



THE PEW RESEARCH CENTER
For The People & The Press

NEWSRelease

*1150 18th Street, N.W., Suite 975
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel (202) 293-3126
Fax(202) 293-2569*

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOR RELEASE: TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2002, 4:00 P.M.

AMERICANS FAVOR FORCE IN IRAQ, SOMALIA, SUDAN AND ...

*Also Including:
Commentary by Kenneth M. Pollack,
Deputy Director – National Security Studies
Council on Foreign Relations*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andrew Kohut, Director
Pew Research Center for The People & The Press
202.293.3126
<http://www.people-press.org>

Kenneth M. Pollack, Senior Fellow
Council on Foreign Relations
202.518.3400
<http://www.cfr.org>

AMERICANS FAVOR FORCE IN IRAQ, SOMALIA, SUDAN AND ...

The public expects and supports continued military action to combat terrorism. No less than 92% think the United States will have to use military force to reduce the threat of terrorism, even if Osama bin Laden is captured or killed. The perception that the fight against terrorism remains unfinished also is reflected in the fact that just 38% of Americans say the military effort to destroy terrorism is going *very well*, in spite of the quick victory over the Taliban.

A solid majority (73%) favors taking military action against Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule there, and as many as 56% support using force even if it means the United States might suffer thousands of casualties. This is less than the number in previous surveys who favored taking action against the terrorists responsible for the Sept. 11 attacks, but it nonetheless represents a strong endorsement of the prospective use of force compared with other military missions in the post-Cold War era.

The nationwide survey of 1,201 adults by the Pew Research Center, conducted Jan. 9-13 in collaboration with the Council on Foreign Relations, also finds the public taking a tough line when presented with options for reviving weapons inspections in Iraq. Nearly half (49%) favor threatening force to get Saddam to accept weapons inspections, while just a third say the United States should offer to lift economic sanctions against Baghdad.

The only possible qualification to the public's broad endorsement of military action against Iraq is the widely-held view that the United States should gain allied support before launching an attack. Of those who favor the use of force, 53% say the U.S. should proceed on that course only if the allies agree, while 41% are willing to go it alone. Still, there is wide agreement that any one of several reasons could justify a possible U.S. attack – including confirmation that Iraq is developing weapons of mass destruction.

The public's war footing also is seen in the solid majorities favoring offensive action against terrorist groups in Somalia and Sudan, and in the comparable level of support for aiding the Philippines and Indonesia in their anti-terror efforts. Not only do Americans endorse a military approach in those concrete circumstances, most believe that striking at countries attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction is an effective way to reduce future terrorism.

America's War Footing			
	<i>Support use of force in ...</i>		
	<u>Iraq</u>	<u>Somalia</u>	<u>Sudan</u>
	%	%	%
Favor	73	65	73
Oppose	16	16	14
Don't know	<u>11</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>13</u>
	100	100	100
<i>If bin Laden is captured/killed ...</i>			
Terrorism threat mostly over			5
Need further military action			92
Don't know			<u>3</u>
			100
<i>Support use of force in Iraq even if thousands of casualties ...</i>			
Favor			56
Oppose			31
Don't know			<u>13</u>
			100
<i>How to convince Saddam to allow weapons inspections ...</i>			
Threaten attack			49
Offer sanctions removal			33
Both/Neither/Don't know			<u>18</u>
			100
<i>Attack Iraq over weapons inspections ...¹</i>			
Only if allies agree			53
Even if allies won't join			41
Don't know			<u>6</u>
			100

¹ Asked of those who favor military force.

While clearly comfortable with a military approach in the struggle against terrorism, Americans back other strategies as well. A 53% majority gives high priority to cutting U.S. dependence on Mideast oil as a means of reducing future terrorism. Among those who closely follow international affairs, this option attracts more support than any military or diplomatic alternative.

Few oppose President Bush's plan to use military tribunals, rather than the criminal court system, for trials of non-U.S. terrorist suspects. Still, the proportion who worry that the government's new anti-terrorism laws may excessively restrict civil liberties has risen since September, from 34% to 45%.

Many Reasons Justify Iraq Action

Americans see several possible justifications for expanding the war into Iraq. Fully 83% say evidence that Iraq abetted the Sept. 11 attacks would be a very important reason for using force. Nearly as many say force is justified if Iraq is developing weapons of mass destruction (77%) or is harboring other terrorists (75%).

	Reasons to Attack Iraq			
	<i>Justification for military action</i>			
	Very Impt %	Fairly Impt %	Not Impt %	DK/ Ref %
<i>If we learned Iraq ...</i>				
Helped 9/11 attack	83	11	3	3=100
Develops weapons of mass destruction	77	15	5	3=100
Harbors terrorists	75	18	4	3=100

However, the idea of taking military action against Iraq meets with some resistance, especially when American casualties are mentioned. Support for the use of force falls from 73% to 56% when the prospect of major U.S. casualties is raised, while opposition nearly doubles (from 16% to 31%). The threat of losses to American troops is of particular concern to women and Democrats, no more than half of whom would support military action in Iraq if it might mean thousands of casualties.

Within at least two other important constituencies – minorities and the elderly – there also is significant concern about expanding the war into Iraq. While a majority of non-whites (57%) favor military action to end Saddam Hussein's rule in Iraq, that proportion falls to 38% when the threat of casualties is mentioned. Fewer than half of those age 65 and over (48%) would favor military action if it might mean U.S. forces would suffer major casualties, compared with 58% of those under age 65.

	<i>Favor taking military action in Iraq</i>	<i>Favor action even if thousands of casualties</i>
	%	%
Total	73	56
Men	76	63
Women	70	50
Republicans	83	72
Democrats	69	47
Independents	70	54
White	76	61
Non-white	57	38
18-29	75	59
30-49	77	60
50-64	74	55
65+	60	48

Most Prefer Force to Diplomacy

Americans appear to have little faith in the effectiveness of diplomacy when it comes to dealing with Saddam Hussein. Given the choice of offering to remove economic sanctions against Iraq or threatening military attacks as a means of renewing weapons inspections in Iraq, just a third favor the softer option, with nearly half (49%) choosing force. Of those who would offer to roll back sanctions, the vast majority (67%) say that if Saddam still resisted weapons inspections, military force would be justified.

Not surprisingly, support for diplomacy comes from some of the groups expressing reservations about using force. Fully half of African-American respondents favor at least trying to come to a negotiated agreement before resorting to force, while majorities of whites and Hispanics favor using military pressure. A plurality of liberals (46%) prefer a diplomatic approach, while conservatives, by more than two-to-one (57%-26%) think the threat of military attack is a better approach to dealing with Iraq.

While younger Americans are more likely than retirees to say they would favor military strikes in Iraq, they also are more open to at least trying diplomacy first. Four-in-ten (41%) 18-29 year-olds think the U.S. should offer to remove economic sanctions as an inducement to Saddam. Just 22% of those who are age 65 and older favor offering to remove economic sanctions.

But Allied Support Is Crucial

The public's support for military action against Iraq comes with a condition: of those willing to threaten military attack in order to force Saddam Hussein to accept weapons inspections in Iraq, 53% say we should attack only if our major allies agree to join us, while 41% are willing to go it alone.

This view is held particularly strongly by older Americans. By more than two-to-one (62%-30%) Americans age 65 and older who say force is an option feel we should follow through only with allied support. Those under age 29 are divided on whether allied support is necessary (49%-49%).

Beyond Baghdad

The public favors taking the anti-terrorism military campaign well beyond Iraq. Strong majorities say they would favor using military force to destroy terrorist groups in Sudan (73%) and Somalia (65%). As with the use of force in Iraq, women and Democrats are somewhat less supportive of military action in all of these cases.

Similarly, more than two-thirds (69%) favor providing military aid to help the Philippines and Indonesia fight terrorist organizations in their countries. The struggle against terrorism also has made Americans less reluctant to station peacekeepers in dangerous situations: fully 68% think the U.S. should keep military forces in Afghanistan as a means of maintaining civil order after the bombing has stopped. That is far more than the percentages that favored the deployment of peacekeepers in Kosovo (54%) or Bosnia (58%) in the late 1990s.

Majority Backs Cutting Oil Dependence

The public is divided over the best ways to reduce future terrorism against the United States. A 54% majority favors increasing defense spending to bolster U.S. military forces, while the same number says it is very important to take military action against countries that seek to develop nuclear weapons. But there is as much support for a dramatically different approach – 53% give high priority to decreasing this country’s dependence on Middle East oil.

Other possible strategies aimed at reducing the terrorist threat win less public backing. Roughly four-in-ten (42%) think it is very important to encourage democracy in the Middle East. About as many give high priority to providing military and other assistance to anti-terror allies, and to buying up and destroying nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union. Only about a quarter of the public (24%) believes that providing aid to alleviate poverty in the Middle East is a very important means of reducing terrorism.

	Total %	Interest in Intl Affairs	
		High %	Low %
<i>Ways to reduce terrorism ...</i>			
Decrease dependence on Mideast oil	53	63	41
Increase defense spending	54	56	47
Encourage Mideast democracy	42	49	33
Military to wipe out nuclear facilities	54	47	52
Increase foreign aid to countries fighting terrorism	41	47	35
Destroy nuclear weapons in Soviet republics	40	42	30
Increase military aid to countries fighting terrorism	39	36	40
Reduce poverty in Mideast	24	29	18

Americans who are closely following international affairs express somewhat different views about what would be effective in reducing terrorism than do those who are paying little attention.¹ Among those who are engaged by international affairs, 63% say it is very important to decrease U.S. dependence on Middle East oil; just 41% of those less interested and not as well informed about international affairs agree. While approximately the same proportion in each group place high priority on providing military aid to allies in the war against terrorism, they diverge on the question of foreign aid. Three-in-ten (29%) of those interested in foreign affairs say it is very important to try to combat terrorism by alleviating poverty in poor countries in the Middle East; just 18% of those who are not as engaged by international affairs agree.

¹ Interest in international affairs is a measure of how attentive and informed a respondent is about foreign news stories about Afghanistan, Pakistan and India, and Argentina. Respondents are divided into high, moderate, and low interest categories, with the high and low compared in this analysis.

Republicans and Democrats are in broad agreement over most anti-terror approaches, but they differ sharply over military spending and foreign aid. Two-thirds of Republicans rate increased defense spending as a top priority, compared with 51% of Democrats. More Democrats than Republicans say it is very important to provide foreign aid to alleviate poverty in the Middle East (30%-18%).

Modest Rise in Support for Israel

As in the past, a majority of the public (53%) believes that the United States should maintain its present level of support for Israel. But those who think the U.S. should side more with Israel outnumber those who would like to see the U.S. weaken its ties to Israel, 22%-14%. As recently as mid-October, this disparity did not exist (16% preferred stronger ties, 19% wanted the U.S. to side less with Israel).

The shift toward a pro-Israel stance has been most notable among younger, less-educated citizens. Among Americans with a high school degree or less, those who favor closer relations with Israel outnumber those who want to side less with Israel by more than two-to-one (25%-10%). But 26% of college graduates say the United States should *reduce* support for Israel, while just 17% want the U.S. to side more with Israel. Similarly, 26% of Americans under age 50 think the U.S. should side with Israel more, compared with 18% of those age 50 to 64 and just 12% of those age 65 and older.

The religious divide on this issue is more striking. Roughly a third (34%) of white evangelical Protestants express the desire for stronger support for Israel, while just 5% think the U.S. should move in the other direction. Opinion among white mainline Protestants, white Catholics and the non-religious are divided.

Changing Sympathies?

Only about one-in-four Americans (27%) have more sympathy for Russia in its struggle with Islamic rebels in Chechnya these days. A 44% plurality feels no differently about the conflict and just 8% say they are less sympathetic to our newfound allies.

	<i>U.S. should side with Israel</i>			
	<u>More</u> %	<u>Less</u> %	<u>Same</u> %	<u>DK</u> %
Total	22	14	53	11=100
College grad	17	26	52	5=100
Some college	22	12	55	11=100
H.S. graduate	24	11	54	11=100
< High School	27	8	44	21=100
18-29	26	10	55	9=100
30-49	26	16	49	9=100
50-64	18	17	55	10=100
65+	12	14	52	22=100
White Evangelical	34	5	48	13=100
White Mainline	13	17	57	13=100
White Catholic	16	20	55	9=100
Secular	20	20	55	5=100

As many as 41% of Americans who have above-average knowledge of and interest in international affairs have become more sympathetic to Russia in its conflict with the Chechen rebels, compared with one-in-five expressing that view among the disengaged segment of the public.

	<u>Total</u> %	<i>Interest in Intl Affairs</i>	
		<u>High</u> %	<u>Low</u> %
<i>Sympathy for Russia</i>			
More	27	41	16
Less	8	6	5
No change	44	40	45
Don't Know	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>34</u>
	100	100	100

Among the public overall, opinion regarding China's efforts to combat Islamic rebels along its western borders is largely unchanged (51%) or uncertain (22%), with only smaller minorities feeling more (15%) or less (12%) sympathy for China. Even those who are the most engaged by world news do not have strong opinions on this issue.

More Concern Over Civil Liberties

Four months after the terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington D.C., Americans remain firm in their belief that the war on terrorism will require citizens to sacrifice some of their freedoms. Moreover, there continues to be strong support for the use of military tribunals for cases involving terrorist suspects who are not U.S. citizens. Still, a growing number express at least some concern that anti-terrorism efforts by the government might go too far.

A 55% majority of Americans think it will be necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties in order to curb terrorism in this country, while 39% believe this will not be necessary. This is virtually identical to opinion measured in the week following the Sept. 11 attacks. In general, more educated, higher income, and middle-aged (30-64 year old) people are the most likely to believe sacrifices will be necessary. Politically, majorities of Republicans (60%), Democrats (53%) and independents (54%) think people will have to give up some civil liberties in the interest of public safety.

Racial Divide on Tribunals

An even larger proportion (65%) approve of the Bush administration's plan to put non-U.S. citizens charged with terrorism on trial in special military tribunals rather than in the regular criminal court system, a measure also virtually unchanged from a Newsweek poll taken in late November. But there is a distinct racial divide on this issue, with whites favoring this approach by more than three-to-one (68%-19%) while blacks are divided (48% approve, 42% disapprove).

There is little disagreement between Republicans and Democrats over the need to sacrifice some civil liberties to achieve public safety, yet there is a substantial partisan gap in the level of support for the use of military tribunals. Fully 82% of conservative Republicans and 75% of moderate-to-liberal Republicans favor the use of tribunals for non-citizens accused of terrorism. By comparison, less than half of liberal Democrats (47%), and only slightly more conservative-to-moderate Democrats (55%) concur.

Overall, three-in-ten Democrats disapprove of the tribunals, compared with just 12% of Republicans. Political independents fall between the two groups of partisans, though 26% of independents also disapprove of bypassing the regular criminal court system.

Interestingly, while there is no gender gap over the perceived need for Americans to sacrifice some of their civil liberties, there is a strong divide over the use of military tribunals. Majorities of men (55%) and women (56%) agree that it will be necessary for the average person to give up some freedoms in order to curb terrorism in this country. But men are significantly more likely to approve of the use of military tribunals for non-citizens than are women (72%-58%).

More Worry About Government Excesses

Despite the continuing sense that sacrificing some freedoms will be necessary in the war on terrorism, there is growing concern that the government may go too far in its efforts. When asked whether they are more concerned that the government will fail to enact sufficiently strong anti-terrorism laws, or whether they are more concerned that new laws might excessively restrict civil liberties, 45% say the latter, up from just 34% in mid-September.

Highly educated Americans, in particular, are becoming increasingly anxious over the government's anti-terror tactics. In the immediate wake of the attacks, those who had at least some college education were significantly less concerned about excessive government action, and more concerned about the government not doing enough, compared with people who never attended college. Today, the college educated are at least as concerned as those with less education about undue restrictions on civil liberties.

	Ap- prove %	Dis- approve %	Don't Know %
Total	65	23	12=100
Men	72	21	7=100
Women	58	25	17=100
White	68	19	13=100
Black	48	42	10=100
Hispanic	58	29	13=100
Cons Republican	82	9	9=100
Mod-Lib Republican	75	15	10=100
Independent	67	26	7=100
Cons-Mod Democrat	55	29	16=100
Liberal Democrat	47	39	14=100

	Mid-Sept %	Now %	Change
Total	34	45	+11
Men	37	49	+12
Women	31	40	+9
White	32	41	+9
Black	45	65	+20
College grad	29	47	+18
Some college	29	45	+16
H.S. Grad & Less	39	43	+4

And as with other aspects of the civil liberties issue, there are significant and growing racial divisions. By three-to-one (65%-22%), blacks are more concerned about excessive government action than about the government not doing enough. Whites, though, are split (41% worry about excessive laws, 43% worry the government will not do enough). And while men are more supportive than women of military tribunals for non-citizens, they also are more concerned than women about the government excessively limiting citizens' freedoms.

Mixed Grades for Anti-Terror Efforts

The public remains largely approving of the government's anti-terror efforts, but Americans continue to be more upbeat about the military campaign abroad than about progress in building defenses at home.

Overall, nearly nine-in-ten (89%) say the military campaign is going well, although fewer than four-in-ten (38%) say it is going very well. That marks an improvement in the public's assessment of the war effort since early November, when 75% offered a favorable view (30% said it was going very well, 45% fairly well).

A majority of Americans also give a positive rating of progress in building defenses against terrorism in this country (13% excellent, 47% good). But more people have reservations about this aspect of the anti-terror effort – 37% rate it as fair or poor, compared with just 9% who see the overseas military campaign as not going well. The number holding negative opinions of the homeland defense effort has inched up since mid-October, when 26% rated the government's performance as fair or poor.

Home Defenses Gain Priority

Concern that the nation could be hit with another round of terrorist attacks, which declined throughout the fall, is on the rise again. More than six-in-ten Americans (62%) say they are very or somewhat worried by the prospect of new attacks, up from 52% who expressed such concerns in December. The proportion saying they are very worried rose from 13% to 20%.

Accordingly, the public, by 44%-40%, now rates building anti-terror defenses at home as a higher priority than taking military action to destroy terrorist networks overseas. Opinion on this issue shifted gradually during the fall, with this marking the first time in a Pew Center survey that even a slight plurality has given homeland defense top priority.

Shifting Terrorism Priorities			
	<i>A higher priority to ...</i>		
	<u>Home</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>Both/</u>
	<u>Defenses</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
	%	%	%
Total			
Now	44	40	16=100
Late Sept	33	44	23=100
Men			
Now	40	47	13=100
Late Sept	25	51	24=100
Women			
Now	47	34	19=100
Late Sept	40	37	23=100

In late September, men backed foreign military action against terrorists by two-to-one (51%-25%), but that gap has narrowed considerably. In the current survey, 47% of men rate foreign military action as the higher priority, while 40% view homeland defense as more important. Women, who were divided in their priorities four months ago, now are much more likely to see building homeland defenses as the more important objective.

Despite the public's renewed concern that the nation could be targeted with new attacks, Americans' personal worries about terrorism, which declined in November, remains relatively low. Fewer than four-in-ten (38%) say they are very or somewhat worried that they or their families could become victims of terrorism, which is largely unchanged from early November (40%) but down from 50% in October.

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

Results for the survey are based on telephone interviews conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates among a nationwide sample of 1201 adults, 18 years of age or older, during the period January 9-13, 2002. Based on the total sample, one can say with 95% confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points. For results based on either Form 1 (N=600) or Form 2 (N=601), the sampling error is plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.

In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

*Commentary by Kenneth M. Pollack,
Deputy Director, National Security Studies
Council on Foreign Relations*

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC CONTEMPLATES PHASE II OF THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Although U.S. forces remain deeply engaged in the hunt for Osama bin Ladin and other mopping up operations in Afghanistan, the Administration has begun to think about carrying the war against terrorism beyond Afghanistan. The U.S. has begun to deploy troops to the Philippines to help Manila combat al-Qa'eda's Filipino subsidiary, Abu Sayyaf. Likewise, Washington has begun discussing the possibility of training and support operations in conjunction with the Indonesian and Yemeni governments, and even of going back to Somalia to root out al-Qa'eda terrorists based there. Meanwhile, a campaign is being mounted to press the Administration to make toppling Iraq the next item on its agenda.

The latest poll by the Pew Research Center and the Council on Foreign Relations reveals that public opinion remains strong for additional actions against terrorism beyond Afghanistan, but the ardor following the September 11th attacks is beginning to cool as additional concerns begin to surface.

Back to Iraq?

The new Pew/CFR polling data indicates that public support for military action against Iraq remains strong (73 percent of those polled favored U.S. military action against Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule), but is clearly tempered by other considerations. In particular, if the threat of considerable U.S. casualties is introduced into the equation, the number favoring military action falls to 56 percent.

Perhaps of greatest importance, Americans continue to place cooperation with our allies high on the list of criterion for a military operation against Iraq. Of those who believed that the U.S. should use military force to compel Saddam Hussein to accept UN weapons inspectors, the majority (53 percent) felt that the U.S. should do so only if our major allies agreed to participate in the operation.

These numbers indicate that if the Administration wants to take military action against Iraq it will have some work to do in securing public support for such an operation. The different responses suggest that while the American public is amenable to the idea of striking Iraq in the abstract, when trade-offs are introduced, their zeal declines noticeably. As noted, raising the prospect of significant casualties caused a 17-point slide in support for military operations (which is also well below the 75-80 percent support for military action during the Gulf War despite the threat of similar levels of casualties).

Likewise, as indicated in previous Pew/CFR polls, the American public are somewhat skittish of unilateral action and would much prefer that the U.S. have allies on board if it does take action against Iraq. As the Administration ponders whether to attack Iraq, it will have to consider whether the public will be willing to take heavy casualties in a new war with Iraq and how they would react if many of our allies turned against us as they are threatening to do.

Targets of Opportunity

There is also strong public support for U.S. military action against other states with large al-Qa'eda presences. Almost two-thirds would favor military action against Somalia, 73 percent against Sudan, and 69 percent support the provision of military assistance to the Philippines and Indonesia. These numbers suggest that the public does believe that the war on terrorism needs to be carried beyond Afghanistan. Indeed, it suggests that for the public, victory in the war on terrorism will have to include the eradication, or at least neutralization, of the entire al-Qa'eda terrorist network and not merely its assets in Afghanistan.

However, what these numbers do not yet reveal is how willing the public is to make sacrifices to achieve these goals. It may be that, as in the case of Iraq above, the public is perfectly willing to use military force in a variety of places as long as the operations are relatively painless both militarily and diplomatically but would be more reticent if there were serious costs attached. Given the limits of the available data, it would be a mistake for the Administration to assume that the public is on board for largescale military operations on a global scope.

Are We Willing to Put our Money Where our Mouths Are?

Indeed, as the responses to the final questions indicate, public sentiment is still unclear about the price the American people are willing to pay for the war on terrorism. The Pew/CFR poll raised eight different tactics to get at the root causes of terrorism—decreasing U.S. oil dependence, encouraging democracy in the Middle East, using military action against those pursuing nuclear weapons, increasing military and economic aid to countries fighting terrorism, purchasing nuclear materials in the former USSR, increasing our own defense spending, and increasing our foreign aid to reduce Middle Eastern poverty. In general, there was strong support for the U.S. adopting all eight approaches. Nevertheless, the degree of support was noticeably more tepid for several categories that would require a major commitment of U.S. resources—economic assistance to Middle East countries to alleviate poverty, and economic and military aid to countries fighting terrorism. More research on this would be helpful, but these initial responses suggest that fears about the economy may be starting to rival the public's determination to wage the war on terrorism.

OPINION OF MILITARY ACTION

	<i>Against Terrorists</i> — <i>Mid-November 2001</i> † —			<i>Against Iraq</i> — <i>January 2002</i> —			<u>Change in Favor</u>
	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	
Total	81	11	8=100	65	23	12=100	-16
Sex							
Male	87	9	4	70	22	8	-17
Female	75	13	12	60	25	15	-15
Race							
White	84	9	7	68	21	11	-16
Non-white	66	21	13	48	36	16	-18
Black	64	21	15	46	35	19	-18
Hispanic*	77	15	8	62	23	15	-15
Race and Sex							
White Men	90	7	3	75	17	8	-15
White Women	80	10	10	62	23	15	-18
Age							
Under 30	78	12	10	67	24	9	-11
30-49	84	11	5	69	23	8	-15
50-64	84	9	7	64	22	14	-20
65+	74	13	13	54	25	21	-20
Sex and Age							
Men under 50	88	8	4	74	21	5	-14
Women under 50	76	14	10	62	26	12	-14
Men 50+	86	10	4	63	24	13	-23
Women 50+	74	12	14	57	23	20	-17
Education							
College Grad.	81	12	7	60	32	8	-21
Some College	79	12	9	70	22	8	-9
High School Grad.	84	9	7	67	19	14	-17
<H.S. Grad.	74	14	12	59	21	20	-15
Family Income							
\$75,000+	88	7	5	64	29	7	-24
\$50,000-\$74,999	87	6	7	73	21	6	-14
\$30,000-\$49,999	85	10	5	71	22	7	-14
\$20,000-\$29,999	88	9	3	71	15	14	-17
<\$20,000	71	18	11	52	28	20	-19

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization.

Question: As part of the U.S. war on terrorism, would you favor or oppose taking military action in Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule (even if it meant that U.S. forces might suffer thousands of casualties)?

†In Mid-November 2001, question was asked: "Do you favor or oppose taking military action, including the use of ground troops, to retaliate against whoever is responsible for the terrorist attacks (even if it means that U.S. armed forces might suffer thousands of casualties)?"

Continued ...

	<i>Against Terrorists</i> — <i>Mid-November 2001</i> † —			<i>Against Iraq</i> — <i>January 2002</i> —			<u>Change in Favor</u>
	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	
Total	81	11	8=100	65	23	12=100	-16
Region							
East	78	14	8	66	26	8	-12
Midwest	83	9	8	65	22	13	-18
South	81	10	9	63	22	15	-18
West	80	13	7	64	26	10	-16
Religious Affiliation							
Total White Protestant	86	7	7	69	18	13	-17
White Protestant Evangelical	86	7	7	69	18	13	-17
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	86	7	7	68	19	13	-18
White Catholic	89	7	4	70	20	10	-19
Secular	75	15	10	57	32	11	-18
Community Size							
Large City	79	14	7	55	33	12	-24
Suburb	86	9	5	68	20	12	-18
Small City/Town	79	11	10	65	23	12	-14
Rural Area	82	11	7	70	19	11	-12
Party ID							
Republican	91	4	5	78	14	8	-13
Democrat	76	17	7	58	28	14	-18
Independent	79	12	9	62	28	10	-17
Party and Ideology							
Conservative Republican	93	3	4	79	13	8	-14
Moderate/Liberal Republican	86	7	7	77	15	8	-9
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	78	16	6	60	27	13	-18
Liberal Democrat	74	21	5	53	32	15	-21
Bush Approval							
Approve	87	7	6	71	19	10	-16
Disapprove	44	47	9	37	48	15	-7
Democratic Congressional Approval							
Approve	n/a	n/a	n/a	64	25	11	-
Disapprove	n/a	n/a	n/a	70	24	6	-
2000 Presidential Vote							
Bush	90	4	6	75	17	8	-15
Gore	75	17	8	56	30	14	-19
Marital Status							
Married	84	9	7	66	24	10	-18
Unmarried	77	14	9	63	23	14	-14
Parental Status							
Parent	83	10	7	65	25	10	-18
Non-Parent	80	12	8	64	23	13	-16
Labor Union							
Union Household	84	12	4	62	27	11	-22
Non-Union Household	81	11	8	65	23	12	-16

GOVERNMENT ACTION ON CIVIL LIBERTIES

	— <i>Mid-September 2001</i> —			— <i>January 2002</i> —			Change in Excessive Restrictions
	Excessive Restrictions	Fail to Enact Laws	Neither/ DK	Excessive Restrictions	Fail to Enact Laws	Neither/ DK	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	34	39	27=100	45	40	15=100	+11
Sex							
Male	37	39	24	49	39	12	+12
Female	31	39	30	40	42	18	+9
Race							
White	32	40	28	41	43	16	+9
Non-white	41	37	22	58	29	13	+17
Black	45	36	19	65	22	13	+20
Race and Sex							
White Men	38	38	24	46	42	12	+8
White Women	27	42	31	37	44	19	+10
Age							
Under 30	45	37	18	52	41	7	+7
30-49	35	43	22	47	41	12	+12
50-64	33	39	28	43	43	14	+10
65+	20	33	47	31	36	33	+11
Sex and Age							
Men under 50	40	39	21	53	38	9	+13
Women under 50	37	42	21	45	44	11	+8
Men 50+	32	39	29	41	43	16	+9
Women 50+	23	34	43	35	38	27	+12
Education							
College Grad.	29	51	20	47	44	9	+18
Some College	29	46	25	45	44	11	+16
H.S. Grad. and Less	39	30	31	43	37	20	+4
Region							
East	31	44	25	48	41	11	+17
Midwest	33	37	30	40	41	19	+7
South	35	39	26	44	41	15	+9
West	39	36	25	47	38	15	+8

Question: What concerns you more right now? That the government will fail to enact strong, new anti-terrorism laws, or that the government will enact new anti-terrorism laws which excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties?

APPROVAL OF MILITARY TRIBUNALS

	<u>Approve</u> %	<u>Disapprove</u> %	<u>Don't Know</u> %	<u>(N)</u>
Total	65	23	12=100	(1201)
Sex				
Male	72	21	7	(576)
Female	58	25	17	(625)
Race				
White	68	19	13	(1017)
Non-white	53	38	9	(168)
Black	48	42	10	(93)
Hispanic*	58	29	13	(87)
Race and Sex				
White Men	76	18	6	(486)
White Women	61	21	18	(531)
Age				
Under 30	64	29	7	(209)
30-49	68	22	10	(503)
50-64	69	20	11	(269)
65+	53	22	25	(207)
Sex and Age				
Men under 50	72	21	7	(375)
Women under 50	61	27	12	(337)
Men 50+	71	22	7	(197)
Women 50+	54	21	25	(279)
Education				
College Grad.	67	24	9	(456)
Some College	69	21	10	(288)
High School Grad.	67	20	13	(348)
<H.S. Grad.	51	31	18	(105)
Family Income				
\$75,000+	67	26	7	(249)
\$50,000-\$74,999	67	24	9	(193)
\$30,000-\$49,999	72	18	10	(303)
\$20,000-\$29,999	70	18	12	(135)
<\$20,000	53	32	15	(184)

* The designation Hispanic is unrelated to the white-black categorization.

Question: From what you've seen or heard in the news, do you approve or disapprove of the Bush Administration's plan to put non-U.S. (United States) citizens charged with terrorism on trial in special military tribunals rather than in the regular criminal court system?

Continued ...

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>(N)</u>
	%	%	%	
Total	65	23	12=100	(1201)
Region				
East	61	27	12	(235)
Midwest	68	19	13	(286)
South	67	21	12	(425)
West	61	26	13	(255)
Religious Affiliation				
Total White Protestant	68	16	16	(554)
White Protestant Evangelical	69	16	15	(267)
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	67	17	16	(287)
White Catholic	71	17	12	(236)
Secular	55	38	7	(122)
Community Size				
Large City	55	33	12	(235)
Suburb	67	21	12	(252)
Small City/Town	67	20	13	(462)
Rural Area	69	21	10	(243)
Party ID				
Republican	78	12	10	(378)
Democrat	54	30	16	(360)
Independent	67	26	7	(381)
Party and Ideology				
Conservative Republican	82	9	9	(215)
Moderate/Liberal Republican	75	15	10	(155)
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	55	29	16	(263)
Liberal Democrat	47	39	14	(85)
Bush Approval				
Approve	73	17	10	(963)
Disapprove	25	62	13	(140)
Democratic Congressional Approval				
Approve	64	26	10	(631)
Disapprove	72	22	6	(324)
2000 Presidential Vote				
Bush	81	12	7	(456)
Gore	53	33	14	(350)
Marital Status				
Married	67	21	12	(667)
Unmarried	62	25	13	(533)
Parental Status				
Parent	66	23	11	(397)
Non-Parent	64	23	13	(803)
Labor Union				
Union Household	65	24	11	(191)
Non-Union Household	65	23	12	(998)

**PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS
& COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
JANUARY 2002 NEWS INTEREST INDEX
FINAL TOPLINE
January 9-13, 2002
N=1,201**

Now a few questions about the war on terrorism...

Q.25 How well is the MILITARY effort to destroy the terrorist groups going? **[READ]**

		<u>Early Nov, 2001</u>	<u>Oct 15-21, 2001</u>	<u>Oct 10-14, 2001</u>
38	Very well	30	38	45
51	Fairly well	45	45	35
6	Not too well	12	9	6
3	Not at all well	4	2	4
<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
100		100	100	100

Q.26 How would you rate the job the government is doing in BUILDING DEFENSES at home to prevent future terrorist attacks? Would you say the government is doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job?

		<u>Early Nov, 2001</u>	<u>Oct 15-21, 2001</u>	<u>Oct 10-14, 2001</u>
13	Excellent	15	18	20
47	Good	47	51	47
31	Only fair	25	22	22
6	Poor	7	5	4
<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>
100		100	100	100

Q.27 If you had to choose, what should get a higher priority now? **[READ AND ROTATE]**

		<u>Early Nov 2001</u>	<u>Oct 15-21 2001</u>	<u>Oct 10-14 2001</u>	<u>Late Sept 2001</u>
44	Building our defenses at home to prevent future terrorist attacks	42	37	36	33
	OR				
40	Taking military action to destroy terrorist networks around the world	42	48	45	44
12	Both (VOL)	11	13	13	16
<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
100		100	100	100	100

NO Q.28

Q.29 If Osama bin Laden is captured or killed, do you think that the terrorism threat will be mostly over or do you think we will have to take further military actions to reduce the threat of terrorism to the United States?

5	Mostly over
92	Take further military actions
<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=600]:

Q.30F1 As part of the U.S. war on terrorism, would you favor or oppose taking military action in Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule?

		Against Terrorists*	
		Mid-Nov	Mid-Sept
		<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
73	Favor	85	82
16	Oppose	8	8
11	Don't know/Refused	7	10
<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

*** Note: For Mid-November and Mid-September 2001, the question was worded: "Do you favor or oppose taking military action, including the use of ground troops, to retaliate against whoever is responsible for the terrorist attacks?"**

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=601]:

Q.31F2 As part of the U.S. war on terrorism, would you favor or oppose taking military action in Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule, even if it meant that U.S. forces might suffer thousands of casualties?

		Against Terrorists**	
		Mid-Nov	Mid-Sept
		<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
56	Favor	77	77
31	Oppose	14	9
13	Don't know/Refused	9	14
<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

****Note: For Mid-November and Mid-September 2001, the question was worded: "Do you favor or oppose taking military action, including the use of ground troops, to retaliate against whoever is responsible for the terrorist attacks, even if it means that U.S. armed forces might suffer thousands of casualties?"**

ASK ALL:

Q.32 Here are some reasons given for using military force against Iraq. As I read a reason, tell me if it is a very important, fairly important, or not important reason to justify the use of military force against Iraq. First, **(READ ITEM)**, would that be a very important reason, fairly important reason, or not important reason to justify the use of military force against Iraq?

		<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Fairly Important</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	If we learned that Iraq is developing nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction	77	15	5	3=100
b.	If we learned that Iraq helped the terrorists attack the United States on September 11 th	83	11	3	3=100
c.	If we learned that Iraq was harboring other terrorists	75	18	4	3=100

NO Q.33

C.1 What do you think the U.S. should do to try to get Saddam Hussein to accept weapons inspections? Should we offer to remove economic sanctions against Iraq, or should we threaten him with a military attack?

33	Offer to remove sanctions
49	Threaten military attack
4	Both (VOL)
3	Neither (VOL)
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

IF "1" IN C.1, ASK [N=402]:

C.2 If Saddam Hussein will not accept weapons inspections in exchange for lifting economic sanctions, would you favor or oppose using military force against Iraq?

67	Favor
27	Oppose
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

IF FAVOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE ("2" IN C.1 OR "1" IN C.2), ASK [N=843]:

C.3 In that case, should we attack Iraq only if our major allies agree to join us, or attack Iraq even if allies do not want to join us?

53	Attack only if allies agree
41	Attack even if allies won't join
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=600]:

Q.34a

F1 Would you favor or oppose the U.S. taking military action to destroy terrorist groups in Somalia?

65	Favor
16	Oppose
<u>19</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=601]:

Q.34b

F2 Would you favor or oppose the U.S. taking military action to destroy terrorist groups in Sudan?

73	Favor
14	Oppose
<u>13</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK ALL:

Q.34c Would you favor or oppose the U.S. providing military aid to the Philippines and Indonesia to combat terrorist groups in those countries?

69	Favor
21	Oppose
<u>10</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=600]:

Q.34d

F1 These days, are you more sympathetic or less sympathetic to Russia in its war against Islamic rebels in Chechnya, or hasn't your opinion about this changed?

27	More Sympathetic
8	Less Sympathetic
44	No change
<u>21</u>	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=601]:

Q.34e

F2 These days, are you more sympathetic or less sympathetic to China in its efforts to combat Islamic rebels in western China, or hasn't your opinion about this changed?

15	More Sympathetic
12	Less Sympathetic
51	No change
<u>22</u>	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	

ASK ALL:

Q.35 Do you think the United States should keep military forces in Afghanistan in order to maintain civil order there, or should the United States not do this?

68	Yes, keep forces in Afghanistan
26	No
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	

On another subject...

Q.36 In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it will be necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties, or not?

		Mid-Sept <u>2001</u>	April <u>1997</u>	March <u>1996</u>	<i>L.A. Times</i> <u>April 1995</u>
55	Yes, it will be necessary	55	29	30	49
39	No, it will not be necessary	35	62	65	43
<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

Q.37 What concerns you more right now? That the government will fail to enact strong, new anti-terrorism laws, or that the government will enact new anti-terrorism laws which excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties?

		Mid-Sept <u>2001</u>	<i>L.A. Times</i> <u>April 1995</u>
40	Fail to enact strong laws	39	40
45	Enact laws that restrict civil liberties	34	44
3	Neither (VOL)	10	4
<u>12</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>17</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

Q.38 From what you've seen or heard in the news, do you approve or disapprove of the Bush Administration's plan to put non-U.S. (United States) citizens charged with terrorism on trial in special military tribunals rather than in the regular criminal court system?

		<i>Newsweek</i> <u>11/29-30/01</u>
65	Approve	68
23	Disapprove	22
<u>12</u>	Don't know/Refused (VOL)	<u>10</u>
100		100

ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=600]:

Q.39F1 How worried are you that there will soon be another terrorist attack in the United States? [READ]

		Dec <u>2001</u>	Oct 15-21 <u>2001</u>	Oct 10-14 <u>2001</u>	Early Oct <u>2001</u>
20	Very worried	13	29	27	28
42	Somewhat worried	39	42	40	45
28	Not too worried	27	18	19	15
9	Not at all worried	19	10	12	11
<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
100		100	100	100	100

ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=601]:

Q.40F2 All in all, how worried are you that you or someone in your family might become a victim of a terrorist attack? Would you say you are [READ]

		Early Nov <u>2001</u>	Oct 10-14 <u>2001</u>	Late Sept <u>2001</u>	----- Gallup -----				
		<u>2001</u> ²	<u>2001</u> ³	<u>2001</u> ³	9/14-15 <u>2001</u> ²	9/11 <u>2001</u> ³	Aug <u>1998</u>	July <u>1996</u>	April <u>1995</u> ⁴
12	Very worried	13	18	17	18	23	10	13	14
26	Somewhat worried	27	32	36	33	35	22	26	28
38	Not too worried	35	29	31	35	24	38	34	33
24	Not at all worried	24	19	15	13	16	29	27	24
*	Already victim (VOL)	0	0	*	*	1	--	--	--
*	Don't know/Refused	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>
100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ASK ALL:

Q.41 Thinking about the Mideast situation these days, do you think the U.S. should take Israel's side more, less or about as much as it has in the past?

		<u>Oct 15-21, 2001</u>
22	More	16
14	Less	19
53	As much as in the past	56
<u>11</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>9</u>
100		100

² For the September 14-15 Gallup trend the question started with wording, "I'd like to ask you a few questions about the events that occurred this past Tuesday in New York City and Washington, DC..."

³ For the September 11 Gallup trend the question started with wording, "I'd like to ask you a few questions about the events that occurred today in New York City and Washington, DC..."

⁴ For the April 1995 Gallup trend the question was worded, "How worried are you that you or someone in your family will become a victim of a terrorist attack similar to the bombing in Oklahoma City?"

NO Q.42, Q.43 OR Q.44

Q.45 As I read from a list tell me how important each of the following is as a way to reduce terrorism in the future. (First), **[READ AND ROTATE]** is this very important, fairly important, not too important, or not at all important as a way to reduce terrorism in the future?

		<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Fairly Important</u>	<u>Not too Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
ASK FORM 1 ONLY [N=600]:						
a.F1	Decrease American dependence on oil imported from the Middle East	53	29	9	4	5=100
b.F1	Encourage more democracy in Mideast countries like Egypt and Saudi Arabia	42	35	11	5	7=100
c.F1	Take military action to wipe out facilities of countries attempting to build nuclear weapons	54	27	9	5	5=100
d.F1	Increase foreign aid to countries that help the U.S. combat terrorism	41	40	11	4	4=100
ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=601]:						
e.F2	Purchase and destroy nuclear wastes and weapons in former Soviet Republics	40	33	17	5	5=100
f.F2	Increase defense spending to maintain our military preparedness	54	33	7	3	3=100
g.F2	Attempt to reduce poverty with foreign aid as a way of combating terrorism in poor Mideast countries	24	41	21	10	4=100
h.F2	Increase military aid to countries that help the U.S. combat terrorism	39	40	12	5	4=100