

## **Multilateralism Survey Results, May 2012**

---

**Josh Busby**, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas

**Jon Monten**, University of Oklahoma

**Will Inboden**, LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas

Is there an insurmountable partisan divide over the place of multilateralism in U.S. foreign policy? To explore this question, we conducted a unique survey of foreign policy professionals in mid 2011 and early 2012 from both parties, assessing their attitudes toward a range of multilateral issues and institutions.

### **SURVEY DESIGN**

We designed the survey to ascertain the views of some of the most influential foreign policy actors in each party: those who have served in policy-making positions. For balance we sent surveys to approximately 50 Republicans and 50 Democrats with the criteria that the individual had served in a mid-level or higher foreign policy position in the Clinton, Bush, or Obama Administrations, or on Capitol Hill. Approximately 80-90% of respondents had served at the Deputy Assistant Secretary or Senior Director-level or higher in the executive branch, including some Under Secretaries. Most respondents reported having a postgraduate degree. The median age of the group was 47 years old. Our surveys produced a response rate of around 45%, with completed surveys from 20 Republican and 23 Democratic foreign policy-makers.

### **GLOBAL ECONOMY**

Elites of both parties shared the greatest convergence of attitudes on economic issues. There was strong favorability for Bretton Woods-era institutions, with the World Bank favored by 77.3% of Democrats and 65% of Republicans and the IMF (72.7%-D, 63.2%-R), with the differences between them not statistically significant. In terms of the IMF, both strongly agreed that the IMF is important (86.4%-D, 70%-R) and both rejected the notion that the organization is no longer relevant or influential (9.1%-D, 5%-R). That said, there was more doubt within both parties about how central the IMF has been in the current crisis with nearly identical percentages suggesting the IMF has not been the primary forum (59.1%-D, 55%-R). There were slight differences in attitudes with Republicans were more likely to agree that IMF lending encourages risky behavior (13.6%-D, 40%-R) while Democrats were more likely to say global financial regulation was very important (71.4%-D, 31.6%-R).

## Bretton Woods

<b><i>Favorability</i></b>	<u><i>Democrats</i></u>	<u><i>Republicans</i></u>
<i>World Bank</i>	77.3%	65%
<i>IMF</i>	72.7%	63.2%
<b><i>Agreement</i></b>		
<i>IMF lending generates risk behavior</i>	13.6%	<b>40%</b>
<i>The IMF is no longer relevant or influential</i>	9.1%	5%
<i>The IMF is important</i>	86.4%	70%
<i>The IMF is useful but not primary forum recently</i>	59.1%	55%
<b><i>Very Important</i></b>		
<i>Global Financial Regulation</i>	<b>71.4%</b>	31.6%

\* **Bolded** numbers in the tables represent statistically significant differences

On the subject of international trade, elites were also in strong agreement. Democrats and Republicans both strongly favored the WTO (86.4%-D, 85%-R) and and NAFTA (77.3%-D, 100%-R). In terms of the WTO, elites of both parties strongly supported abiding by WTO decisions even when they go against the United States (90.9%-D, 83.3%-R). There were zero support for withdrawal from the WTO. Both parties agreed that international trade was a very important issue that should be addressed multilaterally 95%-D, 85%-R. Republicans were, however, modestly more supportive of the idea that US interests could be better secured through bilateral or regional agreements 18.2%-D, 57.9%-R.

## Trade

	<i>Democrats</i>	<i>Republicans</i>
<b>Favorability</b>		
NAFTA	77.3%	<b>100%</b>
WTO	86.4%	85%
<b>Agreement</b>		
Abide by WTO decisions that go against US	90.9%	83.3%
Withdraw from WTO	0%	0%
US interests better secured through bilateral or regional agreements	18.2%	<b>57.9%</b>
<b>Very important</b>		
International Trade	76.4%	89.5%
International Trade Multilateral Response	95%	85%

## INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

In terms of security issues, we find some points of convergence and divergence. Namely, both Democrats and Republicans are favorable to NATO (90.9%-D, 85%-R). There are some slight differences of emphasis. Republicans were more agreed that we should use NATO when we can (78.9%), while Democrats were more split, some emphasizing that we should always use NATO (50%) and others emphasizing that we should use NATO when we can (45.5%). A minority view of Republicans (25%) see NATO as ineffective, somewhat higher than the 4.5% on the Democratic side.

## NATO

	<i>Democrats</i>	<i>Republicans</i>
<b>Favorability</b>	90.9%	85%
<b>Agreement</b>		
We should always use NATO	<b>50%</b>	10%
Use NATO when we can	45.5%	<b>78.9%</b>
NATO ineffective	4.5%	<b>25%</b>

On the issue of arms control, however, there was more divergence between Democrats and Republicans and among Republicans. Democrats were overwhelmingly favorable to the IAEA (95.5%), the NPT (100%), the Chemical Weapons Convention (95.5%), and START (95.5%), while only 45%, 60%, 55%, and 45% of Republicans respectively favored these organizations and treaties. Both parties strongly agreed that nonproliferation was a very important problem (95.2%-D, 89.4%-R) that should be addressed multilaterally (95%-D, 85%-R). However, with Republicans much more supportive of newer approaches like the Proliferation Security Initiative (47.6%-D, 83.3%-R), this suggests that there is wider disagreement on the means despite consensus on both the ends and the importance of a multilateral approach. Some of the most stark differences were observed with respect to terrorism where Republicans more likely to think the issue very important (52.4%-D, 89.5%-R) and one that should be addressed multilaterally (65%-D, 85%-R).

### Arms Control

<b><i>Favorability</i></b>	<b><i>Democrats</i></b>	<b><i>Republicans</i></b>
IAEA	<b>95.5%</b>	45%
Non-Proliferation Treaty	<b>100%</b>	60%
Chemical Weapons Convention	<b>95.5%</b>	55%
START	<b>95.5%</b>	45%
Proliferation Security Initiative	47.6%	<b>83.3%</b>
<b><i>Very Important</i></b>		
Nonproliferation	95.2%	89.5%
Nonproliferation Multilateral Response	95%	85%
Terrorism	52.4%	<b>89.5%</b>
Terrorism Multilateral Response	65%	<b>85%</b>

In terms of alliances, we also find some significant differences, with Republicans much more favorable to alliances with Afghanistan (9.1%-D, 55%-R), Iraq (13.6%-D, 75%-R) and Israel (45.5%-D, 100%-R). On Iraq and Afghanistan, the slight difference in deployment of the survey February 2012 for Democrats and June 2011 may explain some of the differences. The results for Israel suggests that U.S.-Israel relations are much more contentious within Democratic elite circles than among Republicans. On other traditional alliances, there is strong bipartisan support for relationships with the UK, Japan, Australia, and South Korea with strong bipartisan support for U.S.-India relations as well.

## Alliances/Partnerships

<b>Favorability</b>	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>Republicans</b>
Afghanistan	9.1%	<b>55%</b>
Iraq	13.6%	<b>75%</b>
Israel	45.5%	<b>100%</b>
<i>No statistically significant differences for Australia, India, Japan, South Korea, UK</i>		

In terms of the United Nations, we see stronger disagreement than other areas. Democrats are more favorable (77.3%) to the United Nations than Republicans (30%) and were much more likely to agree that the UN is important because it has global legitimacy (90.9%-D, 25%-R). Republicans, however, were more likely to agree that we should distinguish between the UN and parts of the UN that are ineffective and act against US interests (90%, R, 27.2% D). That said, partisans of both agreed that the UN Security Council is an important place to defend U.S. interests (100%-D, 70%- R). Again, Republicans more heavily emphasized sovereignty concerns, suggesting that US law takes precedence over the UN (95%- R, 63.6%-D).

## UNITED NATIONS

<b>Favorability</b>	<b>Democrats</b>	<b>Republicans</b>
<b>Favorability</b>	<b>77.3%</b>	30%
<b>Agreement</b> <i>We should work through the UN because it has global legitimacy.</i>	<b>90.9%</b>	25%
<i>The UN Security Council is an important place to defend our interests.</i>	<b>100%</b>	70%
<i>Need to distinguish between UN and good work of UN agencies</i>	56.5%	<b>80%</b>
<i>UN agencies ineffective.</i>	27.2%	<b>90%</b>
<i>US law takes precedence over UN.</i>	63.6%	<b>95%</b>

Turning to other newer issue areas like health and the environment, there are some striking areas of partisan difference as well as other areas of potential bipartisanship. While health issues are not regarded as especially important, both groups support the

Global Fund to Fight Aids, TB, and Malaria (81.8%-D, 66.7%-R) and the World Health Organization (81.8%-D, 65%-R). By contrast, elite policymakers are unsurprisingly divided on the issue of climate change with Democrats much more supportive of the Kyoto Protocol (72.7%-D, 0%-R) and more likely to say the issue is very important (76.2%-D, 10%-R). In the area of human rights, while Democrats strongly favored the International Criminal Court (72.7%-D, 20%-R), Republicans were more likely to identify human rights as a very important issue (47.6%-D, 84.2%-R).

## NEWER ISSUES

<b>Favorability</b>	<u>Democrats</u>	<u>Republicans</u>
International Criminal Court	<b>72.7%</b>	20%
Global Fund	81.8%	66.7%
Kyoto Protocol	<b>72.7%</b>	0%
World Health Organization	81.8%	65%
<b>Very Important</b>		
Human Rights	47.6%	<b>84.2%</b>
Climate	<b>76.2%</b>	10.5%
Health	38.1%	31.6%

With respect to principles, our evidence suggests Republicans are more preoccupied with defending sovereignty than Democrats. While Republicans universally agree in the need to preserve the country's freedom of action (100%) and nearly all of them agree that protecting U.S. sovereignty is important (90%), Democrats are less unified on these questions (75% and 57.9% respectively). Democrats, for their part, uniformly agree that we need to enlist others to have international legitimacy (100%) and that most problems cannot be solved alone (100%). That said, while these differences are statistically significant, strong majorities of Republicans also agreed in the importance of legitimacy (60%) and problem-solving with others (70%). Sharper differences emerged over whether it is more efficient to act alone than cooperate with others (50% Republicans to 19% for Democrats) and a preference for coalitions of the willing (65% for Republicans to 9.5% for Democrats).

## PRINCIPLES

<b><i>Agreement</i></b>	<b><i>Democrats</i></b>	<b><i>Republicans</i></b>
<i>It is more efficient to act alone than it is to cooperate with others.</i>	19%	<b>50%</b>
<i>It is important to protect U.S. sovereignty.</i>	57.9%	<b>94.7%</b>
<i>We need to preserve our freedom of action.</i>	75%	<b>100%</b>
<i>Most international problems today cannot be solved alone</i>	<b>100%</b>	70%
<i>We need to enlist others to have international legitimacy.</i>	<b>100%</b>	60%
<i>Coalitions of the willing' are usually preferable to acting through formal multilateral institutions.</i>	9.5%	<b>65%</b>