



## Prohibiting Purchases of Public Lands by Foreign Adversaries – Questionnaire –

**SAMPLE PROVIDED BY:** Nielsen Scarborough  
**SAMPLE SIZE:** 2,625 Respondents

**FIELD DATES:** May 19-30, 2023  
**MARGIN OF ERROR:** +/- 1.9%

(Q1 – Q12 Released Separately)

### [Briefing]

This survey is now going to look at policies that restrict the sale of certain U.S. assets (businesses, technology, land and real estate) to corporations and individuals, who are foreign (i.e., not American).

As you may know, the Executive Branch has the power to review and stop major purchases by foreign entities of U.S. technology and businesses if they believe that the sale would be a threat to national security (such as materials and technology used by the military, or the energy sector).

When it comes to land and real estate, the Executive Branch can also stop the sale to a foreign entity of land or real estate, but only if the Department of Defense believes it is critical to national security, such as land next to military bases, and air or seaports.

There is currently a proposal in Congress that would expand on these policies as follows:

- The Executive Branch would stop the sale of any U.S. land or real estate to any entity that the Executive Branch believes is affiliated in some way with a government that is an adversary.
- Adversaries include China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, Cuba and sponsors of terrorism.<sup>1</sup>
- This would apply to all land or real estate, not just cases that are critical to national security.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q13. We should not let our adversaries control any of our properties. If corporations affiliated with our adversaries get control of our property, these governments will gain influence over our economy and ultimately our politics. Chinese corporations are already buying up important parts of the American economy. It is too big of a risk to sell any land or real estate to our adversaries.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	54.8%	31.9%	<b>86.7%</b>	9.6%	3.2%	<b>12.8%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	71.3%	18.9%	<b>90.2%</b>	6.5%	2.6%	<b>9.1%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	41.0%	42.0%	<b>83.0%</b>	12.9%	3.6%	<b>16.5%</b>	0.4%
Independents	48.5%	38.5%	<b>87.0%</b>	9.2%	3.8%	<b>13.0%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	60.9%	25.2%	<b>86.1%</b>	7.7%	5.6%	<b>13.3%</b>	0.6%
Somewhat red	57.8%	31.9%	<b>89.7%</b>	7.0%	2.7%	<b>9.7%</b>	0.5%
Lean red	60.2%	30.1%	<b>90.3%</b>	6.0%	3.4%	<b>9.4%</b>	0.4%
Lean blue	59.3%	31.5%	<b>90.8%</b>	7.1%	1.8%	<b>8.9%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	47.6%	36.0%	<b>83.6%</b>	13.0%	2.7%	<b>15.7%</b>	0.7%
Very blue	41.8%	36.1%	<b>77.9%</b>	17.5%	4.3%	<b>21.8%</b>	0.3%

<sup>1</sup> [H.R.212](#) - Protecting our Land Act by Rep. Steube

Here is an argument against:

Q14. Foreign investments in the US have stimulated lots of economic growth and jobs. If businesses from countries like China think they will be accused of being controlled by their government, and won't be able to buy land or buildings, they will take their money elsewhere. The U.S. will lose out on that investment and ultimately jobs. All because of the vague fear that China or Russia is going to somehow influence our politics by owning some land or office buildings.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	8.1%	27.2%	<b>35.3%</b>	30.1%	34.0%	<b>64.1%</b>	0.6%
Republicans	4.6%	19.7%	<b>24.3%</b>	28.5%	46.5%	<b>75.0%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	9.6%	33.7%	<b>43.3%</b>	33.8%	22.2%	<b>56.0%</b>	0.7%
Independents	12.4%	29.5%	<b>41.9%</b>	25.4%	32.2%	<b>57.6%</b>	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	8.2%	25.0%	<b>33.2%</b>	27.0%	39.1%	<b>66.1%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	7.0%	25.4%	<b>32.4%</b>	27.5%	39.5%	<b>67.0%</b>	0.6%
Lean red	6.9%	23.1%	<b>30.0%</b>	32.4%	36.8%	<b>69.2%</b>	0.8%
Lean blue	6.5%	26.4%	<b>32.9%</b>	31.0%	35.5%	<b>66.5%</b>	0.5%
Somewhat blue	8.7%	32.5%	<b>41.2%</b>	29.2%	29.0%	<b>58.2%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	12.1%	30.8%	<b>42.9%</b>	32.7%	23.6%	<b>56.3%</b>	0.8%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q15. This proposal is a smart foreign policy move. Being able to prohibit adversaries from investing in U.S. land or real estate will give the U.S. leverage over them to get them to change their behavior. Participating in our domestic economy is a privilege, not a right. If they want access to any land or real estate in the U.S., they will have to stop acting in ways that harm the U.S.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	44.4%	35.4%	<b>79.8%</b>	14.7%	5.0%	<b>19.7%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	53.7%	30.5%	<b>84.2%</b>	11.9%	3.2%	<b>15.1%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	37.9%	38.5%	<b>76.4%</b>	17.0%	6.1%	<b>23.1%</b>	0.5%
Independents	37.8%	39.5%	<b>77.3%</b>	15.8%	6.5%	<b>22.3%</b>	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	46.1%	34.2%	<b>80.3%</b>	13.8%	5.5%	<b>19.3%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat red	49.2%	31.8%	<b>81.0%</b>	13.4%	5.0%	<b>18.4%</b>	0.6%
Lean red	48.1%	35.2%	<b>83.3%</b>	12.5%	3.3%	<b>15.8%</b>	0.9%
Lean blue	48.3%	34.9%	<b>83.2%</b>	12.8%	3.8%	<b>16.6%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	39.4%	40.2%	<b>79.6%</b>	15.9%	4.1%	<b>20.0%</b>	0.4%
Very blue	34.0%	36.4%	<b>70.4%</b>	19.9%	9.0%	<b>28.9%</b>	0.6%

Here is another argument against:

Q16. We already have difficult relations with these countries. Preventing their companies from doing business in the US will worsen those relations. It will surely lead to a backlash against US businesses which invest a lot in these countries, especially China. If we have a problem with what other governments are doing, then we should deal with them directly, not punish their businesses. Having shared economic interests helps counter the tensions we have with these countries.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	9.3%	30.6%	<b>39.9%</b>	29.2%	30.2%	<b>59.4%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	6.9%	20.8%	<b>27.7%</b>	27.3%	44.3%	<b>71.6%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	11.4%	36.7%	<b>48.1%</b>	32.3%	18.7%	<b>51.0%</b>	0.9%
Independents	9.9%	39.3%	<b>49.2%</b>	26.1%	24.1%	<b>50.2%</b>	0.6%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	8.0%	26.9%	<b>34.9%</b>	29.9%	34.5%	<b>64.4%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	10.9%	25.8%	<b>36.7%</b>	26.5%	36.1%	<b>62.6%</b>	0.8%
Lean red	7.3%	29.5%	<b>36.8%</b>	30.1%	32.4%	<b>62.5%</b>	0.7%
Lean blue	8.9%	28.5%	<b>37.4%</b>	31.2%	31.1%	<b>62.3%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat blue	9.3%	37.4%	<b>46.7%</b>	29.8%	22.7%	<b>52.5%</b>	0.9%
Very blue	11.7%	35.9%	<b>47.6%</b>	27.3%	24.0%	<b>51.3%</b>	1.1%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q17. Foreign ownership of our farmland is a risk to our food security. Instead of selling these foods in the U.S. foreign corporations are shipping them back to their home country. This is especially a problem with China which is the largest foreign investor in farmland. It recently bought the largest U.S. pork producer. Our food security should be more of a priority than attracting foreign investors.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	61.4%	26.5%	<b>87.9%</b>	8.6%	2.9%	<b>11.5%</b>	0.6%
Republicans	73.1%	18.7%	<b>91.8%</b>	6.0%	1.9%	<b>7.9%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	53.1%	31.7%	<b>84.8%</b>	10.8%	3.3%	<b>14.1%</b>	1.0%
Independents	53.7%	32.3%	<b>86.0%</b>	9.7%	4.1%	<b>13.8%</b>	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	71.5%	20.7%	<b>92.2%</b>	3.3%	4.4%	<b>7.7%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat red	66.9%	21.2%	<b>88.1%</b>	10.6%	1.0%	<b>11.6%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	64.2%	26.0%	<b>90.2%</b>	7.7%	1.8%	<b>9.5%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	61.5%	27.7%	<b>89.2%</b>	7.0%	3.1%	<b>10.1%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat blue	55.2%	30.4%	<b>85.6%</b>	10.4%	3.1%	<b>13.5%</b>	0.9%
Very blue	50.5%	32.5%	<b>83.0%</b>	11.6%	4.3%	<b>15.9%</b>	1.1%

Here is another argument against:

Q18. This proposal is another example of politicians using fear to give more power to the federal government. This fear is totally irrational – less than 1% of land in the U.S. is owned by companies from countries that are adversaries.<sup>2</sup> This proposal will have no effect on our food security. But what it will do, is give the President the power to help corporate friends and donors by undermining a foreign company that is competing with them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	12.3%	27.4%	<b>39.7%</b>	29.3%	30.2%	<b>59.5%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	9.6%	19.4%	<b>29.0%</b>	30.3%	39.9%	<b>70.2%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	13.9%	34.7%	<b>48.6%</b>	28.7%	22.0%	<b>50.7%</b>	0.7%
Independents	15.0%	29.1%	<b>44.1%</b>	28.6%	26.6%	<b>55.2%</b>	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	11.5%	25.6%	<b>37.1%</b>	29.6%	32.6%	<b>62.2%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	13.6%	23.6%	<b>37.2%</b>	27.2%	34.9%	<b>62.1%</b>	0.7%
Lean red	10.0%	24.0%	<b>34.0%</b>	33.8%	31.5%	<b>65.3%</b>	0.7%
Lean blue	10.6%	26.2%	<b>36.8%</b>	29.0%	33.2%	<b>62.2%</b>	1.0%
Somewhat blue	11.9%	32.6%	<b>44.5%</b>	31.9%	22.8%	<b>54.7%</b>	0.9%
Very blue	16.6%	33.1%	<b>49.7%</b>	24.8%	24.9%	<b>49.7%</b>	0.6%

Here is another argument against:

Q19. This is a political effort to exploit anti-Chinese sentiment. The primary purpose of this proposal is for the government to target Chinese people living and working in America. The government could say that any Chinese immigrant in the US is connected to the Chinese government in some way. This country has a history of anti-Chinese discrimination, and we should not fall back into that.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	15.0%	26.4%	<b>41.4%</b>	26.4%	31.5%	<b>57.9%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	10.0%	17.1%	<b>27.1%</b>	27.9%	44.3%	<b>72.2%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	20.0%	34.2%	<b>54.2%</b>	25.6%	19.5%	<b>45.1%</b>	0.7%
Independents	15.2%	29.7%	<b>44.9%</b>	24.6%	29.6%	<b>54.2%</b>	1.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	15.6%	23.1%	<b>38.7%</b>	27.8%	33.0%	<b>60.8%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat red	13.3%	23.3%	<b>36.6%</b>	29.3%	32.5%	<b>61.8%</b>	1.6%
Lean red	13.7%	22.2%	<b>35.9%</b>	26.8%	37.0%	<b>63.8%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	11.8%	28.2%	<b>40.0%</b>	24.6%	34.7%	<b>59.3%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat blue	16.5%	30.2%	<b>46.7%</b>	26.9%	25.5%	<b>52.4%</b>	0.9%
Very blue	20.8%	30.7%	<b>51.5%</b>	22.9%	24.8%	<b>47.7%</b>	0.8%

<sup>2</sup> CRS. (2023) [Foreign Ownership and Holdings of U.S. Agricultural Land](#); USDA. (2021) [Foreign Holdings of U.S. Agricultural Land](#), p. 4; NPR, Feb 2023, [Chinese firms, individuals own 14K acres of Virginia farmland: USDA](#)

Here is a counter argument:

Q20. This is not an outright prohibition on Chinese individuals owning land or property. Many Chinese individuals are and will continue to own property in the U.S. This proposal simply gives the government the ability to take action if it determines an individual is working for the Chinese government.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	31.0%	42.4%	<b>73.4%</b>	18.3%	7.9%	<b>26.2%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	38.2%	38.7%	<b>76.9%</b>	14.1%	8.6%	<b>22.7%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	25.4%	45.4%	<b>70.8%</b>	21.4%	7.2%	<b>28.6%</b>	0.7%
Independents	27.2%	43.8%	<b>71.0%</b>	21.0%	7.8%	<b>28.8%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	32.8%	44.9%	<b>77.7%</b>	14.4%	7.7%	<b>22.1%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat red	36.2%	43.0%	<b>79.2%</b>	14.8%	5.7%	<b>20.5%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	33.0%	35.4%	<b>68.4%</b>	20.7%	10.4%	<b>31.1%</b>	0.4%
Lean blue	31.6%	43.9%	<b>75.5%</b>	16.7%	7.3%	<b>24.0%</b>	0.5%
Somewhat blue	27.2%	45.1%	<b>72.3%</b>	20.5%	6.0%	<b>26.5%</b>	1.2%
Very blue	24.4%	43.0%	<b>67.4%</b>	22.4%	9.9%	<b>32.3%</b>	0.3%

Now that you have heard the arguments, here again is the proposal:

Q21. The Executive Branch would stop the sale of any U.S. land or real estate to any entity that the Executive Branch believes is affiliated in some way with a government that is an adversary.

This would apply to all land or real estate, not just cases that are critical to national security.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	21.2%	12.0%	66.2%	0.6%
Republicans	13.6%	6.4%	79.1%	1.0%
Democrats	26.1%	15.9%	57.7%	0.3%
Independents	27.8%	16.0%	56.1%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>				
Very red	15.3%	11.4%	73.3%	0.0%
Somewhat red	19.7%	10.3%	69.5%	0.5%
Lean red	18.7%	10.3%	70.2%	0.8%
Lean blue	17.3%	12.4%	69.0%	1.3%
Somewhat blue	25.3%	13.9%	60.4%	0.4%
Very blue	31.0%	14.2%	54.8%	0.0%

Q22. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	73.3%	26.3%	0.4%
Republicans	84.4%	15.3%	0.3%
Democrats	63.9%	35.9%	0.2%
Independents	69.3%	29.9%	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	79.1%	20.0%	0.8%
Somewhat red	77.4%	22.0%	0.6%
Lean red	78.3%	21.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	74.8%	25.1%	0.1%
Somewhat blue	68.5%	31.0%	0.5%
Very blue	61.7%	38.3%	0.0%

**[Review All Farmland Sales]**

Along these lines, there is another proposal that would require the Executive Branch to review any sale of US farmland to any foreign government, person or corporation to see if it poses a national security risk. If they decide that it does, then the President would be able to stop that sale.<sup>3</sup> Currently, the Executive Branch does this for large sales of US businesses.

Q23. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	14.8%	12.2%	72.5%	0.5%
Republicans	12.3%	9.7%	77.5%	0.5%
Democrats	15.3%	12.2%	71.8%	0.7%
Independents	19.4%	18.0%	62.3%	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>				
Very red	11.6%	12.9%	75.0%	0.5%
Somewhat red	14.7%	9.8%	75.3%	0.2%
Lean red	11.4%	13.9%	73.7%	1.0%
Lean blue	13.1%	12.7%	73.3%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	16.2%	12.6%	70.8%	0.4%
Very blue	22.1%	11.7%	65.9%	0.3%

Q24. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	80.4%	18.8%	0.8%
Republicans	84.1%	15.0%	1.0%
Democrats	78.3%	21.4%	0.4%
Independents	76.6%	21.9%	1.5%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	79.8%	18.3%	1.9%
Somewhat red	81.5%	17.6%	0.9%
Lean red	85.5%	13.6%	0.9%
Lean blue	80.8%	18.9%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	78.7%	20.1%	1.3%
Very blue	74.4%	25.6%	0.0%

<sup>3</sup> [S. 168](#) PASS Act of 2023 by Sen. Rounds and [H.R. 683](#) Rep. Stefanik. Similar bills have also been proposed by Rep. Strong ([H.R. 3357](#)) and Sen. Braun ([S. 926](#))

## [Strategic Petroleum Reserve]

Moving to another related topic. As you may know, the US has a large reserve of oil called the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. At times, the U.S. government adds to it while at other times it sells some of the oil. There is a debate about who the U.S. should sell the oil to.

First, here is some background information about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve:

In 1975, Congress passed a law that enabled the U.S. federal government to buy and hold a certain amount of oil in case events disrupt the supply of oil and could cause increases to its price. When there is such an emergency, the White House can sell oil from the reserve. It is required by law to sell at the market price to the highest bidder. But, by providing more supply to the market, it helps bring the price of oil down or prevents it from going up.

When the government sells oil from the reserve, it simply sells it into the general oil market so anyone can buy it.

Currently, there is a debate about whether the U.S. should restrict who can purchase oil from the reserves.

There is a proposal to prohibit selling oil to corporations from countries that are adversaries to the U.S. (China, Russia, Iran, North Korea and Cuba.) Most of these corporations are directly owned or controlled by their governments.<sup>4</sup>

When the U.S. has sold oil out of the reserve a small amount—a few percent—have been sold to corporations from China and a smaller amount to Russia.<sup>5</sup>

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal to prohibit the sale of oil from the U.S. oil reserves to any corporations from countries that are adversaries to the U.S.

Q25. We sell oil from our reserves when there has been some serious crisis that affects supply causing a spike in prices or a general disruption to the oil we need to keep industry going. The point of selling our oil reserves is to help the U.S., as well as our allies, have a steady supply of oil and keep their economies running smoothly. We should not be directly helping our adversaries.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	49.0%	36.2%	<b>85.2%</b>	10.5%	3.5%	<b>14.0%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	60.6%	29.1%	<b>89.7%</b>	7.3%	2.5%	<b>9.8%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	41.5%	42.1%	<b>83.6%</b>	11.4%	4.4%	<b>15.8%</b>	0.7%
Independents	39.8%	39.2%	<b>79.0%</b>	15.7%	3.9%	<b>19.6%</b>	1.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	56.9%	30.7%	<b>87.6%</b>	7.8%	4.4%	<b>12.2%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat red	51.7%	33.6%	<b>85.3%</b>	9.7%	3.1%	<b>12.8%</b>	1.9%
Lean red	52.9%	32.6%	<b>85.5%</b>	11.4%	2.8%	<b>14.2%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	49.8%	38.9%	<b>88.7%</b>	8.3%	2.4%	<b>10.7%</b>	0.6%
Somewhat blue	45.1%	38.3%	<b>83.4%</b>	11.3%	4.8%	<b>16.1%</b>	0.5%
Very blue	37.6%	42.9%	<b>80.5%</b>	14.6%	4.2%	<b>18.8%</b>	0.8%

<sup>4</sup> [H.R.293 Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act, Rep. Witt](#)

<sup>5</sup> CRS. (2023) [Strategic Petroleum Reserve Crude Oil Sales: Buyers and Exports](#), Figure 1.



Here is an argument against:

Q26. This proposal is based on a misunderstanding. The U.S. doesn't sell the oil at a discount. Simply by providing more supply to the market, prices everywhere come down. So, it doesn't matter who the oil is sold to. Furthermore, it's such a small amount of oil in the big picture, it's irrelevant. Making this rule about not selling to countries like China is just a way to make it look like we are being tough on them when it would really have no effect.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	12.8%	31.4%	<b>44.2%</b>	26.5%	28.8%	<b>55.3%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	9.2%	22.3%	<b>31.5%</b>	26.7%	41.2%	<b>67.9%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	15.9%	39.3%	<b>55.2%</b>	26.3%	17.8%	<b>44.1%</b>	0.7%
Independents	14.0%	34.2%	<b>48.2%</b>	26.6%	25.3%	<b>51.9%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	10.4%	24.3%	<b>34.7%</b>	30.2%	34.8%	<b>65.0%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat red	8.9%	32.0%	<b>40.9%</b>	25.0%	33.2%	<b>58.2%</b>	0.8%
Lean red	10.5%	29.1%	<b>39.6%</b>	28.8%	31.3%	<b>60.1%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	12.5%	29.4%	<b>41.9%</b>	28.4%	29.4%	<b>57.8%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	16.7%	35.4%	<b>52.1%</b>	23.4%	23.9%	<b>47.3%</b>	0.6%
Very blue	18.1%	38.0%	<b>56.1%</b>	23.0%	20.0%	<b>43.0%</b>	1.0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q27. We must take a moral stand against our adversaries, and that includes stopping the sale of our oil reserves. It is important that we send a message to them that their abusive behavior will not be tolerated, and the U.S. should lead the way in saying that. This position is one piece of a larger foreign policy posture towards our adversaries.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	36.4%	36.1%	<b>72.5%</b>	19.3%	7.5%	<b>26.8%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	49.0%	30.4%	<b>79.4%</b>	15.1%	5.0%	<b>20.1%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	26.6%	40.6%	<b>67.2%</b>	22.9%	8.7%	<b>31.6%</b>	1.2%
Independents	30.1%	38.8%	<b>68.9%</b>	20.7%	10.5%	<b>31.2%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	39.8%	39.1%	<b>78.9%</b>	15.9%	4.3%	<b>20.2%</b>	0.8%
Somewhat red	40.6%	32.9%	<b>73.5%</b>	19.1%	6.5%	<b>25.6%</b>	0.9%
Lean red	40.9%	33.2%	<b>74.1%</b>	20.0%	5.3%	<b>25.3%</b>	0.6%
Lean blue	38.6%	39.8%	<b>78.4%</b>	14.9%	5.9%	<b>20.8%</b>	0.9%
Somewhat blue	33.2%	35.7%	<b>68.9%</b>	22.2%	8.6%	<b>30.8%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	24.8%	35.6%	<b>60.4%</b>	24.8%	14.1%	<b>38.9%</b>	0.7%

Here is another argument against:

Q28. Relationships with our adversaries are already tense. This proposal won't actually hurt them. But it may make them want to hit back against US companies. This could actually hurt some American companies, for example those operating in China, and could lead to higher prices for U.S. consumers.



	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	10.1%	34.7%	<b>44.8%</b>	30.1%	24.6%	<b>54.7%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	7.3%	25.6%	<b>32.9%</b>	30.4%	36.1%	<b>66.5%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	12.5%	40.6%	<b>53.1%</b>	31.4%	15.1%	<b>46.5%</b>	0.4%
Independents	11.1%	42.3%	<b>53.4%</b>	26.3%	20.0%	<b>46.3%</b>	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	8.0%	32.4%	<b>40.4%</b>	30.0%	29.0%	<b>59.0%</b>	0.7%
Somewhat red	10.9%	33.4%	<b>44.3%</b>	25.7%	28.9%	<b>54.6%</b>	1.1%
Lean red	9.3%	29.9%	<b>39.2%</b>	34.5%	25.8%	<b>60.3%</b>	0.5%
Lean blue	10.6%	34.1%	<b>44.7%</b>	27.7%	27.4%	<b>55.1%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	7.9%	41.3%	<b>49.2%</b>	32.2%	18.4%	<b>50.6%</b>	0.2%
Very blue	14.2%	38.1%	<b>52.3%</b>	30.5%	16.8%	<b>47.3%</b>	0.4%

So, here again is the proposal:

Q29. Prohibit the sale of oil from the U.S. oil reserves to any corporations from countries that are adversaries to the U.S.<sup>6</sup>

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	21.6%	13.6%	64.8%	0.0%
Republicans	14.1%	10.5%	75.4%	0.0%
Democrats	26.0%	16.5%	57.5%	0.0%
Independents	28.8%	13.8%	57.4%	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>				
Very red	16.9%	12.3%	70.8%	0.0%
Somewhat red	20.6%	12.2%	67.2%	0.0%
Lean red	16.3%	13.6%	70.1%	0.0%
Lean blue	16.3%	14.0%	69.7%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	24.1%	16.8%	59.0%	0.0%
Very blue	36.8%	11.9%	51.3%	0.0%

Q30. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	72.0%	27.4%	0.5%
Republicans	81.7%	17.8%	0.6%
Democrats	64.9%	34.7%	0.4%
Independents	66.2%	33.0%	0.8%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very red	74.5%	24.8%	0.7%
Somewhat red	72.0%	27.2%	0.9%
Lean red	76.9%	22.6%	0.5%
Lean blue	77.3%	22.4%	0.3%
Somewhat blue	69.9%	29.9%	0.1%
Very blue	59.5%	39.6%	0.8%

<sup>6</sup> [H.R.293 Banning Oil Exports to Foreign Adversaries Act](#)

**[China follow-on]**

**[If oppose banning all adversaries, Q30 = 2 or skip]**

There is another proposal that would prohibit the sale of oil from the U.S. reserves to corporations from China only.<sup>7</sup>

Here is an argument in favor:

Q31. China has its own oil reserves that they can use during an emergency. The U.S. should not be shrinking its emergency stockpile to allow China to keep their own oil reserves full. Plus, China has repeatedly acted against U.S. interests and shows no sign of stopping. The U.S. needs to send them a message.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	4.3%	12.0%	<b>16.3%</b>	8.2%	3.3%	<b>11.5%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	4.3%	7.8%	<b>12.1%</b>	4.3%	1.9%	<b>6.2%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	4.6%	15.1%	<b>19.7%</b>	10.8%	4.1%	<b>14.9%</b>	0.5%
Independents	3.4%	14.8%	<b>18.2%</b>	11.1%	4.4%	<b>15.5%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	4.5%	13.0%	<b>17.5%</b>	5.4%	2.5%	<b>7.9%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	4.1%	12.9%	<b>17.0%</b>	8.1%	2.8%	<b>10.9%</b>	0.3%
Lean red	4.9%	9.2%	<b>14.1%</b>	5.9%	2.8%	<b>8.7%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	3.9%	10.2%	<b>14.1%</b>	6.1%	2.3%	<b>8.4%</b>	0.3%
Somewhat blue	3.8%	13.0%	<b>16.8%</b>	8.3%	5.0%	<b>13.3%</b>	0.0%
Very blue	4.9%	14.9%	<b>19.8%</b>	15.7%	4.5%	<b>20.2%</b>	0.4%

*\*Values are a percentage of the total sample.*

Here is an argument against:

Q32. This proposal will do nothing to actually affect China or their relationship with the U.S. Of all the oil that China buys from the U.S., only 2% comes from the oil reserves. The rest is from U.S. corporations. If the U.S. wants to seriously address the problems it has with China, this is not the right way to do it.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	9.2%	13.5%	<b>22.7%</b>	4.1%	1.0%	<b>5.1%</b>	0.1%
Republicans	5.7%	8.4%	<b>14.1%</b>	3.4%	0.6%	<b>4.0%</b>	0.2%
Democrats	11.8%	18.2%	<b>30.0%</b>	4.1%	0.9%	<b>5.0%</b>	0.1%
Independents	11.2%	14.3%	<b>25.5%</b>	6.0%	2.2%	<b>8.2%</b>	0.0%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	7.2%	13.0%	<b>20.2%</b>	3.2%	2.1%	<b>5.3%</b>	0.0%
Somewhat red	11.8%	11.6%	<b>23.4%</b>	3.5%	0.9%	<b>4.4%</b>	0.2%
Lean red	7.4%	12.7%	<b>20.1%</b>	2.2%	0.5%	<b>2.7%</b>	0.3%
Lean blue	7.2%	9.3%	<b>16.5%</b>	5.2%	0.8%	<b>6.0%</b>	0.2%
Somewhat blue	9.2%	15.8%	<b>25.0%</b>	4.2%	0.9%	<b>5.1%</b>	0.0%
Very blue	13.2%	20.1%	<b>33.3%</b>	5.9%	1.3%	<b>7.2%</b>	0.0%

*\*Values are a percentage of the total sample.*

<sup>7</sup> [H.R.22, S. 9 - Protecting America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve from China Act](#) ; [H.R.222 No Oil for CCP Act](#)

Q33. Now that you have heard the arguments, here again is the proposal: prohibit the sale of oil from the U.S. reserves to corporations from China only.<sup>8</sup>

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	18.1%	5.5%	4.2%	0.1%
Republicans	10.8%	4.0%	3.4%	0.1%
Democrats	23.7%	5.9%	5.3%	0.2%
Independents	22.3%	7.7%	3.7%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>				
Very red	15.3%	4.8%	5.2%	0.2%
Somewhat red	18.4%	5.3%	4.3%	0.0%
Lean red	13.5%	4.3%	5.0%	0.2%
Lean blue	12.8%	5.7%	4.2%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	19.7%	6.5%	3.8%	0.0%
Very blue	30.6%	6.4%	3.0%	0.5%

\*Values are a percentage of the total sample.

Q34. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Favor on Q30	Total Favor (Q30 + Q34)	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	5.1%	22.6%	72.0%	77.1%	0.2%
Republicans	4.6%	13.6%	81.7%	86.3%	0.2%
Democrats	5.7%	29.2%	64.9%	70.6%	0.2%
Independents	5.2%	28.3%	66.2%	71.4%	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>					
Very red	4.9%	20.1%	74.5%	79.4%	0.5%
Somewhat red	5.7%	22.3%	72.0%	77.7%	0.0%
Lean red	6.4%	16.3%	76.9%	83.3%	0.4%
Lean blue	5.6%	17.1%	77.3%	82.9%	0.0%
Somewhat blue	4.2%	25.6%	69.9%	74.1%	0.2%
Very blue	3.6%	36.5%	59.5%	63.1%	0.3%

\*Values are a percentage of the total sample.

<sup>8</sup> [H.R.22, S. 9 - Protecting America's Strategic Petroleum Reserve from China Act](#)

Lastly, a few questions about China.

[Pew] D8. Please tell us if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of China.

	Very favorable	Somewhat favorable	Total favorable	Somewhat unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Total unfavorable	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	2.5%	17.7%	<b>20.2%</b>	50.9%	28.2%	<b>79.1%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	2.1%	9.9%	<b>12.0%</b>	44.3%	43.2%	<b>87.5%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	2.3%	22.0%	<b>24.3%</b>	57.8%	17.3%	<b>75.1%</b>	0.6%
Independents	3.5%	25.9%	<b>29.4%</b>	50.3%	18.6%	<b>68.9%</b>	1.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>							
Very red	2.6%	16.4%	<b>19.0%</b>	50.0%	30.7%	<b>80.7%</b>	0.4%
Somewhat red	2.1%	11.7%	<b>13.8%</b>	50.7%	34.5%	<b>85.2%</b>	1.0%
Lean red	1.5%	17.4%	<b>18.9%</b>	49.5%	31.1%	<b>80.6%</b>	0.5%
Lean blue	3.3%	16.8%	<b>20.1%</b>	52.1%	26.3%	<b>78.4%</b>	1.6%
Somewhat blue	2.6%	20.8%	<b>23.4%</b>	52.3%	23.6%	<b>75.9%</b>	0.7%
Very blue	2.8%	23.9%	<b>26.7%</b>	51.0%	21.9%	<b>72.9%</b>	0.3%

[Pew] D9. On balance, do you think of China as a partner of the United States, a competitor of the United States or an enemy of the United States?

	A partner of the United States	A competitor of the United States	An enemy of the United States	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	6.5%	58.7%	34.4%	0.3%
Republicans	4.8%	42.1%	52.9%	0.2%
Democrats	6.9%	73.6%	19.3%	0.2%
Independents	9.6%	62.8%	26.7%	0.9%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>				
Very red	4.2%	51.8%	43.5%	0.4%
Somewhat red	6.4%	52.3%	40.9%	0.4%
Lean red	3.3%	62.1%	34.4%	0.2%
Lean blue	7.4%	58.7%	33.2%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	8.0%	61.9%	29.9%	0.2%
Very blue	10.1%	64.5%	25.3%	0.0%

D10. On balance, would you say China's influence in the world is:

	Very positive	Somewhat positive	Total positive	Equally positive and negative	Total negative	Somewhat negative	Very negative	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	2.2%	6.4%	<b>8.6%</b>	32.0%	<b>59.1%</b>	38.1%	21.0%	0.3%
Republicans	1.8%	4.0%	<b>5.8%</b>	21.7%	<b>72.5%</b>	40.4%	32.1%	0.1%
Democrats	2.7%	7.9%	<b>10.6%</b>	39.0%	<b>50.1%</b>	38.4%	11.7%	0.2%
Independents	2.2%	8.5%	<b>10.7%</b>	39.8%	<b>48.7%</b>	32.0%	16.7%	0.7%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>								
Very red	0.4%	6.1%	<b>6.5%</b>	32.2%	<b>60.9%</b>	35.5%	25.4%	0.4%
Somewhat red	2.0%	3.5%	<b>5.5%</b>	32.1%	<b>62.4%</b>	36.7%	25.7%	0.0%
Lean red	1.5%	3.4%	<b>4.9%</b>	32.7%	<b>62.0%</b>	40.4%	21.6%	0.4%
Lean blue	3.7%	5.3%	<b>9.0%</b>	33.8%	<b>56.6%</b>	35.5%	21.1%	0.6%
Somewhat blue	3.1%	9.3%	<b>12.4%</b>	30.2%	<b>57.3%</b>	41.8%	15.5%	0.1%
Very blue	2.2%	12.0%	<b>14.2%</b>	31.6%	<b>54.2%</b>	38.0%	16.2%	0.0%

###