



## Survey on International Security, Ukraine and Nuclear Policy

– ARIZONA QUESTIONNAIRE –

**Field Dates:** July 19-August 2, 2024

**Sample Size:** Arizona: 607 Adults      National: 1,211 Adults

**Confidence Interval:** Arizona: +/- 4.5%      National: +/- 3.2%

**Sample Provided by:** Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.

**Note:** Values may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

This survey is going to address US policies regarding a variety of topics. You will be provided background information, as well as arguments for and against various policy positions. This survey will take 20-25 minutes.

First, we are going to ask you a few questions about yourself, such as your age, ethnicity, income, and education. This information is important because it allows us to make sure we have a representative sample of citizens.

**PRIVACY NOTICE:** The answers to these questions and all of your personal information will be kept **completely anonymous and confidential. We are both ethically committed to protecting your privacy, and as part of the University of Maryland we are legally required to do so.**

The first topic will be about US international security. As you may know, after World War II, the United States together with other countries set up a number of international agreements and institutions with most of the major countries in the world. The aim was to enable countries to cooperate in an effort to preserve peace, promote international trade, lessen poverty through economic development, reduce hunger, respond to disasters, help refugees, promote health, and further human rights and democracy.

The most prominent institution has been the United Nations and its related global agencies, such as the World Food Program and, more recently, the World Trade Organization. But such agreements and institutions also include regional alliances like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO and regional trade agreements like the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Many people think that these agreements and institutions are still valuable and important, have served the U.S. well, and should be maintained even if they require some cost. But, other people think they are no longer useful and the U.S. should disengage from them so that the U.S. is freer to pursue its interests independently.

In this survey, we will give you some background on some of the guiding principles of these agreements and institutions, and have you evaluate arguments for the U.S. maintaining or disengaging from them.

The first area we are going to explore is collective security. All nations face the risk of being attacked or invaded by another nation. The key trigger for World War II was that Germany and Japan invaded neighboring countries.

After the war, the major countries in the world agreed in the United Nations Charter that the use of military force against another country is a violation of international law, unless it is in self-defense, collective defense, or is approved by the UN Security Council.

But, because there is no international police force to enforce the law, they also agreed that when a country comes under attack, other countries should join together to defend the country being attacked, not only through military force, but also through economic sanctions. This is the principle of “collective security.”

The idea is that leaders who might have the desire to conquer neighboring countries, will be deterred or dissuaded if they believe that other countries will join together to come to the defense of the country.

Some countries have collective defense agreements in which they promise to come to each other's aid if attacked. We'll look at those types of alliance arrangements shortly.

The UN Charter provides for a looser form of collective security that doesn't necessarily require participation from members. The UN Security Council agrees on taking action and invites member states to contribute to some type of international response. Collective security was one of the central principles behind the Gulf War in 1991. When Iraq under Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, numerous countries joined together, under U.S. leadership, and drove Iraq out of Kuwait.

Here is an argument in support of the idea that collective security should be a high priority:

Q1. Before World War II, nations frequently went to war with others in an effort to gain new territory. Since World War II this has occurred very rarely. This is in large part because countries have agreed that countries should not invade each other and that countries should join together to prevent any country from invading another. This is no time to abandon this principle that has been so important for preserving peace and security among world powers. If the countries of the world were to fall back into trying to invade each other it would lead countries to build up their militaries and would destabilize the world economy. It would likely lead more countries to try to get nuclear weapons which could lead to extraordinary destruction. It is clearly in the U.S. interest to promote and support the principle of collective security.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	44%	41%	<b>85%</b>	7%	3%	<b>9%</b>	6%
GOP	42%	43%	<b>84%</b>	8%	1%	<b>9%</b>	7%
Dem.	51%	41%	<b>92%</b>	3%	3%	<b>5%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	44%	41%	<b>85%</b>	6%	3%	<b>10%</b>	6%
GOP	38%	46%	<b>84%</b>	8%	4%	<b>12%</b>	5%
Dem.	55%	34%	<b>88%</b>	2%	3%	<b>5%</b>	7%
Indep.	30%	46%	<b>76%</b>	13%	4%	<b>17%</b>	7%

Here is a counter argument:

Q2. The whole idea that the U.S. should play a role in helping defend countries from aggression might have made sense during the Cold War when the Soviet Union was a big threat and we wanted to make sure that no country would come into their orbit. But now, Russia is not a major threat and even China poses a limited threat to our vital interests. So, we should not feel that it is important for the U.S. to try to uphold the principle of collective security for the world. We cannot have confidence that other countries will be there to join us when the going gets rough. But other countries are always expecting the U.S. to step in. Too many countries have gotten lax thinking that they can count on the U.S. to defend them.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	21%	37%	<b>57%</b>	24%	16%	<b>40%</b>	3%
GOP	28%	34%	<b>62%</b>	25%	10%	<b>35%</b>	3%
Dem.	17%	37%	<b>53%</b>	23%	22%	<b>45%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	23%	37%	<b>59%</b>	22%	15%	<b>37%</b>	4%
GOP	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	20%	10%	<b>31%</b>	4%
Dem.	20%	35%	<b>54%</b>	22%	20%	<b>41%</b>	4%
Indep.	17%	39%	<b>56%</b>	29%	13%	<b>41%</b>	3%

Here is another argument in support of the idea that collective security should be a high priority:

Q3. The U.S. has been a key leader in upholding the principle of collective security and if it were to be perceived as backing away from this role, other countries would disengage too. Some nations would be likely to draw closer to Russia and China for protection. Potential aggressors would be emboldened, and the world would become less stable and much more dangerous. The principle of collective security has been effective in preventing major wars for more than 70 years. It has served U.S. interests by creating a more stable world that furthers economic development which has served U.S. interests. This is no time to abandon the principle of collective security and let the world drift back into a kind of jungle rule where countries throw around their military might to try to get advantages over each other.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	38%	41%	<b>79%</b>	13%	4%	<b>18%</b>	3%
GOP	37%	41%	<b>77%</b>	15%	3%	<b>18%</b>	5%
Dem.	46%	36%	<b>82%</b>	13%	4%	<b>16%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	38%	41%	<b>80%</b>	14%	3%	<b>17%</b>	4%
GOP	34%	41%	<b>75%</b>	19%	2%	<b>21%</b>	4%
Dem.	45%	40%	<b>85%</b>	9%	2%	<b>11%</b>	4%
Indep.	28%	48%	<b>76%</b>	15%	8%	<b>23%</b>	1%

Here is a counter argument:

Q4. The fact is, nations will always try to use their military might to get advantages. It is unrealistic to think that this will change. What has happened over the last few decades is that the U.S. has been so powerful that it has been able to keep other countries in line, at least to some extent. But the U.S. can't keep playing this role. The U.S. has plenty of its own problems to worry about. Basically, we should do what makes sense in terms of our own interests at any particular moment and let other countries look out for themselves.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	23%	38%	<b>60%</b>	24%	15%	<b>39%</b>	1%
GOP	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	23%	10%	<b>33%</b>	1%
Dem.	16%	36%	<b>52%</b>	24%	23%	<b>47%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	26%	37%	<b>63%</b>	24%	12%	<b>36%</b>	1%
GOP	31%	41%	<b>72%</b>	21%	5%	<b>26%</b>	2%
Dem.	21%	35%	<b>56%</b>	25%	18%	<b>43%</b>	1%
Indep.	23%	34%	<b>57%</b>	30%	14%	<b>43%</b>	0%

Q5. So, in conclusion, do you think it should or should not be a high priority in U.S. foreign policy to uphold the principle of collective security, by contributing to collective military operations and/or using economic sanctions in response to international aggression?

	Should	Should Not	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	79%	21%	0%
GOP	77%	23%	0%
Dem.	88%	12%	0%
<b>National</b>	80%	20%	0%
GOP	79%	21%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Indep.	66%	33%	1%

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Should	Should Not	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	82%	18%	0%
	Hispanic	80%	20%	0%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	85%	15%	0%
	Women	74%	26%	0%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	75%	25%	0%
	30-49	79%	21%	0%
	50-64	79%	22%	0%
	65 or older	84%	16%	0%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	77%	24%	0%
	\$50-100,000	82%	19%	0%
	\$100-150,000	81%	20%	0%
	More than \$150,000	79%	21%	0%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	79%	21%	0%

Some college	79%	21%	0%
College degree	83%	17%	0%

Closely related to the idea of collective security is the idea of mutual defense treaties or alliances. When nations enter into an alliance, they promise that if any one of them is attacked, all of the other members of the alliance will band together and defend that nation. While collective security is a general principle, a mutual defense treaty is a firm commitment to help defend another country or group of countries in the event that they come under attack. An attack on one is considered an attack on all.

We will now evaluate some of America’s alliances. Some people believe that these alliances continue to serve U.S. interests and values, while others think that they have grown obsolete.

America’s most significant alliance is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO. This includes 30 European nations, and Canada as well as the U.S. It was formed after World War II with 15 members in response to the concern that Europe might be attacked by the Soviet Union. Later, additional countries were added that were in Eastern Europe and had originally been part of an alliance with the Soviet Union, including Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and others. Sweden and Finland joined in the last year in response to Russia’s actions in Ukraine.

The NATO charter includes a key section, called Article 5, which says that NATO members regard an attack on any member as an attack on all and that all members will defend any member that is attacked. While a key focus is the potential for an attack by Russia, NATO has addressed other issues as well. After the September 11th attacks on the US, NATO invoked Article 5 and several member countries joined the US in its operation in Afghanistan.

The military forces of the NATO countries are closely linked, have joint command structures, and do military exercises together to ensure that they will be able to work together effectively if it is necessary to defend any of the members. The U.S. keeps about 100,000 troops stationed in Europe to help defend Europe if necessary and to send a signal of its commitment to help defend Europe. The European members have around 1.7 million troops stationed in Europe.

Currently, there is some debate about whether the U.S. should continue to be part of NATO. Here is an argument in favor of continuing to be part of NATO:

Q6. While Russia is not as powerful as it was during the Cold War years, it still poses a major threat to the U.S., to its allies in Europe, and to other areas of the world as well. Russian president Vladimir Putin openly expresses regret that the Soviet Union ended and clearly has ambitions to expand Russian power. Russia has a major nuclear arsenal of over 6,000 weapons as well as major conventional military forces. Russia has occupied or invaded Ukraine on many occasions, most recently in 2022. It has also threatened Georgia. It is simply unacceptable for Russia to come to dominate Europe as it seems to want to do or to expand its power in other areas of the world as well. European countries have 1.7 million troops stationed in Europe and it’s very much in the U.S. interest to have those troops committed to the shared goal of containing Russia.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
Arizona	46%	38%	<b>84%</b>	9%	4%	<b>13%</b>	4%

GOP	44%	38%	<b>82%</b>	10%	4%	<b>14%</b>	4%
Dem.	56%	34%	<b>90%</b>	6%	1%	<b>7%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	45%	37%	<b>82%</b>	10%	4%	<b>14%</b>	4%
GOP	41%	38%	<b>78%</b>	12%	5%	<b>18%</b>	4%
Dem.	53%	34%	<b>87%</b>	8%	2%	<b>10%</b>	4%
Indep.	33%	49%	<b>82%</b>	13%	5%	<b>18%</b>	1%

Here is a counter argument:

Q7. Why exactly does the U.S. have to make this expensive commitment to defend Europe? The only real possible threat is from Russia and the idea that Russia might invade Europe is far-fetched and simply out of date. Russia has stated that it invaded Ukraine in part because it felt threatened by NATO trying to expand closer to Russia. Furthermore, Europe is far wealthier than Russia and already spends more than twice as much on its military than Russia. Why exactly do they need us? Remember, we are promising to be ready to go to war with Russia--which could well end up escalating to an all-out nuclear war--if any NATO member gets into conflict with Russia. Would we be ready to go to war over some little NATO country like Lithuania? If not, then we have no business being in this outdated alliance.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	18%	34%	<b>52%</b>	27%	18%	<b>45%</b>	3%
GOP	26%	33%	<b>59%</b>	28%	11%	<b>40%</b>	1%
Dem.	12%	30%	<b>43%</b>	26%	29%	<b>55%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	20%	35%	<b>55%</b>	24%	18%	<b>43%</b>	3%
GOP	24%	38%	<b>61%</b>	24%	12%	<b>36%</b>	3%
Dem.	18%	32%	<b>50%</b>	23%	24%	<b>48%</b>	2%
Indep.	15%	35%	<b>50%</b>	30%	19%	<b>49%</b>	1%

Here is another argument in favor of the U.S. continuing to be part of NATO:

Q8. Having U.S. and European countries tied closely together in a common bond is critical and NATO is an important means to that end. They are our primary partners in upholding principles of freedom and democracy in the world. We have a shared interest in maintaining an open trading system in the world as well as the one trillion dollars-worth of trade with Europe. Besides protecting Europe, NATO members participate in other military efforts that are important to the U.S., such as the operation in Afghanistan. Having our militaries highly integrated through the NATO structure makes such joint action more feasible and effective. NATO is not a burden on the U.S.--rather it is a partnership that allows us to share the effort to keep the world safe and prosperous.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	42%	39%	<b>81%</b>	11%	5%	<b>16%</b>	3%
GOP	39%	40%	<b>79%</b>	13%	6%	<b>19%</b>	3%
Dem.	51%	34%	<b>86%</b>	8%	2%	<b>11%</b>	4%
<b>National</b>	38%	42%	<b>80%</b>	13%	4%	<b>17%</b>	4%
GOP	29%	45%	<b>74%</b>	18%	4%	<b>22%</b>	4%

Dem.	50%	37%	<b>86%</b>	7%	2%	<b>10%</b>	4%
Indep.	30%	48%	<b>78%</b>	14%	8%	<b>22%</b>	1%

Here is a counter argument:

Q9. The ties between Europe and the U.S. are strong and multifaceted due to our shared values and interests. We can pursue those values and interests in many ways. We do not need to have a military alliance for that purpose. Having a military alliance that is clearly targeted at Russia is provocative. The fact that NATO keeps expanding by bringing in more and more countries that used to be allied with Russia, drawing closer to the Russian border, is destabilizing. Russia perceives it as a threat and as violating the understanding between the U.S. and Russia that occurred at the end of the Cold War. This sense of threat is a key reason that Putin and his aggressive stance have been elevated in Russia. If we were to phase out NATO, relations with Russia would likely improve and whatever threat is there would diminish.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	18%	34%	<b>51%</b>	25%	21%	<b>46%</b>	3%
GOP	23%	34%	<b>57%</b>	24%	15%	<b>40%</b>	4%
Dem.	16%	29%	<b>45%</b>	25%	28%	<b>53%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	17%	36%	<b>53%</b>	26%	17%	<b>44%</b>	3%
GOP	19%	39%	<b>58%</b>	25%	13%	<b>38%</b>	4%
Dem.	18%	32%	<b>50%</b>	26%	22%	<b>48%</b>	3%
Indep.	10%	39%	<b>49%</b>	32%	18%	<b>50%</b>	1%

Q10. So, how acceptable do you find the U.S. continuing to be part of the NATO military alliance, on a scale of 0-10, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable and 10=very acceptable?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	16%	19%	64%	1%
GOP	18%	18%	64%	0%
Dem.	11%	14%	74%	1%
<b>National</b>	18%	18%	63%	2%
GOP	20%	21%	57%	2%
Dem.	13%	11%	74%	1%
Indep.	27%	29%	43%	1%

Q11. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the U.S. continuing to be part of the NATO military alliance?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	80%	19%	1%
GOP	74%	26%	1%
Dem.	89%	11%	0%
<b>National</b>	78%	22%	0%
GOP	70%	30%	1%
Dem.	87%	13%	0%

Indep.	75%	25%	0%
--------	-----	-----	----

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	85%	15%	0%
	Hispanic	72%	28%	0%
Gender	Men	85%	15%	0%
	Women	75%	24%	1%
Age	18-29	75%	25%	0%
	30-49	79%	21%	1%
	50-64	78%	22%	0%
	65 or older	88%	9%	2%
Income	Less than \$50,000	71%	30%	0%
	\$50-100,000	80%	20%	0%
	\$100-150,000	84%	14%	2%
	More than \$150,000	89%	11%	1%
Education	High School or less	69%	31%	0%
	Some college	84%	15%	1%
	College degree	87%	12%	1%

Let us now turn to questions about what you think US policy should be regarding the Ukraine-Russian war. As you may know, the conflict between Russia and Ukraine started in 2014 and escalated in 2022, when the Russian government launched a full-scale attack on Ukraine.

You will have the opportunity to give your opinion on what US policy should be for the following:

- Whether the US should continue to provide military aid to Ukraine
- Whether the US should continue to provide humanitarian aid to Ukraine
- Whether the US should press Ukraine to start negotiating a peace deal with Russia

First, here is some background information about Ukraine’s relation to Russia.

Ukraine shares a border with Russia. In the 1920s, Ukraine became one of the founding republics of the Soviet Union, along with Russia. In 1991, the Soviet Union came apart. Ukraine became an independent nation recognized by the United Nations, the US and Russia.

Soon after, a number of Eastern European nations who were former members of the Soviet Union expressed interest in joining the military alliance NATO, which includes the US and many western European nations. US leaders were also encouraging them to join, while Russia was strongly opposed. In 1999 Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic became NATO members.

In 2000, Vladimir Putin became President of Russia. He expressed strong concern that nations close to Russia were forming ties with the US and Western Europe. There has been a lot of controversy over NATO expansion.



According to leaders of the Russian government, after the Soviet Union came apart, the US and other European leaders said NATO would not expand any closer to Russia.<sup>1</sup> When NATO started accepting new members the Russian government felt that promise had been broken, and that their security was at risk.

On the other side, US and Western European leaders have said they made no promise not to expand NATO closer to Russia, and that those nations chose to join NATO on their own. There is a debate among Western scholars about whether at the time the US made such promises, either implicitly or explicitly.

When NATO said that the Republic of Georgia, which is on Russia's border, could eventually become part of NATO, Russia expressed strong disapproval and increased its military presence in Georgia. This led to a military conflict.

Q12. How aware were you of these events?

	Very	Somewhat	Total Aware	Just a Little	Not at All	Total Unaware	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	42%	<b>69%</b>	21%	10%	<b>31%</b>	1%
GOP	27%	48%	<b>75%</b>	16%	10%	<b>25%</b>	0%
Dem.	29%	40%	<b>68%</b>	24%	7%	<b>31%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	24%	47%	<b>71%</b>	18%	11%	<b>28%</b>	1%
GOP	25%	48%	<b>73%</b>	18%	8%	<b>26%</b>	1%
Dem.	27%	48%	<b>75%</b>	15%	10%	<b>25%</b>	0%
Indep.	13%	42%	<b>55%</b>	24%	20%	<b>44%</b>	1%

Here is the situation with Ukraine since they became an independent nation. There has been a division within Ukraine, between those who want to increase ties with Europe, who are mainly in the western part of Ukraine, and those who want to increase ties with Russia, who are mainly in the eastern part.<sup>2</sup>

In 2013, the Ukrainian Parliament took steps toward joining the European Union. However, the President at the time blocked it. This contributed to a major political uprising in 2014. The Parliament removed the President, opening the door to moving closer to Europe.<sup>3</sup>

In response, the Russian government started amassing troops on the border of Ukraine. During this political uprising, groups in the eastern part of Ukraine that wanted to be closer to Russia overthrew their local governments, with Russian military assistance.

Majorities in two areas voted to become independent, and one area – Crimea – voted to become part of Russia. However, these votes have been widely criticized because independent observers were not allowed to witness the vote counting, and Russian and pro-Russian military forces were present at the time of voting. The Russian government then incorporated Crimea into Russia. The Ukrainian government and most countries still consider these areas to be part of Ukraine.

<sup>1</sup> George Washington University, National Security Archive. (2017) [NATO Expansion: What Gorbachev Heard](#)

<sup>2</sup> Institute of National Strategic Studies. (1995) Partnership for Peace: Guaranteeing Success, Strategic Forum 44; NATO. (1998) [Mass Public Opinion in Ukraine about NATO and NATO-Ukraine Relationships](#); Sociological Service of the Ukrainian Centre for Economic and Political Studies Olexander Razumkov (2006); Yaremenko Ukrainian Institute for Social Studies and the Social Monitoring Center. (2007); Pew Research Center. (2010) [Ukraine Says 'No' to NATO](#); PPC. (2014) [The Ukrainian People on the Current Crisis](#)

<sup>3</sup> [Rada removes Yanukovich from office, schedules new elections for May 25](#)

Since 2014, the Ukrainian government has been moving closer to Europe, which has been supported by a growing majority of the Ukrainian public.<sup>4</sup> Ukraine is moving toward becoming part of the European Union. Ukraine is also making moves toward joining NATO and has been getting military training and weapons from NATO and participating in joint military exercises.

Russia strongly opposed Ukraine moving closer to Europe and NATO and said that it threatened Russia's vital security interests. Then in February 2022, the Russian government launched a full attack on Ukraine. Russia's stated intention was to overthrow the Ukrainian government and bring Ukraine closer to Russia.

In response, the UN General Assembly condemned the attack as a violation of the UN Charter that prohibits Members from invading another state. The vote was 141 in favor and 5 opposed, with 47 abstaining or absent. China and India abstained and have not condemned the invasion.

The US and several dozen other nations have:

- placed economic sanctions on Russia, primarily by not purchasing Russian oil and making it harder for Russia to do business internationally.
- provided military assistance to the Ukrainian military, such as weapons and training.
- provided humanitarian and financial assistance.

Q13. How closely have you followed these events?

	A lot	Somewhat	Total Closely	A little	Not at All	Total Not Closely	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	41%	<b>67%</b>	23%	9%	<b>33%</b>	0%
GOP	30%	38%	<b>68%</b>	24%	8%	<b>32%</b>	0%
Dem.	28%	43%	<b>72%</b>	22%	6%	<b>28%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	27%	45%	<b>72%</b>	19%	9%	<b>27%</b>	1%
GOP	25%	49%	<b>74%</b>	19%	6%	<b>25%</b>	1%
Dem.	33%	45%	<b>78%</b>	14%	8%	<b>22%</b>	0%
Indep.	16%	36%	<b>51%</b>	32%	17%	<b>49%</b>	0%

Since the invasion, Russia has gained military control over about 15% of Ukraine. Russia has declared a large portion of the eastern part of Ukraine to now be part of Russia and has begun to incorporate those areas, for example by introducing Russian currency.

The Ukrainian military has been surprisingly successful in stopping Russian advances, as well as taking back some areas that were captured by Russia.

The US Defense Intelligence Agency estimates that the war has resulted in:

- up to 70,000 Ukrainians killed and 120,000 injured

<sup>4</sup> IRI. (2021) [Public Opinion Survey of Residents of Ukraine](#); NDI (2023) [Opportunities and Challenges Facing Ukraine's Democratic Transition](#); trendlines from multiple surveys compiled for Wikipedia: [Popular Support to EU Integration of Ukraine in Ukraine](#).

- up to 100,000 Russians killed and 200,000 injured<sup>5</sup>

The UN estimates that about 14 million Ukrainians have fled their homes (about a third of the total Ukrainian population) to get away from the battles.<sup>6</sup>

We will now turn to a key question: **whether the US should continue to provide military and other assistance to Ukraine.**

As you may know, the US has been providing the Ukrainian military: military equipment, ammunition, training and intelligence. It is difficult to put a dollar value on this assistance, as much of the military equipment provided is fairly old and used, but it is roughly some tens of billions of dollars.

European countries have been providing an equivalent amount of military assistance. Here is an argument in favor of the US continuing to provide military assistance to Ukraine:

Q14. Russia has violated the central principle of the UN Charter and international law that says that nations should not invade other nations. The US and other countries have a duty to protect nations that are attacked. If we let Russia get away with this the whole international order will be at risk. When nations failed to stop Hitler's invasion of Poland, it only encouraged him to go further. Clearly, the US, together with other nations, should uphold international law and help Ukraine.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	44%	37%	<b>81%</b>	12%	5%	<b>17%</b>	2%
GOP	42%	36%	<b>78%</b>	14%	7%	<b>21%</b>	2%
Dem.	55%	36%	<b>91%</b>	7%	1%	<b>8%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	43%	36%	<b>79%</b>	13%	6%	<b>19%</b>	2%
GOP	37%	37%	<b>74%</b>	17%	7%	<b>24%</b>	2%
Dem.	52%	34%	<b>86%</b>	9%	4%	<b>13%</b>	2%
Indep.	34%	43%	<b>77%</b>	15%	7%	<b>22%</b>	2%

Here is an argument against:

Q15. The US being involved in Ukraine is unnecessary, and risky, especially since Russia and the US have nuclear weapons. Russia has already reminded the world that it has nuclear weapons and implied it might use them before accepting defeat in Ukraine. Things could easily escalate. If the US aiding Ukraine increases the risk of nuclear war by even a small fraction, then it is not worth the US being involved in Ukraine.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	22%	35%	<b>57%</b>	26%	15%	<b>41%</b>	2%

<sup>5</sup> New York Times. (Dec 2023) [Troop Deaths and Injuries in Ukraine War Near 500,000, U.S. Officials Say](#), citing declassified U.S. Defense estimates; Reuters (Feb 2024) [U.S. intelligence assesses Ukraine war has cost Russia 315,000 casualties, citing declassified U.S. Defense estimates](#); estimates used in original questionnaire came from: Associated Press. (April 12, 2023) [Ukraine war, already with up to 354,000 casualties, likely to last past 2023 - U.S. documents](#), citing U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency "Russia/Ukraine - Assessed Combat Sustainability and Attrition."

<sup>6</sup> International Organization for Migration. (2024) Ukraine & Neighboring Countries 2022-2024: 2 Years of Response.

GOP	30%	35%	<b>65%</b>	23%	11%	<b>34%</b>	2%
Dem.	17%	33%	<b>50%</b>	29%	20%	<b>49%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	24%	36%	<b>60%</b>	24%	16%	<b>39%</b>	1%
GOP	29%	39%	<b>68%</b>	21%	10%	<b>31%</b>	1%
Dem.	21%	33%	<b>54%</b>	25%	21%	<b>46%</b>	1%
Indep.	20%	34%	<b>54%</b>	26%	19%	<b>45%</b>	1%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q16. It is important for US security, not just Europe's, for Russia not to gain territory in Europe. If they are able to take over Ukraine, this will strengthen and embolden them. If they attack a NATO member that the US is committed to defending, like the Baltic states, it could easily lead the US into an all-out war with Russia that is likely to go nuclear.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	41%	39%	<b>81%</b>	13%	6%	<b>18%</b>	1%
GOP	38%	38%	<b>76%</b>	16%	7%	<b>23%</b>	0%
Dem.	49%	38%	<b>87%</b>	9%	2%	<b>12%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	40%	40%	<b>80%</b>	14%	6%	<b>20%</b>	1%
GOP	37%	39%	<b>75%</b>	16%	8%	<b>24%</b>	1%
Dem.	48%	39%	<b>87%</b>	9%	4%	<b>12%</b>	1%
Indep.	25%	46%	<b>70%</b>	25%	5%	<b>29%</b>	0%

Here is another argument against:

Q17. The US does not need to be involved in every global problem. This war is a European problem, and they should be responsible for dealing with it. The major nations in Europe – like the U.K., Germany, and France – have advanced militaries that are providing support to Ukraine and can provide more. Furthermore, the idea that any time a nation attacks another one, the international order is going to collapse, is unnecessarily alarmist.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	24%	31%	<b>55%</b>	26%	18%	<b>44%</b>	2%
GOP	33%	29%	<b>61%</b>	23%	13%	<b>37%</b>	2%
Dem.	18%	29%	<b>46%</b>	28%	25%	<b>52%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	25%	34%	<b>59%</b>	26%	15%	<b>41%</b>	1%
GOP	32%	36%	<b>68%</b>	23%	8%	<b>31%</b>	1%
Dem.	19%	31%	<b>51%</b>	27%	23%	<b>49%</b>	1%
Indep.	18%	38%	<b>56%</b>	29%	14%	<b>44%</b>	0%

Q18. So, here again is the proposal: whether the US should continue to provide military and other assistance to Ukraine.

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	27%	19%	54%	1%
GOP	31%	22%	46%	1%
Dem.	19%	14%	66%	1%
<b>National</b>	26%	18%	55%	1%
GOP	35%	20%	43%	2%
Dem.	13%	14%	72%	1%
Indep.	37%	23%	40%	1%

Q19. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the US continuing to provide military assistance to Ukraine, including military equipment, ammunition, training and intelligence?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	66%	32%	1%
GOP	56%	43%	1%
Dem.	82%	17%	1%
<b>National</b>	67%	33%	1%
GOP	57%	42%	1%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Indep.	59%	41%	0%

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	74%	26%	0%
	Hispanic	56%	41%	3%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	73%	27%	0%
	Women	60%	38%	3%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	66%	34%	1%
	30-49	61%	38%	1%
	50-64	66%	32%	2%
	65 or older	75%	23%	2%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	59%	41%	0%
	\$50-100,000	69%	31%	0%
	\$100-150,000	69%	27%	4%
	More than \$150,000	71%	27%	2%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	59%	39%	2%
	Some college	68%	30%	2%
	College degree	74%	26%	0%

Both the US and European countries have also been giving Ukraine humanitarian aid, including providing food and shelter, and helping them repair access to water and electricity. So far, the US has given about \$48 billion in such assistance.<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>7</sup> CRS. (2023) [Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs \(SFOPS\) Supplemental Funding for Ukraine: In Brief](#): FY22 and FY23 Economic Support Fund; International Disaster Assistance; Migration and Refugee Assistance; in addition to the recently passed aid package, which included \$9 billion in new humanitarian assistance.

Europeans have contributed an equivalent amount and have also accepted about 4 million Ukrainian refugees into their countries.<sup>8</sup>

Q20. Another proposal is for the US to continue giving humanitarian assistance to Ukraine.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	23%	15%	60%	3%
GOP	30%	14%	55%	2%
Dem.	14%	14%	69%	3%
<b>National</b>	23%	15%	59%	3%
GOP	28%	17%	51%	4%
Dem.	15%	12%	70%	3%
Indep.	28%	21%	50%	1%

Q21. Do you favor or oppose the US continuing to give humanitarian assistance to Ukraine?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	73%	25%	2%
GOP	64%	34%	2%
Dem.	86%	14%	1%
<b>National</b>	74%	26%	1%
GOP	65%	35%	1%
Dem.	84%	15%	0%
Indep.	69%	31%	0%

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	79%	21%	0%
	Hispanic	63%	33%	5%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	81%	18%	1%
	Women	66%	31%	3%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	69%	29%	3%
	30-49	66%	32%	2%
	50-64	74%	25%	2%
	65 or older	87%	12%	2%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	65%	33%	2%
	\$50-100,000	75%	24%	1%
	\$100-150,000	78%	18%	4%
	More than \$150,000	79%	22%	0%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	63%	34%	3%
	Some college	76%	21%	3%
	College degree	84%	16%	0%

<sup>8</sup> Council of the European Union. (2024). [Refugees from Ukraine in the EU](#)

Now we are going to turn to policies about using nuclear weapons. As you may know, only the President has the authority to order the launch of nuclear weapons and he is not required to consult with or get approval from Congress. A proposal has been put forward to change that:

**The President would still have the authority to use nuclear weapons in response to the launch of a nuclear strike against the U.S. or an ally.**

**But, to use nuclear weapons first, the President would first have to consult Congress and Congress would have to issue a declaration of war on the country the U.S. would be attacking with nuclear weapons.**

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q22. The choice to start a nuclear war is the most significant decision any president can make. No individual, particularly one who would likely be under tremendous stress, should be able to make this decision alone, except in the event of a nuclear attack on the country, when particularly swift decision-making might be necessary. The Founders entrusted the decision to go to war to Congress, not to the president acting alone. Initiating nuclear hostilities is certainly an act of war and should require Congressional consent.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	48%	34%	<b>82%</b>	11%	5%	<b>16%</b>	2%
GOP	48%	34%	<b>82%</b>	12%	5%	<b>17%</b>	1%
Dem.	53%	32%	<b>85%</b>	9%	3%	<b>12%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	41%	40%	<b>81%</b>	13%	5%	<b>17%</b>	2%
GOP	39%	38%	<b>77%</b>	15%	6%	<b>21%</b>	2%
Dem.	42%	43%	<b>84%</b>	10%	3%	<b>14%</b>	2%
Indep.	42%	40%	<b>81%</b>	14%	4%	<b>18%</b>	1%

Here is an argument against:

Q23. The Constitution states that the President is the Commander in Chief and he clearly has the authority to use military force to defend the nation from attack. The last time Congress formally declared war was during World War II. If Congress imposes this requirement on the President, that would make it extremely hard to get the necessary approval, so potential adversaries might no longer believe that the United States would use nuclear weapons in response to a major non-nuclear attack. That could weaken deterrence and be very dangerous.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>Arizona</b>	21%	39%	<b>59%</b>	26%	13%	<b>39%</b>	2%
GOP	25%	42%	<b>67%</b>	21%	10%	<b>31%</b>	3%
Dem.	20%	33%	<b>53%</b>	28%	17%	<b>45%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	24%	41%	<b>66%</b>	22%	11%	<b>33%</b>	1%
GOP	28%	40%	<b>68%</b>	20%	9%	<b>30%</b>	2%

Dem.	25%	42%	<b>66%</b>	22%	11%	<b>33%</b>	1%
Indep.	12%	44%	<b>56%</b>	30%	14%	<b>44%</b>	1%

Q24. So, here again is the proposal:

Congress passing a law that says:

- the President would still have the sole authority to order the use of nuclear weapons in response to a nuclear attack.
- to use nuclear weapons first, the President would first have to consult Congress and Congress would have to issue a declaration of war on the country to be attacked with nuclear weapons.

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	23%	18%	57%	1%
GOP	27%	19%	54%	1%
Dem.	16%	16%	67%	2%
<b>National</b>	24%	18%	57%	1%
GOP	24%	18%	56%	2%
Dem.	20%	16%	63%	1%
Indep.	33%	26%	40%	1%

Q25. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	70%	29%	1%
GOP	68%	32%	0%
Dem.	79%	20%	1%
<b>National</b>	69%	31%	1%
GOP	67%	33%	1%
Dem.	73%	27%	1%
Indep.	63%	36%	1%

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	77%	23%	0%
	Hispanic	61%	37%	2%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	74%	26%	0%
	Women	65%	33%	2%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	67%	32%	1%
	30-49	65%	34%	1%
	50-64	73%	27%	0%
	65 or older	76%	22%	2%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	60%	39%	1%
	\$50-100,000	74%	26%	0%
	\$100-150,000	74%	22%	4%



	More than \$150,000	74%	26%	0%
Education	High School or less	70%	29%	1%
	Some college	72%	26%	2%
	College degree	74%	27%	0%

Now we are going to turn to US policy for testing nuclear weapons.

Testing means to actually explode a nuclear weapon to make sure it works as intended. Here is some background.

Between 1942 and the mid-1990s, about two thousand nuclear tests were conducted across the world, mostly by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. In the early 1990s, the United States decided that it did not need to develop any more kinds of nuclear weapons, and that its priority should be convincing other countries not to test in order to acquire nuclear weapons or pursue more advanced nuclear weapons than they already had.

The U.S. adopted a moratorium on testing nuclear weapons. In the mid-1990s, most of the countries in the world signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which completely banned all nuclear tests. Preventing testing makes it very hard for countries to develop new warheads.

A global monitoring system was put in place to watch for evidence of nuclear explosions and report to the global community. Three countries with nuclear weapons--India, Pakistan, and Israel--did not sign it and later North Korea withdrew.

The U.S. signed the Treaty, but the Senate did not ratify it. A few other countries did not ratify it as well or have reversed their ratification. So, the Treaty is not officially in force. But the global monitoring system remained in place.

More significantly, since the late 1990s all countries but one have abided by a moratorium on testing, meaning they have all stopped testing nuclear weapons for the last two decades, and show no intention of breaking the moratorium. The one exception is North Korea, which has conducted several tests recently.

The U.S. has continued to abide by the moratorium, though it has said that it would reserve the right to resume testing if it is needed to assure the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons. To date, U.S. officials have assessed that there is no need for testing for those purposes.

The current administration has said that it will continue to abide by the moratorium.

Q26. How acceptable do you find the US continuing to abide by the moratorium on nuclear testing?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	16%	25%	59%	1%
GOP	18%	25%	56%	1%
Dem.	11%	19%	70%	1%
<b>National</b>	15%	20%	64%	0%
GOP	18%	23%	59%	1%

Dem.	11%	16%	73%	0%
Indep.	21%	24%	55%	0%

Q27. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the U.S. continuing to abide by the moratorium on nuclear testing?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
<b>Arizona</b>	74%	25%	2%
GOP	68%	31%	1%
Dem.	82%	17%	1%
<b>National</b>	75%	25%	1%
GOP	72%	28%	0%
Dem.	80%	20%	0%
Indep.	69%	29%	2%

Demographic Results for Arizona				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<b>Race</b>	White	77%	22%	1%
	Hispanic	70%	27%	3%
<b>Gender</b>	Men	77%	22%	1%
	Women	71%	27%	2%
<b>Age</b>	18-29	64%	33%	3%
	30-49	74%	26%	1%
	50-64	77%	23%	0%
	65 or older	80%	17%	4%
<b>Income</b>	Less than \$50,000	66%	33%	2%
	\$50-100,000	78%	21%	1%
	\$100-150,000	78%	19%	4%
	More than \$150,000	75%	23%	1%
<b>Education</b>	High School or less	69%	29%	2%
	Some college	74%	24%	3%
	College degree	82%	18%	1%

---

Thank you for taking this policymaking simulation. We greatly appreciate the time and thought you have put into this survey, and we hope you found it both enjoyable and informative.

## Methodology

### Fielding and Sample Size

The Arizona survey was fielded online July 19th through August 2nd, 2024 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with a representative non-probability sample of 607 adults in Arizona. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.5%. The response rate was 3.4%.

### Pre-Stratification and Weighting

The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, metro/non-metro status, marital status and home ownership, using benchmarks from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. The maximum weight applied was 4.5.

### Sample Collection

Sample collection was managed by QuantifyAI with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

### Data Collection and Privacy

Survey responses were collected directly on the Alchemer platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer or mobile phone.

Alchemer ensures that data is collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

### Quality Control

Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey to disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.