



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION  
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

## ASSESSING THE IRAN DEAL

Conducted by the Program for Public Consultation, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland

Field Dates: August 17 – August 20, 2015

### NATIONAL SAMPLE

Total sample size: 702

Margin of error: +/-3.7%

---

As you may know in the United States these days there is a debate about what should be done about Iran’s nuclear program. This is a challenging issue for U.S. policymakers. You may also have heard that the permanent members of the UN Security Council (which includes the United States, France, Britain, China and Russia) plus Germany, recently completed a deal with Iran about its nuclear program.

Congress is now in the process of reviewing this deal. We would like to know your recommendation about what your Members of Congress should do. But first we need to give you some background about the negotiations and the terms of the deal. You will get to assess critiques of the deal and rebuttals to those critiques.

Finally, we will ask you make your own recommendations on what should be done.

If at any time you find that you do not want to answer a question feel free to skip it and move on to the next one.

### BRIEFING

So, let’s start with some background. As you may know the US, Iran, and most other countries are members of the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty that aims to prevent new countries from acquiring nuclear weapons.

[Q1.] How much have you heard about the Non-Proliferation Treaty or NPT?

	Nothing at all	Just a little	Some	A lot	Refused/ Don’t know
<b>National</b>	16	33	39	12	<1
<b>  </b> GOP	11	33	42	14	
<b>  </b> Dem.	20	34	34	12	
<b>  </b> Indep.	17	30	43	9	1

In the NPT, all members that did not already have nuclear weapons agreed not to develop them. Iran is one of those members that has agreed not to develop nuclear weapons.

[Q2.] Did you know that Iran, as a member of the NPT, has agreed to not develop a nuclear weapon, or had you not heard this?

	<u>I knew this</u>	<u>I had not heard this</u>	<u>Refused/ Don't know</u>
<b>National</b>	58	42	<1
GOP	59	41	
Dem.	55	45	
Indep.	62	38	1

As a Member of the NPT, Iran can have a nuclear energy program. However, the NPT requires that Iran provide information about its nuclear energy programs and allow inspections by a UN agency called the IAEA, to ensure that it is not trying to develop nuclear weapons.

A sensitive issue arises when a country enriches uranium. Enriched uranium can be used for producing nuclear energy, but can also be used for developing nuclear weapons. For the purposes of nuclear energy, it is only necessary to enrich uranium to the level just under 5%. For nuclear weapons, it is usually necessary to enrich it to around 90%.

One of the key purposes of IAEA inspections is to ensure that the enrichment being done by non-nuclear weapons states is only for peaceful purposes.

In 2002, the IAEA determined that Iran had been building an enrichment facility without telling the IAEA, and doing some other activities that might be related to developing nuclear weapons. The IAEA did not conclude that Iran was trying to produce nuclear weapons, but its secrecy raised questions about Iran's intentions.

During negotiations with three European countries in 2003, Iran temporarily suspended enrichment-related activities and worked with the IAEA to resolve these suspicions. However, when these negotiations did not produce a final agreement, in 2006, Iran resumed its enrichment and reduced cooperation with the IAEA.

In 2006, the UN Security Council subsequently demanded that Iran suspend its uranium enrichment activities for a period. Iran refused, saying that it has a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes under the NPT. The UN Security Council then imposed some economic sanctions on Iran and Iran reduced its cooperation the IAEA.

The US imposed additional sanctions on Iran. However, since the US stopped virtually all its trade with Iran some time ago, the only way that it has been able to impose new sanctions is by getting other countries to stop doing business with Iran. This means that the US has needed to threaten these other countries with penalties. As a result, many countries have reduced their business relations with Iran.

Despite the sanctions, Iran persisted in enriching uranium and substantially increased its capacity to do so.

In February 2013, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (including the US), the European Union and Germany, entered into a new round of negotiations with Iran.

As you may have heard, on July 14 the parties announced the completion of a comprehensive deal. The UN Security Council endorsed the deal on July 20.

Congress is now in the process of deciding whether it will approve the deal. This is the question we will be asking you to weigh in on.

First: Here are the main components of the deal.

Among other things, Iran has agreed to:

- Recommit to never build a nuclear weapon.
- Limit its uranium enrichment below the 3.67 percent level for 15 years, making the uranium only useful for nuclear energy. After 15 years they will be able to enrich to a higher level, such as for medical purposes, but not to develop a military capability.
- Deeply reduce its stockpile of low-enriched uranium--cutting it by 98 percent--for 15 years.
- Reduce its number of centrifuges (the devices that enrich uranium) by two-thirds--keeping only its older and slower centrifuge models--for 10 years. The other centrifuges will go into storage monitored by the IAEA.
- Allow intrusive inspections of all declared nuclear facilities, which will be permanent.
- Allow inspection of any site, including military bases, where inspectors have evidence of suspicious activity. Iran could appeal to a council that includes all the countries that signed the agreement and seek to explain the suspicious activity, whereupon the council will decide, by majority rule, whether the inspections will proceed. The process of making this decision cannot take more than 24 days.

In exchange, the UN and the EU will lift their nuclear-related sanctions on Iran and the US will suspend its nuclear-related sanctions, after verification that Iran has fulfilled its requirements. If Iran is found to be in violation of the agreement the sanctions against Iran will 'snap back' and be reimposed. If Iran complies fully with its obligation for eight years, then Congress will consider whether or not the US nuclear-related sanctions should be permanently lifted.

[Q3a.] Based on what you have heard so far, how would you feel if Congress were to APPROVE of this international agreement that limits Iran’s capacity to enrich uranium to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, requires it to accept intrusive inspections, and lifts sanctions on Iran once it deeply reduces its stockpile of enriched uranium and its number of operating centrifuges? Would this be:

	Not acceptable (0-4)	Just tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
<b>National</b>	39	16	45	1	5.1
GOP	59	16	24	2	3.3
Dem.	21	19	60		6.5
Indep.	36	11	52	1	5.3

[Q3b]

How would you feel if Congress were to NOT APPROVE of this international agreement? Would this be:

	Not acceptable (0-4)	Just tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
<b>National</b>	40	12	47	1	5.6
GOP	17	12	71		7.6
Dem.	59	12	28	1	3.9
Indep.	47	13	39	1	5.0

## GENERAL CRITIQUES

There are a number of debates about the deal with Iran. We are now going to ask you to evaluate a number of general critiques of the deal with Iran. In each case you will then be asked to evaluate a counter argument. For each argument please select how convincing or unconvincing you find it.

[Q4.] One of these debates is over whether we should even make any deal with Iran. Here is an argument *against the* idea of dealing with Iran:

The whole idea of making a deal with Iran is misguided. Iran is fundamentally hostile to the United States, with Iranians regularly chanting ‘Death to America.’ Iranian leaders also endorse the elimination of Israel. They support terrorist groups and seek to dominate the Middle East. Iran has shown that it is unreliable and dishonest: it has violated arms control agreements in the past. We simply can’t trust Iran’s government. Making a deal with it treats them like they are a legitimate country, which they are not.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	41	28	<b>69</b>	15	15	<b>30</b>	2
GOP	63	23	<b>86</b>	7	4	<b>11</b>	3
Dem.	24	25	<b>49</b>	23	27	<b>50</b>	2
Indep.	33	39	<b>72</b>	12	15	<b>27</b>	1

[Q5.] Here is a rebuttal:

Regardless of how we feel about Iran, a diplomatic agreement with tight restrictions and tough inspections is the best available approach. We have been tightening sanctions for years now and yet Iran has not given up enriching uranium. Bombing Iran’s nuclear facilities would just lead Iran to kick out the IAEA inspectors and rebuild the program underground. Invading and occupying is completely unrealistic given that Iran is a huge country, with a substantial military, and a large population that would likely be very hostile. Given that the Iranian government has reached an agreement with our negotiators that is based on a commitment not to build nuclear weapons, we should give this option a chance. Making a deal with them does not mean we trust them—it means having intrusive inspections to verify that they are respecting the limits they agreed to and are not building a nuclear weapon.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	28	35	<b>63</b>	15	20	<b>35</b>	2
GOP	11	35	<b>46</b>	21	31	<b>52</b>	2
Dem.	46	34	<b>80</b>	11	7	<b>18</b>	2
Indep.	27	38	<b>65</b>	13	21	<b>34</b>	1

[Q6.] Another debate is about whether the deal will increase or reduce the chances that Iran will end up with a nuclear weapon. Here is an argument saying that it *will* increase the chances:

This deal *increases* the chance that Iran will end up with a nuclear weapon. The deal does not fully remove Iran’s capacity to develop nuclear weapons. Most of the centrifuges will simply be stored away. More important, limiting Iran’s enrichment to the 3.67% level does not mean that its progress toward a nuclear weapon will be completely stopped. They will be able to continually refine their know-how on enrichment and do other types of research and development. After eight and a half years they will also be able to produce some more advanced centrifuges. Thus, should Iran decide to break out of the agreement, it will be able to simply kick out the UN inspectors, restart its centrifuges and move toward getting a nuclear weapon even faster than it could now.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	38	30	<b>68</b>	18	12	<b>30</b>	3
GOP	57	27	<b>84</b>	9	4	<b>13</b>	4
Dem.	23	34	<b>57</b>	26	16	<b>42</b>	1
Indep.	31	29	<b>60</b>	20	16	<b>36</b>	5

[Q7.] Here is a rebuttal:

This deal *reduces* the chances that Iran will end up with a nuclear weapon. It puts in place a permanent intrusive inspection regime so we will know exactly what the Iranians are doing, and it blocks all their paths to a nuclear weapon. It reduces their stockpile of enriched uranium by 98% and their number of centrifuges by two-thirds. If Iran sticks with the deal, we'll know they aren't making a nuclear weapon. If they try to break out of the deal, with more intrusive inspections, we will have much better means to spot it immediately, and it will be so completely clear that we will be better able to mobilize the world against them. Either way we come out ahead of where we are now.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	25	31	<b>56</b>	17	24	<b>41</b>	2
GOP	12	25	<b>37</b>	25	37	<b>62</b>	2
Dem.	42	35	<b>77</b>	9	11	<b>20</b>	2
Indep.	18	35	<b>53</b>	18	25	<b>43</b>	5

[Q8.] Another debate is about whether the US should hold out for a better deal with Iran. Here is an argument saying that it *should* have:

Surely, the US could have gotten a better deal. When the deal was reported in Tehran, people were cheering in the streets. Clearly they feel that they got the better of us and were relieved at the possibility of the sanctions coming off. They need this deal more than we do. If we had simply walked away from the table the Iranians would have begged us to come back, and they would have been ready to make more concessions.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	23	31	<b>54</b>	24	20	<b>44</b>	2
GOP	35	37	<b>72</b>	15	10	<b>25</b>	4
Dem.	13	26	<b>39</b>	32	28	<b>60</b>	<1
Indep.	21	29	<b>50</b>	24	23	<b>47</b>	2

[Q9.] Here is a rebuttal:

It is always an appealing fantasy that with a little more pressure one could get a better deal. In Tehran, some Iranians are also complaining that Iran could have gotten a better deal. Though many average people in Tehran were cheering, the hardliners were not happy with the deal and the Supreme Leader seems to have come around only begrudgingly. When we put more pressure on them in earlier negotiations, they did not come back with more concessions, but rather, greatly accelerated their nuclear program.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	21	34	<b>55</b>	23	20	<b>43</b>	1
GOP	6	33	<b>39</b>	31	28	<b>59</b>	2
Dem.	37	38	<b>75</b>	15	10	<b>25</b>	1
Indep.	19	31	<b>50</b>	25	24	<b>49</b>	2

## CRITIQUES OF SPECIFICS

[Q10.] Now we are going to evaluate a number of critiques about the specifics of the deal. Here is one of those arguments:

The deal allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium. It should require that Iran give up all of its capacity for enrichment. Iran has shown that it cannot be trusted with this capability. Letting Iran have the capacity to enrich leaves it in a position to break out of the deal and race for a nuclear weapon.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	40	28	<b>68</b>	20	10	<b>30</b>	2
GOP	60	24	<b>84</b>	12	2	<b>14</b>	2
Dem.	26	32	<b>58</b>	25	17	<b>42</b>	1
Indep.	35	30	<b>65</b>	23	9	<b>32</b>	2

[Q11.] Here is a rebuttal:

Getting Iran to commit to limit its enrichment is the only reasonable goal. As a Member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran has agreed not to have nuclear weapons, but it never agreed not to enrich uranium. The Treaty even recognizes all nations' right to a nuclear energy program. We would never let other countries tell us whether or not we can make our own nuclear fuel.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	29	32	<b>61</b>	19	19	<b>38</b>	1
<b>GOP</b>	14	32	<b>46</b>	23	30	<b>53</b>	1
<b>Dem.</b>	45	30	<b>75</b>	16	8	<b>24</b>	1
<b>Indep.</b>	27	34	<b>61</b>	17	21	<b>38</b>	2

[Q12.] Here is another critique:

While the deal does allow us to continuously monitor nuclear sites, it does not provide anytime/anywhere access to other sites such as military installations. We can demand to inspect those sites if we see suspicious activities, but Iran can ask for hearings where it can argue that it is not really necessary. We can ultimately gain access, but the whole process can take up to 24 days, and meanwhile Iran could hide their illegal activities. While some illegal nuclear activities can be detected, others cannot.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	48	31	<b>79</b>	12	8	<b>20</b>	2
<b>GOP</b>	64	25	<b>89</b>	6	2	<b>8</b>	3
<b>Dem.</b>	33	38	<b>71</b>	18	12	<b>30</b>	<1
<b>Indep.</b>	47	29	<b>76</b>	13	9	<b>22</b>	2

[Q13.] Here is a rebuttal:

It will be very hard for Iran to cheat without being caught. In addition to continuously monitoring nuclear sites, we will be able to monitor activities throughout the country with resources on the ground and by satellite. If we see suspicious activities we can demand access anywhere. Even if Iran holds up the process a few weeks we will continue to observe the site closely during that period. Further, it's not possible to remove all signs of nuclear activities. For example, Geiger counters can detect whether any significant nuclear materials were in the area at any time in the previous several months.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	21	32	<b>53</b>	21	26	<b>47</b>	1
<b>GOP</b>	7	27	<b>34</b>	26	38	<b>64</b>	2
<b>Dem.</b>	37	34	<b>71</b>	15	13	<b>28</b>	
<b>Indep.</b>	16	34	<b>50</b>	20	28	<b>48</b>	2



[Q14.] Here is another critique:

After 10-15 years most of the special limits on Iran’s nuclear activities will go away. Iran will be able to increase its stockpile of enriched uranium, increase its numbers of centrifuges and enrich above the 3.67% limit. Clearly, Iran will then be in a position to break out of the agreement and build a nuclear weapon quickly. They will just have to bide their time for awhile and eventually their day will come.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	42	30	<b>72</b>	15	11	<b>26</b>	2
GOP	62	25	<b>87</b>	6	4	<b>10</b>	3
Dem.	27	33	<b>60</b>	22	17	<b>39</b>	1
Indep.	35	31	<b>66</b>	19	13	<b>32</b>	2

[Q15.] Here is a rebuttal:

It is true that if after 10 years Iran has complied with the terms of the agreement, it will be able to have the same civilian nuclear programs as other members of the NPT Treaty without nuclear weapons. However, the intrusive inspections will stay in place and Iran will still be committed to not building a nuclear weapon. After 15 years of intrusive inspections of all aspects of Iran’s nuclear program--from its uranium mines through to its centrifuges--we will have a good handle on the situation and be able to detect unusual activities if Iran were to decide to break out of the NPT and pursue a nuclear weapon. We will be in a good position--much better than now--to intervene in whatever way we see fit. Nothing in the agreement would prevent us from taking whatever steps we deem necessary to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	20	31	<b>51</b>	24	23	<b>47</b>	2
GOP	7	23	<b>30</b>	32	37	<b>69</b>	2
Dem.	35	36	<b>71</b>	16	12	<b>28</b>	1
Indep.	17	34	<b>51</b>	25	22	<b>47</b>	2

[Q16.] Here is another critique:

The deal calls for removing the sanctions on Iran, which will make about \$100 billion of frozen Iranian funds available to the Iranian government. Iran will be able to use this money to strengthen its military, pursue its destabilizing activities in the Middle East and support terrorist groups. That’s why allies in the region are worried about this deal. Thus, this deal will hurt our friends and help our enemies. It will also strengthen

Iran's economy which will help them withstand future sanctions if they decide to breakout and go after a nuclear weapon.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	51	25	<b>76</b>	13	8	<b>21</b>	3
GOP	71	16	<b>87</b>	5	3	<b>8</b>	4
Dem.	34	33	<b>67</b>	18	14	<b>32</b>	1
Indep.	48	27	<b>75</b>	16	8	<b>24</b>	2

[Q17.] Here is a rebuttal:

Even though some of the funds that are unfrozen may be used in support of the kinds of activities that make Iran a problem for the US, a recent CIA assessment concluded that most of the money from frozen assets will be used to shore up Iran's economy. Iran only spends 3% of its GDP on defense, so it is unlikely to treat this money differently. Furthermore, surveys show that the Iranian public is expecting to see some immediate positive economic results from the deal, so President Rouhani will probably have to try to deliver on that promise.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	17	34	<b>51</b>	22	25	<b>47</b>	1
GOP	4	27	<b>31</b>	29	38	<b>67</b>	2
Dem.	33	35	<b>68</b>	21	10	<b>31</b>	<1
Indep.	12	43	<b>55</b>	15	28	<b>43</b>	2

## EVALUATING ALTERNATIVES

Now we would like you to consider some alternatives to approving of the deal with Iran.

[Q18.] Here is the first one:

The US Congress should reject the current deal with Iran and instead insist on getting Iran to give up its enrichment program entirely. We should stick with sanctions and ratchet them up higher, not just on Iran, but also on other countries that are doing business with Iran. We can see they are working. The Iranian economy is suffering and the Iranian people have had enough. That is why they elected a new president that was willing to come to the table. Eventually, the Iranian people will get tired of the economic pain that comes from the sanctions, and this will lead them to demand that Iran fully give up its enrichment program. We

should stick with the sanctions until Iran gives up enrichment entirely and permanently, and allows inspectors in on our terms.

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>National</b>	33	30	<b>63</b>	18	18	<b>36</b>	1
GOP	43	39	<b>82</b>	11	5	<b>16</b>	2
Dem.	21	24	<b>45</b>	25	29	<b>54</b>	2
Indep.	35	26	<b>61</b>	18	20	<b>38</b>	1

[Q19.] Here is a critique of this proposal:

Because the US has already stopped its trade with Iran, the only way Congress has been able to impose new sanctions is by threatening other countries, some of them allies, with sanctions unless they stop their business relations with Iran. Sometimes, we have actually punished their companies with fines. Many countries resent this. Cutting off trade with Iran hurts other countries' economies and they do not like being pushed around. This harms our relations with other countries, including friends and allies. We need to face the fact that, whether we like it or not, our allies and other Members of the UN Security Council have signed the deal with Iran. The idea that the US is going to get other countries to go along with its plan for Iran by threatening not to do business with them is just not going to work.

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>National</b>	28	34	<b>62</b>	21	17	<b>38</b>	1
GOP	15	33	<b>48</b>	27	23	<b>50</b>	1
Dem.	43	27	<b>70</b>	18	10	<b>28</b>	1
Indep.	21	44	<b>65</b>	16	18	<b>34</b>	1

[Q20.] If the US reverses its support for the deal with Iran and threatens to impose sanctions on countries that do business with Iran, how likely do you think it is that most countries will agree not to do business with Iran?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Not very likely	Not at all Likely	Not very/not at all likely	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	15	44	<b>59</b>	34	6	<b>40</b>	<1
GOP	12	56	<b>68</b>	30	2	<b>32</b>	
Dem.	17	38	<b>55</b>	36	8	<b>44</b>	<1
Indep.	17	36	<b>53</b>	36	9	<b>45</b>	1

[Q21.] Here is another alternative proposal:

The US Congress should reject the nuclear deal with Iran and do whatever it can to keep sanctions in place. Congress should tell the administration to try to renew negotiations with Iran so as to get better terms. Negotiators would then seek to get even tighter limits on Iran’s enrichment activities, to extend time limits on the terms of the deal, and to ensure that IAEA inspectors have true anytime/anywhere inspections. Sanctions on Iran would remain in place or tightened further until a better deal is reached. With the threat of continued or increased sanctions and a greater resolve in the negotiations we will be effective in extracting more concessions.

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>National</b>	28	31	<b>59</b>	22	17	<b>39</b>	2
GOP	38	42	<b>80</b>	15	3	<b>18</b>	3
Dem.	20	21	<b>41</b>	28	30	<b>58</b>	<1
Indep.	25	30	<b>55</b>	25	18	<b>43</b>	2

[Q22.] Here is a critique of this proposal:

This proposal is simply unrealistic. It is extremely unlikely that the other permanent Members of the UN Security Council, especially China and Russia, after years of negotiations, would simply abandon the existing deal and reopen negotiations with Iran because the US changed its mind. It is equally unlikely that Iran would agree to reopen negotiations or would be willing to show any greater flexibility. Other countries that are already gearing up to do business with Iran are unlikely to want to reverse course because the US changed its mind. Many countries would be annoyed with the US. The most likely scenario is that the sanctions against

Iran would simply fall apart, and the US and its allies would be divided. In the end, Iran would be less constrained than it is now and much less constrained than it would be under the deal.

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>National</b>	33	34	<b>67</b>	21	11	<b>32</b>	2
<b>GOP</b>	19	39	<b>58</b>	29	12	<b>41</b>	2
<b>Dem.</b>	50	26	<b>76</b>	14	9	<b>23</b>	2
<b>Indep.</b>	28	37	<b>65</b>	18	14	<b>32</b>	2

[Q23.] How likely do you think it is that the other permanent Members of the UN Security Council and Germany would agree to abandon the existing deal with Iran and return to negotiations with Iran, seeking better terms?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Not very likely	Not at all Likely	Not very/not at all likely	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	9	35	<b>44</b>	40	14	<b>54</b>	1
<b>GOP</b>	5	46	<b>51</b>	42	7	<b>49</b>	
<b>Dem.</b>	11	25	<b>36</b>	40	21	<b>61</b>	3
<b>Indep.</b>	12	34	<b>46</b>	38	15	<b>53</b>	1

[Q24.] How likely do you think it is that Iran would agree to return to negotiations and would agree to make more concessions?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Not very likely	Not at all Likely	Not very/not at all likely	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	5	16	<b>21</b>	46	33	<b>79</b>	1
<b>GOP</b>	3	17	<b>20</b>	54	26	<b>80</b>	
<b>Dem.</b>	5	15	<b>20</b>	43	36	<b>79</b>	1
<b>Indep.</b>	6	15	<b>21</b>	40	38	<b>78</b>	1

[Q25.] Here is another alternative proposal:

The US Congress should reject the deal with Iran. Rather, the US should use its military power as a means of assuring that Iran gives up its enrichment program and any possibility of acquiring nuclear weapons. First, we should threaten them with military strikes against those nuclear sites unless they agree to give up their program and allow full inspections on our terms for an indefinite period. If they do not agree, we should proceed to strike those sites. If they still do not agree and start to move their nuclear facilities underground, we need to be ready to escalate our military attacks further until they relent. Military conflict with Iran would not be a good thing for the US, but a nuclear-armed Iran would be worse.

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>National</b>	14	32	<b>46</b>	17	35	<b>52</b>	2
GOP	14	45	<b>59</b>	22	17	<b>39</b>	2
Dem.	12	24	<b>36</b>	12	52	<b>64</b>	1
Indep.	18	27	<b>45</b>	19	35	<b>54</b>	2

[Q26.] Here is a critique of this proposal:

This is an extremely dangerous idea. The chances that Iran will capitulate in the face of military threats are low. Iran is noted for its determination. When Iraq attacked and moved into Iran with superior military power in 1980, Iran fought back hard, suffered millions of casualties and regained all its territory. If we attack Iran's nuclear sites they are unlikely to capitulate. They will surely rebuild those facilities underground, and most likely with the determination to build a nuclear weapon to defend themselves. At that point our only options would be to accept their building a nuclear weapon, or invade the country. Since Iran is more than twice the size of Iraq, this would be extraordinarily difficult and costly, and chances are that the US would be pretty much by itself in this effort. Surely, it makes more sense to first try and see if we can make the current deal with Iran work out.

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>National</b>	38	34	<b>72</b>	17	9	<b>26</b>	1
GOP	25	42	<b>67</b>	24	9	<b>33</b>	1
Dem.	54	25	<b>79</b>	15	6	<b>21</b>	2
Indep.	34	38	<b>72</b>	12	15	<b>27</b>	2

[Q27.] If the US were to threaten to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities how likely do you think it is that Iran would agree to give up its enrichment program and allow anytime/anywhere inspections?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Not very likely	Not at all Likely	Not very/not at all likely	Refused / Don't know
<b>National</b>	5	13	<b>18</b>	42	39	<b>81</b>	<1
GOP	7	19	<b>26</b>	47	27	<b>74</b>	
Dem.	3	10	<b>13</b>	36	51	<b>87</b>	
Indep.	6	9	<b>15</b>	45	41	<b>86</b>	1

[Q28.] Now, having assessed these alternatives, let’s come back to the deal that the US and the other permanent members of the UN Security Council have made with Iran that limits Iran’s capacity to enrich uranium to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, requires it to accept intrusive inspections, and lifts sanctions on Iran once it deeply reduces its stockpile of enriched uranium and its number of operating centrifuges.

How would you feel if Congress were to APPROVE of this international agreement? Would this be:

	Not acceptable (0-4)	Just tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
<b>National</b>	36	17	46	1	5.3
GOP	56	20	24		3.6
Dem.	22	14	62	2	6.6
Indep.	29	18	53	1	5.7

[Q29.] How would you feel if Congress **were to NOT APPROVE** this international agreement with Iran?

	Not acceptable (0-4)	Just tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
<b>National</b>	42	16	42	1	5.1
GOP	21	16	63	1	7.0
Dem.	62	15	23		3.5
Indep.	42	19	39	1	4.9

## FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Q30. So, now, finally, we would like to know what you think would be best. Would you recommend that your Members of Congress APPROVE or NOT APPROVE the agreement that limits Iran’s capacity to enrich uranium to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, requires it to accept intrusive inspections, and lifts sanctions on Iran once it deeply reduces its stockpile of enriched uranium and its number of operating centrifuges?

	Approve	Not Approve	Refused/ Don’t know
<b>National</b>	52	47	1
GOP	30	69	1
Dem.	69	32	
Indep.	60	39	1

### [FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT APPROVE:]

[Q31.] Of the following options which do you think would be best:

- The US should stick with sanctions and ratchet them up higher, not just on Iran, but on other countries that are doing business with Iran, until Iran gives up enrichment entirely and permanently, and allows inspectors in on our terms.
- Congress should tell the administration to try to renew negotiations with Iran so as to get better terms. The administration should then try to get Iran to return to the table and renegotiate.
- The US should threaten Iran with military strikes against those nuclear sites unless they agree to give up their program and allow full inspections on our terms for an indefinite period. If they do not agree, we should proceed to strike those sites. If they still do not agree and start to move their nuclear facilities underground, we need to be ready to escalate our military attacks further until they relent.

Or you can reconsider the option to:

- Have Congress approve of the existing UN Security Council deal with Iran that limits Iran’s capacity to enrich uranium to the low level necessary for nuclear energy, requires it to accept intrusive inspections, and lifts sanctions on Iran once it deeply reduces its stockpile of enriched uranium and its number of operating centrifuges.

	Selected A	Selected B	Selected C	Selected D	Don’t know
<b>National</b>	23	14	7	3	2
GOP	36	20	9	3	4
Dem.	14	8	6	3	<1
Indep.	18	15	4	1	2



[Q30:Q31 combined]

What do you think would be best for the United States to do?

	<b>Approve of the agreement</b>	<b>Ratchet up sanctions, until Iran gives up enrichment</b>	<b>Renew negotiations</b>	<b>Use or threaten the use of military force</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<b>National</b>	55	23	14	7	2
<b>  GOP</b>	33	36	20	9	4
<b>  Dem.</b>	72	14	8	6	<1
<b>  Indep.</b>	61	18	15	4	2

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Party Identification	
Republican.....	37%
Independent .....	25
Democrat .....	38
Gender	
Male .....	47
Female.....	54
Race	
White, Non-Hispanic.....	74
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic .....	13
Hispanic.....	9
Asian, Non-Hispanic .....	3
Other (includes Native Americans).....	1
Age	
18-24 .....	10
25-44 .....	31
45-64 .....	38
65+ .....	22
Income	
Under \$30,000 .....	16
30,000-49,999 .....	17
50,000-74,999 .....	21
75,000-99,999 .....	15
100,000-149,999 .....	16
150,000 or higher.....	15
Education	
High school or less .....	33
Some college.....	31
College.....	23
Advanced degree .....	13