



# PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

## Survey on Artificial Intelligence - Questionnaire -

**Sample Provided by:** Precision Sample  
**Sample Size:** 3,610 Registered Voters

**Field Dates:** February 16-23, 2024  
**Confidence Interval:** Varies from +/-1.3% to 1.8%

### [General Briefing]

As you may know, there is much news coverage these days on significant new developments in “Artificial Intelligence” – or AI for short.

These new developments have brought new capacities and efficiencies in many fields. But, there is also concern that AI programs might unintentionally cause harm or be misused. Thus, there have been calls to regulate them in various ways. We are going to explore those options and ask your opinion on them.

But first, we are going to give you some background on these AI technologies.

In brief, AI programs have the ability to complete tasks, make recommendations or even make decisions in a way that would have otherwise required human intelligence.

So, what is new and different? The first computer programs were simply a set of instructions that a computer followed in an automatic and rigid manner.

Later, with developments in the field of Artificial Intelligence, computer programs were gradually taught to learn from examples, and even be somewhat autonomous. As a result, AI programs can increasingly come up with their own solutions to complex problems, and also communicate in ways that are increasingly human-like. You may have heard about or experienced the new ChatGPT program.

AI can also do things like create images and videos of people or events that appear very real even though they are not.

The use of AI programs has increased greatly over the last several years, by companies, governments, and individuals. They have been used in a wide range of areas including:

- healthcare
- engineering
- transportation
- consumer services
- government services
- banking
- education
- criminal justice

and more. They have increased efficiency in many industries and improved scientific research.

It is widely believed they also have the potential to do such things as create new life-saving drugs, detect tumors earlier than doctors can currently, and reduce traffic injuries and deaths. Experts estimate that the use of AI will grow the global economy by several trillion dollars.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> European Parliament. (2023) [Economic impacts of artificial intelligence \(AI\)](#); CEPR. (2023) [The impact of artificial intelligence on growth and employment](#); McKinsey. (2023) [The economic potential of generative AI: The next productivity frontier](#); Goldman Sachs. (2023) [The Potentially Large Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Economic Growth](#)

Q1. How much have you read or heard about the recent developments in Artificial Intelligence (or AI)?

	A lot	Some	A lot - Some	A little	Nothing at all	A little - Nothing at all	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	26.8%	48.3%	<b>75.1%</b>	21.2%	3.7%	<b>24.9%</b>	0.0%
Republicans	22.0%	49.8%	<b>71.8%</b>	24.1%	4.1%	<b>28.2%</b>	0.0%
Democrats	31.2%	47.5%	<b>78.7%</b>	19.2%	2.1%	<b>21.3%</b>	0.0%
Independents	27.0%	46.6%	<b>73.6%</b>	18.7%	7.6%	<b>26.3%</b>	0.0%

While, as discussed above, there are many positive results associated with AI, there are also widespread concerns about negative effects. Those with such concerns include people who are directly involved in developing AI, as well as people in government, people who represent workers, and so on.

Some of these concerns are long term or hypothetical. There are concerns that as AI programs become more powerful, they could get into the hands of bad actors who could use AI in their efforts to do things like taking down energy grids or taking control of military weapons systems.

Among some AI experts there are also concerns that large-scale AI programs could be created that are highly intelligent with advanced capabilities, and, perhaps most significantly, have a high level of autonomy. According to these experts, these AI programs could become uncontrollable by humans and engage in dangerous behavior that causes massive harm.

Other experts think these concerns are exaggerated and an overreaction.

We will address these long-term or hypothetical concerns later.

### **[Immediate Concerns]**

First, we will address immediate concerns about AI programs that are already being used.

For example, some AI programs have:

- violated regulations, though they were not instructed to do so
- provided incorrect information
- made flawed recommendations or decisions
- unintentionally treated some groups in a biased way (e.g. by race or gender)

AI programs have also been purposely used to:

- create misinformation very quickly and on a large scale
- create fake videos of people or events that appear very real which have misled people or damaged reputations
- steal private data

Some of these concerns can be addressed at the national level, by the federal government. We will explore proposals for what the government might do.

There are also concerns that are more international in nature, such as the use of AI for military purposes or in international crime. We will also explore proposals for what the international community might do.

Q2. How much have you read or heard about these concerns about AI programs?

	A lot	Some	A lot - Some	A little	Nothing at all	A little - Nothing at all	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	26.6%	45.6%	<b>72.2%</b>	22.2%	5.5%	<b>27.7%</b>	0.0%
Republicans	21.2%	47.9%	<b>69.1%</b>	24.8%	6.0%	<b>30.8%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	30.9%	44.5%	<b>75.4%</b>	20.9%	3.8%	<b>24.7%</b>	0.0%
Independents	29.4%	42.6%	<b>72.0%</b>	18.7%	9.4%	<b>28.1%</b>	0.0%

### [Preventative Approach Briefing]

As mentioned, there is debate about what role the government should play in regulating AI companies and AI programs.

There are two general approaches that the government can take:

One approach is for the government to take action only after a company has sold a product or service, something has gone wrong, and the product has harmed consumers in some way.

Another approach is for the government to more actively intervene in advance to try to prevent harm from happening. This is called a **preventative approach**. This approach is used by the government in some areas, such as in healthcare, whereby the government requires new drugs to pass a series of tests before they can be put on the market.

We will now explore some proposals for how the government could take a preventative approach in regulating AI and the debate surrounding each proposal.

### [Domestic Structures] [Pre-Testing and Approval of Decision-Making AI Programs]

One way that the government can take a preventative approach with AI is to require that new AI programs pass a series of tests before they can be put into general use. This is called “pre-testing”. This would be similar to how the government requires testing new drugs.

There is now a proposal to require pre-testing of new AI programs that are going to be used to make decisions that can have significant impacts on people, including in healthcare, banking, housing, education, employment, legal services, and utilities like electricity.

For example, this would include AI programs used:

- by banks to determine who gets accepted for a loan
- by government agencies to determine whether a person is eligible for government benefits, such as food stamps
- by health insurance companies to determine whether a person’s medical treatment is covered
- by companies to determine whether a person should be hired
- by utility companies to determine how to allocate resources, like electricity when there is a shortage

The tests would try to ensure that the AI program:

- follows regulations to reduce the chances that it will break the law
- follows best practices established by professionals, to reduce the chances it will cause harm
- has security protections for data privacy and against hacking
- does not have unintended biases that result in it treating some groups worse than others, based on their race, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, or nationality

These tests would be run by the government, or by an independent third-party verified by the government.

If the AI program does not pass the tests, it would not be approved for general use.<sup>2</sup>

Here is an argument in support of this proposal:

Q3. AI programs have the potential to cause harm to millions of people, even in ways we can’t yet anticipate. Because of the widespread use and power of AI, the government has a duty to regulate it. The government shouldn’t just react after the harm has been

<sup>2</sup> European Union. [Artificial Intelligence Act](#) proposal to have “conformity assessments” on “high-risk” AI; similar proposal is [Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2022](#) by Sen. Wyden and Rep. Clark, which would require impact assessments of all AI programs in high-risk areas, if problems found they would need to fix them.

caused. The government already takes a preventative approach with lots of products that can cause mass harm, such as new drugs and chemicals. AI should be treated the same.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	40.0%	45.9%	<b>85.9%</b>	9.9%	3.2%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.9%
Republicans	37.4%	48.4%	<b>85.8%</b>	10.0%	3.5%	<b>13.5%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	43.7%	44.8%	<b>88.5%</b>	8.8%	1.7%	<b>10.5%</b>	1.0%
Independents	36.4%	42.2%	<b>78.6%</b>	13.4%	7.3%	<b>20.7%</b>	0.9%

Here is an argument against:<sup>3</sup>

Q4. The government should only intervene when there is clear evidence that a problem has occurred. These AI programs are nothing like new drugs; in most cases they are just doing tasks that humans used to do, in many cases substantially better. If the government were to try to anticipate all possible harms of new technologies, it would slow down or bias the direction of development. It would cost money for AI businesses that would then pass the costs onto consumers. Being so cautious will hurt innovation and we could lose out on many possible benefits of AI.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	16.0%	35.4%	<b>51.4%</b>	33.7%	14.1%	<b>47.8%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	15.4%	37.3%	<b>52.7%</b>	33.2%	13.4%	<b>46.6%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	16.9%	32.1%	<b>49.0%</b>	35.9%	14.5%	<b>50.4%</b>	0.6%
Independents	15.1%	40.2%	<b>55.3%</b>	28.4%	14.9%	<b>43.3%</b>	1.5%

Here is another argument in support:

Q5. These technologies are advancing quickly, and the corporations creating them are often reckless in their pursuit of profit. To get to market ahead of their competitors, they cut corners on safety testing. It's better to be cautious with this new technology, even if it means slowing down some innovation, than to find ourselves cleaning up a huge mess later. It would rightly strengthen confidence in US-made AI products. If we had taken a more cautionary approach with new technologies, like the internet and social media, we might not have some of the problems we have now.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	42.5%	41.5%	<b>84.0%</b>	11.9%	3.3%	<b>15.2%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	40.7%	41.2%	<b>81.9%</b>	13.6%	3.7%	<b>17.3%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	45.5%	42.3%	<b>87.8%</b>	9.7%	1.9%	<b>11.6%</b>	0.7%
Independents	38.4%	40.2%	<b>78.6%</b>	14.0%	6.6%	<b>20.6%</b>	0.7%

<sup>3</sup> Center for Data Innovation. (2023) [Comment submitted to NTIA's request for public input](#); Center for Data Innovation. (2023) [Ten Principles for Regulation That Does Not Harm AI Innovation](#)

Here is another argument against:

Q6. The private sector can move faster than the government to address risks from rapidly advancing technologies. The market is developing certifications and standards to test for safety and reliability without government intervention. The AI industry has already voluntarily committed to testing their products.<sup>4</sup> The government getting involved would just slow down this whole process, and there's no guarantee they would do a better job at pre-testing than the industry itself.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	18.4%	40.9%	<b>59.3%</b>	29.8%	10.5%	<b>40.3%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	20.1%	46.0%	<b>66.1%</b>	26.0%	7.4%	<b>33.4%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	16.1%	36.5%	<b>52.6%</b>	33.3%	13.5%	<b>46.8%</b>	0.6%
Independents	20.1%	39.4%	<b>59.5%</b>	29.8%	10.3%	<b>40.1%</b>	0.3%

Here is another argument in support:

Q7. AI programs have frequently made errors that have caused widespread and irreversible harm. An AI program that was developed for state governments to detect fraud in unemployment insurance ended up wrongfully accusing thousands of people of fraud. Those people had their wages taken to repay benefits they had received. Some ended up being evicted from their homes. These AI programs are being used all over the country. They must be tested before they are put into use.<sup>5</sup>

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	54.2%	32.8%	<b>87.0%</b>	9.6%	3.0%	<b>12.6%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	52.5%	34.2%	<b>86.7%</b>	9.3%	3.5%	<b>12.8%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	57.7%	30.3%	<b>88.0%</b>	9.5%	2.1%	<b>11.6%</b>	0.3%
Independents	48.4%	36.0%	<b>84.4%</b>	10.8%	4.5%	<b>15.3%</b>	0.3%

Here is another argument against:

Q8. With any new technology there will be some hiccups, but that doesn't mean we should overreact. We already have laws to deal with possible problems. If, in the unusual case, an AI program unintentionally violates some regulations or causes harm, then the company that made it, or the organization that used it, will be held legally liable.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	18.4%	37.7%	<b>56.1%</b>	27.9%	15.8%	<b>43.7%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	16.6%	40.8%	<b>57.4%</b>	27.7%	14.6%	<b>42.3%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	20.5%	33.8%	<b>54.3%</b>	28.5%	17.1%	<b>45.6%</b>	0.2%
Independents	17.6%	40.2%	<b>57.8%</b>	26.5%	15.3%	<b>41.8%</b>	0.4%

<sup>4</sup><https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/07/21/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-secures-voluntary-commitments-from-leading-artificial-intelligence-companies-to-manage-the-risks-posed-by-ai/>

<sup>5</sup> UNM. (2022) *Who to blame: UNM professor researches AI harm and culpability*; US News. (2020) *States Increasingly Turn to Machine Learning and Algorithms to Detect Fraud*

Here is another argument in support:

Q9. Companies have been using AI programs to increase profits by purposely harming their customers. For example, AI programs used by health insurance companies were designed to reject as many claims as possible, rather than make the most accurate judgment. Hundreds of thousands of people were wrongfully denied coverage for needed medical treatment. And when people pointed this out, the company just blamed the AI and denied responsibility. We need to make sure that companies can't exploit AI for their own benefit.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	53.7%	32.9%	<b>86.6%</b>	10.1%	3.0%	<b>13.1%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	51.7%	33.7%	<b>85.4%</b>	10.5%	4.0%	<b>14.5%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	56.7%	32.8%	<b>89.5%</b>	8.4%	1.6%	<b>10.0%</b>	0.5%
Independents	50.3%	30.8%	<b>81.1%</b>	13.9%	4.7%	<b>18.6%</b>	0.3%

Here is another argument against:

Q10. It is not in the interest of the company to harm their customers, who will then take their business elsewhere. It is clearly in the company's interest to anticipate any problem in advance and to fix them as quickly as possible. This is a problem that the market will solve. We don't need the government inserting itself into the market with a whole pre-testing bureaucracy.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	15.4%	33.8%	<b>49.2%</b>	32.0%	18.4%	<b>50.4%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	14.6%	37.8%	<b>52.4%</b>	33.8%	13.2%	<b>47.0%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	16.0%	29.4%	<b>45.4%</b>	31.0%	23.4%	<b>54.4%</b>	0.2%
Independents	15.9%	35.6%	<b>51.5%</b>	29.8%	18.7%	<b>48.5%</b>	0.0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q11. A serious flaw that many AI programs have is bias. Research has shown that many AI programs treat some groups of people worse than others—especially racial minorities, older people and women.<sup>6</sup> For example, an AI program used by banks to decide who gets accepted for a loan found that it rejected these groups more than human loan officers would.<sup>7</sup> Thus AI programs can make inequalities worse. AI has the potential to make life better for everyone, no matter who they are, but that will only happen if we actively steer it in the right direction.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	38.9%	41.9%	<b>80.8%</b>	13.3%	5.5%	<b>18.8%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	30.1%	46.8%	<b>76.9%</b>	15.4%	7.4%	<b>22.8%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	47.4%	39.2%	<b>86.6%</b>	9.6%	3.0%	<b>12.6%</b>	0.8%
Independents	38.4%	35.9%	<b>74.3%</b>	18.3%	7.3%	<b>25.6%</b>	0.1%

<sup>6</sup> EU. (2022) [Bias in algorithms: Artificial intelligence and discrimination](#); IEEE. (2021) [Bias and Discrimination in AI: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective](#); ACM. (2022) [Robots Enact Malignant Stereotypes](#)

<sup>7</sup> AP. (2022) [The secret bias hidden in mortgage-approval algorithms](#); CAIP. (2021) [Ageism in AI: new forms of age discrimination in the era of algorithms and artificial intelligence](#); Women's World Banking. (2021) [Algorithmic Bias, Financial Inclusion, and Gender](#)

Here is another argument against:

Q12. This proposal will give Federal bureaucrats excessive power in shaping AI programs. It gives them the ability to insert their own bias into these pre-tests and could require that AI programs give priority to certain values – liberal or conservative – over being good at the actual task it's supposed to accomplish. This will result in AI programs that are worse at their jobs, which will harm everyone.<sup>8</sup>

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	25.8%	40.4%	<b>66.2%</b>	23.3%	10.2%	<b>33.5%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	27.3%	40.9%	<b>68.2%</b>	22.8%	8.9%	<b>31.7%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	23.2%	38.4%	<b>61.6%</b>	25.9%	11.9%	<b>37.8%</b>	0.6%
Independents	29.2%	44.8%	<b>74.0%</b>	16.6%	9.1%	<b>25.7%</b>	0.2%

So, again, here is the proposal:

Require pre-testing for any new AI program that is going to be used to make decisions that can have significant impacts on people, including in healthcare, banking, housing, education, employment, legal services, and utilities (like electricity).

These tests would try to ensure that the AI program: follows regulations and best practices, has data privacy and security protections, and does not have unintended biases. These tests would be conducted by the government or an independent third-party.

If it does not pass the tests, it would not be approved for general use.

Q13. How acceptable do you find this proposal on a scale of 0-10, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable and 10=very acceptable?

Not at all acceptable	1	2	3	4	Just tolerable	5	6	7	8	9	Very acceptable
<b>0</b>						<b>5</b>					<b>10</b>

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	13.8%	15.6%	70.5%	0.1%
Republicans	14.7%	16.3%	68.9%	0.1%
Democrats	12.0%	11.8%	76.1%	0.0%
Independents	16.8%	25.5%	57.4%	0.2%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	80.5%	19.3%	0.2%
Republicans	75.9%	23.9%	0.2%
Democrats	87.8%	12.1%	0.1%
Independents	71.3%	28.6%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	78.5%	21.5%	0.0%
Somewhat Red	78.2%	21.8%	0.0%
Lean Red	80.6%	19.4%	0.0%
Lean Blue	81.6%	17.9%	0.5%
Somewhat Blue	82.5%	17.3%	0.2%
Very Blue	84.1%	15.9%	0.0%

### [Auditing]

Some AI programs are already in use and have not been pre-tested. AI programs can also change over time as they learn more or are updated by the company.

<sup>8</sup> AAF. (2023) [AAF EXPOSES Biden admin, top Dems' plot to make AI woke](#)

Here is another proposal that has been put forward as a way for the government to take a preventative approach to regulating AI programs.

Give the government the authority to audit AI programs, or to contract independent third parties to audit them, that are already in use and that make decisions which have significant impacts on people's lives.<sup>9</sup>

The audits would include tests on whether the program follows regulations and best practices, has data privacy and security protections, and does not have unintended biases. If the audit finds that the AI program has problems in any of those areas, then the company who owns the AI program would have to fix them and redistribute the corrected version.

Q15. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	14.7%	15.8%	69.3%	0.2%
Republicans	16.4%	16.4%	67.1%	0.0%
Democrats	11.3%	13.3%	75.2%	0.2%
Independents	19.8%	21.9%	57.7%	0.6%

Q16. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	77.4%	22.3%	0.3%
Republicans	74.4%	25.2%	0.4%
Democrats	81.8%	18.0%	0.2%
Independents	72.6%	27.2%	0.2%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	74.0%	26.0%	0.0%
Somewhat Red	75.2%	23.9%	0.9%
Lean Red	80.3%	19.7%	0.0%
Lean Blue	81.4%	18.4%	0.2%
Somewhat Blue	73.4%	26.6%	0.0%
Very Blue	77.8%	21.2%	1.0%

[Randomly Divide sample into one-third samples: A, B, C]

### [Require Disclosure of Training] [Sample A, C]

If the government does pre-test or audit AI programs, another question is how much access the government would have, to see how the AI companies develop their programs.

One proposal is to require that companies disclose to the government how their AI program was "trained", when the government requests it.

The purpose of this proposal is two-fold. It would help the government:

- when it is pre-testing or auditing, to find problems in an AI program and to identify the source of the problem
- find whether the AI company violated any data privacy laws while collecting data to create its AI program

Here is the full proposal:

Require that AI companies provide the government with information about how the AI was trained, when the government requests it. This would include a summary of the data used to train the AI, and a description of how the data was obtained.<sup>10</sup> This would not include any sensitive information about individuals, such as medical or financial records.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

<sup>9</sup> European Union. [Artificial Intelligence Act](#); similar proposal is [Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2022](#) by Sen. Wyden (D) and Rep. Clark (D), which would require impact assessments of all AI programs in high-risk areas, if problems found they would need to fix them.

<sup>10</sup> Axios. [Scoop: Schumer lays groundwork for Congress to regulate AI](#)



Q17. Pre-tests and audits will not be able to see all the problems with an AI program because they are only looking at the outputs, and they won't be able to look at every possible output. Being able to look inside the AI program – the data that it was trained on and how it was programmed – will give the government an important tool for catching problems before they can cause harm.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	28.5%	50.8%	<b>79.3%</b>	15.9%	4.5%	<b>20.4%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	24.7%	53.0%	<b>77.7%</b>	16.3%	5.9%	<b>22.2%</b>	0.2%
Democrats	34.5%	49.3%	<b>83.8%</b>	13.4%	2.4%	<b>15.8%</b>	0.4%
Independents	22.6%	48.7%	<b>71.3%</b>	21.9%	6.8%	<b>28.7%</b>	0.0%

Here is an argument against:

Q18. The government should not have the power to force a private company to hand over information about how its AI program was developed. Any time a company has to disclose its data it increases the risk that it is leaked, and the government is known to have many data breaches. This could compromise intellectual property. If the AI program is working fine, then it shouldn't matter what is happening under the hood; and if there is a problem, then the AI company can look into the training data itself.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	21.0%	39.0%	<b>60.0%</b>	26.8%	13.1%	<b>39.9%</b>	0.1%
Republicans	21.5%	42.0%	<b>63.5%</b>	25.9%	10.5%	<b>36.4%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	18.9%	34.0%	<b>52.9%</b>	31.1%	15.8%	<b>46.9%</b>	0.1%
Independents	25.6%	44.0%	<b>69.6%</b>	17.5%	12.6%	<b>30.1%</b>	0.2%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q19. Without access to training data, the government could never know whether an AI company has been illegally collecting data unless a whistleblower inside the company decides to come forward. These data could include private health or financial information obtained without consent, or even images or videos of minors. One AI company recently settled a lawsuit for collecting face scans of people without their consent to create an AI-powered surveillance program.<sup>11</sup>

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	39.1%	43.5%	<b>82.6%</b>	13.5%	3.6%	<b>17.1%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	36.8%	43.8%	<b>80.6%</b>	14.1%	5.2%	<b>19.3%</b>	0.0%
Democrats	41.2%	44.3%	<b>85.5%</b>	11.6%	2.3%	<b>13.9%</b>	0.7%
Independents	39.9%	40.3%	<b>80.2%</b>	16.8%	2.6%	<b>19.4%</b>	0.4%

<sup>11</sup> National Law Review. (2022) [Facial Recognition: Clearview-ACLU Settlement Charts a New Path for BIPA and the First Amendment](#)

Here is another argument against:

Q20. It is not consistent with the principles of the American constitution for the government to be able to effectively search your property (including your AI programs), whenever it wants to, looking for something it believes might be illegal. If a government agency has reason to believe there is something wrong, it can go to a judge, make its case, and the judge can decide whether to require the company to disclose the training data.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	27.0%	40.6%	<b>67.6%</b>	22.4%	9.9%	<b>32.3%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	29.1%	43.3%	<b>72.4%</b>	18.6%	8.9%	<b>27.5%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	23.6%	40.4%	<b>64.0%</b>	25.0%	10.8%	<b>35.8%</b>	0.2%
Independents	30.3%	33.2%	<b>63.5%</b>	25.9%	10.2%	<b>36.1%</b>	0.4%

So, here again is the proposal:

Require that AI companies provide the government with information about how the AI was trained, when the government requests it. This would include a summary of the data used to train the AI, and a description of how the data was obtained.

Q21. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	18.7%	17.6%	63.3%	0.4%
Republicans	22.8%	17.2%	59.3%	0.7%
Democrats	12.9%	15.9%	71.1%	0.1%
Independents	23.3%	23.3%	53.1%	0.2%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	72.2%	27.3%	0.5%
Republicans	67.0%	32.1%	0.9%
Democrats	80.6%	19.3%	0.1%
Independents	63.5%	36.1%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	68.7%	31.0%	0.3%
Somewhat Red	76.0%	24.0%	0.0%
Lean Red	69.9%	30.1%	0.0%
Lean Blue	73.3%	24.6%	2.1%
Somewhat Blue	73.3%	26.5%	0.2%
Very Blue	71.6%	27.5%	0.9%

### [Deepfakes] [Full Sample]

As you may know, some AI programs can create fake images, audio, or videos, of real people or events, that look completely real. These images or videos are known as “deepfakes”.

Programs like Photoshop have already made it possible to make fake images, but with AI programs the deepfakes are more realistic, harder to detect, and can be readily applied to video as well as fixed images.

[Labeling – Sample A, C]

One proposal to regulate deepfakes is to:

**Require that any deepfake image or video distributed publicly – e.g. posted online or shown on TV – must have a label that states that it is not real and was generated by AI.<sup>12</sup> For videos, this label would need to be present the entire time the deepfake is on the screen. For audio deepfakes, they would be required to have a verbal statement at the beginning.**

Deepfakes that are used for entertainment purposes to impersonate a real person (such as portraying a movie actor as younger), would not be required to have a label, as long as the person being portrayed has given their consent.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q23. Deepfakes could easily be used to damage a person’s reputation causing irreversible harm. They could be shown doing something illegal or saying something awful. They could be fired from their job, have their relationships damaged or be socially outcast in their community for something they didn’t do. People need to know whether a video or image is not real.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	67.4%	22.1%	<b>89.5%</b>	5.9%	3.9%	<b>9.8%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	67.6%	22.3%	<b>89.9%</b>	5.8%	4.0%	<b>9.8%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	68.0%	21.9%	<b>89.9%</b>	5.8%	3.3%	<b>9.1%</b>	1.1%
Independents	65.2%	22.1%	<b>87.3%</b>	6.6%	5.5%	<b>12.1%</b>	0.6%

Here is an argument against:

Q24. We already have laws that can be used to punish people who use deepfakes to cause harm. It is illegal to defame a person, and deepfakes would not be immune from these laws. We don’t need a new law that would apply to every deepfake made. We shouldn’t let bad actors ruin this amazing new technology.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	17.9%	22.5%	<b>40.4%</b>	31.1%	28.3%	<b>59.4%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	16.4%	23.7%	<b>40.1%</b>	34.6%	25.0%	<b>59.6%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	18.6%	19.9%	<b>38.5%</b>	28.6%	32.9%	<b>61.5%</b>	0.1%
Independents	20.6%	26.4%	<b>47.0%</b>	28.4%	24.5%	<b>52.9%</b>	0.0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q25. Unlabeled deepfakes have the potential to substantially harm our democracy, financial markets, and the fabric of our society, which relies on knowing what is real and what isn’t. Activists can create deepfakes showing politicians or groups they don’t like doing terrible things. And when a politician is caught doing or saying something unpopular, they can just claim it was a deepfake. People won’t know what’s true.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	55.0%	33.5%	<b>88.5%</b>	7.7%	3.7%	<b>11.4%</b>	0.1%
Republicans	52.8%	36.1%	<b>88.9%</b>	7.5%	3.4%	<b>10.9%</b>	0.1%
Democrats	59.9%	29.1%	<b>89.0%</b>	7.4%	3.4%	<b>10.8%</b>	0.2%
Independents	47.8%	38.3%	<b>86.1%</b>	8.9%	5.0%	<b>13.9%</b>	0.0%

<sup>12</sup>[DEEP FAKES Accountability Act](#) by Rep. Clarke (D); [AI Disclosure Act](#) by Rep. Torres (D); [AI Labeling Act](#) by Sen. Schatz (D)

Here is another argument against:

Q26. The government should not be in the business of restricting free expression, that goes against our First Amendment rights. There are already programs to create fake images that look very real, like Photoshop, and we don't require those to be labeled. This would require another government bureaucracy to detect deepfakes and hunt down the people who made them. Furthermore, many deepfakes will have their labels removed, and if this law is passed, then people will just automatically believe the deepfakes are real because they don't have a label.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	20.8%	32.2%	<b>53.0%</b>	28.2%	17.9%	<b>46.1%</b>	0.9%
Republicans	21.8%	34.5%	<b>56.3%</b>	27.8%	15.1%	<b>42.9%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	19.1%	30.5%	<b>49.6%</b>	28.8%	20.5%	<b>49.3%</b>	1.1%
Independents	22.8%	30.2%	<b>53.0%</b>	27.8%	18.7%	<b>46.5%</b>	0.5%

So, here again is the proposal:

Require that any deepfake image or video distributed publicly – e.g. posted online or shown on TV – must have a label that states that it is not real and was generated by AI. For audio deepfakes, they would be required to have a verbal statement at the beginning.

Q27. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	11.2%	12.0%	76.6%	0.1%
Republicans	9.4%	12.2%	78.3%	0.2%
Democrats	10.4%	10.0%	79.5%	0.1%
Independents	18.6%	17.2%	64.1%	0.1%

Q28. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	83.1%	16.4%	0.5%
Republicans	83.2%	16.1%	0.7%
Democrats	85.4%	14.2%	0.4%
Independents	76.1%	23.5%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	80.6%	18.8%	0.7%
Somewhat Red	81.6%	18.4%	0.0%
Lean Red	84.5%	15.5%	0.0%
Lean Blue	86.6%	11.8%	1.6%
Somewhat Blue	84.0%	15.9%	0.1%
Very Blue	85.3%	14.1%	0.6%

[Full Sample A, B, C]

We will now look at proposals that would entirely prohibit the use of deepfakes for certain purposes.

**[Prohibiting Deepfakes for Campaign Ads]** [Sample B, C]

As you may know, there have already been campaign advertisements that have used deepfakes depicting politicians doing or saying things they have not, and events that have not happened.

One proposal is to:

**Make it illegal for political campaigns, including PACs, to use deepfakes in their campaign advertisements.**<sup>13</sup>

Here is an argument in favor of prohibiting the use of deepfakes in political campaign advertisements.

Q29. We have already seen the damage that comes from politicians lying and spreading disinformation. Deepfakes can make this so much worse. It can further divide the country: People who oppose a politician will tend to believe the fake videos that make them look bad, and their supporters won't. Even if the news reports that a video is fake, it is often too late because the video has been viewed by millions.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	61.5%	28.9%	<b>90.4%</b>	6.9%	2.3%	<b>9.2%</b>	0.4%
Republicans	58.4%	30.4%	<b>88.8%</b>	8.3%	2.4%	<b>10.7%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	66.8%	24.9%	<b>91.7%</b>	5.9%	2.1%	<b>8.0%</b>	0.3%
Independents	53.3%	37.2%	<b>90.5%</b>	6.5%	3.0%	<b>9.5%</b>	0.0%

Here is an argument against:

Q30. There are already laws in place that can apply to politicians creating fake videos with the purpose of harming their political opponent's reputation. That's called defamation and it's illegal. We do not need to make a whole new law.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	16.7%	27.1%	<b>43.8%</b>	27.1%	29.0%	<b>56.1%</b>	0.2%
Republicans	16.3%	29.5%	<b>45.8%</b>	29.7%	24.3%	<b>54.0%</b>	0.2%
Democrats	15.9%	23.5%	<b>39.4%</b>	25.8%	34.7%	<b>60.5%</b>	0.1%
Independents	20.1%	31.5%	<b>51.6%</b>	23.6%	24.4%	<b>48.0%</b>	0.4%

Here is a counter argument:

Q31. Defamation laws will not solve this problem. It is nearly impossible to convict someone of defaming a public figure like a politician and lawsuits take years. Also, defamation laws do not apply to many political deepfakes such as fake videos of terrible things that the ad falsely claims happened when their opponent was in office. We need a new law that explicitly prohibits any use of deepfakes in political ads.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	47.7%	36.8%	<b>84.5%</b>	11.2%	3.8%	<b>15.0%</b>	0.5%
Republicans	41.7%	42.6%	<b>84.3%</b>	10.7%	4.7%	<b>15.4%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	54.4%	32.6%	<b>87.0%</b>	9.5%	2.8%	<b>12.3%</b>	0.7%
Independents	44.3%	32.6%	<b>76.9%</b>	18.4%	4.4%	<b>22.8%</b>	0.2%

<sup>13</sup> FEC. (2023) [Comments sought on amending regulation to include deliberately deceptive Artificial Intelligence in campaign ads.](#)

Here is another argument against:

Q32. There are many good uses for this technology in campaigns. They can be used to show people what a politician's policies could achieve, for example by creating videos of new hospitals being built in a rural town; or to show people what risks the politician is worried about, such as a local bridge collapsing because of their opponent's refusal to invest in infrastructure. We should not simply ban this form of expression.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	12.6%	32.0%	<b>44.6%</b>	32.0%	23.1%	<b>55.1%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	10.8%	31.6%	<b>42.4%</b>	35.8%	21.7%	<b>57.5%</b>	0.0%
Democrats	13.5%	31.3%	<b>44.8%</b>	29.6%	25.1%	<b>54.7%</b>	0.6%
Independents	15.6%	35.6%	<b>51.2%</b>	28.2%	20.5%	<b>48.7%</b>	0.1%

So, here again is the proposal:

**Make it illegal for political campaigns, including PACs, to use deepfakes in their campaign advertisements.**

Q33. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	11.7%	11.4%	76.8%	0.1%
Republicans	11.9%	11.0%	77.1%	0.1%
Democrats	10.6%	9.5%	79.9%	0.1%
Independents	15.1%	18.9%	65.9%	0.0%

Q34. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	83.9%	15.7%	0.5%
Republicans	83.3%	16.0%	0.7%
Democrats	85.7%	14.0%	0.2%
Independents	79.5%	20.1%	0.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	77.9%	21.7%	0.4%
Somewhat Red	88.6%	11.3%	0.1%
Lean Red	84.5%	14.8%	0.7%
Lean Blue	87.7%	12.0%	0.4%
Somewhat Blue	85.4%	13.7%	0.9%
Very Blue	78.4%	21.0%	0.5%

**[Prohibit sharing pornographic deepfakes of individuals without their consent]** [Sample A,B]

Let's turn to a proposal for prohibiting certain kinds of deepfakes.

As you may know, people have created deepfake images and videos of individuals engaging in sexual activities without that person's consent. For example, people's faces have been put on images and videos of other people engaging in sexual acts. These deepfakes have then been posted publicly online.

There is a proposal to:

**Make it illegal to publicly distribute a deepfake of a person engaging in sexual activity, such as by posting it on the internet, without that person's consent.**<sup>14</sup>

It would not apply to people who only make such deepfakes for their personal use and do not make them public.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q35. Pornographic deepfakes can damage a person's reputation and cause them and their family serious mental anguish. People have been using deepfake technology to create lewd videos of celebrities, and to harm their ex-partners or political figures. Many states already make it illegal to distribute sexual images of someone without their consent, and we should definitely regulate deepfake pornography to protect people whose image is being used without their consent.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	66.0%	24.8%	<b>90.8%</b>	5.7%	2.9%	<b>8.6%</b>	0.6%
Republicans	65.6%	26.0%	<b>91.6%</b>	5.4%	2.6%	<b>8.0%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	68.6%	22.0%	<b>90.6%</b>	5.4%	3.1%	<b>8.5%</b>	0.8%
Independents	58.8%	30.2%	<b>89.0%</b>	7.2%	3.3%	<b>10.5%</b>	0.4%

Here is an argument against:<sup>15</sup>

Q36. If we are going to have a First Amendment right to free expression, we need to recognize and accept that this means that some content will be lawful but awful. People already create lewd drawings of celebrities or ex-partners, and these are protected as free speech. So, now we are going to have the government saying what looks too realistic? The government should not be in the role of trying to police the images people make public.<sup>16</sup>

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	14.2%	26.5%	<b>40.7%</b>	27.2%	31.5%	<b>58.7%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	14.4%	30.0%	<b>44.4%</b>	26.5%	28.8%	<b>55.3%</b>	0.4%
Democrats	13.4%	22.3%	<b>35.7%</b>	27.8%	35.4%	<b>63.2%</b>	1.1%
Independents	15.8%	29.8%	<b>45.6%</b>	27.3%	27.1%	<b>54.4%</b>	0.0%

So here again is the proposal:

**Make it illegal to publicly distribute a deepfake of a person engaging in sexual activity, such as by posting it on the internet, without that person's consent.**

Q37. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	12.1%	8.7%	78.7%	0.5%
Republicans	11.9%	8.8%	78.7%	0.6%
Democrats	10.4%	6.7%	82.3%	0.5%
Independents	18.3%	14.8%	66.5%	0.3%

<sup>14</sup> [Preventing Deepfakes of Intimate Images Act](#) by Rep. Morelle (D); [S.3696 DEFIANCE Act of 2024](#), by Sen. Durbin

<sup>15</sup> Cardozo Law Review. (2023) [Deeply Fake, Deeply Disturbing, Deeply Constitutional: Why the First Amendment Likely Protects the Creation of Pornographic Deepfakes](#); EEF. (2018) [We Don't Need New Laws for Faked Videos, We Already Have Them](#)

<sup>16</sup> [Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. vs. Goldsmith et al](#), 598, U.S. (2023)

Q38. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	85.6%	14.0%	0.4%
Republicans	85.0%	14.6%	0.4%
Democrats	86.8%	12.7%	0.5%
Independents	83.4%	16.3%	0.3%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	85.7%	14.2%	0.1%
Somewhat Red	88.2%	11.6%	0.3%
Lean Red	87.3%	12.0%	0.8%
Lean Blue	84.2%	15.0%	0.8%
Somewhat Blue	80.2%	19.3%	0.5%
Very Blue	84.3%	15.3%	0.4%

**[Federal Agency]** [Full Sample]

So far, we have been talking about some specific problems with AI. We are now going to explore a more general proposal for having a Federal agency for AI.

Currently, a variety of federal agencies are responding to specific concerns with AI programs that are arising in their own area of expertise.

This proposed agency for AI would take a preventative and comprehensive approach to overseeing and regulating the development and use of AI programs.<sup>17</sup> The agency would:

- closely monitor the state of AI programs and their uses, and try to anticipate potential problems
- define best practices for developing and using AI programs, based on input from AI experts, industry leaders, and other professionals
- make recommendations for AI regulations to Congress and the Executive Branch
- enforce AI regulations that have been adopted

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:<sup>18</sup>

Q39. AI technology is growing by leaps and bounds. If not properly regulated, AI has the potential to cause widespread and lasting harm in ways that we cannot even predict right now. A single AI program can affect multiple areas of the economy and society in complex ways. Most government agencies react to problems only in their one area of expertise. Problems can easily fall through the cracks. It is important to have a single agency with many types of expertise, that is preventative, forward-looking and able to regulate AI in a comprehensive way.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	41.5%	43.0%	<b>84.5%</b>	10.6%	4.2%	<b>14.8%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	39.1%	43.7%	<b>82.8%</b>	11.5%	5.0%	<b>16.5%</b>	0.6%
Democrats	45.5%	41.6%	<b>87.1%</b>	9.2%	2.8%	<b>12.0%</b>	0.8%
Independents	35.9%	44.9%	<b>80.8%</b>	12.4%	6.1%	<b>18.5%</b>	0.7%

<sup>17</sup> [Digital Platforms Commission Act](#) by Sen. Bennett (D). The precautionary aspect of the agency: “adopt, where relevant and practical, a risk management regulatory approach that prioritizes anticipating, limiting, and balancing against other interests the broad economic, societal, and political risks of harm...”

<sup>18</sup> Senator Bennett. (2023) [Bennet, Welch Reintroduce Landmark Legislation to Establish Federal Commission to Oversee Digital Platforms](#)



Here is an argument against:<sup>19</sup>

Q40. There is no need to create a whole new agency devoted just to AI. We already have federal agencies that oversee every area that AI is being used in. AI programs are used in so many different areas that the agency would have to be a massive bureaucracy with a lot of duplication of the efforts of existing agencies. We've never had an agency for one type of technology before, and we shouldn't start now. A new regulatory agency, because its sole purpose is to regulate and make itself relevant, will over-regulate and stifle innovation.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	19.6%	31.4%	<b>51.0%</b>	30.9%	17.3%	<b>48.2%</b>	0.7%
Republicans	20.7%	31.6%	<b>52.3%</b>	30.4%	16.8%	<b>47.2%</b>	0.5%
Democrats	17.8%	31.1%	<b>48.9%</b>	31.0%	19.2%	<b>50.2%</b>	0.9%
Independents	22.4%	32.0%	<b>54.4%</b>	32.3%	12.8%	<b>45.1%</b>	0.4%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q41. As AI programs spread across the world, it will become increasingly important and necessary to have global standards and guardrails to ensure its safety. Having a single federal agency devoted to AI will allow the US to take a strong leadership role in setting these global standards. This would be much more difficult if the responsibilities for AI oversight and regulation were split between dozens of agencies.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	36.8%	43.0%	<b>79.8%</b>	15.0%	5.0%	<b>20.0%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	32.0%	43.5%	<b>75.5%</b>	18.5%	5.6%	<b>24.1%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	42.2%	42.5%	<b>84.7%</b>	11.3%	3.6%	<b>14.9%</b>	0.3%
Independents	34.2%	42.8%	<b>77.0%</b>	15.8%	7.2%	<b>23.0%</b>	0.0%

Here is another argument against:<sup>20</sup>

Q42. Having just one AI agency makes it that much easier for corporations and other special interests to lobby and shape the rules of AI to their own benefit, at the expense of the public interest. It's better to have AI regulation be divided between various agencies, making it more difficult for special interests to exert their influence over the entirety of AI regulation.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	22.4%	38.8%	<b>61.2%</b>	27.9%	10.5%	<b>38.4%</b>	0.3%
Republicans	23.9%	37.8%	<b>61.7%</b>	29.0%	9.0%	<b>38.0%</b>	0.3%
Democrats	21.5%	38.6%	<b>60.1%</b>	28.1%	11.5%	<b>39.6%</b>	0.4%
Independents	21.1%	42.7%	<b>63.8%</b>	24.2%	11.8%	<b>36.0%</b>	0.2%

So, here again is the proposal:

Create a new federal agency dedicated to taking a preventative and comprehensive approach to overseeing and regulating the development and use of AI programs. This new agency would:

- closely monitor the state of AI programs and their uses, and try to anticipate potential problems
- define best practices for developing and using AI programs, based on input from AI experts, industry leaders, and other professionals
- make recommendations for AI regulations to Congress and the Executive Branch
- enforce AI regulations that have been adopted

<sup>19</sup> Federalist Society. (2023) [The Problems with AI Licensing and an "FDA for Algorithms"](#); Center for Data Innovation. (2023) [Ten Principles for Regulation That Does Not Harm AI Innovation](#)

<sup>20</sup> Federalist Society. (2023) [The Problems with AI Licensing and an "FDA for Algorithms"](#); CATO. (2023) [The Worst Possible Reason to Support New AI Regulation](#)

Q43. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	18.5%	14.7%	66.6%	0.2%
Republicans	22.2%	15.2%	62.3%	0.3%
Democrats	13.1%	12.3%	74.5%	0.0%
Independents	24.1%	20.7%	54.5%	0.6%

Q44. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	73.8%	25.7%	0.5%
Republicans	68.3%	30.8%	0.9%
Democrats	80.8%	19.0%	0.2%
Independents	68.3%	31.6%	0.1%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	70.7%	28.8%	0.5%
Somewhat Red	68.2%	30.8%	0.9%
Lean Red	72.4%	27.3%	0.3%
Lean Blue	74.8%	25.0%	0.2%
Somewhat Blue	70.7%	28.7%	0.5%
Very Blue	74.6%	25.1%	0.2%

### **[International Structures]** [Full Sample]

Now, let's turn to proposals for addressing international issues concerning AI.

As you may know, AI programs are being developed in many different countries, and are sold internationally. Currently, there are no global treaties or agreements regulating the development and uses of AI programs.

### **[Treaty to ban lethal autonomous weapons]** [Sample A, B]

One international proposal is to create a treaty to regulate the use of AI in weapon systems.

As you may know, AI programs have been put into weapons to assist with finding and locking onto targets. There is a concern that the weapon will not only be programmed to find a certain type of target (enemy combatant or military site), but also to make the decision whether to fire on a target, independent of any human choice at the time. These types of weapons are known as lethal autonomous weapons.

The reason that militaries would build lethal autonomous weapons is that they can be more efficient and effective than weapons which require some human control: Thousands of them can be deployed at the same time without the need for an equivalent number of humans controlling them or making the final decision to attack targets.

There is a concern that these weapons may not always accurately distinguish the target and may end up firing on civilians or non-military sites.

A proposal has been put forward for an international treaty that would prohibit lethal autonomous weapons. Weapons could use AI to find and lock onto a target, but a human would have to decide whether it fires on that target.<sup>21</sup>

The treaty would also have a UN agency enforce this requirement. Member nations would have to disclose information about the use of AI in their weapons systems and allow the UN agency to inspect their weapons systems. Non-Member nations would be pressured to ban lethal autonomous weapons as well.

This proposal is modeled after other international treaties for monitoring and regulating potentially dangerous technologies, such as nuclear and biochemical weapons.

<sup>21</sup> ICRC. (2021) [ICRC position on autonomous weapon systems](#); UN News. (2019) [Autonomous weapons that kill must be banned, insists UN chief](#); HRW and Harvard's IHRC. (2021) [Crunch Time on Killer Robots Why New Law Is Needed and How It Can Be Achieved](#)

So, the question is whether the US should actively work with other nations to create an international treaty to ban lethal autonomous weapons.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q45. Having weapons that are able to operate fully on their own is way too risky. The potential damage that these weapons could cause to civilians and society in general is massive. AI-powered weapons have already fired on their own military. Imagine a swarm of thousands of drones that start firing on a major city and kill thousands of innocent civilians. Weapons of war need human control, and any weapons which don't have that should be banned completely.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	58.1%	30.8%	<b>88.9%</b>	7.2%	3.1%	<b>10.3%</b>	0.8%
Republicans	56.5%	32.0%	<b>88.5%</b>	7.0%	3.9%	<b>10.9%</b>	0.7%
Democrats	62.0%	28.6%	<b>90.6%</b>	6.5%	2.2%	<b>8.7%</b>	0.7%
Independents	49.9%	34.5%	<b>84.4%</b>	10.0%	3.8%	<b>13.8%</b>	1.8%

Here is an argument against:<sup>22</sup>

Q46. Humans make errors all the time in combat. An AI-powered weapon will be much more accurate and will likely reduce civilian casualties. And humans still have oversight over how and when to deploy AI-powered weapons. Removing soldiers from the battlefield can keep them safer, which means fewer injuries and deaths. Furthermore, countries or terrorist groups that do not sign, or sign and violate the treaty will have an advantage over those who do sign and abide by it. We should not tie our arm behind our back.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	17.3%	36.8%	<b>54.1%</b>	28.6%	16.1%	<b>44.7%</b>	1.2%
Republicans	16.0%	39.8%	<b>55.8%</b>	28.6%	14.1%	<b>42.7%</b>	1.5%
Democrats	18.5%	33.7%	<b>52.2%</b>	28.5%	18.4%	<b>46.9%</b>	0.8%
Independents	17.0%	38.0%	<b>55.0%</b>	28.8%	14.5%	<b>43.3%</b>	1.6%

Here is another argument against:<sup>23</sup>

Q47. This treaty is unnecessary to ensure that autonomous weapons do not harm civilians. There are already treaties that prohibit weapons that indiscriminately kill civilians as well as military targets. For example, chemical weapons that kill everyone in the area they are dropped on – whether they are enemy combatants or not – are prohibited. So, if a lethal autonomous weapon could not discriminate between civilian and military enemy targets, it would be prohibited. If an autonomous weapon has an AI system that *can* discriminate—at least as well or better than a human—it should be allowed.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	18.6%	41.8%	<b>60.4%</b>	27.3%	11.0%	<b>38.3%</b>	1.3%
Republicans	16.2%	44.5%	<b>60.7%</b>	27.8%	10.7%	<b>38.5%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	20.9%	38.2%	<b>59.1%</b>	27.8%	11.6%	<b>39.4%</b>	1.6%
Independents	18.2%	45.5%	<b>63.7%</b>	24.4%	9.9%	<b>34.3%</b>	2.1%

Here is a counter argument:

Q48. Current international laws are not enough. We do not know how well the AI systems of lethal autonomous weapons can distinguish between civilians and military targets. No matter how much testing is done by the corporations that make them or the militaries that buy them, we will not know how well they will operate in actual warfare until they are deployed on the battlefield. They may malfunction or the enemy might hack into the system. We should not put civilian lives at risk. We should err on the side of caution and simply ban them.

<sup>22</sup> CFR. (2023) [Stop the “Stop the Killer Robot” Debate: Why We Need Artificial Intelligence in Future Battlefields](#)

<sup>23</sup> CFR. (2023) [Stop the “Stop the Killer Robot” Debate: Why We Need Artificial Intelligence in Future Battlefields](#); International Humanitarian Law Database. [Rule 71. The use of weapons which are by nature indiscriminate is prohibited.](#); [Article 51 Protocol of the Geneva Convention](#)

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	34.6%	42.8%	<b>77.4%</b>	15.8%	5.1%	<b>20.9%</b>	1.7%
Republicans	33.1%	41.2%	<b>74.3%</b>	17.7%	6.4%	<b>24.1%</b>	1.6%
Democrats	35.2%	46.1%	<b>81.3%</b>	13.1%	4.0%	<b>17.1%</b>	1.6%
Independents	37.0%	37.1%	<b>74.1%</b>	18.6%	5.2%	<b>23.8%</b>	2.1%

So, here again is the proposal:

The US is actively working with other nations to create an international treaty that would prohibit lethal autonomous weapons. Weapons could use AI to find and lock onto a target, but a human would have to decide whether it fires on that target.

The treaty would also have a UN agency enforce this requirement. Member nations would have to disclose information about the use of AI in their weapons systems and allow the UN agency to inspect their weapons systems to ensure they are complying with the treaty. Non-Member nations would be pressured to ban lethal autonomous weapons as well.

Q49. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	15.4%	15.8%	68.0%	0.8%
Republicans	18.1%	18.1%	63.3%	0.4%
Democrats	12.0%	10.9%	76.2%	1.0%
Independents	18.3%	24.8%	55.6%	1.3%

Q50. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the US actively working with other nations to create an international treaty that would prohibit lethal autonomous weapons.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	80.9%	18.5%	0.5%
Republicans	77.1%	22.6%	0.3%
Democrats	85.4%	14.1%	0.5%
Independents	77.7%	20.9%	1.4%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	77.3%	22.3%	0.4%
Somewhat Red	79.4%	20.3%	0.2%
Lean Red	77.6%	21.7%	0.7%
Lean Blue	84.8%	14.1%	1.1%
Somewhat Blue	80.9%	19.1%	0.0%
Very Blue	82.6%	16.7%	0.7%

## [Treaty to create agency to regulate large-scale AI] [Sample B, C]

Let's turn to a proposal for dealing with large-scale AI programs.

Among some AI experts, there is a concern that large-scale AI programs could be created that are highly intelligent, have advanced capabilities, and, perhaps most significantly, have a high level of autonomy. According to these experts, these AI programs could become uncontrollable by humans and engage in dangerous behavior that causes massive harm.

On the other hand, some AI experts have said that these fears of an AI program becoming so powerful and destructive independent of human control are neither realistic nor based on any evidence.

A recent survey of AI experts found that more than half believe there is at least a five percent chance that AI could be developed to the point that it could cause extremely bad outcomes, even possibly human extinction.<sup>24</sup>

In addition to concerns about AI acting autonomously there are also broad concerns that highly powerful AI programs could be hacked or misused to cause massive harm.

Thus, a proposal<sup>25</sup> has been put forward for an international treaty for regulating large-scale AI programs.

This treaty would have two parts:

- 1) **Member nations (those that signed the treaty) would establish a set of regulations for the development and use of large-scale AI programs**, with the goal of ensuring that they:
  - can always be shut down by human operators in case they get out of control
  - have robust security measures to protect them from being hacked or misused
  - do not cause major unintended and problematic consequences

As AI technology advances and changes, member nations could establish new regulations.

- 2) **An international agency would be created to monitor and inspect whether nations' large-scale AI projects are following the agreed-on regulations and help fix any problems that arise.** Member nations would be required to disclose information about their large-scale AI programs and agree to inspections and non-Member nations would be pressured to do so as well.

This proposal is modeled after previous international treaties for monitoring and regulating potentially dangerous technologies, such as nuclear and biochemical weapons.

So, the question is whether the US should actively work with other nations to create such an international treaty to establish an agency to regulate large-scale AI programs.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q51. The world is so digitally connected that an AI problem in one country could easily turn into an AI problem for all countries. For example, AI programs could be hacked and used to take down national security systems or infrastructure (like electrical grids). They could be used to create deepfake campaigns to interfere with other nations' politics or destabilize international relations and markets. Powerful AI programs could even go rogue and decide that humans are a threat to their survival and try to take us out. Problems like this cannot be prevented or stopped by each nation individually. International coordination is needed to help make sure that large-scale AI programs do not cause such harm.

---

<sup>24</sup> AI Impact. (2022) [2022 Expert Survey on Progress in AI](#)

<sup>25</sup> Based on the proposal put forward by OpenAI. (2023) [Governance of Superintelligence](#); Professor Gary Marcus and Anka Reuel in [The Economist](#); and [UN Secretary-General Guterres](#)

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	47.5%	37.9%	<b>85.4%</b>	8.9%	3.8%	<b>12.7%</b>	1.9%
Republicans	44.3%	39.2%	<b>83.5%</b>	9.7%	5.6%	<b>15.3%</b>	1.3%
Democrats	51.6%	35.6%	<b>87.2%</b>	7.9%	2.1%	<b>10.0%</b>	2.8%
Independents	43.8%	41.9%	<b>85.7%</b>	10.0%	3.5%	<b>13.5%</b>	0.8%

Here is an argument against:

Q52. AI is nothing like the weapons regulated by international treaties, like nuclear or biochemical weapons. AI programs are developed mostly by private businesses, not governments. Also, AI programs exist on computers and so they can be developed almost anywhere. This treaty would lead to giving a global agency sweeping authority to go into a nation's private businesses and inspect their private property. An international agency should never have that much power, because it would be a violation of national sovereignty and would surely be abused.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	21.8%	36.1%	<b>57.9%</b>	28.1%	13.1%	<b>41.2%</b>	0.9%
Republicans	22.0%	39.5%	<b>61.5%</b>	27.2%	10.6%	<b>37.8%</b>	0.8%
Democrats	20.7%	33.1%	<b>53.8%</b>	29.1%	16.0%	<b>45.1%</b>	1.1%
Independents	25.4%	35.7%	<b>61.1%</b>	27.6%	11.1%	<b>38.7%</b>	0.3%

So, here again is the proposal:

**The US is actively working with other nations to create an international treaty to regulate large-scale AI programs.**

Q53. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>National</b>	15.8%	17.4%	66.7%	0.2%
Republicans	17.9%	21.5%	60.1%	0.5%
Democrats	12.7%	11.9%	75.4%	0.0%
Independents	19.2%	22.9%	57.9%	0.0%

Q54. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the US actively working with other nations to create an international treaty to regulate large-scale AI programs.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
<b>National</b>	76.6%	22.9%	0.5%
Republicans	71.0%	28.8%	0.2%
Democrats	83.6%	15.8%	0.6%
Independents	71.0%	28.1%	0.9%
<b>Cook's PVI (D-R)</b>			
Very Red	69.7%	29.9%	0.3%
Somewhat Red	75.4%	24.6%	0.0%
Lean Red	79.8%	19.6%	0.5%
Lean Blue	75.8%	24.0%	0.2%
Somewhat Blue	73.8%	25.9%	0.3%
Very Blue	79.0%	20.9%	0.0%

###