



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

War Powers / Arms Sales / Congressional Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs)

- QUESTIONNAIRE -

February 2022

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough
Sample Size: 2,702 Registered Voters

Field Dates: January 27 - February 28, 2022
Margin of Error: +/- 1.9%

[Introduction]

In this survey, we'd like your opinions about some current issues. There are no right or wrong answers, so please answer the questions based on what seems right to you.

Today, we are going to do a survey on several current issues. If at any time you find that you do not want to answer a question, feel free to skip it and move on to the next one.

[War Powers Act]

There has been a long-running debate about the role of Congress and the President when it comes to decisions about the use of military force.

Currently, there is a proposal in Congress that will give Congress a stronger role in deciding whether the US will use military force. Before going into this question, here is a little background.

The Constitution gives both Congress and the President a role in the use of military force:

- Congress is responsible for funding the military and has the power to declare war
- The President is the Commander in Chief of the military

A less clear area is when the President might use military force outside of the framework of a declaration of war.

To answer this question, in 1973 Congress passed the War Powers Act. It states that the President may at times use military force without first getting Congressional approval. But if Congress does not vote in favor of continuing the action within 60 days, the President must stop the military action and withdraw the forces.

Nonetheless, all Presidents since then have taken the position that, though they may ask Congress for approval, because the President is the Commander in Chief, they do not need Congressional approval to use military force.

Most significantly, various Presidents have used military force, Congress did not approve, but after 60 days the President continued to use military force. These include:¹

- Reagan sending the military into the Persian Gulf (1987)
- Clinton sending the military into Kosovo (1999)
- Obama sending the military into Libya² (2011)

¹ [CRS. \(2012\) War Powers Litigation Initiated by Members of Congress Since the Enactment of the War Powers Resolution; CRS. \(2012\) War Powers Resolution: Presidential Compliance](#)

² [Declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes \(H.Res. 292, 112th Congress\)](#)

In each case, Congress had the option of taking an action to cut off funding for the military operation. However, if Congress were to do that, the President could veto such an action. Then it would require two thirds of the votes in both houses of Congress to override that veto. This is politically difficult to achieve.

Currently, there is a proposal that would make it more possible for Congress to stop a President’s military operation. Rather than Congress having to vote to stop a military operation--and possibly be vetoed--the military operation could only continue after 60 days if a majority in Congress were to vote in favor.

If Congress does not vote to continue the operation within the 60 days, funding will be automatically cut off.³ That way the President could not veto this cut-off. (This would not apply to military actions in response to a direct attack on the US or its military.)

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q1. Our government only functions with checks and balances. The Constitution states that Congress has the authority to decide whether to send our troops into battle, and thus when to bring them home. But Presidents have been abusing their power by ignoring the War Powers Act and ignoring Congress. This is too much power for a President to have. If over half of Congress does not think a military operation should continue -- that it does not protect our national security and is not worth our troops’ lives -- then that should be enough to stop it.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

Q1.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	26.7%	48.8%	75.5%	16.1%	6.7%	22.8%	1.8%
Republicans	25.6%	46.4%	72.0%	17.7%	8.3%	26.0%	1.9%
Democrats	28.2%	53.0%	81.2%	13.3%	4.7%	18.0%	0.8%
Independents	25.5%	44.4%	69.9%	18.9%	7.3%	26.2%	3.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	26.4%	45.8%	72.2%	21.3%	4.0%	25.3%	2.4%
Somewhat red	25.7%	47.1%	72.8%	17.3%	8.4%	25.7%	1.4%
Lean red	25.4%	48.8%	74.2%	15.2%	8.8%	24.0%	1.8%
Lean blue	27.7%	48.4%	76.1%	15.2%	7.1%	22.3%	1.7%
Somewhat blue	25.7%	54.6%	80.3%	14.5%	3.5%	18.0%	1.7%
Very blue	28.5%	46.7%	75.2%	15.1%	7.6%	22.7%	2.1%

Here is an argument against the proposal:⁴

Q2. The Constitution states that the President is Commander in Chief. The President should not have to rely on Congress for approval. We don’t want to find ourselves in a situation where the President has sent our military to fight a dangerous threat overseas but has to withdraw them because Congress has gotten bogged down in a partisan fight. This will embolden our enemies and weaken the trust our allies have in our ability to protect them. If Congress wants to stop the military operation, they already have a way to do so: get two thirds of Members to vote to cut off the funding. Making the funding cut-off automatic is irresponsible.

³ [War Powers Act Enforcement Act \(H.R. 2108\)](#) by Rep. Sherman (D); [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [National Security Reforms and Accountability Act \(H.R. 5410\)](#) by Rep. James McGovern (D)

⁴ [National Review. Biden Doesn’t Need to Restrain His War Powers](#); [AEI. 2021 National Student Symposium: Unilateral presidential war powers](#)

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

Q2.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	22.9%	41.5%	64.4%	26.4%	8.4%	34.8%	0.8%
Republicans	24.1%	44.3%	68.4%	22.5%	8.1%	30.6%	1.0%
Democrats	22.0%	40.4%	62.4%	29.0%	8.0%	37.0%	0.7%
Independents	22.0%	37.2%	59.2%	30.1%	10.3%	40.4%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	20.4%	47.4%	67.8%	23.5%	7.6%	31.1%	1.2%
Somewhat red	20.9%	44.7%	65.6%	24.7%	9.6%	34.3%	0.0%
Lean red	30.0%	39.9%	69.9%	20.4%	8.6%	29.0%	1.1%
Lean blue	21.7%	39.3%	61.0%	30.5%	8.1%	38.6%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	23.1%	41.9%	65.0%	25.1%	7.9%	33.0%	2.1%
Very blue	21.3%	37.0%	58.3%	32.6%	9.2%	41.8%	0.0%

Here is another argument in favor:⁵

Q3. The decision of when to use military force has too many consequences for the world and our foreign policy for it to be made by just one person. Sending our military overseas has changed the direction of countries and created new enemies to the U.S. These decisions should be debated openly by Congress, which represents the many voices and opinions of America. If Presidents know that their decisions will be subject to open debate, they will be more cautious and thoughtful about the use of our military. Presidents cannot take the position that they know best when we are talking about putting American lives and the security of the country at risk.

Q3.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	30.2%	40.7%	70.9%	20.4%	6.7%	27.1%	2.0%
Republicans	30.9%	35.5%	66.4%	22.3%	9.5%	31.8%	1.8%
Democrats	30.8%	45.9%	76.7%	18.2%	3.5%	21.7%	1.5%
Independents	26.9%	41.3%	68.2%	21.0%	7.0%	28.0%	3.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	30.0%	35.6%	65.6%	23.6%	7.7%	31.3%	3.2%
Somewhat red	29.5%	40.5%	70.0%	21.8%	6.0%	27.8%	2.2%
Lean red	31.9%	37.1%	69.0%	20.3%	8.4%	28.7%	2.2%
Lean blue	31.3%	43.1%	74.4%	18.2%	6.1%	24.3%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	29.8%	43.9%	73.7%	18.0%	5.9%	23.9%	2.4%
Very blue	27.8%	42.3%	70.1%	22.3%	6.4%	28.7%	1.3%

Here is another against:⁶

Q4. In order to fight threats to US security, there needs to be just one person in charge to make the necessary decisions to protect the US.⁷ By handing power over to Congress, we are making every representative a

⁵ [National Review. Biden Doesn't Need to Restrain His War Powers](#); [Politico. McCain fears '535 commanders in chief'](#); [Statement by Lindsey Graham](#)

⁶ [National Review. Biden Doesn't Need to Restrain His War Powers](#); [Politico. McCain fears '535 commanders in chief'](#); [Statement by Lindsey Graham](#);

⁷ "At the time of the Framing, the commander in chief and executive powers were commonly understood to include the executive's sole authority to use the military to respond to attacks, invasions, or threats to a nation's security." Using the military to defend the nation requires action and energy in execution, rather than the deliberate formulation of rules to govern private conduct." From [Memorandum for Alberto R. Gonzales Counsel to the President](#) by John C. Yoo

Commander in Chief. Military operations often involve top secret information that only the President and top generals have. It would be too risky to give this information to every Member of Congress; it could too easily be leaked. Congress should have a role, but it is appropriate that Congress should only be able to cut off funding for a military operation with a two-thirds majority.

Q4.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	23.5%	36.7%	60.2%	25.7%	13.3%	39.0%	0.8%
Republicans	25.7%	38.2%	63.9%	24.3%	10.9%	35.2%	0.9%
Democrats	21.1%	35.8%	56.9%	26.0%	16.2%	42.2%	0.9%
Independents	23.7%	34.9%	58.6%	28.6%	12.4%	41.0%	0.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	19.3%	43.4%	62.7%	24.2%	12.0%	36.2%	1.1%
Somewhat red	23.6%	39.2%	62.8%	24.2%	12.6%	36.8%	0.5%
Lean red	27.7%	31.3%	59.0%	27.1%	12.6%	39.7%	1.3%
Lean blue	23.5%	33.8%	57.3%	27.2%	14.0%	41.2%	1.5%
Somewhat blue	22.6%	41.0%	63.6%	25.8%	10.6%	36.4%	0.0%
Very blue	23.2%	32.9%	56.1%	25.1%	18.4%	43.5%	0.4%

Here again is the proposal:

Q5. Make it more possible for Congress to stop a President's military operation. Rather than Congress having to vote to stop a military operation--and possibly be vetoed--the military operation could only continue after 60 days if a majority in Congress were to vote in favor.

If Congress does not vote to continue the operation within the 60 days, funding will be automatically cut off.⁸ That way the President could not veto this cut-off. (This would not apply to military actions in response to a direct attack on the US or its military.)

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

Q5.	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	42.6%	13.1%	43.8%	0.4%
Republicans	46.8%	13.5%	39.4%	0.3%
Democrats	38.2%	11.2%	49.9%	0.6%
Independents	42.7%	16.7%	40.3%	0.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	43.1%	12.1%	44.5%	0.3%
Somewhat red	40.2%	15.8%	44.1%	0.0%
Lean red	44.1%	12.4%	42.6%	0.9%
Lean blue	44.3%	11.6%	43.4%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	44.4%	12.4%	42.9%	0.2%
Very blue	40.0%	14.6%	45.0%	0.4%

⁸ [War Powers Act Enforcement Act \(H.R. 2108\)](#) by Rep. Sherman (D); [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [National Security Reforms and Accountability Act \(H.R. 5410\)](#) by Rep. James McGovern (D)

Q6. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

Q6.	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	57.5%	41.2%	1.3%
Republicans	53.1%	45.7%	1.2%
Democrats	61.8%	36.8%	1.4%
Independents	58.2%	40.4%	1.4%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	59.1%	39.1%	1.8%
Somewhat red	56.2%	43.1%	0.7%
Lean red	56.7%	41.7%	1.6%
Lean blue	55.8%	42.9%	1.2%
Somewhat blue	55.0%	43.5%	1.4%
Very blue	62.2%	36.4%	1.4%

[Congressional Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs)]

Another debate these days is about whether a Congressional Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) that was made in 2001 should still be effective.

As you may recall, shortly after the 9/11 attacks Congress passed a resolution that gave the president (who was then George W. Bush) the authority to use military force against:

- any country, organization or foreign individual that was involved with the 9/11 attacks
- OR -
- has helped the organizations involved with the 9/11 attacks.

What is controversial is that over the last two decades the 2001 AUMF has been repeatedly used as the legal basis for using military force against organizations that were *not* involved with 9/11 but have similar beliefs and readiness to use terrorist methods.

Since it was passed, the 2001 AUMF has been used by Presidents Bush, Obama, Trump, and Biden as the legal basis for dozens of military operations against various organizations in various countries around the world. These include extended operations (longer than 60 days) in Syria, Somalia, Yemen, Libya, and Iraq.

A proposal has been put forward to repeal the 2001 AUMF.⁹ As discussed above, the President would still have the power to use military force to defend against organizations deemed an imminent threat. But to have an operation that would last longer than 60 days the President would need to get a new AUMF from Congress.

Here is an argument in favor of repealing this authorization:¹⁰

Q7. This 2001 AUMF has been used by Presidents as a blank check for using military force for purposes far beyond its original intent, with US troops operating for long periods in numerous countries without Congressional approval. It also sets the stage for the President to use the authorization to get into a large-scale war, without involving Congress. Ending this authorization would not prevent the president from quickly taking military action to defend against any organization that poses a threat to the US--the President already has that power. Ending the 2001 AUMF would simply require that for long drawn-out conflicts, Congress should play its constitutional role in deciding whether the US effectively goes to war.

⁹ [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [Repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force \(H.R. 255\)](#) by Rep. Lee (D)

¹⁰ [Sen. McConnell. Repealing 2002 AUMF Won't Solve Terrorist Threat](#)

Q7.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	33.0%	41.6%	74.6%	16.0%	6.4%	22.4%	3.0%
Republicans	27.0%	42.0%	69.0%	18.1%	9.6%	27.7%	3.3%
Democrats	39.3%	41.9%	81.2%	12.9%	3.3%	16.2%	2.7%
Independents	33.3%	40.0%	73.3%	18.2%	5.6%	23.8%	3.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	28.3%	43.4%	71.7%	14.0%	10.7%	24.7%	3.7%
Somewhat red	30.8%	41.9%	72.7%	15.7%	8.6%	24.3%	3.1%
Lean red	37.0%	38.8%	75.8%	15.1%	6.2%	21.3%	2.9%
Lean blue	36.8%	37.7%	74.5%	17.4%	5.3%	22.7%	2.7%
Somewhat blue	29.6%	46.8%	76.4%	17.0%	3.4%	20.4%	3.2%
Very blue	32.6%	43.6%	76.2%	15.9%	5.3%	21.2%	2.7%

Here is an argument against:

Q8. This AUMF has given the President the ability to use all force necessary against terrorist groups that pose a threat to the US and our allies, without having to worry about time limits. Terrorist groups like Al-Qaeda who were responsible for the horrific 9/11 attacks still exist and are constantly evolving and its followers are forming new groups. If they know that the President has to go to Congress to continue any fight after 60 days, this may embolden them. This AUMF has worked well so far. We have not had a foreign terrorist attack in the US since 9/11. If it's not broken why try to fix it.

Q8.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	19.8%	35.5%	55.3%	29.4%	14.5%	43.9%	0.8%
Republicans	24.8%	36.1%	60.9%	27.7%	10.4%	38.1%	1.0%
Democrats	16.6%	35.2%	51.8%	30.9%	17.0%	47.9%	0.4%
Independents	14.8%	35.0%	49.8%	30.3%	18.9%	49.2%	1.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	21.6%	35.0%	56.6%	26.9%	14.6%	41.5%	1.9%
Somewhat red	22.7%	35.5%	58.2%	28.3%	12.8%	41.1%	0.7%
Lean red	21.0%	36.4%	57.4%	27.7%	14.1%	41.8%	0.8%
Lean blue	19.7%	32.5%	52.2%	31.6%	15.6%	47.2%	0.6%
Somewhat blue	18.3%	40.1%	58.4%	28.1%	13.0%	41.1%	0.5%
Very blue	16.1%	34.6%	50.7%	32.5%	16.5%	49.0%	0.3%

Q9. Here again is the proposal:¹¹

Repeal the 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) which has given the president the authority to use military force against:

- any country, organization or foreign individual that was involved with the 9/11 attacks
- OR -
- has helped the organizations involved with the 9/11 attacks

¹¹ [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [Repeal of the Authorization for Use of Military Force \(H.R. 255\)](#) by Rep. Lee (D)

Please select how acceptable this proposal would be to you.

Q9.	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	40.7%	11.8%	46.8%	0.7%
Republicans	46.4%	10.1%	42.8%	0.7%
Democrats	34.5%	11.3%	53.4%	0.8%
Independents	40.9%	17.2%	41.1%	0.8%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	41.1%	9.9%	47.9%	1.1%
Somewhat red	42.5%	13.7%	43.1%	0.7%
Lean red	42.7%	11.5%	45.2%	0.6%
Lean blue	41.2%	7.8%	50.0%	1.0%
Somewhat blue	39.9%	12.4%	47.4%	0.3%
Very blue	35.9%	15.9%	47.4%	0.8%

Q10. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

Q10.	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	59.2%	39.4%	1.4%
Republicans	52.4%	45.8%	1.8%
Democrats	65.0%	34.1%	1.0%
Independents	63.0%	35.8%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	55.4%	42.3%	2.3%
Somewhat red	55.2%	43.3%	1.4%
Lean red	56.7%	42.4%	0.9%
Lean blue	61.4%	36.4%	2.2%
Somewhat blue	60.8%	39.0%	0.2%
Very blue	66.0%	32.7%	1.4%

[Arms Sales]

Now let's turn to another issue: the sale of U.S. made military equipment – such as planes, missiles, tanks, and military computer technologies – to foreign governments.

As you may know, Congress passed a law in 1976 that gave the President the power to approve all such arms sales.

This law states that Congress can disapprove of a sale of military equipment over \$14 million dollars. But the President can veto such an action. Then it would require a two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress to override the veto.

In fact, Congress has never succeeded in stopping an arms sale.

There is now a debate about whether Congress should play a greater role in approving arms sales.

Currently, there is a proposal that would make it more possible for Congress to stop an arms sale over \$14 million.¹² Rather than Congress having the power to vote to stop an arms sale – and possibly be vetoed – arms sales could only occur if a majority in Congress were to vote in favor of the sale.

¹² [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [National Security Reforms and Accountability Act \(H.R. 5410\)](#) by Rep. James McGovern (D)

This would mean that Congress could stop a sale with 51% of votes in both houses of Congress, while currently it could require two-thirds of both houses.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q11. US arms sales have a big impact on the world, and the President should not have near-total power over them. Congress needs to reassert its constitutional authority to play a role in these decisions. When it is simply up to the President that is a recipe for abuse and short-term thinking. Presidents can use arms sales for political favors from other countries or to gain political points at home and may make poor judgments. This could lead to the U.S. selling weapons to governments who end up using the weapons in ways contrary to our interests and values. Including Congress in the process would provide greater accountability, because each sale would need to be openly debated and scrutinized.

Q11.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	31.8%	39.4%	71.2%	17.3%	8.6%	25.9%	2.9%
Republicans	28.7%	37.1%	65.8%	19.5%	11.5%	31.0%	3.2%
Democrats	36.3%	41.8%	78.1%	14.3%	5.1%	19.4%	2.5%
Independents	28.4%	39.6%	68.0%	19.0%	9.8%	28.8%	3.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	29.9%	40.3%	70.2%	16.9%	8.7%	25.6%	4.2%
Somewhat red	33.5%	38.3%	71.8%	18.3%	6.7%	25.0%	3.2%
Lean red	30.9%	40.8%	71.7%	13.8%	10.9%	24.7%	3.7%
Lean blue	34.9%	38.0%	72.9%	16.8%	8.3%	25.1%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	31.0%	37.9%	68.9%	21.0%	7.5%	28.5%	2.6%
Very blue	29.7%	40.0%	69.7%	18.9%	9.0%	27.9%	2.4%

Here is an argument against:¹³

Q12. The president is in charge of U.S. foreign policy and military policy. The sale of U.S. military equipment is all part of those policies. The President needs to be able to have negotiations with foreign powers that include arms sales, without having to worry that partisan forces in Congress might undermine the deal. Members of Congress can also be driven by narrow interests such as ethnic groups or arms manufacturers in their district. Congress has a lot of trouble agreeing on anything. Making arms sales dependent on their decisions could undermine the ability of the US to have a coherent and effective foreign policy.

Q12.	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	17.4%	39.8%	57.2%	28.8%	12.6%	41.4%	1.4%
Republicans	18.9%	39.8%	58.7%	28.6%	10.9%	39.5%	1.9%
Democrats	16.7%	40.5%	57.2%	28.6%	13.2%	41.8%	1.0%
Independents	15.2%	38.4%	53.6%	30.1%	15.4%	45.5%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	15.5%	35.0%	50.5%	33.1%	14.4%	47.5%	1.9%
Somewhat red	15.5%	46.0%	61.5%	27.9%	8.9%	36.8%	1.6%
Lean red	21.5%	34.6%	56.1%	27.1%	15.3%	42.4%	1.5%
Lean blue	15.7%	40.7%	56.4%	29.6%	12.7%	42.3%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	18.5%	43.3%	61.8%	28.3%	9.4%	37.7%	0.5%
Very blue	17.9%	37.0%	54.9%	27.6%	15.7%	43.3%	1.8%

¹³ [Testimony by Ambassador Kaidanow to Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade Committee on Foreign Affairs](#)

Q13. So, here again is the proposal:

Any deal to sell US-made military equipment to a foreign government that is worth over \$14 million must be approved by a majority of Congress.¹⁴

Q13.	Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	36.9%	13.2%	49.2%	0.7%
Republicans	41.8%	12.5%	44.9%	0.8%
Democrats	31.0%	12.2%	56.2%	0.6%
Independents	38.7%	17.7%	43.0%	0.6%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	38.3%	14.0%	46.9%	0.8%
Somewhat red	36.1%	14.3%	48.7%	1.0%
Lean red	39.4%	11.5%	48.0%	1.0%
Lean blue	37.2%	10.6%	51.4%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	34.0%	13.1%	52.8%	0.2%
Very blue	35.8%	16.4%	47.2%	0.5%

Q14. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

Q14.	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	61.4%	36.9%	1.6%
Republicans	55.6%	42.8%	1.6%
Democrats	67.6%	30.6%	1.7%
Independents	61.3%	37.2%	1.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	57.4%	41.6%	1.0%
Somewhat red	60.7%	38.3%	1.0%
Lean red	58.7%	39.9%	1.4%
Lean blue	63.9%	33.7%	2.4%
Somewhat blue	65.8%	32.3%	2.0%
Very blue	60.5%	37.6%	1.9%

###

¹⁴ [National Security Powers Act of 2021 \(S. 2391\)](#) by Sen. Murphy (D); [National Security Reforms and Accountability Act \(H.R. 5410\)](#) by Rep. James McGovern (D)