



**PUBLIC ATTITUDES  
TOWARDS ACTIVE  
DEFENSE:  
ABM & STAR WARS,  
1945-1985**

*# 2520*

Thomas W. Graham

CENTER FOR  
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES  
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE  
OF TECHNOLOGY  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARDS ACTIVE DEFENSE:  
ABM & STAR WARS, 1945-1985

by

THOMAS W. GRAHAM

Center for International Studies  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

May 1986



Table of Contents

CHAPTERS

1	Introduction
2	ABM Questions and Data
3	Star Wars/Strategic Defense Initiative Questions and Data
4	Interview Dates, Sample Sizes & Bibliographic Information
5	Abbreviations & Survey Organizations

Total Number of National Surveys about Star Wars	46
Total Number of State Surveys about Star Wars	2
Total Number of National Surveys about ABM	28
Total Number of State Surveys about ABM	3



PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARDS ACTIVE DEFENSE:  
ABM & STAR WARS, 1945-1985

Thomas W. Graham

President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), popularly called "Star Wars," is the most recent manifestation of a forty-year debate over developing systems to defend against nuclear attack. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the debate over defensive nuclear systems focused on the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system. Public opinion is one element in the current debate over the role of nuclear weapons and the advisability of developing Star Wars. The purpose of this report is to bring together all opinion data relevant to active defense against nuclear weapons.<sup>1</sup> It is hoped that this will facilitate a more informed discussion of public attitudes on this important public policy issue. This publication contains the text of questions and data from 74 national and 5 state public opinion polls conducted from December 1945 through November 1985. Material presented in this report expands on previously published research conducted by this author and Bernard M. Kramer.<sup>2</sup>

1. Civil defense questions are not included in this report. All surveys that have been published or placed in a university-based archive have been included. Private political polls, such as those conducted by the White House, have not been included unless they have been made available by special permission.

2. Thomas W. Graham and Bernard M. Kramer (1986), "The Polls: ABM and Star Wars: Attitudes Toward Nuclear Defense, 1945-1985," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 50, No. 1. Analysis of this data is presented in Bernard M. Kramer and Thomas W. Graham (1985), "ABM & Star Wars: Public Attitudes Toward Active Defense Against Nuclear Weapons," a paper presented at the 40th annual conference of the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).

What do the polls tell us about public attitudes concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative launched by President Reagan on March 23, 1983? At one level, a review of 46 national polls conducted between May 1981 and November 1985 paints a very confusing picture. Some polls indicate that a majority of the public is against the idea of a space based nuclear defense system. Other polls suggest that a majority of people, in some cases as high as 75% of the public, supports the idea of building a defense system against nuclear missiles. How can one explain these differences?

Part of this discrepancy can be explained by carefully reading the survey questions. People answer the specific question that is asked, not one that might be implied from an intellectual or policy framework that is used by elite actors. When similar questions are asked, clearer patterns emerge. However, responses are extremely sensitive to question wording.

An additional explanation is that the basic constellation of attitudes towards nuclear weapons contain both stable and volatile elements. Despite changes in nuclear weapons technology, missile delivery systems, and the U.S.-Soviet nuclear balance and independent of the recent 1980s public debate over nuclear war and the role of nuclear weapons, the public has held some constant attitudes. This introductory essay reviews some of the general patterns that have been discovered in reviewing relevant survey data over the last 40 years.

1. From the beginning of the atomic age, the U.S. public seems to have had a moderately optimistic attitude toward the possibility of building a defense against nuclear weapons. A majority (up to two-thirds) of the population has believed that the U.S. or its scientists could develop a defense against nuclear weapons.

2. Awareness of defensive nuclear systems--both the ABM system and the Star Wars/SDI research program--has hovered around the 70% level. Despite this relatively high level of awareness, no more than one-quarter of the public is following the current Star Wars debate "a lot" or "very closely." To the public, it appears, SDI is an esoteric issue followed by relatively few people. This echoes the ABM debate during which time only a small number of people had both heard of the system and had an opinion concerning its deployment.

3. In another area concerning awareness, in 1985 only about one-third of the public has heard about the ABM/SALT I treaty. Thus the SALT I treaty, which is extremely important in policy debates on this subject, is unknown to two-thirds of the public.

4. Approximately 75% of the public holds the (inaccurate) belief that the United States has a fairly effective defense against nuclear weapons. Most people are satisfied with our (non-existent) defense against nuclear attack.

5. In the 1960s, a majority of the population believed that the Soviet Union had an existing ABM defense. In the 1980s, a plurality of about one-third thought the Soviets were ahead of the U.S. in Star Wars technology.



6. In 1969, advocates of ABM deployment outnumbered opponents. However, only a minority of the public both had heard of the Safeguard system and had an opinion about its construction. While a plurality of voters and the general public continued to support deployment of the ABM through July 1969, one major change took place. Beginning in April and continuing with more force in July, those with more than a college education changed their opinion and eventually opposed development of the ABM. Among this group, the argument made by scientists that the system would not work seems to have carried the day.

The general public as well as the voting public turned against the ABM only beginning in January 1971 in the context of opposition to spending additional money for the defense system. The relative popularity of the ABM prior to 1971 was unusual because the public turned against increased military spending by July 1969.

7. More recently, the public holds mixed views about Star Wars depending on the context in which the question is asked. Star Wars questions that emphasize defense in general receive public support. Star Wars questions that emphasize cost or nuclear weapons are rejected by the public.

8. A substantial majority of the public has consistently supported the idea of negotiating an ABM arms control agreement or negotiating limitations on Star Wars with the Soviets.

9. Despite this pro-arms control stance, the public believes that moving forward with Star Wars will encourage the Soviet Union to negotiate a nuclear arms control agreement with the U.S.

10. People believe development of Star Wars would increase the arms race, and would not necessarily make them feel more secure.

11. In the process of examining this archival data, one is tempted to manufacture a pattern of consistency lying under the contradictions that appear on the surface of the polling results. How can one explain both the public desire to build a Star Wars defense as a bargaining chip with the public's concerns that building an SDI system would increase the nuclear arms race? Without additional analysis and specially designed polling, it is almost impossible to determine why the public holds these views simultaneously. Instead of trying to force an interpretation on the data, this author thought it was better first to publish what the public actually says, warts and all, and second to complete more detailed analysis.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, and most importantly, I wish to thank the many individuals who helped me discover this wealth of public opinion data and the survey organizations, listed in Chapter 5, that graciously have made it available for academic research.<sup>2</sup>

1. Additional related research is being conducted for my Ph.D. dissertation, "The Politics of Failure: Strategic Nuclear Arms Control, Public Opinion and Domestic Politics in the United States, 1945-1985," MIT- Department of Political Science, forthcoming.

2. Special thanks to the always cooperative Marilyn Potter, Lois Timms and John Benson of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut; Ann Gray, David Sheaves, and Josephine Marsh of the Louis Harris Data Center, Institute for Research in Social Sciences at the University of North Carolina; Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa and Nicholas R. Trio of the University Center for Social and Urban Research at the University of Pittsburgh; Tom Smith and Pat Bova at NORC; Dr. Al Richman and Dr. Bernard Roshco in the Public Affairs Bureau in the U.S. Department of State; John Marttila and Tom Kiley; Dr. Clark Abt; my sometimes co-author Professor Bernard M. Kramer at the University of Massachusetts- Boston; Lynn Whittaker at Harvard; Phyllis Gutterman, Jessie Jajigian, and Dr. Amelia Leiss at MIT and Professor Jack P. Ruina of MIT for providing moral support and financial aid from a Carnegie Corporation grant.

Chapter 2  
ABM

12/1945 As you may have heard, General Arnold and many scientists say that there is no real defense against a surprise attack by fast long-range airplanes and rockets carrying atomic bombs. Do you think there is a real defense or not? (NORC T42)

Yes	11
No	69
Don't know	20

6/1946a Do you think the US will be able to work out an effective defense against the atomic bomb before other nations could use it against us? (SSRC)

Yes	54
No	19
No opinion	27

6/1946b Do you think we will be able to work out a defense against the bomb before other countries learn how to make it? (SSRC)

Yes	35
Yes, with qualification	5
Undecided, don't know	36
No, with qualifications	1
No	18
Opinions not ascertained	4
Not know what atomic bomb was	1

8/1946a Do you think the US will be able to work out an effective defense against the atomic bomb before other nations could use it against us? (SSRC)

Yes	56
No	19
No opinion	25

8/1946b Do you think we will be able to work out a defense against the bomb before other countries learn how to make it? (SSRC)

Yes	36
Yes, with qualification	4
Undecided, don't know	29
No, with qualifications	1
No	24
Opinions not ascertained	4
Not know what atomic bomb was	2

2/1947 Do you believe scientists will find some defensive weapon against the atomic bomb, or do you think no defense against atomic bombs will be found? (MINN 42)

Will find defense	61
Won't find defense	20
Undecided	19

11/1949 Do you think scientists will be able to develop any defense against the atom bomb within, say, the next ten years? (AIPO 449 K&T)

Yes	60
No	19
No opinion	21

12/1963 Now here are some cards. On these cards are printed various possible future situations which may exist in our civil defense. On this folder are pockets which show how likely something is. As before, the zero pocket on the bottom of the folder stands for something that is impossible or nearly impossible. The top pocket -- 10 -- stands for something you consider certain or just about certain to happen. Five means that something is as likely to happen as not--the chances are about fifty-fifty. Would you please put these cards into the pockets according to how likely it is that each situation will come about in five years or so--about 1968? You may use as many pockets as you want, and any number of cards may go into any pocket. (NORC SRS-330/Nehnevajsa)

Likelihood of ballistic missile defense

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
3	2	3	5	4	13	8	9	12	16	24	*

12/1963 On some of these cards are written things you personally might very much like to happen. On other cards are things you might like less, and on still others may be things you would dislike very much. Please take the cards from the first pocket and sort them into this row of pockets--on the line that is next to it. Sort them into this row according to how much you want the thing written on the card to happen. The pockets in each row have numbers written on them. Minus three stands for something that you would dislike very much. Plus three stands for those things which you would very much want to happen. Zero stands for those situations that you don't particularly care about one way or another. You may use any of these seven pockets you wish. (NORC SRS-330/Nehnevajsa)

Desirability of ballistic missile defense

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	DK
8	3	2	5	8	16	59	*

6/1964 Here is the card with the scale on it again, with numbers from zero to ten. I'm going to read you three statements. As before, if you think our defenses against nuclear attack are very good or almost perfect, use ten. If you think they are very bad, use zero. If you think they are somewhere in between, use any number between zero and ten. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

A. Now, how good are our defenses against enemy bombers?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
1	*	1	1	1	7	5	9	21	18	35	1

B. How good are our defenses against guided missiles?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
2	1	3	3	3	12	10	13	18	13	20	1

C. How good are our defenses against submarines?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
1	1	1	3	4	12	7	12	19	13	24	1

6/1964 Please sort the cards you now have depending on how likely you believe these various civil defense situations will be within the next five years, or by about 1968. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

In addition to shelters and existing defense against bombers, there will be defenses against ballistic missiles around our large cities and military installations.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
4	3	3	3	4	15	11	10	12	11	23	1

6/1964 Now will you please sort these cards once again, depending on how much you personally want or do not want each of these civil defense situations. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	DK
5	2	1	4	6	13	67	1

6/1964 As far as you know, is there any defense possible against enemy missiles? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

Yes	55
No	23
Don't know	22

6/1964 [Asked of 45% who said no or don't know] Do you think any defense against enemy missiles will become possible during the next five years or so? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

Yes	68
No	14
Don't know	18

6/1964 (Follow-up) [If yes] What kind of defense is there/will there be against enemy missiles? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

Answer included missile	42
Other means	30
Don't know	28

6/1964 (Follow-up) [If mentioned missiles] Do you happen to know how these anti-missiles (would) work? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

Mentioned nuclear warhead 5

6/1964 The kinds of weapons that could be used against enemy missiles are called anti-missile missiles. As far as you know, does the United States already have these anti-missile missiles ready for action? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

Yes	66
No	6
Not yet, but will	4
Don't know	24

6/1964 Does Russia already have these anti-missile missiles ready for action? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

Yes	59
No	7
Not yet, but will	3
Don't know	31

6/1964

Here is a kind of scale like one you used before. It shows how desirable or wanted something is. Plus 3 means that something is very desirable. Minus 3, that it's extremely undesirable. Zero stands for something you don't particularly care about one way or another. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajaa)

	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
A. Using this scale, how desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around all larger cities in America?	61	17	9	2	2	1	6	1
B. How desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around your city/ the city, or cities nearest you?	46	16	14	7	3	3	6	1
C. How desirable is it even if real estate values went down a little because of it?	39	17	13	8	4	3	2	1
D. Even if it involves some risk that these missiles could be fired by accident?	29	15	15	4	7	6	9	1
E. How desirable is it to put the anti-missile around our cities even though the radar to go with these missiles may cause poorer television reception around here?	42	15	13	7	3	3	3	1
F. How about shelters? How desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around our cities if it means we must set up shelters for everyone?	40	16	13	6	4	3	3	2
G. How desirable is it to go ahead even though there might be some local opposition to putting anti-missile missiles around some cities?	40	19	13	7	3	3	2	1
H. Even if they take up a lot of acres that could be used differently, how desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around our cities?	40	19	14	5	3	3	3	1
I. If you knew that these anti-missile missiles could shoot down just about all enemy missiles attacking a city, maybe nine out of ten, how desirable is it to put such weapons around cities?	67	14	8	2	1	1	4	1
J. And suppose you knew that they could shoot down about one out of three enemy missiles?	42	19	17	4	4	3	4	1



6/1964	Now I'll read a few more statements to you. Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement, or whether you are undecided. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Un- Dec
	A. If we have anti-missile missiles around our cities, there will be less need for fallout shelters.	7	35	38	7	12
	B. If we have anti-missile missiles around our cities, we will need fallout shelters even more than we need them now.	11	30	42	4	13
	C. There is no need for anti-missile missiles or for fallout shelters.	2	5	48	34	9
	D. If we have such missiles around our cities, we should have shelters to protect against fallout because some enemy weapons will get through the defense anyway.	18	65	7	2	8
	E. Even if cities are defended, enemy attacks on them would produce lots of fallout, so anti-missile missiles make sense only if we have fallout shelters for everyone.	12	51	20	2	14
	F. Putting anti-missile missiles around our cities will make people think that war is more likely.	6	41	40	4	8
	G. Such missiles will make the Russians think that we are going to start a war; therefore, they might start one.	3	21	53	8	13
	H. These missiles will give Americans a false sense of security.	3	28	52	4	12
	I. Anti-missile missiles will make Americans more anxious.	3	31	49	3	12
	J. Anti-missile missiles will lead to a stepping up of the arms race.	4	44	33	2	16
	K. Such missiles will cost too much money to be worthwhile.	3	14	58	10	17
	L. New offensive weapons will soon put anti-missile missiles out of date, so it really is not worth having them.	1	12	53	7	25
	M. Putting in anti-missile missiles makes it more difficult to reach agreements on arms control and disarmament.	2	28	47	4	18
	N. Anti-missile missiles will make America stronger, and an enemy will be even less likely to attack us than without these missiles.	15	61	13	2	8
	O. With such missiles around our cities, an enemy will be less likely to try to push us around than he might otherwise do.	14	62	13	1	7

6/1964 Not all cities might be defended by anti-missile missiles. Would you rather live in a city, or near one, that is defended by anti-missile missiles or in a city that does not have any such anti-missile missiles around it? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

In protected city	65
No difference	16
In unprotected city	13
Don't know	6

6/1964 Now will you please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with these statements concerning your feelings about living in or near a city that has anti-missile missiles? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis- Agree	Strongly Disagree	Un- Dec
A. I would feel guilty to be in a defended city when other Americans are not defended as well.	3	29	54	5	8
B. I would feel that I want to move out of the city.	1	9	71	9	8
C. I would feel lucky that my city is better protected than some other city.	12	60	17	1	8
D. I would feel worried living in a defended city when other cities are not defended by missiles, because this would mean that my city will surely be attacked in the event of a war.	3	26	55	5	9
E. I would feel angry, because I am opposed to having anti-missile missiles around here.	*	5	73	14	6
F. I would feel that I can do nothing about the missiles.	5	64	19	2	8
G. I would feel more secure than if I were living in a city that is not protected with anti-missile missiles.	8	50	28	3	10

6/1964 Using the same card, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with these statements about living in a city that does not have anti-missile defenses when some other cities have them. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis- Agree	Strongly Disagree	Un- Dec
A. I would feel that it is unfair that some cities are defended when my city is not.	5	37	47	2	7
B. I would feel that I want to move to a defended city.	4	31	49	2	12
C. I would feel more worried than if I were in a city that is protected by anti-missile missiles.	3	36	48	3	8
D. I would feel more secure living in an undefended city because this would mean that my city might not be attacked in the event of a war.	2	22	59	6	11
E. I would feel that I can do nothing about the missiles.	5	67	18	2	8
F. I would feel lucky that I don't have to put up with missiles around here.	1	18	61	6	13
G. I would feel that I ought to do something to make sure that my city also gets missiles like other cities.	7	46	28	1	16

6/1964 Now, no matter how the government might want to defend all American cities, it may be that only some can be protected by anti-missile missiles. On this card are listed some of the factors that may go into these difficult decisions. Please look at the kinds of cities listed on the card. A) Which of these kinds of cities is the most important to defend if all of them cannot be? B) Which would be next most important? C) Which of those kinds of cities would be least important to defend, if all of them cannot be? D) And which would be next least important, as you see it? (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

	Most	Next Most	Least	Next Least
1) Cities with the largest population.	19	12	4	10
2) Cities with the most industry.	24	36	3	4
3) Cities with military establishments around them	43	25	3	3
4) Cities that are important in American history.	1	2	48	32
5) Sea and land transportation centers.	9	20	7	9
6) Cities which are drawn by lot to insure that all have equal chances to be defended.	2	2	33	39

6/1964 One more question along these lines. Here is a list of a few American cities. Suppose only seven of these cities could be defended. If you were in a position to make the decision right now, which of these cities would you say should have anti-missile defenses? (If respondent is opposed to the whole idea--Even though you are opposed to the idea, please try to put yourself in the position of a person who would have to make this decision--which seven cities should it be?) (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

Your own city, unless included on this list			18
Boston	28	Kansas City	8
Chicago	65	Los Angeles	57
Dallas	11	Miami	29
Denver	12	New Orleans	19
Detroit	47	New York	88
Houston	14	Omaha	8
Indianapolis	7	Philadelphia	29
		Pittsburg	39
		St. Louis	8
		San Francisco	71
		Seattle	37
		Tucson	3
		Tulsa	3
		Washington, D.C.	90

6/1964 I have only two small items left. A while back, we used a scale that measures how desirable something is to you, or how undesirable it is. Please remember that plus 3 means it is very desirable, and minus 3 that it is very undesirable. (NORC-SRS 640/Nehnevajsa)

	+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
A. With some of the information that you now have, how desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around our cities?	52	20	12	4	2	2	5	1
B. How desirable is it to put anti-missile missiles around your city/city or cities nearest you?	40	16	16	7	5	3	10	1

2/1966 Let me give you a few more cards. On these cards are written some [8] possible international situations that may come about in about five years or by the early 1970's. We shall use the folder again that you already saw when we talked about the Cold War in general.

Please sort the cards you now have depending on how likely you believe these various world situations will be within the next five years, or by the early 1970's.

The United States will have anti-missile missiles that will be so effective in shooting down enemy missiles that no enemy would think of attacking us. (NORC-SRS 876/Nehnevajsa)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	DK
11	7	6	6	7	20	9	7	8	8	12	1

2/1966 Now will you please sort these cards once again, depending on how much you personally want or do not want each of these international situations to happen.

The United States will have anti-missile missiles that will be so effective in shooting down enemy missiles that no enemy would think of attacking us. (NORC-SRS 876/Nehnevajsa)

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	DK
7	1	2	4	7	9	69	1

6/1968 Do you think there is any defense possible against enemy missiles now? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

Yes	55
No	23
Don't know	22

6/1968 What kind of defense are you thinking about? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

Missile	36
Other	10
Don't know	54

6/1968 How would these missiles work? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

Correct answer (simple)	16
Correct answer (sophisticated)	8
Don't know	72

6/1968 Does the U.S. already have some ABM's ready for action? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

Yes	70
No	4
Don't know	25
Not yet	1

6/1968	Does Russia already have some ABM's ready for action? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)	
	Yes	71
	No	1
	Don't know	27
	Not yet	1
6/1968	How about China? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)	
	Yes	30
	No	17
	Don't know	43
	Not yet	10
6/1968	If we had an ABM system in full operation, what would our nation's need for fallout shelters be? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)	
	Needed for everyone	14
	More needed	18
	About the same needed	39
	Fewer needed	29
	Not needed	6
	Don't know	14
6/1968	Would you rather live in or near an area that is defended by ABM's or in an area that does not have such protection? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)	
	Protected city	49
	No difference	16
	Unprotected city	23
	Don't know	12
6/1968	Why would you say that? (ORC/Nehnevajsa)	
	(Those who answered protected city--first response)	
	Safety	13
	Protection	24
	Survival	8
	Don't know	54
	(Those who answered unprotected city--first response)	
	Safety	2
	Survival	1
	Not target	12
	Live away from city	2
	Don't know	83

6/1968 I am going to read you some statements about ABM's. I would like to know how desirable or wanted each action is. This will be the scale that you will use. The minus 3 stands for something that you would dislike very much. Zero stands for something you don't care one way or another about. Plus three stands for something you would very much want to happen. You may use any number on the scale that best fits your opinion. (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	DK
How desirable is it to put ABM's around all large cities in America?	5	3	3	9	9	11	48	11
How desirable is it if they only could shoot down about one out of every two missiles?	22	7	5	9	9	10	23	16
In late 1967, the government announced that it was starting a limited ABM program costing about five billion dollars in the next five years. How desirable is such a program to you?	7	3	3	10	11	13	39	14
A bigger program costing about 40 billion dollars has been suggested. How desirable is such a program to you?	14	4	5	16	9	8	26	17
If we know that the Russians have an active ABM program, how desirable would it be that the U.S. have one?	3	1	1	5	5	9	66	9

6/1968 Here are some possible consequences of this ABM program. I would like to know for each one whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that it might be a consequence. (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

	SA	A	D	SD	DK
Having ABM's around our cities will make people think that war is more likely.	13	37	36	6	8
If we have ABM's, the Russians will think that we are going to start a war.	5	25	50	9	11
Having ABM's will make America stronger, and an enemy will be less likely to attack us.	26	48	15	3	9
New offensive weapons will put ABM's out of date, so it is really not worth having them.	4	17	43	9	27

6/1968 Now I'm going to ask some questions about possible partial disarmament agreements that the United States could make with other nations. Please tell me how desirable you think each one would be. (ORC/Nehnevajsa)

	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	DK
Reach an agreement with Russia to limit the number of ABM's	11	3	2	10	9	10	44	12

12/1968 Now let me ask about a number of specific areas where it has been suggested the U.S. military defenses be strengthened. For each, tell me if you think this ought to be done or not? (Harris 1900)

	Ought To Be Done	Should Not Do	Not Sure
1. Build up a system of anti-missile defenses.	60	23	17
2. Increase the number of airplanes which can carry nuclear warheads.	48	33	19
3. Increase the number of nuclear warhead long-range missiles.	51	28	21
4. Increase the number of men in the U.S. armed forces.	31	52	17
5. Give NATO a real capability for waging nuclear warfare.	25	48	27
6. Convert the space program into a system of nuclear weapons space stations.	25	49	26

4/1969- On the next topic, have you heard or read about the discussion of the ABM program--that is the antiballistic missile program? (AIPO 777)

Yes	69
No	31

4/1969 (Of those [69%] who had heard of ABM) Do you happen to have an opinion about the ABM program as submitted to Congress by President Nixon? (AIPO 777)

Yes	29
No	40
Not heard	31



4/1969 (Of those [42%] who had heard and had an opinion) Do you favor or oppose the ABM program submitted by Nixon? (AIPQ 777)

Favor	23
Oppose	18
Not heard or no opinion	59

4/1969 President Nixon recently made a decision to go ahead with building the "thin" Sentinel-Safeguard missile defense system. At the beginning this would involve putting in the system at two of our missile bases in Montana and South Dakota for seven billion dollars. Do you tend to approve or disapprove of President Nixon's decision to go ahead with the anti-missile system? (Harris 1926)

Agree	48
Disagree	25
Not sure	27

4/1969 Let me read some statements about President Nixon's decision to go ahead with the Sentinel Safeguard anti-missile system. For each one, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree:  
(Harris 1926)

	Agree	Dis- Agree	Not Sure
Many scientists think the system is a mistake because it could not prevent the loss of millions of U.S. lives in an atomic attack.	40	28	32
The Russians have already installed 66 ABM's, so we should have some, too.	60	19	20
By taking this step, President Nixon hurt the chances of reaching arms control agreements with the Russians.	19	52	29
President Nixon's decision was a cautious first step, not even going as far as President Johnson wanted to go.	46	14	40
We could have used the seven billion dollars better for our education, health, housing, and poverty needs at home.	49	31	20
It is better to be over-prepared militarily than to be caught short without proper defenses.	78	9	13
In a nuclear age, the U.S. should concentrate on peaceful arms control rather than building more missile systems.	47	29	24
President Nixon has now shown he will follow a tough line on military matters	50	18	32
We would be better eliminating the 10% income tax surcharge than building the Sentinel-Safeguard missile system.	31	40	29
The Russians are developing super-nuclear missiles and we need to be defended against them.	68	10	22

5/1969 On the next topic, have you heard or read about the discussion on the ABM program--that is the anti-ballistic missile program?  
(AIPO 780K)

Yes	72
No	26
No opinion	2

(Of those [72%] who had heard of ABM) Do you happen to have an opinion about the ABM program as submitted to Congress by President Nixon? (AIPO 780K)

Yes	41
No	31
Not heard and no opinion	28

(Of those [41%] who had heard and had an opinion) Do you favor or oppose the ABM program submitted by Nixon? (AIPO 780K)

Favor	25
Oppose	14
Not heard and no opinion	61

7/1969 On the next topic, have you heard or read about the discussion on the ABM program--that is the anti-ballistic missile program? (AIPO 784K)

Yes	69
No	31

(Of those [69%] who had heard of ABM) Do you happen to have an opinion about the ABM program as submitted to Congress by President Nixon? (AIPO 784K)

Yes	28
No	41
Not heard	31

(Of those [28%] who had heard and had an opinion) Do you favor or oppose the ABM program submitted by Nixon? (AIPO 784K)

Favor	18
Oppose	10
Not heard and no opinion	72

7/1969 Let me read you some statements which have been made about events in the news. For each, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree: (Harris 1939)

	Agree	Dis- Agree	Not Sure
The Safeguard ABM anti-missile system is necessary in order for us to keep up with the Russians in the nuclear arms race.	50	24	26
It is better to be overprepared militarily than to be caught short without proper defenses.	84	7	9
In a nuclear age, the U.S. should concentrate on peaceful arms control rather than building more missile systems like the Safeguard ABM.	50	24	26

9/1970 Would you favor or oppose agreement between the U.S. and Russia on . . . Limiting anti-missile (ABM) systems (Harris 2037)

Agree	69
Disagree	16
Not Sure	15

1/1971 Would you like to see the federal government increase the amount of money spent, cut back, or not change the amount of money spent . . . ABM missile systems (Harris 2055)

Increase	15
Cut Back	40
Not Change	32
Not Sure	13

6/1971 Would you favor or oppose agreement between the United States and Russia on . . . limiting anti-missile (ABM) systems (Harris 2124)

Agree	71
Disagree	14
Not Sure	15

2/1972 Would you favor or oppose agreement between the U.S. and Russia on limiting anti-missile (ABM) systems (Harris 2154)

Agree	74
Disagree	13
Not Sure	13

3/1972 There are, of course, other important things that various people have been talking about and suggesting. Not all of them are likely to come about, but regardless of how likely they are, please tell me how much you personally would like to see each one happen or not happen. Here is a scale on which minus three indicates that you personally would not like to see this happen, zero indicates that you are neither opposed nor in favor of it, and plus three indicates that you would very much like to see it happen. You may use any number on the scale to indicate your opinion.

Stopping all plans to put anti-missile missiles (ABM's) around some military bases and cities. (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
12	6	7	16	12	13	34	7

Protecting most of our big cities and important military bases with anti-missile missiles (ABM's) (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
43	16	14	14	4	4	6	5

3/1972

Here is another simple card. I would like to ask you a few questions about how much money you think we, as a country, are spending on a few programs. The card shows the approximate total amount for one year.

How much do you think was spent on the anti-missile missiles (ABM's); that is, missiles that could shoot down enemy missiles before they could hit us?

And about how much should we spend on anti-missile missiles (ABM's) each year? (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

	Was Spent	Should Spend
0	1	9
5 million	1	*
10 million	4	8
15 million	-	1
20 million	4	6
35 million	*	1
50 million	6	9
75 million	1	1
100 million	7	9
150 million	1	*
200 million	7	10
300 million	1	1
400 million	12	8
700 million	1	1
1 billion	15	14
1.5 billion	1	-
2 billion	11	7
3.5 billion	1	1
5 billion	15	7
7.5 billion	2	1
10 billion	12	10
DK	37	37

3/1972

Now using the same desirability card as we did earlier, I would like to ask you a few questions on disarmament. If our government decided to sign a general disarmament treaty, there are probably some conditions that you would want our country to insist upon. Taking one condition at a time, how desirable is it that it be met before our country actually signs a treaty?

Reach an agreement with Russia to limit the number of anti-missile missiles (ABM's). (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
43	15	11	14	5	3	9	7

Agree with Russia to have no anti-missile missiles (ABM's) at all. (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
27	5	7	16	8	6	21	8

6/1972 Do you approve or disapprove of the agreement between Russia and the U.S. . . . to limit the manufacture of nuclear defensive missiles (ABM's) (Harris 2216)

Agree	79
Disagree	12
Not Sure	9

7/1972-5/1974 Missiles which can intercept and destroy enemy rockets launched against this country before they get near enough to cause serious damage.

If a development like the one described above were to be put into operation, how much would it change your own life? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Very much	9	10
Quite a bit	11	11
Slightly	7	6
Not very much	6	6
Not at all	11	11
NA	-	54
DK	-	2
NA & DK	56	56

7/1972-5/1974 How much do you think it [defensive missiles] would change life for most people? (Field-LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Very much	10	12
Quite a bit	13	12
Slightly	8	10
Not very much	7	5
Not at all	6	6
NA	-	53
DK	-	2
NA & DK	56	55

7/1972-5/1974 How sure do you feel that this development would have beneficial results? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Absolutely sure	8	10
Quite sure	16	16
Not too sure	14	15
Would have none	5	4
NA	-	54
DK	-	2
NA & DK	57	56

7/1972  
5/1974

(Asked of those 30% in 1972 and 26% in 1974 who were absolutely sure or quite sure of beneficial results) What do you see as the most important benefits or good things that might result if such a development were actually to take place? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Provide added protection, protect, safeguard country, make country secure, protect us	25	27
Make us feel safe, protected, help us have peace of mind, less tension, fear	15	12
Would deter aggression, enemy won't attack	13	20
Would save lives, people would survive, keep us from being wiped out	12	14
Always need better defenses, necessary for country	12	4
Might help bring peace, promote peace, be no sense in war	3	5
Would intercept missiles before they got here, before they do damage	15	14
Would make jobs, increase employment	4	3
All others	-	1

7/1972  
5/1974

How sure do you feel that this development would have a drawback or bad results? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Absolutely sure	4	4
Quite sure	9	9
Not too sure	16	17
Would have none	10	8
NA	-	59
DK	-	3
NA & DK	61	62

7/1972  
5/1974

(Asked of those 13% in 1972 and 16% in 1974 who were absolutely sure or quite sure of bad results) What do you see as the most important drawbacks or bad things that might result if such a development were actually to take place? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Cost too much, cost to develop too high	18	8
Should spend money for other things, not weapons	7	11
It could be misused, used against others	3	3
It could lead to war, annihilation	19	18
It continues the arms race, they have same thing	20	20
All complaints against policy of armaments, violence wrong, nations should trust each other	23	26
Too much potential for error, human error, could go wrong	10	11
All others	-	3

7/1972  
5/1974

How much would you like to see or how strongly would you be opposed to missiles which can intercept and destroy enemy rockets launched against this country before they get near enough to cause serious damage? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Very strongly opposed to	6	7
Somewhat strongly opposed to	3	2
Slightly opposed to	2	2
Neither opposed to nor would like to see	5	6
Slightly like to see	6	6
Somewhat strongly like to see	9	7
Very strongly like to see	14	17
NA & DK	55	53



7/1972  
5/1974

Which one or two of the people or groups listed in Question . . . do you think actually has the most say in deciding whether space stations which would be manned by military personnel who can aim rockets and missiles at targets on earth should be built? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Technical experts	19	19
Business leaders	4	4
Top government leaders	57	61
Congressmen	12	13
The courts	*	*
Organized consumer groups	*	*
Individual people/the public	2	1
No one	*	*
DK & NA	4	-

\* denotes < .5%

7/1972-  
5/1974

Which one or two of the people or groups listed in Question . . . do you think has the least say in deciding whether space stations which would be manned by military personnel who can aim rockets and missiles at targets on earth should be built? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Technical experts	1	1
Business leaders	5	4
Top government leaders	1	1
Congressmen	1	1
The courts	8	4
Organized consumer groups	12	11
Individual people/the public	61	76
No one	4	1
DK & NA	7	-

7/1972-  
5/1974

Which one or two of the people or groups mentioned in Question . . . in order to protect the public interest, should have the most say in deciding whether space stations which would be manned by military personnel who can aim rockets and missiles at targets on earth should be built? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Technical experts	19	22
Business leaders	1	1
Top government leaders	25	25
Congressmen	10	13
The courts	1	1
Organized consumer groups	3	2
Individual people/the public	35	35
No one	2	1
DK & NA	4	-

7/1972-  
5/1972

Which one or two of the people or groups mentioned in Question . . . in order to protect the public interest, should have the least say in deciding whether space stations which would be manned by military personnel who can aim rockets and missiles at targets on earth should be built? (Field/LMH)

	7/1972	5/1974
Technical experts	4	6
Business leaders	24	31
Top government leaders	14	20
Congressmen	5	3
The court	11	10
Organized consumer groups	11	16
Individual people/the public	9	11
No one	12	3
DK & NA	10	-

9/1972

Would you like to see the federal government spend more money, less, or about the same amount of money on . . . anti-missile systems? (Harris 2234)

More	15
Less	33
About the Same	41
Not Sure	11

6/1973

Let me read you some possible areas of agreement that might come out of the Nixon-Brezhnev talks in Washington this month. For each, tell me if you would favor or oppose this agreement. . . . further limiting anti-missile (ABM) systems. (Harris 2330)

Favor	73
Oppose	10
Not Sure	17

11/1973 Let me read you some proposals which have been made for possible agreements between Russia and the United States. For each, tell me if you would favor or oppose this agreement . . . Further limiting anti-missile (ABM) systems (Harris 2351)

Favor	75
Oppose	12
Not Sure	13

1/1976 Do you feel that the Russians have lived up to the terms they agreed to under the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT Treaty) with the United States, or don't you think the Russians have done so? (Harris 7588)

Russians lived up to agreement	11
Not lived up to agreement	49
Not sure	40

12/1978 Now using the same desirability card as we did just now, I would like to ask you a few questions on disarmament. If our government decided to sign a general disarmament treaty, there are probably some conditions that you would want our country to insist upon. Taking one condition at a time, how desirable is it that it be met before our country actually signs a treaty? (MIS/Nehnevajsa)

Agree with Russia to have no anti-missile missiles (ABM's) at all?

+3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	-3	DK
32	9	8	13	7	8	22	8

4/1979 How effective do you feel our military defense is against a Russian missile attack on this country--very effective, only somewhat effective, or not very effective? (Harris 792106)

Very effective	31
Only somewhat effective	43
Not very effective	21
Not sure	5

Chapter 3  
STAR WARS/STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

- 5/1981      There are a number of practical uses that the space shuttle may provide by taking as many as 400 flights into space and back over the next several years. Tell me if, in your judgment, each use I read off to you would be very important, only somewhat important, or not very important at all?  
               Developing a military capability in space beyond what the Russians are doing (Harris 812106)
- |                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| Very important          | 68 |
| Only somewhat important | 20 |
| Not important at all    | 10 |
| Not sure                | 1  |
- 10/1981      Should the emphasis of the U.S. space program be primarily on national defense or on scientific exploration? (NBC/AP)
- |                  |    |
|------------------|----|
| National defense | 47 |
| Scientific       | 43 |
| Both (vol)       | 10 |
- 5/1982      Do you approve or disapprove of our government's present policies regarding defense against nuclear war? (Abt 1 & Abt 2)
- |            |      |      |
|------------|------|------|
|            | 5/82 | 7/82 |
| Approve    | 46   | 43   |
| Disapprove | 35   | 42   |
| Don't know | 18   | 15   |
- 8/1982      Are you aware that the U.S. now has no means of defending itself from incoming ballistic missiles? (Sindlinger)
- |            |    |
|------------|----|
| Yes        | 32 |
| No         | 66 |
| Don't know | 2  |
- 8/1982      If the U.S. had the capability of changing this situation by deploying an antiballistic missile defense, would you favor it being done? (Sindlinger)
- |            |    |
|------------|----|
| Yes        | 86 |
| No         | 10 |
| No opinion | 4  |
- 8/1982      Would the cost of such a system be the primary factor which you would use to judge whether it should be deployed? (Sindlinger)
- |     |    |
|-----|----|
| Yes | 27 |
| No  | 73 |

4/1983

As you know, President Reagan recently proposed that the US move ahead to develop a new defense system in outer space. He described the possibilities of building laser-beam and particle beam systems and stations in space that could shoot down nuclear missiles. Now let me read you some statements about this new proposal. For each, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree. (Harris 832103)

While it might be possible to develop such defensive systems in outer space, once such means of destruction were built, they could easily be turned into threatening mankind with new and frightening space wars. (Harris 832103)

Agree	72
Disagree	24
Not sure	4

Since it will take many years to develop such a defense against nuclear attack, the proposal does not really ease the possibilities of nuclear war in the next thirty years. (Harris 832103)

Agree	62
Disagree	32
Not sure	6

Once the Russians knew we were building a new outer space anti-nuclear defense system, they would be more willing to negotiate a treaty that would halt the nuclear arms race. (Harris 832103)

Agree	40
Disagree	55
Not sure	5

The only way to avoid a nuclear war is to develop new weapons in space that can shoot down all nuclear missiles. (Harris 832103)

Agree	38
Disagree	57
Not sure	5

4/1983

All in all, do you favor or oppose spending billions of dollars for the U.S. to develop a laser-beam and particle-beam outer space defense system? (Harris 832103)

Favor	36
Oppose	58
Not sure	5

4/1983 Now let me ask you about some specific things President Reagan has done. How would you rate him on . . . -- excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?

His proposing to construct new weapons systems in outer space that would be capable of shooting down nuclear missiles with laser and particle beams. (Harris 832103)

Excellent	17
Pretty good	24
Only fair	24
Poor	25
Not sure	10

4/1983 Have you heard or read about a proposal by Reagan that the U.S. develop defensive military weapons using lasers and particle beams to shoot down enemy missiles? (ABC/WP)

Yes	65
No	34
No opinion	1

4/1983 Do you favor or oppose developing such defensive weapons, or what? (ABC/WP)

Favor	54
Oppose	37
No opinion	8

4/1983 Just your best guess, if the United States does develop such defensive weapons, would that increase or reduce the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union, or what? (ABC/WP)

Increase	57
Decrease	24
Not change (vol)	9
No opinion	10

4/1983 President Reagan has proposed developing a defensive system that would destroy incoming Russian missiles before they reach the United States. Some people say it might be difficult technologically, but we should try to develop it. Other people say it would be impractical, expensive and sounds like science fiction. Do you think we should try to develop the system, or not? (CBS/NYT)

Should	67
Should not	25
Don't know	8

5/1983

Under such an agreement (a proposed nuclear freeze), neither the United States nor the Soviet Union would be permitted to further develop an anti-nuclear system for defensive purposes. In view of this, would you continue to favor an agreement between the two nations for an immediate verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, or would you now oppose such a freeze? (AIPO 214G)

Continue to favor freeze	63
Now oppose	23
No opinion	13

2/1984

Do you think the chances for world peace would be greater if the U.S. had a defense system capable of stopping nuclear missiles, or if the U.S. freezes production of nuclear weapons equal to the Soviet Union? (A. Finkelstein) [California]

Star Wars	52
Freeze	34
Not sure	14

2/1984

Which of the following weapons systems is most important to American security? (A. Finkelstein) [California]

Star Wars defense	55
Don't know	23
Nuclear submarine	11
MX missile	5
B-1 bomber	3
Cruise missile	3

4/1984

Do you favor or oppose plans to develop defensive weapons that would operate in space in order to protect the US by destroying any incoming missiles? (Penn & Schoen)

Favor	75
Oppose	17
Don't know	8

4/1984

If a nuclear freeze were negotiated, should development of such defensive space weapons continue or should development be abandoned? (Penn & Schoen)

Continue	54
Abandon	35
Don't Know	11

4/1984 How satisfied are you with the current state of our nuclear defenses? (Penn & Schoen)

Very satisfied	13
Somewhat satisfied	41
Somewhat dissatisfied	23
Very dissatisfied	15
Don't know	8

6/1984 Now I am going to read you a list of statements. Please tell me for each if you agree or disagree . . . Ronald Reagan's plan to put satellite weaponry in space is a bad idea and should not be funded by Congress? (Hart) [Illinois]

Agree	47
Disagree	36
Not sure	17

6/1984 Now let me read you several proposals that some people have made. For each one I read, please tell me if this would help arms control and national security a lot, help some, help very little, or hurt arms control and national security? . . . A ban by both sides on satellite weapons in space (Hart) [Illinois]

Help a lot	46
Help some	26
Help very little	13
Hurt	8
Not sure	7

6/1984 Now, let me ask you about specific bills that have been passed by the House of Representatives on which Speaker O'Neill has taken leadership positions. For each, tell me if you favor or oppose that bill. . . refusing to give funds for developing weapons for use in warfare in outer space. (Harris)

Favor	51
Oppose	44
Not sure	5



7/1984

As you know, the negotiations between the U.S. and Russia to reduce nuclear arms broke down in Geneva. Now the Russians have proposed that the two countries sit down in Vienna in September to discuss an agreement to outlaw the use of weapons in outer space. The U.S. agreed to such negotiations but said it would also raise nuclear arms negotiations at those talks. The Russians said they found the U.S. answer totally unsatisfactory and would meet to discuss only the outer-space weapons. Now there is some doubt that any negotiations will take place in September.

Do you favor or oppose the U.S. and the Soviet Union sitting down to negotiate an agreement to outlaw the use of weapons in outer space? (Harris)

Favor	82
Oppose	16
Not Sure	2

How optimistic are you that the U.S. and Russia will come to an agreement anytime soon to outlaw the use of weapons in space--very optimistic, somewhat optimistic, not very optimistic, or not optimistic at all? (Harris)

Very optimistic	9
Somewhat optimistic	23
Not very optimistic	36
Not optimistic at all	31

7/1984

Of course, everyone is more interested in some things being carried in the news than in others. Is news about . . . developments in so-called "star-wars" weapons to defend against nuclear ballistic missiles something you have recently been following fairly closely, or just following casually, or not paying much attention to? (Roper)

Following closely	27
Following casually	43
No attention or don't know	30

7/1984

President Reagan has proposed that the United States build a space-based defense system against incoming missiles. Many people think that this is a good idea because it would give us an advantage over the Russians in this area, which would help deter a Soviet attack. Many others feel that a space-based defense system is a bad idea because it would escalate the arms race and increase the risk of a nuclear confrontation with Russia. How do you feel--do you think the United States should or should not build a space-based defense system? (Roper)

Should build	54
Should not	34
Don't know	12

9/1984 Would you support a US attempt to build a defensive system against nuclear missiles and bombers? (Abt 4)

Yes	80
No	16
Don't know	4

9/1984 Would you support a US attempt to built a defensive system against nuclear missiles and bombers under the following conditions: (Abt 4)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
A) if it did not use nuclear explosives and was only partially effective such as being able to shoot down 90% of all Soviet nuclear missiles and bombers, and letting 10% get through?	57	35	8
B) if it used nuclear explosives and was only partially effective such as being able to shoot down 90% of all Soviet nuclear missiles and bombers, and letting 10% get through?	44	48	8
C) if it was expensive and increased defense spending by at least 10% and increased government spending by 3%?	58	35	7

10/1984 Regardless of who you may vote for in this election, who do you think did better in the debate--Walter Mondale or Ronald Reagan?

Let me read you some specific questions about the (second 1984 Presidential) debate. Regardless of who you may vote for in this election, who do you think was more convincing on whether to go ahead with the development of a "Star Wars" system in space that would be used to destroy all incoming weapons-- Walter Mondale or Ronald Reagan? (Harris/BW 842233b)

	Debate	Star Wars
Mondale	37	23
Reagan	47	57
Neither (vol)	12	5
Not sure	4	15

10/1984<sup>e</sup> What one thing that either of the candidates said or did tonight made the strongest impression on you? (Who said or did that?) (CBS/NYT)

## MONDALE

Freeze-Weapons Issues	5	Style	4
<u>Star Wars</u>	3	Negative Style	3
Leadership	2	Central America	2
Knowledge	2	Lebanon	2
Defense	1	Summation	1
	1	Attacks on Reagan	1

## REAGAN

Style	5	Age Comment/Humor	5
Issues	5		
Trade Weapons Information	4		
Defense/USSR	4	Leader	3
<u>Star Wars</u>	2	Better Than Before	2
Attacks on Mondale	2	Rattled/Age	2
Knowledgeable	1	Lebanon	1
Economy	1	Carter Administration	1

## GENERAL ISSUES

Immigration	1
Nuclear Arms	1
Nothing	11
No Opinion	20

10/1984<sup>f</sup> Some people have proposed a defense system in space to protect the United States from nuclear attack, the concept called "Star Wars." Do you think this would make us more secure, or would it just speed up the arms race? (CBS/NYT)

Make more secure	31
Speed up arms race	48
Both (vol)	3
Neither (vol)	2
No opinion	16

11/1984 (Now here are some agreements the U.S. and the Soviet Union might make. Would you favor or oppose each of these agreements?) . . . An agreement to outlaw the use of weapons in outer space? (Harris)

Favor	66
Oppose	32
Not sure	3

1/1985

Ronald Reagan has proposed developing a defensive nuclear system in space that would destroy incoming missiles before they reach the United States, a system some people call "Star Wars." Do you think such a system could work? (CBS/NYT)

Yes	62
No	23
No opinion	15

Do you think that developing this system would make negotiations with the Soviet Union easier? (CBS/NYT)

Yes	48
No	41
No opinion	11

Do you think this would make the arms race more dangerous than it is now? (CBS/NYT)

Yes	54
No	35
No opinion	11

Do you think this would be worth the amount of money it would cost? (CBS/NYT)

Yes	40
No	46
No opinion	14

Would having this system make you feel secure or would putting nuclear weapons in space worry you? (CBS/NYT)

Make feel secure	25
Worry you	60
Both (vol)	4
Neither (vol)	2
No opinion	8

1/1985 What do you expect Ronald Reagan to accomplish in the next four years? (CBS/NYT)

No opinion	21
Nothing	15
Improve economy	11
Reduce deficit	9
Continue Ronald Reagan program	7
More jobs	7
Arms talks/USSR/peace	6
Lower inflation	3
Cut taxes	3
War/nuclear war	3
Generally negative	3
Improve foreign policy	2
General better	2
Defense/ <u>Star Wars</u>	1
Increase deficit	1
Lower interest rates	1
Do more for the middle class	1
Increase social programs	1
Cut social programs	1
Cut social security	1
Other	1

1/1985 Have you heard or read about a proposal by Reagan that the U.S. develop defensive military weapons using lasers and particle beams to shoot down enemy missiles? (ABC/WP 179)

Yes	63
No	35
No opinion	2

1/1985 Do you favor or oppose developing such defensive weapons, or what? (ABC/WP 179)

Favor	49
Oppose	44
No opinion	7

1/1985 If the United States does develop such defensive weapons, would that increase or reduce the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union, or what? (ABC/WP 179)

Increase	67
Decrease	21
Not change	6
No opinion	5

1/1985

As you know, the United States is presently planning to spend 26 billion dollars over the next five years for research on ways to conduct war in outer space. The administration calls this project the strategic defense initiative and the press has nicknamed it "Star Wars." How much would you say you have heard or read about this project: a lot, or some, or a little or haven't you heard anything yet about Star Wars? (LAT 93)

A lot	24
Some	30
A little	33
Nothing	12
Not sure	1

1/1985

Some people say that the first thing we have to do is conduct Star Wars research to find out if the idea works. Then when we know what is at stake, there will be time enough to negotiate with the other side. But other people say that, just as soon as one side starts research, the other side will try to improve its weapons so they can avoid Star Wars defenses, and nuclear development escalates. Do you think the two sides should wait until research turns up something before they negotiate or do you think the research should be banned at the start to avoid nuclear weapons escalation? (LAT 93)

Ban	55
Delay	33
Not sure	11
Refused	1

1/1985

Generally speaking, do you favor or oppose an agreement to outlaw the use of all military weapons in outer space? Is that (favor/oppose) strongly or somewhat? (LAT 93)

Favor strongly	43
Favor somewhat	16
Oppose somewhat	15
Oppose strongly	16
Not sure	10

1/1985 The idea behind our nuclear defense over the past forty years is called "Mutual Assured Destruction." It says that what keeps both the United States and the Soviet Union from firing off their nuclear weapons at each other is the certainty that the other side would counterattack with dreadful destruction. Now some people think the "Star Wars" system would destabilize this balance of terror. They claim that if one side had a way to defend itself against nuclear counterattack, it could launch an aggressive war without fear of retaliation. Do you think that a "Star Wars" system threatens its opponents or not? (LAT 93)

Yes	56
No	28
Not sure (vol)	15
Refused	1

1/1985 How closely have you followed the discussions over the administration's so called "Star Wars" proposal--that is, its proposal to develop a space-based defense against nuclear attack? (AIPO 249G)

Very closely	16
Fairly closely	51
Not closely at all	30

1/1985 Would you like to see the United States go ahead with the development of such a system or not? (AIPO 249G)

Yes	52
No	38
No opinion	10

1/1985 In your opinion, would the United States' developing this system increase or decrease the likelihood of reaching a nuclear arms agreement with the Soviet Union? (AIPO 249G)

Increase	47
Decrease	32
No difference	13
No opinion	8

1/1985 In your opinion, would developing this system make the world safer from nuclear destruction, or less safe? (AIPO 249G)

Make world safer	50
Make world less safe	32
No difference (vol)	11
No opinion	7

2/1985 Do you want the United States to defend Americans against Soviet missiles? (Finkelstein)

Yes 90

2/1985 Did you know that the United States has a treaty with the Soviet Union not to protect Americans from a Soviet missile attack? (Finkelstein)

No 83

3/1985 President Reagan has proposed that the US move ahead to develop a new defense system in outer space and on the ground. He described the possibilities of building laser-beam and particle-beam systems and stations in space and on the ground that could shoot down incoming nuclear missiles. Now let me read you some statements about this new proposal. For each, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree. (Harris)

Once the Russians knew we were building a new outer space anti-nuclear defense system, they would be more willing to agree to a treaty that would halt the nuclear arms race.

Agree 52  
Disagree 44  
Not sure 4

The only way to avoid a nuclear war is to develop new weapons in space that can shoot down all nuclear missiles. (Harris)

Agree 44  
Disagree 52  
Not sure 4

Once it looked as though we were capable of defending against today's nuclear weapons, the Soviets would then go all-out to develop new kinds of nuclear and other weapons we couldn't defend against. (Harris)

Agree 75  
Disagree 20  
Not sure 5

Even though President Reagan wants to spend only \$3.8 billion at first on developing a laser defense system, the cost could rise to \$25 billion to \$50 billion on a system that might not even work. (Harris)

Agree 63  
Disagree 30  
Not Sure 7



3/1985 All in all, do you favor or oppose spending billions of dollars for the U.S. to develop a laser-beam and particle-beam outer space defense system? (Harris)

Favor	39
Oppose	56
Not sure	5

3/1985 Now, because of this deterrence that has existed, both the U.S. and Russia have tried to discourage the other country from developing defenses against nuclear weapons. The reason is that if one country thought the other was about to find a way to shoot down its nuclear weapons, it might be tempted to use its nuclear weapons first. In other words, one side developing a real defense against nuclear weapons could destabilize relations between the two countries. Does this argument make sense to you or not? (Harris)

Makes sense	54
Does not make sense	42
Not sure	4

3/1985 President Reagan has proposed that the United States build a space-based defense system against incoming missiles. Many people think that this is a good idea because it would give us an advantage over the Russians in this area, which would help deter a Soviet attack. Many others feel that a space-based defense system is a bad idea because it would escalate the arms race and increase the risk of a nuclear confrontation with Russia. How do you feel--do you think the United States should or should not build a space-based defense system? (Roper 85-3)

Should build	52
Should not	36
Don't know	12

5/1985 Can the United States protect itself from incoming nuclear missiles? (Sindlinger/CPD)

Yes	9
No	57
Not sure	18
Hope so	16

5/1985

Current U.S. policy is to deter a Soviet nuclear attack by threatening massive retaliation against the Soviet Union, while at the same time leaving the United States defenseless against a Soviet nuclear attack. This strategy is often referred to as MAD (which stands for Mutual Assured Destruction), or as the "balance of terror." Which one of the following statements do you feel most comfortable with? (Sindlinger/CPD)

A. The current strategy does not need to be changed.

No need to change	12
Needs to be changed	74
No opinion	14

B. The current strategy is dangerous and does not sufficiently defend the United States.

Yes	61
No	30
No opinion	9

5/1985

If "Star Wars" can be made to work, and there is a choice between the current mutual assured destruction ("balance of terror") strategy or the new plan of "Star Wars," which would be your number one choice? (Sindlinger/CPD)

A. Keep the current strategy

Yes	10
No	80
No opinion	10

B. Or develop and deploy "Star Wars"?

Yes	77
No	10
No opinion	13

5/1985

Under what conditions would you support the President's Strategic Defense proposals? (Sindlinger/CPD)

A. If it could destroy almost all incoming missiles?

Yes	84
No	11
Not sure	5

B. If it could destroy at least half of incoming missiles?

Yes	72
No	19
Not sure	9

C. If it defends only U.S. retaliatory missiles?

Yes	61
No	27
Not sure	12

5/1985 Would the development of "Star Wars" (the President's strategic defense strategy) make the United States more secure or less secure? (Sindlinger/CPD)

More secure	73
Less secure	9
No difference	10
Not sure	8

5/1985 Currently the civilian population of the United States has no complete defense against any enemy nuclear attack. Even if a perfect defense cannot be developed, would you favor and support developing a system which protects most of our population, even if it cannot protect everyone? (Sindlinger/CPD)

Yes	85
No	2
Not sure	13

5/1985 According to the best information available, the Soviet Union now has 1,398 land-based missiles which could reach the United States. On the other hand, we have 1,030 land-based missiles which could reach the Soviet Union. Which of these conditions would make you most secure? (Sindlinger/CPD)

A. The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. agreed to freeze their nuclear arsenals at present levels?

Yes	48
No	49
No opinion	3

B. The U.S. built the President's strategic defense system?

Yes	65
No	16
No opinion	19

C. The U.S. built more missiles to equal the Soviet Union?

Yes	36
No	25
No opinion	39

5/1985 Some people say that in the development of any strategic defense system that could destroy incoming missiles, the Soviet Union is far ahead of the United States, while other people are saying that the United States is far ahead of the Soviet Union. What do you think? (Sindlinger/CPD)

Soviet Union ahead	34
Soviet Union behind	26
Both the same	17
Not sure	23

5/1985 Would you favor development and an eventual deployment of a "Star Wars" defense system for the United States, even if it meant that the U.S. would have to renegotiate or withdraw from our existing arms control agreements with the Soviet Union? (Sindlinger/CPD)

Yes	69
No	7
No opinion	24

5/1985 Throughout the arms control talks, President Reagan has insisted that the U.S. continue to do research on the Star Wars defense system in space. Do you think that developing such a system is more likely to produce an arms control agreement with the Soviets, less likely, or don't you think that the Star Wars system has any impact on arms control negotiations? (YSW)

More likely	37
No impact	25
Less likely	25
Not sure (vol)	13

5/1985 From what you know about it, do you think that building the so-called Star Wars defense system in space is a good idea for the U.S. or a bad idea? (YSW)

Good idea	51
Bad idea	35
Not sure	14

7/1985 Have you read or heard about plans by the Reagan administration to develop weapons in outer space that could destroy nuclear missiles fired at the United States by the Soviet Union or other countries? Reagan calls the research on these weapons SDI, for Strategic Defense Initiative, and some people refer to it as "Star Wars." (ABC/WP)

Yes, have heard or read	84
No, have not read or heard	16
Don't know or no opinion	1

7/1985 Supporters say such weapons could guarantee protection of the United States from nuclear attack and are worth whatever they cost. Opponents say such weapons will not work, will increase the arms race, and that the research will cost many billions of dollars. How about you: would you say you approve or disapprove of plans to develop such space-based weapons? (ABC/WP)

Approve	41
Disapprove	53
Don't know	5

7/1985 (For those 41% who approved) Currently the U.S. and the Soviet Union have an anti-ballistic missile treaty that prohibits both nations from developing certain weapons. Suppose the U.S. had to violate or abandon that treaty in order to develop the space-based weapons. Would you still favor the development of those space-based weapons, or not? (ABC/WP)

Yes, would still favor	63
No, would not still favor	32
Don't know or no opinion	5

7/1985 Do you think that President Reagan's proposed "star wars" system increases or decreases the threat of nuclear war--or makes no difference in this respect? (YSW)

Increases threat	30
Makes no difference	34
Decreases threat	26
Not sure (vol)	10

7/1985 How much have you heard or read about President Reagan's proposal to develop a space-based anti-missile defense system--sometimes called "star wars"? Have you read or heard a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or nothing at all? (Roper 85-7)

Great deal	23
Fair amount	36
Not very much	30
Nothing at all	10
Don't know	1

7/1985 President Reagan has proposed that the United States build a space-based defense system against incoming missiles. Many people think that this is a good idea because it would give us an advantage over the Russians in this area, which would help deter a Soviet attack. Many others feel that a space-based defense system is a bad idea because it would escalate the arms race and increase the risk of a nuclear confrontation with Russia. How do you feel--do you think the United States should or should not build a space-based defense system? (Roper 85-7)

Should build	43
Should not	35
Don't know	22

7/1985 Here are some arguments that have been made in favor of a space-based anti-missile defense system. (Hand respondent card) For an argument to be convincing it has to be both important and true. If it isn't important, or isn't true, it isn't convincing. Would you tell me for each of these arguments whether you find it a very convincing argument for a space-based anti-missile defense system, or somewhat convincing, or not very convincing, or not at all convincing? (Roper 85-7)

	VC	SC	NVC	NAAC	DK
A space-based anti-missile defense system would reduce the risk of war by eliminating the chance that the Soviets would launch an attack against us.	22	35	21	12	10
A space-based anti-missile defense system would utilize the U.S. advantage in technical know-how and give the U.S. an edge over the Soviets in nuclear military capability.	20	36	22	11	11
Development of a space-based anti-missile defense system by the U.S. would encourage the Soviets to come to an agreement with the U.S. on controlling nuclear arms.	17	29	27	16	11
The world would be safer if the U.S. and the Soviet Union could each rely on a space-based anti-missile defense system for their security rather than relying, as they now do, on offensive missile systems to deter each other from launching an attack.	19	30	21	16	14

7/1985 Here are some arguments that have been made against a space-based anti-missile defense system. (Hand respondent card) Would you tell me for each of those arguments whether you find it a very convincing argument against a space-based anti-missile defense system, or somewhat convincing, or not very convincing, or not at all convincing? (Roper 85-7)

VC SC NVC NAAC DK

If the U.S. tries to develop a spaced-based anti-missile defense system it would increase the chance that the Soviets would launch an attack against us before we are able to install the system.

11 25 34 17 13

A space-based anti-missile defense system would be very costly, reducing the amount we could spend on domestic social and economic programs.

31 35 18 7 9

A space-based anti-missile defense system isn't worth its high cost because it would only be partially effective because it would not intercept all incoming missiles.

19 33 23 10 15

If the U.S. developed a space-based anti-missile system, the Soviets would try to develop ways to overcome it, thereby speeding up the nuclear arms race.

29 33 17 8 13

7/1985 In 1983, the United States announced a research program into a strategic defense system which might be able to destroy attacking enemy missiles before they hit their targets. This program is called the Strategic Defense Initiative or SDI. How much have you heard or read about the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative or SDI--a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or nothing at all? (DMI)

A great deal	10
A fair amount	27
Not very much	43
Nothing at all	20

7/1985 Some people have referred to SDI as "Star Wars." Have you ever heard or read of any US defense initiative referred to in this way? (DMI)

Yes	79
No	21

7/1985

Some people say that research on a defense against nuclear-armed missiles, such as SDI, is a good idea because it will help deter a Soviet attack, increase the chance of reaching an arms control agreement, and reduce the risk of war.

Other people say that research on a defense against nuclear-armed missiles, such as SDI, is a bad idea because it will upset the balance of power between the U.S. and the USSR, accelerate the arms race, and increase the risk of war.

Which statement is closer to your own opinion--that research on a defense against nuclear-armed missiles is a good idea or a bad idea? (DMI)

Good idea	67
Bad idea	30
No opinion	3

7/1985

How much have you heard or read about a Soviet strategic defense research program much like the U.S.'s SDI--a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or nothing at all? (DMI)

Great deal	3
Fair amount	14
Not very much	48
Nothing at all	36

7/1985

If it became known that the Soviet Union was conducting advanced research on a strategic defense system similar to the research proposed by the U.S., would you be . . . more likely to support U.S. research in this area . . . less likely to support U.S. research . . . or wouldn't this change your position at all? (DMI)

More likely	64
Less likely	5
No difference	30

7/1985

Some people believe that the best way to avoid war is to develop a defense against nuclear-armed missiles and that research should go on in this area even if it means not getting a nuclear arms control agreement with the Soviet Union.

Other people believe that the best way to avoid a war is to achieve a nuclear arms control agreement with the Soviet Union and that research on a defense against nuclear-armed missiles is primarily a bargaining chip which would be given up in return for a nuclear arms control agreement.

Which statement is closer to your own opinion, that research on an anti-missile defense system is the best way to avoid war and should go on, or that research on an anti-missile defense system is best as a bargaining chip to achieve nuclear arms control and could be given up? (DMI)

Way to avoid war	51
Bargaining chip	47
No opinion	2



8/1985 Some people feel the United States should try to develop a space-based Star Wars system to guard against a nuclear attack. Others oppose such an effort because they say it would be too costly and escalate the arms race. Which view comes closer to your own? (AIPO/NW)

Try to develop	45
Oppose	47
Don't know	8

9/1985 Have you heard or read anything about a program called the Strategic Defense Initiative, or SDI, also known as "Star Wars"? (Marttila & Kiley)

Yes	69
No	31

9/1985 What exactly is S.D.I., or Star Wars? What do you know about it? (Marttila & Kiley)

Protection, defense from nuclear weapons	19
Reference to outer space	17
Reference to weapons, nuclear weapons	12
General reference to nuclear weapons in space	8
Satellite defense systems	8
Laser defense system	4
Theoretical, undeveloped plan	4
Nuclear defense system in space	4
Unfavorable comment	3
Cost too much money	2
Favorable comment	1
Reagan plan	1
All other	3
Inaccurate, semi-accurate description	11
Not sure	26

9/1985 In 1972, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the ABM treaty, which prohibited either nation from testing or deploying a national system of defense against long-range nuclear missiles. Had you previously been aware of this ABM treaty, as far as you can recall? (Marttila & Kiley)

Yes	36
No	64

9/1985 The Reagan administration is now working on this program known as Star Wars. It will attempt to build a new defensive system in outer space that could shoot down nuclear missiles fired at the U.S. Since the program is currently only a research project, it is impossible to predict how complete a defense it will provide. I'm going to read a list of four possible Star Wars systems. For each one, tell me if you would strongly support, support, oppose, or strongly oppose building each type of system. (Marttila & Kiley)

	SS	S	O	SO	NS
A. A system that was perfect and could successfully defend against all incoming nuclear weapons.	58	28	5	4	4
B. A system that could protect our missile sites and some population centers, but could not guarantee the safety of many of our major cities.	12	32	34	16	6
C. A system designed only to protect U.S. missiles, key military bases, and Washington, D.C., but not other areas.	5	16	39	34	5
D. A system that could provide a complete defense against long-range nuclear missiles, but cannot defend against missiles fired from submarines or bombers.	8	32	34	17	10

9/1985 Now I'm going to read several statements people have made about the Star Wars proposal. Some of the statements argue in favor of Star Wars and some argue against it. Regardless of how you feel, please listen to each statement and tell me whether you strongly agree, mostly agree, mostly disagree, or strongly disagree with each one. (Marttila & Kiley)

	SA	MA	MD	SD	NS
A. If we build the Star Wars system the Soviets will just start building more and more weapons until they can penetrate it.	37	39	13	5	6
B. Star Wars is the kind of bold, new step we need to lead us away from the arms race.	18	29	26	17	11
C. Star Wars will make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.	11	22	32	22	14
D. It would be a dangerous mistake to expand the nuclear arms race into outer space.	27	27	25	12	4
E. Star Wars will encourage the Soviet Union to reach an agreement with us to reduce nuclear weapons.	16	31	27	18	9
F. The Soviet leaders are extremely concerned about Star Wars, which means we must be on the right track with this idea.	28	36	18	8	10
G. Even if it's a good idea, Star Wars costs too much to seriously consider building, especially at a time when our federal deficit is already at an all-time high.	29	29	21	11	9

9/1985 Supporters of the ABM treaty say it has made the world safer by giving both the United States and the Soviet Union the security of knowing that the other side cannot use nuclear weapons without being destroyed in retaliation. At some point, development of Star Wars will require the U.S. to either withdraw from the ABM Treaty or violate the Treaty. If you had to choose between developing Star Wars or keeping the ABM Treaty, which would you choose? (Marttila & Kiley)

Develop Star Wars	37
Keep ABM Treaty	48
Not sure	15

9/1985 From what you know about it, do you think that building the so-called Star Wars defense system is a good idea for the U.S. or a bad idea? (YSW)

Good idea	54
Bad idea	28
Not sure	18

10/1985 Have you read or heard about plans by the Reagan administration to develop weapons in outer space that could destroy nuclear missiles fired at the United States by the Soviet Union or other countries? Reagan calls the research on these weapons SDI, for Strategic Defense Initiative, and some people refer to it as "Star Wars." (ABC/WP)

Yes, have heard or read	85
No, have not read or heard	14
Don't know or no opinion	1

10/1985 Have you read or heard a great deal about plans for such space-based weapons, a fair amount, or very little? (ABC/WP)

Great deal	19
Fair amount	44
Very little	35
Don't know/No opinion	1

10/1985 Supporters say such weapons could guarantee protection of the United States from nuclear attack and are worth whatever they cost. Opponents say such weapons will not work, will increase the arms race, and that the research will cost many billions of dollars. How about you: would you say you approve or disapprove of plans to develop such space-based weapons? (ABC/WP)

	10/85	7/85
Approve	48	41
Disapprove	46	53
Don't know	5	5

- 10/1985 In general, which would you say is more important: for the United States to develop space based weapons to defend against nuclear attack, or for the U.S. and the Soviet Union to agree to a substantial reduction of nuclear arms by both countries? (ABC/WP)
- |   |    |
|---|----|
| For the U.S. to develop space weapons           | 20 |
| For the U.S. & USSR to agree to arms reductions | 74 |
| Both equally (vol)                              | 2  |
| Don't know/no opinion                           | 4  |
- 10/1985 How closely have you followed the discussions over the administration's so called "Star Wars" proposal--that is, its proposal to develop a space-based defense against nuclear attack--very closely, fairly closely, or not at all? (AIPO 258G)
- |                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Very closely   | 15 |
| Fairly closely | 46 |
| Not at all     | 36 |
| No opinion     | 3  |
- 10/1985 (Asked of 61% who followed Star Wars very or fairly closely) Would you like to see the United States go ahead with the development of such a system? (AIPO 258G)
- |                   |    |
|-------------------|----|
| Yes, develop      | 61 |
| No, don't develop | 28 |
| No opinion        | 11 |
- 10/1985 (Asked of 61% who followed Star Wars very or fairly closely) In your opinion would the United States' developing this system increase or decrease the likelihood of reaching a nuclear arms agreement with the Soviet Union? (AIPO 258G)
- |                               |    |
|-------------------------------|----|
| Increase chances of agreement | 48 |
| Decrease chances of agreement | 36 |
| No difference & no opinion    | 16 |
- 10/1985 (Asked of 61% who followed Star Wars very or fairly closely) In your opinion would developing this system make the world safer from nuclear destruction, or less safe? (AIPO 258G)
- |                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| Make world safer           | 44 |
| Make world less safe       | 29 |
| No difference & no opinion | 27 |
- 10/1985 Soviet leader Gorbachev has proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union agree to cut their strategic missile forces by 50 percent and to negotiate a total ban on the development and deployment of space-based weapons. Do you favor or oppose this proposal? (AIPO 258G)
- |            |    |
|------------|----|
| Favor      | 47 |
| Oppose     | 32 |
| No opinion | 21 |

- 10/1985 Soviet leader Gorbachev has offered to cut Soviet long-range nuclear weapons by 50% if the U.S. will stop research on President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, commonly known as the Star Wars plan. Do you think that's a fair trade, or that it is a bad idea, or don't you think you know enough to be sure? (Harris/BW)
- |                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| A fair trade                 | 10 |
| Bad idea                     | 37 |
| Don't know enough to be sure | 52 |
| Not sure                     | 1  |
- 10/1985 What if the U.S. were able to continue research on Star Wars, but agreed not to actually deploy that space-based defense system in return for major Soviet reductions in long-range nuclear weapons? Do you think that's a fair trade-off, is it a bad idea, or don't you think you know enough to be sure? (Harris/BW)
- |                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| A fair trade                 | 27 |
| A bad idea                   | 24 |
| Don't know enough to be sure | 47 |
| Not sure                     | 2  |
- 10/1985 Have you heard or read enough about the proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, often referred to as "Star Wars," to have an opinion about it? (NBC/WSJ)
- |                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| Yes                          | 55 |
| Haven't heard or read enough | 45 |
- 10/1985 (Asked of those who had heard or read enough to have an opinion) Do you favor or oppose the development of "Star Wars"? (NBC/WSJ)
- |          |    |
|----------|----|
| Favor    | 36 |
| Oppose   | 14 |
| Not sure | 5  |
- 11/1985 Have you read or heard about plans by the Reagan administration to develop weapons in outer space that could destroy nuclear missiles fired at the United States by the Soviet Union or other countries? Reagan calls the research on these weapons SDI, for Strategic Defense Initiative, and some people refer to it as "Star Wars." (ABC/WP)
- |                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| Yes, have heard or read    | 83 |
| No, have not read or heard | 17 |
| Don't know or no opinion   | 1  |

11/1985 Have you read or heard a great deal about plans for such space-based weapons, a fair amount, or very little? (ABC/WP)

	11/85	10/85
Great deal	22	19
Fair amount	44	44
Very little	33	35
Don't know/No opinion	1	1

11/1985 Supporters say such weapons could guarantee protection of the United States from nuclear attack and are worth whatever they cost. Opponents say such weapons will not work, will increase the arms race, and that the research will cost many billions of dollars. How about you: would you say you approve or disapprove of plans to develop such space-based weapons? (ABC/WP)

	11/85	10/85	7/85
Approve	55	48	41
Disapprove	38	46	53
Don't know	6	5	5

11/1985 In general, which would you say is more important: for the United States to develop space based weapons to defend against nuclear attack, or for the U.S. and the Soviet Union to agree to a substantial reduction of nuclear arms by both countries? (ABC/WP)

	11/85	10/85
To develop space weapons	21	20
To agree to arms reductions	71	74
Both equally (vol)	4	2
Don't know/no opinion	4	5

11/1985 Reagan says it is essential for the U.S. to develop space based weapons. Suppose the only way to get an arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union is for the U.S. to stop development of space based weapons. Should the U.S. agree to that, or not? (ABC/WP)

Yes, US should agree to stop development	41
No, US should not agree to stop development	52
Don't know/no opinion	6

11/1985a	Ronald Reagan has proposed developing a defensive nuclear system in space that would destroy incoming missiles before they reach the United States, a system some people call "Star Wars." Do you think such a system could work? (CBS/NYT)		
		1/85	11/85
	Yes	62	58
	No	23	27
	No opinion	15	15
11/1985a	The Soviet Union has said it will not discuss a reduction in nuclear missiles if the United States goes ahead in developing Star Wars. Do you believe they really mean that, or do you think they're just saying that? (CBS/NYT)		
	Really mean	42	
	Just saying	48	
	Don't know/No answer	10	
11/1985a	If it came down to only these choices, what should the United States do--work to develop a Star Wars system and give up negotiations, or work to negotiate a reduction in nuclear missiles and give up Star Wars? (CBS/NYT)		
	Develop Star Wars		33
	Negotiate		53
	Neither (vol)		2
	Don't know/no answer		12
11/1985a	Is the administration's proposed Star Wars system intended to protect the entire population, about half of the population, or less than ten percent of the population? (CBS/NYT)		
	Entire population		30
	About half		28
	Less than 10%		15
	Don't know/no answer		27
11/1985b	If it came down to only these choices, what should the United States do--work to develop a Star Wars system and give up negotiations, or work to negotiate a reduction in nuclear missiles and give up Star Wars? (CBS/NYT)		
	Develop Star Wars		31
	Negotiate		49
	Don't know/No answer		20

- 11/1985 Is Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, also known as Star Wars, more likely to increase the chances of peace or more likely to increase the chances of war? (AIPO/NW)
- |                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Increase chances of peace | 53 |
| Increase chances of war   | 32 |
| Neither (vol)             | 5  |
| Don't know                | 10 |
- 11/1985 Should President Reagan accept some limits on the development of his Star Wars program in exchange for a fair treaty to limit or reduce the levels of strategic nuclear weapons? Or should Reagan resist any limits on Star Wars development even if that means not getting a treaty? (AIPO/NW)
- |               |    |
|---------------|----|
| Accept limits | 46 |
| Resist limits | 39 |
| Don't know    | 15 |
- 11/1985 Missing from any agreement at the summit were the following things. For each, tell me if you think it is highly significant that nothing was done on them, somewhat significant, not very significant, or hardly significant at all. . . no agreement on Star Wars research (Harris)
- |                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Highly significant        | 35 |
| Somewhat significant      | 28 |
| Not very significant      | 16 |
| Hardly significant at all | 17 |
| Not sure                  | 4  |
- 11/1985 What do you think is the most important topic that should be discussed at the Geneva summit meeting. . . nuclear weapons disarmament, or a nuclear test ban, or outlawing nuclear weapons in space, or reducing intermediate-range missiles stationed in Europe, or peace talks for regional trouble-spots, or human rights, or cultural exchanges, or what? I could repeat those, if you wish. Is there another important topic that should be discussed at the summit? (LAT)
- |  |    |
|--|----|
| Nuclear weapons disarmament            | 50 |
| Peace talks for regional trouble spots | 31 |
| Human rights                           | 22 |
| Outlawing nuclear weapons in space     | 18 |
| Nuclear test ban                       | 12 |
| Reducing intermediate range missiles   | 9  |
| Cultural exchanges                     | 6  |
| Other (vol)                            | 1  |



11/1985 The United States has begun research on a defensive system that would protect the United States against attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles. The administration calls this project the Strategic Defense Initiative and the press has nicknamed it "Star Wars." How much would you say you have heard or read about this project: a lot, or some, or a little, or haven't you heard anything yet about Star Wars? (LAT)

A lot	23
Some	34
A little	34
Haven't heard anything	8
Not sure	1

11/1985 Some people say that the first thing we have to do is conduct Star Wars research to find out if the idea works. Then when we know what is at stake, there will be time enough to negotiate with the other side. But other people say that, just as soon as one side starts research, the other side will try to improve its weapons so they can avoid Star Wars defenses, and nuclear development escalates. Do you think the two sides should wait until research turns up something before they negotiate or do you think the research should be banned at the start to avoid nuclear weapons escalation? (LAT)

	11/85	1/85
Ban	41	55
Delay	44	33
Not sure	13	11
Refused	2	1

11/1985 President Reagan says that Star Wars--the Strategic Defense Initiative--is not negotiable and he insists he will not bargain it away at the summit in exchange for nuclear disarmament. Do you think the President says this because he believes in Star Wars and won't give it up . . . or do you think he says it because he wants to bargain from a position of strength? (LAT)

Believes in Star Wars	28
Bargain from position of strength	58
Not sure	13
Refused	1

- 11/1985 It has been proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union agree to outlaw the use of all military weapons in outer space. Generally speaking, do you favor or oppose such an agreement? Is that (favor/oppose) strongly or somewhat? (LAT)
- |                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| Favor strongly  | 37 |
| Favor somewhat  | 24 |
| Oppose somewhat | 15 |
| Oppose strongly | 16 |
| Not sure        | 8  |
- 11/1985 Which side would you say is now ahead in defenses against nuclear weapons, the United States or the Soviet Union? (LAT)
- |            |    |
|------------|----|
| US         | 38 |
| Even (vol) | 9  |
| Soviets    | 36 |
| Not sure   | 16 |
| Refused    | 1  |
- 11/1985 Among the various types of defense systems proposed for Star Wars research, two have been made public. One type involves placing nuclear weapons in space orbit, ready to be triggered from the ground so that their explosions would focus pumped X-ray laser beams at enemy missiles or satellites. The other type would not involve nuclear devices but would consist of electromagnetic launchers, or "rail guns" on the ground which would destroy targets in space. If you had to choose between these two types of Star Wars systems, would you prefer the nuclear weapon or the non-nuclear weapon? (LAT)
- |             |    |
|-------------|----|
| Nuclear     | 12 |
| Non-nuclear | 77 |
| Not sure    | 10 |
| Refused     | 1  |
- 11/1985 From what you have heard or read, how do you think Star Wars is likely to be effective? Do you think it will someday be a leakproof umbrella against enemy missiles, or will it be able to reduce the number of missiles that can get through, or will it be effective mainly against enemy satellites, or will it be able to protect small areas where missiles are stored, or do you think a Star Wars system will never be effective at all? (LAT)
- |   |    |
|---|----|
| Reduce number of missiles getting through | 32 |
| Not sure                                  | 24 |
| Never effective                           | 22 |
| Leakproof umbrella                        | 10 |
| Protect small areas                       | 6  |
| Effective against enemy satellites        | 5  |
| Refused                                   | 1  |

11/1985 On the whole, do you think President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative--also known as Star Wars--is more likely to increase the chances of peace, or increase the chances of war? (LAT)

Increase chances of peace	54
No change (vol)	6
Increase the chances of war	28
Not sure	11
Refused	1

11/1985 Although no one has yet estimated how much it will cost to develop Star Wars, President Reagan has asked for a total of 26 billion dollars over the next five years for "research" on the Strategic Defense Initiative. Considering the current budget situation, would you say that's too much to spend on research, or is it about the right amount, or would you say it isn't enough? (LAT)

Too much	59
Right	27
Not enough	7
Not sure	7

11/1985 The idea behind our nuclear defense over the past forty years is called "Mutual Assured Destruction." It says that what keeps both the United States and the Soviet Union from firing off their nuclear weapons at each other is the certainty that the other side would counterattack with dreadful destruction. Now some people think the "Star Wars" system would destabilize this balance of terror. They claim that if one side had a way to defend itself against nuclear counterattack, it could launch an aggressive war without fear of retaliation. Do you think that a "Star Wars" system threatens its opponents or not? (LAT)

	11/85	1/85
Yes	54	56
No	32	28
Not sure	13	15
Refused	1	1

11/1985 So that neither side would feel threatened, it has been suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union disclose to each other everything they know about how to defend against intercontinental ballistic missile attack. Would you favor or oppose having both sides share their research on nuclear defenses? (LAT)

Favor	39
Oppose	54
Not sure	6
Refused	1

- 11/1985 Taking all things into consideration, do you think the United States should develop a Strategic Defense Initiative--Star Wars--or not? (LAT)
- |                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Develop        | 58 |
| Do not develop | 30 |
| Not sure       | 11 |
| Refused        | 1  |
- 11/1985 There is some question about whether research on Star Wars violates a 1972 treaty that the United States signed with the Soviet Union in which we promised not to develop, test or deploy anti-ballistic missiles. Would you still be in favor of going ahead with research on Star Wars even if it was in violation of the anti-ballistic missile treaty? (LAT)
- |                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Go ahead       | 65 |
| Don't go ahead | 29 |
| Not sure       | 6  |
- 11/1985 If President Reagan were willing to discuss the Strategic Defense Initiative at the summit conference, he might be able to trade it for a significant reduction of Soviet nuclear weapons. On the other hand, he might also trade away an opportunity for the United States to develop a defense against nuclear weapons. What do you think President Reagan should do about Star Wars? Do you think he should place it on the bargaining table in Geneva, or not? (LAT)
- |            |    |
|------------|----|
| Should     | 37 |
| Should not | 53 |
| Not sure   | 9  |
| Refused    | 1  |
- 11/1985 The Reagan administration has proposed developing weapons in outer space that could destroy missiles fired at the United States by other countries. This is sometimes referred to as "Star Wars." Is this something you have heard or read about? (YSW)
- |                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Yes            | 88 |
| No             | 9  |
| Not sure (vol) | 3  |
- 11/1985 (Asked of the 88% who had heard of Star Wars) The Reagan administration has proposed developing weapons in outer space that could destroy missiles fired at the United States by other countries. This is sometimes referred to as "Star Wars." How much would you say you know about Star Wars--a lot, little, or nothing at all? (YSW)
- |                |    |
|----------------|----|
| A lot          | 18 |
| A little       | 69 |
| Nothing at all | 12 |
| Not sure       | 1  |

11/1985

(Asked of the 77% who said they knew a lot or a little about Star Wars) The Reagan administration has proposed developing weapons in outer space that could destroy missiles fired at the United States by other countries. This is sometimes referred to as "Star Wars."

Do you think this Star Wars defense system is likely to work or not work? (YSW)

Likely to work	65
Likely not to work	22
Mixed, some of both (vol)	6
Not sure (vol)	8

In general, do you favor or oppose developing the Star Wars defense system? (YSW)

Favor	59
Oppose	34
Not sure (vol)	7

Do you think that developing the Star Wars system will make us feel more secure, less secure, or make no difference either way? (YSW)

More secure	58
Less secure	8
Make no difference	33
Not sure (vol)	2

Do you think that developing the Star Wars system will make it easier to reach an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union, more difficult to reach an agreement, or make no difference either way? (YSW)

Easier	36
More difficult	33
Make no difference	28
Not sure (vol)	4

Do you think that developing the Star Wars system will increase the risk of nuclear war, decrease the risk of nuclear war, or make no difference either way? (YSW)

Increase risk	20
Decrease risk	36
Make no difference	41
Not sure (vol)	3

11/1985 People have different ideas about what the goals of the summit meeting should be. Please tell me whether you think each of these goals is very important for the summit meeting or not very important: Reaching an arms control agreement in which the United States stops building Star Wars defense systems and the Soviet Union makes similar cutbacks in its military system? (YSW)

Very important	74
Not very important	18
Not sure (vol)	8

11/1985 Please tell me whether you think it is likely or unlikely that each of these goals will be achieved at the summit meeting: Reaching an arms control agreement in which the United States stops building Star Wars defense systems and the Soviet Union makes similar cutbacks in its military system? (YSW)

Likely	19
Not likely	73
Not sure (vol)	8

11/1985 Have you heard or read enough about the proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, often referred to as "Star Wars," to have an opinion about it? (NBC/WSJ)

	10/85	11/85
Yes	55	48
Haven't heard or read enough	45	52

11/1985 (Asked of those who had heard or read enough to have an opinion) Do you favor or oppose the development of "Star Wars"? (NBC/WSJ)

	10/85	11/85
Favor	36	32
Oppose	14	13
Not sure	5	3

11/1985 (Asked of those who had heard or read enough to have an opinion) Which statement comes closest to your feelings about Star Wars? (NBC/WSJ)

We should build a system no matter what the Soviets do.	52
We should agree not to build it if the Soviets agree to reduce nuclear weapons.	26
We should not build such a system at all.	18
Not sure	4

Chapter 4

Survey Dates, Sample Sizes and Bibliographic Information

Reference Poll Date		Code-Book Date	Begin Survey Date	End Survey Date	Sample Size	Population
<b><u>ABM Surveys</u></b>						
12/1945	NORC T42	12/7	12/7	12/8	526	national adult
6/1946a	SSRC	-	-	-	3090	national adult
6/1946b	SSRC	-	-	-	600	national adult
8/1946a	SSRC	-	-	-	2894	national adult
8/1946b	SSRC	-	-	-	600	national adult
2/1947	MINN 42	2/4	-	-	875	state (Minn.) adult
11/1949	AIPO 449 K&T	10/28	10/30	11/4	2903	national adult
12/1963	NORC SRS 330*	-	12/2	12/31	1557	national adult
6/1964	NORC SRS 640*	-	-	-	1464	national adult
2/1966	NORC SRS 876*	-	-	-	1497	national adult
6/1968	ORC/Nehnevaja	6/12	-	-	1508	national adult
12/1968	Harris 1900	12/68	12/12	12/18	1544	national adult
4/1969	AIPO 777	3/25	3/27	4/1	-	national adult
4/1969	Harris 1926	3-4/69	4/5	4/11	1573	national adult
5/1969	AIPO 780 K	5/13	5/15	5/20	1523	national adult
7/1969	AIPO 784 K	7/8	7/10	7/15	-	national adult
7/1969	Harris 1939	7/69	7/16	7/22	2087	national adult
9/1970	Harris 2037	8/70	9/18	9/24	1609	national adult
1/1971	Harris 2055	1/71	-	-	3092	national adult
6/1971	Harris 2124	6/71	6/9	6/15	1614	national adult
2/1972	Harris 2154	2/72	2/8	2/14	1579	national adult
3/1972	MIS/Nehnevaja	-	-	-	1302	national adult
6/1972	Harris 2216	6/72	6/7	6/12	1303	national adult
7/1972	Field/LMH	-	6/20	7/10	980	state (Ca.) adult
9/1972	Harris 2234	8/72	8/30	9/1	1632	national adult
6/1973	Harris 2330	6/73	6/14	6/18	1511	national adult
11/1973	Harris 2351	11/73	11/13	11/16	1460	national adult
5/1974	Field/LMH	-	5/1	5/50	786	state (Ca.) adult
1/1976	Harris 7588	12/75	12/18	1/2	1400	national adult
12/1978	MIS/Nehnevaja	-	9/16	12/15	1620	national adult
4/1979	Harris 792106	4/79	4/6	4/9	1200	national adult

\* Conducted with Dr. Nehnevaja

Reference Poll Date		Code- Book Date	Begin Survey Date	End Survey Date	Sample Size	Population
<u>Star Wars Surveys</u>						
5/1981	Harris 812106	-	5/6	5/10	1250	national adult
10/1981	NBC/AP 71	-	10/25	10/26	1598	national adult
5/1982	Abt 1	5/17	-	-	1000	national adult
7/1982	Abt 2	-	7/7	7/15	1003	national adult
8/1982	Sindlinger	-	7/15	8/4	2718	national adult
4/1983	Harris 832103	-	4/7	4/10	1250	national adult
4/1983	ABC/WP	-	4/8	4/12	1516	national adult
4/1983	CBS/NYT	-	4/7	4/11	1489	national adult
5/1983	AIPO 214G	-	5/13	5/16	1540	national adult
2/1984	Finkelstein	-	2/15	2/20	1010	state (Ca.)
4/1984	Penn & Schoen	-	3/31	4/2	1000	national adult
6/1984	Hart	-	6/9	6/11	755	state (Ill.) lk voter
6/1984	Harris	-	6/7	6/11	1251	national lk voter
7/1984	Harris	-	7/2	7/7	1259	national lk voter
7/1984	Roper	-	7/7	7/14	2000	national adult
9/1984	Abt 4	-	9/4	9/10	1002	national adult
10/1984	Harris 842233b	-	10/22	10/23	2003	national adult
10/1984	CBS/NYT	-	10/21	10/21	494	national reg voter
10/1984	CBS/NYT	-	10/23	10/25	1068	national adult
11/1984	Harris	-	11/26	11/29	1255	national adult
1/1985	CBS/NYT	-	1/2	1/4	1525	national adult
1/1985	ABC/WP 179	-	1/4	1/6	504	national adult
1/1985	LAT 93	-	1/19	1/24	1454	national adult
1/1985	AIPO 249G	1/22	1/25	1/28	1528	national adult
2/1985	Finkelstein	-	-	-	1005	national adult
3/1985	Harris	-	3/2	3/5	1256	national adult
3/1985	Roper 85-3	-	-	-	-	national adult
5/1985	Sindlinger	-	5/7	5/27	2318	national adult
5/1985	YSW	-	4/30	5/2	1014	national adult
7/1985	ABC/WP	-	7/25	7/29	1506	national adult
7/1985	YSW	-	7/23	7/25	1013	national reg voter
7/1985	Roper 85-7	-	7/13	7/20	-	national adult
7/1985	DMI	-	7/1	7/3	1500	national adult
8/1985	AIPO/NW	-	8/27	8/28	862	national adult
9/1985	Marttila & Kiley	-	9/5	9/15	1008	national reg voter
9/1985	YSW	-	9/19	9/17	1014	national reg voter
10/1985	ABC/WP	-	10/24	10/28	1506	national adult
10/1985	AIPO	-	10/11	10/14	1540	national adult
10/1985	Harris/BW	-	10/23	10/27	1252	national adult
10/1985	NBC/WSJ	-	10/7	10/8	1573	national adult



Reference Poll Date	Code- Book Date	Begin Survey Date	End Survey Date	Sample Size	Population	
11/1985	ABC/WP	-	11/10	11/13	1507	national adult
11/1985a	CBS/NYT	-	11/6	11/10	1659	national adult
11/1985b	CBS/NYT	-	11/20	11/20	800	national adult
11/1985	AIPO/NW	-	11/13	11/14	588	national adult
11/1985	Harris	-	11/22	11/24	1258	national adult
11/1985	LAT	-	11/1	11/7	2041	national adult
11/1985	YSW	-	11/14	11/18	1020	national reg voters
11/1985	NBC/WSJ	-	11/22	11/23	1584	national adult

### Bibliographic Information

Unless specifically noted below, the text of the question has been taken from the codebook used to conduct each survey. The data has been obtained from reports published by the relevant survey organizations or from the Harris Center at the University of North Carolina and the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut.

Date            Poll

#### ABM Surveys

6/1946a	SSRC	This survey was done by Richard S. Crutchfield (Swarthmore College) with an AIPO-format codebook. Text and data from SSRC 1947, pp. 3, 40, 51, 54, 60-61, 68, 74-5; Cottrell & Eberhart 1948, pp. 104-105.
6/1946b	SSRC	This survey was done by Angus Campbell, Sylvia Eberhart and Patricia Woodward at Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. Text and data from SSRC 1947 pp. 107-112, 214, 243, 245, 247, 251; Cottrell & Eberhart 1948, pp. 105-106.
8/1946a	SSRC	Text and data from SSRC 1947, pp. 3, 40, 51, 54, 60-61, 68, 74-5, 109-112, 243, 245, 247, 251; Cottrell & Eberhart 1948, pp. 104-105.
8/1946b	SSRC	Text and data from SSRC 1947, pp. 107-112, 214, 243, 245, 247, 251; Cottrell & Eberhart 1948, pp. 105-106.
12/1963	NORC SRS 330	Text and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.
6/1964	NORC SRS 640	Text from NORC SRS 640 and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.

2/1966	NORC-SRS 876	Text from NORC SRS 876 and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.
6/1968	ORC/Nehnevajsa	Text and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.
3/1972	MIS/Nehnevajsa	Text and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.
12/1978	MIS/Nehnevajsa	Text and data from Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa at the University of Pittsburgh.

### Star Wars Surveys

5/1982	Abt 1	Text and data from Abt Associates, Cambridge, Ma.
7/1982	Abt 2	Text and data from Abt Associates, Cambridge, Ma.
8/1982	Sindlinger	Text and data from Sindlinger release.
2/1984	Finkelstein	Text and data from Gregory A. Fossedal (1984), "A Bipartisan Memo on Star Wars," <u>Wall Street Journal</u> , August 18, 1984, p. 14 and Walter Andrews (1984), "Star Wars Defense Gets Poll Victory," <u>Washington Times</u> , March 23, 1984, p. 3.
4/1984	Penn & Schoen	Text and data from the Committee on the Present Danger.
6/1984	Hart	Text and data from Peter D. Hart release.
9/1984	Abt 4	Text and data from Abt Associates, Cambridge, Ma.
2/1985	Finkelstein	Text and data from the <u>Washington Post</u> August 14, 1984 and <u>Public Opinion</u> , Vol. 8, No. 4 (August/September 1985).
3/1985	Roper 85-3	Text and data from <u>Public Opinion</u> , Vol. 8, No. 4, (August/September 1985).
5/1985	Sindlinger	Text and data from Committee on the Present Danger.
9/1985	Marttila & Kiley	Text and data from Marttila & Kiley, Boston, Ma.

### Citations

Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr. and Sylvia Eberhart (1948), American Opinion on World Affairs in the Nuclear Age (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Social Science Research Council (1947), Public Reaction to the Atomic Bomb and World Affairs: A Nation-Wide Survey of Attitudes and Information (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University).



## Chapter 5

### Abbreviations & Survey Organizations

In the preceding pages several abbreviations have been used. The following list of abbreviations and their meanings are presented below.

#### Miscellaneous Abbreviations

Ca.	California
DK	Don't know
Ill.	Illinois
lk voter	Likely voter
NA	Not asked or not available
reg	Registered
vol	Volunteered response, option not asked by interviewer
*	Responses equal less than .5 %

#### Survey Abbreviations    Survey Organizations

ABC/WP	American Broadcasting Company & Washington Post.
ABT	Clark Abt Associates, Cambridge, Ma.
AIPO	American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup).
AIPO/NW	American Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup)/ Newsweek.
CBS/NYT	Columbia Broadcasting System/New York Times.
DMI	Decision Making Information, McLean, Va.
Field/LMH	Field Research Corporation & Todd La Porte, Daniel Metlay, and Robert Heyer.
Finkelstein	Arthur J. Finkelstein, New York, NY.
Harris	Louis Harris & Associates.
Harris/BW	Louis Harris & Associates/Business Week.
Hart	Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Washington, D.C.
LAT	Los Angeles Times.
Marttila & Kiley	Marttila & Kiley, Boston, Ma.
MINN	Minnesota poll.
MIS/Nehnevajsa	Market Information Service, Atlanta, Ga. & Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa.
NBC/AP	National Broadcasting Company/Associated Press.
NBC/WSJ	National Broadcasting Company/Wall Street Journal.
NORC	National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois.
NORC/Nehnevajsa	National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Illinois & Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa.
ORC/Nehnevajsa	Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, NJ & Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa.
Penn & Schoen	Penn & Schoen Associates, New York, NY.
Roper	The Roper Organization, New York, NY.
SSRC	Social Science Research Council.
Sindlinger	Sindlinger & Company, Inc., Media, Pa.
Sindlinger/CPD	Sindlinger & Company, Inc., Media, Pa. & Committee on the Present Danger.
YSW	Yankelovich, Skelly & White, New York, N.Y.