

UN-Secretariat matters Pu-R:
UN-Secretariat matters Pu-R -
5

HS L 179:95a



Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

UN/ Secretariat matters 1954

Public Information Studies

27 Oct - Dec. 53 - January 54

- American Attitudes on World Organization, by E. Roper.

Public Opinion Quarterly, Princeton University

- 2 letters from Elmo Roper (N. York), with encl. - to D.H.
- 1 letter from D.H. - to E. Roper (public opinion analyst)
- 1 cable

9 December 1953

Dear Mr. Roper,

My sincere thanks for your kindness in sending me an advance copy of your extensive study of the mood of the American people ^{ON} in world affairs, which I have read with great interest.

Yours sincerely,

Dag Hammarskjold
Secretary-General

Mr. Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, New York.

27 Oct 1953

CORDIER/
dg

3800

EOSG

ELMO ROPER
30 Rockefeller Plaza
NEW YORK CITY

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL: CONFIRMATION TO MR. CORDIER ONLY

PLEASE DO NOT EDIT

IMMEDIATE RETURN

ON BEHALF OF PAUL HOFFMAN I WISH TO INVITE YOU ALONG WITH SEVERAL OTHERS
TO ATTEND A MEETING IN MY OFFICE ON THIRTY EIGHTH FLOOR OF SECRETARIAT
BUILDING UNITED NATIONS ~~AT~~ THURSDAY NOVEMBER FIFTH FROM NINE TO ELEVEN A.M.
TO CONTINUE DISCUSSIONS WHICH MR. HOFFMAN HAS ALREADY INITIATED WITH YOU

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD

ANDREW W. CORDIER

Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General

9 December 1953

Dear Mr. Roper,

My sincere thanks for your kindness in sending me an advance copy of your extensive study of the mood of the American people ^{on} ~~in~~ world affairs, which I have read with great interest.

Yours sincerely,

Dag Hammarskjold
Secretary-General

Mr. Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, New York.

9 December 1953

Dear Mr. Roper,

My sincere thanks for your kindness in sending me an advance copy of your extensive study of the mood of the American people ^{on} ~~in~~ world affairs, which I have read with great interest.

Yours sincerely,

Dag Hammarskjold
Secretary-General

Mr. Elmo Roper
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York 20, New York.

We are fast approaching the day when a whole generation will have come of age since the beginning of World War II. In four years, we will begin drafting young men who were just being born as the armies of Hitler swept into Poland in 1939. The generation of Americans who fought in that war are approaching middle age.

Time has slipped away rapidly since the most devastating of all wars, but time has not stilled the fears of the people over war. Ours is an era of international tension, of life caught up, as Bernard Baruch put it nearly a decade ago, "between the quick and the dead."

The years have had their effect on the American people. The day-in-day-out rumble of the thunder of war--sometimes larger war, sometimes smaller outbreaks in remote parts of the earth--has had a profound impact on the American people. Strange indeed, that the world views of the people in the most pivotal nation have not been more systematically measured and analyzed. We have had pieces of information and some revealing glimpses in what seems, in retrospect, to be a hundred different crises. But rarely has the time, money, and energy been available to study underlying American attitudes on a subject that most of our people believe is the best hope for world peace: some form of world organization.

The purpose of the study I report here was to measure the American public's attitudes toward isolation and several kinds of world cooperation which this country might pursue as a means to peace. Besides trying to learn how many people--and what kinds of people--believe in world cooperation, the study sought to find out as much as possible about their reasons for believing as they do. The study was undertaken with the avowed intention of making the results available to any group of citizens interested in the question of peace and the part this country should take in the world, with the hope that their efforts might be better guided by this knowledge.

In all, 3,502 personal interviews were conducted by trained interviewers among a national cross section of the adult American population during the early part of September, 1953. A "modified area" method of sampling was used to determine selection of the people interviewed. In order to insure breadth of scope in the inquiry as well as to guard against imbalance in the questioning, a committee was formed to consult with the Roper organization in preparation of the questionnaire. This committee was composed of: W. H. Ferry, Thomas K. Finletter, Clinton S. Golden, Eric Hodgins, Earl D. Osborn, and H. Christian Sonne.

The Backdrop

The mood of the American people on world affairs as we have measured it in this survey is essentially one of guarded pessimism, but not fatalism. The years of international tension have left a mark of awareness of the dangers of imminent war and deep respect for the difficulties in achieving any kind of lasting peace.

For instance, 53 per cent of the people think another World War is almost certain within the next 25 to 30 years. Only 35 per cent believe it might be possible to avoid it. The balance are uncertain what they think. Most pessimistic are the young people who have come of age in the last few years. Most optimistic are people with a college education.

But only 6 per cent of the people want to see us go to war with Russia. And an even smaller number--4 per cent--want us to stop our arms build-up and come to an appeasement type of settlement with the Russians. Clearly, the American people want to steer a middle course between these two extremes. Twenty-three per cent are content to rely completely on our military build-up. The largest group, an easy majority, coming to 59 per cent, believe we should keep up our military guard, but should go beyond this and exhaust every avenue that might bring about peace and an easing of the tensions between East and West.

By an overwhelming margin, the people of this country are convinced that the United States cannot escape another major war should one break out. By a count

of 81 to 9 per cent, they believe we would find it impossible to "sit out" any war in Europe, and by a 60 to 20 per cent margin that we cannot avoid becoming involved in any major Asiatic war.

Yet 60 per cent of the people believe we are doing the best we can to prevent war. The three things these people list most frequently as our best positive moves to avert World War III are in order: our program of foreign aid, our efforts to support international organization, and our military rearmament program.

Twenty-six per cent feel that we are falling short in our efforts to avert war. These people offer such criticisms as our "giving away too much to other peoples," "cutting our military strength," "too much appeasement of Russia," "too weak a policy in Korea--should have followed MacArthur," and "not minding our own business." This is the minority view, but its adherents are both substantial in number and have vocal and powerful spokesmen.

As a people, we have our divisions and our areas of agreement. We are evenly divided as to whether or not the Russians really have enough atomic bombs to launch an attack--34 per cent think they do, 36 per cent they do not, and 30 per cent simply don't have any idea. The division in high ranking Administration circles concerning Russian atomic power is clearly reflected in this difference of estimates among our people. But we are agreed, by a decisive 82 to 9 per cent count, that in the event of another war, this country would suffer serious destruction from atom bombing.

Clearly, the source of our uncertainty is our inability either to get together with Russia and the Communist world or to force them to come to a settlement. Yet by a 2 to 1 count, the American people with an opinion about it believe it is wise to have Russia in rather than out of the United Nations.

In short, we feel that we are embarked on more or less the only course we could follow in our national quest for peace, but we tend to be pessimistic about the chances of averting ultimate war. We are convinced--on balance--that the forces of world Communism will probably block and subvert steps that might lead to world peace.

But we want Russia in rather than out of the one organization most people feel is the best hope for achieving peace--the United Nations. We have become realists about how difficult peace is to win. When pressed, we are more pessimistic than optimistic. But we have not lost hope for we know that our very survival is at stake.

Out of this welter of underlying hopes and expectations emerges a pattern of American attitudes about world organization. For the purposes of this study, we gave people six alternate choices, and asked them:

"While everyone seems to agree that peace is an important thing, there are a good many different views as to how to bring it about. Here are some different ideas--there's one on each of these cards. (Respondent given set of cards, one for each of the propositions listed below.) Will you look through them and tell me which you come closest to agreeing with?"

	<u>Total sample</u>
	(3502)
1. We shouldn't get tied up in any <u>more</u> alliances or joint commitments with other countries and we should aim at getting out of as many as we can as soon as we can. (This is the isolationist view.)	100% %
2. We should continue to work along with the United Nations just about as we have been, gradually trying to make it better as time goes on. (This is the compliant United Nations view.) " <u>as is</u> " view)	9
3. We should immediately get behind <u>strengthening</u> the United Nations and do everything necessary to give it more power and authority than it has--enough to actually keep even a strong nation from starting a war. (This is the militant United Nations view.) <u>Stronger</u>	21
4. In addition to continuing with the United Nations, we should also unite with the friendly democratic countries into one government in which each member nation would in effect become a state, somewhat like the different states in this country. (This is the <u>Democratic</u> Atlantic Union view.)	35
5. We should start now working toward transforming the United Nations into a real world government of <u>all</u> nations of the world, in which every nation would in effect become a state, somewhat like the different states in this country. (This is the world government view.)	6
6. Some of these ideas are good, but we won't get any of them working in time to prevent war, so we'd better not rely on them. (This is the hopeless view.)	11
No opinion	7
	11

→ insert

insert

In evaluating these results, it should be realized that some overlap may exist in some of these propositions - at least in some people's minds. When asked for their second choice of these propositions, certain patterns appear that suggest the differences between them may be more of methods than of objectives. For example, when "world government" people were asked for their second choice of these propositions, they tended to divide between the stronger UN and democratic union views. And more whose first choice is a strengthened UN took the democratic union and world government positions as second choice than either the isolationists or "UN as is" people

Here, then, we have the broad outlines of American public opinion on the outlook for world organization. The range is wide. The spread is from isolation to hopelessness as the extremes with some form of world organization in between. The vast middle group--nearly 6 out of every 10 people--pins its hopes on the United Nations, either as now constituted or as strengthened. Those who want to go beyond the UN--^{beyond} even/a strengthened UN--are greater in number than those who want to roll back time and give up on world cooperation.

In a day when the United States is contemplating a vast program of atomic defense expansion, when we are absorbed in the horrors that hydrogen warfare might bring, we might with profit take a closer look at the six basic types of outlook our survey has measured. The evidence will not help our military planners appreciably in how to make more efficient plans for war. But it might help those concerned with this nation's destiny to determine the next great try for peace. For if there is one element which might hold the key to mankind's bid for peace, it might very well be the American people themselves.

→ Insert
Differences by Groups

International organization has been the subject of a good many generalizations and few facts. For years images have been conjured up about the "isolationist Midwest," about the "world government-minded young people," about the "internationalist East," about "women being less for world organization than men," and a number of others.

The facts from this survey indicate clearly that rather than differences by groups, uniformity is much more likely to be the rule. Isolationist sentiment can be found among nearly every important segment of the population--and in nearly equal numbers. World government support is drawn from nearly every major group--again, in nearly equal numbers.

Part of the significant news from this study is that support for each of the various positions comes from just about every important segment of the population, and that differences between groups are far less significant than we might have been led to believe. The following table of breakdowns illustrates this fact:

Insert
In evaluating the percentages in the foregoing table, it is important to bear in mind that some of the questions overlap. For example, a fairly considerable group recognized an affinity between Question 3 and Question 5, to the extent that it was felt that the United Nations must someday be developed into a world federation with adequate powers to enforce world law. In this connection, it might be pointed out that the citizen group in this country most directly identified with world federalism - the United World Federalists - has as its central policy the strengthening of the United Nations.

	<u>Isolationist</u>	<u>UN as is</u>	<u>Stronger UN</u>	<u>Union of Democratic Countries</u>	<u>World Government</u>	<u>Hopeless</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total Sample*	9	21	35	6	11	7
<u>Sex</u>						
MEN	10	22	35	6	11	7
WOMEN	9	20	35	5	11	6
<u>Age</u>						
21 - 24	5	23	38	6	13	6
25 - 39	7	22	41	4	11	7
40 - 49	9	24	34	6	13	5
50 AND OVER	13	17	29	7	8	8
<u>Economic Level</u>						
A	10	21	45	4	9	6
B	9	20	47	4	12	5
C	9	22	37	6	11	6
D	10	19	26	6	9	9
<u>Race</u>						
WHITE	9	21	37	6	10	6
NEGRO	11	18	24	7	13	11
<u>Education completed in:</u>						
GRAMMAR SCHOOL	13	21	25	7	8	9
HIGH SCHOOL	9	23	38	5	12	7
COLLEGE	6	18	49	5	14	6
<u>Religion</u>						
PROTESTANT	9	20	37	6	11	7
CATHOLIC	10	26	32	5	10	6
JEWISH	5	20	44	6	14	5
OTHER	13	17	30	9	12	9
NONE	20	9	32	3	15	9
<u>Geographic Section</u>						
NORTHEAST	10	22	36	6	10	6
MID-WEST	9	21	36	6	11	7
SOUTH	10	21	33	5	10	7
FAR WEST	8	19	38	5	11	9
<u>Political Party</u>						
DEMOCRATS	9	22	36	6	11	7
REPUBLICANS	11	21	38	5	11	7
INDEPENDENTS	10	20	40	4	13	8
OTHER OR DON'T KNOW	9	21	17	6	5	8
<u>Veteran Status</u>						
RESPONDENT A VETERAN	8	24	41	4	12	6
FAMILY MEMBER A VETERAN	10	20	38	5	10	8
FAMILY MEMBER NOW SERVING OR ABOUT TO ENTER SERVICE	10	23	36	6	8	8
NO ONE IN FAMILY HAS BEEN OR ABOUT TO BE IN SERVICE	10	22	33	6	12	7

*The 11% of respondents who had no opinion and couldn't classify themselves as believing in any of these positions are not shown on this table.

Our study went behind these initial positions and tested for consistency and stability of point of view for each. An examination of these results yields a number of clues about the motivation of the people who took each position. The first group I shall deal with are the "hopeless," not because they are most important, but because they are the least positive and most "off-beat" in their views.

"The Hopeless"

Seven per cent of the American public believe that there is little use left in struggling for peace. These people are more convinced that another World War is inevitable than any other group among us. They tend to divide into one group which feels that war is absolutely unavoidable and there is nothing anyone can do about it, and another group which feels that since war is inevitable, we should arm ourselves as much as possible. And a few would even start a war with the Russians at the most opportune and strategic moment.

If they were assured that war could be averted through some miracle they now do not believe in, most of these people's second choice as to the course America should follow would not be that of isolationism:

Second Choice of the "Hopeless" Group

	<u>Total</u>
	%
Isolationism	29
Continue with UN <i>as is</i>	19
Strengthen UN	26
Union of Democracies	8
World Government	14
Don't know	16

When given a list of possible reasons for their views, 54 per cent of these people answered "the best thing to rely on is a strongly armed United States"; 28 per cent said that "human nature being what it is, we'll always have wars"; and 23 per cent

said, "Russia will upset every plan for peace anyone tries to make."

All in all, these people have lived through the strains of the past generation and have found nearly any hope for peace baseless. They are dim about the prospects of the world surviving war, but are resigned to the inevitable. In a very real sense, they are "the hopeless" in our midst.

"Shades of Isolation"--9%

Nine per cent of the American people regret that the United States hasn't pulled in its horns and retired to a state of isolation. These people feel by and large, not only that we have gone too far in what we have done but that the time has come to pull out of our international alliances and commitments.

As might be expected, these people tend more than others to believe that the United States should have taken a smaller part in world affairs since the end of World War II. Minorities of them--but substantial minorities--think that it might be possible for us to stay out of another war in either Europe or Asia, that we are far from doing the most we can to stay out of another war, but that perhaps we won't be as pulverized by an atomic blitz as some "war-mongers" claim we will.

Some in this isolationist group reject the idea of strengthening the United Nations on the grounds that the UN doesn't do anything anyhow, some fear that it will become too powerful, and others feel that any further involvement in world affairs will simply end with Uncle Sam picking up the tab. They reject the idea of a democratic union of countries on the grounds that such an idea will never work, we have no business getting involved with other nations, and people being as different as they are, nations never will be able to work together.

When given a list of reasons for holding isolationist views, they selected the following:

REASONS FOR NOT GETTING TIED UP
IN ALLIANCES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

	<u>Total</u>
	%
There are enough things to do here at home before worrying about the welfare of foreigners	58
All other countries do is to take our money and give nothing in return	55
We can do more good by being a good example to other countries than by getting mixed up with them	53
Countries in Europe and Asia have always been in wars and always will be and we don't have to let them drag us into their wars	42
We will lose our sovereignty if we keep on getting mixed up with other countries	26

It is interesting to note that, compared with ~~these~~ ^{the} other reasons, the risk of losing our sovereignty as a nation pulled relatively less weight. By and large, however, the isolationist group is not very confident that their point of view is going to prevail here in the United States. When asked to give their estimate of the chance of their position emerging as the dominant one in this country, 38 per cent thought it would. But 34 per cent felt there was little chance that a majority of people would rally to their banner, and the remaining 28 per cent weren't sure.

Actually, a high 87 per cent reported that they ~~are~~ ^{have done} nothing to spread their point of view, such as belonging to organizations, discussing their position with friends, or engaging in work of other sorts. As a group, they seem not to be very active, despite the great activity of some of their spokesmen.

If their position ever comes to prevail in this country, a few of them say it will be because a MacArthur type of administration will come to power, or there will be a break-up among the allies of the free world, or eventually people "will come around to finally knowing what really goes on around the world."

They seem to be convinced that they are pitted against a concerted campaign on the part of the last Democratic Administrations and now the Eisenhower

Administration to lead the American people down the road to international involvement. As a group, they are most certainly opposed to America's internationalist foreign policy--past or present.

Interesting is the fact that over the past eight years since the end of World War II, we have little evidence that this group has either grown or diminished appreciably. It remains a tight core of people whose spokesmen have at times bitterly assailed nearly every measure this nation has taken to move closer toward world cooperation. They are more inclined than others today to rely on our own military strength, and there is some sentiment among them--but not a majority--for "getting the war with Russia over with" at the most opportune moment. They have little use for the United Nations, but--since we have it--a substantial minority are willing to endorse the proposition that the UN be strengthened in its powers to control atomic energy and to declare war on an aggressor nation. But this is far from a vote of endorsement of the world organization.

These people are somewhat defensive about their position, but hold firm to what they believe is the only course for America to follow. For nearly a generation now, they have been fighting this rear-guard action, and feel justified--not in spite of but rather because of--World War II, the Korean War, and the continuing conflict between the two poles of power on earth. But they are only 9% of the population. "Let's Keep Doing What We're Doing"--21%

Twenty-one per cent of the people in this country feel that the surest, soundest, and best way to work for peace is to work along with the United Nations about as we are doing. As a second choice, most of these people will choose strengthening the UN, rather than return to isolationism.

By and large, these people are convinced that America is in world affairs for keeps. Mostly they are convinced that we would not be able to stay out of a major war in either Asia or Europe. They are the most likely ^{group} to say that we have been doing just about all we can to prevent another World War. And they tend to take the middle

positions on the way to handle our relations with the USSR and the Communist world. These people don't want war, nor do they want appeasement. They want to keep strong militarily, but don't want to close the door to negotiation.

When asked what their main reasons are for holding the point of view they do, this is what they answered:

REASONS FOR WORKING WITH THE UNITED NATIONS
MUCH AS WE HAVE BEEN DOING

	<u>Total</u>
	%
The world needs a forum where all nations can express an opinion	65
It's a good way to keep an eye on Russia	46
The United Nations does a lot of good work with health, children, and so on	37
It is important to keep the veto the way the United Nations now has it	21
We are doing just about enough as it is. Going any further would mean giving up our sovereignty	21

The chief image that emerges here is that the UN is valuable and important as a "debating forum" and as a "place to keep our eye on Russia." Coming well down in the list of reasons cited by these people are fears about changing the veto provisions of the great powers or of giving up our national sovereignty. The main reasoning of these people is that the UN is good and sufficient as it is now constituted.

These people reject isolationism, they say, because we simply cannot revert back to the way things were 15 years ago, we are far too committed to other nations to break "our good word now," or because we need other countries for our own survival and protection. While most would take strengthening the UN as a second choice position, there is a feeling that this is pushing things too much.

This is not to say, however, that these people conceive of the UN as a debating forum or observation center alone. In answer to a series of direct questions on specific UN powers, a substantial minority said they'd like to see the United Nations

reduce armaments of member countries to the point where its own armed forces are larger than any single country; a majority would like to see the UN control atomic energy; and a majority think it should declare war on aggressor nations. Seventy-nine per cent want the UN to do some one or two or all three of these--and every one of them means action.

As a group, these people are confident--90 per cent of them--that their view will remain the prevailing one in the country. They feel they are riding with the majority, in sharp contrast with the isolationists who are defensive and a good deal more doubtful their position will win out in the end.

About half of them don't readily think of any specific thing that would either give the United Nations a serious setback or make it more powerful. But some can foresee a setback as a result of disagreements or a falling out among member nations, or if the Communist world were to become more recalcitrant than it has up to now. On the other hand, some see the United Nations becoming more powerful as it registers more successes and as the world teeters closer to the brink of war, and people feel they "must look to the UN as the last best hope for peace."

But, as with the isolationists, a full 84 per cent of these people report they do nothing to propagate their position. By and large, these people are conservatives, but also internationalists. They feel they have learned the basic lessons of the last half century, but they don't want to push things beyond the limits they think are workable and feasible.

"For A Stronger United Nations"--35%

Thirty-five per cent of the people--the largest single group in our population--feel that our best chance for peace is a stronger United Nations.

On the whole, these "strengthen the UN" people feel that the United States has been on the right track in world affairs. They are inclined more than most other groups to believe that there is a chance to avoid World War III. But they feel overwhelmingly that there is no way for this country to escape participation if a war

should come--either in Asia or Europe. They want this country to depend only partly on a military build-up, but also to undertake fullest possible negotiations with the Communist world to see if some honorable settlement can be worked out.

These "stronger UN" people might be described as the more articulate and perhaps more decisive "first cousins" to the "keep the UN as is" group. When pressed for a second choice, the bulk say they would select this latter alternative. It will be recalled that the "keep UN as is" people ^{mostly selected} listed "strengthening the UN" as their second choice. And as with that group, these people--81 per cent of them--are confident that the chances are very good that their hopes will prevail and the UN will be strengthened in the period immediately ahead.

The background to this point of view is shown by the answers we received to a question listing possible reasons for feeling the UN ought to be strengthened:

REASONS WHY THE UN OUGHT TO BE STRENGTHENED

	<u>Total</u>
	%
A powerful United Nations is the only way to handle Russia	61
A powerful United Nations is the only answer to the atom bomb	43
The United Nations is the best way to bring about universal disarmament	40
Either the United Nations should be given real power, or it should be dissolved	36
The United Nations is not much more than a debating society now	16

People in this group are not critical of the concept of the UN. They are of the opinion, however, that it could do much more with "adequate power."

When this "strengthen the UN group" were asked about certain specific UN powers, majorities favored requiring every member nation in the UN to reduce its armaments to a point where the UN has a bigger military force than any other country. Even higher majorities want the UN to control the atomic bomb, and to have the power

to declare war on an aggressor nation. A high 88 per cent want the UN to accomplish one or more of the three--reduce armaments, control atomic energy, declare war on aggressors. However, a majority of these people are not willing to hand over authority to the UN to set immigration quotas for various nations, or to determine tariffs and trade laws. Their chief focus appears to be on the military security aspects of United Nations power.

They also are aware of the problem of "giving away too much control over America to the rest of the world." For instance, when asked why they wouldn't go along with the democratic union or world ^{Government} ~~federation~~ idea, the chief objections they gave were that these ideas probably wouldn't work, and they impinged on our national sovereignty.

Just what specifically might happen to speed support in this country for strengthening the UN isn't yet readily apparent to a good many of them. But some feel support may increase as the threat of war grows more imminent and people feel that a stronger international body is needed to deter potential aggressors. Some also feel that with the passage of time, the UN will register some further successes and thus will enhance its reputation and be able to acquire greater authority. And some also believe that with more public education and information about the UN, the process of strengthening the organization will be speeded up.

A deep schism among member nations is considered the principal possibility that might make this country draw back from a stronger UN. Some also see possible deterrents to a stronger UN in an economic depression in this country, a spreading of a false sense of security among the American people, political disunity or even in a growth of indifference in this country toward the UN.

All in all, however, these people are confident that the UN will not only survive but will acquire new and greater powers within a matter of a few years. While 80 per cent say they don't do ^{anything} ~~much~~ to further their beliefs, 20 per cent say they do. Six per cent say they talk with people to try to get them to want the UN strengthened; 4 per cent say they are good citizens, buying Government Bonds, voting, and pursuing

other activities they feel help the United Nations; 3 per cent report that they belong to some group which is working in international affairs; 2 per cent report that they work with a church group supporting the UN; 2 per cent say they pray for the world organization; 1 per cent teach or lecture on the subject; 1 per cent say they are studying or reading up on the UN; and a final 1 per cent say they ^{help by giving} give it moral support.

From what these people have seen of the United Nations, most feel there is nothing wrong with the UN that giving it more power and authority won't rectify. They are not critical of the world body and what it has done. They simply would like to see it do more. And the difference between what the UN is now and what it might be, they believe, might be that crucial margin between war and devastation on the one hand, and survival and peace on the other.

"Union of Democratic Countries" -- 6%

Six per cent of the people feel that in addition to carrying on with the United Nations, we should join in a new partnership with other democratic nations constituting a single government. ~~This idea, of course, is embodied chiefly in the program of the Atlantic Union Committee.~~

These democratic union people are especially pessimistic about the possibilities of averting World War III. They also tend more than others to feel that this country has not taken a large enough part in world affairs since the close of World War II.

Their main reasons for selecting their position are:

REASONS FOR FAVORING A UNION OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONS

	<u>Total</u>
	%
A union with other democratic countries would solve a good many of the economic problems now existing between us	66
We have to really combine with other free countries if we're going to beat Communism	60
A union of democratic countries is the most practical first step toward world government	52

	<u>Total</u>
	%
We'll never get anywhere trying to work something out with dictatorships	23
After all, there are people in the world no more different from us than Texans are from New Yorkers	17

It is of interest that about half of these people see this proposition as a practical, first step toward world government. However, it should also be pointed out that about half the people who are for a union of democratic countries do not see it as a world government step--but perhaps as a substitute for it.

These people tend to be against merely strengthening the UN, on the grounds that the United Nations, even if given more authority, would not have enough power to act decisively. They are against the specific, immediate, world ^{government} ~~federation~~ proposal, chiefly because they believe it won't work and it goes too far, at least at this time.

Like other groups, a good many haven't crystallized their ideas as to what kind of things might speed or slow up a democratic union of nations. But some feel that the idea of a democratic union would be enhanced if the Communist threat grew worse, or if there were more cooperation among the democratic nations, or if the United States engaged in a program of assistance to more countries. Some can see their idea being hampered by disagreements between the free countries, by trouble or a war with Russia, and a few fear a depression in this country, a failure of this country to support its allies, or a failure on our part to make democracy work at home.

The first countries to join in such a union in the minds of these people are Great Britain, France, and Canada. However, upon direct questioning, 70 per cent would like to see Australia in, 57 per cent West Germany, 48 per cent the Union of South Africa, 46 per cent Japan, 46 per cent Spain, 45 per cent Turkey, and 41 per cent India. The country on the list about which they expressed most qualms over admission was Yugoslavia.

While 43 per cent of the people favoring this position do not think the chances are very good for achieving it, and 20% have no opinion, 37 per cent do think there is a good chance for it. But among all, a high 84 per cent say they don't do much to spread their point of view.

All in all, these people feel they stand on a middle ground between full and complete world government and something ^{different from} ~~more effective~~ than the present United Nations. They are, on the whole, not as optimistic over the ultimate success of their viewpoint as those who would strengthen the UN. But they do feel that the United States should take the lead in an endeavor in world organization beyond what has been tried up to now, and in believing this, they are hopeful that their numbers will grow.

Government
"A Federation of the World" - 11%

The final group are those people who want us to start working now toward ~~a federation of all nations of the world to be consummated by~~ ^{one} a world government ^{for all} ~~nations in the world.~~

Eleven per cent of the people in our nationwide cross section hold to this view.

Inset

More of these people than in most other groups feel that the United States should have been taking a larger part in world affairs, and they are also more optimistic about avoiding World War III than most other groups. They are also more inclined to think this country could do a good deal more to avert another big war.

The chief reasons they give for holding their world ^{Government} ~~federation~~ position are:

REASONS FOR FAVORING WORLD ^{Government} ~~FEDERATION~~

	<u>Total</u> %
The money everyone spends for arms could be spent for health, better living standards and education, but only if all or most of the world is united into one government	55
The world is too small to have separate nations any more; what affects one affects them all.	41
One government for all nations would let every part of the world develop its full economic possibilities	38
One government for all nations is the only thing that will save us from the atomic bomb	29
It's the best way to get universal disarmament	21

Inset

The results of the poll reflect some public confusion over the term World Government. This may be a reflection of the fact that not all World Government advocates mean the same thing when they use the term. Some have in mind a federation of powers confined to the common security; others have in mind a super-state with far-reaching powers similar to the authority that the individual nation today has over its own citizens and institutions. Generally speaking, it seems fair to suggest that most of those who believed in federation with limited powers as a natural and necessary development of the United Nations may have selected Point Three, while most of those who believed in outright world government Selected Point Five. But the possibility of over-lapping between these two questions must not be discounted, as was pointed out earlier.

Those who have formed opinions of what would speed up ~~need for~~ world government most often cite international tensions between East and West. Some pin their hopes on nations getting used to working together. A few see more education and information as an answer. On the other hand, those who have thought about what might slow up ~~need for~~ world government mainly fear a war with Russia or a falling out among the nations of the world.

~~Most of these people reject the idea~~ of a union of democratic countries, ¹⁸ partly because they think it simply won't work, partly out of the conviction that it isn't fair to leave out any nations, and partly because they think it will drive the world even more into two opposing camps. By a 47 to 37 per cent margin, they think the chances are good for a world ^{Government} ~~federation~~, and the median time expectancy is within from 5 to 29 years.

Out of the many approaches and many answers in this study, seven major facts emerge about the American people and their views toward the world today:

1. There is no doubt whatsoever that the adult population of the United States is definitely committed to internationalism and international organization in one form or other.

2. It is evident that the isolationist point of view has been over-represented both in the daily press and in Congress. Only a small minority of the people are die-hard isolationists. Numerically, they are ~~not a major segment~~ ^{a small segment} of the population.

3. For all of the criticism, maligning, and outright condemnation that has been directed at it, the United Nations is still considered the single best hope for peace by a substantial majority of the people.

4. A significantly large percentage of the American people ~~37 per cent~~ ³⁴ appear to be ~~ready to work~~ ^{at least receptive} towards some form ^{or degree} of ~~world federation or world government~~.

^{This 34}
~~The 37~~ per cent figure is obtained by totalling all those who selected the world government or democratic union choices as their first or second choices. ^{is the fact that of one group is all those who selected a strengthened U.N. either as their first or second choice}

5. Despite the wide-spread suspicion and lack of confidence in the Soviet Union, ^{Choice} a majority of the people still want the Russians in the United Nations. The majority ^{the total} is 54% of people have not yet closed the door to some kind of honorable settlement. ^{of the entire population.}

6. The vast majority of Americans reject the alternatives of appeasement or preventive war. They hold the hope that some kind of negotiations can be conducted between East and West, with the possibility that eventual peace may emerge. The weight of public opinion ^{on how to handle Russia} is clearly behind the general outlines of policy initiated by Truman and continued by Eisenhower.

7. Every position - whether isolationist or internationalist - draws its support with great evenness from all parts of the population. The news here is not the differences but the similarities that exist among us on this question of where we go in search for survival.