.0%	1.1%
Lean red	84.3%	15.1%	0.6%
Lean blue	83.2%	16.1%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	84.9%	13.3%	1.8%
Very blue	82.1%	16.2%	1.7%

[TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE] [SAMPLE B]

Right now the government has a program to provide assistance to people who get laid off from their job directly because of an increase in trade. This is over and above regular unemployment benefits. This approach, called Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA):

- guarantees free job training and assistance in finding a job
- extends the regular time period that unemployment benefits can be collected
- provides credits to cover up to three-quarters of health insurance costs, among other benefits

Currently, the government has such a program that costs about half a billion dollars a year and serves about 50,000 people.

However, the number of people who have been laid off from their job due to trade is substantially larger.

It has been proposed to increase the amount of funds available for TAA so that it can benefit more people who get laid off from their jobs due to trade.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal.

Q24. Trade benefits most Americans through lower prices, new job opportunities, and increased tax revenue to the government. But it can impose large costs on those who lose their jobs because of low-priced imports or companies moving overseas. It is only fair that, as a society, we devote some of the benefits gained from trade to easing the pain of those who suffer as a result of trade and help them get a new job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	25.0%	46.0%	71.0%	21.7%	6.8%	28.5%	0.6%
GOP	16.0%	40.7%	56.7%	31.1%	11.2%	42.3%	0.9%
Dem.	36.5%	47.2%	83.7%	13.5%	2.5%	16.0%	0.2%
Indep.	16.8%	54.1%	70.9%	21.0%	7.4%	28.4%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	19.6%	45.4%	65.0%	27.2%	7.1%	34.3%	0.8%
Somewhat red	21.3%	44.4%	65.7%	24.3%	8.9%	33.2%	1.2%
Lean red	29.2%	44.3%	73.5%	20.6%	5.9%	26.5%	0.0%
Lean blue	28.7%	45.9%	74.6%	20.0%	5.3%	25.3%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	20.5%	48.7%	69.2%	21.5%	9.2%	30.7%	0.1%
Very blue	34.1%	46.9%	81.0%	13.8%	4.5%	18.3%	0.7%

Here is a counter argument.

Q25. These kinds of programs are yet another government program. Many of these programs are not very effective in helping people find jobs. By making people more comfortable, they reduce people's incentives to go out and find a job. Getting people into these new jobs is the responsibility of workers and companies, not the government. Businesses know what they need and offer training for the necessary skills.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	23.1%	35.5%	58.6%	24.9%	16.1%	41.0%	0.5%
GOP	38.8%	37.5%	76.3%	17.3%	6.0%	23.3%	0.4%
Dem.	9.8%	31.8%	41.6%	31.1%	27.2%	58.3%	0.2%
Indep.	21.0%	40.1%	61.1%	26.3%	11.4%	37.7%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	26.8%	43.3%	70.1%	21.6%	8.1%	29.7%	0.3%
Somewhat red	24.5%	37.8%	62.3%	22.4%	14.5%	36.9%	0.8%
Lean red	23.3%	30.3%	53.6%	29.0%	17.4%	46.4%	0.0%
Lean blue	18.3%	36.5%	54.8%	25.9%	19.3%	45.2%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	20.4%	39.3%	59.7%	24.5%	15.6%	40.1%	0.2%
Very blue	25.6%	23.0%	48.6%	24.8%	24.8%	49.6%	1.7%

[TAA RECOMMENDATION]

Q26. So now, do you favor or oppose expanding the Trade Adjustment Assistance program to more people who get laid off from their job directly because of an increase in trade?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	58.1%	41.1%	0.8%
GOP	40.0%	59.9%	0.2%
Dem.	74.1%	24.5%	1.4%
Indep.	58.7%	40.7%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	51.5%	47.4%	1.1%
Somewhat red	50.3%	49.7%	0.0%
Lean red	62.4%	36.3%	1.3%
Lean blue	58.2%	40.7%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	59.4%	39.6%	1.0%
Very blue	69.9%	29.8%	0.3%

[If “Favor” or skipped Q26, Then Presented Q27]

Another debate is about whether help like that provided under Trade Adjustment Assistance should be provided only to people who get laid off from their job directly because of an increase in trade. Some people argue that the growth of trade affects the economy in many ways that result in people being laid off, even if it cannot be directly linked to trade. And some get laid off due to other factors-- automation, for example. Therefore, they argue, such assistance should be extended to all people, who get laid off from their job. Others argue that this goes too far and would cost too much.

Q27. Do you favor or oppose extending to all people who get laid off from their job, the type of assistance provided by Trade Adjustment Assistance programs?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	38.8%	19.4%	0.6%
GOP	21.8%	18.0%	0.3%
Dem.	53.7%	20.9%	0.9%
Indep.	39.7%	18.9%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	32.9%	19.1%	0.6%
Somewhat red	31.8%	17.5%	1.1%
Lean red	40.4%	22.8%	0.5%
Lean blue	39.3%	19.3%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	42.7%	17.7%	0.0%
Very blue	50.0%	19.2%	0.9%

[LABOR AND ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS] [SAMPLE A]

As was discussed above, one possible negative effect from international trade is that lowering trade barriers can weaken labor standards or environmental standards. There are two ways that this can occur.

- Companies in countries with lower labor and environmental standards may have lower production costs and are thus able to charge lower prices. This makes their products more competitive in international trade. It may also encourage other countries to lower their standards so they can compete.
- Companies in countries with higher labor and environmental standards may move their factories to countries with lower standards, to lower their production costs. Here too, this may encourage countries to lower their standards so that they are attractive to companies when they decide where to have their factories.

To discourage these things from happening, and to generally raise labor and environmental standards, there have been efforts through the UN to establish international labor and environmental standards. The UN has held a number of conferences on these issues and most countries of the world have agreed to certain international standards.

Sometimes, however, countries have signed the UN agreement and established such laws, but have not enforced them or later lowered the standards. In other cases they have not even established the laws. As mentioned, in cases where a country is not abiding by the standards it has agreed to, they may get an advantage because it becomes cheaper to produce certain products.

There is some debate about whether the US, in any new international trade agreements, should make it a requirement that countries abide by the standards they have agreed to and do not lower their labor or environmental standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge and to have an effective system for enforcing the standards.

We would like to know your opinion about this issue.

[LABOR STANDARDS]

We will first look at international labor standards. The main labor standards that have been agreed to are:

- No child labor that is likely to harm the health, safety, or morals of children or prevent them from attending school
- No forced labor where a person is coerced to work through the use of violence, intimidation, or threats of harm
- Right to form and join unions
- The elimination of discrimination in employment, for example based on gender, religion, ethnicity.

There is some debate about whether the US should include in its new international trade agreements the requirements that:

- countries abide by the labor standards they have committed to
- countries do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- there is an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Here is an argument in favor.

Q28. Making sure that each country has a minimum level of labor standards that are actually being enforced, levels the playing field. Companies in countries with unions and labor laws that are actually enforced will not have to compete with companies that intimidate their employees from unionizing and only pay them for half the time they work. We need to make sure that type of treatment does not become the norm, and that workers are treated with more dignity. No country should be able to get an economic advantage by mistreating their workers. Because of how international trade laws work, this is the best way of making sure that countries who have committed themselves to these labor standards actually enforce them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	45.6%	39.0%	84.6%	10.3%	4.0%	14.3%	1.2%
GOP	37.5%	41.3%	78.8%	14.4%	6.4%	20.8%	0.4%
Dem.	56.5%	36.1%	92.6%	4.6%	1.2%	5.8%	1.6%
Indep.	35.4%	41.4%	76.8%	15.6%	5.6%	21.2%	2.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	43.5%	41.1%	84.6%	9.2%	5.3%	14.5%	0.9%
Somewhat red	44.5%	37.5%	82.0%	13.4%	3.4%	16.8%	1.2%
Lean red	50.3%	37.0%	87.3%	9.6%	2.9%	12.5%	0.2%
Lean blue	48.7%	35.9%	84.6%	10.2%	3.0%	13.2%	2.1%
Somewhat blue	43.1%	41.5%	84.6%	10.3%	3.9%	14.2%	1.2%
Very blue	44.0%	40.7%	84.7%	8.8%	4.7%	13.5%	1.8%

Here is a counter argument.

Q29. Attaching labor standards to international trade agreements is inappropriate and can hurt the economic growth that developing countries need to lift their people out of poverty. First of all, not all countries have the same priorities as the US. In the trade-off between labor standards and growing their economy they may want to prioritize economic growth until most people have jobs--since without jobs there can be no labor standards. History suggests that the best route to durable labor standards is economic growth, which leads to demands for better worker treatment. Therefore, the US should not be dictating what a country's labor laws are or how they enforce them. Moreover, using its leverage on these issues may lead to the US gaining fewer concessions on partner nations' trade practices.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	10.0%	33.1%	43.1%	38.5%	17.3%	55.8%	1.0%
GOP	14.8%	34.4%	49.2%	37.9%	12.4%	50.3%	0.5%
Dem.	6.3%	29.7%	36.0%	40.6%	22.1%	62.7%	1.3%
Indep.	8.8%	39.3%	48.1%	34.1%	16.1%	50.2%	1.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	14.1%	28.7%	42.8%	35.4%	21.8%	57.2%	0.0%
Somewhat red	9.7%	32.2%	41.9%	37.6%	17.9%	55.5%	2.6%
Lean red	8.0%	32.5%	40.5%	38.3%	21.3%	59.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	11.8%	31.1%	42.9%	39.0%	16.6%	55.6%	1.4%
Somewhat blue	7.5%	36.6%	44.1%	39.9%	14.3%	54.2%	1.7%
Very blue	9.0%	38.3%	47.3%	41.0%	11.1%	52.1%	0.6%

[LABOR STANDARDS RECOMMENDATION]

Q30. Do you favor or oppose the US including in its new international trade agreements the requirements that:

- countries abide by the labor standards they have committed to
- countries do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- there is an effective system for enforcing these requirements

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	88.7%	10.4%	0.9%
GOP	86.4%	12.5%	1.1%
Dem.	93.3%	5.9%	0.9%
Indep.	82.3%	17.2%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	88.0%	11.4%	0.6%
Somewhat red	89.8%	9.5%	0.7%
Lean red	90.5%	8.9%	0.6%
Lean blue	90.3%	8.6%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	88.3%	10.6%	1.0%
Very blue	87.1%	11.5%	1.4%

[ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS]

We will now look at the question of whether the US should also include requirements for environmental standards in international trade agreements.

As mentioned, there have been a number of international conferences attended by UN member countries where the countries agreed to pursue certain environmental standards or goals related to such areas as air and water pollution, endangered species, greenhouse gas emissions, deforestation and others. Each country has agreed to bring their own laws in line with those standards or goals.

There is some debate about whether the US should include in all of its new international trade agreements the requirements that:

- countries abide by the environmental standards they have committed to
- countries do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- there is an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Here is an argument in favor.

Q31. Having an actual system of enforcement for environmental standards that countries have agreed to is necessary to both protect the environment, and make sure countries don't get a competitive edge from the lower costs that come from ignoring environmental standards. Trade should benefit everybody, but when the environment is destroyed to produce and transport more goods, it is the average citizen that suffers -- from breathing in polluted air to drinking contaminated water. This can completely offset the benefits from trade. Without environmental standards countries may lower their environmental standards to attract business and US companies will be tempted to move to those places where they can produce goods more cheaply. Requiring countries to uphold environmental standards is not only good for the planet, it is good for America.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	46.9%	39.1%	86.0%	9.0%	3.8%	12.8%	1.2%
GOP	36.0%	42.6%	78.6%	12.7%	7.6%	20.3%	1.0%
Dem.	60.1%	33.7%	93.8%	4.3%	0.5%	4.8%	1.5%
Indep.	37.3%	45.3%	82.6%	12.7%	3.8%	16.5%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	42.4%	38.2%	80.6%	10.4%	7.0%	17.4%	1.9%
Somewhat red	47.3%	39.7%	87.0%	8.4%	2.9%	11.3%	1.6%
Lean red	56.8%	34.5%	91.3%	5.5%	2.8%	8.3%	0.4%
Lean blue	49.4%	38.3%	87.7%	8.7%	2.8%	11.5%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	42.2%	43.8%	86.0%	10.2%	2.2%	12.4%	1.7%
Very blue	42.6%	41.7%	84.3%	10.2%	4.3%	14.5%	1.2%

Here is a counter argument.

Q32. The environment is a different issue from trade and should be dealt with separately. Adding too many rules to an agreement can overburden it and slow down the growth of trade. Countries may start using loose interpretations of (often vague) environmental standards to harass other countries. If countries signed on to an environmental agreement, then it should be up to them whether they want to live up to it or how. They should not be threatened with economic attacks if they want to go in another direction. Moreover, history shows that the most effective way to ensure that US trading partners develop durable environmental standards is for them to grow economically: higher standards of living generate greater public concern over the environment. And trade helps that happen.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	12.3%	32.2%	44.5%	31.4%	22.9%	54.3%	1.2%
GOP	17.8%	37.3%	55.1%	30.7%	12.3%	43.0%	1.9%
Dem.	8.8%	26.2%	35.0%	32.3%	32.1%	64.4%	0.6%
Indep.	8.6%	36.2%	44.8%	30.9%	23.1%	54.0%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	14.6%	35.2%	49.8%	24.8%	24.8%	49.6%	0.5%
Somewhat red	14.8%	30.9%	45.7%	28.4%	24.7%	53.1%	1.3%
Lean red	7.7%	31.2%	38.9%	34.1%	26.0%	60.1%	1.0%
Lean blue	11.9%	28.5%	40.4%	36.8%	21.1%	57.9%	1.6%
Somewhat blue	9.7%	37.7%	47.4%	31.8%	18.8%	50.6%	2.0%
Very blue	14.0%	30.0%	44.0%	33.8%	21.4%	55.2%	0.9%

[ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS RECOMMENDATION]

Q33. So now, do you favor or oppose the US including in its new international trade agreements the requirements that:

- countries abide by the environmental standards they have committed to
- countries do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- there is an effective system for enforcing these requirements

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	86.0%	12.7%	1.3%
GOP	79.2%	18.5%	2.3%
Dem.	94.1%	5.7%	0.2%
Indep.	80.6%	17.5%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	84.1%	14.9%	1.0%
Somewhat red	82.0%	16.2%	1.8%
Lean red	91.7%	7.2%	1.1%
Lean blue	87.8%	11.0%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	86.0%	12.2%	1.8%
Very blue	85.9%	13.0%	1.1%

[SAMPLE A,B]

[If "Disapprove" of International Trade on Q12 and support one or more of the mitigation strategies listed below, then Presented Q34]

Previously you said that you are opposed to the US continuing to promote greater trade through international agreements to lower trade barriers. You also said that you favor:

[Respondents only presented mitigation options they selected previously]

- increasing unemployment benefits for people who lose their jobs
- increase job training programs
- having a program that helps workers who lose their jobs due to the growth of trade
- including labor standards in trade agreements
- including environmental standards in trade agreements

Q34. Suppose that the government would take [these steps/this step] you propose. Would you then favor or oppose the US continuing to promote greater trade through international agreements to lower trade barriers?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	4.2%	3.4%	0.1%
GOP	5.2%	4.9%	0.1%
Dem.	3.5%	1.0%	0.0%
Indep.	4.0%	6.3%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	2.7%	4.2%	0.1%
Somewhat red	3.5%	4.2%	0.0%
Lean red	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%
Lean blue	5.3%	2.7%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	4.3%	3.3%	0.4%
Very blue	5.5%	4.3%	0.2%

[WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION] [SAMPLE B]

Another major question related to international trade that we will now explore is whether the US should continue to be part of the World Trade Organization or WTO.

As discussed above, after World War II, most of the nations of the world agreed to a set of rules for conducting international trade called the GATT.

In 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO) was created to facilitate negotiation of additional trade rules as needed. The WTO also deals with disputes when a nation believes another nation is violating the rules. In these cases nations can go to the WTO "court."

Here is how it works: If Country A believes that Country B has violated an international trade rule that Country B has agreed to, Country A may file a complaint. The two countries first discuss the issue and try to work out a solution. If that doesn't work, then the case is brought before a panel of independent trade experts from countries not involved in the dispute.

The panelists hear both sides and decide whether or not any trade rules have been violated. If the country is found to be in violation, then it is given a certain amount of time to change its behavior.

The panelists also specify that if the violating country does not change its behavior, the country that brought the complaint will have the right to retaliate against the violating country, by such measures as imposing tariffs on some of the products from the violating country.

While the large majority of complaints brought to the WTO are resolved through negotiations between the countries, since 1995, the WTO has issued just over 350 rulings.

The US has been on both the complaining and the defending side in over a hundred cases the WTO ruled on. For all cases it has brought to the WTO, it has won the vast majority of them.

At the same, when the US has been the defendant, it has lost most of the time. This is true for other countries as well, because generally countries will only bring a case to the WTO if they are pretty certain they will win.

We will now look at the debate about whether the US should continue to be part of the WTO.

Here is an argument in favor.

Q35. The economic world order that was established in the post-World War II period has produced a period of remarkable economic growth unprecedented in human history. It did not happen by itself. Agreements and institutions played a central role. These have evolved into the World Trade Organization. The WTO may not be perfect, but abandoning it would greatly increase the risk that unresolved disputes could rapidly turn into spiraling trade wars. The US led the way in creating the WTO and it has served US interest well, in addition to benefiting the world. The US should continue to be part of the WTO and work to make it even better.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	35.1%	42.8%	77.9%	16.2%	4.4%	20.6%	1.6%
GOP	20.1%	46.4%	66.5%	25.4%	7.4%	32.8%	0.7%
Dem.	52.7%	37.3%	90.0%	6.1%	1.3%	7.4%	2.6%
Indep.	25.0%	48.0%	73.0%	20.4%	5.3%	25.7%	1.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	27.7%	43.5%	71.2%	19.4%	7.1%	26.5%	2.3%
Somewhat red	36.4%	40.0%	76.4%	17.8%	4.3%	22.1%	1.4%
Lean red	35.9%	42.2%	78.1%	15.9%	4.1%	20.0%	2.0%
Lean blue	36.2%	43.6%	79.8%	16.9%	2.0%	18.9%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	32.5%	49.0%	81.5%	12.8%	5.0%	17.8%	0.7%
Very blue	45.7%	38.4%	84.1%	10.2%	3.6%	13.8%	2.1%

Here is a counter argument.

Q36. The WTO is not really necessary for the US. The US has so much leverage because of its large market it can probably get a better deal negotiating directly with other countries than working through an inefficient and unwieldy organization like the WTO. Working with 163 other nations the US has to make lots of compromises just to get along. Furthermore, the WTO makes many rules and the US follows them, but a lot of other countries, like China, do not. The US does better when it is free to act on its own.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	17.7%	34.0%	51.7%	31.8%	14.7%	46.5%	1.7%
GOP	29.9%	39.8%	69.7%	24.6%	4.7%	29.3%	1.0%
Dem.	6.3%	27.7%	34.0%	37.9%	25.1%	63.0%	3.0%
Indep.	18.9%	36.6%	55.5%	32.9%	11.2%	44.1%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	19.0%	37.9%	56.9%	33.4%	7.6%	41.0%	2.2%
Somewhat red	18.7%	32.8%	51.5%	33.1%	14.7%	47.8%	0.7%
Lean red	16.6%	35.7%	52.3%	31.0%	14.5%	45.5%	2.2%
Lean blue	17.9%	31.2%	49.1%	34.1%	15.4%	49.5%	1.4%
Somewhat blue	16.6%	37.5%	54.1%	27.1%	16.6%	43.7%	2.1%
Very blue	16.2%	28.0%	44.2%	31.6%	22.2%	53.8%	2.0%

[WTO FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q37. So now do you approve or disapprove of the US continuing to be part of the World Trade Organization?

	Approve	Disapprove	Ref / DK
National	72.2%	27.0%	0.8%
GOP	53.6%	45.8%	0.5%
Dem.	89.0%	9.5%	1.5%
Indep.	71.7%	28.3%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	65.2%	32.3%	2.6%
Somewhat red	70.9%	28.8%	0.3%
Lean red	74.0%	25.7%	0.2%
Lean blue	72.8%	27.0%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	75.0%	24.2%	0.8%
Very blue	80.5%	18.6%	0.8%

[STEEL TARIFFS]

We are now going to turn to some controversies related to the WTO.

As you may know the US administration recently increased its tariffs on steel to 25% and 10% on aluminum. Raising tariffs like that is generally not allowed under WTO rules, but there are some exceptions.

One of these exceptions is for national security. The national security exemption goes like this: if a certain domestic industry is necessary for national security and it is failing or at risk of failing, then a country may raise tariffs to protect that industry.

The US administration has used this national security exemption to justify its tariffs on steel and aluminum.

Here is some background. In the last decade the demand for steel has grown. But while the amount of steel that the US produces has not diminished, it has become a smaller portion of the total US steel market, primarily as a result of lower priced steel imports from China and other countries.

The US administration has recently said that the US steel and aluminum industry is at risk due to foreign competition and that steel and aluminum are critical for US military systems such as weapons. Therefore, the US administration says it is justified in invoking the WTO national security exemption and imposing these tariffs to protect its steel and aluminum industries.

Here is an argument in favor of the US administration invoking the national security exemption.

Q38. The US should not put itself in a position where it is reliant on foreign companies for its national security needs. But that is where we have been headed. Over the last decade, US steel and aluminum companies have lost ground competing with foreign companies, many of whom are unfairly helped by their governments. For example, China has been dumping cheap steel and aluminum in the world market, driving down prices everywhere. If this keeps up many US steel and aluminum factories could go out of business. This would leave the US vulnerable to not having enough steel and aluminum to meet the needs of the military. These tariffs are a reasonable response to this threat.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	33.0%	38.2%	71.2%	20.2%	7.6%	27.8%	1.0%
GOP	48.6%	36.7%	85.3%	11.1%	3.0%	14.1%	0.6%
Dem.	19.0%	38.6%	57.6%	28.3%	12.9%	41.2%	1.1%
Indep.	32.8%	40.5%	73.3%	20.4%	5.0%	25.4%	1.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	36.1%	37.3%	73.4%	22.0%	3.7%	25.7%	0.8%
Somewhat red	33.1%	44.4%	77.5%	16.4%	5.6%	22.0%	0.5%
Lean red	34.1%	36.5%	70.6%	21.2%	7.6%	28.8%	0.6%
Lean blue	35.6%	34.5%	70.1%	20.2%	8.4%	28.6%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	29.9%	37.6%	67.5%	22.6%	7.9%	30.5%	1.9%
Very blue	26.9%	39.9%	66.8%	18.5%	14.4%	32.9%	0.2%

Here is a counter argument.

Q39. The idea that, due to imports, the US won't be able to meet the needs of the military makes no sense--even US military leaders say there is no such concern. There is no prospect that US companies are going to all go out of business or that steel and aluminum companies in allied countries like Canada and the UK won't sell to us. Furthermore, the rise in imports over the last decade is not a real problem, but rather a fluctuation. More importantly, the total amount of steel that the US produces has actually been going up. Clearly this so-called security concern is just being used as an excuse for plain-old protectionism. It sets a bad example and may lead other countries to use phony excuses for keeping out US products.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	24.0%	40.4%	64.4%	26.8%	7.9%	34.7%	0.9%
GOP	12.5%	38.3%	50.8%	36.2%	12.1%	48.3%	0.9%
Dem.	36.9%	40.0%	76.9%	18.7%	3.6%	22.3%	0.8%
Indep.	18.2%	45.8%	64.0%	26.0%	9.0%	35.0%	1.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	15.9%	42.2%	58.1%	32.7%	9.1%	41.8%	0.0%
Somewhat red	22.5%	41.1%	63.6%	27.8%	8.0%	35.8%	0.5%
Lean red	24.1%	40.7%	64.8%	23.6%	10.9%	34.5%	0.7%
Lean blue	24.0%	38.3%	62.3%	30.6%	6.8%	37.4%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	24.6%	42.5%	67.1%	24.9%	6.9%	31.8%	1.0%
Very blue	37.3%	36.2%	73.5%	18.8%	4.9%	23.7%	2.8%

Here is an argument in favor.

Q40. Over and above our concern for the supply of steel and aluminum for military needs, the threat to our steel and aluminum industries from underpriced imports is a threat to our economy. And a threat to our economy is a threat to our national security. People worry too much about the US simply doing what is clearly in its interest. The WTO rules include a national security exemption and the US can make a case for it so we should use it. Everybody looks out for their interest. The US should too. That doesn't mean that the whole international trade system is going to fall apart. The US has always been a major producer of steel and we should not lose that industry to foreign competition.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	24.2%	41.6%	65.8%	24.0%	8.5%	32.5%	1.7%
GOP	38.5%	43.1%	81.6%	15.3%	1.8%	17.1%	1.3%
Dem.	12.9%	37.5%	50.4%	31.9%	15.7%	47.6%	2.1%
Indep.	20.5%	47.9%	68.4%	23.9%	5.9%	29.8%	1.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	32.5%	36.9%	69.4%	22.4%	5.2%	27.6%	2.9%
Somewhat red	24.5%	39.4%	63.9%	26.6%	7.0%	33.6%	2.4%
Lean red	21.0%	45.3%	66.3%	23.7%	8.4%	32.1%	1.6%
Lean blue	24.2%	40.2%	64.4%	26.4%	8.1%	34.5%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	22.6%	46.1%	68.7%	21.3%	8.8%	30.1%	1.1%
Very blue	18.8%	43.0%	61.8%	22.3%	15.0%	37.3%	1.0%

Here is a counter argument.

Q41. There is no serious risk that the US is going lose its steel industry. US steel production is up, not down. The real risk is that these tariffs will damage US manufacturers that use steel and aluminum, since they are likely to have to pay more for steel and aluminum. That is why numerous US companies, such as Caterpillar and Harley Davidson, have strongly opposed the tariffs. To the extent that China is exporting underpriced steel or aluminum, there are several means for addressing that through the WTO. In fact, we are already doing that and the US has gotten a ruling against China on one type of steel and other cases are underway. China has now reduced its production of steel. We should stick with the proper way for dealing with this problem and not undermine the system by using phony excuses to get around the rules.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	26.3%	40.7%	67.0%	24.4%	6.9%	31.3%	1.6%
GOP	15.3%	39.1%	54.4%	32.5%	11.5%	44.0%	1.6%
Dem.	39.1%	40.2%	79.3%	16.8%	2.1%	18.9%	1.7%
Indep.	19.7%	45.1%	64.8%	25.2%	8.5%	33.7%	1.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	20.1%	40.5%	60.6%	29.2%	7.8%	37.0%	2.5%
Somewhat red	27.6%	37.5%	65.1%	27.7%	5.8%	33.5%	1.5%
Lean red	23.7%	44.6%	68.3%	22.4%	7.5%	29.9%	1.8%
Lean blue	27.4%	34.9%	62.3%	28.9%	7.9%	36.8%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	25.7%	49.8%	75.5%	17.8%	5.6%	23.4%	1.1%
Very blue	36.8%	37.1%	73.9%	17.4%	7.1%	24.5%	1.6%

[STEEL TARIFFS FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q42. So now, do you approve or disapprove of the US administration invoking the national security exemption and imposing tariffs of 25% on steel imports and 10% on aluminum imports?

	Approve	Disapprove	Ref / DK
National	50.8%	47.6%	1.5%
GOP	75.9%	22.7%	1.4%
Dem.	27.9%	70.2%	1.9%
Indep.	51.8%	47.3%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	57.5%	40.4%	2.2%
Somewhat red	55.2%	42.4%	2.4%
Lean red	46.7%	51.3%	2.1%
Lean blue	48.2%	50.1%	1.7%
Somewhat blue	52.1%	47.9%	0.0%
Very blue	43.4%	56.4%	0.2%

[TARIFFS ON CHINA]

Now let's turn to another controversy.

As you may know there is currently a controversy about the US administration imposing tariffs on China without first getting a WTO ruling.

For some years now, the US has sought to get China to change a number of trade practices that it has found to be unfair, such as requiring many US companies to hand over their intellectual property, not enforcing copyright laws for US products, and in various ways improperly favoring Chinese companies over US companies.

The US has had one-on-one meetings with China that have not ultimately produced results satisfactory to the US. It has also submitted complaints to the WTO, but the process has taken time and the WTO has not yet made a ruling.

Recently, the US administration proceeded to put 25% tariffs on \$50 billion worth of Chinese goods and 10% tariffs on an additional \$200 billion of imports from China.

This US step is controversial because, as discussed, within the WTO system countries are not supposed to punish other countries with tariffs on their own. They are supposed to submit their complaints to the WTO. If the WTO rules in their favor and the other country does not change their behavior the WTO then gives the complaining country the right to raise certain tariffs in retaliation, and the other country has to accept the punishment.

China has accused the US of violating WTO rules and imposed tariffs of 5 to 25% on \$60 billion of US goods. This action is also controversial because it is also not consistent with WTO rules.

Right now, there is a debate about whether the US administration should have unilaterally imposed tariffs on China without first getting a ruling by the WTO.

Here is an argument for the US administration unilaterally imposing tariffs on China without a WTO ruling.

Q43. China has been violating its commitments to intellectual property rights for decades and shows little sign of stopping this in addition to other unfair trade practices. This costs the US hundreds of billions and puts the US and other innovative economies at risk from Chinese competition. We tried bilateral agreements with China and have submitted complaints to the WTO, but China has not stopped its unfair trade practices. It is time for the US to take stronger measures. These US tariffs are not an attack on the international trade system, but an act of defense against an increasingly powerful country that has no respect for it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	37.1%	37.6%	74.7%	18.6%	5.5%	24.1%	1.2%
GOP	58.4%	32.0%	90.4%	7.0%	1.9%	8.9%	0.7%
Dem.	18.2%	43.9%	62.1%	28.2%	8.7%	36.9%	0.9%
Indep.	36.9%	34.8%	71.7%	20.3%	5.3%	25.6%	2.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	42.2%	36.2%	78.4%	15.0%	4.4%	19.4%	2.1%
Somewhat red	40.5%	37.2%	77.7%	16.5%	5.4%	21.9%	0.5%
Lean red	33.5%	42.9%	76.4%	18.3%	4.4%	22.7%	1.0%
Lean blue	35.7%	33.7%	69.4%	22.5%	6.9%	29.4%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	33.4%	48.0%	81.4%	16.3%	2.2%	18.5%	0.0%
Very blue	34.6%	28.9%	63.5%	23.9%	10.9%	34.8%	1.7%

Here is a counter argument.

Q44. China is certainly not the first country to violate intellectual property laws, nor will it be the last. The US needs to approach this problem like it has all violations of trade rules: by using the rules and systems that were built specifically for these problems and which have successfully solved them in the past. Breaking the rules to force another country to stop breaking the rules will lead everybody further away from the rules-based system. When the US, the primary creator of this international system, disregards these rules it sends a signal to other countries that they might as well follow suit. Working with our allies within the WTO and following the rules will be much more effective at putting pressure on China, while upholding the system that has provided the US and the world unprecedented stability and prosperity.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	22.0%	41.4%	63.4%	24.4%	11.0%	35.4%	1.1%
GOP	9.2%	34.3%	43.5%	34.8%	20.7%	55.5%	1.0%
Dem.	35.5%	45.7%	81.2%	15.4%	2.3%	17.7%	1.1%
Indep.	17.1%	46.7%	63.8%	23.7%	10.9%	34.6%	1.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	15.7%	42.9%	58.6%	26.7%	13.4%	40.1%	1.2%
Somewhat red	20.8%	40.3%	61.1%	24.7%	13.0%	37.7%	1.2%
Lean red	22.0%	40.3%	62.3%	26.0%	11.1%	37.1%	0.5%
Lean blue	24.7%	40.9%	65.6%	25.3%	7.2%	32.5%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	18.3%	49.5%	67.8%	20.5%	11.5%	32.0%	0.2%
Very blue	33.7%	35.1%	68.8%	20.4%	9.6%	30.0%	1.3%

[TARIFFS ON CHINA FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q45. So, in conclusion, do you approve or disapprove of the US administration imposing tariffs on China without first getting a WTO ruling against China?

	Approve	Disapprove	Ref / DK
National	50.1%	49.1%	0.8%
GOP	77.0%	22.1%	1.0%
Dem.	24.9%	74.4%	0.6%
Indep.	52.3%	46.8%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	60.6%	39.1%	0.3%
Somewhat red	49.4%	49.9%	0.7%
Lean red	49.7%	49.7%	0.6%
Lean blue	48.1%	49.0%	2.9%
Somewhat blue	45.1%	54.9%	0.0%
Very blue	42.9%	56.9%	0.2%

[TARIFFS ON CHINA FINAL RECOMMENDATION]

Q46. As you may know there is discussion of the possibility of imposing additional tariffs on China if China does not change its trade practices. Which of the following two options would you prefer the administration to pursue?

- 1) Impose additional tariffs on China, without first getting a WTO ruling against China
- 2) Not to impose additional tariffs on China and continue to work through the WTO to get a ruling against China

	1. Impose tariffs without WTO ruling	2. Not impose tariffs; work through a ruling	Ref / DK
National	38.6%	54.7%	6.6%
GOP	63.5%	29.8%	6.7%
Dem.	16.3%	77.0%	6.7%
Indep.	38.7%	54.9%	6.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	46.9%	44.4%	8.6%
Somewhat red	44.4%	48.2%	7.4%
Lean red	39.1%	54.0%	6.9%
Lean blue	34.0%	63.5%	2.5%
Somewhat blue	36.8%	54.1%	9.1%
Very blue	24.5%	70.3%	5.2%

[INITIAL RECOMMENDATION ON NAFTA]

As you may recall, the US, Mexico and Canada have had a free trade agreement since 1994 called the North American Free Trade Agreement or NAFTA. It lowered or eliminated tariffs on most products sold between the three countries, increasing the amount of trade.

Q47. Based on what you know about NAFTA do you favor or oppose the US being in the NAFTA agreement?

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Total favor	Strongly oppose	Somewhat oppose	Total oppose	Ref / DK
National	33.3%	39.1%	72.4%	17.6%	9.1%	26.7%	0.9%
GOP	20.2%	34.8%	55.0%	26.8%	17.5%	44.3%	0.6%
Dem.	48.1%	39.7%	87.8%	9.8%	1.9%	11.7%	0.5%
Indep.	26.5%	46.5%	73.0%	16.7%	8.0%	24.7%	2.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	25.0%	38.5%	63.5%	25.3%	10.0%	35.3%	1.2%
Somewhat red	30.7%	42.1%	72.8%	16.1%	10.9%	27.0%	0.1%
Lean red	35.4%	39.8%	75.2%	15.0%	9.7%	24.7%	0.0%
Lean blue	36.7%	35.9%	72.6%	18.0%	9.2%	27.2%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	35.9%	40.7%	76.6%	15.2%	7.0%	22.2%	1.2%
Very blue	40.0%	39.3%	79.3%	13.1%	5.7%	18.8%	1.8%

[RENEGOTIATING NAFTA]

Recently, the US administration negotiated some new terms for the NAFTA agreement, which was renamed the US – Mexico – Canada – Agreement (USMCA), seeking to address some concerns. Congress is in the process of deciding whether to adopt this new agreement. Here are some of the main changes. The new agreement:

- Requires a certain portion of auto parts to be made by workers making \$16 an hour, reducing the competition from lower wage auto workers in Mexico.
- Reduces the amount of parts that can be imported from outside of North America for cars sold tariff-free, helping North American auto parts producers, especially in the US, but likely raising the price of cars.
- Lengthens the period that certain kinds of prescription drugs would be protected from competition from generic drugs, helping US drug companies, but likely raising drug prices.
- Lowers Canadian tariffs on some US dairy products.
- Takes a number of steps to modernize the 25-year-old NAFTA accord, addressing such matters as e-commerce, trade in services, and data flows.
- Also, though NAFTA already requires all three countries to maintain certain standards related to the treatment of workers and the environment, this new agreement makes these standards stronger and more enforceable.

Congress is deciding whether to approve this new agreement. We would like to know what you think representatives in Congress should do.

Here is an argument in favor of the new deal.

Q48. The new USMCA is not perfect, but simply pulling out of NAFTA is not really an option. While it may help some US workers, many more would be hurt. The new deal is good for US workers in a variety of ways and helps some US auto companies, dairy producers, and drug companies. It makes it harder for Mexico to undercut us. On balance it is a good deal.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	20.6%	51.7%	72.3%	22.0%	4.3%	26.3%	1.4%
GOP	25.1%	57.2%	82.3%	13.5%	2.8%	16.3%	1.4%
Dem.	18.2%	45.7%	63.9%	29.4%	5.5%	34.9%	1.2%
Indep.	16.3%	54.3%	70.6%	22.6%	4.8%	27.4%	1.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	19.3%	50.9%	70.2%	23.5%	5.3%	28.8%	1.0%
Somewhat red	17.6%	52.3%	69.9%	23.2%	4.6%	27.8%	2.2%
Lean red	26.2%	48.7%	74.9%	19.2%	4.2%	23.4%	1.7%
Lean blue	24.9%	48.1%	73.0%	23.9%	1.8%	25.7%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	19.2%	56.5%	75.7%	18.9%	4.0%	22.9%	1.4%
Very blue	14.8%	54.7%	69.5%	24.0%	6.4%	30.4%	0.0%

Here is a different argument in favor.

Q49. By reducing trade barriers, NAFTA has been good for the US economy overall and for most American workers. In regard to the changes being proposed, on the one hand some of the proposed provisions are helpful for trade. On the other hand, some are not helpful because they make trade less free. But, they are not that big a deal. Walking away from NAFTA would be really bad. Since the trade-restrictive changes are probably necessary, politically, it would be better to vote for it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	15.7%	46.2%	61.9%	28.9%	7.7%	36.6%	1.4%
GOP	10.2%	43.8%	54.0%	32.2%	12.0%	44.2%	1.8%
Dem.	22.8%	48.9%	71.7%	23.9%	3.7%	27.6%	0.7%
Indep.	10.5%	44.9%	55.4%	34.0%	8.4%	42.4%	2.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	12.3%	45.0%	57.3%	32.2%	9.3%	41.5%	1.2%
Somewhat red	15.2%	43.8%	59.0%	29.5%	10.1%	39.6%	1.4%
Lean red	13.0%	53.0%	66.0%	25.0%	8.3%	33.3%	0.7%
Lean blue	21.7%	41.3%	63.0%	30.1%	5.7%	35.8%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	16.2%	47.2%	63.4%	27.7%	6.4%	34.1%	2.4%
Very blue	16.8%	48.0%	64.8%	28.4%	5.3%	33.7%	1.5%

Here is an argument against.

Q50. NAFTA has not been good for American workers. These new provisions are not enough to make a serious difference. They mostly only help American auto workers. We can't be sure the labor and environmental standards will really be enforced. Most of the changes help American companies, while actually raising prices for American consumers. Congress should make it clear that NAFTA is not a good idea, even with these changes, and vote against the new deal.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	11.8%	42.9%	54.7%	33.2%	10.2%	43.4%	1.9%
GOP	14.8%	47.5%	62.3%	30.5%	5.6%	36.1%	1.5%
Dem.	9.1%	36.9%	46.0%	36.7%	15.3%	52.0%	2.0%
Indep.	11.8%	47.6%	59.4%	30.5%	7.6%	38.1%	2.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	10.9%	48.3%	59.2%	30.6%	7.7%	38.3%	2.5%
Somewhat red	10.3%	48.0%	58.3%	29.0%	11.5%	40.5%	1.2%
Lean red	8.5%	42.6%	51.1%	35.8%	12.2%	48.0%	0.9%
Lean blue	13.0%	35.6%	48.6%	38.1%	9.7%	47.8%	3.5%
Somewhat blue	13.8%	46.7%	60.5%	29.7%	7.7%	37.4%	2.2%
Very blue	15.4%	33.5%	48.9%	37.7%	12.7%	50.4%	0.7%

Here is a different argument against.

Q51. The freer trade that NAFTA has brought about has been good for the US economy and for most American workers. American companies have new markets for their products, enabling them to hire more US workers and consumers have access to lower-priced goods. The changes that are being proposed here set the process back by putting new limits on trade. They dilute the positive effects of free trade and make the economy less efficient. Congress should vote against it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
National	13.1%	46.0%	59.1%	31.2%	7.7%	38.9%	2.1%
GOP	8.3%	41.0%	49.3%	37.6%	11.0%	48.6%	2.0%
Dem.	19.1%	49.4%	68.5%	25.2%	4.7%	29.9%	1.6%
Indep.	8.9%	48.4%	57.3%	31.6%	7.7%	39.3%	3.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	10.2%	42.9%	53.1%	35.2%	9.6%	44.8%	2.1%
Somewhat red	11.4%	46.5%	57.9%	30.1%	9.6%	39.7%	2.4%
Lean red	9.8%	53.1%	62.9%	29.8%	6.3%	36.1%	1.0%
Lean blue	13.7%	49.0%	62.7%	31.0%	4.7%	35.7%	1.6%
Somewhat blue	15.7%	44.0%	59.7%	29.4%	8.1%	37.5%	2.7%
Very blue	19.6%	39.2%	58.8%	30.7%	7.9%	38.6%	2.7%

[NAFTA RECOMMENDATION]

Q52. So in conclusion, do you think your representatives in Congress should:

1 Vote for new deal

2 Vote against the new deal

	Vote for new deal	Vote against new deal	Ref / DK
National	52.8%	44.9%	2.3%
GOP	63.7%	34.3%	2.0%
Dem.	42.9%	53.9%	3.1%
Indep.	53.1%	46.2%	0.7%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	59.7%	39.6%	0.7%
Somewhat red	52.6%	45.8%	1.5%
Lean red	55.9%	42.3%	1.8%
Lean blue	49.2%	47.4%	3.4%
Somewhat blue	52.0%	45.5%	2.4%
Very blue	45.0%	50.9%	4.1%

[IF “vote for the new deal” or skipped on Q52 AND “Approve” of Steel Tariffs or skipped on Q42, Presented Q52a]

[NAFTA RECOMMENDATION]

Q52a. Though the new agreement was signed by all three countries' presidents, the US Congress and the parliaments of Canada and Mexico must approve it. Some key legislators in the US congress and the Canadian parliament have said that they will not approve of the new agreement unless the US lifts its new tariffs on steel and aluminum for imports from Canada and Mexico. If it appears necessary to get the approval for the new agreement, would you favor or oppose the US lifting the new steel and aluminum tariffs on imports from Canada and Mexico?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
National	21.8%	14.3%	0.3%
GOP	30.4%	24.7%	0.3%
Dem.	14.8%	4.5%	0.2%
Indep.	19.9%	15.3%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	22.5%	20.5%	0.4%
Somewhat red	21.3%	17.9%	0.0%
Lean red	24.0%	12.2%	0.2%
Lean blue	18.9%	13.0%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	24.1%	10.8%	0.7%
Very blue	19.5%	8.7%	0.2%

[NAFTA RECOMMENDATION]

Q53. If Congress does not approve this new deal do you think the president should:

1 Withdraw from NAFTA

2 Stay in NAFTA

	Withdraw from NAFTA	Stay in NAFTA	Ref / DK
National	33.8%	63.2%	3.0%
GOP	55.6%	41.9%	2.5%
Dem.	13.2%	83.4%	3.4%
Indep.	36.1%	60.4%	3.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	37.7%	59.4%	2.9%
Somewhat red	37.4%	60.7%	1.9%
Lean red	28.0%	67.8%	4.3%
Lean blue	37.9%	59.8%	2.3%
Somewhat blue	31.5%	66.1%	2.4%
Very blue	27.0%	67.8%	5.2%

###