

COUNCIL *on*  
FOREIGN  
RELATIONS

# Public Opinion on Global Issues

Chapter 11: U.S. Opinion on Violent Conflict

*[www.cfr.org/public\\_opinion](http://www.cfr.org/public_opinion)*

August 28, 2012

## CHAPTER 11: U.S. OPINION ON PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO VIOLENT CONFLICT

### *The Use of Force*

**In international polls, most Americans agree that military force is sometimes necessary to maintain order in the world.**

In 2010, Pew Global Attitudes Project polled people in the United States on whether they agreed that “it is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.” A large majority agreed (77 percent); the same percentage as in 2007—though those who agreed “completely” dropped from 35 to 30 percent.

Americans’ view that military force is sometimes necessary is significantly higher than the global average. Among all twenty-two countries polled, an average of 61 percent of respondents agreed and 35 percent disagreed. This marks a slight decrease from 2007, when the figures were 64 and 31 percent, respectively.<sup>1</sup>

### *The UN Security Council and the Use of Force*

**International polls find that publics around the world, including in the United States, believe that the UN Security Council has the right to authorize the use of force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies. These include: to defend a country that has been attacked, to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide, to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups, and to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown. More broadly, Americans say the idea that national sovereignty precludes intervention in the internal affairs of countries is outdated.**

In a Chicago Council on Global Affairs (CCGA) poll from 2006, Americans showed strong support for the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force to prevent and respond to violent conflict in a variety of contingencies. Responses were similar to the average response to the same questions in a poll of eighteen nations conducted by WorldPublicOpinion.org (WPO) and CCGA from 2006 to 2008.

The highest level of U.S. support was for the UN Security Council having the right to authorize military force in order “**to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.**” A large majority of Americans (83 percent) were in favor of this principle, while only 13 percent were not. Overall, 76 percent of respondents in eighteen nations polled agreed that the UN Security Council should have this right, while 16 percent replied that the Security Council should not.<sup>2</sup>

The U.S. public expresses similarly high levels of support for the UN Security Council’s right to authorize the use of military force “**to defend a country that has been attacked.**” Eighty-three percent of U.S. respondents endorsed this view, while 14 percent were opposed. This number was slightly higher than the 76 percent of respondents globally who felt the UN Security Council should have this right.<sup>3</sup>

A slightly smaller, though still significant, majority of U.S. respondents favored the UN Security Council having the right “**to stop a country from supporting terrorist groups.**” Seventy-six percent of Americans were in favor, while 20 percent were not. This is approximately the same level of support expressed across all nations polled (73 percent of respondents in favor, 19 percent opposed).<sup>4</sup>

Among the scenarios outlined, Americans expressed the lowest level of support for the United Nations having the right to authorize the use of military action “**to restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown.**” A modest majority (57 percent) was in favor, while 38 percent were opposed to giving the Security Council this right. On average, 53 percent of all publics polled thought the Council should have this right as opposed to 35 percent who did not.<sup>5</sup>

More broadly, the U.S. public appears to believe that the principle of nonintervention based on national sovereignty is an outdated idea. As early as 1999, Harris found that 68 percent agreed with the idea, “The old idea of national sovereignty which did not allow foreign interference in the domestic affairs of any country, even if it killed many of its own people, is no longer acceptable and must change.”<sup>6</sup>

*UN Responsibility to Protect*

**Polls further find that the UN Security Council is seen as having not only the right, but the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to prevent severe human rights violations.**

CCGA asked Americans in 2010 whether the UN Security Council has a responsibility to authorize military force to protect people from severe human rights violations, such as genocide. A majority (66 percent) said that the UN does have this responsibility. This represents a drop of eight points from 74 percent in 2008. At the time the average across 20 countries polled was significantly lower than the American position, though still a clear majority, with 61 percent agreeing.<sup>7</sup>

Americans perceive this responsibility as applying to other Western powers as well. Seventy-seven percent of Americans agreed in 2006 that “the United States and other Western powers have a moral obligation to use military force if necessary, to prevent one group of people from committing genocide against another” (Pew 2006).<sup>8</sup>

*UN Role in Peacekeeping*

**In principle, most Americans favor the United Nations having a standing peacekeeping force that it selects, trains, and commands. A majority also wants peacekeeping policy to be decided at the United Nations rather than by national governments or regional organizations. Americans favor providing financial support to the United Nations for peacekeeping.**

CCGA asked Americans whether they favored or opposed having a standing peacekeeping force selected, trained, and commanded by the United Nations. A large majority of Americans (72 percent) favored this idea, while 24 percent were opposed. This is slightly higher than the average level of support for this proposition among publics in all twenty-two countries polled (66 percent in favor, 23 percent opposed) (WPO/CCGA).<sup>9</sup>

Americans also tend to favor having the United Nations take the lead in peacekeeping. In polling conducted by the World Values Survey, U.S. respondents were offered three options for structuring international peacekeeping efforts. A large plurality (50 percent) of respondents said that policies regarding peacekeeping efforts should be made at the level of the United Nations, while smaller percentages of respondents were split between policymaking by regional organizations or national governments. This was in line with global attitudes, as publics in twenty-eight of the forty-three countries polled also indicated that the United Nations should decide policies regarding international peacekeeping efforts (2005-2008).<sup>10</sup>

The U.S. public also believes that U.S. financial support to the United Nations for its peacekeeping efforts is important. More than two-thirds of respondents (69 percent) said it was “important and worthwhile,” while 24 percent said it was “a waste of resources” (Public Agenda 2006).<sup>11</sup> Only 32 percent of respondents said that the United States spends “too much” on international peacekeeping efforts, while six in ten said the United States spends not enough (25 percent) or about the right amount (35 percent) (Kaiser 2004).<sup>12</sup>

Americans have continued to express confidence in the effectiveness of the United Nations in peacekeeping, even when U.S.-UN relations hit a low point over the Iraq War. In April 2003, a poll by the *Wall Street Journal*/NBC News asked Americans, “Based on its role in the recent Iraq conflict, do you think that the United Nations can effectively function as an international peacekeeping force?” Fifty percent of those polled said that the United Nations “can function effectively” and 42 percent said that the United Nations “cannot function effectively.”<sup>13</sup> This is surprisingly strong support, given the timing of the poll and the unfavorable ratings the United Nations was receiving during this same period.

In 1999, the International Committee of the Red Cross sponsored a study asking respondents residing in four permanent members of the UN Security Council (United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France) whether UN peacekeeping operations were making things better, worse, or not making a difference. A slight majority of Americans (52 percent) believed that operations were making things better, 28 percent said that they made no difference, and 15 percent said that peacekeeping operations were making things worse. The level of positive responses was close to the average among all of the permanent members polled (54 percent), and also similar to public perceptions in the countries receiving peacekeeping forces (51 percent).<sup>14-15</sup>

*Participation in Military Operations to Prevent and Respond to Violent Conflict*

**A large majority in the United States approves in principle of participating in peacekeeping. As a general rule, support is strong for participation in post-conflict situations, but less consistent when it comes to intervening in civil conflict. In the recent past, Americans have expressed support for contributing U.S. troops to military operations in the Balkans, southern Lebanon, Haiti, and Liberia. A slight majority has also favored contributing to a UN operation to keep peace between India and Pakistan.**

When Americans are asked about the broader principle of contributing to peacekeeping missions, support tends to be quite high. A large majority (78 percent) believes that the United States should participate, if asked by the United Nations, in a UN international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world. Only 19 percent of respondents say it should not (CCGA 2004).<sup>16</sup>

The modest polling evidence available suggests that, if anything, the U.S. public prefers the United Nations over the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a vehicle for using U.S. military force. In July 2000, the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) asked, "As a general rule, when it is necessary for the United States to use military force, do you think it is best for the United States to act as part of a United Nations operation, act as part of a NATO operation, or act on its own?" A 49-percent plurality preferred the United States to act as part of a UN operation, 26 percent preferred NATO, and only 17 percent preferred unilateral action.<sup>17</sup>

**Support for Types of Missions**

American public support tends to be very strong for missions to intervene in genocidal situations. A 2010 CCGA poll found 72 percent of Americans favored contributing U.S. troops to **"stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people."** In 2008, this number was roughly similar at 69 percent.<sup>18</sup>

A 2004 German Marshall Fund (GMF) poll asked several countries about contributing **peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended**. A majority of U.S. respondents (66 percent) approved of this use of military forces, while 29 percent disapproved. European support was quite a bit higher, with an average of 77 percent expressing approval and 17 percent expressing disapproval.<sup>19</sup>

Asked about deploying troops to provide **food and medical assistance to victims of war**, a large majority of Americans (81 percent) approved, while 16 percent disapproved. While U.S. support was high, it was still less than the average level of European approval (89 percent).<sup>20</sup>

When the proposed military action requires intervention in a situation of ongoing violence, public support is much lower, both in the United States and Europe. When questioned about contributing **"to stop the fighting in a civil war"** (GMF 2004), a plurality of Americans (49 percent) opposed sending the U.S. military to stop civil war violence, while 38 percent approved. In contrast, Europeans expressed modest support, with an average of 62 percent of respondents approving the use of European forces.<sup>21</sup>

Americans do favor, on the other hand, using their military forces **to remove a government that abuses human rights**. Asked about this scenario, a majority of Americans (57 percent) approved, while 36 percent disapproved. European attitudes were often mixed across countries, but an average of 53 percent approved and 39 percent disapproved.<sup>22</sup>

**Support for Specific Missions**

In the 2007 GMF survey, respondents were asked about deploying troops to maintain peace and order in the **post-conflict Balkans**. A modest majority of Americans (54 percent) were in favor, while 38 percent were opposed. Support was higher in the twelve European nations polled (where an average of 65 percent approved and 29 percent disapproved).<sup>23</sup>

Similarly, a 2007 GMF international poll asked about the deployment of a country's troops **to monitor and support a ceasefire in southern Lebanon** following the 2006 Lebanon War. A majority of U.S. respondents were also in favor of

such a deployment (55 percent), which was in line with the European average (58 percent).<sup>24</sup> Another 2006 CNN poll found 51-percent support for having U.S. troops be part of an international peacekeeping force on the border between Israel and Lebanon.<sup>25</sup> However, when asked about sending in a peacekeeping force “to end the fighting between Israel and the Hezbollah militants in Lebanon” (emphasis added) only 32 percent favored sending U.S. troops for this purpose, though six in ten favored sending UN troops (CBS/*New York Times* 2006).<sup>26</sup>

In 2004, Americans were asked whether it was necessary for the United States to have sent peacekeeping forces to Haiti. A modest majority (52 percent) said it was and 28 percent said it was not (Fox 2004).<sup>27</sup>

In 2003, a large majority (61 percent) of Americans polled favored the participation of U.S. troops in an international peacekeeping force in Liberia, while 33 percent were opposed (CNN/*USA Today*).<sup>28</sup> An NBC/*Wall Street Journal* poll also found that 58 percent of U.S. respondents approved of “sending a thousand American soldiers to Liberia as part of a UN peacekeeping force.”<sup>29</sup>

In 2010, slightly fewer than half of Americans (49 percent) favored contributing U.S. troops to “enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians” (CCGA). When asked in 2008 this number was a slight majority (52 percent).<sup>30</sup>

Finally, in 2004, 51 percent of Americans favored contributing U.S. troops to a “UN-sponsored force to keep the peace between India and Pakistan.” Two years later, when the reference to the United Nations was removed, support dropped to 40 percent.<sup>31</sup>

### *Syria’s Crisis*

**Americans express concern about the Syrian situation and support the removal of the Syrian regime as a U.S. foreign policy goal. Large majorities support the United States taking part in international sanctions against Syria and providing humanitarian aid. Six in ten support establishing a no-fly zone over Syria. Two thirds approve of the idea of the Arab League and Turkey establishing safe havens for civilians inside Syria. Half approve of the United States providing air cover for such safe havens. While initially most opposed providing arms and supplies to the opposition, views are now divided. Sending U.S. troops gets only low support.**

Concern about Syria’s crisis extends to a large majority of the American public. When asked “how concerned they are about the situation in Syria,” seven in ten expressed concern in an August 2012 CNN poll (29 percent very concerned, 43 percent somewhat concerned).<sup>32</sup>

Two thirds (65 percent) said “the removal of the Syrian regime from power” is an important U.S. foreign policy goal. However only 19 percent said it was very important (not too important, 18 percent; not important at all, 15 percent).<sup>33</sup>

A very large majority favors U.S. participation in sanctions against Syria. In the June 2012 poll by CCGA, 63 percent supported the United States and its allies increasing diplomatic and economic sanctions on Syria.<sup>34</sup> A little earlier, a March 2012 PIPA poll gave respondents a brief description of the situation in Syria, telling them that “the Arab League, a group of 21 countries in the region, has taken an active role in trying to deal with the conflict,” and that the League has imposed economic sanctions on Syria, in which the United States has joined, as have other countries. Seven in ten (71%) supported the United States participating in sanctions.<sup>35</sup>

An overwhelming majority supports providing humanitarian aid to Syrians. A Fox News poll described the situation in Syria and asked whether the United States should provide humanitarian aid. Eighty-two percent said the United States should, with 14 percent opposed (Fox News, March 2012).<sup>36</sup> When the option of humanitarian aid is pitted against others—either taking military action, or noninvolvement—humanitarian aid is still the most popular. NBC/*Wall Street Journal* (March 2012) told respondents that “Syrian civilians have been killed by their government in response to protests” and that “the U.S. is taking diplomatic and economic measures to try to stop the Syrian government from taking military action against its citizens.” It then asked respondents to choose one of four options, and the most popular was providing

humanitarian aid (48 percent), followed by taking no action (25 percent), taking military action (13 percent), or providing weapons to the opposition (11 percent).<sup>37</sup>

There is public support for using air power over Syria in order to create a no-fly zone. CCGA (June 2012) asked respondents whether they would support the United States and its allies enforcing a no-fly zone over the country; 58 percent said that they would.<sup>38</sup>

However, when air cover is presented as taking sides in the conflict, this does not elicit majority support. In August 2012 CNN asked about “the U.S. and other countries using military airplanes and missiles to try to establish zones inside Syria where the opposition forces would be safe from attacks by the Syrian government.” (Such zones would not fit within the meaning of “safe havens,” because they would not be intended for noncombatants.) This question received a divided response (46 percent in favor, 49 percent opposed).<sup>39</sup> Fox News (March 2012) asked whether the U.S. should “provide air support to protect the anti-government groups”; 51 percent said no (yes, 37 percent). Another Fox question in the same poll pushed the issue further by asking whether the United States should “launch U.S. air strikes to try to oust the Syrian government; 68 percent were opposed.”<sup>40</sup>

There is also majority support for the idea of the Arab League sponsoring safe havens for civilians. Respondents were told that “Members of the Arab League and Turkey are considering establishing safe havens on the border areas inside Syria to provide Syrians who are at risk of being attacked by government forces a place to retreat. Other nations would need to provide military aid to protect them.” Respondents were also introduced to the debate as follows: “Some say this would violate Syria’s sovereignty, while others say that the international community has the responsibility to protect Syrians at risk.” Two thirds (67 percent) thought it was a good idea for the Arab League and Turkey to establish safe havens inside Syrian borders, while 27 percent thought it was not a good idea (PIPA, March 2012).<sup>41</sup>

PIPA then asked respondents to assume that the Arab League also requests U.S. help in defending these havens, asking them to consider three different forms of potential military assistance: to provide air cover with U.S. planes; to provide weapons; or to send U.S. troops. On providing air cover for safe havens, about half (48 percent) said the United States should be willing, though almost as many (45 percent) disagreed. Interestingly, a 54 percent majority of both Republicans and Democrats favored the idea, while a plurality of independents was opposed (47 to 34 percent).<sup>42</sup> Only 37 percent of Americans supported the idea of helping the defense of possible safe havens by providing weapons; 56 percent were opposed.<sup>43</sup> Three quarters (77 percent) of the entire sample rejected sending U.S. troops to defend the safe havens.<sup>44</sup>

While initially majorities opposed providing arms and supplies to the opposition views are now divided. In August 2012, CNN/ORC asked whether “the U.S. and other countries” should send “weapons and other military supplies to the opposition forces” and found the public divided, with 48 percent in favor and 47 percent opposed. In earlier months, though, clear majorities were opposed to supplying weapons and materiel.<sup>45</sup>

As recently as June 2012, when CCGA asked whether respondents would support the United States and its allies “sending arms and supplies to anti-government groups in Syria,” two thirds (67 percent) opposed it.<sup>46</sup> In response to very similar questions, Pew (March 2012) found 63 percent opposed with 29 percent in favor;<sup>47</sup> Fox News in the same month found 64 percent opposed (25 percent in favor).<sup>48</sup> Views are evenly divided about the Arab League providing weapons. PIPA asked if it would be a good idea for Arab League member states to provide weapons to Syrian opposition forces: 45 percent of Americans were in favor with 48 percent opposed.<sup>49</sup> Asked about the United States contributing weapons if the Arab League were to decide to do so and ask for American help, 66 percent were opposed.<sup>50</sup>

In general the idea of the United States contributing troops garners very low support. CNN in August 2012 found only 32 percent support (64 percent opposed) the United States and allies “using ground troops to try to establish zones” where opposition forces could not be attacked.<sup>51</sup> When CCGA in June 2012 proposed the United States and allies simply “sending troops into Syria”, four out of five Americans opposed this prospect (81 to 14 percent).<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Fox News (March 2012) asked about simply “put[ting] U.S. troops on the ground” in Syria; 78 percent were opposed.<sup>53</sup>

According to Pentagon doctrine, the enforcement of a no-fly zone requires the destruction of air defenses as a first step. In response to a poll that presented the option of the United States and its allies “bombing Syrian air defenses” without this context, (CCGA June 2012) seventy-two percent said they would not support this step, while 22 percent were in favor.<sup>54</sup>

### *Libya Intervention*

**Looking back on the multilateral military action in Libya, a clear majority thinks that undertaking it was the right decision. Before military action began, following the passage of in March 2011, majorities supported a no-fly zone and increased sanctions. Large majorities also supported a multilateral approach, with the United States not taking a dominant role. A modest majority supported the use of force as part of the NATO mission to enforce the UN resolution. Most Americans opposed arming the rebels or sending ground troops. As military action continued in spring and summer without definitive victories by the rebels, opinion became somewhat negative for a time, with majorities declining to say the actions were the “right thing” and a plurality disapproving of the coalition’s military action.**

In March 2012—five months after the official end of the multilateral military action in Libya—when respondents were asked: “All things considered, do you think that the U.S. and its allies made the right decision or the wrong decision to conduct military airstrikes in Libya?” 56 percent said it was the right decision, while 33 percent called it the wrong decision. The same question was asked four times by Pew over the course of hostilities, and each time elicited plurality support but not majority support. In the first two weeks of the mission, March-April 2011, support was 47 and 50 percent (wrong decision, 36-37%). By September 2011 support was 44 percent with 33 percent disagreeing, and an unusually high 23 percent unsure.<sup>55</sup> After the toppling of the Qaddafi regime, the public appears to have reassessed the intervention more positively.

The conflict in Libya began after the government led by President Muammar Qaddafi responded violently to protests in January and February 2011. The violence escalated toward civil war in March. As Libyan government forces advanced on the main rebel stronghold of Benghazi, Qaddafi was quoted in the press as saying that “[for those who resist] there will be no mercy or compassion” and “we will march to purge Libya inch by inch, house by house, alley by alley.” This led to an international atmosphere of concern in which many Western countries, as well as the Arab League, actively supported UN Security Council action to intervene to protect civilians in the conflict.

On March 17, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1973 by a 10-0 vote (with five abstentions). The resolution “demand[ed] the immediate establishment of a cease-fire and a complete end to violence and all attacks against, and abuses of, civilians” and “authorized Member States... to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in [Libya], including Benghazi, while excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory.” Other measures included a no-fly zone, arms embargo, and freeze of Libyan government assets. The United States and European allies then began a series of military strikes in Libya, soon organized as a NATO operation.

Before military action began, a majority of Americans polled supported a no-fly zone provided the action would be multilateral and no ground troops would be involved. Fifty-six percent favored “an area patrolled by military planes from the U.S. and other countries to prevent Ghaddafi from using his air force. No U.S. ground troops would be involved but U.S. airplanes or missiles might be used to shoot down Libyan air planes or attack ground bases” (40% opposed; CNN, March 2011). In the same poll 54 percent favored “the US and other countries using planes and missiles to directly attack Ghaddafi’s troops in Libya” (43% opposed).<sup>56</sup> In a Pew poll, increased economic and diplomatic sanctions received the support of a slim majority (51 percent). Sixty-nine percent opposed sending arms and supplies to the rebels, a finding that remained consistent (66 percent) in a later March poll after the intervention began.<sup>57</sup> Opposition to the use of ground troops on Libyan soil was also strong before (82 percent) and after (76 percent) the entrance of the United States into the hostilities (Pew and CNN respectively).<sup>58</sup>

Americans have consistently recognized and supported the international nature of the mission and have backed the Obama administration policy of taking a supporting rather than a leading role. Asked in March 2011 before the passage of

UNSCR 1973, 74 percent of Americans supported leaving the leading role to “international organizations or allies such as Great Britain or France to take the leading role in Libya.”<sup>59</sup> In April of the same year, 82 percent said they would rather see the U.S. “support the military forces of other countries in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) but not take a leading role.”<sup>60</sup> Later that month after military action began, Pew asked whether the U.S. was “leading the military action in Libya, or is the US just one of a coalition of countries that are involved,” and 57 percent were aware that the U.S. was not leading the military action.<sup>61</sup>

When CBS News asked respondents immediately after military action began about “the U.S. military and other countries’ ...cruise missile and air strikes in Libya in order to protect civilians from attacks by Qaddafi's forces,” 68 percent approved and 26 percent disapproved. This initial peak of support, which is typical at the start of military actions, had declined 14 points by April; a Sadat Chair/PIPA poll asked the CBS question once again and 54 percent approved while 43 percent disapproved. The Sadat/PIPA poll then asked if respondents would support “providing arms to the Libyan rebels...if the air campaign does not succeed in protecting civilians from attacks by Qaddafi’s forces,” and found a majority (59 percent) who disapproved.<sup>62</sup>

Asked in May by CNN whether they favored or opposed “the limited use of military force by the United States in Libya as part of the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) mission to enforce United Nations resolutions,” 54 percent of Americans were in favor (43% opposed).<sup>63</sup>

One source of confusion about the objectives in the conflict has been the ambiguity about whether the removal of Qaddafi from power was authorized under the UN mandate and whether it should have been a goal of the U.S. and its allies. CNN found consistent majorities who said “the removal of Moammar Gadhafi from power in Libya” should be an important goal of the United States. In May 2011, 31 percent said this was “very important” and 37 percent said it was “somewhat important.”<sup>64</sup> When asked in a straight-up fashion whether they favored or opposed “taking increased military action against Libya to remove Moammar Gadhafi from power”, 55 percent of Americans were in favor (Associated Press/Gfk, March 2011). However, when this option was presented as a choice between focusing on protecting civilians or removing Qaddafi by Pew in March 2011, opinion was divided: 46 favored the aim of the mission being removing Qaddafi and 43 percent favored focusing on the protection of non-combatants.<sup>65</sup>

Opinion on the mission as it continued became somewhat negative. In April 2011, a plurality (45 percent) said it was the right decision to conduct military air strikes in Libya (Pew).<sup>66</sup> When asked by CBS News/New York Times in June 2011 if the United States was doing the right thing in Libya or should not be involved, 59 percent said the United States should not be taking part.<sup>67</sup> Gallup in June 2011 found a plurality (46 percent) that disapproved of “current US military actions against Libya”.<sup>68</sup>

The lack of any strong public position on the conflict during this phase may have been due to confusion on the goals of the intervention. At its outset, 58 percent said that U.S. President Barack Obama had not clearly stated the goals of the military mission in Libya (Quinnipiac University, March 2011). Concordantly, 57 percent told Pew that same month that they did not believe the United States and its allies had a clear goal.<sup>69</sup> Confusion about the objectives of the conflict did not subside: In a June 2011 Fox News poll, two-thirds (67 percent) said the Obama administration had not “explained what the United States is trying to achieve in Libya.”<sup>70</sup>

### *War in Afghanistan*

**A majority of Americans thinks that the original decision to send military forces to Afghanistan was the right thing to do. However, majorities now say that the costs have not been worth the benefits and that it has not made the US safer from terrorism.**

**Nonetheless, majorities do not call for the immediate withdrawal of US troops. A very large majority approves the Obama administration’s policy of drawing down troop levels in Afghanistan, with a full exit taking place in 2014. The numbers calling for this withdrawal to occur at a faster pace increased after the killings of a US sergeant in March, but in most polls and in the most recent poll less than half want to expedite withdrawal. Less than one in four would like to slow the pace or to stay until Afghan stability is achieved.**

**Several factors may be diminishing support for the operation. Clear majorities are pessimistic about the ultimate success of the operation, majorities now believe that most Afghans are opposed to the US's efforts in Afghanistan, and there is substantial dissatisfaction with the level of multilateral support.**

### **Evaluating the War**

A majority thinks that the original decision to send military forces to Afghanistan was the right thing to do; a lesser four in ten think it was a mistake. However, majorities question whether the costs have been worth the benefits.

Gallup asked in March 2012: “Looking back, do you think sending troops to Afghanistan was the right thing or the wrong thing for the U.S. to do?” Fifty-nine percent called it the right thing and 35 percent the wrong thing to do.<sup>71</sup> A similar PIPA/Sadat Chair question in August 2011 found a similar result, with 57 percent saying the U.S. “made the right decision” in going to war and 38 percent saying the U.S. “made a mistake.”<sup>72</sup>

Gallup has asked over the years: “Thinking now about the U.S. military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?” In May 2011 (shortly after the successful raid that killed Osama bin Laden), 58 percent said the original mission was not a mistake (mistake, 39 percent).<sup>73</sup> In March 2011, this view was at 53 percent, with 42 percent calling it a mistake. (At the beginning of the war in November 2001, 89 percent said the Afghanistan intervention was not a mistake.)

When asked by CCGA in 2010 if eliminating terrorist threats from Afghanistan is a worthwhile goal for U.S. troops to fight and possibly die for, 59 percent said they believed it is. Two-fifths (37 percent) said that they believed that it is not a worthwhile goal.<sup>74</sup>

### *Considering Costs and Benefits*

On whether the costs have been worth the benefits of the Afghanistan war, the Chicago Council on Global Affairs asked in June 2012 whether ““all in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting, or not?” and found a two-to-one margin saying it has not been worth fighting (67 percent to 32 percent).<sup>75</sup>

While this is the largest majority recorded since this question was first asked in September 2009, it is only a little larger than at some earlier points—for example, March 2011 (64 percent to 31 percent). Majorities first began consistently calling it not worth fighting in April 2010.<sup>76</sup>

The Afghanistan war is not perceived by most Americans as having lowered the likelihood of terrorist incidents in the United States. CCGA in June 2012 found that only three in ten saying that it had made the U.S. safer (30 percent) that military action in Afghanistan had made the US safer from terrorism. Nearly seven in ten said it made “no difference” (51 percent) or had made the US less safe (18%).<sup>77</sup>

Most likely it is these assessments that lead majorities to say that they oppose the war in Afghanistan. An AP-GfK poll in May 2012 found 66 percent saying that they oppose the war.<sup>78</sup> A March 2012 CNN/ORC poll found 72 percent saying they are opposed.<sup>79</sup> But based on other polling it should not be interpreted as calling for immediate withdrawal of troops.

### **Attitudes about Continued Troop Presence**

A very large majority approves the Obama administration’s policy of drawing down troop levels in Afghanistan, with a full exit taking place in 2014. In February 2012 Gallup asked whether, “thinking about the following decisions of the Obama administration,” respondents approved of “the drawdown of U.S. troops from Afghanistan.” A very large 79 percent approved (56 percent strongly).<sup>80</sup> A PIPA/Sadat Chair survey in August 2011 found a similar 69 percent who approved of “the Obama administration’s policy,” described more fully as “to gradually turn over the fight in Afghanistan

to the Afghan army and government, reduce US forces in stages, and try to bring the Taliban into negotiations.” Only 25 percent disapproved.<sup>81</sup> In a more recent April 2012 Fox News poll that did not mention the Obama plan specifically or anything about the timing, nearly four in five (78 percent) said they approved of withdrawing U.S. military troops from Afghanistan.<sup>82</sup>

Polls have varied on the question of whether the pace of withdrawal should be sped up, but most polls and the most recent poll do not have majorities calling for a speed up.

The most recent case is a June 2012 CCGA poll. It told respondents that “currently the U.S. is scheduled to withdraw combat forces from Afghanistan by 2014” and asked whether the U.S. should withdraw all of its combat troops before the deadline; bring all of its combat troops home as scheduled by 2014; or leave some combat troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014. The largest number (44 percent) preferred to keep to the 2014 schedule; a lesser 38 percent wanted to exceed the deadline; and 17 percent wanted to leave some combat troops.<sup>83</sup>

Three polls asked the question in March 2012 and got varied results. Support for a faster withdrawal ranged from 44 to 55 percent. CBS/New York Times told respondents that “the U.S. is expected to withdraw about a third of its troops in Afghanistan by the end of 2012 and all of its troops by the end of 2014” and offered three positions on this. The most commonly chosen option (44 percent) was: “the U.S. should withdraw all of its troops sooner, and not wait until the end of 2014”; one in three chose to keep the current timetable; while just 17 percent said it should “stay in Afghanistan for as long as it takes to stabilize the situation there.”<sup>84</sup> In the same month USA Today/Gallup asked “which would you prefer to see happen—for the U.S. to stick to its timetable...speed up its withdrawal...or keep troops in Afghanistan as long as it takes to accomplish its goals?” Half (50 percent) preferred to see a faster withdrawal, while 24 percent wanted to stick to the timetable and 21 percent chose the open-ended option.<sup>85</sup> Similarly CNN found 55 percent who “would rather see” the U.S. remove all of its troops earlier than 2014 (“wait until 2014,” 22 percent; “keep some troops...beyond 2014,” 22 percent).<sup>86</sup>

Polling suggests that public views on Afghanistan may have been sharply affected by the high-profile news of killings of civilians by an American sergeant (March 12, 2012), as previous polling showed lower numbers wanting to speed up withdrawal. In February 2012, Pew asked whether “Obama is removing US troops from Afghanistan too quickly, not quickly enough, or is he handling this about right?” Only 22 percent said it was not quick enough, while 53 percent majority called the pace about right and 20 percent said it was too quick. , while nearly equal numbers said it was too quick (20 percent) or not quick enough (22 percent).<sup>87</sup> (Interestingly, the killings of US troops by uniformed Afghan soldiers, which were sporadic through January and February, did not seem to have triggered increased desire for early withdrawal.)

There is little support for leaving behind a residual force for counter-terrorism and training. In May 2012, an NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll asked respondents about maintaining a troop presence for ten years after 2014 in order to “continue in targeted counter-terrorism efforts and training of Afghan troops.” A majority (53 percent) disapproved of the proposal, 38 percent strongly.<sup>88</sup> Furthermore, a June 2012 CCGA poll found, when asked about military bases in the countries of several strategic allies, 54% for Americans opposed bases in Afghanistan.<sup>89</sup>

When offered a choice between an open-ended stay in Afghanistan or removing troops, a majority inclines toward reductions (though the phrase “removing troops” is not clear--it may be understood by respondents either as reductions or as withdrawal). At the start of 2012, a Pew question that offered the two options—“remove troops as soon as possible,” or “keep military troops in Afghanistan until the situation has stabilized”—found a 56 percent majority supporting removing troops (January).<sup>90</sup> It should be noted this question makes no reference to the troops from other countries in the NATO or ISAF frameworks.

In mid-2011 less than half wanted complete withdrawal. A PIPA/Sadat Chair poll (August 2011) found 73 percent favoring some downscaling of US troop presence, but only 44 percent called for complete withdrawal (29 percent favored reductions). Twenty-three percent favored increasing the number of troops (8 percent) or keeping the same number as there at the time (15 percent).<sup>91</sup>

In the same period, a June 2011 GMF poll found only about a third wanting to fully withdraw when it offered four alternatives—fully withdraw, reduce, maintain, or increase troop levels. . Sixty-six percent wanted to scale down, with 35 percent wanting withdraw all troops and 31 percent wanting to reduce. Thirty-one percent wanted to either maintain (6 percent) or increase (25 percent) troop levels. In the same poll, 55 percent of Americans approved of Obama’s handling of the stabilization of Afghanistan, while 39 percent disapproved. An average of 12 European countries showed similar results, with 51 percent expressing approval and 39 percent disapproval.<sup>92</sup>

### **Pessimism About Ultimate Success**

One of the factors that may contributing to the desire to disengage is that majorities do not view the war as generally successful, and doubt that Afghanistan can be stabilized. This sense that the war is not going well has been prevalent for several years. In general, public willingness to keep, increase or lower troop levels shifts in tandem with public expectations of success. Strikingly, though, in Afghanistan’s case there have been long periods of majority willingness to maintain troop levels at the same time as a majority was pessimistic about how the war was going. In spring 2012 a burst of negative news from Afghanistan seems to have driven down both willingness to maintain troop levels and assessments of the war.

Broadly speaking, a majority does not see the war as a success. CBS/New York Times asked in March 2012: “Regardless of whether you think taking military action in Afghanistan was the right thing to do, would you say the war in Afghanistan has been mostly a success for the United States, or not?” Fifty-nine percent thought it has not been a success, while 29 percent thought it has and another 6 percent volunteered that the results had been mixed.<sup>93</sup>

A majority of Americans are pessimistic on the future prospects of “stabilizing the situation in Afghanistan”. In mid-2011 57 percent of Americans said they were pessimistic, while 40 percent said they were optimistic (GMF, June 2011). Americans were still slightly less negative than Europeans, however. In the average of 12 countries, 66 percent of Europeans expressed pessimism and 28 percent expressed optimism. Pessimism increased from a previous 2010 survey by 8 points in the United States (57 percent, up from 49 percent) and remained about the same in the European average.<sup>94</sup>

However a May 2010 Associated Press poll found a plurality saying that the operation was helping to create democracy in Afghanistan. It asked respondents whether they thought the continued presence of U.S. troops in Afghanistan was doing more to help or hurt “Afghanistan’s efforts to become a stable democracy.” Nearly half (48 percent) said U.S. troops were doing more to help, while 36 percent said their presence was doing more to hurt.<sup>95</sup>

### **Beliefs about Afghans’ Attitudes**

Another factor potentially suppressing support for the war effort is that a majority now thinks most Afghans are opposed to the U.S.’s efforts in Afghanistan.

In an ABC/Washington Post in April 2012 asked, “Considering everything, do you think most Afghans support or oppose what the United States is trying to do in Afghanistan?” Three in five (62 percent) thought most Afghans were opposed; only 22 percent thought most Afghans were in support.<sup>96</sup>

Asked in June 2012 by CCGA whether most Afghans wanted NATO troops to remain for now or to leave now, three in five (61 percent) said they thought most Afghans wanted NATO to depart; 36 percent thought most Afghans wanted NATO to stay.

This is a dramatic increase from 2010—likely due to the number of Afghan attacks on US troops. In a 2010 poll by CCGA, Americans were split in their perceptions of Afghan public opinion— just 47 percent believed that people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to leave now while the same number believed that people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to remain for now.<sup>97</sup>

Perceptions about Afghan public opinion in the CCGA poll appeared to be quite influential in shaping opinions on withdrawal. In 2012, among those who believed most Afghans wanted NATO troops to remain, 74 percent favored maintaining a combat troop presence at least two years or longer, while a quarter (26%) favored immediate withdrawal. This is down 16 points from 2010, when 90% favored maintaining troops at least two years or longer. Among those who believed Afghans wanted NATO troops to withdraw immediately, many fewer--55 percent--favored maintaining a troop presence for at least two years or longer, while 45 percent favored withdrawing troops right away.

### **Dissatisfaction with Multilateral Participation**

Since public support for military action is typically related to perceptions that the action is multilateral, it is noteworthy that the public feels that robust multilateral participation is lacking in Afghanistan. In April 2009, CNN found a very large 78 percent thought “other countries that are allies of the United States” are “not doing enough to help the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan.”<sup>98</sup>

### ***Intervention in Darfur***

**Many Americans feel that the United Nations has the responsibility, rather than simply the right, to intervene in Darfur. Approximately three out of four Americans has expressed a readiness to contribute U.S. troops to an international force to stop the killing and support a humanitarian operation in Darfur.**

A plurality of U.S. respondents (48 percent) said that the UN Security Council has a responsibility to intervene to stop the killing in Darfur, 35 percent said it has a right, but not a responsibility, while 11 percent said that it does not have a right to authorize intervention (CCGA 2006). Overall, the sense of moral obligation to intervene appears stronger in the United States than in other countries polled. On average across fifteen countries, 35 percent of respondents thought the UN had a responsibility to intervene, 27 percent thought it had the right but not a responsibility, and 15 percent thought it did not have the right (WPO/CCGA).<sup>99</sup>

In a 2010 CCGA poll, Americans were asked whether they favored or opposed contributing U.S. troops as part of an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur. A majority of the U.S. public (56 percent) favored contributing troops, while 40 percent were opposed. This was a considerable decrease in support from 2006 when media attention on Darfur was significantly higher, and 65 percent were in favor and 28 were opposed. As part of the 2006 poll, ten other countries were polled and on average across all eleven countries polled on the question was 55 percent in favor and 30 percent opposed (WPO/CCGA).<sup>100</sup>

Other polling has found similar results. In a 2007 CNN poll, 61 percent of U.S. respondents favored sending U.S. ground troops as part of an international peacekeeping force in Darfur (32 percent were opposed).<sup>101</sup> A GMF survey the same year also found 75 percent of Americans support the deployment of U.S. troops to provide humanitarian assistance in Darfur. Europeans expressed nearly identical support (76 percent) for sending their respective country’s troops as part of an international relief mission.<sup>102</sup>

### ***Preference for Using U.S. Military Force as Part of UN Operation***

**Americans show significant resistance to using U.S. military force without UN approval except in self-defense or when vital interests are at stake. Even when it comes to defending other countries from aggression, Americans show reluctance to do so except as part of a UN operation. Support is quite strong for contributing U.S. troops to UN peacekeeping operations.**

Americans show much greater readiness to use military force when it is part of a UN-sponsored operation, rather than acting alone. In recent years, CCGA has asked specifically about using U.S. troops in the event that North Korea invades South Korea, both under the auspices of a "UN-sponsored effort to reverse the aggression" and, alternatively, without mentioning the United Nations. In 2010, the Chicago Council found that 61 percent of U.S. respondents were in favor of the United States "contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN-sponsored effort to reverse the aggression" if North Korea invaded South Korea (34 percent were opposed). In comparison, only 40 percent favored the

use of U.S. troops "if North Korea invaded South Korea" (without mention of the UN or an international effort) while 56 percent were opposed. This finding—majority support for a UN-sponsored international effort and a more divided response when the scenario makes no mention of the United Nations—was similar when the question was asked previously in 2002, 2004, and 2006.<sup>103</sup>

The clear preference for the use of force within the context of an international effort also extends to other scenarios. In 2002, CCGA asked whether U.S. troops should be used if Iraq were to invade Saudi Arabia. While 77 percent favored the United States contributing troops to a "UN-sponsored effort" together with other countries (18 percent opposed), only 48 percent favored using U.S. troops when the United Nations was not mentioned (46 percent were opposed).<sup>104</sup>

Majorities have also consistently rejected the use of U.S. troops in other scenarios where a United Nations or international effort is not mentioned, including if China were to invade Taiwan and if "Arab forces" were to invade Israel (except in the scenario that Iran were to invade Israel, in which case 53 percent would favor the use of U.S. troops) (CCGA 2006).<sup>105</sup> In 2010, 71 percent of Americans opposed the use of U.S. troops if China invaded Taiwan—up from 65 percent in 2008. When asked in 2010 if they favored or opposed the use of U.S. troops "if Israel were attacked by its neighbors," Americans were divided: 50 percent opposed deploying U.S. troops while 47 percent favored this.<sup>106</sup>

Earlier polls also found a strong preference for the United States to use military force through the United Nations over acting alone. When presented with a series of arguments in an April 1995 PIPA poll (when the UN operation in Bosnia was not going well), 89 percent agreed with the position, "When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is generally best for the U.S. to address the problem together with other nations working through the UN, rather than going it alone."

This attitude was sustained even in the face of a strong counterargument that the United States would be more successful acting on its own, with 29 percent of U.S. respondents agreeing with and 66 percent rejecting the argument, "When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is better for the United States to act on its own rather than working through the UN because the United States can move more quickly and probably more successfully."<sup>107</sup>

### *The Responsibility to Participate in NATO and EU Military Operations*

**When NATO decides to take a military action, the U.S. public believes that all NATO members should contribute troops and, if not, at least contribute financially. U.S. support for such a shared contribution is exceptionally higher than that expressed in other NATO member countries.**

Respondents were asked, "To what extent do you tend to agree that *all* NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decides to take military action?" (GMF 2008). An overwhelming majority (82 percent) of Americans said all should, while on average, only 57 percent of Europeans agreed.<sup>108</sup> When publics in the United States and other NATO countries were asked whether they agreed that all NATO members "should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops," responses were essentially the same.<sup>109</sup>

<sup>1</sup> **Pew Global Attitudes Project 2010**

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with it:

It is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.

	Completely agree	Mostly agree	Mostly disagree	Completely disagree	DK/Refused
<b>United States</b>	30	47	13	7	3
<b>Britain</b>	23	50	14	10	3
<b>France</b>	19	38	20	23	0
<b>Germany</b>	13	33	29	25	0
<b>Spain</b>	10	45	28	15	2
<b>Poland</b>	15	46	24	10	5
<b>Russia</b>	23	38	26	9	5
<b>Turkey</b>	20	29	21	23	8
<b>Egypt</b>	12	27	32	27	2
<b>Jordan</b>	11	24	38	26	2
<b>Lebanon</b>	20	38	23	18	0
<b>China</b>	20	40	29	8	4
<b>India</b>	54	38	5	2	2
<b>Indonesia</b>	26	46	19	7	1
<b>Japan</b>	13	44	25	17	1
<b>Pakistan</b>	40	33	7	4	16
<b>South Korea</b>	11	45	34	7	3
<b>Argentina</b>	16	30	16	32	5
<b>Brazil</b>	43	35	12	9	2
<b>Mexico</b>	29	44	15	9	4
<b>Kenya</b>	30	36	13	19	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	28	33	20	16	3
<b>Average</b>	23	38	21	14	3

**Pew Global Attitudes Project May 2007**

As I read another list of statements, for each one, please tell me whether you completely agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or completely disagree with it:

It is sometimes necessary to use military force to maintain order in the world.

	Completely Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Completely Disagree	DK/NR
<b>United States</b>	35	42	14	6	3
<b>Canada</b>	26	45	17	10	2
<b>Argentina</b>	17	35	18	22	8
<b>Bolivia</b>	23	39	22	10	5
<b>Brazil</b>	42	42	10	5	1
<b>Chile</b>	24	36	23	12	5
<b>Mexico</b>	20	52	20	5	3
<b>Peru</b>	26	39	18	9	7

Venezuela	21	51	19	8	0
Britain	19	48	19	9	5
France	26	41	18	15	0
Germany	11	30	29	29	1
Italy	25	48	15	7	6
Spain	11	54	18	9	9
Sweden	37	38	11	10	4
Bulgaria	13	21	26	25	15
Czech Republic	23	39	22	14	1
Poland	16	40	26	11	7
Russia	21	40	21	10	8
Slovakia	16	31	28	23	2
Ukraine	16	36	27	17	6
Turkey	36	38	13	6	6
Egypt	14	26	30	29	2
Jordan	12	25	29	29	5
Kuwait	58	22	6	10	5
Lebanon	21	37	23	15	5
Morocco	24	23	9	12	33
Palestinian Territories	28	31	15	19	7
Israel	39	37	18	4	2
Pakistan	46	26	11	3	14
Bangladesh	57	30	7	4	2
Indonesia	23	51	16	7	3
Malaysia	15	46	20	12	6
China	16	50	22	6	6
India	58	32	7	3	1
Japan	10	50	26	8	6
South Korea	5	38	40	13	4
Ethiopia	24	24	32	18	2
Ghana	26	44	18	11	1
Ivory Coast	44	34	14	8	0
Kenya	41	34	14	10	1
Mali	49	27	17	7	0
Nigeria	40	34	14	9	2
Senegal	36	36	17	9	1
South Africa	31	41	14	8	5
Tanzania	39	22	10	24	4
Uganda	25	29	21	19	6
Average	27	37	19	12	5

<sup>2</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.

	Should	Should not	DK/NR
Mexico	73	17	9
United States	83	13	4
France	85	14	1

---

<b>Russia</b>	64	20	17
<b>Ukraine</b>	69	11	21
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	79	10	11
<b>Egypt</b>	83	17	0
<b>Iran</b>	69	20	12
<b>Israel</b>	83	15	2
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	78	20	2
<b>Turkey</b>	64	16	20
<b>Kenya</b>	90	10	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	88	10	2
<b>China</b>	72	18	9
<b>India</b>	63	28	9
<b>Indonesia</b>	83	7	10
<b>South Korea</b>	74	25	1
<b>Thailand</b>	62	23	15
<b>Average</b>	76	16	8

<sup>3</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: to defend a country that has been attacked

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	65	21	13
<b>United States</b>	83	14	4
<b>France</b>	84	13	3
<b>Russia</b>	70	14	17
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	82	11	7
<b>Egypt</b>	78	22	0
<b>Israel</b>	77	17	6
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	81	17	2
<b>Turkey</b>	68	15	18
<b>Kenya</b>	88	11	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	89	10	1
<b>China</b>	70	18	11
<b>India</b>	66	22	12
<b>Indonesia</b>	71	15	14
<b>South Korea</b>	76	23	1
<b>Thailand</b>	67	14	19
<b>Average</b>	76	16	8

<sup>4</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To stop a country from supporting terrorist groups

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	71	20	9
<b>United States</b>	76	20	3
<b>France</b>	84	16	1
<b>Russia</b>	65	18	17
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	80	10	10

<b>Egypt</b>	81	19	0
<b>Israel</b>	85	12	3
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	61	36	3
<b>Turkey</b>	69	13	17
<b>Kenya</b>	76	22	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	87	11	2
<b>China</b>	67	23	10
<b>India</b>	60	28	11
<b>Indonesia</b>	81	7	13
<b>South Korea</b>	61	38	1
<b>Thailand</b>	71	16	13
<b>Average</b>	73	19	7

<sup>5</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs/WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that the UN Security Council should or should not have the right to authorize the use of military force for each of the following purposes: To restore by force a democratic government that has been overthrown

	<b>Should</b>	<b>Should not</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Mexico</b>	54	30	15
<b>U.S.</b>	57	38	5
<b>France</b>	52	45	3
<b>Russia</b>	35	37	28
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	43	38	19
<b>Egypt</b>	64	36	0
<b>Israel</b>	58	34	7
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	67	30	3
<b>Turkey</b>	43	32	26
<b>Kenya</b>	76	22	2
<b>Nigeria</b>	76	22	3
<b>China</b>	37	45	18
<b>India</b>	51	34	16
<b>Indonesia</b>	51	28	21
<b>South Korea</b>	32	65	2
<b>Thailand</b>	46	29	25
<b>Average</b>	53	35	12

<sup>6</sup> **Harris Poll, October 1999**

Do you agree or disagree with the following?

The old idea of national sovereignty which did not allow foreign interference in the domestic affairs of any country, even if it killed many of its own people, is no longer acceptable and must change.

68%	Agree
22	Disagree
10	Don't know/Refused

<sup>7</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	<b>Has this responsibility</b>	<b>Does not have responsibility</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	72	22	4
<b>2010</b>	66	28	6

#### WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008

Some people say that the UN Security Council has the responsibility to authorize the use of military force to protect people from severe human rights violations such as genocide, even against the will of their own government. Others say that the UN Security Council does not have such a responsibility. Do you think that the UN Security Council does or does not have this responsibility?

	<b>Has this responsibility</b>	<b>Does not have this responsibility</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	48	27	25
<b>United States</b>	74	22	4
<b>Armenia</b>	66	19	16
<b>France</b>	54	39	7
<b>Great Britain</b>	70	22	8
<b>Poland</b>	54	15	31
<b>Russia</b>	48	31	21
<b>Ukraine</b>	40	16	44
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	42	23	35
<b>Egypt</b>	80	20	0
<b>Iran</b>	59	25	16
<b>Israel</b>	64	28	8
<b>Palestinian Territories</b>	69	27	4
<b>Turkey</b>	39	20	40
<b>Kenya</b>	89	8	3
<b>Nigeria</b>	78	18	5
<b>China</b>	76	13	11
<b>India</b>	51	25	25
<b>Indonesia</b>	82	5	14
<b>Thailand</b>	44	22	33
<b>Average</b>	61	21	18

<sup>8</sup> **Pew Global Attitudes Project Poll, May, 2006**

Do you agree or disagree that the US (United States) and other Western powers have a moral obligation to use military force if necessary, to prevent one group of people from committing genocide against another?

77% Agree  
13 Disagree  
10 Don't know/Refused

Do you agree or disagree that the U.S. (United States) and other Western powers have a moral obligation to use military force if necessary, to prevent one group of people from committing genocide against another?

69% Agree  
21 Disagree  
10 Don't know/Refused

<sup>9</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Thinking about specific steps that could be taken to strengthen the United Nations, here are some options that have been proposed. For each one, select if you would favor or oppose this step.

Having a standing UN peacekeeping force selected, trained and commanded by the United Nations

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	48	30	22
<b>Peru</b>	77	19	4
<b>U.S.</b>	72	24	5
<b>Armenia</b>	75	15	10
<b>France</b>	74	25	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	79	17	4
<b>Poland</b>	63	11	26
<b>Russia</b>	58	22	20
<b>Ukraine</b>	54	19	28
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	64	21	14
<b>Egypt</b>	53	47	0
<b>Iran</b>	62	13	25
<b>Israel</b>	64	31	6
<b>Turkey</b>	51	24	25
<b>Kenya</b>	85	14	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	84	15	1
<b>China</b>	62	25	13
<b>India</b>	58	30	12
<b>Indonesia</b>	74	14	12
<b>Philippines</b>	46	44	9
<b>South Korea</b>	68	30	1
<b>Thailand</b>	73	12	15
<b>Average</b>	66	23	12

<sup>10</sup> **World Values Survey 2005-2008**

Some people believe that certain kinds of problems could be better handled by the United Nations than by the various national governments. Others think that these problems should be left entirely to the respective national governments; while others think they would be handled best by the national governments working together with co-ordination by the United Nations. I'm going to mention

some problems. For each one, would you tell me whether you think that policies in this area should be decided by the national governments, by the United Nations, or by the national governments with UN co-ordination? International peacekeeping

	National governments	Regional orgs	UN	National governments, with UN coordination	Nonprofit/ Nongov't orgs	Commercial enterprise	DK	No answer	NA
Italy	22	12	58	0	0	0	6	1	0
Spain	15	13	59	0	0	0	12	0	6
United States	28	16	50	0	0	0	4	3	0
Canada	22	7	66	0	0	0	5	0	0
Japan	11	8	72	0	2	0	0	6	0
Mexico	22	5	65	0	0	0	6	1	0
South Africa	47	14	32	0	0	0	0	7	0
Australia	21	9	66	0	0	0	0	4	0
Sweden	19	8	70	0	0	0	3	0	0
Argentina	22	5	52	0	0	0	21	1	0
Finland	29	10	58	0	0	0	2	1	0
South Korea	47	6	47	0	0	0	0	1	0
Poland	28	6	64	0	0	0	2	0	0
Switzerland	27	9	60	0	0	0	3	1	0
Brazil	22	5	66	0	0	0	6	2	0
Chile	40	6	44	0	0	0	9	1	0
India	44	10	14	0	0	0	32	0	0
Slovenia	26	30	33	0	0	0	10	1	0
Bulgaria	22	17	50	0	0	0	11	0	0
Romania	38	11	34	0	0	0	14	2	0
China	18	2	36	0	0	0	44	1	0
Taiwan	25	16	55	0	0	0	3	0	0
Turkey	46	9	37	0	0	0	8	1	0
Ukraine	52	8	29	0	0	0	8	3	0
Ghana	23	9	64	0	0	0	3	1	0
Moldova	37	19	39	0	0	0	5	0	0
Georgia	79	2	15	0	0	0	3	0	0
Thailand	77	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	14	4	74	0	0	0	7	1	0
Vietnam	50	7	35	0	0	0	8	1	0
Serbia	51	9	32	0	0	0	7	2	0
New Zealand	6	0	33	49	0	0	8	5	0
Egypt	36	17	44	0	0	0	3	*	0
Morocco	50	4	29	0	0	0	0	18	0
Iran	41	12	42	0	0	0	4	1	0
Jordan	24	19	44	0	0	0	13	0	0

<b>Cyprus</b>	30	22	47	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	32	12	53	0	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Andorra</b>	26	8	64	0	0	0	2	1	0
<b>Malaysia</b>	51	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	47	6	34	0	0	0	9	2	0
<b>Ethiopia</b>	41	10	40	0	0	0	5	3	2
<b>Mali</b>	46	5	38	0	0	0	6	3	1
<b>Rwanda</b>	50	41	8	0	0	0	1	0	1
<b>Zambia</b>	29	19	47	0	0	0	4	1	0
<b>Germany</b>	20	20	54	0	0	0	6	1	0
<b>Average</b>	34	11	45	1	0	0	7	2	0

<sup>11</sup> **Public Agenda Confidence in U.S. Foreign Policy Index Poll, January 2006**

Would you say that the U.S. (United States) support of the U.N. (United Nations) Peacekeeping effort is important and worthwhile, a waste of resources?

69%	Important and worthwhile
24	A waste of resources
1	Other (Vol.)
6	Don't know

<sup>12</sup> **Kaiser Family Foundation March 2004**

(I am going to read you several things the United States helps fund with other countries around the world. For each, please tell me whether you think the U.S. government currently spends too much, not enough, or about the right amount on that particular international effort.) What about...peacekeeping?

32%	Too much
25	Not enough
35	About the right amount
8	Don't know/Refused

<sup>13</sup> **NBC News, Wall Street Journal/Hart And Teeter Research Companies 2003**

Based on its role in the recent Iraq conflict, do you think that the United Nations can effectively function as an international peacekeeping force, or not?

Yes, can effectively function	50%
No, cannot effectively function	42
No answer	8

<sup>14</sup> **International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999**

Is the [international force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	Better	Worse	No Difference	DK/ NR
<b>Georgia</b>	9	9	52	8
<b>Abkhazia</b>	2	2	15	2

<b>Cambodia</b>	2	2	9	1
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	13	13	40	7
<b>Lebanon</b>	8	8	44	8
<b>Somalia</b>	27	27	10	17
<b>Average</b>	51	14	27	7

<sup>15</sup> **International Committee of the Red Cross, November 1999**

Is the [peacekeeping force] making it better or worse, or isn't it making a difference?

	<b>Better</b>	<b>Worse</b>	<b>No Difference</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>Total Security Council</b>	54	8	29	8
<b>Great Britain</b>	58	4	31	7
<b>United States</b>	52	15	28	5
<b>France</b>	52	9	27	12
<b>Russia</b>	54	4	31	11
<b>Total War Torn</b>	51	14	27	7
<b>Georgia</b>	31	9	52	8
<b>Abkhazia</b>	81	2	15	2
<b>Cambodia</b>	88	2	9	1
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	41	13	40	7
<b>Lebanon</b>	41	8	44	8
<b>Somalia</b>	46	27	10	17

<sup>16</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2004**

In general, when South Korea/the United States is asked to be part of a united Nations international peacekeeping force in a troubled part of the world, do you think we should take part, or should we leave this job to other countries? (South Korea, United States)

And now, please tell me, if the United Nations asks member countries to participate in a military or police peacekeeping force being sent to some part of the world, what do you think Mexico should do, participate in the peacekeeping force or leave this type of activity to other countries? (Mexico)

	<b>Should take part</b>	<b>Should not take part</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>South Korea</b>	83	17	n/a
<b>United States</b>	78	19	3
<b>Mexico</b>	48	36	6

<sup>17</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, July 2000**

As a general rule, when it becomes necessary for the United States to use military force, do you think it is best for the United States to:

49%	Act as part of a United Nations operation
26	Act as part of a NATO operation
17	Act on its own
8	Don't Know/Refused

<sup>18</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To stop a government from committing genocide and killing large numbers of its own people

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	77	19	4
<b>2004</b>	75	22	4
<b>2006</b>	71	24	5
<b>2008</b>	69	28	3
<b>2010</b>	72	26	2

<sup>19</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide peacekeeping troops after a civil war has ended

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	77	17	6
<b>United States</b>	66	29	5
<b>France</b>	84	14	2
<b>Germany</b>	84	15	2
<b>Great Britain</b>	81	16	3
<b>Italy</b>	77	21	2
<b>Netherlands</b>	88	11	1
<b>Poland</b>	61	31	8
<b>Portugal</b>	76	12	12
<b>Spain</b>	85	13	3
<b>Slovakia</b>	58	26	16
<b>Turkey</b>	77	14	8

<sup>20</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To provide food and medical assistance to victims of war

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	89	8	3
<b>United States</b>	81	16	3
<b>France</b>	92	7	1
<b>Germany</b>	94	5	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	83	5	3
<b>Italy</b>	85	14	1

---

<b>Netherlands</b>	98	2	1
<b>Poland</b>	86	12	3
<b>Portugal</b>	85	7	8
<b>Spain</b>	95	5	1
<b>Slovakia</b>	84	11	5
<b>Turkey</b>	87	9	4

<sup>21</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To stop the fighting in a civil war

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	62	31	7
<b>United States</b>	38	49	13
<b>France</b>	68	27	5
<b>Germany</b>	41	54	5
<b>Great Britain</b>	57	35	8
<b>Italy</b>	56	38	5
<b>Netherlands</b>	56	40	4
<b>Poland</b>	45	47	8
<b>Portugal</b>	63	25	12
<b>Spain</b>	70	23	7
<b>Slovakia</b>	83	11	6
<b>Turkey</b>	81	14	5

<sup>22</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2004**

Now I would like to ask you some questions about when [country] should use its military force. For each of the following reasons, would you approve or disapprove the use of [survey country] military forces?

To remove a government that abuses human rights

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	53	39	8
<b>United States</b>	57	36	7
<b>France</b>	53	43	4
<b>Germany</b>	36	60	4
<b>Great Britain</b>	59	33	8
<b>Italy</b>	54	41	5
<b>Netherlands</b>	53	43	4
<b>Poland</b>	48	41	11
<b>Portugal</b>	63	24	13
<b>Spain</b>	55	38	7
<b>Slovakia</b>	40	43	17
<b>Turkey</b>	64	25	11

<sup>23</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?

To maintain peace and order in post-conflict Balkans

	Approve	Disapprove	(Don't know about topic)	NR
European Average	65	29	4	2
United States	54	38	5	4
France	70	24	2	4
Germany	60	38	1	1
Great Britain	66	27	2	5
Italy	73	25	1	1
Netherlands	74	24	1	1
Poland	58	33	7	2
Portugal	77	18	3	2
Spain	76	23	0	1
Slovakia	62	31	4	3
Turkey	53	33	14	0
Bulgaria	55	39	3	3
Romania	58	30	8	4

<sup>24</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent, would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?

To monitor and support a ceasefire in Southern Lebanon

	Approve	Disapprove	(I don't know anything about this topic)	DK/ NR
European Average	58	36	5	2
United States	55	39	2	4
France	73	23	1	2
Germany	45	52	1	1
Great Britain	65	30	2	4
Italy	66	32	1	1
Netherlands	70	28	1	1
Poland	47	39	10	5
Portugal	63	32	3	2
Spain	69	30	1	1
Slovakia	45	38	10	7
Turkey	46	38	16	1
Bulgaria	35	40	18	7
Romania	47	37	12	5

<sup>25</sup> **CNN Poll, August 2006**

Now here are a few questions about the conflict in the Middle East between Israel and the Arab group known as Hezbollah which is based in Lebanon. Would you favor or oppose the presence of United States (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force on the border between Israel and Lebanon?

51% Favor  
45 Oppose  
4 No opinion

<sup>26</sup> **CBS News/New York Times Poll, July 2006**

In order to try and end the fighting between Israel and the Hezbollah militants in Lebanon, would you favor or oppose the United Nations sending in a peacekeeping force? (If Yes, ask:) Would you favor or oppose the United States sending ground troops as part of the United Nations peacekeeping force?

32%	Favor UN troops and U.S. troops
28	Favor UN, oppose U.S.
32	Oppose UN troops
8	Don't know/No answer

<sup>27</sup> **Fox News/Opinion Dynamics Poll, March 2004**

As you may know, the United States recently sent peacekeeping troops to Haiti. Do you think it was necessary for the United States to send peacekeeping troops to Haiti or not?

52%	Yes, necessary
28	No, not necessary
5	Depends (vol.)
15	Not sure

<sup>28</sup> **Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll, August 2003**

Would you favor or oppose the presence of U.S. (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force in Liberia?

61%	Favor
33	Oppose
6	No opinion

<sup>29</sup> **NBC News, Wall Street Journal 2003**

The West African nation of Liberia, which was founded by former U.S. (United States) slaves, has recently experienced growing poverty and civil war. The United Nations wants to negotiate a cease-fire in this war and send armed peacekeepers to enforce it. Would you approve or disapprove of sending a thousand American soldiers to Liberia as part of a UN peacekeeping force?

Would approve of sending American soldiers	58%
Would disapprove of sending American soldiers	35
Depends (vol.)	3
Not sure	

<sup>30</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2010**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To be part of an international peacekeeping force to enforce a peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	65	30	5
<b>2004</b>	52	43	5
<b>2006</b>	51	44	6
<b>2008</b>	52	47	2

---

2010                      49                      49                      2

<sup>31</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes 2006**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

As part of an international force to help keep the peace between India and Pakistan

**2004**

51% Favor  
44 Oppose  
5 Not sure/ Decline

**2006**

40% Favor  
54 Oppose  
6 Not sure/Decline

<sup>32</sup> **CNN/ORC, August 2012**

In general, how concerned are you about the situation in Syria: very concerned, somewhat concerned, not very concerned, or not concerned at all?

29% Very concerned  
43 Somewhat concerned  
15 Not very concerned  
11 Not concerned at all  
1 Unsure

<sup>33</sup> **CNN/ORC, August 2012**

As far as you are concerned, should the removal of the Syrian government from power be a very important foreign policy goal of the U.S., a somewhat important goal, not too important, or not an important goal at all?

19% Very important  
46 Somewhat important  
18 Not too important  
15 Not important at all  
3 Unsure

<sup>34</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Would you support or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria?

Increasing economic and diplomatic sanctions on Syria

63% Support  
32 Oppose  
6 Not sure/Decline

<sup>35</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

As you may know in Syria there have been large-scale demonstrations across the country calling for a more democratic government.

The Syrian government has suppressed these demonstrations with military force, resulting in the deaths of thousands of civilians. Opposition forces are now organizing and there is the possibility of civil war.

The Arab League, a group of 21 countries in the region, has taken an active role in trying to deal with the conflict. It is demanding that the Syrian government stop its attacks on civilians, that the Syrian President step down, and for representatives of the Arab League to enter Syria and facilitate a democratic resolution of the conflict. The Syrian government has refused.

The Arab League has called for pressuring Syria by cutting off economic trade with Syria; the US and other countries have joined in these sanctions. But the Syrian government has continued its violent crackdown.

Do you approve or disapprove of the United States joining in the economic sanctions against Syria?

71%	Approve
24	Disapprove
5	Don't know/Refused

<sup>36</sup> **Fox News, March 2012**

As you may know, there is civil unrest in Syria as many citizens fight to overthrow the current dictatorial regime in that country, which has killed more than 7,000 of its own people to try to end the rebellion. How involved do you think the United States should get in helping the people of Syria? Should the United States...provide humanitarian aid?

82%	Yes
14	No
4	DK/R

<sup>37</sup> **NBC News/Wall Street Journal Poll, March 2012**

Thinking about the situation in Syria: Syrian civilians have been killed by their government in response to protests and civil unrest. The U.S. is taking diplomatic and economic measures to try to stop the Syrian government from taking military action against its citizens. Which ONE statement best describes what you think? The U.S. should take military action to help stop the killing of civilians. The U.S. should provide weapons to the forces inside Syria opposing the government. The U.S. should provide only humanitarian assistance to the civilians injured or forced from their homes. OR, The U.S. should take none of these additional actions.

13%	Take military action
11	Provide weapons to opposition
48	Provide humanitarian assistance
25	Take none of these actions
3	Unsure

<sup>38</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Would you support or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria?

Enforcing a no-fly zone over Syria

58%	Support
36	Oppose
6	Not sure/Decline

<sup>39</sup> **CNN/ORC, August 2012**

Would you favor or oppose the U.S. and other countries using military airplanes and missiles to try to establish zones inside Syria where the opposition forces would be safe from attacks by the Syrian government?

46%	Favor
49	Oppose
5	Unsure

<sup>40</sup> **Fox News Poll, March 2012**

(As you may know, there is civil unrest in Syria as many citizens fight to over-throw the current dictatorial regime in that country, which has killed more than 7,000 of its own people to try to end the rebellion. How involved do you think the United States should get in helping the people of Syria?) Should the United States...provide air support to protect the anti-government groups?

37% Yes  
51 No  
12 Don't know

(As you may know, there is civil unrest in Syria as many citizens fight to over-throw the current dictatorial regime in that country, which has killed more than 7,000 of its own people to try to end the rebellion. How involved do you think the United States should get in helping the people of Syria?) Should the United States...launch US air strikes to try to oust the Syrian government?

19% Yes  
68 No  
12 Don't know

<sup>41</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

Members of the Arab League and Turkey are considering establishing safe havens on the border areas inside Syria to provide Syrians who are at risk of being attacked by government forces a place to retreat. Other nations would need to provide military aid to protect them. Some say this would violate Syria's sovereignty, while others say that the international community has a responsibility to protect Syrians at risk.

Do you think establishing such safe havens is:

67% A good idea  
27 Not a good idea  
6 Don't know/Refused

<sup>42</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

Suppose the Arab League decides to establish such safe havens and asks the US for help in defending them. Do you think the US should or should not be willing to do each of the following to defend the safe havens:

Provide air cover with US planes

48% Should be willing  
54 Republicans  
54 Democrats  
34 Independents

45% Should not be willing  
44 Republicans  
44 Democrats  
47 Independents

7 Don't know Refused

<sup>43</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

Suppose the Arab League decides to establish such safe havens and asks the US for help in defending them. Do you think the US should or should not be willing to do each of the following to defend the safe havens:

Provide weapons

---

37%	Should be willing
56	Should not be willing
7	Don't know/Refused

<sup>44</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

Suppose the Arab League decides to establish such safe havens and asks the US for help in defending them. Do you think the US should or should not be willing to do each of the following to defend the safe havens...

Send US troops

15%	Should be willing
77	Should not be willing
8	Don't know/Refused

<sup>45</sup> **CNN/ORC, August 2012**

Would you favor or oppose the U.S. and other countries sending weapons and other military supplies to the opposition forces who are fighting to remove the Syrian government from power?

48%	Favor
47	Oppose
4	Unsure

<sup>46</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Would you support or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria?

27%	Support
67	Oppose
6	Not sure/Decline

<sup>47</sup> **Pew, March 2012**

Would you favor or oppose the U.S. and its allies sending arms and military supplies to anti-government groups in Syria?

29%	Favor
63	Oppose
9	Unsure

<sup>48</sup> **Fox News, March 2012**

(As you may know, there is civil unrest in Syria as many citizens fight to over-throw the current dictatorial regime in that country, which has killed more than 7,000 of its own people to try to end the rebellion. How involved do you think the United States should get in helping the people of Syria?) Should the United States...provide weapons to the anti-government groups?

25%	Yes
64	No
11	Don't know

<sup>49</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

Members of the Arab League are considering providing weapons to the opposition forces in Syria. Do you think the Arab League providing such weapons is:

45%	A good idea
48	Not a good idea
7	Don't know/Refused

<sup>50</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

If the Arab League decides to provide weapons to the opposition forces in Syria and asks the US to help, do you think the US should or should not contribute weapons?

27%	Should
66	Should not
7	Don't know/Refused

<sup>51</sup> **CNN/ORC, August 2012**

And would you favor or oppose the U.S. and other countries using ground troops to try to establish zones inside Syria where the opposition forces would be safe from attacks by the Syrian government?

32%	Favor
64	Oppose
4	Unsure

<sup>52</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Would you support or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria?

14%	Support
81	Oppose
6	Not sure/Decline

<sup>53</sup> **Fox News, February 2012**

As you may know, there is civil unrest in Syria as many citizens fight to over-throw the current dictatorial regime in that country, which has killed more than 7000 of its own people to try to end the rebellion. How involved do you think the United States should get in helping the people of Syria? Should the United States...Put U.S. troops on the ground

14%	Yes
78	No
8	DK/R

<sup>54</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Would you support or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following actions with respect to Syria?

Bomb Syrian air defense

22%	Support
72	Oppose
6	Not sure/Decline

<sup>55</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes, March 2012**

All things considered, do you think that the U.S. and its allies made the right decision or the wrong decision to conduct military airstrikes in Libya:

	<b>Right decision</b>	<b>Wrong decision</b>	<b>Don't know/Refused</b>
<b>3/11(Pew)</b>	47%	36%	17%
<b>4/11(Pew)</b>	45	37	19
<b>9/11 (Pew)</b>	44	33	23
<b>3/12</b>	56	33	10

<sup>56</sup> **CNN/ORC, March 2011**

Some people have suggested establishing a 'no-fly zone' in Libya which would be an area patrolled by military planes from the US (United States) and other countries to prevent (Moammar) Gadhafi from using his air force. No US ground troops would be involved but US airplanes or missiles might be used to shoot down Libyan airplanes or attack ground bases used by the Libyan air force. Would you favor or oppose the US and other countries attempting to establish a 'no-fly zone' in Libya?

56% Favor  
40 Oppose  
4 No opinion

(Some people have suggested establishing a 'no-fly zone' in Libya which would be an area patrolled by military planes from the US (United States) and other countries to prevent (Moammar) Gadhafi from using his air force. No US ground troops would be involved but US airplanes or missiles might be used to shoot down Libyan airplanes or attack ground bases used by the Libyan air force)...The military actions to create a 'no-fly zone' might not be directly targeted at Gadhafi's troops who are fighting the opposition forces in Libya. Would you favor or oppose the US and other countries using planes and missiles to directly attack Gadhafi's troops in Libya?

54% Favor  
43 Oppose  
3 No opinion

<sup>57</sup> **Pew, March 2011**

Would you favor or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following with respect to Libya?...Increasing economic and diplomatic sanctions on Libya...Would you favor or oppose this?

51% Favor  
40 Oppose  
9 Don't know/Refused

**Pew, March 2011**

(Would you favor or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following with respect to Libya?)...Sending arms and supplies to anti-government groups in Libya...Would you favor or oppose this?

23% Favor  
69 Oppose  
8 Don't know/Refused

**Pew Research Center for the People & the Press Political Survey, March 2011**

Would you favor or oppose the US (United States) and its allies sending arms and military supplies to anti-government groups in Libya?

---

25%	Favor
66	Oppose
9	Don't know/Refused

<sup>58</sup> **Pew, March 2011**

(Would you favor or oppose the United States and its allies doing each of the following with respect to Libya?)...Sending troops into Libya...Would you favor or oppose this?

13%	Favor
82	Oppose
5	Don't know/Refused

**CNN/ORC, March 2011**

Would you favor or oppose the US (United States) and other countries sending ground troops to Libya?

22%	Favor
76	Oppose
2	No opinion

<sup>59</sup> **CNN/ORC, March 2011**

Do you think the United States should take a leading role in any attempts to resolve the situation in Libya, or do you think the US should leave it to international organizations or allies such as Great Britain or France to take the leading role in Libya?

23%	US
74	Allies and international organizations
4	No opinion

<sup>60</sup> **CNN/ORC, April 2011**

If you had to choose, would you rather see the US (United States) take the leading role in the military action in Libya, or would you rather see the US support the military forces of other countries in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) but not take a leading role?

14%	Leading role
82	Support
4	Other (Vol.)
*	No opinion

<sup>61</sup> **Pew, March 2011**

Is it your impression that the US (United States) is leading the military action in Libya, or is the US just one of a coalition of countries that are involved?

35%	US is leading the military action
57	US is just one of a coalition of countries
8	Don't know/Refused

<sup>62</sup> **CBS News, March 2011**

As you may know, the U.S. military and other countries have begun cruise missile and air strikes in Libya in order to protect civilians from attacks by Qaddafi's forces. Do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. and other countries taking this military action in Libya?

68% Approve  
 26 Disapprove  
 6 Don't know/Refused

**Program on International Policy Attitudes/Sadat Chair, April 2011**

As you may know, the U.S. military and other countries have begun cruise missile and air strikes in Libya in order to protect civilians from attacks by Qaddafi's forces. Do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. and other countries taking this military action in Libya?

54% Approve  
 43 Disapprove  
 3 Don't know/Refused

	<b>4/11</b>	<b>CBS News 3/20-21/11</b>
Approve .....	54%	68%
Disapprove.....	43	26
Don't know/Refused.....	3	6

**Program on International Policy Attitudes/Sadat Chair, April 2011**

If the air campaign does not succeed in protecting civilians from attacks by Qaddafi's forces, would you support or oppose the US and other countries providing arms to the Libyan rebels?

36% Support  
 59 Oppose  
 5 Don't know/Refused

<sup>63</sup> **CNN/ORC, May 2011**

Do you favor or oppose the limited use of military force by the United States in Libya as part of the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) mission to enforce United Nations resolutions?

54% Favor  
 43 Oppose  
 3 No opinion

<sup>64</sup> **CNN/ORC, March 2011**

As far as you are concerned, should the removal of Moammar Gadhafi from power in Libya be a very important foreign policy goal of the US (United States), a somewhat important goal, not too important, or not an important goal at all?

24% Very important  
 47 Somewhat important  
 15 Not too important  
 12 Not important at all  
 2 No opinion

**CNN/ORC, March 2011**

---

As far as you are concerned, should the removal of Moammar Gadhafi from power in Libya be a very important foreign policy goal of the US (United States), a somewhat important goal, not too important, or not an important goal at all?

34%	Very important
43	Somewhat important
13	Not too important
10	Not important at all
*	No opinion

#### **CNN/ORC, April 2011**

As far as you are concerned, should the removal of Moammar Gadhafi from power in Libya be a very important foreign policy goal of the US (United States), a somewhat important goal, not too important, or not an important goal at all?

28%	Very important
45	Somewhat important
12	Not too important
14	Not important at all
1	No opinion

#### **CNN/ORC, May 2011**

As far as you are concerned, should the removal of Moammar Gadhafi from power in Libya be a very important foreign policy goal of the US (United States), a somewhat important goal, not too important, or not an important goal at all?

31%	Very important
37	Somewhat important
15	Not too important
1	Not important at all
2%	No opinion

#### <sup>65</sup> **Pew, March 2011**

In your view, should the aim of the military action by the US (United States) and its allies in Libya include removing Muammar Qaddafi from power, or should they focus only on protecting Libyan civilians from violence?

46%	Remove Qaddafi from power
43	Focus only on protecting civilians
11	Don't know/Refused

#### <sup>66</sup> **Pew, March 2011**

All things considered, do you think that the US (United States) and its allies made the right decision or the wrong decision to conduct military air strikes in Libya?

47%	Right decision
36	Wrong decision
17	Don't know/Refused

#### **Pew, March 2011**

All things considered, do you think that the US (United States) and its allies made the right decision or the wrong decision to conduct military air strikes in Libya?

50%	Right decision
-----	----------------

---

37 Wrong decision  
13 Don't know/Refused

**NBC News/Wall Street Journal, March 2011**

Looking at how things are in Libya today, do you feel that the decision for American forces to engage in military action was the right decision or do you

feel it was the wrong decision?

52% Right decision  
41 Wrong decision  
7 Not sure

**Pew, April 2011**

All things considered, do you think that the US (United States) and its allies made the right decision or the wrong decision to conduct military air strikes

in Libya?

45% Right decision  
37 Wrong decision  
19 Don't know/Refused

<sup>67</sup> **Quinnipiac University, March 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) is doing the right thing by using military force in Libya now, or should the US not be involved in Libya now?

41% Right thing  
47 Should not be involved  
12% Don't know/No answer

**Quinnipiac University, April 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) is doing the right thing by using military force in Libya now, or should the US not be involved in Libya now?

37% Right thing  
53 Should not be involved  
10 Don't know/No answer

**Quinnipiac University, May 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) is doing the right thing by using military force in Libya now, or should the US not be involved in Libya now?

39% Right thing  
48 Should not be involved

12 Don't know/No answer

**CBS News, June 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) is doing the right thing by taking part in the current military conflict in Libya now, or should the US not be involved in Libya now?

30% Right thing  
59 Should not be involved  
11 Don't know/No answer

**CBS News/New York Times, June 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) is doing the right thing by taking part in the current military conflict in Libya now, or should the US not be involved in Libya now?

29% Right thing  
59 Shouldn't be involved  
12 Don't know/No answer

<sup>68</sup> **Gallup, June 2011**

Next we have a question about the current military action by the United States and other countries against Libya. Do you approve or disapprove of the current US military actions against Libya?

39% Approve  
46 Disapprove  
15 No opinion

<sup>69</sup> **Quinnipiac University, March 2011**

Do you think President (Barack) Obama has clearly stated the goals of the US (United States) military mission in Libya or not?

29% Yes  
58 No  
13 Don't know/No answer

**Pew, March 2011**

Do you think the US (United States) and its allies have a clear goal in taking military action in Libya, or not?

30% Yes, have a clear goal  
57 No, do not  
12 Don't know/Refused

<sup>70</sup> **Fox News, June 2011**

Do you think the Obama administration has clearly explained what the United States is trying to achieve in Libya?

27% Yes, it has  
67 No, it hasn't  
7 Don't know

<sup>71</sup> **Gallup/USA Today, March 2012**

Looking back, do you think sending troops to Afghanistan was the right thing or the wrong thing for the US (United States) to do?

59% Right thing  
 35 Wrong thing  
 6 No opinion

<sup>72</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes/Sadat Chair August 2011**

For each of the following, do you feel the US made the right decision or made a mistake?

Going to war in Afghanistan

21% Made the right decision, strongly  
 36 Made the right decision, somewhat  
 25 Made a mistake, somewhat  
 13 Made a mistake, strongly  
 5 Don't know/Refused

<sup>73</sup> **Gallup Poll May 2011**

Thinking now about US (United States) military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?

39% Yes, a mistake  
 58 No, not a mistake  
 5 No opinion

**Gallup Poll March 2011**

Thinking now about US military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?

42% Yes, a mistake  
 53 No, not a mistake  
 5 No opinion

**Gallup/USA Today Poll, March 2009**

Thinking now about the U.S. (United States) military action in Afghanistan that began in October 2001, do you think the United States made a mistake in sending military forces to Afghanistan, or not?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No opinion</b>
<b>November 2001</b>	9	89	2
<b>September 2009</b>	37	61	2

<sup>74</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

Do you think eliminating the threat from terrorists operating from Afghanistan is a worthwhile goal for American troops to fight and possibly die for or not?

**It is a worthwhile goal**      **It is not a worthwhile goal**      **Not sure/ Decline**

2010

59

37

4

<sup>75</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting, or not?

32% Has been worth it  
67 Has not been worth it  
1 Not sure/Decline

<sup>76</sup> **ABC/Washington Post, April 2012**

All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan has been worth fighting, or not?"

10/09: "All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan was / has been worth fighting, or not?" -- "was" and "has been" each asked of half the sample.

9/09 & earlier: "All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war in Afghanistan WAS worth fighting, or not?"

	<b>Worth fighting</b>	<b>Not worth fighting</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
	%	%	%
4/5-8/12	30	66	4
3/7-10/12	35	60	5
6/2-5/11	43	54	3
3/10-13/11	31	64	5
12/9-12/10	34	60	5
7/7-11/10	43	53	4
6/3-6/10	44	53	3
4/22-25/10	45	52	3
12/10-13/09	52	44	4
11/12-15/09	44	52	4
10/15-18/09	47	49	4

<sup>77</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

As a result of the United States' military action in Afghanistan, do you think the United States is more safe from terrorism, less safe from terrorism, or hasn't it made any difference?

30% More safe  
18 Less safe  
51 No difference  
1 Not sure/Decline

<sup>78</sup> **AP-GfK Poll, May 2012**

Do you favor or oppose the war in Afghanistan?

---

27%	Favor
66	Oppose
6	Unsure

<sup>79</sup> **CNN/ORC, March 2012**

Do you favor or oppose the U.S. war in Afghanistan?

25%	Favor
72	Oppose
3	Unsure

<sup>80</sup> **ABC News/Washington Post, February 2012**

(Thinking about the following decisions of the Obama administration, please tell me whether you strongly approve, somewhat approve, somewhat disapprove, or strongly disapprove.)...The drawdown of US (United States) troops from Afghanistan

56%	Strongly approve
23	Somewhat approve
10	Somewhat disapprove
9	Strongly disapprove
2	No opinion

<sup>81</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes/Sadat Chair August 2011**

As you may know, the Obama administration's policy is to gradually turn over the fight in Afghanistan to the Afghan army and government, reduce US forces in stages, and try to bring the Taliban into negotiations. How do you feel about this policy? Do you:

24%	Strongly approve
45	Somewhat approve
16	Somewhat disapprove
9	Strongly disapprove
6	Don't know/Refused

<sup>82</sup> **Fox News, April 2012**

Do you approve or disapprove of the U.S. withdrawing military troops in Afghanistan?

78%	Approve
16	Disapprove
6	Unsure

<sup>83</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Currently the US is scheduled to withdraw combat forces from Afghanistan by 2014. Do you think that the US should:

38%	Withdraw all of its combat troops from Afghanistan before the 2014 deadline
44	Bring all of its combat troops home as scheduled by 2014
17	Leave some combat troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014
1	Not sure/ Decline

<sup>84</sup> **CBS/New York Times, March 2012**

The U.S. is expected to withdraw about a third of its troops in Afghanistan by the end of 2012 and all of its troops by the end of 2014. Which of the following comes closest to your opinion? The U.S. should withdraw all of its troops sooner, and not wait until the end of 2014. The U.S. should keep the timetable and withdraw all of its troops by the end of 2014. OR, the U.S. should stay in Afghanistan for as long as it takes to stabilize the situation there.

44%	Withdraw sooner
33	Keep the timetable
17	Stay as long as it takes
3	Withdraw now [vol.]
3	Unsure

<sup>85</sup> **USA Today/Gallup, March 2012**

As you may know, the U.S. plans to withdraw all of its troops from Afghanistan by the end of the year 2014. Which would prefer to see happen—for the U.S. to stick to its timetable for withdrawing troops by 2014, speed up its withdrawal from Afghanistan, or keep troops in Afghanistan as long as it takes to accomplish its goals?

24%	Stick to timetable
50	Speed up withdrawal
21	Stay as long as it takes
4	Unsure

<sup>86</sup> **CNN, March 2012**

As you may know the U.S. plans to remove all of its troops from Afghanistan in 2014. If you had to choose, would you rather see the U.S. remove all troops earlier than that, or wait until 2014 to withdraw all of its troops, or keep some troops in Afghanistan beyond 2014?

55%	All earlier than 2014
22	All in 2014
22	Keep some beyond 2014
1	Unsure

<sup>87</sup> **Pew, February 2012**

From what you've read and heard, do you think Barack Obama is removing US (United States) troops from Afghanistan too quickly, not quickly enough or is he handling this about right?

20%	Too quickly
22	Not quickly enough
53	About right
5	Don't know/Refused

<sup>88</sup> **NBC News/Wall Street Journal, May 2012**

The current US (United States) plan in Afghanistan calls for almost all combat troops to be removed by 2014. Now, would you approve or disapprove of a proposal that would keep some US troops in Afghanistan to continue in targeted counter-terrorism efforts and training of Afghan troops for another ten years after 2014? (If Approve/Disapprove, ask:) And, would you strongly approve/disapprove or just somewhat approve/disapprove of that proposal?

17%	Strongly approve
25	Somewhat approve
15	Somewhat disapprove
38	Strongly disapprove

- 1 Depends (Vol.)  
4 Not sure

<sup>89</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs, June 2012**

Do you think the United States should or should not have long-term military bases in the following places?

Afghanistan

	<b>Should have*</b>	<b>Should not have*</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	57	40	3
<b>2004</b>	47	45	8
<b>2006</b>	52	39	9
<b>2008</b>	57	40	3
<b>2010</b>	52	46	3
<b>2012</b>	43	54	3

\* Answer options were "Favor"/"Oppose" in 2004

<sup>90</sup> **Pew, January 2012**

Do you think the US (United States) should keep military troops in Afghanistan until the situation has stabilized, or do you think the US should remove troops as soon as possible?

- 38% Keep troops in Afghanistan  
56 Remove troops  
6 Don't know/Refused

<sup>91</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes/Sadat Chair 2011**

In regard to the US troops in Afghanistan, do you think the United States should:

- 8% Increase the number of troops  
15 Keep the same number of troops as there are now  
29 Decrease the number of troops  
44 Withdraw all troops completely  
3 Don't know/Refused

<sup>92</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2011**

As you may know, (COUNTRY) currently has troops stationed in Afghanistan. In your view, should (COUNTRY) increase the number of troops in Afghanistan, keep its troops at its current level, reduce the number of its troops or should it withdraw all troops from Afghanistan?

	<b>Increase</b>	<b>Keep at current level</b>	<b>Reduce</b>	<b>Withdraw all troops</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>European Average</b>	3	29	22	44	2
<b>United States</b>	6	25	31	35	3

Do you approve or disapprove of the way the President of the United States Barack Obama has been handling the following issues?  
How about...stabilizing Afghanistan?

	Approve very much	Approve somewhat	Disapprove somewhat	Disapprove very much	DK/Refusal
European Average	14	37	25	14	10
United States	17	38	21	18	6
Turkey	6	11	33	32	18
Bulgaria	13	37	22	17	11
France	18	40	18	14	9
Germany	12	32	33	16	7
Italy	17	39	18	16	11
Netherlands	27	40	14	12	7
Poland	2	34	37	7	20
Portugal	22	41	19	12	6
Romania	16	38	24	10	12
Slovakia	10	33	25	16	16
Spain	10	37	29	13	11
Sweden	13	41	25	13	8
United Kingdom	17	39	19	18	7

<sup>93</sup> CBS/New York Times, March 2012

Regardless of whether you think taking military action in Afghanistan was the right thing to do, would you say the war in Afghanistan has been mostly a success for the United States, or not?

27%	A success
59	Not a success
6	Mixed (vol.)
8	Unsure

<sup>94</sup> German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2011

And thinking about the future, do you feel optimistic or pessimistic about the prospects of...stabilizing the situation in Afghanistan.

	Very optimistic	Somewhat optimistic	Somewhat pessimistic	Very pessimistic	DK/Refusal
European Average	4	24	45	21	6
United States	9	31	33	24	3
Turkey	9	26	31	21	13
Bulgaria	3	34	36	17	10
France	3	20	53	21	3
Germany	2	18	54	25	2
Italy	6	26	42	19	6
Netherlands	5	22	44	24	5
Poland	1	27	46	11	15
Portugal	5	31	41	17	7
Romania	8	37	32	13	10
Slovakia	3	21	41	21	13
Spain	6	22	49	20	3
Sweden	3	31	43	20	2
United Kingdom	8	28	32	26	6

German Marshall Fund June 2010

And thinking about the future, do you feel optimistic or pessimistic about the prospects of...”

## Stabilizing the situation in Afghanistan

	<b>Very optimistic</b>	<b>Somewhat optimistic</b>	<b>Somewhat pessimistic</b>	<b>Very pessimistic</b>	<b>DK/Refusal</b>
<b>United States</b>	19	32	32	17	
<b>France</b>	1	17	57	23	2
<b>Germany</b>	1	9	56	33	1
<b>United Kingdom</b>	8	27	34	31	1
<b>Italy</b>	6	22	51	19	2
<b>Netherlands</b>	5	24	45	23	2
<b>Poland</b>	1	21	52	19	8
<b>Portugal</b>	3	23	48	23	3
<b>Spain</b>	6	16	52	25	1
<b>Slovakia</b>	4	23	49	15	9
<b>Turkey</b>	10	13	29	33	15
<b>Bulgaria</b>	4	29	35	16	16
<b>Romania</b>	8	34	36	8	14
<b>European Average</b>	5	18	47	26	5

<sup>95</sup> AP-GfK, May 2012

Do you think the continued presence of U.S. troops in Afghanistan is doing more to help or more to hurt Afghanistan's efforts to become a stable democracy?

48%	More to help
36	More to hurt
14	Unsure
1	Refused

<sup>96</sup> ABC News/Washington Post, April 2012

Considering everything, do you think most Afghans support or oppose what the United States is trying to do in Afghanistan?

62%	Support
22	Oppose
15	No opinion

<sup>97</sup> Chicago Council on Global Affairs 2012

Do you think that most people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to remain for now, or do you think most want the NATO forces to leave now?

	<b>Most people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to remain for now</b>	<b>Most people in Afghanistan want NATO forces to leave now</b>	<b>Not sure/Decline</b>
<b>2012</b>	36	61	3
<b>2010</b>	47	47	6

<sup>98</sup> CNN/ORC, April 2009

Do you think other countries that are allies of the United States are doing enough or not doing enough to help the U.S. military effort in Afghanistan?

20%	Yes, doing enough
78	No, not doing enough
2	No opinion

<sup>99</sup> **WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Do you think that in regard to the violence that is occurring in the Darfur region of Sudan the UN Security Council:

	<b>Does not have the right to authorize intervention</b>	<b>Has the right, but not a responsibility, to authorize intervention</b>	<b>Has a responsibility to authorize intervention</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>Argentina</b>	19	15	22	43
<b>United States</b>	11	35	48	7
<b>Armenia</b>	9	15	29	46
<b>France</b>	8	29	55	8
<b>Great Britain</b>	8	24	57	11
<b>Poland</b>	8	23	23	47
<b>Ukraine</b>	16	22	10	52
<b>Egypt</b>	32	21	47	0
<b>Israel</b>	7	31	46	16
<b>Kenya</b>	25	37	35	4
<b>Nigeria</b>	17	34	45	4
<b>China</b>	12	38	20	30
<b>India</b>	20	30	29	21
<b>Thailand</b>	12	17	17	54
<b>Average</b>	15	27	35	25

<sup>100</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

To be a part of an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2006</b>	65	28	7
<b>2008</b>	62	35	4
<b>2010</b>	56	40	4

**WorldPublicOpinion.org 2006-2008**

Would you favor or oppose the use of [country] troops to participate in an international peacekeeping force to stop the killing in Darfur?

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>United States</b>	65	28	7
<b>Armenia</b>	27	45	28

<b>France</b>	84	3	14
<b>Great Britain</b>	71	18	11
<b>Poland</b>	28	42	31
<b>Ukraine</b>	13	56	32
<b>Egypt</b>	78	23	0
<b>Israel</b>	39	52	9
<b>Kenya</b>	84	16	1
<b>Nigeria</b>	81	16	3
<b>Thailand</b>	35	37	28
<b>Average</b>	55	30	15

<sup>101</sup> **CNN/Opinion Research Corporation Poll, October 2007**

Now thinking about the situation in Darfur, a region in the African country of Sudan...do you favor or oppose the presence of U.S. (United States) ground troops, along with troops from other countries, in an international peacekeeping force in Darfur?

61%	Favor
32	Oppose
7	Don't know/Undecided/Refused

<sup>102</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2007**

As you may know, some countries have troops currently engaged in different military operations around the world. To what extent would you approve or disapprove of the deployment of [nationality] troops for the following operations?  
To provide humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of the Sudan.

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>(I don't know anything about this topic)</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	76	18	5	1
<b>United States</b>	75	21	2	2
<b>France</b>	88	10	1	2
<b>Germany</b>	73	25	1	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	80	16	1	3
<b>Italy</b>	86	13	1	0
<b>Netherlands</b>	82	17	1	1
<b>Poland</b>	71	17	11	1
<b>Portugal</b>	84	12	3	1
<b>Spain</b>	90	9	0	1
<b>Slovakia</b>	62	24	8	5
<b>Turkey</b>	58	26	16	0
<b>Bulgaria</b>	44	28	20	8
<b>Romania</b>	57	24	15	5

<sup>103</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

If North Korea were to attack South Korea, would you favor or oppose the U.S. contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN sponsored effort to reverse the aggression?

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2002</b>	57	35	8
<b>2004</b>	64	31	5

---

<b>2006</b>	65	30	5
<b>2010</b>	61	34	6

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

If North Korea invaded South Korea

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>1990</b>	26	61	13
<b>1994</b>	39	48	13
<b>1998</b>	30	58	12
<b>2002</b>	36	56	8
<b>2004</b>	43	51	6
<b>2006</b>	45	49	6
<b>2008</b>	41	56	3
<b>2010</b>	40	56	4

<sup>104</sup> **CCFR/German Marshall Fund/Harris Interactive 2002**

If Iraq were to invade Saudi Arabia, would you favor or oppose the U.S. (United States) contributing military forces, together with other countries, to a UN (United Nations) sponsored effort to reverse the aggression?

77%	Favor
18	Oppose
5	Not sure/Decline

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. I'd like to ask your opinion about some situations. First, would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops

If Iraq invaded Saudi Arabia

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Note Sure/NR</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1990</b>	61	30	10	100
<b>1994</b>	52	38	10	100
<b>1998</b>	46	43	11	100
<b>2002</b>	48	46	6	100

<sup>105</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

If China invaded Taiwan

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>1998</b>	27	58	15

---

<b>2002</b>	32	58	10
<b>2004</b>	33	61	7
<b>2006</b>	32	61	6

If Arab forces invaded Israel

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>1990</b>	45	44	12
<b>1994</b>	42	42	16
<b>1998</b>	38	49	13
<b>2002</b>	48	45	7
<b>2004</b>	43	52	5

If Iran attacked Israel

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>2006</b>	53	42	5	100

<sup>106</sup> **Chicago Council on Global Affairs**

There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using U.S. troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of U.S. troops:

If China invaded Taiwan

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>1998</b>	27	58	15
<b>2002</b>	32	58	10
<b>2004</b>	33	61	7
<b>2006</b>	32	61	6
<b>2008</b>	32	65	3
<b>2010</b>	25	71	4

If Israel were attacked by its neighbors

	<b>Favor</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Not sure/ Decline</b>
<b>2010</b>	47	50	4

<sup>107</sup> **Program on International Policy Attitudes 1995**

Now I am going to read to you a series of arguments that have been made about the U.S. (United States) military and U.N. (United Nations) peace operations. For each one, please tell me if you agree or disagree with the statement. When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is generally best for the U.S. to address the problem together with other nations working through the U.N. rather than going it alone.

Agree	89%
Disagree	8

Don't know/Refused 3

When there is a problem in the world that requires the use of military force, it is better for the U.S. to act on its own, rather than working through the U.N. because they can move more quickly and probably more successfully.

Agree 29%  
Disagree 66  
Don't know/Refused 5

<sup>108</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

To what extent do you tend to agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should contribute troops if the NATO alliance decided to take military action?

	<b>Approve</b>	<b>Disapprove</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	57	34	9
<b>United States</b>	82	12	6
<b>France</b>	62	36	2
<b>Germany</b>	56	43	2
<b>Great Britain</b>	82	15	3
<b>Italy</b>	51	48	2
<b>Netherlands</b>	82	16	2
<b>Poland</b>	57	21	12
<b>Portugal</b>	68	26	6
<b>Spain</b>	56	41	3
<b>Slovakia</b>	37	49	14
<b>Turkey</b>	28	37	35
<b>Bulgaria</b>	42	47	11
<b>Romania</b>	63	25	12

<sup>109</sup> **German Marshall Fund Transatlantic Trends 2008**

To what extent to you agree or disagree that ALL NATO member countries should share in the financial costs of a NATO military action even when they do not contribute troops?

	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>DK/ NR</b>
<b>European Average</b>	58	34	8
<b>United States</b>	82	13	5
<b>France</b>	62	36	2
<b>Germany</b>	62	36	1
<b>Great Britain</b>	80	17	3
<b>Italy</b>	50	47	3
<b>Netherlands</b>	82	17	2
<b>Poland</b>	57	32	11
<b>Portugal</b>	64	29	7
<b>Spain</b>	60	37	2
<b>Slovakia</b>	37	52	11
<b>Turkey</b>	27	36	37
<b>Bulgaria</b>	41	47	13
<b>Romania</b>	67	21	11

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders, and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries. Founded in 1921, CFR carries out its mission by maintaining a diverse membership, with special programs to promote interest and develop expertise in the next generation of foreign policy leaders; convening meetings at its headquarters in New York and in Washington, DC, and other cities where senior government officials, members of Congress, global leaders, and prominent thinkers come together with CFR members to discuss and debate major international issues; supporting a Studies Program that fosters independent research, enabling CFR scholars to produce articles, reports, and books and hold roundtables that analyze foreign policy issues and make concrete policy recommendations; publishing *Foreign Affairs*, the preeminent journal on international affairs and U.S. foreign policy; sponsoring Independent Task Forces that produce reports with both findings and policy prescriptions on the most important foreign policy topics; and providing up-to-date information and analysis about world events and American foreign policy on its website, CFR.org.

The Council on Foreign Relations takes no institutional position on policy issues and has no affiliation with the U.S. government. All statements of fact and expressions of opinion contained in its publications are the sole responsibility of the author or authors.

For further information about CFR or this paper, please write to the Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10065, or call the Director of Communications at 212.434.9400. Visit CFR's website, [www.cfr.org](http://www.cfr.org).

Copyright © 2009 by the Council on Foreign Relations®, Inc.

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

This paper may not be reproduced in whole or in part, in any form beyond the reproduction permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law Act (17 U.S.C. Sections 107 and 108) and excerpts by reviewers for the public press, without express written permission from the Council on Foreign Relations. For information, write to the Publications Office, Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10065.