

TABLE 1 LEADERS' OPINIONS: PARTISAN/IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES (IN PERCENTAGE POINTS)

**(Note: Differences for Republicans vs. Democrats; Conservatives vs. Liberals.
Compiled by authors. See text.)**

Subject	Party			Ideology		
	1998	2002	2004	1998	2002	2004
<i>FEDERAL GOVT. PROGRAMS</i> (expand)	Phone	Phone	Phone	Phone	Phone	Phone
Defense	47	46	32	56	55	30
Military Aid (cut back)	13	17	27	19	30	31
Economic Aid	29	39	27	32	50	31
Intelligence Info	33	22	10	34	38	9
Homeland Security		30	24		40	30
Aid to Education (cut back)	25	9	21	31	14	23
Social Security	23	17	23	31	13	28
Health Care	64	60	53	56	60	53
<i>FOREIGN POLICY GOALS</i> (very important)						
Protect Weak Nations	8	7	3	8	2	8
Strengthen the UN	32	32	23	37	44	35
Combat World Hunger	24	33	26	30	35	27
Combat Internat. Terrorism	5	12	11	9	22	12
Maintain Military Power	32	32	50	40	54	50
Bring Democratic Form.Govt.	-5	-12	14	-8	-7	15
Improve Standard of Living	32	33	29	31	42	24
Preventing Spread Nuclear Weap.	1	4	1	2	3	0
Protecting the Jobs of Americans	3	10	14	9	3	20
Securing Supplies of Energy	11	19	14	16	28	15
Controlling Illegal Immigration	25	18	26	28	32	22
Improving the Global Environment	43	32	46	40	53	49
Stopping the Flew of Illegal Drugs	26	11	28	28	26	27
Protecting American Business		14	35		23	30
<i>TREATIES & AGREEMENTS</i> (support)						
Kyoto Agreement		65	60		67	60
Ban use of Land Mines		35	33		37	38
Prohibit Nuclear Test Explosions		34	26		37	29
International Criminal Court (ICC)		38	50		37	54
<i>USE OF US TROOPS</i> (favor)						
N. Korea Invade S. Korea	2	7	7	-3	7	10
Arab Forces Invade Israel	3	6	7	7	6	13
China Invades Taiwan	18	17	20	15	20	24
Gov. of Pakistan Req. Help		7	25		16	23
Part of Internat. Peacekeeping in Afghanistan		11	5		18	3

Subject	Party			Ideology		
	'98 Phone	'02 Phone	'04 Phone	'98 Phone	'02 Phone	'04 Phone
Part of Internat. Peacekeeping between Israel and Palestinians		23	14		24	11
Stop Govt. from Genocide		15	4		15	7
Fight Drug Lords in Colombia		21	24		32	29
US USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (never)		22	16		35	19
<i>COMBAT INTER. TERROR (fav.)</i>						
US Air Strikes	5	16	16	18	24	17
Attacks by US Ground Troops	14	13	18	19	26	18
Assassination of Terrorist Leaders	29	35	31	35	41	30
Terrorists Trial in the ICC	12	30	28	16	30	32
Help Poor Countries Economies		11	10		16	13
Working through UN		16	13		15	13
Toppling Unfriendly Regimes		29	46		44	49
Restricting Immigration into US		37	32		43	40
Racial Profiling in airport		40	38		46	39
<i>STANDARDS FOR WORKING</i>		19	23		18	21
<i>ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</i>		22	24		19	23
<i>LEGAL IMMIGRATION (decr.)</i>		29	9		22	10
<i>GLOBALIZATION AND U.S.</i>	1	2	7	4	2	-12
<i>COMMITMENT TO NATO (decr.)</i>	2	2	4	4	1	4
US PARTICIPATON IN UN PEACEKEEPING (should)		21	18		32	18
GIVING UN POWER TO FUND ITS ACTIVITIES		39	40		54	41
<i>LONG TERM MILITARY BASES –</i>						
Germany (favor)		9	1		21	3
Turkey		-4	12		13	23
Japan		0	12		14	15
Cuba (Guantanamo Bay)		16	39		41	40
Saudi Arabia		5	25		22	22
Pakistan		-1	8		11	7
South Korea		4	6		17	13
Afghanistan		2	13		14	17
Uzbekistan		-2	24		5	28
<i>SIDES MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT (Israel)</i>		21	20		32	18
<i>US ACTIVE ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS (best for the future)</i>	4	1	0	1	3	2

TABLE 2 PUBLIC OPINION : PARTISAN/IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES (IN PERCENTAGE POINTS)

(Note: Differences for Republicans vs. Democrats; Conservatives vs. Liberals.
Compiled by authors. See text.)

Subject	Party			Ideology				
	1998	2002		2004	1998	2002		2004
	Pers.	Pho	Inter.	Inter.	Pers.	Pho.	Inter.	Inter.
<i>FEDERAL GOVT. PROGRAMS</i> (expand)								
Defense	12	22		23	21	19		19
Military Aid (cut back)	3	9		14	1	9		2
Economic Aid	11	6		7	6	12		10
Intelligence Info	3	13		18	9	19		15
Homeland Security		5		10		10		11
Aid to Education	19	28		28	18	21		30
Social Security	20	31		19	7	13		25
Health Care	18	32		25	12	25		31
<i>POSIBLE VITAL THREATS</i> (critical)								
Economic Comp. from Europe	3	2		2	6	1		1
China as a World Power	7	4		14	5	2		11
Islamic Fundamentalism	12	13		11	-7	1		12
Unfriendly Country Nuclear Pow.	10	2		4	5	3		1
Inter. Terrorism	5	5		16	3	0		15
Immigrants Coming into U.S	1	5		9	7	15		13
Economic Comp. Low-wage	1	2		9	4	5		0
Global Warming	12	28		19	20	24		32
Chemical & Biological Weapons	5	8		7	2	3		8
AIDS, Ebola Virus etc.	9	25		12	5	8		10
Tensions b. India and Pakistan		6		8		3		8
World Population Growth		16		8		8		15
Conflict b. Israel and Arab		2		10		9		5
<i>FOR. POL. GOALS</i> (very important)								
Protect Weak Nations	13	1	5	-2	4	5	4	5
Strength the UN	10	25	20	24	12	16	3	25
Combat World Hunger	14	16	19	13	12	16	20	18
Combat Internat. Terror	4	5	2	14	3	6	13	13
Maintain Military Power	6	16	12	23	9	24	33	18
Bring Democratic Form Govt.	14	7	9	3	3	1	2	1
Improve Standard of Living	16	17	9	10	3	17	10	12
Preventing Spread Nuclear Weap.	5	6	1	2	5	3	1	0
Protecting American Jobs	2	8	1	0	1	5	18	6
Securing Energy Supplies	1	4	7	4	3	13	15	4
Controlling Illegal Immigration	5	5	10	12	8	17	30	11
Improving Global Environment	16	33	19	23	16	29	24	30
Stopping Illegal Drugs into U.S	5	1	3	4	3	14	19	10
Protecting American Business		1	1	5		7	28	5

Subject	Party				Ideology			
	'98 Pers.	'02 Pho.	'02 Inter.	'04 Inter.	'98 Pers.	'02 Pho.	'02 Inter	'04 Inter.
<i>TREATIES & AGREEMENTS</i> (support)								
Kyoto Agreement		27	16	24		28	19	27
Ban use of Land Mines		13	5	12		10	5	13
Prohibit Nuclear Test Expl.		7	9	10		6	6	10
Internat. Criminal Court		5	11	7		9	11	10
World Trade Org. Disputes		5		11		7		10
<i>USE OF U.S TROOPS</i> (strongly favor)								
N. Korea Invade S. Korea	4	20		6	8	14		8
Arab Forces Invade Israel	9	23		19	7	21		22
China Invades Taiwan	6	14		11	3	11		12
Gov. Pakistan Req. Help		8		9		8		13
Part of Internat Peacekeeping in Afghanistan		3		6		0		2
Part of Internat. Peacekeeping betw. Israel and Palestinians		10		7		11		10
Stop Govt. from Genocide		7		3		6		4
Fight Drug Lords in Colombia		11		3		20		7
Insure Oil Supply		13		12		21		12
US TROOPS W/UN IF N. KOREA ATTACKS S. KOREA		0		11		1		9
US USE OF NUCLEAR WEAP.		10		11		19		13
GLOBALIZATION AND U.S.	1	4	1	2	6	15	3	7
<i>COMBAT INTER. TERROR</i> (favor)								
US Air Strikes	6	0	6	11	5	10	18	8
Attacks by US Ground Troops	-2	3	10	11	9	6	20	10
Assassination of Terror. Leaders	9	10	13	15	9	19	23	11
Terrorists Trial in the ICC	1	6	12	1	2	8	11	2
Help Poor Countries' Economies		7		1		4		10
Working through UN		4		9		2		12
Even-hand/Israeli-Palest Conflict		6		4		7		5
Toppling Unfriendly Regimes		6		20		17		21
Restricting Immigration into U.S		4		12		19		8
Racial Profiling in Airport		21		22		20		25
COMMITMENT TO NATO (decrease)	5	5	4	4	7	5	5	10
US PARTICIPATION IN UN PEACEKEEPING (should)	2	2	5	3	-2	18	2	6
GIVING UN POWER TO FUND ITS ACTIVITIES		13		20		20		19
<i>ENGAGING IN TRADE WITH</i>								
Cuba (Guantanamo Bay)		9		7		23		11
Iran		9		6		17		11

Subject	Party				Ideology			
	'98 Pers.	'02 Ph.	'02 Inter.	'04 Inter.	'98 Pers.	'02 Ph.	'02 Inter.	'04 Inter.
North Korea		6		9		11		10
China		4		6		8		10
PRACTICE FAIR TRADE								
European Union	2	2		1	7	11		11
Japan	7	6		2	1	6		0
China		9		14		3		8
Mexico		3		1		3		7
Canada		2		6		3		1
FOREIGN AID (favor)								
Food and Medical		1	3	3		11	4	12
Needy Countries		1	2	2		5	7	7
Prevention of AIDS		12	11	5		20	16	10
Birth Control		16	11	13		12	19	19
Women's Education		10	14	9		17	14	14
Promote Democracy		3	4	8		3	1	6
STANDARDS FOR WORKING		1		1		0		1
STANDARDS FOR ENVIRONMENT		4		1		1		0
LEGAL IMMIGRATION (decrease)		3	10	18		10	13	8
<i>LONG TERM MILITARY BASES</i> – general (fewer)		9		12		13		4
Germany (favor)		4		4		14		1
Turkey		7		11		19		4
Japan		3		8		16		8
Cuba (Guantanamo Bay)		11		18		17		13
Saudi Arabia		3		9		7		6
Pakistan		4		6		6		2
South Korea		7		13		12		5
Afghanistan		5		12		8		15
Uzbekistan		6		5		7		2
WORLD POLICMAN RESPO.		6		6		12		1
U.S WORLD POLICMAN MORE THAN IT SHOULD		18		16		13		10
US REMAIN AS A WORLD SUPERPOWER		6	3	3		12	2	6
LESSON OF 9/11 (work closely)		7		13		8		15
SIDES IN MIDDLE-EAST CONF (Israel)		23	21	21		24	28	22
<i>US ACTIVE IN WORLD AFFAIRS</i> (best for the future)	1	8		10	1	1		1
DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS (favor)								
Cuba		1		1		5		3
Iran		7		0		15		1

Subject	Party				Ideology			
	'98 Pers.	'02 Ph.	'02 Inter.	'04 Inter.	'98 Pers.	'02 Ph.	'02 Inter	'04 Inter.
North Korea		6		6		12		5
China		-6		-1		4		3
FEELINGS RATE – COUNTRIES (cold, 1f-49f)								
North Korea	0	4	17	7	4	4	8	18
Germany	11	9	5	0	3	2	3	0
Mexico	4	3	7	4	7	0	10	6
Israel (warm , 51f-100f)	6	22	18	14	9	24	17	15
Great Britain		4	3	7		4	0	0
China		0	20	12		4	15	13
Saudi Arabia		21		1		13		8
France		15		28		19		21
South Korea		3		9		0		9
Cuba		23		10		20		16
Muslim People		2		11		19		12
FEELINGS, RATE – INTER. ORGS. (cold)								
WTO		0		13		3		15
UN		12		24		12		34
WB		6		10		3		17
Multi Corp		14		8		13		1
EU		3		14		15		26
IMF		3		10		4		13
Inter. Human Rights Groups		15		8		10		22
WC		16		17		19		26

Table 3 Changes in Partisan/Ideological Differences from 1998/2002 to 2004 (from Table 1 and Table 2)

(Note: Entries are percentage point differences from first available time point to 2004. Positive entries indicate divergence and negative ones indicate convergence. Compiled by authors. See text.)

Subject	PUBLIC		LEADERS	
	<i>Party</i>	<i>Ideology</i>	<i>Party</i>	<i>Ideology</i>
<i>FEDERAL GOVT. PROGRAMS</i> (expand)				
Defense	11	-2	-15	-26
Military Aid (cut back)	11	1	14	12
Economic Aid	-4	4	-2	-1
Intelligence Info	15	6	-23	-25
Homeland Security	5	1	-6	-10
Aid to Education	7	12	-4 (cut back)	-8 (cut back)
Social Security	-1	18	0	-3
Health Care	7	19	-11	-3
<i>POSIBBLE VITAL THREATS</i> (critical)				
Economic Comp. from Europe	-1	-5		
China as a World Power	7	6		
Islamic Fundamentalism	-1	19		
Unfriendly Country Nuclear Pow.	-6	-4		
Inter. Terrorism	11	12		
Immigrants Coming into U.S	8	6		
Economic Comp. Low-wage	8	-4		
Global Warming	7	12		
Chemical & Biological Weapons	2	6		
AIDS, Ebola Virus etc.	3	5		
Tensions b. India and Pakistan	2	5		
World Population Growth	-8	7		
Conflict b. Israel and Arab	8	4		
<i>FOR. POL. GOALS</i> (very import.)				
Protect Weak Nations	-15	1	-5	0
Strength the UN	14	13	-9	-2
Combat World Hunger	-1	6	2	-3
Combat Internat. Terror	10	10	6	3
Maintain Military Power	17	9	18	10
Bring Democratic Form Govt.	-11	-2	19	23
Improve Standard of Living	-6	9	-3	-7
Preventing Spread Nuclear Weap.	-3	-5	0	-2
Protecting American Jobs	-2	5	11	11

Subject	PUBLIC		LEADERS	
	Party	Ideology	Party	Ideology
Securing Energy Supplies	3	1	3	-1
Controlling Illegal Immigration	7	3	1	-6
Improving Global Environment	7	14	3	9
Stopping Illegal Drugs into U.S	-1	7	2	-1
Protecting American Business	4	-2	21	7
<i>TREATIES & AGREEMENTS</i> (support)				
Kyoto Agreement	8	8	-5	-7
Ban use of Land Mines	7	8	-2	1
Prohibit Nuclear Test Expl.	1	4	-8	-8
Internat. Criminal Court (ICC)	-4	-1	12	17
World Trade Org. Disputes	6	3		
<i>USE OF U.S TROOPS</i> (strongly favor)				
N. Korea Invade S. Korea	2	0	5	13
Arab Forces Invade Israel	10	15	4	6
China Invades Taiwan	4	9	2	9
Gov. Pakistan Req. Help	1	5	18	7
Part of Internat Peacekeeping in Afghanistan	3	2	-6	-15
Part of Internat. Peacekeeping betw. Israel and Palestinians	-3	-1	-7	-13
Stop Govt. from Genocide	-4	-2	-11	-8
Fight Drug Lords in Colombia	-8	-13	3	-3
Insure Oil Supply	-1	-9		
USE OF US TROOPS W/UN IF N.KOREA ATTACKS S.KOREA	11	8		
US USE OF NUCLEAR WEAP.	1	-6	-6	-16
GLOBALIZATION AND U.S.	1	1	6	16
<i>COMBAT INTER. TERROR</i> (favor)				
US Air Strikes	5	3	11	-1
Attacks by US Ground Troops	13	1	4	-1
Assassination of Terror. Leaders	6	2	2	-5
Terrorists Trial in the ICC	0	0	16	6
Help Poor Countries' Economies	-6	6	-1	-3
Working through UN	5	10	-3	-2
Even-hand/Israeli-Palest Conflict	-2	-2		

Subject	PUBLIC		LEADERS	
	Party	Ideology	Party	Ideology
Toppling Unfriendly Regimes	14	4	17	5
Restricting Immigration into U.S	8	-11	-5	-3
Racial Profiling in Airport	1	5	-2	-7
COMMITMENT TO NATO (decr)	-1	3	2	0
US PARTICIPATION IN UN PEACEKEEPING (should)	1	8	-3	-14
GIVING UN POWER TO FUND ITS ACTIVITIES	7	-1	1	-13
<i>ENGAGING IN TRADE WITH</i>				
Cuba (Guantanamo Bay)	-2	-12		
Iran	-3	-6		
North Korea	3	-1		
China	2	2		
PRACTICE FAIR TRADE				
European Union	-1	4		
Japan	-5	-1		
China	5	5		
Mexico	-2	4		
Canada	4	-2		
FOREIGN AID (favor)				
Food and Medical	2	1		
Needy Countries	1	2		
Prevention of AIDS	-7	-10		
Birth Control	-3	7		
Women's Education	-1	-3		
Promote Democracy	5	3		
STANDARDS FOR WORKING CONDITIONS	0	1	4	3
ENVIROMENTAL STANDARDS	-3	-1	2	4
LEGAL IMMIGRATION (decrease)	15	-2	-20	-12
<i>LONG TERM MILITARY BASES – general (fewer)</i>				
Germany (favor)	0	-13	-8	-18
Turkey	4	-15	16	10
Japan	5	-8	12	1
Cuba (Guantanamo Bay)	7	-4	23	-1
Saudi Arabia	6	-1	20	0
Pakistan	2	-4	9	-4
South Korea	6	-7	2	-4
Afghanistan	7	7	11	3
Uzbekistan	-1	-5	26	23
WORLD POLICMAN RESP.	0	-11		

Subject	PUBLIC		LEDEARS	
	Party	Ideology	Party	Ideology
U.S WORLD POLICEMAN MORE THAN IT SHOULD	-2	-3		
US REMAIN AS A WORLD SUPERPOWER	-3	-6		
LESSON OF 9/11 (work closely)	6	7		
SIDES IN MIDDLE-EAST CONFLICT	-2	-2	-1	-14
<i>US ACTIVE IN WORLD AFFAIRS</i> (best for the future)	9	0	-4	1
DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS (favor)				
Cuba	0	-2		
Iran	-7	-14		
North Korea	0	-7		
China	5	-1		
FEELINGS RATE – COUNTRIES (cold, 1f-49f)				
North Korea	7	14		
Germany	-11	-3		
Mexico	0	-1		
Israel (warm , 51f-100f)	8	6		
Great Britain	3	-4		
China	12	9		
Saudi Arabia	-20	-5		
France	13	2		
South Korea	6	9		
Cuba	-13	-4		
Muslim People	9	-7		
FEELINGS, RATE – INTER. ORGS. (cold)				
WTO	13	12		
UN	12	22		
WB	4	14		
Multi Corp	-6	-12		
EU	11	11		
IMF	7	9		
Inter. Human Rights Groups	-7	12		
WC	1	7		

**TABLE 4 How Much Partisan Polarization Overall?
(Summary of ALL Findings from Tables 1-3)**

	<u>Public Opinion</u>		<u>Leader Opinion</u>	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Number of Survey Questions (Number of Leader Questions)	122 (62)	100% (100%)	62	100%
Cases of Partisan Divergence *	19 (11)	16% (18%)	17	27%
Cases of Partisan Convergence	4 (2)	3% (3%)	6	10%
Cases of Ideological Divergence	23 (11)	19% (18%)	11	18%
Cases of Ideological Convergence	9 (4)	7% (6%)	11	18%
Cases of <u>Both</u> Partisans and Ideological Divergence	9 (4)	7% (6%)	7	11%
Cases of Both Partisan and Ideological Convergence	0 (0)	0% (0%)	3	5%

*Note: “Partisan,” Republicans vs. Democrats. “Ideological,” self-identified conservatives vs. liberals. “Polarization” is indicated by “Divergence” of opinion. Numbers reported and percentages calculated separately for the full 122 questions asked of the public and then (in parentheses) for the 62 questions asked in both the leader and the public opinion surveys. Data compiled by authors. See text.

TABLE 4a How Much Partisan Polarization Overall?
(Summary of FOREIGN POLICY OPINIONS, PERCEPTIONS
and FEELINGS, excluding 8 domestic items)

	<u>Public Opinion</u>		<u>Leader Opinion</u>	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Number of Survey Questions (Number of Leader Questions)	114 (54)	100% (100%)	54	100%
Cases of Partisan Divergence *	18 (10)	16% (19%)	17	31%
Cases of Partisan Convergence	4 (2)	4% (4%)	4	7%
Cases of Ideological Divergence	20 (8)	18% (15%)	11	20%
Cases of Ideological Convergence	8 (3)	7% (6%)	10	19%
Cases of <u>Both</u> Partisans and Ideological Divergence	9 (4)	8% (7%)	7	13%
Cases of Both Partisan and Ideological Convergence	0 (0)	0% (0%)	2	4%

*Note: “Partisan,” Republicans vs. Democrats. “Ideological,” self-identified conservatives vs. liberals. “Polarization” is indicated by “Divergence” of opinion. Numbers reported and percentages calculated separately for the full 114 questions asked of the public and then (in parentheses) for the 54 questions asked in both the leader and the public opinion surveys. Data compiled by authors. See text.

TABLE 4b How Much Partisan Polarization Overall?
(Summary of FOREIGN POLICY OPINION Findings,
excluding perception and feelings questions)

	<u>Public Opinion</u>		<u>Leader Opinion</u>	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Number of Survey Questions (Number of Leader Questions)	82 (54)	100% (100%)	54	100%
Cases of Partisan Divergence *	11 (10)	13% (19%)	17	31%
Cases of Partisan Convergence	2 (2)	2% (4%)	4	7%
Cases of Ideological Divergence	8 (8)	10% (15%)	11	20%
Cases of Ideological Convergence	7 (3)	9% (6%)	10	19%
Cases of <u>Both</u> Partisans and Ideological Divergence	4 (4)	5% (7%)	7	13%
Cases of Both Partisan and Ideological Convergence	0 (0)	0% (0%)	2	4%

*Note: “Partisan,” Republicans vs. Democrats. “Ideological,” self-identified conservatives vs. liberals. “Polarization” is indicated by “Divergence” of opinion. Numbers reported and percentages calculated separately for the full 82 questions asked of the public and then (in parentheses) for the 54 questions asked in both the leader and the public opinion surveys. Data compiled by authors. See text.

TABLE 4c How Much Partisan Polarization Overall?
 (Summary of PERCEPTIONS and FEELINGS Findings)

	<u>Public Opinion</u>	
	N	Percent
Number of Survey Questions	32	100%
Cases of Partisan <u>Divergence</u> *	7	22%
Cases of Partisan Convergence	2	6%
Cases of Ideological Divergence	12	38%
Cases of Ideological Convergence	1	3%
Cases of <u>Both</u> Partisans and Ideological Divergence	5	16%
Cases of Both Partisan and Ideological Convergence	0	0%

*Note: “Partisan,” Republicans vs. Democrats. “Ideological,” self-identified conservatives vs. liberals. “Polarization” is indicated by “Divergence” of Perceptions and Feelings. Numbers reported and percentages calculated separately for the 32 questions asked of the public only. Data compiled by authors. See text.