AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

POLLING DATA ON LATIN AMERICAN OPINION OF UNITED STATES POLICIES, VALUES AND PEOPLE

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 8, 2007

Serial No. 110–25

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

33–824PDF WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TOM LANTOS, California, *Chairman*

HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
BRAD SHERMAN, California
ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
DIANE E. WATSON, California
ADAM SMITH, Washington
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN S. TANNER, Tennessee
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas
RUBÉN HINOJOSA, Texas
DAVID WU, Oregon
BRAD MILLER, North Carolina
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
JIM COSTA, California
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
RON KLEIN, Florida
VACANT
VACANT

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
DONALD A. MANZULLO, Illinois
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
RON PAUL, Texas
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
MIKE PENCE, Indiana
THADDEUS G. McCOTTER, Michigan
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
J. GRESHAM BARRETT, South Carolina
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
BOB INGLIS, South Carolina
LUIS G. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico

ROBERT R. KING, *Staff Director*
YLEEM POBLETE, *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT

BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
VACANT

DANA ROHRABACHER, California
RON PAUL, Texas
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona

CLIFF STAMMERMAN, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
NATALIE COBURN, *Subcommittee Professional Staff Member*
PHAEDRA DUGAN, *Republican Professional Staff Member*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York, *Chairman*

GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ, California
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
BILL DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
RON KLEIN, Florida
GENE GREEN, Texas

DAN BURTON, Indiana
CONNIE MACK, Florida
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
LUIS G. FORTUÑO, Puerto Rico
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
RON PAUL, Texas
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia

JASON STEINBAUM, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
ERIC JACOBSTEIN, *Subcommittee Professional Staff Member*
MARK WALKER, *Republican Professional Staff Member*
ERIN DIAMOND, *Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESS

Mr. John Zogby, President, Zogby International 2

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

Mr. John Zogby: Prepared statement 5

APPENDIX

The Honorable Eliot L. Engel, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, and Chairman, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere: Prepared statement 37

The Honorable Dan Burton, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana: Prepared statement 38

POLLING DATA ON LATIN AMERICAN OPINION OF UNITED STATES POLICIES, VALUES AND PEOPLE

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
HUMAN RIGHTS, AND OVERSIGHT, AND
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to notice, at 3:03 p.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Bill Delahunt (chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight) presiding.

Mr. DELAHUNT. This joint hearing will come to order. Thank you for being here today. This hearing is part of a series on global and regional opinions of the United States. This effort was provoked by a Government Accountability Office report from April 2005 that warned that "anti-Americanism was broadening and deepening around the world," and as such, anti-Americanism could seriously damage U.S. interests.

I thought it would be useful to hear from prominent pollsters about the facts, and I stress "the facts" that they discovered in their research on this topic.

Today's hearing is a joint one with the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee because its focus is on Latin American views of the United States.

Our witness today is John Zogby, the president of Zogby International, and clearly one of the most prominent pollsters dealing in Latin America, and elsewhere, I might add. I would note that Mr. Zogby has a scheduling conflict, and must leave about 4:00, and I understand that his assistant, Sam Rogers, will be able to stay and answer any questions that Mr. Zogby is unable to do because of his absence that my friends and colleagues might have.

Without objection, he will be allowed to do so, and I seek unanimous consent, and hearing none, it will be so ordered.

Given to the time constraints, I would ask my colleagues to keep their opening statements to a minimum, or if they so choose, to even refrain from them entirely, so with that we can hear directly from Mr. Zogby. I will now turn to the ranking member of this subcommittee, Dana Rohrabacher of California. Dana?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I pass.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And I now turn to my friend and colleagues, the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Eliot Engel of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Well, Mr. Chairman, the pressure is on so I better not give an opening statement. Let me just say very quickly how delighted I am that our two subcommittees are meeting together. This is obviously a very important subject, and I look forward to hearing the testimony of Mr. Zogby and Mr. Rogers. Thank you.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Mr. Engel, and I anticipate that we will be conducting a series of joint hearings during the course of this term.

I now turn to the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. Burton. And since he is not here, we will take his absence of an indication that he too has waived his right to an opening statement.

And with that let us proceed directly to Mr. Zogby.

STATEMENT OF MR. JOHN ZOGBY, PRESIDENT, ZOGBY INTERNATIONAL

Mr. ZOGBY. Thank you, Messrs. Chairman and Messrs. Rohrabacher and Burton. Thank you, members of the committee. And thank you very much for adjusting the time to accommodate the tight travel schedule. I really appreciate it.

It is wonderful to have the opportunity to appear before you today and discuss our recent work in Latin America. We have conducted extensive polling in Latin America over the years, both of elites, and most recently during the 2006 elections in several countries among the general public.

In reviewing our findings from most recently and over the years, several trends do emerge:

Number one, there is growing disaffection with the United States which threatens longstanding vital interests and working relationships.

Number two, U.S. policies which anger and alienate not only the general population but also elite communities who are more conservative and more pro-American traditionally.

Number three, specifically immigration policies and regional trade policies are part of the problem. More importantly, in recent years of unilateralist policies with the rest of the world have just augmented this feeling of disaffection. Obviously and particularly that is Iraq and a subdivision of that, Guantanamo, and what that represents and comes into play.

Number four is a widespread feeling of neglect or a feeling of being orphaned as a result of the grandeur war on terrorism.

And number five, as a consequent of all this Latin America nations are increasingly looking elsewhere both internally and externally to forge new relationships, whether it is with China, the European Union, or among themselves.

I am going to be very brief. When we look across the seven countries that we have surveyed, what we find in Chart No. 1 are high negative ratings throughout Latin America. When we asked the question very simply, "How would you regard the U.S. handling of Latin American relations?", what you see is a 13 percent combined positive—these are elites again—and 86 percent negative. These in-

clude 78 percent negative in Colombia which, of course, is the recipient of a significant amount of American aid. Ninety-five percent negative in Chile, one of our best friends in the region, the highest single poor rating. Poor alone is Mexico, our neighbor, among elites, it is 65 percent, yet 67 percent of elites say relations with the United States are very important to them.

What is the origin of the negative attitude? Well, the first source is the overwhelming belief that the United States benefits more from free trade than does Latin America. Forty-seven percent of elites say they want a more balanced approach to free trade.

The second source of negative attitude, U.S. immigration policy. Eighty-two percent of elites believe that the future of Hispanic Americans is either very important or somewhat important to them. If you look at Table 2, in the middle, what you see is the overall opinion of U.S. immigration policy, 15 percent positive and 83 percent negative.

Another cause is reflected in the current administration's overall job performance. This is something that we have asked every year now since 2001, excellent, good, fair, or poor. What we see on the—and that is not up right now. The United States handling of Latin America relations, that should be the performance rating of President Bush. Seventeen percent positive and 81 percent negative. Could that have been flipped? There you go. Sorry.

Of all of the leaders, and we do this every year, of all the leaders that we have tested in the region, in the Americas, the President has traditionally rated the lowest. Eighty-one percent fair and poor. The highest negative is Mexico among the elites, 96 percent. The highest positive comes from Chile, 24 percent; Colombia, 23; and Venezuela at 22. This is still on the performance rating of President Bush.

These high negative marks can not only be attributed to our performance in the region and our immigration policy, but also our handling of world affairs. If you go to the chart all the way on the left now regarding how the United States is handling world conflict management, what you see there is a combined 14 percent positive, 86 percent negative. The highest negative is in Mexico at 98 percent. The highest positive among elites is in Venezuela at 24 percent.

Now, just segueing over to the election polling that we did in a number of countries, and now we are in the middle chart here, this is a combined total now of the elections that we did, this is an aggregate of Nicaragua, Colombia, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela. The overall opinion of the American people in the middle chart, there are 45 percent in aggregate hold a favorable view of the American people. The highest favorable coming from Colombia at 59 percent, and Nicaragua at 50 percent. Thirty-one percent hold a negative or unfavorable view of the American people. Forty-three percent in Mexico, 37 percent in Brazil. This is the general public.

Now, when asked about the American Government, there is increased evidence of a deterioration of America's image, and that is the one all the way over to the left. The overall opinion of the American Government among the aggregate of all those nations that we polled, general public, 33 percent favorable, 45 percent unfavorable. The highest favorables coming from Colombia at 52, and

Nicaragua at 37. Twenty-six percent have a very unfavorable view overall. The highest unfavorables, Mexico at 61, Venezuela at 51, Brazil at 50.

Perhaps the most revealing and potentially significant evidence of Latin America disaffection with the United States emerges when we asked respondents to name the country they feel is most important to America, and that is the last chart that is here on the right. You see 31 percent, the United States in first place, but 27 percent say China, and interestingly among elites China is viewed much more as a competitor than it is as a potential friend, and yet it almost ties with the United States as the country most important to Latin America. After that you have Brazil, Japan and Spain.

To conclude these brief comments, I would just to highlight the causal pattern that places these findings in context. Several trends. The opinion of the United States handling of relations with Latin America, of handling with immigration and world conflicts has fallen over the last years. This decline has led to a lower opinion of the American people, the American Government, and the overall importance of the United States as a regional player.

The net result, this environment can lead to less influence in the Western Hemisphere for the United States, and the potential for other nations to pick up the gap.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Zogby follows:]

John Zogby--Testimony for joint hearing of the House Foreign Relation Subcommittee on International Organizations and Oversight and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere. Thursday 3pm.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Thank you Mr. Rohrabacher. Thank you members of the committee. It is wonderful to have the opportunity to appear before your committee today and discuss our recent work in Latin America. I believe today's hearing merits added significance as this hearing coincides with the start of President Bush's trip to Latin America.

Since 1997, Zogby International has conducted extensive polling in Latin America—focusing not only on national elections, but also on the opinions of elites and key decision makers. In reviewing our findings from the past several years, several trends emerge. First, there is a growing disaffection with the United States that threatens our long standing vital interests and working relationships.

When we examine our data further in an effort to identify the causes for this disaffection, we find over the past several years, U.S. policies have angered and alienated not only the general population, but also the Elite communities—who traditionally are more conservative and pro-American.

And while immigration policies and regional trade policies compose a large part of the picture, our unilateralist policies with the rest of the world have augmented this sense of alienation. As a consequence, Latin American nations increasingly are looking elsewhere, both internally and externally, to forge other close relationships in the region.

Elite Poll Findings

Let us first look at elite opinion regarding the U.S. government's handling of its relations toward Latin America. Here we find an overwhelmingly negative response. Eighty-six percent of those surveyed in our 2006 Elite poll rate the U.S. handling as 'fair' or 'poor.' Approximately one-in-ten (13%) give the U.S. a positive rating (See Appendix A, Table 1).

Looking across the seven countries surveyed we find that high negative ratings exist throughout Latin America, including 78 percent in Colombia, where we have committed significant amounts of foreign aid. Chile, arguably one of our best friends in the region, has the highest negative opinion of U.S. relations at ninety-five percent. While these overall negative ratings are high, the highest 'poor' rating emerges from our neighbor and top trade partner, Mexico, where two-in-three elites (65%) view U.S. relations in a poor light (See Appendix A, Table 1).

In our 2005 survey of elites, two-thirds (67%) told us that relations with the U.S. were very important and that the U.S. should pay more attention to Latin America (See Appendix A, Table 2.1 & 2.2). At many turns we need to remind people that these opinions are from an elite sample, where there is a strong representation of conservatives and moderates, as well as business owners and community leaders.

What is the origin of this negative attitude? One source is the overwhelming belief that the U.S. benefits more from free trade than does Latin America (See Appendix A, Table 3). This opinion has grown stronger over time, particularly among elites in Argentina, Colombia, Chile and Venezuela. Asked what changes the U.S. should make

in its trade policies, nearly half of these elites tell us that they would like to see a more balanced approach to trade relations (See Appendix A, Table 4).

A second source of negative opinion stems from U.S. immigration policies, which show a tremendous disconnect between U.S. policy and regional opinion (See Appendix A, Table 5). We find that respondents follow immigration issues very closely and indeed eighty-two percent believe that the future of Hispanic Americans is either very important or somewhat important (See Appendix A, Table 6).

At the same time, American media and political discourse is littered with leading figures and pundits railing against immigration. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn that more than four out of every five elites (83%) surveyed hold a negative opinion of U.S. immigration policy. In the most extreme example, three-in-four Mexican elites (74%) rate the current U.S. policy as 'poor' (See Appendix A, Table 5).

When asked to rate President Bush's overall job performance, we again find the same high negative ratings with four-in-five elites (81%) giving the President a rating of 'fair' or 'poor' (See Appendix A, Table 7). This includes a stunning ninety-six percent of Mexican elites. Half of all elites (50%) say that President Bush's policies have been worse for the region than those of his predecessors, while only 6 percent say that his policies have been better (See Appendix A, Table 9).

These high negative marks can not only be attributed to our performance in the region and our immigration policy, but also our handling of world affairs—that is to say the war in Iraq and our 'go it alone strategy.' A case in point -- eighty-six percent of elites disagree with the U.S.'s management of world conflicts, including majorities in every nation who strongly disagree (See Appendix A, Table 10).

These negative feelings come at a time when significant change has been occurring throughout the region.

Nationwide Election Poll Findings

During the course of 2006, many Latin American countries held Presidential elections and to gauge the shifting opinions in the region we polled likely voters in five nations—Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, Nicaragua and Venezuela. While the focus of these polls was largely on national political and economic issues, in each country we had respondents rate their opinion of the American people and the U.S. government.

As with the Arab world and as you are going to hear in the coming weeks from my brother Jim Zogby, poorly received policies have hurt the image of the American people among Latin Americans. Less than half (45%) hold a favorable view of the American people with the highest favorable ratings coming from Colombia (59%) and Nicaragua (50%). Almost one-third (31%) hold a negative, or unfavorable view (See Appendix A, Table 11).

When asked about the American government there is increased evidence of a deterioration of America's image. The U.S. government is viewed in a favorable light by only one-third (33%) of Latin Americans, while forty-five percent view it unfavorably. One-quarter say their opinion is very unfavorable (See Appendix A, Table 12).

Perhaps the most revealing and potentially significant evidence of Latin American disaffection with the United States emerges from our 2006 Elite poll when we asked respondents to name the country they feel is most important to Latin America (See

Appendix A, Table 13). Less than one-in-three (31%) think the U.S. is the most important nation—with particularly low marks in Argentina (14%) and Chile (22%). China was named by an almost equal number of respondents (27%), evidence of its increased standing in the region.

To conclude, I would just like to highlight the causal pattern that places these findings into context. Our work throughout Latin America has revealed several trends. First, the opinion of the U.S. handling of relations, immigration and world conflicts has fallen over the last few years, as has the rating of President Bush. This decline has led to a lower opinion of the American people, the American government and the overall importance of the U.S. as a regional player.

Appendix A: Supplemental Tables

1. How would you grade the US government's handling of its relations toward Latin America?

Table 1: Opinion of U.S. Handling of Relations with Latin America

2006 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Colombia	Chile	Mexico	Peru	Venezuela
Excellent	1	--	3	--	--	--	3	4
Good	12	5	14	23	5	14	18	9
Positive*	**13**	**5**	**17**	**23**	**5**	**14**	**20**	**13**
Fair	45	62	46	46	57	21	64	45
Poor	38	33	37	31	38	65	15	43
Negative	**86**	**95**	**83**	**78**	**95**	**86**	**79**	**88**

**Positive responses are the aggregate of Excellent and Good. Negative Reponses are the aggregate of Fair and Poor.*

Source: 2006 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 603, Margin of Error 4.5%.

2. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all important and 5 being extremely important, please rate each of the following as to its overall importance to the economy of Latin America.

Table 2.1: Importance of Trade Agreements to Latin American Economy

2006/2005 Elite	2006		2005		Highest Rating*		Lowest Rating*	
	Higher Importance**	Lower Importance	Higher Importance	Lower Importance	Nation	(%)	Nation	(%)
Latin America	81	6	81	6	Venezuela	95	Brazil	12
U.S.	59	14	50	17	Peru	79	Argentina	20
E.U.	80	8	74	5	Venezuela	88	Argentina	17
China***	70	9	59	16	Chile	57	Mexico	14
Arab Nations	81	8	55	24	Chile	57	Mexico	43

**Highest Rating reflects the nation with the greatest "Higher Importance" rating. Lowest Rating reflects the nation with the greatest "Lower Importance" rating.*
***Higher Importance is the combination of 4&5, while Lower Importance is the combination of 1&2.*
****In 2005, respondents were asked about agreements with Asian Nations. In 2006 they were asked about China, specifically.*

Source: 2006 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 603, Margin of Error 4.5%.
Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

Table 2.2: Importance of Trade Agreements to Latin American Economy

2006/2005 Elite		Argentina		Brazil		Colombia		Chile		Mexico		Peru		Venezuela	
		'06	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*	*'06*	*'05*
Latin America	High	78	78	76	82	82	83	72	76	81	82	88	N/A	93	85
	Low	9	5	12	6	1	4	7	9	4	3	3	N/A	--	4
U.S.	High	36	41	57	55	55	40	70	61	55	44	79	N/A	61	60
	Low	20	18	18	19	9	21	13	7	16	26	3	N/A	14	6
E.U.	High	73	64	73	80	83	69	84	78	77	71	87	N/A	88	83
	Low	6	8	13	4	3	5	6	--	5	13	3	N/A	--	1
China*	High	72	61	62	69	71	51	85	81	64	37	79	N/A	69	54
	Low	5	11	8	11	11	15	5	--	14	37	6	N/A	9	15
Arab Nations	High	34	21	53	5	36	25	57	46	28	14	40	N/A	48	26
	Low	22	34	16	17	34	30	15	15	43	62	18	N/A	18	14

**In 2005, respondents were asked about agreements with Asian Nations. In 2006 they were asked about China, specifically.*

Source: 2006 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 603, Margin of Error 4.5%.
Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

3. Who do you think would benefit most from free trade between Latin America and the U.S.?

Table 3: Beneficiaries of U.S.–Latin American Trade: U.S. or Latin America

2005-2006 Elite	Overall		Argentina		Brazil		Colombia		Chile		Mexico		Venezuela	
	'05	'06	'05	'06	'05	'06	'05	'06	'05	'06	'05	'06	'05	'06
U.S.	54	51	56	43	57	41	57	44	46	36	60	26	35	18
L.A.	9	8	10	6	7	6	9	10	9	15	5	3	16	8
Both	36	39	24	38	38	48	31	46	45	45	29	58	47	71
Neither	1	2	--	1	1	2	1	--	1	1	--	3	--	1
Not Sure	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	--	--	--	--	1	--	3

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

Table 4. Desired Changes in U.S. Latin America Policy

2005 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
More balanced trade relations	**47**	44	30	38	53	58	63
A more European-like hemispheric union	**12**	27	29	31	24	16	19
More free-trade agreements	**16**	13	30	11	6	22	6
More foreign aid conditional on the ally responsible economic policy	**12**	11	14	20	10	3	11
Not sure	**2**	5	1	1	4	--	1

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

5. Generally speaking, how would you evaluate United States immigration policies toward Latin America?

Table 5. Views on U.S. Immigration Policies

2005 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
Excellent	1	3	--	--	--	--	1
Good	14	18	18	13	15	6	14
Positive	**15**	**21**	**18**	**13**	**15**	**6**	**15**
Fair	36	31	30	43	44	20	51
Poor	47	40	48	42	38	74	31
Negative	**83**	**71**	**78**	**85**	**82**	**94**	**82**
Not sure	3	9	4	2	3	--	3

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

6. In your view, how important are Hispanic Americans to your country's future?

Table 6. Importance of Hispanic Americans

2005 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
Very important	**50**	11	64	52	54	78	31
Somewhat important	**32**	41	25	33	32	20	45
Not at all important	**16**	44	7	13	14	1	24
Not sure	**2**	4	4	3	--	1	--

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

7. How would you rate United States President George W. Bush's overall job performance?

Table 7. Rating President Bush

2005/2003	Overall		Argentina		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Mexico		Venezuela	
Elite	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*	*05*	*03*
Excellent	2	2	4	--	2	--	1	1	1	4	1	3	1	1
Good	15	10	13	4	10	2	23	15	22	19	3	2	21	21
Positive	**17**	**12**	**17**	**4**	**12**	**2**	**24**	**16**	**23**	**23**	**4**	**5**	**22**	**23**
Fair	36	37	40	44	29	28	40	48	46	43	19	14	48	54
Poor	45	50	38	49	58	70	35	35	26	35	77	78	25	23
Negative	**81**	**87**	**78**	**93**	**87**	**98**	**75**	**83**	**72**	**78**	**96**	**92**	**73**	**77**
Not sure	3	2	6	4	1	--	--	1	5	--	--	4	5	2

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

8. How would you rate United States President George W. Bush's overall job performance?

Table 8: Opinion of the President Bush—VENEZUELA OVERALL--ELECTION

Venezuela 2006	Overall	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+
Very Favorable	6	5	7	7	7
Somewhat Favorable	14	21	19	15	11
Favorable	**20**	**26**	**26**	**22**	**18**
Somewhat Unfavorable	12	16	18	17	4
Very Unfavorable	45	34	31	37	42
Unfavorable	**57**	**50**	**49**	**54**	**46**
Not Familiar	17	18	17	20	33
Not Sure	6	6	8	5	2

Source: 2006 Venezuela Nationwide Election Survey, Sample Size 800, Margin of Error 3.5%

9. In comparison with other recent U.S. presidents, would you say that President Bush's policies toward Latin America have been better, worse, or the same for the region?

Table 9. Bush and Latin America

2005 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
Better	6	5	1	11	20	1	3
Worse	50	53	59	40	25	66	50
The same	42	38	39	48	51	33	48
Not sure	2	5	1	1	5	–	2

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

10. Do you agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with how the government of the United States is managing world conflict?

Table 10. Views on U.S. World-Conflict Management

2005 Elite	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Mexico	Venezuela
Agree	3	6	2	4	3	--	1
Somewhat agree	11	6	15	9	12	2	23
Agree	**14**	**12**	**17**	**13**	**15**	**2**	**24**
Somewhat disagree	25	31	19	29	31	18	26
Strongly disagree	61	55	63	59	54	80	50
Disagree	**86**	**86**	**82**	**88**	**85**	**98**	**76**
Not sure	0	1	1	--	--	--	--

Source: 2005 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 523, Margin of Error 4.4%

Table 11: Opinion of the American People

2006 Election	Mexico	Colombia	Brazil	Nicaragua	Venezuela
Very Favorable	11	16	7	24	14
Somewhat Favorable	30	43	30	26	29
Favorable	**41**	**59**	**37**	**50**	**43**
Somewhat Unfavorable	20	12	25	14	12
Very Unfavorable	23	10	12	6	16
Unfavorable	**43**	**22**	**37**	**20**	**28**
Not Familiar	9	15	20	13	22
Not sure	7	4	6	17	7

Source: 2006 Latin American Election Series, Sample Size 4,371, Margin of Error 1.5%

Table 12: Opinion of the American Government

2006 Election	Mexico	Colombia	Brazil	Nicaragua	Venezuela
Very Favorable	6	13	5	15	6
Somewhat Favorable	21	39	22	22	19
Favorable	**27**	**52**	**27**	**37**	**25**
Somewhat Unfavorable	22	15	29	11	17
Very Unfavorable	39	16	21	21	34
Unfavorable	**61**	**31**	**50**	**32**	**51**
Not Familiar	7	13	18	14	19
Not Sure	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Source: 2006 Latin American Election Series, Sample Size 4,371, Margin of Error 1.5%

13. What country do you think is most important to Latin America?

Table 13.1: Most Important Country to Latin America

2006 Elite	Overall		Argentina		Brazil		Colombia		Chile		Mexico		Peru		Venezuela	
	Rank	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*
U.S.	1	31	3	14	1	28	1	40	2	22	1	32	1(t)	35	1	44
China	2	27	1	26	2	15	2	28	1	43	2	20	1(t)	35	2	25
Brazil	3	11	2	20	--	--	--	--	4	9	--	--	3	13	--	--
Japan	4	8	--	--	3	9	3	6	3	15	3	9	--	--	3	11
Spain	5	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	7	--	--	4	10

Source: 2006 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 603, Margin of Error 4.5%.

Table 13.2: Most Important Country to Latin America

2006 Elite	18-29	30-49	50-64	65+	Left (1)	(2)	Neutral (3)	(4)	Right (5)
U.S.	31	33	27	24	14	22	31	45	43
China	19	28	27	32	37	35	21	22	37
Brazil	6	11	14	12	13	16	13	5	8
Japan	6	7	10	4	10	3	10	4	8
Spain	6	3	4	8	5	7	3	7	4

Source: 2006 Latin American Elite Survey, Sample Size 603, Margin of Error 4.5%.

Appendix B: Polling Methodology

2006 Latin American Elite Poll Methodology

Countries	Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela
Sample Design	Elite Sample
Mode	Face-to-face and phone interviews
Language	Spanish, Portuguese (in Brazil only)
Dates of Data	November 10 – December 11, 2006
Sample Size	603 (100 in Brazil and Mexico, 80 in all other nations)
Margin of Error	+/- 4.1%, higher in subgroups
Representative of	Latin American elites

*Results are also included from previous Latin American Elite polls conducted by Zogby International in both 2002 and 2005.

- In 2002, Zogby International surveyed 420 elites in six Latin American countries. The overall margin of error was +/- 5.0%. Field work was conducted between 9/02/02 and 10/02/02.

- In 2005, Zogby International surveyed 523 elites in six Latin American countries. The overall margin of error was +/- 4.4%. Field work was conducted between 8/17/05 and 9/15/05.

- Both the 2002 and 2005 survey included Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico and Venezuela. **Peru was only surveyed in 2006.**

2006 Latin America Election Series Methodology

Methodology

Country	**Overall**
Sample Design	Probability sampling
Mode	Face-to-face, adults 18+
Language	Spanish (except in Brazil—Portuguese)
Representative of	Urban Adult Population

Methodology (Cont.)

	Mexico		**Colombia**	**Brazil**		**Nicaragua**		**Venezuela**	
	1st	**2nd**	**1st**	**1st**	**2nd**	**1st**	**2nd**	**1st**	**2nd**
Start Date	5/6	6/19	5/10	7/29	9/2	9/1	10/20	10/1	11/12
End Date	5/9	6/15	5/14	8/12	9/13	9/5	--	10/16	11/18
Sample Size	1,000	1,000	830	941	923	800	800	800	800
Margin of Error (+-)	3.2%	3.2%	3.5%	3.3%	3.3%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%

2006 U.S./Mexico Mirror Poll

Conducted	U.S. and Mexico
Sample Design	Random Probability Sample
Mode	U.S.—Phone Interviews Mexico—Face-to-face
Language	U.S.—English Mexico—Spanish
Fieldwork Dates	U.S.—[illegible] Mexico—[illegible]
Sample Size	U.S.—1,010 Mexico—1,000
Margin of Error	U.S.—[illegible] Mexico—[illegible]
Representative of	Adult Nationwide Populations

Mr. DELAHUNT. Yes, thank you, Mr. Zogby.

All of the sampling that you conducted was a randomly selected group that you defined as "elites." Could you give us your definition of elites?

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes. Some of what I related to you toward the end was of the general public, but among elites we generally use four categories, broad categories, and those include political government, business, academic, and then the fourth is civic NGO. We define the elites from a broad list of categories and titles that we have been using since 2001, and they include not the very highest level, so not the cardinal, but they could very well include the chief of staff to the cardinal, or an auxiliary bishop, to give you an example. They would include labor leaders. They would include academic experts, including deans and college presidents, and the like, opinion leaders.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That comes as a certain, to me, given the ratings of the American Government and specifically in terms of President Bush, one would imagine that this particular group would tend to be pro-business, more conservative than other segments of the local population. Am I correct in making that assumption?

Mr. ZOGBY. That would be the assumption going into this, and I hope that we have this here. In our overall sample of 603 in the seven countries that we did, and this is a regional sample, we found that of those approximately just under a third were politically left or left of center leaning.

The 243 or so, so a little over another third were somewhere in the middle, and then a total of about 28 percent are conservative.

In previous years, when the numbers were not much higher, we had more conservatives, but then of course to adequately reflect what is taking place in Latin America there has been an overall tilt to the left anyway.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The reason I ask that question, I know that some of my colleagues have expressed concerns about the lurch to left, if you will, the disagreements with the Venezuelan Government, but your description of the term "elite," I would be surprised that if those far to the left are those who would support, for example, in Venezuela the Chavez government would be incorporated into that definition.

Again, am I making a fair assumption?

Mr. ZOGBY. There will be no doubt Chavez sympathizers just as there are Lula, then Lagos and Michelet sympathizers, et cetera, supporters. The bottom line is that we took pains with this sample to make sure that it was stratified in such a way that we got an adequate representation of those that tilt to the left, which is more today than it was 3 years ago.

The bulk, at about 36 to 38 percent, is defined in the center, and today about 27 or 28 percent are conservative. So I think we have got a broad representation here. And I should note that if you take this in aggregate, if I were to look at the 160 or so who identified themselves as conservative or right of center, the numbers toward the United States aren't magical there either, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. With that, I yield to my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the committee, Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Zogby, I heard a story once that there was a fellow in your business, it might have been you, who was asked at a party what he did for a living, and he said that he was a pollster, and the gentleman went on to proceed to describe how he had just had the cover on his sofa redone, and went into great deal about upholstery rather than a pollster. Was it you that story is about?

Mr. ZOGBY. What you have heard is a true story.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is a true story.

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Well, I am not going to ask you about the sofa today.

Mr. ZOGBY. Okay, thank you. But if you need one done, I am happy to help.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. A couple of the things that are a little bit disconcerting to me but a couple of things that seem to make sense. I believe that leadership always leads to a decline in popularity. Have you found that to be true with other cases where someone like Abraham Lincoln provided great leadership, and he was very unpopular until 6 months?

Mr. ZOGBY. I am sorry, Mr. Rohrabacher, despite the grayish-white hair, I was not around for the Lincoln administration.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But in the past I have noted this. I mean, Ronald Reagan, his poll numbers were very low, and he was vilified during the 1980's, and as soon as the wall started coming down they might as well have been a saint, and all of a sudden the poll numbers went way up.

So sometimes when you have a negative poll number about this country or about our leadership, it has to be taken into account that we might be providing some leadership that is necessary for a long-term outcome that is very uncomfortable.

What do people down there, they don't like us down in Latin America, but what about—how do they feel about China? I mean, you compared us to China there.

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I mean, China has basically none of the human rights that we have, et cetera, et cetera, and how do people feel about China compared to us?

Mr. ZOGBY. Let me just comment that my recollection, and I wasn't polling on this level in the 1980's, was that Ronald Reagan's numbers were very, very good. There was a dip during the 1982 recession, but that Ronald Reagan by and large operated a very popular presidency.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. ZOGBY. But with that said, no, China is not a role model, and it is viewed as a rival, as a competitor, and at arms-length. It is more a testimonial, Mr. Rohrabacher, to the declining popularity of the United States, that we are almost at par with China, not because of any fundamental popularity that China brings to the table.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yes, and I noticed the poll about people, how they felt about our immigration policies, and how they felt about our President. I found that to be extraordinary considering that this President probably has one of the—how shall I say it—loosest

or the more benevolent open borders immigration policy than any other actually President that I can think of, or at least presidential candidates as well.

So the President's strong support for more open immigration hasn't helped his popularity in Latin America.

Mr. ZOGBY. The guy at the top gets the credit when things go well, and gets the blame when things go badly. In this instance, Iraq is the broad premise here——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. ZOGBY [continuing]. Of virtually everything. The President wanted his administration to be about Iraq. To a great degree, it is. But by the same token let us look at the news and the news coverage, and the news courage regarding immigration is the message that is sent down south these are people that we don't want.

On one hand the elites are saying what happens with Hispanic-Americans is extremely important. On the other hand the message that is somehow being communicated is not a positive one.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Isn't it fascinating? We have more legal immigrants entering our country—legally—than any other country of the world combined, and a great number of those come from Latin America, a large percentage of legal immigrants, and yet many more immigrants than those other Latin America countries permit to emigrate into their country, I might add, and yet they seem to have such a negative view of even our immigration policy.

Let me note, the President is down there. So is he in hostile territory?

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right.

Mr. ZOGBY. I am sorry for not equivocating.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right, and that is an important answer, and we need to make sure that that is perhaps better territory. I don't know from what you have stated, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether or not just being even more open to immigration is going to change that, or whether or not anything except the Iraq War, which has a global impact, is going to make a difference. But thank you very much for your insights.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher, and with that let me yield to the chair of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Mr. Engel of New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Zogby.

I have a bunch of questions to ask you, but I wrote four words down as you were talking, and I would like to ask you that question first, and the four words are, "What do we do?" How do we change this? How do we reverse it? Is the President's trip, could it potentially be the start of a reversal? What is your gut in terms of how that is playing out in Latin America?

You know, some of the papers are playing it out as he is in some kind of a rivalry with Hugo Chavez, and that is the reason he is going down. Others are saying finally this administration is paying attention to Latin America, so that could be spun positively that it is a start of something new.

What is your gut and what do we do because these are horrible numbers?

Mr. ZOGBY. Let us go back a ways. The first foreign leader that the President welcomed was Vicente Fox, and as they were standing at their podiums together, the news, the breaking news was that we bombed Iraq. This was in 2001. This is before 9/11.

There is a sense that what was supposed to be promised, a president who said that he cared about Latin America, that in actuality there has been a feeling of neglect, that the region has been orphaned by the war on terrorism.

And essentially what do we do? I am a humble pollster, but let me just say that I just got out of a meeting at CSIS, the Commission on Smart Power, and a number of the public diplomacy mechanisms that we are trying to kick start and get back into order, and particularly in the Muslim world, is actually something that we need to do worldwide. There needs to be a listening tour. There needs to be, and I think the President's trip can be an opportunity by just simply ending the sense of orphaning of South America, and again putting Latin America on a priority list.

But there are other things as well. We need to send a different message about immigration clearly, and we need to get this resolved, and we need to get it resolved in such a way that is beneficial to our large Hispanic population. If I can just give you some American numbers that I hope you will find useful.

The Hispanic vote in 1996 was 5 percent of 95 million voters. It was 6 percent of 105 million voters in 2000. It was 8.5 percent of 122 million voters in 2004. I and others are projecting up to 10 percent of perhaps 130 million voters in 2008, so this is something that is in everyone's political interests as well as our geo-political interests.

You hear all the time and discuss fair trade, and open markets. In my polling, I have discovered all over the world, in particular, this country, that terms like "globalization" and "free trade" have more negative connotations to them than positive connotations.

In this country, they mean loss of jobs, unfair practices and so on, but in other countries, as you saw among elites, free trade means, oh, something that is good for the United States and not for us. Despite what the reality is, it is not trickling down and it is not being translated.

Number three, we have got to ask the Latin Americans what are their concerns, and you know what their concerns are. Number one is poverty, grueling, incredible poverty, but it is also opportunity, you know, educational opportunity, economic opportunity. And so where are the programs that follow from the United States and U.S. leadership, you know, in terms of micro loans, in terms of targeted aid that deal with these substantial problems?

Mr. ENGEL. Well, thank you. Let me just follow up if I might. You talk about immigration. The Congress, in the last Congress last year, passed an immigration bill, which I happened to vote against, but it passed, and one of the essential things of that bill was the border fence.

What struck me when you were doing the statistic was how much negatively Mexico was than any place else. Now, prior to seeing this, my opinion would have been, just my intuition that it was negative throughout Latin America, but I would have thought that Mexico, because it borders the United States, would probably be

more positive than some of the other countries. In fact, it is quite the opposite.

Is it your gut when we talk about building fences to keep those people out and all the other things that help drive our numbers down?

Mr. ZOGBY. Mr. Engel, I will ask my office to send the CDAC poll. We did extensive polling together with a prominent think tank in Mexico, Americans viewing Mexico, Mexicans viewing America. What an incredible disconnect across this border; and the fence is the moral equivalent of Guantanamo.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Zogby, you referred to a listening tour, and last year Chairman Burton had an unusual meeting of Latin America ambassadors in this very room to discuss their perspective and how they would reconfigure, if you will, our relationship with Latin America. So that resonated with me because we did make an effort last year to listen. There is a lot more listening to do, and with that, I yield to the gentleman, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, my dear friend Dan Burton.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Have you ever done a poll, Mr. Zogby, on how the people in Central America feel about the border being secured between them and Mexico?

Mr. ZOGBY. I have not.

Mr. BURTON. You haven't. If you ever do, I would like to have those figures because I would imagine they are a little ticked off about not being able to get into Mexico, and the Mexicans are trying to protect their border even more stringently than we protect our border, so it is kind of interesting.

Let me ask you this.

Mr. ZOGBY. I might add though there is no Mexican dream and there is an American dream.

Mr. BURTON. Nevertheless, it is a much more stringent situation there than it is here in the United States.

Let me ask you, do you have polling data from 1995 like this?

Mr. ZOGBY. I have not. I began polling the region in a limited basis in 1997, and then 1998, and then skipped to 2001. I don't have anything like that.

Mr. BURTON. So you don't have any figures from back during the Clinton administration?

Mr. ZOGBY. Well, 1997 and 1998.

Mr. BURTON. Do you?

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Would you send those to me? I would like to see the same thing. I mean, I am sure it is probably more positive than this, but I would like to see what the negative figures are on that at that time period because I don't think a lot of those people really like America for a lot of reasons.

The thing that is interesting though, did you ever do a poll to find out what percentage of the people would like to come to America and live and work? I mean, have you ever done a poll to see how many would like to change their living, the way they live and where they live and how they work and everything as opposed to coming to America?

Mr. ZOGBY. The short answer is no, I haven't done that.

Mr. BURTON. Well, I will tell you——

Mr. ZOGBY. Well, no. Yes, I have.

Mr. BURTON. Okay.

Mr. ZOGBY. In the Arab world, no, we have asked the question, and we will get that to you as well.

Mr. BURTON. Well, we are talking about Central and South America right now.

Mr. ZOGBY. No, but if I ever have I——

Mr. BURTON. Send me whatever you have. I would appreciate it.

Mr. ZOGBY. Okay.

Mr. BURTON. It is my opinion, and this is not a poll, I am just a humble congressman. [Laughter.] And you are a humble pollster, but you make a lot more money than I do. [Laughter.]

But it is my opinion that the peoples throughout the world may have issues with the United States, but they sure as heck would like to live here because this is the greatest and freest country on the face of the earth, and they all would like to have a part of it, and I can understand that.

Let me ask you a couple of questions that I think are important. The free trade agreements that we have hanging right now with, let us see, Peru and Colombia and the other trade agreements, or not trade agreements, but preferences that we have with other countries, which is going to expire this year, trading preferences, if those trading preferences are not extended or if this Congress did not approve the free trade agreements or whatever you want to call them with Peru and Colombia, what kind of an impact will that have on our popularity?

Mr. ZOGBY. I don't think there is implicit in any of this polling that there is a lack of a desire of a relationship with the United States, or there is a lack of a desire for an economic relationship with the United States.

All I can do is just relate what the——

Mr. BURTON. Let me put the question another way. If we don't pass those, knowing that it would create more investment and more jobs down there, do you think that would have an adverse impact on the figures you already have?

Mr. ZOGBY. I do.

Mr. BURTON. You do?

Mr. ZOGBY. Because it would be a sign of neglect.

Mr. BURTON. Okay. I hope my colleagues heard that because that is very important on the other side of the aisle. If you think it is bad now, wait until we start dumping those guys on the extension of the trade preferences and on the free trade agreements.

Let me ask you this. In reference to the approval ratings of President Bush in Table 7, I see that his ratings have actually gone up since 2003.

Mr. ZOGBY. That is right.

Mr. BURTON. It must have been really low then.

Mr. ZOGBY. Twelve.

Mr. BURTON. Yes. Is that because our policies in Latin America have become more beneficial since 2003 or is it just because it didn't rain or something?

Mr. ZOGBY. It is within the range of the margin of error, that 12 to 17.

Mr. BURTON. So what is your margin of error?

Mr. ZOGBY. On this, four.

Mr. BURTON. Twelve to 17 is five.

Mr. ZOGBY. Plus four, minus four.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, okay. Well, you got a lot of leeway there. All right. Everyone has their own agenda, especially the elite members of foreign countries who often hold much to gain or lose through wielding their power. Granted the effect of 9/11 had on the President's agenda, and Latin America is not positive. The region had high hopes and saw very little follow-through, but most elites understand the strain the terrorist attack can have on a country, and everyone wants more from us, but pure reality says that that is not always possible.

Taking that into account, this unachievable wish list, in order to make—excuse me 1 second. Have you taken into account this unachievable wish list in order to make your polling become more applicable or the outcome to be more applicable?

Mr. ZOGBY. I am not sure what the unachievable wish list is. Maybe I—I am sorry, I don't understand the question.

Mr. BURTON. I don't understand this polling outcome.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Yes. I am wondering if I can just have 1 minute because I want to follow up on something that Mr. Burton said.

Mr. DELAHUNT. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Zogby, you said that if we didn't complete the free trade agreements, that it would be negative, looked upon as further neglect. Did you do any polling or did anything come through about labor, environmental standards on these free trade agreements?

Because a lot of us, particularly on this side of the aisle, feel that free trade is good if it is fair trade, and part of being fair trade is having good environmental and labor agreements there. So did that come into play at all?

Mr. ZOGBY. Unfortunately, Mr. Engel, it did not, and I don't mean to imply in my response to Mr. Burton that the lack of passage of the specific free trade in its current form would worsen condition. It would be a sign of neglect if we didn't renew and we did nothing.

But I could only intuit that when the elites tell us that the United States is the primary beneficiary of the current free trade agreements, something is broke somewhere.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. With that, I yield to the vice chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Meeks.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Zogby, let me follow up real quick on that same thought pattern dealing with free trade agreements, et cetera.

For example, with reference to agriculture, you know, the poor is very—and our agricultural subsidies that may go along with

United States policies toward Latin America, and thereby many of the poor and indigenous individuals, that is where their area is, so they look at that as a negative when they can't compete with United States, particularly in agriculture, preventing them from having opportunities to improve their life style?

Mr. ZOGBY. Mr. Meeks, not in our polling, but there is plenty of polling data, particularly in Brazil, that reflects particularly that.

Our poll was not that granular, and perhaps it should be. This is an annual sort of thing that we do of about 30 or 35 questions, and that is not one of them, but it certainly gives me an idea that I should ask that. But in particular, there is plenty of polling data regarding agricultural subsidies, and negative feelings toward an imbalance.

Mr. MEEKS. And as a result of that, I was wondering if your poll would reflect individuals, some who may have been in the—I lost my train of thought—in the informal sector of employment as opposed to the formal sector of employment. You know, my experience has been there are a lot of Latin Americans, particularly those that happen to be indigenous or African descent, that are in the informal sector as opposed to the formal sector.

So was there any way that you could discern who was formal and informal, and what that impact was on with regards to whether it was free trade agreements or their view toward America?

Mr. ZOGBY. There is not. The data is not just that granular.

Mr. MEEKS. What about, and I know we have talked about the elites, what about within other social economic groups like rural versus urban, or racial groups, you know, education levels, was there anything in regard that you can compare to in your poll?

Mr. ZOGBY. I believe that there is. I did not focus on that in preparing for this testimony, but if we make note of that, we would be able to get you some cross tabulations on that.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you. I would really appreciate that.

And I am concerned also about the opinion of the American people. Does the opinion of the American people seem to fluctuate with what the opinion is of whoever the president of the United States is? Is there a changing? You know, you have got a certain president, so they like the president and therefore they like the American people? They don't like the president, so therefore they don't—is there any match there?

Mr. ZOGBY. I can't answer that specifically regarding Latin America. We didn't ask the same questions. But I can tell you that in other parts of the world attitudes towards, favorable attitudes toward the American people, American products, American universities, American science and technology have all suffered as a result of the negative perceptions of U.S. policy.

Mr. MEEKS. I mean, I didn't do a poll, but you know, I just found that, for example, at least in Europe on my visits there initially in 2000 and right after 2001, the opinion of the President was low after the unilateral action, but the opinion of the American people was still pretty good. But then after the President was reelected, then the opinion of both started to go down if there was some reflection on the American people as a result.

Mr. ZOGBY. I can only tell you that in regards to Latin America, and in particular the aggregation of the countries that we polled

in the elections last year, the giant sample, the 41 percent favorable, the 33 percent unfavorable are just not good numbers.

Mr. MEEKS. Was there any sense of the reason why there are so many, and you know, people are talking about the immigration issue, so many individuals from Central, or from Latin America who are emigrating here, is it for jobs and opportunity, and is the sense they just want to leave their country, but if they had a similar job or opportunity in their own country, would they still want to emigrate here or would they prefer to stay home?

Mr. ZOGBY. We haven't asked that in Latin America, Mr. Meeks. We have asked that in other parts of the world, and people are ready, a majority of people are ready to leave if the opportunities are there. They are ready to stay if the opportunities are in their home country.

But let me just by way of answering you kind of address something that Mr. Burton raised as well, and that is, all is not lost here or in Asia or in the Middle East or in other parts of the world where we poll. Our numbers are low but America still represents a beacon of hope. It still represents an American dream. It still represents the place I want to go to. I know I am not supposed to get into this, but give me 1 minute.

We polled young Arab leaders. Those are people generally more favorable toward the United States in the UAE. These are a few hundred men and women who are college educated, want to start a business, et cetera, et cetera. We asked them, What do you need? They told us the tools that they needed to start a business or expand their business. Where would you go? The United States. Why? Because that is the platinum standard. Where would you not? China and Japan. Why? Because we have no cultural affinity.

At the same time we asked who is your hero. They said Hassan Nasrallah of Hezbollah. So we got a real problem but at the same time we have a real opportunity.

Why do people want to come to the United States? It is still the platinum standard.

Mr. MEEKS. Last question, Mr. Chair.

Is there a sense of feeling in regards to whether or not the United States is willing to have dialogue with others or stand-offish as far as being arrogant, more arrogant with reference to what some of our positions are? I mean, is anything of that indication through any of the polling as to the attitudes of America when they are working with them? You know, are they confrontational? Are they willing to have dialogue or are they just trying to push it one way and that is it, it doesn't have any effect?

Mr. ZOGBY. Since you asked, anywhere we have asked the question, "Have you been to the United States, would you like to come to the United States, do you have a relative living in the United States?", when we compare the people in every country that say yes to those answers, the numbers are at times 25 to 30 points more favorable than those who say no.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Before I recognize Mr. Paul from Texas, I would just note that it is the intention of the subcommittee to conduct a hearing on the number of international visitors coming to this country because it is of grave concern to me, and I know other colleagues, that the United States is losing its market share, its tradi-

tional market share of international visitors, and therefore it is a substantial economic loss.

But as you just pointed out, Mr. Zogby, people who come here, who interact with us, return to their countries of origin with a very favorable impression of America and American values.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Paul.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to follow up on the question about how we might improve our image, and I think it was Mr. Rohrabacher that brought that up. But before I ask that question, did you imply that what we do in a place like Iraq, if there is an announcement of our activities there, does that affect the opinion of the people in Latin America?

Mr. ZOGBY. That had a huge effect on the elites, absolutely.

Mr. PAUL. Essentially negative?

Mr. ZOGBY. Very negative.

Mr. PAUL. Very negative. You know, in this country if one takes a political position of saying that we should come home, bring troops home, don't spread our military around the world, not be the policemen of the world, and precisely avoid getting involved in the internal affairs of other countries, that is said to be isolationism. That is, you know, a real bad thing to do. And yet I see something happening today that I think you used the term "go it alone attitude," you know, where we just become not multilateral but unilateral, and that to me seems to lead to an impression that we are isolationists.

You know, there is a different kind; it is almost like a diplomatic isolationism, that we will use our force and our intimidation to go and place our will on other people, yet we don't want to talk to country A or country B and try to work things out.

I am just wondering whether or not there couldn't be a position that we might take where we don't divorce ourselves from the world because I don't think that if you—if you accept the idea that you don't have to have troops around the world, you don't have to be a protectionist. Traditionally Americans believed in trading and talking with people without being protectionists, and saying we are going to shoot you if you step over the border, you know, and build up these antagonisms. At the same time it would require change of attitude.

Now, are there any things that I am suggesting there that you think could lead to an improved image and a better understanding of what America is all about?

Mr. ZOGBY. First of all, there is no possible way to spin a 13 percent approval rating among elites on our handling of world affairs. So that is the kind of cut-to-the-bone answer. But in terms of the details, there is absolutely no way that the—this is opinion, okay?

There is absolutely no way that this country can be isolationists. It needn't be a policeman, but it is the world leader. It is recognized as the world leader. There are some knocks that you take by being the world leader that just comes with the territory, but by the same token we should have—we have at our disposal and should use at our disposal various mechanisms that have existed before or exits now to promote a better public diplomacy.

One of the better ways to handle public diplomacy is to deal with what is right now the core problem, and the core problem is Iraq, and then there are subdivisions under Iraq. But I don't have to tell you the divisions in this country. The divisions exist in every country, but those divisions are not a more even split like we have here.

There is widespread opposition to American activity in Iraq all over the world, and this is one of the impacts that happen.

Mr. PAUL. When you say that we no way could be isolationists, and I agree with that, but isn't there room for saying that we could maybe have a little bit of restraint on forcing our opinion on other people with the use of arms without being isolationists?

It seems to me like there would be another option, and it seems like you leave maybe the door open, well, we don't have much choice, we would like to improve our image, but we can't do that because we can't be "isolationists," assuming that there is no way we can give up this responsibility of being the policeman of the world, and the only super power. It seems like there should be another option between those two.

Mr. ZOGBY. We can handle world leadership better, but can I tell you what is going on underneath the surface that I think you should be aware of?

There is a group of young people in this country that I call the world's first global citizens. They are 18 to 28 years old. He is one of them. And essentially these are people that are more likely than anyone else to say, I am a citizen of the planet earth as opposed to a resident of my community, or a citizen of the United States. These are people who consistently favor more diversity because they have lived in the most diverse world. They favor a more multilateral foreign policy. They favor action on global warming.

I don't mean in any way to relate to you a "liberal agenda," but let me just state that this group of young people, substantial in size, may not know where Darfur is on the map but they know Darfur is on the map, and that is a whole lot different than when a lot of us in this room were growing up. For them we can't be isolationists. The world is internationalist, money, the transport of finance, technology, et cetera. Instead of free trade there is open trade. Instead of U.S. innovation there is global innovation. We are a connected world.

Now, how do we wisely use, how do we more wisely use or global leadership than by using mechanisms and paradigms of the past?

Mr. PAUL. It seems to me that you are not willing to even concede that possibly a little restrain on our militarism might not help us, and once again I see the inability to separate the militarism and the trade, and yet I think there is room for that, and I think we have worked this well enough, so I am willing to yield back.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. It is very interesting information. Sorry I missed your presentation, but I just have a couple of questions. I wonder if the policy—first of all, how can you have effective polling when in many of the countries you have a large number of real rural and maybe illiterate people that don't have newspapers or the regular communications? How are you able to kind of get the real feel like in rural Colombia, well, Colombia is

kind of a middle tier country, but some of the poorer ones like Guatemala, Nicaragua?

Mr. ZOGBY. Fair question. And on the other end of the spectrum, how can you do good polling when people are hanging up on the phone on you by the hundreds and the thousands here in this country? We are kind of squeezed on both ends.

The fact of the matter is that you can do good polling, and let me separate out on one hand the elite polling, on the other hand the general election polling, and we will submit a document showing that in those elections our results were very, very close to the actual outcomes.

So the fact of the matter is there are indeed those among the very poorest in every one of these Latin American countries that are also illiterate, who simply cannot be polled. By the same token there are sufficient numbers of those who are among the very poor that can be polled, that give us an adequate enough representation that allow us to weight their numbers up to what their actual election turnout turns out to be that puts us in close approximation to the actual election results which in many ways then legitimates the overall opinion on more qualitative kinds of issues.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Burton was mentioning that everybody in the world wants to come to the United States, I am sort of paraphrasing it, I guess, and you know, do you believe that the average person who comes to the United States say from Latin America prefers to be here, or when they get enough saved or they send it back and they build a home, and they have got some money in the bank, they want to go back home?

Mr. ZOGBY. Very good question, and the answer is believe as opposed to do I have hard data. But the immigrant story is a mixed story, and to a great degree many who come from Latin America come initially to earn enough money to go home. You and your committee, I am sure, track the remittances that are sent back that are in the hundreds of millions of dollars, huge. That is part of that same story.

By the same token, whatever little opportunity they find here the world of produce, picking, and being chamber maids, and so on turns out to be infinitely better to whatever they might go back to, and the story of immigrants, both legal and illegal, is a story of second generation community college students and beyond, and the immigrant story replays itself over and over and over again, and resuscitates, regenerates this nation.

I am, and forgive me for saying this, the son of an illegal immigrant, and Dad didn't do too bad. I don't know how much Mr. Burton makes so I don't know if I make more than him.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Zogby, we are grateful that your parents decided to come to this country. I am sensitive to the time, and before you leave, Mr. Zogby, I would like to recognize an immigrant to this country who is making a tremendous contribution to the United States Congress, and this is the new member from New Jersey, and that is Mr. Sires. Mr. Sires.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity. I know the time is short.

Mr. Zogby, you have your green card? [Laughter.]

Mr. SIRES. I am very fascinated by these polling numbers, and I am fascinated about China, the influence that it seems to be spreading throughout the region because they basically do nothing for these countries.

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. SIRES. I mean, here we are, we try to help with little money to some of these countries, but why is it that China has grown if all they do is just seems to go in there and take? They don't seem to give anything to these countries.

Mr. ZOGBY. China has always fascinated us and it has always fascinated every nation of the world because it is so large. It has a huge market, and today it represents opportunity to do business. What is missing in the China nexus are values, values that any nation aspires to. That is the difference between us and China. They bring to the table huge potential for investment and for markets. We bring to the table the same thing, but we bring our core values which virtually everyone in the world aspires to.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you.

How much influence on the negative outlook of this country do the people like Chavez and Castro have on these poll numbers because I know they are revered in some places in South America, Central America? Are they impacting these polls?

Mr. ZOGBY. Well, you know, I want to be the first to poll Cuba, and so some day maybe I will do it. It is hard to say except that Castro has lasted as long as he has. In Venezuela, we polled, and President Chavez received over 60 percent support in our poll. He received over 60 percent support on Election Day. How many of those people "were coerced" or whatever, to a great degree it was a fair election.

Mr. SIRES. No, no, I am not talking just Venezuela. I am talking about the region.

Mr. ZOGBY. Oh, the region as a whole?

Mr. SIRES. These numbers obviously bode well for this country, but how much influence do you think these two leaders have in creating these negative numbers?

Mr. ZOGBY. I think they reflect a negative undertone. I think they reflect an alienation that we have seen in country after country after country. I think they reflect and to some degree they foment, but let me just tell you we have polled among the elites on Castro and Chavez, and at least in a couple of the years the United States, the President of the United States has gotten lower marks among the elites than Chavez and Castro. Bush has gone from 12 to 17 in our last poll in 2005. Chavez was at 27–28 percent. They reflect and then they foment.

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And we just had another colleague arrive but I know he was here before. Do you have another 5 minutes?

Mr. ZOGBY. I am fine.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Great. And let me yield to the gentleman who chairs the Asia and South Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. Eni Faleomavaega.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize if I am indulging on your time, but I do want to welcome Mr. Zogby and here for a hearing. Being a humble pollster, I am a moderate

member, so I think that should make us both good to work together.

I have your written and my notes here in terms of the President's trip currently in place in Latin America, and I have it entitled here, "A little too late, a little too little."

You expressed earlier that 3 years ago the President's polling went up to about 12 percent, and it is now, what is the polling?

Mr. ZOGBY. Seventeen.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. It is now at 17 percent. Do you think that the President's trip to Latin America really is going to improve relations between that region and our country after 6 years of almost nothing?

Mr. ZOGBY. The answer is I don't know, the honest answer, but if I could speculate. I think so long as the war in Iraq is going on and going badly, so long as Guantanamo exists, so long as there is a perception widespread that free trade benefits the United States better and more than it benefits residents throughout the region, that very likely is too little and too late, but I hedge with the very likely.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I don't know if the media accounts were accurate in saying that when the President was Governor of Texas the only foreign country that he visited before becoming president was Mexico. If that doesn't give you some sense of understanding or appreciation that he has or might have had about foreign relations or relations with other countries of the world, and yet despite that with a great amount of initiative and effort in his meetings with President Vicente Fox, and there was a great expectation on the part of President Fox and the people of Mexico that there was going to be a tremendous relationship between Mexico and the United States, and I understand, the couple of times that I visited Mexico, it was a tremendous disappointment.

Perhaps what you said earlier that right now between Mexico and the United States there is an incredible disconnect. Can you elaborate a little further what you meant by that?

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes. Really detailed polling that we are going to send to you, but I mean basically just how Mexican view Americans is far more negative than how Americans view Americans, and just how Americans view Mexicans, in a whole bunch of qualitative characteristics, far more negative than the way Mexicans see each other. That is people to people.

I think that what exacerbated the problem was that expectations were raised, that there were two new administrations coming to power virtually simultaneously, and to be fair, September 11 did intervene. However, there is certainly a growing sense that United States/Mexican relations suffered on the part of Mexican

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. What the situation of Chavez and Morales in terms of their rise now into political power and the problems existing?

You kept referring to the elites, and I would wonder if you meant by the fact that most of these countries are literally ruled by what I would consider as oligarchy, maybe 70 families in Mexico control the entire economy, which has been for years, and I think this is probably the same pattern throughout most of the Latin America countries. The elites, meaning those whose families who are power-

ful enough economically, business-wise, and they have been controlling every aspect of the economy, politics, and everything of each country, and this is not the reason what gave rise to leaders like Morales and Chavez because there is a disconnect, a huge disconnect between those who have not and with those of the elites.

Do you see this as a consistent situation with Latin America for all these years?

Mr. ZOGBY. Certainly it has been the undertone, and the undertone has come to reality. Democracy, let us not say it is necessarily flourishing, but democracy is expanding and consolidating throughout Latin America, and when you have these kinds of feelings, and you have relatively or even free elections, this is what you got

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Wasn't it a fact that Chavez really was very pro-American in every way, and wanted to work closely with this administration years ago, and wanted to do cooperative arrangements and relationship with our country but he was turned down?

Mr. ZOGBY. You are bound and determined to get me in trouble, aren't you? [Laughter.]

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. No, I am not. I really am very concerned about this.

Mr. ZOGBY. The fact of the matter is I believe, not polling, but I believe that there could have been much better relations. The country that promotes democracy embraces the result of the democracy. Now, that sounds terribly Polly-Annish, but we have to—if we embrace the value of democracy, you have got to take the results that you get, and you work with it

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much, and thank you, Mr. Zogby. We look forward to learning from more of your pollsters, your polling, hopefully in Latin America.

Mr. ZOGBY. Thank you very much

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That will conclude, but let me just pose, if you will indulge just for several minutes, and I am going to call on Mr. Rohrabacher for any closing comments that he might entertain, and I think that will do it.

I think what I heard you say in terms of an overarching theme is that while clearly these results are disturbing, and do impact the United States in many aspects of our international relationships, both commercially as well as our efforts against terrorism, our ability to communicate effectively with the peoples of other nations, at the same time we are admired for our values.

Mr. ZOGBY. Yes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. That the values that America embrace are truly universal. We therefore continue to be the hope, if you will, for many in this world that are genuinely repressed, but at the same time your reference to the war in Iraq, to Guantanamo, renditions, for example, that there is a disappointment on the part of the world that they perceive our policies, which translate into deeds, as failing to meet our own standards, our own values, our American values, and that there is this unease about America, whether we are turning our back on our values, maybe can be best summed up as a profound disappointment at this moment in American history by the rest of the world which historically has held us up to a very

high standard because we do claim, and dare say historically we can justify the claim to a certain moral authority. Your comment.

Mr. ZOGBY. Mr. Chairman, your summation is very fair and it is right on the mark. The good news is that all is not lost. I do hear people say the damage that has been done is going to take generations to undo. Not so. Not so. There is a reservoir of goodwill in all of these countries. It needs attentiveness.

We are, to a great degree, victims of our own values because we bother to project them, but then that is what makes us us and makes China China.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right.

Mr. ZOGBY. I will take us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Right. Thank you.

Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much. Some of this has been very fascinating. Others have reconfirmed some of the things I understood before. Again, let me just reiterate my experience.

Those who provide leadership end up being unpopular during the time when they are trying to make changes, and trying to protect society. Abraham Lincoln was trying to end slavery, and he was the most unpopular guy until he died, and I have sat on—you know, in the White House listening to the worst possible epithets being thrown at Ronald Reagan during the Cold War, that he was the war monger, and he was not for democracy. Then afterwards now he is deified, and neither one of those, by the way, are probably accurate. He was neither a saint nor was the devil.

Let me just note on a couple of points you have just made. I would just have to tell you tyrants can be elected and gangsters can be elected, and Hitler actually came to power after an election. What the difference is is you find out whether they are tyrants or not, and whether they really are the bad guys by whether or not they try to dismantle the election process once they are in power, and Mr. Chavez is just reconfirming for all of us that he is a gangster and a tyrant. I mean, he is dismantling the election process there, and there shouldn't be—I mean, what more do we need than to say that we were right all along about him because now he is dismantling the election process?

I don't care if they are Bolsheviks or Nazis or any other type of gangster tyrants, he is demonstrating that he is in that class of historic leader. So with that said, I don't know what this President could do, and I disagree with him on those of these issues. I voted for NAFTA, but I am not in favor of just free trade and all this globalization. Interestingly enough this President has tried to be more pro-Mexican, for example, than any president in my lifetime.

I mean, he has conferred with the President of Mexico and the leadership of Mexico more than any other president, I believe. Is there another president who has done more? I don't think so. And he has been the most open on immigration, and he has been the most important in terms of trying to help the Mexican economy, et cetera, and you just told me the poll numbers in Mexico. This President is down at the very bottom.

So I don't think that you can make decision on what you think is going to lead to a better world by taking polls. You can get an understanding of where people are at, but in the end you have go

to show leadership and try to take this world to a better place because then the end poll numbers are the ones that really count, what people think of you in history.

So with that said, thanks for giving us an insight as to what is going on right now.

Mr. ZOGBY. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Thank you, Mr. Zogby, and I am going to have to respond, of course.

I would just note for the record that while I am sure that my friend and colleagues from California disagrees profoundly with many of the policies of President Chavez of Venezuela, that Mr. Chavez has been elected and re-elected, and re-elected and re-elected, and to describe President Chavez as dismantling the election process, I would suggest that is totally inaccurate at the same time that those elections have been acknowledged by our own Department of State as being free and fair, along with the Organization of American States, the Carter Center, and the European Union.

With that, this hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:16 p.m., the subcommittees were adjourned.]

APPENDIX

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ELIOT L. ENGEL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AND CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Good afternoon. I am pleased to join Mr. Delahunt, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights and Oversight, in convening this joint hearing on Latin American opinions of U.S. policies, values and people.

Sometimes perception is everything and policymakers need to understand how our actions around the world can translate into positive or negative views of the United States.

Unfortunately, in recent times, our policies have generated rather negative views of our country, even in our own region. A 2006 Gallup poll conducted in 18 countries in Latin America gave President Bush a 27% approval rating. Not so ironically, this is only 3 points away from Bush's 30% approval rating here in the United States, according to the latest survey taken by our witness, Mr. Zogby.

While our failure to fully engage our friends in the region has surely contributed greatly to the poor feelings about the President, U.S. neglect of the Americas cannot fully explain the increased anti-U.S. sentiments. The broader U.S. movement away from multilateralism has not gone unnoticed in Latin America.

Today's hearing comes as President Bush embarks upon a five-country tour of the region. Last week, Ranking Member Burton and I along with all members of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, sent a letter to President Bush applauding his trip to the region and encouraging him to more intensively focus on the region in the remaining two years of his presidency.

But simple engagement with the hemisphere will not be enough. In order to curb anti-Americanism and have a real impact in reducing poverty and inequality, we must take concrete actions. Reducing development assistance to Latin America by $70 million and child health and survival programs by $34 million sends the wrong sign to our neighbors. As I said at last week's hearing, I know that budgets are not easy to write and I know that we all wish we could spend more money than we practically are able to spend. But budgets *do* show priorities and making significant reductions in assistance to Latin America says to the world that this region is not a priority. I hope that we can find ways to increase U.S. assistance to Latin America during this year's appropriations cycle to demonstrate to our friends to the south that the United States sees them as important partners.

Unfortunately, certain populist leaders are intentionally exacerbating the growing anti-Americanism and seeking to capitalize on those negative feelings. But, rather than pick fights with the demagogues, I think we should deal directly with the poverty and inequality which creates the conditions for the populists to emerge.

Like it or not, people all around the world look to America to stand up for the little guy. We have always been a country where those with the least in our society can rise to the top. But, this American dream is really a dream of all people. The desire to succeed does not end at the water's edge, and we can no longer be seen in our hemisphere as simply working to make the rich richer and the elites even more untouchable.

Therefore, as we pursue assistance policies, we should seek to increase those which help the impoverished masses. As we pursue trade policies, we should incorporate social responsibility into agreements we reach so that big business treats their employees and the environment with respect. And, as we deal with our neighbors to the south, we should treat all nations with the dignity they deserve. I believe

that these are the best ways to undercut the populists and make a serious impact in reducing anti-Americanism in the region.

In a speech earlier this week President Bush declared that "the working poor of Latin America need change, and the United States of America is committed to that change." I commend the President for making this commitment to our neighbors. Now I hope that we can work closely with the Administration to back up these words with tangible actions. If real commitments can be followed with sustained engagement and higher levels of assistance—especially regarding poverty and inequality—I believe that we will be able to at least begin to reduce anti-Americanism in the region.

Thank you. I look forward to hearing Mr. Zogby's testimony.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DAN BURTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

Thank you for putting together this hearing on polling data on Latin American opinion of the United States. This information will provide an important link for viewing the entire picture when considering future programs, policy, and the perception of the United States in Latin America. Such planning is not easy when working within today's globalized international community, with many diverse countries pushing individual agendas.

The United States plays a unique role within this extremely heterogeneous hemisphere and, in general, we as a country have become accustomed to our status and our ability to persuade and dissuade as we desire. Given this great power and responsibility, I do not know of another country who would strive to carryout this position with as much goodwill and overall respect for state sovereignty as the United States.

Unfortunately we are often faced with nations that do not work toward the general goodwill of their region and are not willing to sacrifice small domestic gains for broader international peace and prosperity. It is most often the leaders of these nations that spread ill will toward the United States, often consisting of lies, such as President Hugo Chavez's constant proclamations that the U.S. is planning to invade Venezuela; this lie is used to energize his army, who has resultantly grown to falsely fear the United States as an unwarranted aggressor.

It is also important to note that polling in Latin America is extremely challenging. The numbers of people living in poverty in far outlying regions are hard to calculate, let alone contact for their opinion. Additionally, even if contacted, the chance that this population places a high priority on issues such as the role the United States plays in trade negotiations and throughout the Middle East is probably slim to none.

Understanding these restraints and stipulations in the international community and specifically within the Western Hemisphere, I would like to highlight some interesting facts from a study conducted by the Center of Investigation and Economic Teaching (CIDE) and the Mexican Counsel of International Matters (Comexi) addressing public opinion in Mexico.

The study determined broad discrepancies among regions and within nations. For example, the people of Mexico do not agree with the Mexican Leaders who view economic globalization more similar to the United States and Asia. It is impossible to incorporate each of these views under one policy.

Also, even though it was found that Mexicans do not overwhelmingly trust and admire the United States, they recognize that being a neighbor of the U.S. is an advantage; and they support at least some international involvement in addressing world problems. However, most often nations such as Mexico are unable or unwilling to undertake such tasks when called upon. As a result, it falls to the United States to take the lead in solving many world problems.

Some other interesting results showed that Mexicans believe that foreigners who are nationalized citizens of Mexico should not be permitted to be elected to the Congress or the Senate of Mexico, be appointed President of public universities in Mexico, or play in the Mexican national soccer team. The polling also showed that Mexicans approve of a border patrol on their southern border and they do not agree with a temporary workers program for Central Americans in Mexico.

These results are very telling, and are just a few pulled from the comprehensive study. They show that there are wide discrepancies between the views of the populace and their leaders; that even though Mexican's do not like U.S. action on their northern border, they approve of acting in a very similar way regarding their southern border; that Mexican's do not openly welcome even nationalized Mexican citizens of another origin into their society; and that the United States is perceived as

enough of a benevolent power for the majority of Mexican's to see their proximity to the United States as an advantage. As a result, it appears that it is all too easy to fill out a survey pointing angry fingers at other nations, while finding no other alternative and conducting similar or harsher action within your own borders.

As we look at additional polling data from Latin America, I urge my colleagues to acknowledge where there is room for improvement, where a negative opinion was inevitable in the necessity for some action, and where the results indicate the role malicious dictators play in bringing down popular opinion of the United States.