The United States has begun replacing most of the nuclear weapons in its arsenal with new, enhanced bombs and the systems to deliver them (missiles, submarines, and bombers)—at an estimated cost to taxpayers of at least $1.5 trillion over the next 30 years. In fiscal year 2020 alone, the United States allocated $67.6 billion on its nuclear weapons systems (PSR-LA 2020).

Recent polling shows that voters in Michigan do not believe that spending $1.5 trillion to replace the nation's nuclear weapons should be a top priority of the federal government. Instead, they want their tax dollars spent on critical priorities including cleaning up polluted drinking water supplies, expanding access to quality health care, increasing job opportunities, and fixing roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.

A majority of Michigan voters oppose the plan to rebuild the nation's entire nuclear arsenal, while only 16 percent have strong feelings of support. By significant margins, voters find the arguments against rebuilding the nuclear arsenal more compelling than arguments supporting it. Women, voters in suburbs close to cities, voters of color, and college-educated voters are most likely to oppose the nuclear weapons overhaul—with nearly three of five Black voters opposing it. Similarly, a majority of Michigan voters oppose the Pentagon’s plan to spend more than $100 billion just to replace the nation's land-based nuclear missiles, while only 13 percent have strong feelings of support.

By significant margins, voters find the arguments against rebuilding the nuclear arsenal more compelling than the arguments supporting it.
The survey presented voters with three arguments for why the United States should not spend $1.5 trillion to replace its nuclear arsenal and were asked to rank each one on a scale of 0 to 10 (with 10 being the strongest reason):

• Independent experts say that the United States has far more nuclear weapons than needed for our security, and the country can maintain a reliable, safe deterrent for far less than $1.5 trillion. (6.38 average out of 10; 41% rated it an 8, 9, or 10)

• Independent experts say that cancelling some of the more expensive and unnecessary proposed nuclear weapons would save hundreds of billions of dollars that could be invested in our communities to address more immediate and important priorities like ensuring clean water across Michigan. (6.67 average out of 10; 46% rated it an 8, 9, or 10)

• Independent experts say that the world has dramatically changed and nuclear weapons do not help us confront the most important threats we now face. Instead, we would be much safer if this money was used to deal with other pressing security concerns like cyber threats and global pandemics like COVID-19. (6.45 average out of 10; 42% rated it an 8, 9, or 10)

Voters were presented the following neutral statement and were then asked to choose one of the given response options:

Under current US policy, the fundamental reason our country has nuclear weapons is to deter other countries from using nuclear weapons against us or our allies. Right now, the US has about 4,000 active nuclear weapons. Russia has about the same. China has approximately 300. Most US nuclear weapons today are up to 20 times more destructive than those that killed over 200,000 people in Japan at the end of World War II. Currently the United States plans to replace almost all of its nuclear weapons arsenal, which includes the bombs and the systems to deliver them (the missiles, submarines, and bombers). The cost to do this is estimated to be at least $1.5 trillion dollars over the next 30 years. Based on what you know about this issue, would you say you support or oppose the United States spending $1.5 trillion dollars to replace almost all of its nuclear weapons? And would you say you strongly or somewhat support/oppose?

Michigan voters want their tax dollars spent on critical priorities including cleaning up polluted drinking water supplies and expanded access to quality health care.
Voters were presented the following neutral statement and were then asked to choose one of the given response options:

One of the proposed new nuclear weapons is a land-based nuclear missile which would replace the 400 existing missiles currently sited in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Supporters of this new missile say that we need it because the existing missiles are aging and that land-based missiles are a critical part of our nuclear deterrent. Independent experts say that we no longer need any land-based nuclear missiles because the many hundreds of nuclear weapons already deployed on submarines and bombers are a more than adequate nuclear deterent. They say that canceling the new program could save nearly $100 billion dollars that could be invested in our communities instead. Based on what you have just heard about this issue, would you say you support or oppose the United States spending nearly $100 billion dollars to replace most of its land-based nuclear missiles? And would you say you strongly or somewhat support/oppose?