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Public Opinion Strategies, in conjunction with Talmey-Drake Research, conducted a national survey among 800 registered voters in late June on behalf of the Better World Campaign. The sample was segmented into two sub-groups, 600 “well informed*” registered voters and 200 “less informed” registered voters. The margin of error on the sample of 600 is +4.0% and the margin of error on the sample of 200 is +6.93%.

This presentation will primarily focus on the 600 “well informed” voters, since this has been our target audience in this campaign. However, we will briefly profile the 200 “less informed” voters on key questions.

This is the fourth year in a row we have tracked attitudes about the UN and US international assistance among these two populations. Over four years we have conducted six national surveys for the Better World Campaign. This is the first year we have explored the UN Millennium goals.

As well, after September 11th, the global environment shifted and we conducted two brief national surveys in October 2001 and May 2002. This presentation will also include trends from these surveys where applicable among “well informed” voters.

*Well informed voters were screened to meet the following criteria: Definitely planning on voting in 2002; voted in 2000; and follow politics/current events in the news all, most or some of the time.
PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF AMERICAN ENGAGEMENT AROUND THE WORLD
Respondent perception of how involved the US should be internationally is returning to normal pre-attack levels.

With the collapse of the old Soviet Union, some people feel that the role the United States played in international affairs during the cold war era can and should now be cut back. Others, however, feel that because of the many global challenges and opportunities that are now present, it is even more important now for the U.S. to stay involved in international issues and events. How do you feel? Do you feel that the U.S. should become less involved internationally, more involved internationally, or do you feel that our international role should remain pretty much the same as it has been?

- Pre-Attack (Average of 1999, 2000, June 2001):
  - More involved: 27%
  - Less involved: 19%

- October 2001:
  - More involved: 41%
  - Less involved: 12%

- May 2002:
  - More involved: 34%
  - Less involved: 22%

- June 2002:
  - More involved: 32%
  - Less involved: 19%
Although concern about terrorism has decreased in priority since October 2001, the number one world issue is still Peace/Security.

Now, looking forward to the challenges that leaders around the world face as we look ahead to the 21st century, what is the number one issue facing the world that you think the leaders of the United States and other countries should be most concerned about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Peace/Security</th>
<th>Social Issues</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2001</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/01</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2002</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/02</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/02</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Terrorism: 36%
- Peace: 12%
- The Middle East: 7%
- War in general: 3%
- Nuclear weapons: 1%
- General national defense: 1%
- War/world peace: 1%
- Osama Bin Laden: *
- Arms/Weapons: *
- Plight of refugees in Afghanistan: *
MEASURING PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF THE UN MILLENIUM GOALS
We read respondents the UN Millennium Development Goals and asked them to rate the importance of each one. The question asked “Now, do you feel that (insert goal) should be an absolute top priority, a high but not top priority, a medium priority or a lower priority for the UN to accomplish by 2015 or do you think this should not be the role of the UN?”
Voters define providing access to safe drinking water as the top UN millennium goal.

**Millennium Goals**

More than one billion people lack access to safe drinking water, most of them children. Unsafe water and poor sanitation cause about eighty percent of all diseases in the developing world, killing more than five million people every year. The goal is to cut in half the number of people without access to safe drinking water.

In 2001 alone, five million people became infected with HIV, eight hundred thousand of them under the age of fifteen. Up to fourteen thousand new infections occurred each day. The goal is to reverse this trend.

More than one hundred and thirty million primary school-age children around the world are not in school today. The goal is to get almost all these eligible children into a primary education program.

About sixty percent of the children who are not in school are girls, at a time when better educating girls has been shown to translate into better nutrition for the whole family, better health care, declining fertility and better overall economic performance. The goal is to assure girls the same access to education now available to boys.
The goals of “cutting extreme poverty in half” and “cutting the mortality rate of mothers giving birth” are given lower priority.

**Millennium Goals**

In 2000, eighty-one out of every one thousand children under the age of five died before turning six. The goal is to cut by two-thirds this rate of child mortality.  

There are currently 1.2 (ONE-point-TWO) billion people, or almost twenty percent of the world's population, living in extreme poverty, that is, on less than ONE dollar per day. The goal is to cut this number in half.  

Currently, for every one hundred thousand babies born live, an estimated four hundred women die during childbirth. The goal is to cut by two-thirds the mortality rate of mothers giving birth.
The goals voters rate as the most important are also the goals they think are most likely to happen by 2015.

Which ONE do you think is the MOST likely to happen by 2015?
(Ranked by First Choice)

- To cut in half the number of people without access to safe drinking water: 23% (1st Choice), 36% (Total)
- To reverse the trend of new HIV infections: 18% (1st Choice), 30% (Total)
- To assure girls the same access to education now available to boys: 18% (1st Choice), 28% (Total)
- To get almost all eligible children around the world into a primary education program: 12% (1st Choice), 24% (Total)
- To cut by two-thirds the rate of child mortality: 5% (1st Choice), 12% (Total)
- To cut in half the number of people in the world who live in extreme poverty: 4% (1st Choice), 8% (Total)
- To cut by two-thirds the mortality rate of mothers giving birth: 3% (1st Choice), 10% (Total)
However, voters support for HIV/AIDS assistance remains high in importance even though voters remain skeptical that great gains will be achieved by 2015.

Which ONE do you think is the LEAST likely to happen by 2015?

- To cut in half the number of people in the world who live in extreme poverty: 26%
- To reverse the trend of new HIV infections: 24%
- To assure girls the same access to education now available to boys: 11%
- To get almost all eligible children around the world into a primary education program: 9%
- To cut in half the number of people without access to safe drinking water: 8%
- To cut by two-thirds the mortality rate of mothers giving birth: 7%
- To cut by two-thirds the rate of child mortality: 4%
ATTITUDES ABOUT US SPENDING ON INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE & THE UNITED NATIONS
As we saw in the focus groups, telling voters the actual percentage of the US federal budget that is spent on international assistance makes a huge difference in their support of increasing this portion of the US federal budget.

We asked respondents the following question:
And thinking about the portion of the US federal budget that is spent on international assistance to other nations... Do you think the amount of money the United States spends on international assistance to other nations, such as humanitarian aid, disaster relief, peacekeeping activities and the UN and its agencies should be...INCREASED or DECREASED... or should it stay the same?

*Half of the respondents were told “the United States spends less than one percent of the federal budget on all international assistance to other nations.”*
Telling voters the actual percentage of the US federal budget that is spent on international assistance makes a huge difference in their support of increasing this portion of the US federal budget.

Respondents not told how much US currently spends on International Assistance

-20%

Respondents told how much US currently spends on International Assistance – less than 1%

+25%

Not Told 1%

Told 1%
SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS:
TAKE-AWAY TALKING POINTS
SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

- A plurality of Americans do favor the US becoming more involved internationally.

- Although concern about terrorism has decreased in priority since October 2001, the number one world issue is still Peace/Security.

- There is a high degree of support for all of the core Millennium Development Goals – especially those addressing fundamental development issues like access to water, slowing the spread of AIDS, and primary education.

- The Millennium Development Goals Americans prioritize as most important are also the goals they feel are most likely to be achieved by 2015.

  ✓ Increasing access to safe drinking water and the focus on primary education are rated highest in priority, as well as most likely to happen by 2015. Although Americans believe reversing the increasing trend in HIV/AIDS infection rates is a top priority, they are a bit more discouraged about the probability of likely progress.
Telling voters the actual percentage of the US federal budget that is spent on international assistance makes a huge difference in whether or not they support increasing this portion of the US federal budget.

A plurality of Americans who heard the following statement “the United States spends less than one percent of the federal budget on all international assistance to other nations” supported increasing the amount of money the US spends on international assistance.