Supplementary Information

Contents

SI Section 1: Documentation of Manifesto Project data on party platform statements

SI Section 2: Documentation of iPoll public opinion data

SI Section 1: Documentation of Manifesto Project data on party platform statements

This appendix categorizes Democratic and Republican party platform statements from 2004-2020. The Manifesto Project has annotated its codings for every party platform within that range. Prior to 2004, it only releases aggregate data that count the overall number of statements that correspond to various content codes. Parties' 2024 platforms were not available at the time this manuscript was submitted.

Manifesto Project coders divide platforms into "sentence fragments" that convey policy-relevant information. For more detail on how coders delineate sentence fragments, see https://manifestoproject.wzb.eu/down/data/2023a/codebooks/codebook_MPDataset_MPDS2023a.pdf. The paper examines statements that the Manifesto Project assigned to three content codes: negative attitudes towards military power (content code 105), negative attitudes towards internationalism (code 109), and positive attitudes towards protectionism (code 405). These are the principal sources of data that Trubowitz and Burgoon use in their book, *Geopolitics and Democracy*, to document eroding political commitments to supporting global order. As shown below, none of these statements directly challenges the Truman-Eisenhower consensus. Instead, virtually all criticisms of U.S. foreign policy that have appeared in Democratic and Republican party platforms since 2004 address commitments, such as invading Iraq or potentially joining the

International Criminal Court, that fall outside the scope of U.S. foreign policy during the early Cold War.

Statements coded by the Manifesto Project as "Military – Negative" (content code 105).[1]

- *Criticisms of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (46)*
    - 2020 D: "[And we will honor our sacred covenant with our women and men in uniform, our veterans, and our military families] who have carried the burdens of wars that must—at long last—come to an end."
    - 2020 D: "Rather than end our forever wars, he's brought us to the brink of new conflicts"
    - 2020 D: "we need to bring our forever wars to a responsible end"
    - 2020 D: "Our military engagements, which have spanned from West Africa to Southeast Asia, have cost more than $5 trillion"
    - 2020 D: "… and claimed more than half a million lives."
    - 2020 D: "Our war in Afghanistan is the longest war in American history, with the youngest U.S. troops now fighting a war that was launched before they were even born."

[1] This list excludes two statements that criticize the military behavior of other countries (Russia's invasion of Georgia and the Syrian civil war). It also excludes 78 statements that propose countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or enhancing arms control. The Manifesto Project codes support for nonproliferation and arms control as reflecting negative attitudes towards military power because they involve "reducing the importance and significance of military power on the national and international level" (personal communication with Tobias Burst, April 14, 2023). But support for nonproliferation and arms control does not imply that parties wish to retrench U.S. military power.

- 2020 D: “President Trump said he would get the United States out of these wars, but instead he deployed more combat forces, expanded their missions,”
- 2020 D: “… and stoked regional tensions that unnecessarily endangered American lives and interests.”
- 2020 D: “[Democrats will deliver on this overdue commitment to end the forever wars, and we will do it responsibly—setting priorities,] leading with diplomacy”
- 2020 D: “… and bringing our troops home.”
- 2020 D: “That is why we will work with Congress to repeal decades-old authorizations for the use of military force.”
- 2020 D: “Rather than occupy countries and overthrow regimes to prevent terrorist attacks, Democrats will prioritize more effective and less costly diplomatic, intelligence, and law enforcement tools.”
- 2020 D: “[Ending the forever wars,] reducing the enormous stress on our forces,”
- 2020 D: “We spend five times more in Afghanistan each year than we do on global public health and preventing the next pandemic.”
- 2020 D: “Democrats believe it’s past time, however, to rebalance our tools, engagement, and relationships in the Middle East away from military intervention”
- 2016 D: “[When President Obama and Vice President Biden took office…] we were mired in two costly wars.”
- 2016 D: “Democrats will seek an updated Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) that is more precise about our efforts to defeat ISIS and that does not involve large-scale combat deployment of American troops.”

- 2016 D: “We also firmly reject Donald Trump’s willingness to mire tens of thousands of our combat troops in another misguided ground war in the Middle East, which would only further embolden ISIS”
- 2016 D: “and he is unwilling to rule out using a nuclear weapon against ISIS.”
- 2016 R: “[We must rebuild troop numbers and readiness and confirm their mission:] not nation building.”
- 2016 R: “In many cases, they and their children have been at war for 14 years.”
- 2016 R: “The burden of our country's extended military involvement in the Middle East has taken a toll on our service personnel.”
- 2012 D: “And they’re why President Barack Obama has ended one war and is responsibly drawing down another.”
- 2012 D: “paid for with part of the savings from winding down our overseas wars”
- 2012 D: “When President Obama took office in January 2009, our armed forces were engaged in two wars.”
- 2012 D: “Under the leadership of President Obama and the Democratic Party, the tide of war is now receding”
- 2012 D: “We have responsibly ended the war in Iraq.”
- 2012 D: “and established the conditions to draw down our forces in Afghanistan.”
- 2012 D: “After more than a decade at war, we can focus on nation-building here at home”
- 2012 D: “Charting a responsible path out of the war in Iraq has been a crucial element of President Obama’s foreign policy and has enabled important shifts in our broader strategy.”

- 2012 D: “Then-Senator Obama pledged during the 2008 campaign to responsibly end the war in Iraq, saying it was imperative to be as careful getting out as we were careless getting in – and that is precisely what he has done.”
- 2012 D: “When President Obama took office, there were over 140,000 American troops in harm’s way in Iraq.”
- 2012 D: “Today, all of those forces are out of Iraq, and there are no American bases there either.”
- 2012 D: “After taking office, President Obama removed our combat brigades and ended our combat mission on a 19-month timetable.”
- 2012 D: “And after an interim period in which we continued to advise Iraqis and conduct counterterrorism operations, we completed the drawdown of all U.S. troops last December.”
- 2012 D: “This decision was reached after extensive discussions and with the full agreement of the Iraqi government”
- 2012 D: “Many Republicans, including Mitt Romney, would have preferred to leave tens of thousands of U.S. troops in Iraq in an open-ended commitment”
- 2012 D: “President Obama’s decision to end the Iraq war freed up military and intelligence resources to refocus on this fight”
- 2012 D: “…and move away from the type of large-scale military deployments characteristic of the previous administration and favored by many Republicans today.”
- 2012 D: “And, with the support of our allies, the President has outlined a plan to end the war in Afghanistan in 2014.”

- 2012 D: “But we will not build permanent bases in Afghanistan.”
- 2012 D: “Eleven years of continuous military operations and repeated deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan have stretched our forces and strained their families.”
- 2012 D: “By responsibly ending the wars”
- 2012 R: “Combat readiness also requires that we reserve troops for truly necessary operations by not overextending them around the world.”
- 2004 D: “As other countries, including Muslim majority countries, contribute troops, the United States will be able to reduce its military presence in Iraq, and we intend to do this when appropriate so that the military support needed by a sovereign Iraqi government will no longer be seen as the direct continuation of an American military presence.”

- *Emphasis on diplomacy over military force (26)*
  - 2020 D: “Democrats will lead with diplomacy as our tool of first resort”
  - 2020 D: “And we will renew American diplomacy as our tool of first resort,”
  - 2020 D: “[President Trump has] hollowed out American diplomacy,”
  - 2020 D: “[Rather than end our forever wars, he's brought us to the brink of new conflicts,] and further militarized our foreign policy.”
  - 2020 D: “We will revitalize the power and purpose of American diplomacy to compete in a more contested world.”
  - 2020 D: 2020 D: “[“Democrats believe it’s past time, however, to rebalance our tools, engagement, and relationships in the Middle East away from military intervention]… leading with pragmatic diplomacy”

- 2020 D: “We will revitalize the power and purpose of American diplomacy to compete in a more contested world.”
- 2020 D: “And we will use force only when necessary, always as a last resort,”
- 2020 D: “Democrats will revitalize American diplomacy to ensure that the United States remains the world’s pivotal power”
- 2020 D: “Democrats believe that diplomacy should be our tool of first resort.”
- 2020 D: “The world’s greatest power deserves to have the world’s very best diplomatic corps.”
- 2020 D: “But today, American diplomacy is badly adrift and under resourced,”
- 2020 D: “…and our diplomats are demoralized.”
- 2020 D: “Democrats will support and invest in long overdue reforms to make the State Department more strategic, modern, agile, and effective.”
- 2020 D: “Rather than militarize our foreign policy, treat our diplomats with contempt, and call for reckless budget cuts, Democrats will put diplomacy back in the hands of professionals”
- 2020 D: “…and ensure they are better prepared to advance American interests on the central issues of our time, like disruptive technology and climate change.”
- 2020 D: “We will recruit a new generation of Americans who want to serve their country abroad”
- 2020 D: “… and ensure they have the training and tools they need.”
- 2020 D: “And we will expand and reform the Foreign Service so it reflects the diversity and richness of the country it represents.”

- 2020 D: “When used strategically—as one of the tools employed, alongside our allies, to achieve clear policy objectives—financial and economic sanctions are an effective way to advance many core U.S. national security objectives.”
- 2020 D: “Democrats believe the China challenge is not primarily a military one”
- 2020 D: “[Democrats will pursue this strategy without resorting to self-defeating, unilateral tariff wars or falling into the trap of a new Cold War. Those mistakes would only serve to exaggerate China's weight,] over-militarize our policy”
- 2016 D: “[our military] should only be sent into combat when the terms of engagement are clearly presented to the American people and our troops have what they need to fulfill their mission.”
- 2016 D: “We believe that war must always be the last resort, never the first choice”
- 2016 R: “[A strong commitment to international development and diplomacy…] can sometimes serve as an alternative means of keeping the peace, far less costly both in dollars and in human lives than military engagement.”
- 2012 D: “We must send [our military] into harm’s way only when it’s absolutely necessary.

- *Reducing military spending / footprint (13)*
  - 2020 D: “ [Ending the forever wars, reducing the enormous stress on our forces,] and rationalizing our global military footprint [are essential prerequisites to securing our competitive edge]”
  - 2020 D: “We will also increase time between deployments”
  - 2020 D: “[we need to…] rationalize our defense budget”

- 2020 D: "[Democrats believe the measure of our security is not how much we spend on defense, but how we spend our defense dollars] and in what proportion to other tools in our foreign policy toolbox and other urgent domestic investments."
- 2020 D: "We spend 13 times more on the military than we do on diplomacy."
- 2020 D: "We can maintain a strong defense and protect our safety and security for less."
- 2020 D: "It's past time to rebalance our investments"
- 2020 D: "…conduct rigorous annual audits of the Pentagon,"
- 2020 D: "…and end waste and fraud."
- 2012 D: "In our current fiscal environment, we must also make tough budgetary decisions across the board – and that includes within the defense budget."
- 2012 D: "The Budget Control Act enacted by Congress last year, with the support of Republicans and Democrats alike, mandates reductions in federal spending, including defense spending."
- 2012 D: "…The administration has worked with Congress to make these decisions, which has been a strategy-driven process."
- 2012 D: "And we will continue to get rid of outdated Cold War-era systems so that we can invest in cutting-edge technologies and maintain a versatile set of capabilities required to execute a wide range of military missions."

- *Allies need to spend more (2)*
  - 2020 D: "[we will encourage our partners to] take greater responsibility for regional security,"
  - 2020 D: "and contribute their fair share."

- *Anti-sanctions (6)*
    - 2020 D: “But when misused and overused, sanctions not only undermine our interests,”
    - 2020 D: “…they threaten one of the United States’ greatest strategic assets: the importance of the American financial system.”
    - 2020 D: “Democrats will guard against the improper application of economic and financial sanctions that incentivize foreign businesses to bypass our financial system,”
    - 2020 D: “…corrode the power and potential of sanctions,”
    - 2020 D: “…undercut the potential of our diplomacy,…”
    - 2020 D: “…[and] hurt our economy.”
- *Civil-military relations (4)*
    - 2020 D: “We will end the Trump Administration’s politicization of the armed forces”
    - 2020 D: “…and distortion of civilian and military roles in decision-making.”
    - 2020 D: “Democrats will never use active duty soldiers as political props,”
    - 2020 D: “…and we will never send military forces to suppress Americans exercising their constitutional rights.”
- *Opposition to a military draft (4)*
    - 2016 R: “Our country's all-volunteer force has been a success.”
    - 2016 R: “We oppose the reinstatement of the draft, except in dire circumstances like world war, whether directly or through compulsory national service.”

    - 2016 R: “We support the all-volunteer force and oppose unnecessary policy changes, including compulsory national service”
    - 2012 R: “We oppose the reinstatement of the draft whether directly or through compulsory national service.”
- *Guantanamo Bay (3)*
    - 2016 D: “The Democratic Party remains committed to closing the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and ending indefinite detention without trial or conviction.”
    - 2016 D: “Keeping the facility open is a blemish on our record,”
    - 2016 D: “…serves as a recruiting tool for extremists,”
- *Ending the war in Yemen (2)*
    - 2020 D: “[Democrats will end support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen] and help bring the war to an end.”
    - 2020 D: “This war is responsible for the world’s worst humanitarian crisis.”
    - 2020 D: “Democrats believe that the United States should support diplomatic efforts – not block them.”
- *Removing landmines (1)*
    - 2004 D: “We will also support international efforts to address the problem of landmines”
- *Protecting civilians (2)*
    - 2020 D: “He thinks our military should engage in war crimes.”

    - 2020 D: “We reject Donald Trump’s suggestion that our military should engage in war crimes, like torturing prisoners or murdering civilian family members of suspected terrorists.”
- *Peace in the Middle East (1)*
    - 2004 D: “[The Democratic Party is fundamentally committed to the security of our ally Israel and] the creation of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace between Israel and her neighbors.”
- *No War with Iran (1)*
    - 2020 D: “Democrats will call off the Trump Administration’s race to war with Iran”
- *Women in combat (1)*
    - 2016 R: “[We reiterate our support for both the advancement of women in the military] and their exemption from direct ground combat units and infantry battalions.”
- *Syria (2)*
    - 2020 D: “and find a political resolution for this horrific war.”
    - 2016 D: “[Donald Trump would inflame the conflict by alienating our allies, inexplicably allowing ISIS to expand in Syria,] and potentially starting a wider war.
- *Combat human trafficking (1)*
    - 2020 D: “[We will fight human trafficking and strive to end the practice of modern-day slavery around the world. We will aggressively leverage U.S. law

enforcement] and strengthen diplomatic efforts to combat forced labor and commercial sexual exploitation."

Statements coded by the Manifesto Project as "protectionism – positive" (content code 405).

- *Directly criticizing existing trade arrangements (2)*
    - 2016 R: "We need better negotiated trade agreements that put America first."
    - 2016 R: "[we need] an international order that maintains a fair and open global market for America's goods and services."
    - 2004 R: "Nor should an agreement give greater rights to foreign investors than to U.S investors, require the privatization of our vital public services, or limit our government's ability to create good jobs in our communities."
- *Support domestic manufacturing (10)*
    - 2020 D: "We will increase demand for American-made ships by ensuring U.S. cargo is carried on ships flying our flag."
    - 2020 D: "Projects that receive assistance from the [proposed infrastructure] bank will be required to follow Buy America."
    - 2020 D: "Democrats believe more products in our homes, stores, workplaces, and communities should be stamped 'Made in America.'"
    - 2020 D: "including national Buy Clean and Buy America standards to incentivize production of low-carbon building and construction materials, like steel, cement, and timber, here in the United States."
    - 2020 D: "and will expand support for American manufacturing."
    - 2020 D: "We will expand effective tax credits that support domestic manufacturing"

- 2020 D: “while reclaiming market share for domestically produced vehicles.”
- 2020 D: “We will not negotiate any new trade deals before first investing in American competitiveness at home.”
- 2012 D: “It ensured that as we re-built our country, we bought American-made iron, steel, and manufactured goods wherever feasible, consistent with our international obligations.”
- 2004 R: “taking timely action to help domestic industries and workers adjust to foreign competition, including through safeguard actions in support of America's manufacturing sector and trade adjustment assistance for workers;”

- *Anti-offshoring (10)*
  - 2020 D: “We will end policies that incentivize offshoring,”
  - 2020 D: “…and instead accelerate onshoring of critical supply chains, including in medical supplies and pharmaceuticals.”
  - 2020 D: “Too many corporations have rushed to outsource jobs,”
  - 2020 D: “The COVID-19 pandemic has shown the risks of relying too heavily on global supply chains, as shutdowns and shortages have created chaos for workers and consumers”
  - 2020 D: “…and made our public health response even more challenging.”
  - 2020 D: “If companies shut down their operations here and outsource jobs, we’ll claw back any public investments or benefits they received from taxpayers.”
  - 2020 D: “[Democrats will take action to reverse the Trump Administration's…] rewarding corporations for shipping American jobs overseas”
  - 2020 D: “Too many corporations have rushed to outsource jobs,”

- 2012 D: “[Romney’s plan] would create incentives that will lead to hundreds of thousands of jobs going overseas at the expense of American workers.”
- 2012 R: “[America’ high tax rate] encourages corporations to move overseas,”

- *Enforcing free trade (22)*
  - 2020 D: “too many countries have broken their promises to be honest and transparent partners.”
  - 2020 D: “Democrats will take aggressive action against China or any other country that tries to undercut American manufacturing by manipulating their currencies and maintaining a misaligned exchange rate with the dollar,”
  - 2020 D: “…dumping products like steel and aluminum in our markets”
  - 2020 D: “… , or providing unfair subsidies.”
  - 2020 D: “Unlike President Trump, we will stand up to efforts from China and other state actors to steal America’s intellectual property”
  - 2020 D: “We will aggressively enforce existing trade laws and agreements.”
  - 2020 D: “… and will demand China and other countries cease and desist from conducting cyberespionage against our companies.”
  - 2020 D: “We will apply a carbon adjustment fee at the border to products from countries that fail to live up to their commitments under the Paris Climate Agreement,”
  - 2020 D: “… because we won’t let polluters undermine American competitiveness.”
  - 2020 D: “too many countries have reneged on commitments to be honest and transparent partners.”

- 2020 D: “[We will use all tools at our disposal to take action against countries that steal American intellectual property] or manipulate their currencies to get an unfair advantage in international markets.”
- 2016 D: “That’s why the Obama administration has brought trade cases against China at twice the rate of the previous administration”
- 2012 R: “[some governments have used a variety of unfair means to limit American access to their markets] while stealing our designs, patents, brands, knowhow, and technology – the ‘intellectual property’ that drives innovation.”
- 2012 R: “[China] manipulates its currency to the disadvantage of American exporters,”
- 2012 R: “… excludes American products from government purchases, subsidizes Chinese companies to give them a commercial advantage,”
- 2012 R: “and stand ready to impose countervailing duties if China fails to amend its currency policies.”
- 2012 R: “Commercial discrimination will be met in kind.”
- 2012 R: “Counterfeit goods will be aggressively kept out of the country.”
- 2012 R: “Punitive measures will be imposed on foreign firms that misappropriate American technology and intellectual property.”
- 2012 R: “Until China abides by the WTO’s Government Procurement Agreement, the United States government will end procurement of Chinese goods and services.”
- 2012 R: “Our serious trade disputes, especially China’s failure to enforce international standards for the protection of intellectual property and copyrights, as

well as its manipulation of its currency, call for a firm response from a new Republican Administration."

- *Statements with no obvious relation to protectionism (14)*
    - 2020 D: "We will provide further assistance to students at these schools [HBCUs], as well as other students across the country,
    - 2020 D: "…by restoring year-round Pell funding so that low- and middle-income students from all backgrounds can get the support they need to make progress toward a college degree throughout the year."
    - 2016 R: "[For the people of Russia, we affirm our respect and our determination to maintain a friendship beyond the reach of those who wish to divide us. We have common imperatives: Ending terrorism, combating nuclear proliferation,] promoting trade, [and more]."
    - 2016 R: "Determined to crush the double-digit inflation that was part of the Carter Administration's economic legacy, President Reagan, shortly after his inauguration, established a commission to consider the feasibility of a metallic basis for U.S. currency."
    - 2016 R: "In 2012, facing the task of cleaning up the wreckage of the current Administration's policies,"
    - 2016 R: "…we proposed a similar commission to investigate ways to set a fixed value for the dollar."
    - 2016 R: "…With Republican leadership, the House of Representatives has passed legislation to set up just such a commission."

- 2016 R: "… We recommend its enactment by the full Congress and the commission's careful consideration of ways to secure the integrity of our currency."
- 2012 R: "The Republican Party is committed to domestic energy independence."
- 2012 R: "That is the best way to advance North American energy independence."
- 2012 R: "Our dependence on foreign imports of fertilizer could threaten our food supply,"
- 2012 R: "[America's infrastructure networks are critical for economic growth,] international competitiveness, [and national security]."
- 2012 R: "[we will reverse the current Administration's blocking of the Keystone XL Pipeline so that both our countries can profit from this vital venture] and there will no need for hemispheric oil to be shipped to China."
- 2008 R: "Looking to the inevitable day of liberation, we support restrictions on trade with, and travel to, Cuba as a measure of solidarity with the political prisoners and all the oppressed Cuban people."
- 2004 D: "Over the last three years, record surpluses have turned into record deficits [specifically referring to budget deficits, not trade deficits]."

Statements criticizing the United Nations or other Intergovernmental Organizations. These statements are drawn from the Manifesto Project's "Internationalism – Negative" category (code 107).

- *Opposition to joining IGO-facilitated conventions to which the United States is not currently a member (16)*

- 2016 R: “We do not support the U.N. Convention on Women’s Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, as well as various declarations from the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development.”
- 2016 R: “To shield members of our Armed Forces and others in service to America from ideological prosecutions overseas, the Republican Party does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.”
- 2016 R: “We therefore oppose the adoption or ratification of treaties that would weaken or encroach upon American sovereignty or that could be construed by courts to do so.”
- 2016 R: “We will not recognize as binding upon the United States any international agreement forged without the constitutionally required assent of two-thirds of the United States Senate.”
- 2016 R: “Because of our concern for American sovereignty,”
- 2016 R: “…we have deep reservations about the regulatory, legal, and tax regimes inherent in the Law of the Sea Treaty.”
- 2012 R: “Subjecting American citizens to foreign laws is inimical to the spirit of the Constitution.
- 2012 R: “…It is one reason we oppose U.S. participation in the International Criminal Court.”
- 2012 R: “To shield members of our Armed Forces and others in service to America from ideological prosecutions overseas, the Republican Party does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.”

- 2012 R: “[Under our Constitution, treaties become the law of the land. So it is all the more important that the Congress—the Senate through its ratifying power and the House through its appropriating power—shall reject agreements whose long-range impact on the American family is ominous or unclear.] These include the U.N. Convention on Women’s Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty as well as the various declarations from the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development.”
- 2012 R: “Just as George Washington wisely warned America to avoid foreign entanglements and enter into only temporary alliances, we oppose the adoption or ratification of international treaties that weaken or encroach upon American sovereignty.”
- 2012 R: “We oppose any diplomatic efforts that could result in giving the United Nations unprecedented control over the Internet.”
- 2012 R: “International regulatory control over the open and free Internet would have disastrous consequences for the United States and the world.”
- 2012 R: “Because of our concern for American sovereignty, domestic management of our fisheries, and our country’s longterm energy needs, we have deep reservations about the regulatory, legal, and tax regimes inherent in the Law of the Sea Treaty”
- 2012 R: “… and congratulate Senate Republicans for blocking its ratification.”
- 2004 R: “We hail the actions of President Bush and the Republican Congress to ensure that our nation's efforts to meet our global security commitments and

protect Americans are not impaired by the potential for investigations, inquiry, or prosecution by the International Criminal Court, whose jurisdiction we do not accept as extending to Americans."

- *Opposition to programs related to environmental protection (11)*
    - 2016 R: "The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a political mechanism, not an unbiased scientific institution."
    - 2016 R: "…Its unreliability is reflected in its intolerance toward scientists and others who dissent from its orthodoxy."
    - 2016 R: "…We will evaluate its recommendations accordingly."
    - 2016 R: "We reject the agendas of both the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement, which represent only the personal commitments of their signatories"
    - 2016 R: *"*We demand an immediate halt to U.S. funding for the U.N.'s Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in accordance with the 1994 Foreign Relations Authorization Act."
    - 2016 R: "…That law prohibits Washington from giving any money to "any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants Palestinians membership as a state."
    - 2016 R: "…There is no ambiguity in that language."
    - 2016 R: "…It would be illegal for the President to follow through on his intention to provide millions in funding for the UNFCCC and hundreds of millions for its Green Climate Fund."
    - 2016 R: "We emphatically reject U.N. Agenda 21 as erosive of U.S. sovereignty, and we oppose any form of Global Tax."

- 2012 R: “We strongly reject the U.N. Agenda 21 as erosive of American sovereignty”
- 2004 R: “Our President and our Party strongly oppose the Kyoto Protocol and similar mandatory carbon emissions controls that harm economic growth and destroy American jobs.”

- *Demands for institutional reform (7)*
  - 2016 D: “Many of these organizations need reform and updating”
  - 2016 R: “Our continued participation in the United Nations should be contingent upon the enactment of long-overdue changes in the way that institution functions.”
  - 2016 R: “We should no longer tolerate its managerial scandals,”
  - 2012 R: “The United Nations remains in dire need of reform”
  - 2012 R: “…, starting with full transparency in the financial operations of its overpaid bureaucrats.
  - 2012 R: “As long as its scandal-ridden management continues, as long as some of the world’s worst tyrants hold seats on its Human Rights Council, and as long as Israel is treated as a pariah state, the U.N. cannot expect the full support of the American people.”
  - 2008 R: “The UN must reform its scandal-ridden and corrupt management and become more accountable and transparent in its operations and expenses.”
- *Other miscellaneous issues (8)*

- 2016 R: “The U.N.’s Population Fund has, from its origin, been rooted in no-growth policies that limit economic development in the countries needing it most.”
- 2012 R: “and we oppose any form of U.N. Global Tax.”
- 2008 R: “Discrimination against Israel at the UN is unacceptable.”
- 2008 R: “At the United Nations, our country will pay a fair, but not disproportionate, share of dues, but we will never support a UN-imposed tax.”
- 2008 R: “As a matter of U.S. sovereignty, American forces must remain under American command.”
- 2004 R: “We oppose all attempts by the United Nations to impose a global tax and reject any claims of authority by United Nations to do so.”
- 2004 R: “The United Nations was not designed to summon or lead armies in the field and, as a matter of U.S. sovereignty, American troops must never serve under United Nations command.”
- 2004 R: “We support adoption of bipartisan legislation to withhold the annual headquarters contribution made by the U.S. Department of State to the International Committee of the Red Cross if Magen David Adom is not given the opportunity to participate fully in the activities of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.”

SI Section 2: Documentation of iPoll public opinion data

The paper uses data from the Roper Center's iPoll database to compare public opinion from the early Cold War (1946-1960) to public opinion over the last fifteen years (2009-2024).[2] Following the approach developed in Benjamin Page and Robert Shapiro's *The Rational Public* (Chicago, 1995), the paper tracks changes and/or continuity in public opinion by identifying similar questions that were asked in similar ways across those two eras. This appendix explains how those questions were identified and documents the iPoll survey data described in the paper's main text. All data come from nationally-representative samples of U.S. adults.[3]

1. *"The Roper Center's iPoll database contains 28 surveys from the Truman and Eisenhower administrations that asked voters to say whether they thought military spending should be increased, decreased, or kept about the same. On average, 25 percent of these surveys' respondents supported raising military expenditures with 19 percent supporting defense budget cuts."* Search parameters: Surveys from 1945-1960 that iPoll tags as pertaining to defense spending, with three response options (increase, decrease, keep about the same).

- USNORC.460146.R01. 11/1/1946. 14% raise, 21% cut.
- USNORC.490163.R04. 2/6/1949. 29% raise, 26% cut.
- USGALLUP.032450.R09. 3/3/1950. 23% raise, 15% cut.
- USGALLUP.50-454.R13B. 3/31/1950. 64% raise, 7% cut.
- USNORC.510298.R19. 1/1/1951. 36% raise, 22% cut.
- USNORC.510300.R16. 3/1/1951. 20% raise, 29% cut.

[2] The latter period was defined as June 2009 through June 2024.
[3] I.e. questions that iPoll lists as being posed to samples of national adults or national registered voters.

- USNORC.510302.R17. 4/1/1951. 44% raise, 8% cut.
- USNORC.510302.R20. 4/1/1951. 26% raise, 19% cut.
- USNORC.510307.R20. 5/1/1951. 19% raise, 25% cut.
- USNORC.510312.R15. 8/1/1951. 18% raise, 28% cut.
- USNORC.510314.R19. 11/1/1951. 20% raise, 28% cut.
- USNORC.510315.R17. 12/1/1951. 17% raise, 26% cut.
- USNORC.520317.R19. 2/1/1951. 16% raise, 17% cut.
- USNORC.520323.R09. 4/1/1952. 18% raise, 20% cut.
- USNORC.520325.R20. 5/1/1952. 22% raise, 24% cut.
- USNORC.520327.R21. 6/1/1952. 9% raise, 25% cut.
- USNORC.520329.R14. 8/1/1952. 24% raise, 21% cut.
- USNORC.520333.R13. 11/1/1951. 20% raise, 23% cut.
- USGALLUP.52-508.Q02A. 11/19/1952. 30% raise, 25% cut.
- USNORC.52-0334.R05. 12/1/1952. 31% raise, 11% cut.
- USNORC.530337.R08. 2/1/1953. 23% raise, 19% cut.
- USNORC.530341.R16. 6/1/1953. 16% raise, 21% cut.
- USGALLUP.53-519.Q07. 8/20/1953. 23% raise, 20% cut.
- USNORC.550378.R03. 10/10/1955. 26% raise, 8% cut.

- USGALLUP.57-579.Q008. 3/5/1957. 22% raise, 10% cut.
- USGALLUP.59IISR12.Q16A. 8/1/1959. 24% raise, 12% cut.
- USGALLUP.60-625.Q002. 3/7/1960. 22% raise, 19% cut.
- USCPS.60ELEC.Q56. 11/29/1960. 45% raise, 5% cut.

2. *"The iPoll database contains 56 surveys asking similar questions over the last 15 years. On average, 31 percent of those surveys' respondents said the defense budget was too low and 29 percent said the defense budget was too high*. Search parameters: Surveys from 2009-2024 that iPoll tags as pertaining to defense spending, with three response options (increase, decrease, keep about the same).

- USTNS.08TRANS.R10A. 6/24/2008. 26% raise, 36% cut.
- USGREEN.08HOMET.R52 6/26/2008. 11% raise, 53% cut.
- USKN.08GLOBAL.R0020B. 7/15/2008. 31% raise, 28% cut.
- USNORC.GSS08A.Q0068I. 9/13/2008. 23% raise, 41% cut.
- USNORC.GSS08A.Q0069I. 9/13/2008. 26% raise, 35% cut.
- USGALLUP.09FB0009.R14. 2/12/2009. 24% raise, 31% cut.
- USPSRA.070909A.R02HF2. 6/21/2009. 40% raise, 18% cut.
- USSRBI.120309P.R44F1. 11/8/2009. 26% raise, 23% cut.
- USMCLAUG.10NRIPOL.R30. 1/20/2010. 31% raise, 23% cut.

- USGALLUP.10FBY001.R14. 2/3/2010. 27% raise, 34% cut.
- USKN.10GLOBALV.R0025B. 6/22/2010. 30% raise, 27% cut.
- USNORC.GSS10A.Q0070I. 8/12/2010. 23% raise, 34% cut.
- USGALLUP.11FBR02.R12. 2/5/2011. 22% raise, 39% cut.
- USPSRA.021011.R17KF2. 2/7/2011. 31% raise, 30% cut.
- USPSRA.050411.R56A. 3/14/2011. 13% raise, 30% cut.
- USTNS.2011GMF.Q12A. 6/20/2011. 23% raise, 33% cut.
- USTNS.2011GMF.Q12B. 6/20/2011. 22% raise, 29% cut.
- USGALLUP.12FBY02.R12. 2/5/2012. 24% raise, 41% cut.
- USTNS.12TRANS.R35A. 6/24/2012. 20% raise, 32% cut.
- USNORC.GSS12A.Q0067I. 9/25/2012. 24% raise, 32% cut.
- USNORC.GSS12A.Q0068I. 9/5/2012. 25% raise, 29% cut.
- USGALLUP.13FB007.R13. 2/10/2013. 26% raise, 35% cut.
- USPSRA.022213.R28KF2. 2/18/2013. 32% raise, 24% cut.
- USPSRA.120313.R34F2. 11/6/2013. 23% raise, 28% cut.
- USGALLUP.022714.R11. 2/9/2014. 28% raise, 37% cut.
- USKN.2014CCGA.Q12B. 5/29/2014. 25% raise, 28% cut.
- USNORC.GSS14A.Q0067I. 10/11/2014. 34% raise, 30% cut.

- USNORC.GSS14A.Q0068I. 10/11/2014. 32% raise, 30% cut.
- USGALLUP.022015.R01. 2/11/2015. 34% raise, 32% cut.
- USSSRS.071715K.R32C. 5/31/2015. 36% raise, 19% cut.
- USGALLUP.021516.R14. 2/7/2016. 37% raise, 32% cut.
- USNORC.GSS16D.Q1400E. 4/5/2016. 44% raise, 21% cut.
- USSRBI.050516.R42. 4/19/2016. 35% raise, 24% cut.
- USNORC.GSS16A.Q0077I. 11/9/2016. 37% raise, 27% cut.
- USNORC.GSS16A.Q0078I. 11/9/2016. 36% raise, 26% cut.
- USGALLUP.030217.R15. 2/5/2017. 37% raise, 31% cut.
- USASFOX.021417.R19. 2/13/2017. 45% raise, 25% cut.
- USPSRA.022417K.R13D. 2/19/2017. 39% raise, 16% cut.
- USPSRA.042417.R41IF2. 4/11/2017. 46% raise, 20% cut.
- USSSRS.012618K.R08C. 1/21/2018. 40% raise, 19% cut.
- USGALLUP.022118.R13. 2/10/2018. 33% raise, 34% cut.
- USGALLUP.022118.R13A. 2/10/2018. 45% raise, 22% cut.
- 31116351. 11/10/2018. 20% raise, 27% cut.
- 31116351. 11/10/2018. 29% raise, 28% cut.
- 31116081. 2/10/2019. 25% raise, 29% cut.

- 31116197. 3/25/2019. 40% raise, 23% cut.
- 31116533. 5/24/2019. 31% raise, 23% cut.
- 31116534. 6/3/2019. 39% raise, 18% % cut.
- 31116954. 9/22/2019. 35% raise, 9% cut.
- 31117181. 2/16/2020. 17% raise, 31% cut.
- 31117467. 2/16/2020. 22% raise, 30% cut.
- 31117470. 5/18/2020. 22% raise, 30% cut.
- 31119345. 2/17/2022. 32% raise, 31% cut.
- 31120178. 3/20/2023. 35% raise, 29% cut.
- 31120574. 10/9/2023. 39% raise, 31% cut.
- 31120651. 11/6/2023. 32% raise, 31% cut.
- 31121012. 1/7/2024. 32% raise, 19% cut.

3. *"during Truman's last full year in office (1952), just 35 percent of Americans said that the Korean War had been worth fighting with 55 percent of voters disagreeing with that statement."* Search parameters: Surveys from 1952 that include the word "Korea." Questions about whether the war had been worth fighting are the only questions in this list that are comparable to questions regarding the public approval for the Iraq war (S4).

- USNORC.520329.R09. 8/31/1952. As things stand now, do you feel that the United States effort in Korea has been worthwhile? 39% Yes, 54% No.

- USNORC.52-0332.R03. 10/31/1952. As things stand now, do you feel that the war in Korea has been worth fighting, or not? 31% Has, 56% Has not.

- USNORC.520333.R07. 11/301952. As things stand now, do you feel that the war in Korea has been worth fighting, or not? 34% Has, 58% Has not.

- USNORC.52-0334.R02. 12/21/1952. As things stand now, do you feel that the war in Korea has been worth fighting, or not? 39% Has, 52% Has not.

4. *"Those figures resemble polling data from the last full year of George W. Bush's presidency (2008), when an average of 33 percent of Americans said that the Iraq War had been worth fighting with 63 percent of voters disagreeing with that statement."* Search parameters: Surveys from 2008 that include the worth "Iraq." Questions about whether the war had been worth fighting are the only questions in this list that are comparable to questions regarding public approval for the Korean War (S3).

- USABCWP.011508.R05. 1/12/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 34% Worth fighting, 64% Not worth fighting.

- USNBCWSJ.08JAN.R34. 1/22/2008. When it comes to the war in Iraq, do you think that removing Saddam Hussein from power was or was not worth the number of US (United States) military casualties and the financial cost of the war? 32% Worth it, 59% Not worth it.

- USABCWP.020408.R07. 2/1/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 34% Worth fighting. 64% Not worth fighting.

- USLAT.022708.R63. 2/25/2008. All in all, do you think the situation in Iraq was worth going to war over, or not? 33% Worth going to war. 59% Not worth going to war.
- USABCWP.030508.R02. 3/2/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 35% Worth fighting, 64% Not worth fighting.
- USORC.2008004.Q39. 3/16/2008. All in all, do you think the situation in Iraq was worth going to war over, or not? 36% Yes, worth going to war over. 62% No, not worth going to war over.
- USCBS.031808A.R11. 3/18/2008. Do you think the result of the war with Iraq was worth the loss of American life and other costs of attacking Iraq, or not? 29% Worth it, 64% Not worth it.
- USCBS.200803A.Q11. 3/18/2008. Do you think the result of the war with Iraq was worth the loss of American lives and other costs of attacking Iraq, or not? 28% Worth it, 66% Not worth it.
- USCBS.200803B.Q11. 3/20/2008. Do you think the result of the war with Iraq was worth the loss of American lives and other costs of attacking Iraq, or not? 28% Worth it, 65% Not worth it.
- USABCWP.041708.R05. 4/13/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 35% Worth fighting, 63% Not worth fighting.

- USTARR.08BATT2.R13. 5/14/2008. All in all, do you think the war in Iraq is worth fighting, or not? 41% Worth fighting, 56% Not worth fighting.

- USABCWP.061708A.R11. 6/15/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 34% Worth fighting. 63% Not worth fighting.

- USLAT.062508.R49. 6/23/2008. All in all, do you think the situation in Iraq was worth going to war over, or not? 27% Worth going to war, 67% Not worth going to war.

- USABCWP.071408.R11. 7/13/2008. All in all, considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States, do you think the war with Iraq was worth fighting, or not? 35% Worth fighting, 64% Not worth fighting.

5. *"The iPoll database shows that 74 percent of voters originally supported joining NATO, with 11 percent opposed."* Search parameters: Surveys from the early Cold War containing the terms "NATO" or "North Atlantic". Questions about whether NATO was worth joining are the only questions in this list comparable to recent data on the value of participating in the Alliance (S6-S8).

- USGALLUP.070849.R16B. 6/16/1949. The United States and various North Atlantic countries, such as Canada, England, France, Norway, and Holland, have signed a mutual defense pact --that is, each country has agreed to come to the defense of any of the other countries if it is attacked. Do you think the United States Senate should or should not ratify the North Atlantic Security Pact? 67% Should, 15% Should not.

- USGALLUP.49-438.QT06D. 3/11/1949. Do you think the U.S. (United States) and such countries as Canada, England, France, Norway, Holland and other North Atlantic

countries, should join together in a mutual defense pact--that is, agree to come to each other's defense immediately if any of them is attacked? 77% Should, 16% Should not.

- USNORC.490166.R10. 6/30/1949. Under this (North Atlantic) pact the countries of western Europe, Canada and the United States would agree to defend each other against any attack. Now it's up to the United States Senate to vote for or against the treaty. How do you feel about it--are you in favor of the North Atlantic treaty or against it? 76% In favor, 12% Against it.

- USNORC.490167.R13. 6/30/1949. Well (as you probably know), under this pact the countries of western Europe, Canada and the United States would agree to defend each other against any attack. Now it's up to the United States Senate to vote for or against the treaty. How do you feel about it--are you in favor of the North Atlantic treaty, or against it? 77% In favor, 10% Against it.

- USGALLUP.032849.R14D. 3/24/1949. Do you think the United States and such countries as Canada, England, France, Norway, Holland, and other North Atlantic countries, should join together in a mutual defense pact--that is, agree to come to each other's defense immediately if any of them is attacked? 76% Should, 14% Should not.

- USGALLUP.051849.R08B. 5/7/1949. The United States and various North Atlantic countries, such as Canada, England, France, Norway, and Holland, have signed a mutual defense pact--that is, each country has agreed to come to the defense of any of the other countries if it is attacked. Do you think the United States Senate should or should not ratify the North Atlantic Security Pact? 67% Should, 12% Should not.

- USGALLUP.439T.QT14D. 3/24/1949. Do you think the U.S. (United States) and such countries as Canada, England, France, Norway, Holland, and other North Atlantic countries, should join together in a mutual defense pact – that is, agree to come to each other's defense immediately if any of them is attacked? 81% Should, 11% Should not.

- USNORC.490165.R08. 4/30/1949. Under this (North Atlantic) treaty the countries of western Europe, Canada and the United States would agree to defend each other against any attack. Now it's up to the United States Senate to vote for or against the treaty. How do you feel about it--are you in favor of the North Atlantic treaty, or against it? 76% In Favor, 12% Against it.

- USGALLUP.49443T.QT16B. 6/16/1949. The United States and various North Atlantic countries, such as Canada, England, France, Norway, and Holland, have signed a mutual defense pact--that is, each country has agreed to come to the defense of any of the other countries if it is attacked. Do you think the U.S. Senate should or should not ratify (give its approval to) the North Atlantic Security Pact? 69% Should, 14% Should not.

- USGALLUP.49441K.QK08B. 5/7/1949. Should the United States Senate give its approval to the North Atlantic Security Pact between the United States, Britain, Canada, and Western European nations which calls for a promise of mutual aid from all members of the alliance if any single member nation is attacked? 76% Yes, 15% No.

- USGALLUP.440K.QK05A. 4/14/1949. The U.S. (United States) and various North Atlantic countries, such as Canada, England, France, Norway, and Holland, have signed a mutual defense pact--that is, each country has agreed to come to the defense of any of the

other countries if it is attacked. Do you think the U.S. Senate should or should not ratify (approve) the North Atlantic Security Pact? 70% Should, 14% Should not.

6. *"For comparison, iPoll data indicate that, over the last fifteen years, 73 percent of voters have said NATO is good for the United States and 12 percent said that NATO is bad for the United States."* Search parameters for statements S6-S8: Surveys from 2009-2024 containing the terms "NATO" or "North Atlantic". Questions about whether NATO is good for the United States are comparable to data from the early Cold War regarding whether the United States should participate in the Alliance (S5).

- USSRBI.050516.R47. 4/19/2016. As you may know, NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a military alliance between the US, Canada, and many European countries. All in all, would you say being a member of NATO is good for the US or bad for the US? 77% Good, 15% Bad.

- 31116197. 3/25/2019. As you may know, NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a military alliance between the US, Canada, and many European countries. All in all, would you say being a member of NATO is good for the US or bad for the US? 77% Good, 15% Bad.

- 31119529. 4/18/2022. As you may know, NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a military alliance between the United States, Canada, and many European countries. In general, would you say being a member of NATO is good for the United States, bad for the US, or neither good nor bad? 64% Good, 6% Bad.

- 31120895.00002. 2/26/2024. As you may know, NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a military alliance between the United States, Canada, and many

European countries. In general, would you say being a member of NATO is good for the United States, bad for the US, or neither good nor bad? 61% good, 13% bad.

7. *"…79 percent of voters think the United States should maintain its commitment to NATO whereas 18 percent agree that the Alliance is 'not necessary anymore.'"* Search parameters: same as above.

- USGALLUP.021717.R18. 2/5/2017. Now thinking NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), the military alliance among western nations, do you think the NATO alliance should be maintained, or is the alliance not necessary anymore? 80% Should be maintained, 16% Not necessary anymore.
- 31116081. 2/10/2019. Now thinking NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), the military alliance among western nations, do you think the NATO alliance should be maintained, or is the alliance not necessary anymore? 77% Should be maintained, 19% Not necessary anymore.

8. *"On average, 76 percent of voters agreed that President Trump should 'defend all of America's NATO allies, if necessary,' versus 17 percent who disagreed."* Search parameters: same as above.

- USQUINN.112316.R41. 11/20/2016. As president, do you think Donald Trump should...defend all of America's NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies, if necessary, or not? 77% Yes, 16% No.

- USQUINN.011317.R34. 1/9/2017. As president, do you think Donald Trump should--defend all of America's NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies, if necessary, or not? 71% Yes, 20% No.

- USQUINN.020817.R26. 2/6/2017. As president, do you think Donald Trump should--defend all of America's NATO allies, if necessary, or not? 79% Yes, 13% No.

- 31115384. 7/23/2018. As president, do you think Donald Trump should defend all of America's NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) allies, if necessary, or not? 78% Yes, 16% No.

9. *"The iPoll database shows that an average of 52 percent of Americans supported sending military forces to defend Taiwan during the early Cold War, with 33 percent opposed."* Search parameters: Surveys from 1945-1960 containing the terms "Taiwan" or "Formosa." Questions were selected if they asked voters whether they would defend Taiwan from a Chinese attack.

- USNORC.550366.R13. 1/1/1955. "If the Chinese communists attack Formosa, do you think the United States should help defend Formosa, even if other countries do not join with us?" 56% Yes, 28% No.

- USNORC.540365.R09. 11/1/1954. "If the Chinese communists attack Formosa, do you think the United States should help defend Formosa, even if other countries do not join with us?" 54% Yes, 34% No.

- USGALLUP.58-605.Q029C. 9/29/1958. "There's been much discussion about whether this country should get into an all-out war with Red China over the Quemoy and Matsu islands and over Formosa itself. Should the United States go to war for Formosa?" 40% Yes, 45% No.

10. *"Since 2008, by contrast, iPoll data indicate that just 30 percent of U.S. voters have supported sending troops to defend Taiwan, with 66 percent opposed."* Search parameters: Surveys from 2009-2024 containing the terms "Taiwan" or "Formosa." Questions were selected if they asked voters whether they would defend Taiwan from a Chinese attack.

- USKN.10GLOBALV.R0030B. 6/22/2010. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using US (United States) troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations.) Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...if China invaded Taiwan? 25% Favor, 71% Oppose.

- USPSRA.091812G.R32. 5/13/2012. If China were to use military force against Taiwan, should the United States use military force to defend Taiwan, or not? 48% Favor, 43% Oppose.

- USKN.12GLOBALV.R0030B. 6/8/2012. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using US (United States) troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations.) Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...if China invaded Taiwan? 28% Favor, 69% Oppose.

- USKN.201304CCGA.Q17B. 4/15/2013. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using US troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations. Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops)...if China invaded Taiwan? 23% Favor, 77% Oppose.

- USKN.2014CCGA.Q13B. 5/29/2014. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using US troops in other parts of the world. Please give

your opinion about some situations.) Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...if China invaded Taiwan? 26% Favor, 71% Oppose.

- USKN.061215CC.R030B1. 6/17/2015. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using US troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations.) Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...if China invaded Taiwan? 28% Favor, 68% Oppose.

- 31116769. 7/31/2018. (There has been some discussion about the circumstances that might justify using United States troops in other parts of the world. Please give your opinion about some situations.) Would you favor or oppose the use of US troops...if China invaded Taiwan. 35% Favor, 61% Oppose.

11. *"From 1946-1960, according to iPoll data, an average of 36 percent of Americans preferred lowering tariffs and an average of 22 percent of Americans supported raising tariffs."* Search parameters: Surveys from 1946-1960 that iPoll tags as corresponding to "trade," focusing on questions that allow respondents to indicate whether tariffs should be higher or lower.

- USGALLUP.47-389.QK15D. 2/5/1947. Do you think Congress should raise or lower tariffs on most products or leave them as they are now? 24% Raise, 14% Lower.

- USGALLUP.062953.RK13D. 6/4/1953. By and large, do you favor higher tariffs or lower tariffs than we have at present? 30% Higher, 13% Lower.

- USGALLUP.53-520.Q11B. 9/17/1953. Some people say that our present tariffs should be increased. Other people say the U.S. should establish freer trade with other countries by lowering tariffs. By and large, do you favor higher tariffs or lower tariffs than we have at present? 30% Higher, 14% Lower.

- USGALLUP.022854.RK13B. 2/2/1954. By and large, do you favor higher or lower tariffs than we have at present? 40% Higher, 16% Lower.
- USGALLUP.091254.RK25B. 8/10/1954. By and large, do you favor higher or lower tariffs than we have at present? 49% Higher, 27% Lower.
- USGALLUP.010855.RK07B. 12/7/1954. By and large, do you favor higher or lower tariffs than we have at present? 42% Higher, 26% Lower.
- USROPER.CM103.Q10. 3/30/1957. What about tariffs on foreign goods? Do you think tariffs should be fairly high to protect people's jobs and our own industry from foreign competition, or should they be fairly low to keep prices down and encourage international trade? 34% Higher, 34% Lower.
- USGALLUP.59-614.Q054B. 6/3/1959. By and large, do you favor higher tariffs or lower tariffs than we have at present? 40% Higher, 31% Lower.

12. *"Over the last fifteen years, support for lowering restrictions on trade has nearly doubled (to 63 percent), while support for raising trade restrictions has only marginally grown (to 29 percent)."* Search parameters: Surveys from 2009-2024 that iPoll tags as corresponding to "trade," focusing on questions that allow respondents to indicate whether tariffs should be higher or lower.

- 31117961.00044. 10/22/2017. Do you think government should try to encourage international trade or try to discourage international trade?...Strongly encourage international trade, somewhat encourage trade, somewhat discourage international trade, strongly discourage international trade. 69% encourage, 30% discourage.

- USCBS.042617D.R27. 4/24/2017. Do you think the US should put more restrictions on foreign trade, or should the US do more to promote free trade? 56% Less, 34% More.

- USPRRI.120517.R23. 10/30/2017. Do you think the US should put more restrictions on foreign trade, or should the US do more to promote free trade? 63% Less, 29% More.

- USSELZER.032316.R24. 3/22/2016. Turning now to trade, generally speaking, do you think US trade policy should have more restrictions on imported foreign goods to protect American jobs, or have fewer restrictions to enable American consumers to have the most choices and the lowest prices? 65% Less, 22% More.

13. *"The iPoll database similarly shows that the proportion of Americans who think the United Nations is doing a good job dropped from an average of 57 percent during the early Cold War…."* Search parameters: Questions from 1945-1960 that iPoll tagged as corresponding to the United Nations, and that allow voters to indicate whether they think the UN is doing a good job or a bad job (with no intermediate options).

- USGALLUP.011354.RK06. 12/16/1953. In general, do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 55% Good job, 30% Poor job.

- USGALLUP.54-534.Q04. 7/21/1954. In general, do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 58% Good job, 25% Poor job.

14. *"… to an average of 36 percent today*." Search parameters: Questions from 2009-2024 that iPoll tagged as corresponding to the United Nations, and that allow voters to indicate whether they think the UN is doing a good job or a bad job (with no intermediate options).

- USGALLUP.10FEBY01.R16. 2/3/2010. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 31% Good Job, 64% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.13FEB25TR2.R01. 2/5/2011. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 31% Good Job, 62% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.13FEB25TR1.R01. 2/5/2012. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 32% Good Job, 61% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.13FEB25.R01. 2/26/2013. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 35% Good Job, 50% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.022514.R12. 2/9/2014. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 35% Good Job, 57% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.022515A.R16. 2/11/2015. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 35% Good Job, 57% Poor job.
- USGALLUP.030116.R16. 2/7/2016. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 38% Good Job, 54% Poor Job.

- USGALLUP.022417A.R17. 2/5/2017. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 37% Good Job, 60% Poor job.

- USGALLUP.030118A.R15. 2/10/2018. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 34% Good Job, 60% Poor job.

- 31116081. 2/10/2019. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 44% Good Job, 53% Poor job.

- 31117181. 2/16/2020. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 43% Good Job, 54% Poor job.

- 31119345. 2/17/2022. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 37% Good Job, 58% Poor job.

- 31120883.00011. 2/20/2024. Do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face? 33% Good Job, 58% Bad Job.