



**THE PEW RESEARCH CENTER**  
**For The People & The Press**

***NEWSRelease***

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

**EMBARGOED**

FOR RELEASE: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2002, 9:00 A.M.

**One Year Later: New Yorkers More Troubled, Washingtonians More On Edge**  
**THE PERSONAL TOLL PERSISTS, POLICY OPINIONS CHANGE**

***Also Including:***

*Commentary by Lee Feinstein, Senior Fellow & Director of Strategic Policy  
Council on Foreign Relations*

***FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:***

Andrew Kohut, Director  
Scott Keeter, Associate Director  
Carroll Doherty, Editor  
Michael Dimock, Research Director  
Elizabeth Mueller Gross, Special Projects Director  
Nilanthi Samaranayake, Peyton Craighill and Nicole Speulda, Project Directors  
Pew Research Center for The People & The Press  
202/293-3126  
<http://www.people-press.org>

**One Year Later: New Yorkers More Troubled, Washingtonians More On Edge**  
**THE PERSONAL TOLL PERSISTS, POLICY OPINIONS CHANGE**

Over the past year, many of the dramatic reactions of the public to the events of Sept. 11 have slowly faded. The spike in trust in government is mostly gone, the public once again is highly critical of the news media, and even President Bush's approval ratings have come down from the stratosphere.<sup>1</sup> His job approval stands at 60% in the new poll, just nine points higher than pre-attack levels. Yet it is also clear that the attacks have left a lasting, perhaps indelible, imprint on life in America as well as on attitudes toward public policy.

In personal terms, all Americans are connected by recollections of the experience – 97% can remember exactly where they were or what they were doing the moment they heard about the attacks. But the burden and continuing consequences of the attacks are not equally shared. Half feel that Sept. 11 changed their lives, but just 16% describe the changes as major. Understandably, the personal impact is much greater in those areas of the country that came under attack.

People living in the New York area report far more emotional consequences than do Americans living in other parts of the country, including residents of Washington D.C. Tellingly, 46% of respondents in a survey of the New York area said they knew someone who was injured or killed in the attacks, compared with 21% in the Washington D.C. area and 11% nationwide. Among New Yorkers who were in midtown or lower Manhattan of that area on Sept. 11, 59% knew a victim of the attacks. In turn, reports of continued depression, insomnia, and fear are at least twice as high among these respondents as in the nationwide poll.

<b>9/11 Personal Impact</b>			
	<u>Nation</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Cite 9/11 as biggest life event in past year	38	51	44
Know someone hurt or killed in attacks	11	46	21
Suffer two or more <u>emotional consequences</u>	<b>34</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>35</b>
Often recall	28	40	40
Often feel sad	24	37	23
Often feel depressed	10	14	8
Often feel angry	31	41	27
Took one or more <u>preventive measures</u>	<b>43</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>61</b>
Avoided public events	15	31	30
Handled mail differently	24	31	32
Traveled by air less	17	30	28
Experienced one or more <u>direct life consequences</u>	<b>22</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>
Loss of job or cut in pay	13	17	14
Considered moving	6	17	18
Changed job	6	11	8

The latest Pew Research Center survey compares the experiences, recollections and attitudes of 801 residents of the New York (401) and Washington D.C. areas (400) with those of 1,001 Americans nationwide. The poll shows that, on many policy issues, the post-9/11 consensus has started to splinter. Ratings for the government's efforts to defend the nation have fallen, and even the military campaign against terrorism is given lower ratings than last winter. The public also has become less willing to sacrifice civil liberties in the struggle against terrorism. The report includes

---

<sup>1</sup> For attitudes on the media, see "News Media's Improved Image Proves Short-Lived," Aug. 4, 2002.

a special commentary on public policy attitudes by Lee Feinstein, Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. The Council assisted in formulation of the policy questions.

On a personal level, it is clear that while Sept. 11 touched the lives of virtually every American, there are vast differences in the ways people have been affected. Compared to people living elsewhere, New Yorkers and Washingtonians report more direct life consequences over the past year as a result of the attacks. Residents of these metropolitan areas are considering moving from where they live at a rate three times the national average. Reports of lost jobs, pay cuts, and considerations of career changes also are notably higher in New York than elsewhere.

Washingtonians and residents of the New York area have adopted defensive and preventive behaviors more than people elsewhere – they are more likely to avoid air travel and crowded places, and exercise more caution when handling the mail. As many as 69% of Washingtonians say that they live or work in an area where a future terrorist attack is likely, compared with 42% of New Yorkers and 32% of national respondents.

The varied personal impact is also seen in the fact that a 51% majority of New Yorkers volunteered that the 9/11 attacks were the most important thing to occur in their personal lives over the past 12 months. That number is not as high in Washington (44%), and is still lower in the nationwide survey (38%). There is broad agreement, however, concerning the impact of Sept. 11 on the country – 80% of all Americans cited the attacks as the most significant event to occur in the country in the past year.

Concern over another terrorist attack has fluctuated over the course of the past year, but at no point has less than a majority been at least somewhat worried. Currently, 62% of Americans say they are very or somewhat worried about the possibility of a new attack on the United States. That is lower than in June (76%) when the media reported extensively on the capture of “dirty bomb” suspect Jose Padilla.

Worries about another attack are only slightly greater in New York (68%) and Washington (65%). But the gap is wider when it comes to personal concerns over terrorism. Majorities in both New York and Washington fear that they or a member of their family may become a victim of terrorism compared with 40% of the general public.

<b>Terrorism Worries</b>			
	<u>Nation</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>
<i>Worry about another attack</i>	%	%	%
Very	16	28	20
Somewhat	46	40	45
Not too/Not at all	37	31	34
Don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100
<i>Worry about being a victim</i>			
Very	12	25	16
Somewhat	28	32	36
Not too/Not at all	59	39	47
Don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100

In the year since the attacks, the public's assessments of the government's anti-terrorism efforts have steadily declined. The percentage of Americans who rate the government's homeland defense program as excellent or good has fallen from a peak of 69% in October to 57% in the current survey. Local anti-terrorism efforts get even lower ratings; overall, just half (47%) give them excellent or good ratings. New Yorkers and Washingtonians give their local governments comparable grades (47%, 54% respectively).

Increasingly, Americans want the government to focus on homeland defense rather than rooting out terrorist networks abroad. Last fall, pluralities gave greater priority to overseas military action. But now just three-in-ten rate military action as most important, while half give greater priority to homeland defense. There is overwhelming support for the proposed cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security, but relatively little awareness of the new agency. Only about half of Americans have heard or read anything about the department.

The public has a better opinion of the military effort to combat terrorism than it does of homeland defense. However, fewer Americans believe things are going well militarily than was the case last winter (65% now vs. 89% in January). These declining ratings reflect public uncertainty about the course of the war on terrorism. Only 15% feel the war in Afghanistan has been a success; about as many (12%) say it has been a failure. The overwhelming majority of Americans (70%) think it is too early to tell. And just a third of the public believes terrorists are less able to launch a new attack than they were a year ago. Slightly more (39%) say their capability is the same and one-in-five (22%) believe it is greater than it was a year ago.

As the public has grown more critical of the government, especially regarding homefront defenses, it also has become less willing to give up personal civil liberties in order to prevent terrorism. The number favoring mandatory national identity cards has fallen from 70% shortly after the attacks to 59% in the current survey. Americans are much more opposed to the government monitoring their credit card purchases and personal phone calls, and this opposition also has grown.

	Oct 10-14 2001	Oct 15-21 2001	Early Nov 2001	Jan 2002	Now
<i>Military effort is going ...</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Very well	45	38	30	38	22
Fairly well	35	45	45	51	43
Not well	10	11	16	9	22
Don't know	10	6	9	2	13
	100	100	100	100	100
<i>Govt. job on homeland defense</i>					
Excellent	20	18	15	13	13
Good	47	51	47	47	44
Only fair/Poor	26	27	32	37	38
Don't know	7	4	6	3	5
	100	100	100	100	100

<i>Afghanistan war a success?</i>	%
Yes	15
No	12
Too early to tell	70
Don't know	3
	100
<i>Compared to a year ago, terrorists' ability to launch another attack is ...</i>	
Greater	22
Same	39
Less	34
Don't know	5
	100

However, a majority favors permitting airline security personnel to profile people who appear to be of Middle Eastern descent, and two-thirds support the idea of arming airline pilots.

Despite a declining consensus about the war on terror, two profound changes in American public opinion remain apparent. The public continues to be disposed to use military force in the war on terrorism, and Americans favor the United States taking an active role in the world as a way of preventing future terrorist attacks. In terms of specific ways for dealing with terrorism, military options draw broad support but so do alternative strategies.

Nearly six-in-ten (58%) give high priority to taking military action against countries that seek to develop nuclear weapons and about half (53%) say the same about increased defense spending. This feeling carries over to the U.S. military presence abroad as well. By 48%-29%, Americans say that increasing the U.S. military presence overseas would be a more effective way of combating terrorism than decreasing it. Still, a majority of Americans (53%) believe it is very important to reduce U.S. dependence on Middle East oil. These numbers have changed little since the beginning of the year.

The new poll continues to find a public that is supportive of engagement in world affairs. By 53%-34%, Americans favor the U.S. being very much involved in solving international problems as a way to avert terrorism. This is somewhat less than the 61%-32% majority in favor of active engagement last October. But it still represents a departure for a country that had been wary of dealing with global trouble spots in the post-Cold War era.

There still is, however, a reluctance to use economic aid as a weapon in the war on terror. Only a quarter of the public believes that providing aid to alleviate poverty in the Middle East is a very important means of reducing terrorism. But a 56% majority favors coming to the aid of Afghanistan to help it recover from the war and two-thirds accept the idea that the United States will have to continue to deploy troops there to maintain civil order.

<b>Ways To Combat Terrorism</b>		
	<u>Oct 2001</u>	<u>Now</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Take on world problems	61	53
Avoid world problems	32	34
Don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
	100	100
<i>Decrease American dependence on oil</i>		
	<u>Jan 2002</u>	<u>Now</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Very important	53	53
Somewhat important	29	26
Not important	13	13
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>
	100	100
<i>Take action against countries developing nuclear weapons</i>		
Very important	54	58
Somewhat important	27	21
Not important	14	15
Don't know	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
	100	100
<i>Increase defense spending to maintain military preparedness</i>		
Very important	54	53
Somewhat important	33	33
Not important	10	10
Don't know	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
	100	100

The new poll does find considerably more support for basing U.S. anti-terrorism policy mostly on national interests, rather than strongly taking allied interests into account. By 45%-35%, Americans now say national interests should take precedence; last fall, the margin was two-to-one (59%-30%) in favor of giving allied interests strong consideration. The shift in favor of a U.S.-centered policy was most pronounced among Republicans, who favor that idea by 57%-29%.

Significantly, public sentiment for a go-it-alone strategy does not extend to a possible conflict with Iraq. While most Americans (64%) favor using military force to get rid of Saddam Hussein, support for taking action in the absence of allied support withers to just 30%. Support for military action fell to 42% when tested with the prospect that the U.S. may suffer thousands of casualties.

For all the recent focus on a possible war with Iraq, far fewer people have been giving the matter serious consideration compared with the period before the 1991 Persian Gulf War. Just 46% say they have given a great deal of thought to whether the U.S. should go to war in Iraq. In January 1991, a Center survey found that 66% said they had given a great deal of thought to using force to drive Iraq out of Kuwait.

To many Americans, President Bush has yet to clearly lay out the case for a military action against Iraq, particularly when compared with his father a decade ago. As early as August 1990, half of Americans believed that then-President Bush had clearly explained the rationale for sending troops to the Persian Gulf. Today, just 37% say that the president has clearly articulated reasons for using force to end Saddam Hussein's rule.

<b>Iraq Less Considered</b>		
	Jan 1991	Now
<i>Thought given to using force in Iraq</i>	%	%
A great deal	66	46
Some	24	35
Only a little	6	11
Not at all	2	6
Don't know	2	2
	100	100
<b>Less Clarity from this President Bush</b>		
	Aug 1990*	Now
<i>President clearly explains reasons for using force in Iraq</i>	%	%
Explained clearly	50	37
Not clearly	41	52
Don't know	9	11
	100	100

\* New York Times trend

The survey shows that, on a range of issues related to the use of force, fears of future terrorism are shaping public policy attitudes. Those who worry most about possible new attacks are decidedly more likely than other people to favor aggressive policies to deal with terrorism, including increased military spending, pre-emptive strikes to wipe out facilities of countries developing nuclear weapons, and using military force to bring about regime change in Iraq.

One consequence of this is that in the post-9/11 era women worry more than men about another attack and this serves to reduce the long-standing gender gap on the use of force and defense spending. Women are about as supportive as men of taking military action against Iraq and suspected nuclear powers, although they are more sensitive to the possibility of casualties.

Continuing concern about terrorism notwithstanding, the economy once again is a competing source of public anxiety. As many Americans say they want President Bush to focus on the economy as on terrorism. Terrorism trumps domestic issues in the public’s mind, but by a smaller margin than earlier this year. There is a wide partisan gap on these issues, with many more Republicans than Democrats citing terrorism as the top presidential priority.

<i>Bush should focus on ...</i>	Jan 2002 %	Aug 2002 %
Domestic policy	33	29
War on terror	52	43
Both	13	22
Neither/DK	2	6
	100	100
Economy	–	39
War on terror	–	34
Both	–	22
Neither/DK	–	5
		100

The survey also found:

- Americans look at fire fighters, police officers and rescue workers as the heroes of Sept. 11. Asked in an open-ended format whose performance they found to be most inspiring, 37% named fire fighters and other emergency workers while 14% mentioned the president and 10% said former Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. But 22% of New York-area residents named the former New York mayor as most inspirational.
- Shortly after the attacks, two-thirds of Americans considered them more serious than Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor, but that view has changed. Just 37% now believe the attacks were more serious than Pearl Harbor, while 43% say they were about as serious.
- If another attack occurs, four-in-ten expect terrorists to use chemical or biological weapons. And a 54% majority believes that Islamic terrorists already living in the United States would be most likely to carry out a new attack.
- Demonstrations of patriotism have become commonplace in the aftermath of Sept. 11. Nearly every respondent (96%) said there have been at least some displays of patriotism in their community – flags, bumper stickers, etc. Nearly one-in-five (17%) say their community has established a permanent memorial to the victims of the attacks.
- Just 35% of Americans say Sept. 11 was the start of a major conflict between the West and Islam. But another 19% predict it could turn into such a conflict – meaning that 54% believe the war on terrorism is already or could eventually become a “clash of civilizations.”
- Roughly three-quarters of parents in the survey say they have talked to their children about the attack. More moms than dads say they have heard their children express fears about terrorism (53% vs. 34%).

## I. Americans and 9/11: The Personal Toll

The Sept. 11 attacks affected nearly all Americans in some way. Nationally, two-thirds say the attacks had a great emotional impact on them, and another quarter say it had some effect. Fewer than one-in-ten say the events did not move them much.

Demonstrating the national scope of the tragedy, the emotional impact was only slightly greater in the targeted cities than elsewhere; nearly three-quarters in the New York City and Washington D.C. areas say they were moved a great deal by the attacks. Women felt emotionally affected more severely than men – 74% of women nationally say they were moved a great deal, compared to 58% of men, a pattern which was mirrored in New York and, to a lesser extent, Washington.

	Great deal %	Some %	Not much/ not at all %	Don't know %
National	67	25	8	*=100
Women	74	23	3	*=100
Men	58	28	13	1=100
New York	73	21	5	1=100
Women	85	11	3	1=100
Men	61	32	6	1=100
Washington	72	22	5	1=100
Women	75	21	4	*=100
Men	69	23	7	1=100

### *Where Were You When ...*

Virtually all Americans (97%) can recall precisely where they were or what they were doing the moment they heard about the attacks. By comparison, in 1999, the Pew Research Center found that, among those old enough to remember, 90% could recall where they were or what they were doing when they first heard about the assassination of JFK, and 85% remembered first hearing about the attack on Pearl Harbor.

But the public's historical perspective on the attacks has changed over the past year. In an NBC survey conducted on Sept. 12, fully two-thirds of Americans said the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were more serious than the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Today, just four-in-ten (37%) hold this view, while more (43%) say the attacks were about equal in historical importance. Residents of New York and Washington have the same impression as the rest of the nation on this question.

Sept. 11 attacks	97%
<i>1999 survey comparisons*</i>	
JFK assassination	90
Death of Princess Diana	87
Okla. City bombing	86
Pearl Harbor attack	85
Challenger explosion	82
MLK assassination	67

\* Percent who recall exactly where they were or what they were doing the moment they heard the news, based on those who were old enough to remember the event. May, 1999 Millenium study



Younger people are the most likely to rate 9/11 as bigger than Pearl Harbor. Among Americans under age 50, four times as many rate the Sept. 11 attacks as more important than Pearl Harbor as say they were less serious (40% to 10%). By comparison, as many Americans age 65 and older say 9/11 was *less* serious than Pearl Harbor as say it was *more* serious.

**National Impact Greater**

While Americans offer that Sept. 11 was a huge event for the nation, relatively few say that their *own* lives have undergone major changes, and many have experienced other events in their lives over the past year that had a bigger effect on them personally.

Eight-in-ten Americans volunteered the 9/11 attacks had the biggest effect on the *nation* over the past year. But when asked if they could think of anything that had happened over the past year or so that had a big effect on their *own* lives, half as many (38%) mentioned the attacks.

That was the leading response, but a quarter (24%) cited a more personal life event such as a marriage, birth, death or health problem in the family, and 30% said nothing major had happened in their lives over the past year or so. Not surprisingly, 9/11 ranked somewhat higher among respondents in New York and Washington, where 51% and 44%, respectively, said the attacks had a big effect on their own personal lives.

Nationally, younger people are somewhat less likely than their elders to rank 9/11 as the biggest event in their lives over the past year. But this is more related to the eventful lives of young Americans than to a muted reaction to Sept. 11. People under age 30 are more likely than those 30 and older to have rated the birth of a child, a marriage, a graduation or a major move as the biggest event in their lives, overriding the importance of 9/11. This pattern was reversed in Washington D.C., where younger people were somewhat more likely to cite Sept. 11 as having the biggest effect on their lives.

	More serious	About equal	Not as serious	DK/Ref.
	%	%	%	%
Sept 12, 2001*	66	25	5	4=100
August, 2002	37	43	14	6=100
<i>Age</i>				
18-49	40	45	10	5=100
50-64	36	41	17	6=100
65+	29	38	26	7=100

\*NBC News, Sept 12, 2001.

	The Country	---Your own life---		
	%	Natl. %	NYC %	DC %
9/11 attacks	<b>80</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>44</b>
Economy/Stocks	6	3	2	3
Corporate scandal	3	--	--	--
Personal events	--	24	21	21
Other	10	4	3	2
Nothing	5	30	22	28
DK/Refused	1	3	3	3

Open-ended questions; figures add to more than 100% because respondents could give more than one answer.

Similarly, while half of the nation says life in America has changed in a major way as a result of the terrorist attacks, just 16% say this is the case in their own personal lives. Instead, 49% say their lives are basically the same as before the attacks.

	Life in	---Your own life---		
	America	Natl.	NYC	DC
	%	%	%	%
Major change	50	16	24	22
Minor change	35	33	37	41
Basically the same	14	49	37	36
Other/Don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100

The personal impact of the attacks has been greater in the targeted cities. More than six-in-ten in New York City (61%) and Washington D.C. (63%)

areas say the attacks have changed their lives at least a little, compared with 49% nationwide. This sentiment was shared by residents of other large cities. A quarter of people who live in large cities nationwide say their lives have changed in a major way – twice the rate found in small towns and rural areas.

Far and away the most common change people refer to in their lives is a sense of fear and caution arising out of the terrorist attacks. When asked to describe how their lives have changed in a major way, nearly half in both cities and the nation offered that they were more afraid, more careful, more distrustful, or felt more vulnerable. A number also cited financial problems or job losses they have faced as a result of the attacks.

But the effects of 9/11 were not all bad. A substantial minority of Americans, including many residents of New York and Washington, said the biggest change in their lives is that they are spending more time with their families, making a point to enjoy life more and to not take things for granted since the attacks.

***Emotional Repercussions***

Nearly a year later, the attacks are still fresh in the minds of many Americans. A quarter of the public, and four-in-ten in the cities, say they still think about the attacks every day, and a majority in all regions say they think about them at least a few times a week.

For most Americans, Sept. 11 continues to inspire feelings of patriotism and spirituality. Fully 62% say they often feel patriotic as a result of the attacks, while 49% say they frequently think about life in spiritual terms. These feelings are as prevalent in New York and Washington as in the rest of the nation.

	Natl.	NYC	DC
<i>Often feel ...</i>	%	%	%
Patriotic	62	61	60
Spiritual	49	50	49
Angry	31	41	27
Sad	24	37	23
Suspicious	23	29	24
Scared	12	18	15
Depressed	10	14	8
Sleepless	4	9	3

But a sizable minority of Americans are still struggling with other, less positive reactions – anger and sadness, suspicion and fear, depression and insomnia. These feelings, while widely shared, are especially prevalent among New Yorkers. Three-in-ten people nationwide (31%), and as many as four-in-ten in the New York area, say they often still feel angry as a result of the attacks. A quarter (24%) say they often feel sad; again, a much higher proportion of New Yorkers report frequently feeling sad because of the attacks.

Women are more likely than men to report experiencing these reactions, which has been the case since shortly after the attacks. This is particularly true with respect to feeling sad, scared and depressed. Women also are just as likely as men to say they still feel angry as a result of the terrorist attacks. Despite feeling fewer of these emotional effects, men are just as likely as women to still be thinking about 9/11 regularly, and to feel increased patriotism.

Many New Yorkers are experiencing several of these feelings, adding to their emotional burden. More than four-in-ten New Yorkers say they often experience two or more of the following emotions: anger, sadness, suspicion, fear, depression and insomnia. Roughly a quarter nationwide and in the D.C. area say the same.

### ***Fear Drives Lifestyle Changes***

One of the biggest effects on people's behavior as a result of Sept. 11 has been on their family lives. Four-in-ten (42%) say they spend more time close to home and with family, a figure that rises to 57% in New York. Far fewer people have made other major adjustments to their daily lives out of concern about terrorism.

Roughly a quarter of Americans say they have handled mail differently since 9/11, and one-in-five say they have traveled by air less as a result of the attacks. (Of those who say the latter, fully 55% attribute their decrease in flying to their concerns about safety, while just 16% say they are flying less because of the added security hassles.) Other behaviors, such as stockpiling supplies or avoiding travel to certain cities are less prevalent. Just 15% nationwide say they have avoided certain cities since the attacks, and fewer say they have stored up food or water (12%), or stockpiled medications or prescription drugs (4%).

Not surprisingly, worries about terrorism are highly related to these behaviors. Almost half (45%) of those who are very worried that they or their families might become the victim of a terrorist attack say their life has changed in a major way, and 84% say their life has changed at least somewhat. By comparison, 61% of those who have little or no worries about becoming a victim of an attack say their life is basically the same as it was before 9/11.

The minority who have high levels of personal concern about terrorism – 12% of the public – have changed their behavior dramatically. Seven-in-ten are staying closer to home and spending more time with family as a result of the attacks and half are handling mail differently. A third have reduced their air travel plans and roughly four-in-ten are avoiding certain cities and crowded places. Among those who are very worried, one-quarter have stored up food or water in their home in case of an emergency. Just 7% of those who are not too worried about an attack have done the same.

<b>How Daily Life Has Changed Since 9/11</b>				
		<i>Worried about being victim of terrorism</i>		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Very</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Not</u>
<i>Personal life has ...</i>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Changed in a major way	16	45	14	10
Changed only a little	33	39	45	28
Is basically the same	49	14	40	61
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100	100	100
<i>Percent who have ...</i>				
Stayed closer to home	42	72	56	30
Handled mail differently	24	50	28	17
Traveled by air less	17	34	26	9
Avoided certain cities	15	38	18	8
Avoided crowded places	15	41	21	7
Stored up food or water	11	24	14	7
Stored up medications	4	12	4	2
<i>(Percent of Population)</i>		<i>(12%)</i>	<i>(28%)</i>	<i>(59%)</i>

***Closest to Tragedy, Greatest Impact***

The impact of the attacks, on emotions and behaviors, has been far greater in New York and Washington, DC. Yet within these cities, there is a stark division between those who were in the downtown areas on the day of the attacks and those who were not. Notably, 59% of New York area residents who were in midtown or lower Manhattan on Sept. 11 knew someone killed in the attacks. By comparison, about four-in-ten New York area residents who were not in the area that day say the same.

In addition, four-in-ten New Yorkers who experienced the attacks first-hand have since lost their jobs or taken a pay cut. Just 11% of New York area residents who were not in midtown or lower-Manhattan on that day say the same, a rate no higher than in the nation as a whole. Similarly, New Yorkers who were in the downtown area on 9/11 are twice as likely as New Yorkers who were elsewhere to be thinking about changing their careers.

These patterns also are mirrored in Washington D.C., where those who were downtown or near the Pentagon on the day of the attacks have experienced a more direct impact than others in the area. More than a quarter (27%) of this group knew a victim, compared with 16% of other area residents. Just one-in-ten Americans nationwide say they knew someone killed or injured on Sept. 11.

Proximity to the attacks also has had an effect on people's behavior, and a lasting emotional impact. In both New York and Washington, it is the people who were closest to the attacks who have become significantly more cautious in terms of handling their mail more carefully, flying less, or avoiding crowded places.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the emotional toll is greatest among those who were near ground zero in Manhattan on Sept. 11. Half of New Yorkers with this experience still think about the attacks every day and one-in-five often feel depressed. As many as 16% often have difficulty sleeping, twice the rate reported by others living in the region and four times as high as in the rest of the nation.

***Many Make Emergency Plans***

Children as well as adults are struggling with the after effects of the attacks. Among parents with children age 5 to 17 living at home, 44% say their kids have expressed fears about terrorism. A Pew Research Center survey conducted in mid-September, 2001 found similar reporting of fears among children age 5 to 12.

<b>Experiencing Tragedy First-Hand</b>					
	<u>Natl.</u>	<i>New York</i>		<i>Washington</i>	
	<u>%</u>	<u>In city</u>	<u>Not</u>	<u>In city</u>	<u>Not</u>
		<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Knew someone killed/hurt	11	<b>59</b>	43	<b>27</b>	16
Lost job or took pay cut	13	<b>39</b>	11	<b>18</b>	11
Changed career plans	6	<b>20</b>	9	<b>11</b>	4
Thought about moving	6	<b>37</b>	13	<b>23</b>	13
Handled mail differently	24	<b>43</b>	28	<b>38</b>	27
Traveled by air less	17	<b>44</b>	26	<b>32</b>	23
Think about daily	28	<b>48</b>	38	41	38
Avoid crowded places	15	<b>38</b>	29	32	27
Feel depressed	10	<b>19</b>	13	10	6
Have difficulty sleeping	4	<b>16</b>	7	5	2
Number of cases	(1001)	(87)	(314)	(194)	(206)

For NY sample "in Midtown or lower Manhattan on the day of the attacks"  
For DC sample "downtown or near the Pentagon on the day of the attacks"

For the most part, parents have dealt with their children’s concerns by talking about them. Three-quarters of parents in all regions of the country have made a point to talk with their children about terrorism. But some families have been more active: Fully half of parents in the New York area say they have made special arrangements for their children with family or friends in case of possible emergencies, slightly higher than in Washington D.C. (37%) and the nation as a whole (35%).

Parents who are worried that they or a member of their family might become a victim of a terrorist attack are, not surprisingly, far more likely to have taken precautions. Nearly half of parents who worry a great deal or some about terrorism affecting their family have made emergency plans for their kids in case of an emergency – just 22% of parents with less concern have done the same.

These worried parents are also twice as likely to hear worries from their children. Fully 60% of parents very or somewhat worried about terrorist attacks report that their children have expressed such fears, compared with 28% of parents who worry little about such things.

While mothers and fathers appear to be sharing responsibility for talking with their children and making emergency plans, mothers are significantly more likely than fathers to hear their kids express worries about terrorism. Nationally, more than half of mothers of children age 5 to 17 say their kids have expressed fears about terrorist attacks, compared with one-third of fathers.

<i>Responses to terrorism ...</i>	All			<i>Worried</i>		<i>Not</i>	
	<i>Parents</i>	<i>Moms</i>	<i>Dads</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Talked with kids	77	79	74	81	73		
Kids expressed fears	44	<b>53</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>28</b>		
Made emergency plans	35	37	33	<b>48</b>	<b>22</b>		

***Patriotism Prevalent***

Sept. 11 produced a rise in patriotism across the nation, and this is seen in several ways. While six-in-ten (62%) say they often feel patriotic as a result of the attacks, displays of patriotism such as flags, bumper stickers, and signs continue to be visible throughout the nation.

Feelings of patriotism are particularly prevalent among Republicans and older Americans. Fully 74% of Republicans say they often feel patriotic as a result of the attacks, compared with 61% of Democrats and 53% of independents. Three-quarters of those age 65 and above (74%) also say they feel patriotic, more than other age groups.

Nearly eight-in-ten Americans (78%) say they continue to see a lot of this in their community. These displays appear to be more common in the Midwest and the South than in other regions, including the New York and Washington areas.

In addition to flags and signs, many people (17% nationally) report that some type of permanent memorial to the victims of Sept. 11 has been created in their community. A third of those living in the New York metropolitan area say this has happened, as do a quarter of respondents in the Washington area.

	Natl. %	NYC %	WDC %
<i>Displays of patriotism</i>			
A lot	78	72	67
Some	18	20	24
Hardly any	4	6	8
Don't know	*	2	1
	100	100	100
<i>Permanent memorial established</i>			
Yes	17	32	25
No	78	65	70
Don't know	5	3	5
	100	100	100

There is little sign of “9/11 fatigue” in the survey. A majority of the public (58%) thinks the country has paid the right amount of attention to the Sept. 11 attacks, and nearly one-fifth (19%) say the event has received too little attention. Just 18% think too much attention has been paid. People who are very worried that they or their family will be harmed in another attack are more likely than others to believe too little attention has been paid to Sept. 11.

***Spiritual Thinking***

Nearly half of Americans and New York and Washington residents say they often think about life in spiritual terms as a result of the terrorist attacks, making this, along with increased patriotism, one of the most common personal reactions to 9/11. Women are significantly more likely to say this applies to them.

Blacks and Hispanics also are significantly more likely than whites to say they often think about life in spiritual terms as a result of the attacks. Among whites, two-thirds of evangelical Protestants expressed this spiritual reaction, compared to one-third of non-evangelical Protestants, 49% of Catholics, and 16% of seculars.

***Heroes of 9/11***

The public found the actions of firemen, police officers, and rescue workers in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks to be the most personally inspiring. Pluralities in all parts of the nation, the New York and Washington areas included, cite the bravery of these emergency personnel as most inspirational, with firemen singled out for praise.

Total	49%
Women	60
Men	37
White	46
Black	66
Hispanic	59
<i>Among whites</i>	
Evangelical	64
Mainline	36
Catholic	49
Secular	16

As many as 14% name George W. Bush as the most inspiring individual, edging out the ex-mayor of New York, Rudy Giuliani (10%). Giuliani is seen as far more inspirational than the president within the New York City area, where 22% cite him as their greatest inspiration. Nationally, more than a quarter of Republicans hold the president's actions in the highest esteem, compared with 8% of Democrats. Interestingly, younger Americans say they were far more inspired by the president than the New York mayor, while the reverse is true among older Americans.

	<u>Natl.</u> %	<u>NYC</u> %	<u>DC</u> %
Firemen, Police, Rescue	37	32	38
<b>George W. Bush</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>
Everyone/all Americans	11	8	8
<b>Rudy Giuliani</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>
Flight 93 passengers	6	2	7
Victims and families	2	3	3
NYC Residents	2	4	3
The military	2	1	1
Volunteers	1	3	1
Other	4	6	5
Don't know	11	11	11

Roughly one-in-ten Americans offer that the actions of all Americans gave them the greatest inspiration. Black and Hispanic respondents are twice as likely as whites to have been inspired by the actions of regular people. Six percent of Americans were most inspired by the actions of passengers on United Flight 93, who fought with hijackers trying to take control of the plane. Another two percent cite victims, survivors, and the families of those who were killed as the most inspirational.



## II. The Nation and 9/11: Fading Consensus on Progress, Policy

Aside from the emotional toll taken by the attacks, Sept. 11 also had a significant impact on the way Americans think about politics and national affairs. Nearly half (46%) said that the attacks changed their own thinking about politics and national issues “a great deal,” while 30% reported “some” change. Only 21% said their thinking had been affected “not much” or “not at all.”

Among those who say they look differently at politics and policy, there is no consensus as to *how* their views have changed. The most frequently mentioned change is that people are now paying more attention to public affairs and world events.<sup>2</sup>

And people whose thinking on politics has been changed by Sept. 11 do take a different approach to some issues, especially questions involving the use of military force. Two-thirds of this group (68%) say it is very important that the U.S. take military action against countries developing weapons of mass destruction. A majority (56%) say they have thought “a great deal” about whether the U.S. should attack Iraq, and 71% favor military action.

<b>Changed Outlook, More Supportive of Military Force</b>		
	<i>9/11 changed thinking about natl issues</i>	
	Great deal	Some/little
	%	%
<i>Thought about Iraq</i>		
A great deal	56	39
Some or less	42	60
Don't know	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
	100	100
<i>Military action in Iraq</i>		
Favor	71	59
Oppose	19	24
Don't know	<u>10</u>	<u>17</u>
	100	100

By contrast, those who say their views have not changed much as a result of the attacks have thought less about the prospect of military action against Iraq. Just four-in-ten in this group (39%) say they have given the issue a great deal of thought. They also are less likely to support the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

<sup>2</sup>

A sample of those who said their views had been affected were asked to explain in their own words how their thinking had changed.

***Slow Progress in War on Terrorism***

Nearly two-thirds of the public (65%) still say that the military effort to destroy terrorist groups is going at least “fairly well,” a solid majority but down from 89% in January. While nearly four-in-ten thought the war was going “very well” in January, only about one-fifth (22%) now feel this way.

Similarly, just 15% say the war in Afghanistan has been a success; about the same number who say it has been a failure. The vast majority – 70% – say that it is too early to tell.

A majority of the public (57%) also give the government a favorable rating (excellent or good) in defending Americans at home from future terrorist attacks. But this number also has been gradually declining since last October, when 69% of the public rated the government’s job performance in this area as good or excellent.

Confidence in the government’s efforts to combat terrorism – both at home and abroad – has slipped more among Democrats than Republicans. Just half of Democrats have favorable view of the government’s homeland defense efforts, down from 66% last October. While 82% of Democrats gave the military campaign positive marks in October, just 57% do so today. Among Republicans, there has been considerably less slippage.

The public is divided on the question of whether terrorists are better able or less able to launch another major attack on the U.S. About a third (34%) believe they are less able, but more than a fifth (22%) think they are more able. A plurality of 39% think the threat is unchanged. Not surprisingly, people who are very worried about another attack are much more likely than others to think the terrorists are stronger today: half of this group (49%) think the ability of the terrorists to strike has grown.

***Few See Themselves As Possible Victims***

A majority of the public remains at least somewhat worried about another terrorist attack on the United States. More than six-in-ten say they are very (16%) or somewhat (46%) worried about a future attack. Yet significantly fewer Americans believe that they or their families will become victims of terrorism. Just 12% say they are very worried about becoming a victim, and 28% are somewhat worried.

	<i>Military effort going “very/fairly well”</i>		<i>Homeland defense is “excellent/good”</i>	
	<u>Oct 2001</u> %	<u>Aug 2002</u> %	<u>Oct 2001</u> %	<u>Aug 2002</u> %
All	83	65	69	57
Whites	86	66	71	59
Non-whites	74	57	58	53
Under age 50	83	64	68	58
Age 50-64	84	68	74	56
Age 65 and older	83	60	65	57
Republicans	89	77	79	70
Democrats	82	57	66	50
Independents	81	66	65	56

Levels of national and personal concern have remained relatively stable since last fall, although news of the alleged “dirty bomb” plot increased national concern in June. Nationally, parents with children living in the home – mothers in particular – are more likely than others to worry about becoming a victim of terrorism. Among people under 50 years of age, 54% of mothers are at least somewhat worried, compared with 35% of women without children. Similarly, 46% of fathers are worried, compared with 32% of non-fathers.

### ***Chemical, Biological Attack Most Likely***

A majority of Americans (54%) believe that if there is another attack, it will be committed by Islamic terrorists already in this country. Just 18% expect the perpetrators to be Islamic terrorists from abroad. And relatively few (9%) expect an attack engineered by non-Islamic terrorists like Timothy McVeigh.

When presented with several scenarios for a possible attack, 40% feel a chemical or biological weapon is most likely. A quarter (26%) think a suicide bomb attack in a restaurant, bus or other public place is most likely, and 8% think a nuclear weapon would be used. Just 5% think another attack with an airplane would be the chosen method for an attack.

The proposed cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security has not yet had much of an impact on the public, except for those in the Washington area, the location of the agency. Nationally, roughly half (52%) say they have heard or read something about the new department, but that figure rises to 70% in Washington. Among those aware of the idea nationwide, a large majority (76%) support it, with only 15% opposed. In Washington, 14% of those who are aware of the proposal say they or someone in their household would be directly affected by it.

### ***Less Support for Intrusive Measures***

Even as worries about future terrorism persist, public support for potentially intrusive government measures to deal with the threat at home has decreased. Support for requiring all citizens to carry a national identity card has declined from 70% in September to 59% today.

Similarly, shortly after the attacks last September, 40% favored allowing the government to “monitor your credit card purchases”; now 32% favor this. And the percentage in favor of allowing the government to “monitor your personal telephone calls and e-mails” declined a little (from 26% to 22%) over the same period. Decreases in support are seen among nearly all demographic groups, especially among women, those age 65 and older and people who have not attended college.

Anti-terrorism steps that do not involve greater government scrutiny of private activities garner significantly more support. A solid majority (68%) supports the idea of allowing airline pilots to carry handguns, and 59% favor allowing airport personnel to do extra checks on passengers who appear to be of Middle Eastern descent.

People who are worried about a new terrorist attack give much more support to nearly all of these measures than do those who are less concerned. For example, 70% of those who are very worried about another attack support the idea of ethnic profiling at airports; by contrast, only about half (49%) of those who are not too worried or not at all worried favor this measure.

Public support for some of these anti-terrorism measures is affected by whether the idea is targeted at unspecified individuals (allowing the government to monitor personal calls) or at the individual survey respondent (allowing the government to monitor *your* personal calls). Targeting calls and e-mails in general is favored by 33%; targeting “your” calls and e-mails is favored by only 22%. Similarly, monitoring credit card purchases in general is supported by 43%; monitoring “your” purchases is supported by only 32%. But support for a system of national identity cards is not affected by whether the idea is posed for “all citizens” or for “you.”

	Sept 2001	Aug 2002
<i>Require natl ID card</i>	%	%
Favor	70	59
Oppose	26	38
Don't know	4	3
	100	100
<i>Allow govt to monitor phone &amp; e-mail</i>		
Favor	26	22
Oppose	70	76
Don't know	4	2
	100	100
<i>Allow govt to monitor credit card purchases</i>		
Favor	40	32
Oppose	55	63
Don't know	5	5
	100	100
<i>Allow pilots to carry handguns</i>		
Favor	--	68
Oppose	--	28
Don't know	--	4
		100
<i>Allow profiling at airports</i>		
Favor	--	59
Oppose	--	38
Don't know	--	3
		100

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
<i>Government monitoring of ...</i>	%	%	%
Telephone and e-mail	33	61	6=100
<i>Your</i> telephone and e-mail	22	76	2=100
Credit card purchases	43	51	6=100
<i>Your</i> credit card purchases	32	63	5=100

Split form; each version asked of half sample.

### III. Foreign Policy and 9/11: Stay Involved, But More Say Go It Alone

A year after the attacks, the public still believes that the best way to avoid problems like terrorism is to stay engaged internationally. A 53% majority currently holds that view, down from 61% last October. The number who say it is better not to get too involved in overseas problems has shown no significant increase; 32% said that in October, 34% today. And when the public is given a menu of possible anti-terrorist options, 32% rate avoiding international problems as a very important way to combat terrorism.

At the same time, the public has become much more supportive of a terrorism policy based primarily on U.S. national interests. A 45% plurality backs a policy based mostly on U.S. interests, while 35% believe the United States should strongly take allied interests into account. This is a major change since last October when the public, by two-to-one (59%-30%), favored taking allied interests into account. In fact, support for multilateralism is even lower than it was in early September 2001, just prior to the attacks, when 48% of Americans favored that approach.

This shift has occurred across all age, income and political groups. But the change among Republicans is especially evident; in October, a solid majority of Republicans (56%) said they favored an approach to terrorism that strongly took allied views into account. In the current survey, about half that number

	--- Oct 2001 ---			--- Aug 2002 ---		
	<u>All</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>
<i>Terrorism policy should ...</i>	%	%	%	%	%	%
Be based mostly on US interest	30	<b>33</b>	29	45	<b>57</b>	43
Take account of allies' interests	59	56	61	35	29	38
Both/Neither	7	8	6	11	8	12
Don't know	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
	100	100	100	100	100	100

(29%) support a strong multilateralist approach while 57% back a terrorism policy based primarily on U.S. national interests. Democrats and independents also now are much more likely to favor policy premised on national interests but the change among Republicans has been more striking.

Republicans also are more likely than Democrats and independents to say that U.S. terrorism policy already takes allied interests into account. More than half of Republicans (53%) believe this, while 36% think that the United States is mostly acting on its own interests in the war on terrorism. Democrats are more divided on this question, while nearly half of independents (49%) view the United States as mostly pursuing its own interests.

Overall, the public is divided on this point, which represents a slight shift since April, when a 48% plurality said the U.S. was taking allied interests into account. The April survey also showed that people living in major Western European nations thought that the U.S. was mainly acting on its own in the war on terrorism (See “Americans and Europeans Differ Widely on Foreign Policy Issues,” April 17, 2002).

**Limited Conflict, For Now**

For the most part, the public views the terrorist attacks as part of a limited conflict with a small radical group rather than the start of a broader clash between the West and Islam. But the number who believe the attacks lit the fuse on a wider conflict has increased, from 28% last October to 35% in the current survey. Further, another 19% believe it *will* grow into major conflict – meaning 54% say it already is a major clash between the West and Islam or eventually will become one.

Opinion on this question is linked with concerns about future terrorism. More than half (56%) of those who say they are very worried about a new attack say Sept. 11 began a major clash between the West and Islam. Another 17% say it is limited but will grow into a larger conflict. By comparison, four-in-ten of those who express little concern over new attacks say the terrorist attacks started a major conflict or believe it will turn into one.

	<u>All</u> %	<i>Worried about ---future attacks---</i>		
		<u>Very</u> %	<u>what</u> %	<u>at all</u> %
<i>Terror attacks are ...</i>				
Start of major conflict	35	56	34	27
Conflict w/small group	52	34	54	58
Will become major	19	17	23	13
Will remain limited	28	16	26	38
Don't know	5	1	5	7
Don't know	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>
	100	100	100	100

In terms of the factors contributing to the attacks, the public continues to believe that the terrorists who attacked the U.S. on Sept. 11 were motivated by their political, rather than religious, beliefs. More than half (53%) believe the terrorists were driven by their political beliefs, little change from last November (49%).

**One-Third Say Past U.S. Acts Motivated 9/11**

The public is no more inclined than it was last fall to say that past U.S. actions may have motivated the attacks. About four-in-ten (38%) believe past U.S. wrongdoing in its dealings with other countries may have motivated the attacks – little change from last September (33%) – while 49% reject this view.

The idea that U.S. actions may have led to the attacks has credence among some demographic groups. Nearly half of college graduates and people under age 50 say past U.S. actions may have motivated the attacks (49%, 45% respectively).

By comparison, fewer people say that the United States has been *unfair* in its dealings with other countries in a way that may have led to the attacks. Just 23% of the respondents who were asked this form of the question agreed that unfair dealings by the U.S. may have motivated the attacks, while 64% disagreed. That is virtually unchanged from last September (21%). Twice as many liberals as conservatives say that unfair actions by the United States may have led to the attacks (37% vs. 18%).

	-- U.S. did wrong --			-- U.S. was unfair --		
	Yes %	No %	DK %	Yes %	No %	DK %
Total	38	49	13=100	23	64	13=100
18-49	45	46	9=100	26	65	9=100
50+	26	55	19=100	17	63	20=100
Coll. Grad.	49	42	9=100	31	61	8=100
Some coll.	42	48	10=100	23	68	9=100
H.S. or less	31	53	16=100	19	64	17=100
Conserv.	34	56	10=100	18	71	11=100
Moderate	36	54	10=100	22	65	13=100
Liberal	45	41	14=100	37	54	9=100

***Aggressive Anti-Terrorist Steps Favored***

Nearly half of Americans (48%) say increasing U.S. forces overseas would be effective in reducing terrorism, while 29% believe it would be better to reduce the nation’s overseas military presence. Republicans favor expanding America’s overseas presence by more than two-to-one (58%-22%). Democrats are divided: 41% want a greater international military presence, 34% think decreasing it would be the best way to reduce the terrorists threat.

When asked to assess the importance of several anti-terrorism options, 58% rate taking military action against countries developing nuclear weapons as very important. Among non-military options, reducing the nation’s dependence on Middle East oil is the leading anti-terrorism measure. Other steps, such as encouraging democracy and alleviating poverty in the Middle East, are less highly regarded. Public opinion on anti-terrorist strategies has changed little since January of this year.

There are major partisan differences over some of these approaches. The biggest gap between Republicans and Democrats is over military-related measures; Republicans are more supportive of attacking countries that may be developing nuclear weapons and increasing the defense budget. But those differences extend to non-military issues as well. Nearly half of Republicans (46%) see encouraging democracy in Middle East countries like Egypt and Saudi Arabia as a very important way to reduce terrorism, compared with 37% of Democrats.

Americans who express a high level of concern about future terrorism are more likely to favor aggressive strategies than those who are less worried. Nearly eight-in-ten (78%) of those who are very worried about future attacks on the U.S. see striking at countries who are developing nuclear weapons as a very important way to combat terrorism, compared with 60% of those who are only somewhat concerned.

***Iraq Conflict: Not Quick or Easy***

Unlike the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the public expects that a new conflict with Iraq would not be concluded quickly. Half of Americans (52%) expect that a war with Iraq will be long, while 38% say it can be concluded quickly. That represents a major difference from the public’s mood prior to the 1991 war, when most Americans (57%) thought it would end quickly.

Opponents of military action against Iraq are much more likely than supporters to anticipate a lengthy conflict. Six-in-ten (64%) of those who oppose the use of force when major casualties are mentioned expect a long war, while just three-in-ten (29%) say it will be brief. Among those who favor military action under that scenario, 52% say the war expect the war to be concluded quickly, compared with 42% who expect a long conflict.

<b>A Different War Expected</b>		
	Jan 1991 %	Now %
<i>War with Iraq would be ...</i>		
Long	30	52
Quick	57	38
Don't know	13	10
	100	100
<i>U.S. have to keep forces in Iraq after a war?</i>		
Yes	--	76
No	--	15
Don't know	--	9
		100

There is much more agreement on the question of whether the United States will have to keep military forces in Iraq following a conflict to maintain civil order there. Three-quarters of Americans (76%) expect U.S. troops will have to stay in Iraq after military action there; this view is shared by all demographic and political groups.

Two-thirds also support the deployment of U.S. forces in Afghanistan to secure civil order in that country. That is about the same as in January, when 68% backed the continued deployment of forces in Afghanistan to maintain order. Asked a different form of the question, 56% said the United States should “come to the aid of Afghanistan” to help it recover from war, while 35% said the U.S. should not get involved.



***Focused Americans Back Force***

Americans are not yet as engaged by the prospect of war with Iraq as they were during the days leading up to the Persian Gulf War. But those who are thinking a lot about possible military action against Baghdad – 46% of the public – take a far different view of the issue than those who have given it less consideration.

Fully 85% of those who have thought a “great deal” about whether the United States should use force to oust Hussein favor that action, compared with half of those who have given less consideration to a possible attack on Iraq. Even when the possibility of heavy casualties is mentioned, 55% of those who have thought a great deal about a possible conflict still support military action, while 35% of those who have paid less attention do so.

<b>Engaged Public Favors Military Action</b>		
<i>Military action against Iraq ...</i>	<i>Thought about using force ...</i>	
	<u>A great deal</u> %	<u>Some/little</u> %
Favor	85	50
Oppose	11	29
Don't know	4	21
	100	100
<i>... Even if it means thousands of casualties</i>		
Favor	55	35
Oppose	34	45
Don't know	11	20
	100	100

It is important to note that those who say they have thought a great deal about the possibility of an attack on Iraq generally favor military-related strategies against terrorism, such as increased defense spending and initiating military action against countries who develop nuclear weapons. Yet even those who give relatively low priority to those measures – *and* have focused on the possibility of military action against Iraq – support the idea of using force against Hussein’s regime at higher rates than do those in that group who have not given the matter as much consideration.

There is a partisan split on these attitudes, with Republicans more supportive than Democrats and independents of taking military action against Hussein. Better than seven-in-ten Republicans generally favor the use of force against Iraq, while 58% support it if it meant thousands of casualties. Six-in-ten Democrats (61% ) back military action, but just a third (32%) favor it in the case of major casualties. There is no gender gap on the general question of using force against Iraq, but men are more likely than women to favor military action when casualties are mentioned (by 51% to 34%).

Aside from the question of casualties, a 56% majority conditions its support for military action against Iraq upon Bush gaining the consent of Congress; roughly a third say the president should be able to proceed even if Congress opposes the use of force. Democrats are far more supportive than Republicans of Bush seeking the backing of Congress before launching an attack.

#### IV. The President and 9/11: The Return of Politics

As the congressional midterm elections approach, President Bush's approval rating continues to edge downward. Six-in-ten now approve of Bush's job performance, down from 65% last month and 80% at the start of the year. Bush now has virtually the same rating as former President Clinton in September 1998, two months before that year's congressional elections.

Bush's falling ratings are primarily due to a steep decline in support among Democrats. In January, nearly seven-in-ten Democrats approved of his job performance; now, just four-in-ten give him a positive rating. Bush's job approval has softened among Republicans and independents as well, though not nearly as much.

While Bush's ratings have taken on more of a partisan cast, Clinton's approval marks were more deeply split along party lines. In September 1998, just a third of Republicans approved of his job performance; Bush currently is drawing a slightly higher rating from Democrats.

The public remains divided in its assessment of national conditions. Roughly half (47%) express satisfaction with the state of the nation, while 44% are dissatisfied. In May, Americans were evenly divided on this measure, while in March 50% were satisfied, 40% dissatisfied. Satisfaction with national conditions remains below its post-Sept. 11 peak, reached in late September of last year (57%).

##### ***Presidential Priorities: War, Economy***

When asked about the president's priorities, a 43% plurality believes it is more important for him to focus on the war on terrorism rather than domestic policy. But when a separate group of respondents was asked a different form of the question, 39% said it was more important for Bush to focus on the economy, while 34% said the war on terrorism.

While men are evenly divided over whether the war on terrorism or domestic policy should take precedence, women by two-to one (46%-23%) believe Bush should concentrate on the war. This split is less pronounced on the war vs. economy. Still, more men than women say it is more important for the president to focus on the economy.

	<u>All</u>	<u>Rep</u>	<u>Dem</u>	<u>Ind</u>
<i>Bush Approval</i>	%	%	%	%
August, 2002	60	83	<b>39</b>	65
July, 2002	65	91	40	68
June, 2002	70	95	53	66
January, 2002	80	95	<b>69</b>	79
<i>Clinton Approval</i>				
September, 1998	61	32	88	59

Traditionally, women have placed more emphasis on domestic concerns while men have been more likely to say national security should take precedence. But that has changed since Sept. 11, as women have become more concerned about the threat of terrorism and have become much more security conscious.

***Priorities and Presidential Performance***

The public’s priorities are playing a role in shaping evaluations of Bush’s performance in office. Those who think the president should be focusing on the war on terrorism rate him much more highly than those who think he should turn his attention to domestic issues. Among those whose priority is the war, 69% approve of his performance in office, while 22% disapprove. By contrast, among those who think domestic policy is more important, only 51% approve, with 37% disapproving.

<b>Public’s Priorities Affect Views of Bush</b>		
	<i>Think president should focus on ...</i>	
	Domestic	War on
	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Terrorism</u>
<i>Job approval</i>	%	%
Approve	51	69
Disapprove	37	22
Don’t know	12	9
	100	100

Not surprisingly, public perceptions about homeland defense and the progress of the military effort in Afghanistan are closely linked with evaluations of President Bush’s performance in office. Even among those who think the president’s focus should be on the war, people with a favorable view of the government’s performance in homeland defense give Bush much higher ratings (77% approval) than those who think homeland defense is not going so well (54% approval).

*Commentary by Lee Feinstein, Senior Fellow  
Council on Foreign Relations*

Politicians and political consultants generally believe elections are not won or lost on foreign policy issues. With the midterm congressional elections approaching, many political experts contend this is true, even in the aftermath of last September's terrorist attacks and with a military confrontation with Iraq looming.

The latest nationwide poll by the Pew Research Center, conducted in association with the Council on Foreign Relations, focuses on the impact of the terrorist attacks on American public opinion one year later. The results of this poll suggest that, whatever their effect on the domestic political landscape, last year's terrorist attacks have made a continuing and probably lasting imprint on Americans' sense of national priorities. The attacks have blurred the traditional lines dividing domestic and foreign policy concerns, and Americans are giving a higher priority to national security issues than they have in the years following the Cold War.

***Lingering Concerns About Terrorism***

The Pew Center data suggest that one year after the attacks on New York and Washington, Americans remain concerned about the possibility of another terrorist strike.

Most Americans (62%) say they were very or somewhat concerned that there soon will be another terrorist attack on the U.S. Virtually the same number (61%) believe the ability of terrorists to launch another major attack on the United States is greater or the same today as it was a year ago.

These findings are in keeping with the public's views about the conduct of the war in Afghanistan. A majority of Americans still believe the overall war effort is going well, though the number holding that view has declined from 89% in January to 65% today. When asked about the U.S. military action in Afghanistan, however, Americans express greater doubts. Just 15% of Americans rate the U.S. military action in Afghanistan to be a success, about the same proportion (12%) judge it a failure, with an overwhelming majority, 70%, saying it is too early to judge.

Concerns about the progress of the counterterrorism effort extend to the homefront as well. A majority of Americans (57%) say the government is doing a good or excellent job in defending Americans at home against a future terrorist attack. This represents a decline from a peak of 69% last October, before the creation of the Transportation Security Administration to improve airport security, and before the administration put its support behind the creation of a Department of Homeland Security, an initiative that draws broad support, even though about half acknowledged they hadn't heard about the proposal.

Most Americans say they believe building defenses at home to prevent future terrorist attacks is more important than taking military action abroad to avert terrorist attacks. When asked to choose, just three-in-ten give priority to military action overseas, while half (51 percent) give greater priority to homeland defense.

When asked specifically to judge the anti-terrorism efforts of their local governments, only 47% rate those efforts as excellent or good. That result suggests that homeland security could become a factor affecting local congressional races.

### ***Iraq***

The Pew Center data illustrate the importance of the president taking a leadership role in making the case for a confrontation with Iraq.

Only 37% believe the president has clearly explained why the United States might use military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Indeed, despite a fervid debate in official Washington, including highly publicized Senate hearings in August, only 46% said they had thought a great deal about whether the United States should use force in Iraq.

To the extent the public has reached a conclusion, the Pew Center data suggest that American support for military action against Iraq is solid (64% favor military action to oust Saddam Hussein) but tempered by other concerns.

Perhaps most important, Americans place cooperation with allies high on the list of factors for a military operation. Of those who favor military action to oust Saddam, just 30% feel the United States should do so without support from our allies. Congressional approval was another important factor, with 56% saying President Bush should use force only if Congress favors a confrontation, while 34% said the president should use force even if Congress opposes it.

### ***America's Role in the World***

The Pew data also indicate the ways in which the terrorist attacks have affected Americans' views of the relative importance of foreign policy, and on American engagement in international affairs.

Americans continue to support a high level of U.S. involvement in international affairs. A declining but still significant number (53%) say American involvement in solving international problems is the best way to avoid problems like terrorism.

One year after the attacks, and amidst signs of a weak economic recovery, the public is about evenly divided over whether the war on terrorism or economy should be higher on the President's agenda. Roughly a third (34%) say it is more important for the president to focus on the war on terrorism than on the economy, while 39% give greater priority to the economy, and 22% believe the president should give equal attention to both.

In the past, women have placed more emphasis on domestic concerns than men. But in the current survey women, by two-to-one (46%-23%), favor Bush focusing more on the war on terrorism than domestic policy. The apparent closing (or overturning) of the gender gap suggests how much uncertainty last September's terrorist attacks may inject into political calculations this fall.

## PERSONAL AND NATIONAL CHANGE SINCE 9/11

	---- Change in personal life ----				---- Change in American life ----			
	Major	Only a	Total	Basically	Major	Only a	Total	Basically
	Change	Little	Change	Same	Change	Little	Change	Same
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Total</b>	16	33	(49)	49	50	35	(85)	14
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	13	32	(45)	53	45	36	(81)	18
Female	18	36	(54)	46	54	33	(87)	11
<b>Race</b>								
White	14	33	(47)	52	47	36	(83)	15
Non-white	23	38	(61)	39	58	29	(87)	12
<b>Race and Sex</b>								
White Men	13	33	(46)	52	41	39	(80)	19
White Women	15	33	(48)	51	53	33	(86)	12
<b>Age</b>								
Under 30	20	36	(56)	43	49	36	(85)	15
30-49	17	40	(57)	41	48	41	(89)	10
50-64	14	31	(45)	54	54	27	(81)	18
65+	10	19	(29)	69	51	27	(78)	17
<b>Sex and Age</b>								
Men under 50	14	34	(48)	50	46	38	(84)	16
Women under 50	22	43	(65)	35	51	40	(91)	8
Men 50+	11	27	(38)	59	43	32	(75)	23
Women 50+	14	24	(38)	62	60	23	(83)	14
<b>Education</b>								
College Grad.	23	31	(54)	44	40	47	(87)	12
Some College	13	40	(53)	47	50	34	(84)	16
H.S. Grad. or Less	14	32	(46)	52	55	28	(83)	14
<b>Family Income</b>								
\$50,000+	21	36	(57)	42	48	40	(88)	11
\$30,000-\$49,999	17	29	(46)	53	47	36	(83)	17
<\$30,000	11	33	(44)	54	53	28	(81)	17

Question: As a result of the attacks, has your own personal life changed in a major way, changed only a little bit, or is your life basically the same as it was before the attacks?

As a result of the attacks, has life in America changed in a major way, changed only a little bit, or is life in America basically the same as it was before the attacks?

Continued ...

	---- Change in personal life ----				---- Change in American life ----			
	<u>Major</u> <u>Change</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Only a</u> <u>Little</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Change</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Basically</u> <u>Same</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Major</u> <u>Change</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Only a</u> <u>Little</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Change</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Basically</u> <u>Same</u> <u>%</u>
<b>Total</b>	16	33	(49)	49	50	35	(85)	14
<b>Region</b>								
East	20	30	(50)	48	56	34	(90)	10
Midwest	9	34	(43)	54	49	36	(85)	15
South	18	34	(52)	47	52	31	(83)	15
West	16	36	(52)	48	44	39	(83)	17
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>								
Total White Protestant	12	29	(41)	57	51	34	(85)	14
White Protestant Evangelical	10	33	(43)	56	52	34	(86)	13
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	15	24	(39)	57	50	34	(84)	14
White Catholic	17	39	(56)	42	46	40	(86)	15
<b>Community Size</b>								
Large City	25	31	(56)	43	60	26	(86)	14
Suburb	19	30	(49)	50	47	43	(90)	9
Small City/Town	12	36	(48)	50	46	36	(82)	18
Rural Area	10	34	(44)	53	51	30	(81)	14
<b>Party ID</b>								
Republican	12	35	(47)	50	49	36	(85)	13
Democrat	14	39	(53)	47	53	32	(85)	14
Independent	16	31	(47)	50	48	35	(83)	16
<b>Bush Approval</b>								
Approve	--	--	--	--	48	40	(88)	13
Disapprove	--	--	--	--	51	27	(78)	19
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>								
Bush	17	28	(45)	54	49	36	(85)	14
Gore	16	38	(54)	45	55	35	(90)	10
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	16	38	(54)	44	51	35	(86)	13
Unmarried	15	30	(45)	54	49	34	(83)	15
<b>Parental Status</b>								
Parent	20	43	(63)	35	50	37	(87)	12
Non-Parent	14	28	(42)	58	50	33	(83)	16



## TREND IN GOVERNMENT JOB DEFENDING AMERICANS

	---- Mid-October 2001 ----			---- August 2002 ----			Change in Exc/Good %
	Excellent/ Good %	Only Fair/ Poor %	DK %	Excellent/ Good %	Only Fair/ Poor %	DK %	
<b>Total</b>	69	27	4=100	57	38	5=100	-12
<b>Sex</b>							
Male	64	33	3=100	59	38	3=100	-5
Female	73	22	5=100	56	37	7=100	-17
<b>Race</b>							
White	71	25	4=100	59	36	5=100	-12
Non-white	58	38	4=100	53	42	5=100	-5
Black	52	44	4=100	49	46	5=100	-3
<b>Race and Sex</b>							
White Men	66	31	3=100	58	38	4=100	-8
White Women	76	19	5=100	58	35	7=100	-18
<b>Age</b>							
Under 30	67	32	1=100	57	42	1=100	-10
30-49	68	28	4=100	58	38	4=100	-10
50-64	74	24	2=100	56	37	7=100	-18
65+	65	27	8=100	57	33	10=100	-8
<b>Sex and Age</b>							
Men under 50	64	34	2=100	60	38	2=100	-4
Women under 50	72	24	4=100	56	40	4=100	-16
Men 50+	65	31	4=100	57	38	5=100	-8
Women 50+	74	21	5=100	56	33	11=100	-18
<b>Education</b>							
College Grad.	67	29	4=100	53	42	5=100	-1
Some College	68	29	3=100	59	36	5=100	-9
High School Grad.	72	25	3=100	57	39	4=100	-15
<H.S. Grad.	63	29	8=100	62	27	11=100	-1
<b>Family Income</b>							
\$75,000+	70	26	4=100	55	42	3=100	-15
\$50,000-\$74,999	69	29	2=100	61	34	5=100	-8
\$30,000-\$49,999	67	30	3=100	60	36	4=100	-7
\$20,000-\$29,999	74	23	3=100	63	34	3=100	-11
<\$20,000	63	32	5=100	56	37	7=100	-7

Question: How would you rate the job the government is doing defending Americans at home from future terrorist attacks? Would you say the government is doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job?

Continued ...

	---- Mid-October 2001 ----			---- August 2002 ----			Change in Exc/Good %
	Excellent/ Good %	Only Fair/ Poor %	DK %	Excellent/ Good %	Only Fair/ Poor %	DK %	
<b>Total</b>	69	27	4=100	57	38	5=100	-12
<b>Region</b>							
East	67	31	2=100	60	35	5=100	-7
Midwest	67	28	5=100	54	40	6=100	-13
South	72	24	4=100	60	35	5=100	-12
West	68	29	3=100	55	40	5=100	-13
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>							
Total White Protestant	75	21	4=100	59	34	7=100	-16
White Protestant Evangelical	77	19	4=100	62	32	6=100	-15
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	73	23	4=100	55	37	8=100	-18
White Catholic	71	25	4=100	61	35	4=100	-10
Secular	57	40	3=100	63	35	2=100	+6
<b>Community Size</b>							
Large City	61	36	3=100	53	42	5=100	-8
Suburb	69	27	4=100	59	37	4=100	-10
Small City/Town	73	25	2=100	58	37	5=100	-15
Rural Area	72	21	7=100	59	35	6=100	-13
<b>Party ID</b>							
Republican	79	17	4=100	70	26	4=100	-9
Democrat	66	32	2=100	50	45	5=100	-16
Independent	65	31	4=100	56	42	2=100	-9
<b>Party and Ideology</b>							
Conservative Republican	80	16	4=100	73	22	5=100	-7
Moderate/Liberal Republican	76	21	3=100	65	34	1=100	-11
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	67	31	2=100	47	48	5=100	-20
Liberal Democrat	65	34	1=100	52	44	4=100	-13
<b>Bush Approval</b>							
Approve	78	20	2=100	70	26	4=100	-8
Disapprove	58	37	5=100	37	59	4=100	-21
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>							
Bush	78	18	4=100	70	25	5=100	-8
Gore	64	33	3=100	44	53	3=100	-20
<b>Marital Status</b>							
Married	73	24	3=100	60	36	4=100	-13
Unmarried	63	33	4=100	56	38	6=100	-7
<b>Parental Status</b>							
Parent	72	26	2=100	57	39	4=100	-15
Non-Parent	67	29	4=100	58	36	6=100	-9
<b>Labor Union</b>							
Union Household	67	28	5=100	52	46	2=100	-15
Non-Union Household	69	27	4=100	58	36	6=100	-11

## DEFENSE PRIORITIES

	<i>Government job defending Americans</i>				<i>What should get a higher priority?</i>			
	<i>Excel- lent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Only Fair/</i>	<i>DK</i>	<i>Building Defenses</i>	<i>Military Action</i>	<i>Both</i>	<i>DK</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Total</b>	13	44	38	5=100	51	30	13	6=100
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	13	46	38	3=100	47	35	13	5=100
Female	14	42	37	7=100	55	26	13	6=100
<b>Race</b>								
White	13	46	36	5=100	50	32	13	5=100
Non-white	15	38	42	5=100	55	27	11	7=100
Black	18	31	46	5=100	60	27	4	9=100
<b>Race and Sex</b>								
White Men	13	45	38	4=100	46	36	12	6=100
White Women	13	45	35	7=100	54	27	14	5=100
<b>Age</b>								
Under 30	16	41	42	1=100	51	36	11	2=100
30-49	12	46	38	4=100	52	29	13	6=100
50-64	11	45	37	7=100	48	30	13	9=100
65+	13	44	33	10=100	55	24	13	8=100
<b>Sex and Age</b>								
Men under 50	11	48	39	2=100	50	35	11	4=100
Women under 50	16	40	40	4=100	54	28	14	4=100
Men 50+	15	42	38	5=100	42	35	16	7=100
Women 50+	10	46	33	11=100	58	21	12	9=100
<b>Education</b>								
College Grad.	8	45	42	5=100	47	32	12	9=100
Some College	17	42	36	5=100	46	35	14	5=100
High School Grad.	12	45	39	4=100	56	27	13	4=100
<H.S. Grad.	18	44	27	11=100	56	27	10	7=100
<b>Family Income</b>								
\$75,000+	12	43	42	3=100	48	35	11	6=100
\$50,000-\$74,999	13	48	34	5=100	45	37	12	6=100
\$30,000-\$49,999	16	44	36	4=100	47	33	14	6=100
\$20,000-\$29,999	17	46	34	3=100	55	30	11	4=100
<\$20,000	14	41	38	7=100	57	27	11	5=100

Question: How would you rate the job the government is doing defending Americans at home from future terrorist attacks? Would you say the government is doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job?

If you had to choose, what should get a higher priority now... building our defenses at home to prevent future terrorist attacks, OR taking military action to destroy terrorist networks around the world?

Continued ...

	<i>Government job defending Americans</i>				<i>What should get a higher priority?</i>			
	Excel- lent %	Good %	Only Fair/ Poor %	DK %	Building Defenses %	Military Action %	Both %	DK %
<b>Total</b>	13	44	38	5=100	51	30	13	6=100
<b>Region</b>								
East	13	47	35	5=100	57	21	16	6=100
Midwest	13	41	40	6=100	50	32	11	7=100
South	15	45	35	5=100	48	32	13	7=100
West	12	43	40	5=100	53	33	10	4=100
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>								
Total White Protestant	13	46	34	7=100	50	32	13	5=100
White Protestant Evangelical	12	50	33	5=100	54	28	14	4=100
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	14	42	36	8=100	46	36	11	7=100
White Catholic	14	47	35	4=100	50	35	12	3=100
Secular	10	53	36	2=100	51	26	16	7=100
<b>Community Size</b>								
Large City	15	38	42	5=100	55	27	9	9=100
Suburb	12	47	37	4=100	49	33	12	6=100
Small City/Town	12	46	37	5=100	51	30	15	4=100
Rural Area	14	45	35	6=100	50	30	13	7=100
<b>Party ID</b>								
Republican	17	53	26	4=100	39	39	16	6=100
Democrat	12	37	46	5=100	60	23	11	6=100
Independent	11	45	42	2=100	57	28	11	4=100
<b>Party and Ideology</b>								
Conservative Republican	17	55	23	5=100	36	42	18	4=100
Moderate/Liberal Republican	16	48	34	2=100	45	36	13	6=100
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	12	35	48	5=100	57	27	11	5=100
Liberal Democrat	13	39	44	4=100	69	15	11	5=100
<b>Bush Approval</b>								
Approve	17	53	26	4=100	43	36	16	5=100
Disapprove	6	31	58	5=100	61	24	7	8=100
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>								
Bush	16	54	25	5=100	40	37	18	5=100
Gore	10	34	53	3=100	64	21	10	5=100
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	14	46	36	4=100	50	30	15	5=100
Unmarried	13	43	38	6=100	52	31	10	7=100
<b>Parental Status</b>								
Parent	14	43	39	4=100	49	33	13	5=100
Non-Parent	13	45	36	6=100	52	29	12	7=100
<b>Labor Union</b>								
Union Household	11	41	46	2=100	57	26	14	3=100
Non-Union Household	13	45	36	6=100	50	31	13	6=100

## NATIONAL VS. ALLIED INTERESTS

	<i>U.S. Should Determine Its Terrorism Policy on ...</i>						Change in Interests of Allies
	<i>--- Mid-October 2001 ---</i>			<i>--- August 2002 ---</i>			
	<u>Mostly U.S. Interests</u>	<u>Interests of Allies</u>	<u>Both/ Neither/DK</u>	<u>Mostly U.S. Interests</u>	<u>Interests of Allies</u>	<u>Both/ Neither/DK</u>	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<b>Total</b>	30	59	11=100	45	35	20=100	-24
<b>Sex</b>							
Male	29	62	9=100	49	36	15=100	-26
Female	31	56	13=100	41	34	25=100	-22
<b>Race</b>							
White	29	60	11=100	44	38	18=100	-22
Non-white	35	53	12=100	49	24	27=100	-29
<b>Race and Sex</b>							
White Men	28	63	9=100	50	37	13=100	-26
White Women	30	58	12=100	38	39	23=100	-19
<b>Age</b>							
Under 30	38	53	9=100	47	35	18=100	-18
30-49	29	62	9=100	43	36	21=100	-26
50-64	29	59	12=100	44	36	20=100	-23
65+	22	60	18=100	49	31	20=100	-29
<b>Sex and Age</b>							
Men under 50	28	63	9=100	48	37	15=100	-26
Women under 50	37	54	9=100	40	35	25=100	-19
Men 50+	29	62	9=100	51	36	13=100	-26
Women 50+	24	57	19=100	43	31	26=100	-26
<b>Education</b>							
College Grad.	24	67	9=100	48	39	13=100	-28
Some College	34	56	10=100	40	40	20=100	-16
H.S. Grad. or less	30	57	13=100	46	30	24=100	-27
<b>Family Income</b>							
\$50,000+	29	62	9=100	48	40	12=100	-22
\$30,000-\$49,999	31	60	9=100	43	38	19=100	-22
<\$30,000	33	55	12=100	46	31	23=100	-24

Question: How should the U.S. determine its policy with regard to the war on terrorism? Should it be based mostly on the national interests of the U.S., or should it strongly take into account the interests of its allies?

**Continued ...**

	<i>U.S. Should Determine Its Terrorism Policy on ...</i>						<i>Change in Interests of Allies</i>
	<i>--- Mid-October 2001 ---</i>			<i>--- August 2002 ---</i>			
	<i>Mostly U.S. Interests</i>	<i>Interests of Allies</i>	<i>Both/Neither/DK</i>	<i>Mostly U.S. Interests</i>	<i>Interests of Allies</i>	<i>Both/Neither/DK</i>	
<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		
<b><i>Total</i></b>	30	59	11=100	45	35	20=100	-24
<b><i>Region</i></b>							
East	30	59	11=100	48	33	19=100	-26
Midwest	28	61	11=100	39	40	21=100	-21
South	34	53	13=100	49	29	22=100	-24
West	25	66	9=100	42	41	17=100	-25
<b><i>Religious Affiliation</i></b>							
Total White Protestant	29	58	13=100	44	36	20=100	-22
White Protestant Evangelical	33	54	13=100	44	35	21=100	-19
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	24	62	14=100	44	36	20=100	-26
White Catholic	30	63	7=100	54	37	9=100	-26
<b><i>Community Size</i></b>							
Large City	29	58	13=100	41	31	28=100	-27
Suburb	27	64	9=100	44	36	20=100	-28
Small City/Town	30	60	10=100	48	35	17=100	-25
Rural Area	35	55	10=100	45	36	19=100	-19
<b><i>Party ID</i></b>							
Republican	33	56	11=100	57	29	14=100	-27
Democrat	29	61	10=100	43	38	19=100	-23
Independent	28	61	11=100	42	38	20=100	-23
<b><i>2000 Presidential Vote</i></b>							
Bush	32	59	9=100	61	26	13=100	-33
Gore	26	64	10=100	33	49	18=100	-15
<b><i>Marital Status</i></b>							
Married	30	60	10=100	45	41	14=100	-19
Unmarried	30	57	13=100	45	29	26=100	-28
<b><i>Parental Status</i></b>							
Parent	34	59	7=100	48	36	16=100	-23
Non-Parent	28	59	13=100	43	34	23=100	-25

## THOUGHT GIVEN TO WAR & EXPLANATION OF WAR WITH IRAQ

	<i>Thought about war with Iraq</i>				<i>Bush explanation of Iraq war</i>			(N)
	Great Deal	Some	Only a Little	None/DK	Explained Clearly	Not Clearly	Don't Know	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<b>Total</b>	46	35	11	8=100	37	52	11=100	(1001)
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	53	30	9	8=100	40	53	7=100	(466)
Female	41	39	12	8=100	33	51	16=100	(535)
<b>Race</b>								
White	46	36	11	7=100	39	50	11=100	(838)
Non-white	50	30	9	11=100	28	58	14=100	(144)
Black	52	26	10	12=100	23	65	12=100	(75)
<b>Race and Sex</b>								
White Men	51	32	10	7=100	43	51	6=100	(393)
White Women	40	40	13	7=100	36	50	14=100	(445)
<b>Age</b>								
Under 30	44	34	11	11=100	33	60	7=100	(190)
30-49	47	36	12	5=100	39	48	13=100	(380)
50-64	47	39	6	8=100	37	51	12=100	(229)
65+	50	28	11	11=100	34	53	13=100	(190)
<b>Sex and Age</b>								
Men under 50	53	30	10	7=100	40	53	7=100	(281)
Women under 50	39	41	13	7=100	34	51	15=100	(289)
Men 50+	54	31	7	8=100	41	53	6=100	(181)
Women 50+	44	36	10	10=100	32	51	17=100	(238)
<b>Education</b>								
College Grad.	42	42	10	6=100	35	55	10=100	(330)
Some College	43	37	11	9=100	36	52	12=100	(260)
High School Grad.	49	33	9	9=100	39	51	10=100	(331)
<H.S. Grad.	52	24	17	7=100	34	48	18=100	(76)
<b>Family Income</b>								
\$75,000+	50	36	10	4=100	43	48	9=100	(208)
\$50,000-\$74,999	43	39	10	8=100	28	60	12=100	(141)
\$30,000-\$49,999	47	35	11	7=100	43	47	10=100	(235)
\$20,000-\$29,999	53	30	8	9=100	36	52	12=100	(122)
<\$20,000	47	26	15	12=100	30	57	13=100	(141)

Question: How much have you yourself thought about whether the US should use military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq... a great deal, some, only a little, or not at all?

Do you think George W. Bush has explained clearly what's at stake as to why the US might use military force to end the rule of Saddam Hussein, or do you think he has not explained the reasons clearly enough?

Continued ...

	<i>Thought about war with Iraq</i>				<i>Bush explanation of Iraq war</i>			<i>(N)</i>
	<i>Great Deal</i>	<i>Some</i>	<i>Only a Little</i>	<i>None/DK</i>	<i>Explained Clearly</i>	<i>Not Clearly</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>	
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Total</b>	46	35	11	8=100	37	52	11=100	(1001)
<b>Region</b>								
East	44	40	10	6=100	38	51	11=100	(182)
Midwest	41	38	11	10=100	34	55	11=100	(241)
South	54	30	10	6=100	40	48	12=100	(347)
West	43	34	12	11=100	33	54	13=100	(231)
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>								
Total White Protestant	48	34	12	6=100	41	47	12=100	(456)
White Protestant Evangelical	51	36	8	5=100	42	45	13=100	(228)
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	45	32	16	7=100	40	49	11=100	(228)
White Catholic	44	38	12	6=100	41	51	8=100	(166)
Secular	42	36	9	13=100	35	53	12=100	(120)
<b>Community Size</b>								
Large City	47	32	10	11=100	33	59	8=100	(189)
Suburb	42	39	13	6=100	34	54	12=100	(239)
Small City/Town	47	34	11	8=100	36	51	13=100	(357)
Rural Area	51	34	9	6=100	44	45	11=100	(205)
<b>Party ID</b>								
Republican	50	35	9	6=100	55	35	10=100	(308)
Democrat	46	34	12	8=100	26	61	13=100	(300)
Independent	47	35	10	8=100	30	63	7=100	(306)
<b>Party and Ideology</b>								
Conservative Republican	54	35	7	4=100	62	30	8=100	(185)
Moderate/Liberal Republican	48	35	7	10=100	45	44	11=100	(113)
Conservative/Moderate Democrat	45	35	12	8=100	30	59	11=100	(200)
Liberal Democrat	49	33	11	7=100	19	71	10=100	(85)
<b>Bush Approval</b>								
Approve	46	36	11	7=100	44	42	14=100	(313)
Disapprove	51	31	10	8=100	15	81	4=100	(128)
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>								
Bush	49	37	9	5=100	52	38	10=100	(389)
Gore	45	35	13	7=100	21	68	11=100	(257)
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	50	36	9	5=100	40	48	12=100	(531)
Unmarried	43	33	13	11=100	33	55	12=100	(466)
<b>Parental Status</b>								
Parent	49	37	9	5=100	40	49	11=100	(332)
Non-Parent	45	34	12	9=100	35	53	12=100	(669)
<b>Labor Union</b>								
Union Household	43	39	11	7=100	33	61	6=100	(132)
Non-Union Household	47	34	11	8=100	37	51	12=100	(860)



## OPINION OF MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

				<i>Even if U.S. casualties</i>		
	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>DK</u> %
<b>Total</b>	64	21	15=100	42	41	17=100
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	66	19	15=100	51	38	11=100
Female	62	23	15=100	34	44	22=100
<b>Race</b>						
White	66	20	14=100	43	40	17=100
Non-white	60	22	18=100	41	45	14=100
<b>Race and Sex</b>						
White Men	68	18	14=100	48	39	13=100
White Women	64	23	13=100	38	41	21=100
<b>Age</b>						
Under 30	73	20	7=100	38	47	15=100
30-49	68	16	16=100	53	34	13=100
50-64	57	27	16=100	44	40	16=100
65+	55	26	19=100	20	53	27=100
<b>Sex and Age</b>						
Men under 50	71	15	14=100	56	37	7=100
Women under 50	68	20	12=100	39	40	21=100
Men 50+	60	25	15=100	42	41	17=100
Women 50+	52	28	20=100	28	49	23=100
<b>Education</b>						
College Grad.	53	33	14=100	50	36	14=100
Some College	70	20	10=100	42	42	16=100
H.S. Grad. or less	67	16	17=100	38	44	18=100
<b>Family Income</b>						
\$50,000+	64	24	12=100	52	39	9=100
\$30,000-\$49,999	69	20	11=100	43	42	15=100
<\$30,000	66	21	13=100	39	43	18=100

Question: 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)?

**Continued ...**

	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK</u>	<i>Even if U.S. casualties</i>		
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK</u>
<b>Total</b>	64	21	15=100	42	41	17=100
<b>Region</b>						
East	54	33	13=100	46	40	14=100
Midwest	66	16	18=100	47	41	12=100
South	73	14	13=100	40	42	18=100
West	58	27	15=100	36	42	22=100
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>						
Total White Protestant	72	15	13=100	42	39	19=100
White Protestant Evangelical	76	16	8=100	38	38	24=100
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	68	15	17=100	45	41	14=100
White Catholic	61	26	13=100	46	41	13=100
<b>Community Size</b>						
Large City	70	20	10=100	33	46	21=100
Suburb	66	18	16=100	51	41	8=100
Small City/Town	62	22	16=100	43	40	17=100
Rural Area	63	23	14=100	42	38	20=100
<b>Party ID</b>						
Republican	73	17	10=100	58	26	16=100
Democrat	61	24	15=100	32	48	20=100
Independent	63	25	12=100	42	49	9=100
<b>Bush Approval</b>						
Approve	--	--	--	53	32	15=100
Disapprove	--	--	--	26	64	10=100
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>						
Bush	73	15	12=100	55	29	16=100
Gore	58	26	16=100	29	61	10=100
<b>Marital Status</b>						
Married	68	21	11=100	47	36	17=100
Unmarried	61	21	18=100	36	48	16=100
<b>Parental Status</b>						
Parent	72	17	11=100	50	34	16=100
Non-Parent	59	24	17=100	38	45	17=100

## WHAT SHOULD BE PRESIDENT BUSH'S FOCUS?

	<u>The Economy</u> %	<u>War on Terrorism</u> %	<u>Both</u> %	<u>Neither/ DK</u> %
<b>Total</b>	39	34	23	4=100
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	45	32	19	4
Female	34	36	26	4
<b>Race</b>				
White	40	36	21	3
Non-white	35	29	29	7
<b>Race and Sex</b>				
White Men	46	34	17	3
White Women	35	38	24	3
<b>Age</b>				
Under 30	37	45	14	4
30-49	42	33	21	4
50-64	37	32	27	4
65+	38	28	31	3
<b>Sex and Age</b>				
Men under 50	45	36	16	3
Women under 50	36	37	22	5
Men 50+	45	27	25	3
Women 50+	31	34	32	3
<b>Education</b>				
College Grad.	46	29	21	4
Some College	39	32	23	6
H.S. Grad. or less	35	38	24	3
<b>Family Income</b>				
\$50,000+	43	36	19	2
\$30,000-\$49,999	41	29	25	5
<\$30,000	38	33	24	5

Question: Right now, which is more important for President Bush to focus on... the economy or the war on terrorism?

**Continued ...**

	<u>The Economy</u> %	<u>War on Terrorism</u> %	<u>Both</u> %	<u>Neither/ DK</u> %
<b>Total</b>	39	34	23	4=100
<b>Region</b>				
East	44	31	21	4
Midwest	40	30	25	5
South	36	40	22	2
West	39	32	21	8
<b>Religious Affiliation</b>				
Total White Protestant	35	39	23	3
White Protestant Evangelical	35	40	22	3
White Prot. Non-Evangelical	35	37	23	5
White Catholic	47	31	21	1
<b>Community Size</b>				
Large City	42	29	22	7
Suburb	40	37	21	2
Small City/Town	37	38	22	3
Rural Area	39	34	23	4
<b>Party ID</b>				
Republican	33	46	20	1
Democrat	44	30	24	2
Independent	44	29	22	5
<b>2000 Presidential Vote</b>				
Bush	33	39	26	2
Gore	47	29	21	3
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Married	41	35	22	2
Unmarried	37	34	23	6
<b>Parental Status</b>				
Parent	42	32	23	3
Non-Parent	37	36	22	5

## ABOUT THIS SURVEY

Results for this survey are based on telephone interviews conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates among a nationwide sample of 1,001 adults 18 years of age or older, a New York City area sample of 401 adults, and a Washington, D.C. area sample of 400 adults, each conducted during the period August 14-25, 2002. Based on the total national 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 the New York and Washington D.C. samples, the confidence interval is plus or minus 5.5 percentage points. For national results based on either Form 1 (N=500) or Form 2 (N=501), the sampling error is plus or minus 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.

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY IN DETAIL

The sample for this survey is a random digit sample of telephone numbers selected from telephone exchanges in the continental United States. The New York City area and Washington D.C. area surveys are random digit samples of telephone numbers selected from exchanges within the following areas:

New York City: New York City  
New York State: Rockland, Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk counties  
New Jersey: Hudson, Bergen, Essex, Union and Middlesex counties  
Connecticut: the Stamford-Norwalk region (PMSA) of Fairfield county

Washington D.C.: The District of Columbia  
Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia (including Cities of Alexandria, Falls Church and Fairfax)  
Montgomery and Prince George's counties in Maryland

The telephone exchanges were selected with probabilities proportional to their size. The first eight digits of the sampled telephone numbers (area code, telephone exchange, bank number) were selected to be proportionally stratified by county and by telephone exchange within county. That is, the number of telephone numbers randomly sampled from within a given county is proportional to that county's share of telephone numbers in the U.S. Only working banks of telephone numbers are selected. A working bank is defined as 100 contiguous telephone numbers containing one or more residential listings.

The random digit aspect of the sample is used to avoid "listing" bias and provides representation of both listed and unlisted numbers (including not-yet-listed). The design of the sample ensures this representation by random generation of the last two digits of telephone numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange, and bank number.

The sample was released for interviewing in replicates. Using replicates to control the release of sample to the field ensures that the complete call procedures are followed for the entire sample. The use of replicates also insures that the regional distribution of numbers called is appropriate. Again, this works to increase the representativeness of the sample.

At least 10 attempts were made to complete an interview at every sampled telephone number. The calls were staggered over times of day and days of the week to maximize the chances of making a contact with a potential respondent. All interview breakoffs and refusals were re-contacted at least once in order to attempt to convert them to completed interviews. In each contacted household, interviewers asked to speak with the "youngest male 18 or older who is at home." If there is no eligible man at home, interviewers asked to speak with "the oldest woman 18 or older who is at home." This systematic respondent selection technique has been shown empirically to produce samples that closely mirror the population in terms of age and gender.

Non-response in telephone interview surveys produces some known biases in survey-derived estimates because participation tends to vary for different subgroups of the population, and these subgroups are likely to vary also on questions of substantive interest. In order to compensate for these known biases, the sample data are weighted in analysis. The demographic weighting parameters are derived from a special analysis of the most recently available Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (March 2001). This analysis produced population parameters for the demographic characteristics of households with adults 18 or older, which are then compared with the sample characteristics to construct sample weights. The analysis only included households in the continental United States that contain a telephone. The weights are derived using an iterative technique that simultaneously balances the distributions of all weighting parameters.

**PEW RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE PEOPLE & THE PRESS**  
**LATE AUGUST 2002 YEAR-AFTER 9/11 POLL**  
**FINAL TOPLINE**  
**August 14-25, 2002**

**National Sample: N=1001 / New York City Sample: N=401 / Washington, DC Sample: N=400**

Q.1 Can you think of anything that has happened over the past year or so that has had a big effect personally on your life? **[IF YES: What?]** **[IF NO, NOT SURE PROBE ONCE WITH: Anything at all – what would you say has had the biggest personal effect on your life over the past year or so?]** **[MULTIPLE RECORD - ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
38	51	44	September 11 <sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks
24	21	21	Life changes (births, deaths, health problems, school, work, marriage, divorce)
3	2	3	Stock market / poor economy
4	3	2	Other
30	22	28	No, nothing
3	3	3	Don't know/Refused

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL [N=500] AND CITIES ONLY:**

Q.2 All in all, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in this country today?

	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Late August, 2002			
National	47	44	9=100
NYC	37	52	11=100
WDC	50	41	9=100
<b><i>National Trend</i></b>			
May, 2002	44	44	12=100
March, 2002	50	40	10=100
Late September, 2001	57	34	9=100
Early September, 2001	41	53	6=100
June, 2001	43	52	5=100
March, 2001	47	45	8=100
February, 2001	46	43	11=100
January, 2001	55	41	4=100
September, 2000	51	41	8=100
June, 2000	47	45	8=100
April, 2000	48	43	9=100
August, 1999	56	39	5=100
January, 1999	53	41	6=100
November, 1998	46	44	10=100
Early September, 1998	54	42	4=100
Late August, 1998	55	41	4=100
Early August, 1998	50	44	6=100
February, 1998	59	37	4=100
January, 1998	46	50	4=100
September, 1997	45	49	6=100
August, 1997	49	46	5=100
January, 1997	38	58	4=100
July, 1996	29	67	4=100
March, 1996	28	70	2=100
October, 1995	23	73	4=100
June, 1995	25	73	2=100
April, 1995	23	74	3=100
July, 1994	24	73	3=100
March, 1994	24	71	5=100
October, 1993	22	73	5=100

<b>Q.2 CONTINUED ...</b>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
September, 1993	20	75	4=100
May, 1993	22	71	7=100
January, 1993	39	50	11=100
January, 1992	28	68	4=100
November, 1991	34	61	5=100
<i>Late February, 1991 (Gallup)</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>3=100</i>
August, 1990	47	48	5=100
May, 1990	41	54	5=100
January, 1989	45	50	5=100
September, 1988 (RVs)	50	45	5=100
May, 1988	41	54	5=100
January, 1988	39	55	6=100

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.3 Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? **[IF DK ENTER AS DK. IF DEPENDS PROBE ONCE WITH: Overall do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? [IF STILL DEPENDS ENTER AS DK]**

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Late August, 2002 National	60	27	13=100
<b><i>National Trend</i></b>			
August, 2002	67	21	12=100
Late July, 2002	65	25	10=100
July, 2002	67	21	12=100
June, 2002	70	20	10=100
April, 2002	69	18	13=100
Early April, 2002	74	16	10=100
February, 2002	78	13	9=100
January, 2002	80	11	9=100
Mid-November, 2001	84	9	7=100
Early October, 2001	84	8	8=100
Late September, 2001	86	7	7=100
Mid-September, 2001	80	9	11=100
Early September, 2001	51	34	15=100
August, 2001	50	32	18=100
July, 2001	51	32	17=100
June, 2001	50	33	17=100
May, 2001	53	32	15=100
April, 2001	56	27	17=100
March, 2001	55	25	20=100
February, 2001	53	21	26=100

**ASK ALL:**

Q.4 Can you think of anything that has happened over the past year or so that has had a big effect on THE COUNTRY? [IF YES: What?] [IF NO, NOT SURE PROBE ONCE WITH: Anything at all – what would you say has had the biggest effect on THE COUNTRY over the past year or so?] [MULTIPLE RECORD - ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES]

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
80	80	82	September 11 <sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks
3	3	3	Stock market decline
3	4	4	Economy / recession
3	2	4	Corporate scandal / corruption
2	2	2	War on terrorism/Afghanistan
1	2	2	Bush presidency/leadership
1	3	0	Terrorism threat/concerns
1	1	*	Child abductions
1	1	*	Jobs situation / layoffs
*	2	*	Iraq/ possibility of war
4	4	5	Other
5	3	3	No, nothing
1	*	*	Don't know/Refused

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL [N=500] AND CITIES ONLY:**

Q.5 Right now, which is more important for President Bush to focus on... the economy or the war on terrorism?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
39	39	42	The economy
34	35	35	War on terrorism
2	3	*	Neither (VOL.)
22	21	21	Both (VOL.)
<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	100	100	

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.6 Right now, which is more important for President Bush to focus on... domestic policy or the war on terrorism?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Jan 2002</u>
29	--	--	Domestic policy	33
43	--	--	War on terrorism	52
1	--	--	Neither (VOL.)	*
22	--	--	Both (VOL.)	13
<u>5</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>
100				100

**ASK ALL:**

Q.7 Compared to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, would you say that the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks were more serious, not as serious, or about equal?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<i>National Trend</i> <i>NBC News</i> <i>Sept 2001<sup>3</sup></i>
37	39	41	More serious than Pearl Harbor	66
14	13	17	Not as serious as Pearl Harbor	5
43	42	36	Equal to Pearl Harbor	25
<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>4</u>
100	100	100		100

<sup>3</sup>

The September 12, 2001 NBC News question was worded "Would you say that Tuesday's attacks (on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, DC) are more serious than, equal to, or not as serious as the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941?"



Q.8 How much did the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks affect how you think about politics and national issues? **[READ]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
46	53	49	A great deal
30	22	33	Some
12	12	8	Not much
9	9	10	Not at all
3	4	*	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**NO QUESTION 9**

**ASK ALL:**

Q.10 How much did the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks move you or affect you emotionally? **[READ]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
67	73	72	A great deal
25	21	22	Some
5	4	3	Not much --OR--
3	1	2	Not at all
*	1	1	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.11 When you think about the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks, whose actions were the most inspiring to you personally? **[DO NOT READ OPTIONS – PRECODED OPEN-END]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
<b>37</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>(NET) Firemen, police, rescue workers</b>
32	28	34	Firemen \ NY/DC firemen
3	2	3	Rescue/emergency workers
2	5	5	Policemen \ NY/DC police
14	9	14	George W. Bush \ the president
11	8	8	Average/ordinary Americans
10	22	11	Rudy Giuliani \ the mayor of New York City
6	2	7	Airplane passengers on flights \ those who fought hijackers on Penn. flight
2	3	3	Victims \ survivors \ victims' families
2	4	3	Residents of New York City
2	1	1	The military \ army \ soldiers \ troops overseas \ national guard
1	3	1	Volunteers
4	6	5	Other
11	11	11	Don't know/Refused

Q.12 These days, how often do you think about the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks? That is, how often do the events of a year ago come to mind? **[READ]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
28	40	40	Every day
34	31	29	A few times a week
25	19	23	Once a week or less --OR--
11	8	8	Rarely
1	*	*	Never <b>(VOL.)</b>
1	2	*	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL [N=500] AND CITIES ONLY:**

Q.13 As a result of the attacks, has your own personal life changed in a major way, changed only a little bit, or is your life basically the same as it was before the attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
16	24	22	Changed in a major way
33	37	41	Changed only a little bit
49	37	36	Basically the same
1	*	*	Other (VOL.)
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused
100	100	100	

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.14 As a result of the attacks, has life in America changed in a major way, changed only a little bit, or is life in America basically the same as it was before the attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
50	--	--	Changed in a major way
35	--	--	Changed only a little bit
14	--	--	Basically the same
*	--	--	Other (VOL.)
<u>1</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused
100			

-- CITIES SKIP TO Q.23 --

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:**

All in all...

Q.15 How should the U.S. determine its policy with regard to the war on terrorism? Should it be based mostly on the national interests of the U.S., or should it strongly take into account the interests of its allies?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Mid-Oct 2001</u>	<u>Early Sept 2001<sup>4</sup></u>
45	--	--	U.S. national interests	30	38
35	--	--	Interests and views of allies	59	48
10	--	--	Both (VOL)	7	7
1	--	--	Neither (VOL)	*	1
<u>9</u>	--	--	Don't Know/Refused	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
100				100	100

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.16 How do you see the US led war on terrorism – do you think the US is taking into account the interests of its allies in the fight against terrorism, or do you think the US is acting mainly on its own interests?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Early April 2002</u>
44	--	--	Taking into account the interests of its allies	48
42	--	--	Acting mainly on its own interests	41
<u>14</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused	<u>11</u>
100				100

4

In Early September 2001, the question was worded: "All in all, how should the U.S. determine its foreign policy? Should it be based mostly on the national interests of the U.S., or should it strongly take into account the interests of its allies?"

**ASK ALL NATIONAL:**

Q.17 In the long run, what is the best way for the U.S. to avoid problems like terrorism? Should the U.S.: **[READ AND ROTATE]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Mid-Oct 2001</u>
53	--	--	Be very much involved in solving international problems?	61
34	--	--	Not get too involved with international problems?	32
13	--	--	Don't know/Refused	7
100				100

Q.18 Do you think the terrorist attacks are the start of a major conflict between the people of America and Europe versus the people of Islam, or is it only a conflict with a small, radical group?

**IF CONFLICT WITH A SMALL RADICAL GROUP (Q.18=2), ASK:**

Q.19 Do you think this conflict is going to grow into a major world conflict, or do you think it will remain limited to a small, radical group?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Mid-Oct 2001</u>
35	--	--	Major conflict	28
52	--	--	Conflict with a radical group	63
19	--	--	Is going to grow into a major world conflict	--
28	--	--	Will remain limited to a small, radical group	--
5	--	--	Don't know/Refused	--
13	--	--	Don't know/Refused	9
100				100

**NO QUESTION 20 THRU 22**

**ASK ALL:**

Q.23 We're interested in how the attacks might still be affecting people personally. For example, how often would you say you **[feel sad]** these days as a result of the terrorist attacks -- often, sometimes, rarely or never? ... How often do you **[INSERT NEXT ITEM, ROTATE ITEMS b. THRU h. REPEAT FULLY FOR EACH ITEM]** as a result of the terrorist attacks?

		<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	Feel sad					
	National	24	42	24	9	1=100
	NYC	37	39	15	8	1=100
	WDC	23	39	26	11	1=100
b.	Feel depressed					
	National	10	20	27	42	1=100
	NYC	14	30	25	30	1=100
	WDC	8	17	28	46	1=100
c.	Have difficulty sleeping					
	National	4	10	19	66	1=100
	NYC	9	15	18	56	2=100
	WDC	3	13	21	63	0=100
d.	Feel angry					
	National	31	37	16	15	1=100
	NYC	41	32	14	13	*=100
	WDC	27	38	19	15	1=100
e.	Feel scared					
	National	12	23	26	38	1=100
	NYC	18	32	21	27	2=100
	WDC	15	28	33	24	0=100
f.	Feel patriotic					
	National	62	22	7	6	3=100
	NYC	61	21	7	7	4=100
	WDC	60	26	7	6	1=100
g.	Feel suspicious of other people					
	National	23	27	27	22	1=100
	NYC	29	29	22	18	2=100
	WDC	24	30	29	15	2=100
h.	Think about life in spiritual terms					
	National	49	24	12	13	2=100
	NYC	50	27	9	8	6=100
	WDC	49	29	9	11	2=100

Thinking back to the events of last September...

Q.24 Do you happen to remember EXACTLY where you were or what you were doing the MOMENT you heard the news about the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
97	99	99	Yes, remember where they were/what they were doing
3	1	1	No, don't remember
*	0	0	Don't know/Refused
100	100	100	

Q.25 Do you, yourself, personally know someone who was hurt or killed in the attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
11	46	21	Yes
89	54	78	No
*	0	1	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ROTATE QUESTIONS 26 THRU 30**

Q.26 Did you or anyone in your household lose a job or take a cut in pay at least in part as a result of the attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
13	17	14	Yes
86	83	84	No
1	*	2	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.27 Have you or anyone in your household been called into military or National Guard service since the attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
5	5	8	Yes
95	95	92	No
*	0	0	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.28 Have you thought about moving from where you live because of concerns about further acts of terrorism?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
6	17	18	Yes
94	83	82	No
*	0	*	Already did move / is moving (VOL.)
*	0	0	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.29 Have you, or has anyone in your household, changed jobs or made different career plans as a result of concerns about terrorism?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
6	11	8	Yes
94	89	92	No
*	*	*	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ASK IN NYC / WASH D.C. SAMPLES ONLY:**

Q.30 Were you in [Midtown or lower Manhattan / downtown Washington or close to the Pentagon] on the day of the terrorist attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
--	19	48	Yes
--	81	52	No
--	0	0	Don't know/Refused
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**NO QUESTION 31**

Thinking more broadly...

Q.32 Compared to other problems we face as a nation, have we paid too much, too little or the right amount of attention to the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
18	19	16	Too much attention
19	27	14	Too little attention
58	49	66	Right amount of attention
<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL [N=500] AND CITIES ONLY:**

Q.33 How well is the MILITARY effort to destroy the terrorist groups going? [READ]

				----- National Trend -----			
				Jan	Early Nov	Oct 15-21	Oct 10-14
<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
22	15	20	Very well	38	30	38	45
43	45	48	Fairly well	51	45	45	35
18	23	21	Not too well	6	12	9	6
4	7	4	Not at all well	3	4	2	4
<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.34 Do you think the war against terrorist organizations in Afghanistan so far has been a success, a failure, or is it too early to tell?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
15	--	--	A success
12	--	--	A failure
70	--	--	Too early to tell
<u>3</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>			

**ASK ALL:**

Q.35 How would you rate the job the government is doing defending Americans at home from future terrorist attacks? Would you say the government is doing an excellent job, a good job, only a fair job, or a poor job? [READ]

				----- National Trend -----			
				Jan	Early Nov	Oct 15-21	Oct 10-14
<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>2002<sup>5</sup></u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
13	9	14	Excellent	13	15	18	20
44	40	47	Good	47	47	51	47
30	34	29	Only fair	31	25	22	22
8	11	7	Poor	6	7	5	4
<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

5

In January 2002, Early November 2001 and Mid-October 2001 question was worded "How would you rate the job the government is doing in BUILDING DEFENSES at home to prevent future terrorist attacks? Would you say ..."

Q.36 If you had to choose, what should get a higher priority now? [READ AND ROTATE]

			----- National Trend -----						
<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>June</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Early</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Late</u>
				<u>2002</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Nov</u>	<u>15-21</u>	<u>10-14</u>	<u>Sept</u>
				<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
51	52	52	Building our defenses at home to prevent future terrorist attacks	51	44	42	37	36	33
			OR						
30	32	28	Taking military action to destroy terrorist networks around the world	34	40	42	48	45	44
13	9	15	Both (VOL)	8	12	11	13	13	16
<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.37 How worried are you that there will soon be another terrorist attack in the United States? [READ]

			----- National Trend -----						
<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>June</u>	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Dec</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Oct</u>	<u>Early</u>
				<u>2002</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>15-21</u>	<u>10-14</u>	<u>Oct</u>
				<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2001</u>
16	28	20	Very worried	32	20	13	29	27	28
46	40	45	Somewhat worried	44	42	39	42	40	45
25	21	25	Not too worried	17	28	27	18	19	15
12	10	9	Not at all worried	7	9	19	10	12	11
<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	Don't know/Refused	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
100	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100

Q.38 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]

		(VOL.)					
		<u>Very</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not too</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Already</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
		<u>Worried</u>	<u>Worried</u>	<u>Worried</u>	<u>Worried</u>	<u>a Victim</u>	
Late August, 2002							
	National	12	28	35	24	*	1=100
	NYC	25	32	25	14	1	3=100
	WDC	16	36	33	14	0	1=100
<b>National Trend</b>							
	June, 2002	17	28	36	19	*	*=100
	January, 2002	12	26	38	24	*	*=100
	Early November, 2001	13	27	35	24	0	1=100
	October 10-14, 2001	18	32	29	19	0	2=100
	Late September, 2001	17	36	31	15	*	1=100
	<b>Gallup: 9/14-15/01<sup>6</sup></b>	18	33	35	13	*	1=100
	<b>Gallup: 9/11/01<sup>7</sup></b>	23	35	24	16	1	1=100
	<b>Gallup: August, 1998</b>	10	22	38	29	--	1=100
	<b>Gallup: July, 1996</b>	13	26	34	27	--	*=100
	<b>Gallup: April, 1995<sup>8</sup></b>	14	28	33	24	--	1=100

<sup>6</sup> 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..."

<sup>7</sup> 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..."

<sup>8</sup> 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?"

Q.39 As a result of the terrorist attacks, have you [INSERT ITEM; ROTATE, WITH ITEM g. ALWAYS LAST] over the past year, or not? ... [REPEAT QUESTION STEM FOR EACH ITEM]

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.	Avoided traveling to certain cities			
	National	15	85	*=100
	NYC	28	72	*=100
	WDC	18	82	*=100
b.	Avoided going to large public events or other crowded places			
	National	15	84	1=100
	NYC	31	69	*=100
	WDC	30	70	*=100
c.	Stored up food or water at your home			
	National	11	89	0=100
	NYC	14	86	0=100
	WDC	18	82	0=100
d.	Stored up medications or prescription drugs			
	National	4	96	*=100
	NYC	8	91	1=100
	WDC	6	94	0=100
e.	Handled mail differently			
	National	24	76	0=100
	NYC	31	69	0=100
	WDC	32	68	0=100
f.	Spent more time close to home and with family			
	National	42	57	1=100
	NYC	57	43	*=100
	WDC	47	53	*=100
g.	Traveled by air less			
	National	17	82	1=100
	NYC	30	69	1=100
	WDC	28	72	*=100

**IF TRAVELED LESS BY AIR (Q.39g=1), ASK:**

Q.40 Is that mostly because you are concerned about safety, or because of the added hassles associated with flying these days?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
55	58	49	Concerned about safety
16	20	19	Added hassles
13	10	19	Both ( <b>VOL.</b> )
16	11	12	Neither ( <b>VOL.</b> )
0	1	1	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	
(N=159)	(N=107)	(N=102)	



**ASK ALL:**

Q.41 Are you the parent or guardian of any children under 18 now living in your household?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
37	28	35	Yes
63	72	65	No
0	0	*	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**IF PARENT (Q.41=1), ASK:**

Q.42a How many of these children are age 5 to 12?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
41	32	41	None
33	34	38	One
25	34	21	More than one
1	0	0	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	
(N=332)	(N=123)	(N=128)	

**IF PARENT (Q.41=1), ASK:**

Q.42b How many of these children are age 13 to 17?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
63	53	58	None
25	34	29	One
11	13	12	More than one
1	0	1	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	
(N=332)	(N=123)	(N=128)	

**IF ONE OR MORE CHILDREN AGE 5 TO 17 (2 OR 3 IN Q.42a OR Q.42b), ASK:**

Q.43 As a result of the terrorist attacks, [INSERT ITEM; ROTATE], or not?

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>	
a.	(Has/Have) your (child/children) expressed any fears about terrorism or terrorist attacks				
	National	44	56	*=100	(N=269)
	Mid-September, 2001 <sup>9</sup>	46	54	0=100	
	January, 1991	43	57	*=100	
	NYC	44	56	0=100	(N=103)
	WDC	44	56	0=100	(N=97)
b.	Have you made special arrangements for your children with family or friends in case of possible emergencies				
	National	35	65	0=100	(N=269)
	NYC	51	49	0=100	(N=103)
	WDC	37	63	0=100	(N=97)
c.	Have you made a point to talk with your children about terrorism				
	National	77	23	0=100	(N=269)
	NYC	75	25	0=100	(N=103)
	WDC	75	25	0=100	(N=97)

9

Mid-September 2001 and January 1991 trends are based on parents of children age 5-12.

**ASK ALL:**

Q.44 Do you live or work in an area where you think a terrorist attack is likely, or is the area where you live and work not likely to be a target for terrorism?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
32	42	69	Live or work in an area where a terrorist attack is likely
64	53	28	Live and work in an area not likely to be targeted
4	5	3	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.44a How would you rate the job your local government is doing preparing for the possibility of a terrorist attack – would you say excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
9	8	9	Excellent
38	39	45	Good
30	34	27	Only fair
10	11	9	Poor
13	8	10	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.45 Since the terrorist attacks, have you yourself become more suspicious of people who you think are of Middle-Eastern descent, or not?

			<i>---- National Trend ----</i>	
			June	Late Sept
<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2001</u>
37	45	40	36	28
61	52	59	62	70
2	3	1	2	2
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

Q.46 Thinking about the community where you live, has any type of permanent memorial such as a garden, monument, or grove of trees been created to remember the people killed on September 11<sup>th</sup>?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
17	32	25	Yes
78	65	70	No
5	3	5	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

Q.47 And again thinking about your own community, are there a lot, some, or hardly any displays of patriotism such as flags, bumper stickers, and signs?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
78	72	67	A lot
18	20	24	Some
4	6	8	Hardly any
*	2	1	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**-- CITIES SKIP TO Q.60 --**

Q.48 All in all, which do you think would have a greater effect in reducing the threat of terrorist attacks on the United States? [READ AND ROTATE]

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
48	--	--	Increasing America's military presence overseas OR
29	--	--	Decreasing America's military presence overseas
8	--	--	Neither / Keep things as they are now (VOL.)
15	--	--	Don't know/Refused
100			

Q.49 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? (Next... [NEXT ITEM])

		<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Fairly Important</u>	<u>Not too Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
<b>ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:</b>						
a.	Decrease American dependence on oil imported from the Middle East					
	National	53	26	8	5	8=100
	January, 2002	53	29	9	4	5=100
b.	Encourage more democracy in Mideast countries like Egypt and Saudi Arabia					
	National	38	31	13	11	7=100
	January, 2002	42	35	11	5	7=100
c.	Take military action to wipe out facilities of countries attempting to build nuclear weapons					
	National	58	21	9	6	6=100
	January, 2002	54	27	9	5	5=100
d.	Increase foreign aid to countries that help the U.S. combat terrorism					
	National	36	41	9	7	7=100
	January, 2002	41	40	11	4	4=100
<b>ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:</b>						
e.	Increase defense spending to maintain our military preparedness					
	National	53	33	7	3	4=100
	January, 2002	54	33	7	3	3=100
f.	Attempt to reduce poverty with foreign aid as a way of combating terrorism in poor Mideast countries					
	National	25	34	19	16	6=100
	January, 2002	24	41	21	10	4=100
g.	Not get involved in trying to solve the problems of other countries					
	National	32	32	17	12	7=100
h.	Increase military aid to countries that help the U.S. combat terrorism					
	National	39	40	11	6	4=100
	January, 2002	39	40	12	5	4=100

On another subject...

Q.50 How much have you yourself thought about whether the US should use military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq? **[READ]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Jan 1991</u> <sup>10</sup>
46	--	--	A great deal	66
35	--	--	Some	24
11	--	--	Only a little – OR –	6
6	--	--	Not at all	2
<u>2</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused	<u>2</u>
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:**

Q.51/53 Would you favor or oppose taking military action in Iraq to end Saddam Hussein's rule? **[IF FAVOR, ASK: 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?]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		----- Gallup <sup>11</sup> -----				
				<u>June 2002</u>	<u>Nov 2001</u>	<u>Feb 2001</u>	<u>June 1993</u>	<u>March 1992</u>
64	--	--	Favor	59	74	52	70	55
30	--	--	Even if allies won't join	--	--	--	--	--
30	--	--	Only if allies agree	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	Don't know/Refused	--	--	--	--	--
21	--	--	Oppose	34	20	42	27	40
<u>15</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.52/53 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? **[IF FAVOR, ASK: 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?]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
42	--	--	Favor
18	--	--	Even if allies won't join
21	--	--	Only if allies agree
3	--	--	Don't know/Refused
41	--	--	Oppose
<u>17</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>			

<sup>10</sup> In January 1991 the question was worded "How much thought have you given to the question of whether the U.S. should use military force against Iraq if it does not withdraw its forces from Kuwait?"

<sup>11</sup> Gallup trend was worded "Would you favor or oppose sending American troops back to the Persian Gulf in order to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq?"

**ASK ALL NATIONAL:**

Q.54 Do you think George W. Bush has explained clearly what's at stake as to why the US might use military force to end the rule of Saddam Hussein, or do you think he has not explained the reasons clearly enough?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<i>New York Times</i> <u>Aug 1990</u> <sup>12</sup>
37	--	--	Explained clearly	50
52	--	--	Not clearly	41
11	--	--	Don't know/Refused	9
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>

Q.55 In your opinion, how large a role should Congress play in deciding whether the US should use force to end the rule of Saddam Hussein? **[READ]**

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
56	--	--	Should President Bush only use force if Congress favors it OR
34	--	--	Should President Bush be able to use force, even if Congress opposes it
10	--	--	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>			

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:**

Q.56 If the United States does remove Saddam Hussein from power, do you think the US will have to keep military forces in Iraq in order to maintain civil order there, or not?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
76	--	--	Will have to keep military forces in Iraq
15	--	--	Will not
9	--	--	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>			

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.57 From what you have heard or read, what's your impression of what a war with Iraq would be like? Do you think it would be a long war or a quick one?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Jan 1991</u>
52	--	--	Long	30
38	--	--	Quick	57
10	--	--	Don't know/Refused	13
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:**

And thinking about Afghanistan for a moment ...

Q.58 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?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Jan 2002</u>
67	--	--	Yes, keep forces in Afghanistan	68
24	--	--	No	26
9	--	--	Don't know/Refused	6
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>

<sup>12</sup>

New York Times trend was worded "Do you think George Bush has explained clearly what's at stake and why the U.S. is sending troops to Saudi Arabia, or do you think ..."

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.59 Do you think the United States should come to the aid of Afghanistan to help it recover from the war, or should the United States not get involved?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>March 2002</u>
56	--	--	U.S. should come to the aid of Afghanistan	49
35	--	--	U.S. should not get involved	43
9	--	--	Don't know/Refused	8
<u>100</u>				<u>100</u>

**ASK ALL:**

Q.60 In your view, why did the terrorists attack the World Trade Center and the Pentagon ... [READ AND ROTATE]

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>National Trend</u> <u>Mid-Nov 2001</u>
25	20	23	Was it mostly because of their religious beliefs OR	30
53	55	51	Was it mostly because of their political beliefs	49
11	11	17	Both equally (VOL.)	10
4	4	3	Other (VOL.)	5
7	10	6	Don't know/Refused	6
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>		<u>100</u>

Q.61 And overall, do you think the ability of terrorists to launch another major attack on the U.S. is greater, the same, or less than it was a year ago?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
22	22	19	Greater
39	38	46	The same
34	36	32	Less
5	4	3	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL [N=500] AND CITIES ONLY:**

Q.62 What do you think is the most likely kind of terrorist threat? [READ; ROTATE OPTIONS 1-4 WITH 5 ALWAYS LAST]

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
5	3	4	Another attack with an airplane
40	40	38	An attack using chemical or biological weapons
8	6	6	An attack using nuclear weapons
26	26	32	A suicide bomber attack on a restaurant, bus or other public place
9	7	6	– OR – Something else [SPECIFY]
*	*	1	Not likely to happen (VOL.)
<u>12</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>13</u>	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	

**ASK FORM 2 ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.63 If there is another terrorist attack on the U.S., WHO do you think is most likely to commit it [READ, IN ORDER]

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
54	--	--	Islamic terrorists already living in America
18	--	--	Islamic terrorists planning to come into America
9	--	--	– OR – Terrorists not connected to Islamic terrorism, like Timothy McVeigh
4	--	--	Other (VOL.)
<u>15</u>	--	--	Don't know/Refused
<u>100</u>			

-- CITIES SKIP TO Q.66 --

**ASK FORM 1 NATIONAL ONLY [N=500]:**

Q.64 Do you think there is anything that the U.S. did wrong in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the terrorist attacks, or not?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Late Sept 2001</u>
38	--	--	Yes, U.S. dealings may have motivated attacks	33
49	--	--	No	55
13	--	--	Don't know/Refused	12
100				100

**ASK FORM 2 NATIONAL ONLY [N=501]:**

Q.65 Do you think there is any way that the U.S. was unfair in its dealings with other countries that might have motivated the terrorist attacks, or not?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>		<u>Late Sept 2001</u>
23	--	--	Yes, unfair dealings may have motivated attacks	21
64	--	--	No	70
13	--	--	Don't know/Refused	9
100				100

**ASK ALL:**

On another subject...

Q.66 Would you favor or oppose the following measures to curb terrorism: **[INSERT ITEM; ROTATE OBSERVE FORM SPLITS; CITY SAMPLES RECEIVE FORM 1 ONLY]**

		<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
a.F1	Requiring that all citizens carry a national identity card at all times to show to a police officer on request			
	National	59	38	3=100 (N=500)
	Mid-September, 2001	70	26	4=100
	NYC	67	27	6=100
	WDC	57	40	3=100
a.F2	Requiring you to carry a national identity card at all times to show to a police officer on request			
	National	61	35	4=100 (N=501)
	NYC	--	--	--
	WDC	--	--	--
b.F1	Allowing the U.S. government to monitor personal telephone calls and e-mails			
	National	33	61	6=100 (N=500)
	NYC	37	57	6=100
	WDC	33	62	5=100
b.F2	Allowing the U.S. government to monitor your personal telephone calls and e-mails			
	National	22	76	2=100 (N=501)
	Mid-September, 2001	26	70	4=100
	NYC	--	--	--
	WDC	--	--	--

**Q.66 CONTINUED ...**

		<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>DK/Ref</u>
c.F1	Allowing the U.S. government to monitor credit card purchases			
	National	43	51	6=100 (N=500)
	NYC	53	37	10=100
	WDC	52	44	4=100
c.F2	Allowing the U.S. government to monitor your credit card purchases			
	National	32	63	5=100 (N=501)
	Mid-September, 2001	40	55	5=100
	NYC	--	--	--
	WDC	--	--	--
d.	Allowing pilots to carry handguns			
	National	68	28	4=100
	NYC	61	33	6=100
	WDC	59	36	5=100
e.	Allowing airport personnel to do extra checks on passengers who appear to be of Middle-Eastern descent			
	National	59	38	3=100
	NYC	59	34	7=100
	WDC	49	47	4=100

Q.67 Have you heard or read anything about President Bush's proposal to create a cabinet-level department of Homeland Security that includes several existing agencies?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
52	55	70	Yes
47	42	30	No
1	3	*	Don't know/Refused
100	100	100	

**IF HEARD OR READ ABOUT PROPOSED DEPT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (Q.67=1), ASK:**

Q.68 Do you favor or oppose the creation of the proposed Department of Homeland Security?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
76	74	75	Favor
15	18	17	Oppose
9	8	8	Don't know/Refused
100	100	100	
(N=580)	(N=244)	(N=308)	

**WASHINGTON SAMPLE ONLY:**

**IF HEARD OR READ ABOUT PROPOSED DEPT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (Q.67=1), ASK:**

Q.69 As far as you know, will you or anyone in your immediate family be DIRECTLY affected by the proposed creation of a Department of Homeland Security?

<u>Natl.</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>WDC</u>	
--	--	14	Yes
--	--	81	No
--	--	5	Don't know/Refused
		100	
		(N=308)	