

THE POLLS—TRENDS
REACTIONS TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS OF
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

LEONIE HUDDY
NADIA KHATIB
THERESA CAPELOS

The terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, spawned a large number of public polls designed to gauge Americans' reactions to these events. It is difficult to think of many other events to which Americans' reactions have been assessed as thoroughly. From as soon as the day of the attack, public opinion has been assessed on a slew of issues linked to President Bush's popularity, U.S. overseas military involvement, homeland security and its implications for civil liberties, airport security, and the personal impact of the attacks on Americans' psychology and behavior. We review trends in these polls to determine the scope, nature, and etiology of U.S. reactions to the attacks since September 11, 2001.

In reviewing the polls devoted to the events of September 11 and their aftermath, we return on occasion to several earlier polls to place recent public opinion in context. At times, the impact of terrorism has been as high as that reported since September 11. But in previous polls, the reach of terrorism was much more limited. Questions in the past were typically confined to the likelihood of attacks, the subjective impact of terrorism on personal vulnerability, and satisfaction with levels of airport security. The far-reaching consequences of the September 11 attacks can be seen in the diversity of poll questions included in this review. Topics range from domestic security, civil liberties, and airport safety to the U.S. assassination of terrorist leaders, the maintenance of internal coalitions in the war on terrorism, and the involvement of U.S. troops in diverse countries, including Iraq.

LEONIE HUDDY is associate professor and director of the Center for Survey Research and NADIA KHATIB and THERESA CAPELOS are graduate students in the Department of Political Science, SUNY at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392; telephone (516) 632-7639.

Civil Liberties

Americans were wary from the outset about the extent to which surveillance policies put in place after the attacks would infringe on their civil liberties. Opinion was split, at best, over support for the monitoring of phone lines and e-mails and reached a high of 59 percent when the target of surveillance was left unspecified (polls by LAT, OD/FOX, and HARRIS in table 1); this increased slightly to 63 percent when the focus was on chat groups. Support for such policies dropped to percentages in the low 30s, however, when ordinary Americans were the target or when surveillance was done without the person's knowledge (GALLUP, CBS/NYT). Support plummeted even further to 26 percent when the respondent's e-mail and phone communications were the target of monitoring policies. Americans were thus moderately supportive of the government monitoring communications when the target of investigation remained vague but were less supportive of broad communications monitoring when the target was the phone, e-mail messages, or regular mail of ordinary Americans, including themselves (table 1).

There was some evidence of a decline in support for government surveillance policies over time. Both Fox and CBS/NYT asked a question about the monitoring of phone lines and e-mail in late September that was repeated in late November and early December. Both organizations observed a decline of over 10 points in that period (the decline was from 45 to 31 for CBS/NYT and from 54 to 40 for OD/FOX).

Mixed feelings about the violation of civil rights extended to the treatment of suspected terrorists. Support for the use of military tribunals was highest (reaching 58 percent in an ABC/WP poll) when few details were given about the legal process in either a civilian or military court. Support for a military tribunal dropped somewhat, however, when the military tribunal was described as a process in which "evidence is withheld" (OD/FOX) or as not requiring a "unanimous verdict" (CBS/NYT; see table 2).

American ambivalence over the government's surveillance of personal communications did not extend to the establishment of a national identity system, however (table 3). When the nature of the identity system was left vague, upward of 70 percent of the public supported it (PSRA/PEW, HARRIS). Support was somewhat lower when an identity card was described in CBS/NYT polls as containing "detailed information about each person," and this dropped slightly from 56 percent in September 2001 to 50 percent in February 2002 in response to the same question. Nonetheless, even this intrusive version of a national identity card elicited more support than opposition on balance. There was even stronger support for identity checks at work and in public buildings, a policy that has been widely adopted since September 11, with more than 75 percent expressing support in all polls included in table 3. But there are clear limits to security checks. A majority of Americans (69 percent) opposed random police checks of people's possessions in order to prevent terrorism.

Given strong support for a national identity system and identity checks at work, it is not surprising to find that most Americans believed they would have to give up some freedoms or civil liberties in order to combat terrorism. The percentage of Americans who felt this way (55–79 percent) was somewhat higher after the 2001 attacks than responses to the same question asked in the immediate aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 (49 percent; LAT) and was substantially higher than responses to the same question asked in 1997 (29 percent; PSRA/PEW) in the absence of any recent terrorist attack (see table 4). The exact percentage of Americans who felt this way after the attacks of September 11 bounced around somewhat in early September, ranging from 55 to 63 percent in response to the same question wording (LAT, PSRA/PEW).

Homeland Security

It is important to assess Americans' perceived risk of future terrorist attacks on U.S. soil, since threats to the nation can have a powerful effect on support for foreign and domestic policies (Arian 1989; Huddy et al. 2002). Not surprisingly, levels of perceived threat vary with temporal proximity to an attack. In the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, over 80 percent of Americans said it was somewhat or very likely that there would be an act of terrorism somewhere in the United States in the next 12 months, and almost half (48 percent) thought an attack was very likely. This is substantially higher than the percentage who perceived an attack on the United States as very likely in the aftermath of attacks on Americans overseas such as the Berlin disco bombing in 1986 (27 percent), the Lockerbie, Scotland, plane bombing in 1988 (28 percent), and the Gulf War in 1991 (23 percent), although these numbers are derived from a question that asks about a major terrorist attack in the United States in the near future, not the next 12 months (table 5).

Unfortunately, the most commonly asked question after September 11 (CBS/NYT, CBS) also varies slightly from earlier questions in terms of the time frame by inquiring about the next few months (not the next 12 months or the near future). This makes it difficult to draw direct comparisons with the period prior to September 11. High levels of national threat were observed in the immediate aftermath of the events of September 11. In late September, 78 percent of Americans thought a future attack on the United States was somewhat or very likely; this increased to 88 percent in late October and then subsided to 62 percent by late February 2002. This decline in perceived national threat is even clearer among those who thought a future attack was very likely; 53 percent reported feeling this way in late October, but this had declined to 18 percent by late February. Nonetheless, levels of threat still remained reasonably high in February, some 5 months after the terrorist attacks.

High levels of perceived national threat were combined with moderate

confidence in the ability of the government to prevent future attacks, although confidence in the government's ability to prevent terrorism was boosted after September 11 and has remained at somewhat higher levels than recorded in the 1990s since then (table 6). From the late 1980s through to the late 1990s, a majority of Americans in most polls had only a fair amount or no confidence in the ability of the government to prevent an attack. Moreover, the findings presented in table 6 reveal a decrease over time in the number of Americans expressing confidence in the government during this period. In 1989, 46 percent of Americans had a great deal or a good amount of confidence that the government could prevent terrorist attacks on U.S. soil; this steadily decreased to 36 percent in 1997. These trends are based on identical or near-identical questions (ABC/WP, PRIN, and H&T).

A declining sense of confidence in the government was reversed by the terrorist attacks of September 11. In an ABC/WP question that was worded identically before and after the attacks, 66 percent of Americans expressed a great deal or a good amount of confidence in the government on the day of the attacks, an increase of 30 percentage points over the last recorded numbers from 1997. Confidence waned somewhat in subsequent ABC/WP polls, with only 18 percent expressing a great deal of confidence in the government in early March 2002, compared with 35 percent on September 11. Still, confidence levels in March 2002 (56 percent had a great deal or a good amount of confidence) remained higher than those recorded at the previous peak of confidence in March 1989 (46 percent).

Americans were also optimistic that the government would be able to protect its citizens from a future attack; this confidence was at its peak in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, with over a third expressing "a great deal" of confidence in the government, but dropped to under a quarter by January 2002 (table 7). Americans remain generally optimistic, however, with 81 percent expressing a great deal or a fair amount of confidence in the government in January 2002. Americans were also moderately confident that the government could prevent a future bioterrorist attack, although less than 20 percent expressed a great deal of confidence in the government in this respect. Levels of confidence in the government's ability to prevent bioterrorism increased slightly from 51 percent who felt very or somewhat confident in late September 2001 to 59 percent in early November of the same year (table 8). In addition, a majority of Americans believe the government has done enough to prevent future terrorist attacks since September 11 (table 9). Opinion is more evenly divided over whether enough has been done by the government to secure airports; when it comes to the airports themselves, a majority believe they could be doing more to improve airport security (table 10).

Substantial numbers of Americans worried that they or a family member would be victimized by a terrorist attack before and after September 11 despite the small percentage of the U.S. population who have died in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil (Downes-Le Guin and Hoffman 1993). Prior to September 11,

somewhere between 24 and 42 percent of Americans worried that they or a family member might be the victim of a bombing similar to the 1995 bombing in Oklahoma City, with 34 percent saying they were worried in May 2001, some 4 months before the attacks of September 11 (table 11). Questions asked after the attacks did not refer to the Oklahoma City bombing but assessed more directly a respondent's level of worry about themselves or a family member being the victim of terrorism (GALLUP/CNN/USA) or a terrorist attack (GALLUP/CNN/USA, PSRA/PEW), slight variants on essentially the same question. It is thus difficult to compare directly levels of personal threat before and after the September 11 attacks, but it is possible to examine trends in threat levels after then. On the day of the attacks, 58 percent of Americans were somewhat (35 percent) or very worried (23 percent) about being victimized (GALLUP/CNN/USA). This number declined steadily over time, however, so that just under 40 percent felt somewhat (27 percent) or very worried (13 percent) by late October 2001 (PSRA/PEW); this percentage had eroded even further to 35 percent in early February 2002. Thus, by the early months of 2002, the proportion of Americans who were worried about being personally victimized by terrorism had dropped to roughly the same number as had been concerned about being a victim of an Oklahoma City-style bombing in the late 1990s and early 2000s (table 11).

A sizable percentage of Americans (from 35 to 55 percent) were also concerned about being the victim of bioterrorism in polls conducted at the height of the anthrax attacks in October and November 2001 (table 12). And just under 40 percent of Americans were worried about a terrorist attack in their area 2–3 days after September 11, although this number declined steadily, with just over 20 percent expressing some level of concern about a local attack in January 2002 (table 13). Thus, levels of concern about personal victimization increased dramatically after September 11 but have declined since then to parallel the moderately high levels of personal threat experienced before the terrorist attacks.

Personal Impact of Attacks

By design, there is something personally disturbing, immediate, vivid, and frightening about the threat of terrorism, and the attacks of September 11 affected a minority of Americans in this way. Just over a third of Americans reported feeling edgy or short-tempered in October, 2001—comparable with the number reporting such feelings in the middle of the Gulf War (table 14). But the number of Americans who reported feeling depressed was higher after September 11 than during the Gulf War; 50 percent of Americans reported feeling depressed by the Gulf War in 1991 compared with 71 percent who felt depressed by the terrorist attacks in September 2001. Compared with individuals who felt depressed after the Gulf War in 1991, a greater percentage

of those depressed after September 11 reported difficulty in concentrating because of the way that they felt about the terrorist attacks (59 vs. 30 percent) and also had problems with insomnia (42 vs. 26 percent).

Over one-third of Americans reported that they had changed or planned to change their behavior to reduce their exposure to terrorism on September 11—roughly double the number found the day after the Oklahoma City bombing. And there was clear evidence that a large minority of Americans changed their behavior in response to the anthrax scare. In November 2001, over 40 percent of Americans reported greater caution in handling their mail, and 35 percent reported gathering information on what to do in case of a bioterrorism attack. In addition, there were small minorities of individuals who reported having taken other specific actions in response to the attacks. Roughly 10 percent reported having changed travel plans, avoided crowded places, stockpiled goods, purchased a weapon, and learned about terrorist precautions on a Web site since September 11 (table 15). A very small percentage of individuals (between 1 and 4 percent) had additionally purchased a gas mask and bought antibiotics.

Military Action and the War on Terrorism

As noted, Americans had mixed feelings about domestic policies that might combat internal terrorism but could infringe on their civil liberties. They had many fewer qualms about U.S. military action overseas. Support for the military action that began in early October 2001 was strong and sustained, hovering around 90 percent from October until March 2002, the most recent poll included in this review (tables 16 and 17). This support was reduced somewhat when references were made to possible substantial military casualties, dropping to somewhere between 65 and 77 percent (table 18). Support also dropped somewhat when reference was made to possible civilian casualties. Prior to the first attacks on Afghanistan in early November 2001, somewhere between 65 and 71 percent of Americans supported U.S. military action if it resulted in civilian casualties (table 19). There was broad support for the deployment of ground troops. A majority of Americans had supported the use of ground troops to attack terrorist facilities after the bombing of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in August 1998. But support for the use of ground troops strengthened after the attacks of September 11, increasing from roughly 60 percent in late 1998 to 80 percent in the days after the attacks in 2001. Harris repeated the same question in late September 2001, mid-October 2001, and mid-March 2002 and found increased support for the use of ground troops in Afghanistan over time (from 64 to 80 percent—see table 20).

Americans have been reasonably sanguine about the success of the campaign against terrorism. Since the first strikes in Afghanistan in early November, Americans felt overwhelmingly that the war against terrorism was

going somewhat or very well. But the percentage of those who thought it was going very well increased through November and December 2001, reaching a peak of 51 percent, and then declined somewhat in January 2002 to 38 percent (table 21). This was coupled with a growing sense that the United States was winning the war on terrorism. In early November, Americans were evenly split between those who thought the United States was winning and those who thought no one was winning the war; by January 2002, almost two-thirds believed the United States was winning the war against terrorism, although this had declined to 51 percent by late March (table 22). Despite such dips and peaks in the perceived success of the war, President Bush's handling of the campaign against terrorism received high levels of approval throughout this time period, with 86 percent of Americans approving of his handling of the campaign in early March 2002 (table 23).

Osama bin Laden

Roughly two-thirds of Americans initially believed in November and December 2001 that the war would not be a success without bin Laden being captured or killed, but this view shifted over time (table 24). By January, a bare majority (51 percent) believed the war could be a success without capturing or killing bin Laden, and this view persisted through to early March 2002. A majority of Americans have been somewhat or very confident that bin Laden would be killed or captured in all polls since September 11, but the number who believe this has declined over time. Consider the CBS polls in table 25 that rely on the same question wording. In early October, 76 percent of Americans were confident that the United States would capture or kill bin Laden; this had decreased to 64 percent in late February 2002. The Gallup polls in table 25 show a similar trend; 76 percent were confident that bin Laden would be captured or killed in mid-December, but this had decreased to 55 percent in early March 2002 (the percentage of respondents who thought it "very likely" that bin Laden would be captured or killed dropped from 43 to 16 percent). If bin Laden were to be captured, Americans hold very mixed views over how he should be treated. Feelings are essentially split between trying him in an international court or a U.S. military tribunal; somewhat fewer Americans want him tried in a U.S. criminal court (table 26).

Military Action beyond Afghanistan

A sizable majority of Americans (roughly 75–80 percent) support the extension of military action beyond Afghanistan to other countries that harbor terrorists, and this support has persisted over time, with roughly 80 percent of Americans in early January expressing support for military action in other nations found to be aiding or hiding terrorists (table 27). A majority of Amer-

icans have supported the removal of Saddam Hussein since the Gulf War, although this support has varied over time. It hit its lowest point after the war in 1991 and 1992 (between 56 and 58 percent), peaked in late 1994 (72 percent), declined somewhat through 1998, and then increased in the latter part of 1998 (76 percent) and early 1999 (74 percent). With the exception of the 1991 question (YANK/CNN/USA), these trends are based on responses to an identical question. Questions asked prior to September 11 emphasized the use of military force to remove Hussein from power. Questions asked after September 11 are worded slightly differently and refer to either “military action,” “U.S. military action,” or “U.S. forces taking military action to attempt to remove from power,” “force from power,” “to try and remove from power,” or “remove Hussein.” The question closest to that asked before September 11 suggests that there was no major change in support for the removal of Hussein after September 11. In late November 2001, 78 percent of Americans favored “having U.S. forces take military action against Iraq to force Saddam Hussein from power” (OD/FOX). This number is comparable with the 74 percent of Americans who favored “using military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power” in February 1999. Nor did support for action against Hussein change dramatically in the months after September 11. In response to an identical question asked in late November 2001 and early March 2002 (and the same as that asked by OD/FOX), the number of Americans who wanted military action to force Hussein from power declined very slightly from 78 percent in November to 72 percent in March 2002 (ABC/WP; table 28).

There is also moderately strong support for the assassination of terrorist leaders overseas. In 1998, 54 percent of Americans supported the assassination of individual terrorist leaders. Questions asked after September 11 differed from the questions asked prior to the attacks and from each other, making it more difficult to assess trends over time in support for assassinations. Nonetheless, Gallup asked a question in early October 2001 that referred to support for the assassination of “known terrorists” that was roughly comparable with the question asked prior to September 11 (in late 1998), which referred to support for the “assassination of individual terrorist leaders.” While the questions are not identical, their comparison suggests at least some increase in support for assassinations from 54 percent in 1998 to 77 percent in October 2001. Overall, the percentage of Americans supporting overseas assassinations of “terrorists,” “people in foreign countries who commit terrorist acts,” or “enemies abroad” after September 11 is somewhere between 65 and 77 percent (table 29). Most Americans seemed resigned to the fact that the war against terrorism would not be short-lived, with a majority (roughly 60 percent) believing that the war would last for more than 2 years (table 30).

International Coalition

Americans have generally felt confident that the U.S. government could maintain the international coalition of countries supporting its military efforts, although the percentage of individuals expressing strong confidence in the government has declined somewhat since early October. Just under half (46 percent) of all Americans felt very confident that the government could maintain the coalition in early October; this declined to 33 percent in early December. Nonetheless, support remained strong even in December, with over 90 percent of Americans saying they felt somewhat or very confident in the government's ability to keep the coalition together (table 31).

Conclusion

The terrorist attacks of September 11 affected Americans in a number of different ways as documented by polls that asked similar questions before and after the attacks. Changes were observed in the personal impact of the attacks, support for domestic and foreign policies, and views of the government. More specifically, the attacks of September 11 led to increased levels of reported depression compared with levels reported during the Gulf War, and, among those feeling depressed, higher levels of insomnia and greater concentration difficulties. The attacks increased concern among Americans that they or a family member would become a general victim of terrorism compared with concerns reported prior to September 11 about being a victim of a bombing similar to that in Oklahoma City. They led to an increased likelihood of change in one's personal life and activities than reported immediately after the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995. Compared with attitudes reported prior to September 11, the attacks also increased the willingness to forgo civil liberties, boosted confidence in the government's ability to prevent terrorism in the United States, and increased support for the use of ground troops in attacks against terrorists.

Change before and after September 11 is difficult to gauge in some areas because comparable questions were not asked prior to the attacks. Public opinion was assessed more fully after the attacks, however, and it is clear that the power and impact of the attacks declined somewhat over time. There was a decrease in Americans' sense of perceived threat both to the nation, oneself, and other family members after September 11. This was accompanied by declining support for the monitoring of Americans' communications and somewhat decreased confidence in the ability of the government to prevent future attacks. This stands in marked contrast to the relative fixity of views on overseas military activities. Americans remained staunch supporters of the intervention in Afghanistan, the use of ground troops overseas, President Bush's handling of the campaign against terrorism, and military action against

other countries that support terrorists. The one aspect of overseas intervention on which Americans changed their position was linked to bin Laden. Americans changed their position from pervasive doubt to modest agreement that the war could succeed without the death or detention of bin Laden. There was also a marked decrease over time in confidence that bin Laden would be captured or killed.

Appendix

Sources

The data were collected from the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research's on-line Public Opinion Location Library (POLL), Polling Report (<http://www.pollingreport.com>), the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA, <http://www.pipa.org>), Gallup (<http://www.gallup.com>), CBS News reports, the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, and Kuzma (2000). All survey results are based on representative national samples of adults unless otherwise noted in the tables. Following Roper Center policy, all results are weighted to be consistent with the data reported in the POLL database. Further information about these data can be obtained from the Roper Center and the specific survey organizations listed below.

Abbreviations

ABC: ABC News
ABC/MM: ABC News/*Money Magazine*
ABC/WP: ABC News/*Washington Post*
AP/ICR: International Communications Research for Associated Press
CBS: CBS News
CBS/NYT: CBS News/*New York Times*
GALLUP: Gallup Organization
GALLUP/CCFR: Gallup for the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations
GALLUP/CNN/USA: Gallup Organization for CNN/*USA Today*
HARRIS: Harris Interactive
HARRIS/TIME/CNN: Harris Interactive for *Time* and CNN
H&T: Hart and Teeter Research Companies
H&T/NBC/WSJ: Hart and Teeter Research Companies for NBC News/*Wall Street Journal*
IPSOS-REID: IPSOS-REID Corporation
LAT: *Los Angeles Times*
OD/FOX: Opinion Dynamics for Fox News
PIPA: Program on International Policy Attitudes, University of Maryland
PRIN: Princeton University Survey
PSRA/NEWS: Princeton Survey Research Associates for *Newsweek*
PSRA/PEW: Princeton Survey Research Associates for Pew Research Center

PSRA/TM: Princeton Survey Research Associates for *Times Mirror*

ROPER: Roper Organization

YANK: Yankelovich Partners, Inc.

YCS: Yankelovich, Clancy and Shulman

YANK/TIME/CNN: Yankelovich/*Time*/CNN

Civil Liberties

I. MONITORING AMERICANS' COMMUNICATIONS

Phone

LAT: Some people say that in order to fight terrorism, government agencies should be given broader powers to tap telephone lines and monitor cell phones and other wireless communications. Would you approve or disapprove of such a move?

E-Mail

LAT: Some people say that in order to fight terrorism, government agencies should be given broader powers to monitor Internet communications and be given the legal authority to read all private e-mails. Would you approve or disapprove of such a move?

Phone and E-Mail

CBS/NYT: In order to reduce the threat of terrorism, would you be willing or not willing to allow government agencies to monitor the telephone calls and e-mail of ordinary Americans on a regular basis?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (9/14–15/01): Next, please tell me if you would favor or oppose each of the following as a means of preventing terrorist attacks in the United States. How about making it easier for legal authorities to read mail, e-mail, or tap phones without the person's knowledge?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (10/19–21/01): Next, please tell me if you favor or oppose taking each of the following actions in the United States for at least several years. How about making it easier for legal authorities to read mail, e-mail, or tap phones without the person's knowledge?

OD/FOX: Please tell me if you support or oppose each of the following possible solutions that have been proposed as ways of dealing with terrorism: allowing the government to increase monitoring of private telephone and e-mail communications.

HARRIS: Here are some increased powers of investigation that law enforcement agencies might use when dealing with people suspected of terrorist activity, which would also affect our civil liberties. For each, please say if you would favor or oppose it . . . expanded government monitoring of cell phones and e-mail, to intercept communications.

Personal Phone and E-Mail

PSRA/PEW: Would you favor or oppose the following measures to curb terrorism: allowing the U.S. government to monitor your personal telephone calls and e-mails.

Internet Chat Groups

HARRIS: Here are some increased powers of investigation that law enforcement agencies might use when dealing with people suspected of terrorist activity, which would

also affect our civil liberties. For each, please say if you would favor or oppose it.
 . . . Law enforcement monitoring of Internet discussions in chat rooms and other forums.

	<i>Approve/ Favor/ Support/ Willing (%)</i>	<i>Disapprove/ Oppose/ Not Willing (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Phone:				
9/13–14/01 (LAT)	54	40	6	1,561
11/10–13/01 (LAT)	59	36	5	1,995
E-mail:				
9/13–14/01 (LAT)	50	45	5	1,561
11/10–13/01 (LAT)	51	45	5	1,995
Phone and e-mail:				
9/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	39	53	8	959
9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/ USA)	33	65	2	1,032
9/19–20/01 (OD/FOX)	54	39	7	900 ^a
9/19–24/01 (HARRIS)	54	41	4	1,012
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	45	51	4	1,216
10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/ USA)	37	60	3	1,006
11/28–29/01 (OD/FOX)	40	52	8	900 ^a
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	31	65	4	1,052
Personal phone/e-mail: 9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	26	70	4	1,200
Internet chat groups: 9/19–24/01 (HARRIS)	63	32	5	1,012

^a National registered voters.

2. MILITARY TRIBUNALS

ABC/WP: Do you think non-U.S. citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in the regular U.S. criminal court system or in a special military tribunal?

OD/FOX: Do you think suspected terrorists should be tried in a nonpublic military tribunal, in which the names of the defendants and the evidence is withheld, or should they be tried in the normal justice system?

CBS/NYT: When it comes to dealing with people suspected of involvement in terrorist attacks against the United States, which would you prefer: (1) trying them in open criminal court with a jury, a unanimous verdict, and a civilian judge; or (2) trying them in a secret military court with a military judge and without a unanimous verdict?

GALLUP/CNN/USA: If suspected terrorists are captured and put on trial by the United States, would you rather see that happen in a regular court of law in which evidence would be presented in a public trial, (or) a military tribunal in which the U.S. officers would examine evidence in secret hearings?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Regular</i>	<i>U.S. Military</i>	<i>Don't Know/</i>	<i>N</i>
	<i>U.S. Court</i>	<i>Tribunal</i>	<i>Not Sure</i>	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	
11/27/01 (ABC/WP)	38	58	3	759
11/28–29/01 (OD/FOX)	57	30	13	900
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	50	40	10	1,052
12/14–16/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	42	53	5	1,019

3. NATIONAL IDENTITY SYSTEM

National Identity (ID) System

PSRA/PEW: Would you favor or oppose the following measures to curb terrorism: requiring that all citizens carry a national identity card at all times to show to a police officer on request.

Harris: Here are some increased powers of investigation that law enforcement agencies might use when dealing with people suspected of terrorist activity, which would also affect our civil liberties. For each, please say if you would favor or oppose it. . . . Adoption of a national ID system for all U.S. citizens.

CBS: In order to reduce the threat of terrorism, would you be willing or not willing for the government to require everyone in the United States to carry a national electronic identification card, or “smart card,” that would have detailed information about each person?

ID Check at Work

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Next, please tell me if you would favor or oppose each of the following as a means of preventing terrorist attacks in the United States. How about . . . requiring every person going into an office building or public place to show ID.

PSRA/NEWS: I’m going to read you some other things that might be done to improve security and protect against terrorism in the United States. For each one, tell me if you strongly favor it, would accept it if necessary, or think it would go too far. . . . ID checks at all workplaces and public buildings.

ID Check at Random

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Next, please tell me if you would favor or oppose each of the following as a means of preventing terrorist attacks in the United States. How about . . . allowing police to stop people on the street at random to search their possessions?

	<i>Favor/</i>	<i>Oppose/</i>	<i>Don't Know/</i>	<i>N</i>
	<i>Willing/</i>	<i>Not Willing/</i>		
	<i>Accept</i>	<i>Goes Too Far</i>	<i>N.A.</i>	
	(%)	(%)	(%)	
National ID system:				
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	70	26	4	1,200
9/19–24/01 (HARRIS)	68	28	4	1,012
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	56	38	6	1,216
2/24–26/02 (CBS/NYT)	50	44	6	861
ID check at work:				
9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	77	22	1	1,032

Poll Trends: Reactions to September 11

431

9/20–21/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	84 ^a	15	1	1,005
9/27–28/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	85 ^a	14	1	1,000
ID check—highways: 9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	29	69	2	1,032

^a Includes strongly favor and accept.

4. AMERICANS FORGO CIVIL LIBERTIES

LAT, PSRA/PEW, PSRA/NEWS: In order to curb terrorism in this country, do you think it will be necessary for the average person to give up some civil liberties, or not?

CBS/NYT, CBS: Do you think Americans will have to give up some of their personal freedoms in order to make the country safe from terrorist attacks, or not?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Yes/Necessary</i> (%)	<i>No/Not Necessary</i> (%)	<i>Don't Know/ N.A.</i> (%)	<i>N</i>
<i>Pre-9/11/01:</i>				
4/95 (LAT)	49	43	8	1,032
4/97 (PSRA/PEW)	29	62	9	1,206
<i>Post-9/11/01:</i>				
9/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	74	21	5	959
9/13–14/01 (LAT)	61	33	6	1,561
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	55	35	10	1,200
9/20–21/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	63	32	5	1,005
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	79	19	2	1,216
10/8/01 (CBS)	79	17	4	436

Homeland Security

5. NATIONAL THREAT

ABC/WP (4/86): In your opinion, how likely is a major terrorist attack in the United States itself during 1986? Is that very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?

ABC/WP, CBS/NYT (1/91): In your opinion, how likely is a major terrorist attack in the United States itself in the near future? Is it very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?

YANK/TIME/CNN: How likely do you think it is that an act of terrorism will occur somewhere in the United States in the next 12 months?

CBS/NYT (post-9/11/01), CBS: How likely do you think it is that there will be another terrorist attack on the United States within the next few months: very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, not at all likely?

	<i>Very Likely</i> (%)	<i>Somewhat Likely</i> (%)	<i>Not Too Likely/ Somewhat Unlikely</i> (%)	<i>Not at All Likely/ Very Unlikely</i> (%)	<i>Don't Know/ N.A.</i> (%)	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11:						
4/86 (ABC/WP)	27	53	...	20	1	1,505
7/88 (ABC/WP)	28	52	...	19	1	1,500
3-4/89 (ABC/WP)	26	54	...	19	1	1,525
1/91 (CBS/NYT)	23	50	...	21	6	1,348
4/95 (YANK/ TIME/CNN)	48	38	8	3	3	600
Post-9/11:						
9/20-23/01 (CBS/NYT)	36	42	16	4	2	1,216
10/8-9/01 (CBS)	48	36	10	3	3	870
10/25-28/01 (CBS/NYT)	53	35	8	2	2	1,024
12/7-10/01 (CBS/NYT)	23	50	19	5	3	1,052
1/5-6/02 (CBS/NYT)	18	47	27	6	2	1,060
1/21-25/02 (CBS/NYT)	23	48	21	4	3	1,034
2/24-26/02 (CBS)	18	44	29	5	4	861

6. CONFIDENT GOVERNMENT CAN PREVENT ATTACKS

ABC/WP (pre-9/11/01), ABC, H&T, PRIN, WP: Generally speaking, how much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to prevent terrorist attacks against Americans in this country: a great deal, a good amount, only a fair amount, or none at all?

ABC/WP (post-9/11/01): How much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to prevent further terrorist attacks against Americans in this country: a great deal, a good amount, only a fair amount, or none at all?

	<i>A Great Deal</i> (%)	<i>A Good Amount</i> (%)	<i>A Fair Amount</i> (%)	<i>None at All</i> (%)	<i>Don't Know/ N.A.</i> (%)	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11:						
3/89 (ABC/WP)	16	30	38	16	0	1,525
6/93 (PRIN)	17	47	24	10	2	1,000
4/95 (ABC)	13	24	51	11	1	545
5/95 (ABC/WP)	12	24	51	12	1	1,011

Poll Trends: Reactions to September 11

433

6/95 (H&T)	12	24	51	12	1	1,008
8/96 (ABC/WP)	12	21	49	16	...	1,514
8/96 (H&T)	12	21	49	16	0	1,203
6/97 (ABC)	10	26	52	10	3	514
Post-9/11:						
9/11/01						
(ABC/WP)	35	31	30	2	1	608
9/25–27/01 (WP)	35	31	30	3	1	1,215
11/5–6/01						
(ABC/WP)	17	35	40	7	1	756
11/27/01						
(ABC/WP)	24	39	32	5	1	759
1/24–27/02						
(ABC/WP)	18	40	37	6	1	1,507
3/7–10/02						
(ABC/WP)	18	38	39	5	...	1,008

7. CONFIDENT GOVERNMENT CAN PROTECT CITIZENS

GALLUP/CNN/USA, CBS/NYT, CBS: How much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to protect its citizens from future terrorist attacks: a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?

	<i>A Great Deal</i>	<i>A Fair Amount</i>	<i>Not Very Much</i>	<i>None at All</i>	<i>Don't Know/N.A.</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Post-9/11</i>	<i>(%)</i>	<i>(%)</i>	<i>(%)</i>	<i>(%)</i>		
9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	41	47	9	2	1	1,032
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	35	53	10	1	1	1,216
10/8–9/01 (CBS)	26	58	13	1	1	870
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	18	58	20	4	0	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	22	52	20	4	2	805
12/7–10/01 (CBS)	17	60	18	4	1	1,052
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	23	58	16	2	1	1,060

8. CONFIDENT GOVERNMENT CAN HANDLE BIOTERRORISM

PSRA/NEWS: How confident are you that national and local governments in this country are prepared to deal with a terrorist attack using chemical or biological weapons and prevent many deaths?

CBS; CBS/NYT: How much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks involving anthrax—a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?

	<i>Very Confident/ A Great Deal (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident/ A Fair Amount (%)</i>	<i>Not Too Confident/ Not Very Much (%)</i>	<i>Not Confident at All/ None at All (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Biological/ chemical attack: 9/27–28/01 (PSRA/ NEWS)	14	37	30	16	3	1,000
10/11–12/01 (PSRA/ NEWS)	18	38	27	14	3	1,004
10/18–19/01 (PSRA/ NEWS)	19	48	24	7	2	1,006
10/25–26/01 (PSRA/ NEWS)	16	48	23	10	3	1,005
11/1–2/01 (PSRA/ NEWS)	17	42	25	14	2	1,001
Anthrax: 10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	15	54	25	5	1	1,024
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	17	50	26	4	3	1,060

9. GOVERNMENT DOING ENOUGH TO PREVENT ATTACKS

CBS/NYT, CBS: From what you know, since the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, has the government done enough to make the country more secure against another terrorist attack or has the government not done enough?

ABC/WP, ABC: Do you think the United States is doing all it reasonably can do to try to prevent further terrorist attacks, or do you think it should do more?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Done Enough/ All It Reasonably Can (%)</i>	<i>Do More/ Not Done Enough (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	61	30	9	1,216
10/8/01 (CBS)	54	36	10	436
10/08–9/01 (ABC/WP)	71	27	2	1,009
10/15/01 (ABC/WP)	68	29	3	509
11/5–6/01 (ABC/WP)	56	43	2	756

11/27/01 (ABC/WP)	62	36	1	759
12/18–19/01 (ABC)	59	40	1	755
3/7–10/02 (ABC/WP)	66	33	1	1,008

10. AIRPORT SECURITY

Government

CBS/NYT (10/25–28/01), CBS (11/13–14/01, 1/5–6/02, 2/24–26/02): Do you think the federal government has done enough to improve airport security since September 11, or not?

Airports

LAT: Turning your attention now to airport security: in your opinion, do you feel that U.S. airports are doing enough to secure the safety of passengers or are they doing too little?

CBS/NYT (10/25–28/01), CBS (11/13–14/01, 1/5–6/02, 2/24–26/02): Do you think the airlines have done enough to improve airport security since September 11, or not?

	<i>Done Enough (%)</i>	<i>Not Done Enough/ Done Too Little (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Government:				
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	51	42	7	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	37	56	7	805
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	41	54	5	1,060
2/24–26/02 (CBS)	48	45	7	861
Airports:				
9/13–14/01 (LAT)	14	82	4	1,561
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	42	50	8	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	28	66	6	805
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	35	59	6	1,060
2/24–26/02 (CBS)	38	54	8	861

11. PERSONAL/FAMILY THREAT

ABC/WP, GALLUP/CNN/USA (4/95, 4/96, 7/96, 4/00), YANK/TIME/CNN; AP/ICR: 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—very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not worried at all?

GALLUP (11/2–4/01, 2/4–6/02), GALLUP/CNN/USA (11/2–4/01, 11/26–27/01): How worried are you that you or someone in your family will become a victim of terrorism—very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not worried at all?

GALLUP (8/98, 10/11–14/01), GALLUP/CNN/USA (9/11/01, 9/14–15/01, 9/21–22/01, 10/19–21/01): How worried are you that you or someone in your family will become a victim of a terrorist attack—very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not worried at all?

PSRA/PEW: 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 very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not at all worried?

	<i>Very Worried (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Worried (%)</i>	<i>Not Very Worried (%)</i>	<i>Not at All Worried (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11/01:						
4/95 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	14	28	33	24	1	1,008
4/96 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	13	22	33	32	<.5	1,010
7/96 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	13	26	35	27	<.5	1,010
8/96 (ABC/WP)	11	27	29	33	0	1,514
4/97 (YANK/ TIME/CNN)	10	26	32	31	1	1,040
8/98 (GALLUP)	10	22	38	29	1	600
4/00 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	4	20	41	34	1	1,006
5/01 (AP/ICR)	11	23	34	32	...	1,004
Post-9/11/01:						
9/11/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	23	35	24	16	1	619
9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	18	33	35	13	1	1,032
9/21–22/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	14	35	32	18	1	1,005
9/21–25/01 (PSRA/PEW)	17	36	31	15	1	1,488
10/10–14/01 (PSRA/PEW)	18	32	29	19	2	891
10/11–14/01 (GALLUP)	18	33	35	14	...	1,011
10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	13	30	33	23	1	1,006
10/31–11/7/01 (PSRA/PEW)	13	27	35	24	1	1,000
11/2–4/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	11	28	34	26	1	1,012
11/26–27/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	8	27	34	30	<.5	1,025

1/9–13/02 (PSRA/PEW)	12	26	38	24	...	1,201
2/4–6/02 (GALLUP)	8	27	39	25	1	1,011

I2. PERSONAL THREAT OF BIOTERRORISM

OD/FOX: How worried are you that you personally or a family member or friend will be exposed to bioterrorism, such as anthrax?

ABC/WP, ABC: How concerned are you about the chance that you personally, or a close friend or relative, might be the victim of an anthrax attack? Does that worry you a great deal, somewhat, not too much, or not at all?

Date	Very Worried/ A Great Deal (%)	Somewhat Worried (%)	Not Very Worried (%)	Not at All Worried (%)	Don't Know/ N.A. (%)	N
10/15/01 (ABC/WP)	26	29	29	17	...	509
10/17–18/01 (OD/FOX)	16	30	30	22	2	900 ^a
10/24/01 (ABC)	17	30	32	21	1	508
10/31–11/1/01 (OD/FOX)	15	31	35	18	1	900 ^a
11/5–6/01 (ABC/WP)	10	25	33	31	...	756

^a National registered voters.

I3. LOCAL THREAT

CBS/NYT (7/95), GALLUP/CNN/USA: Do you personally feel any sense of danger from terrorist acts where you live and work, or not?

CBS, CBS/NYT (post-9/11): Would you say you personally are very concerned about a terrorist attack in the area where you live, or not?

	Feel Danger/ Concerned (%)	Do Not/ Not Concerned (%)	Don't Know/ N.A. (%)	N
Pre-9/11:				
3/93 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	12	87	1	1,007
4/95 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	16	84	0	601
7/95 (CBS/NYT)	20	79	1	1,209
Post-9/11:				
9/11/01 (CBS/NYT) ^a	43	56	1	402
9/11–12/01 (CBS/NYT)	36	62	2	1,041
9/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	39	59	2	959
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	32	66	2	1,216
10/8–9/01 (CBS)	30	68	2	870

10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	26	71	3	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	27	72	3	805
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	24	75	1	1,052
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	22	77	1	1,060

^a This is the subsample of individuals from the 9/11–12/01 CBS/NYT study that were interviewed on September 11.

Personal Impact

I.4. PSYCHOLOGICAL REACTIONS

Nervous or Edgy

CBS (1/91, 2/91): Some people say that because of the war they are edgy or short-tempered or are having trouble sleeping. Others say the war hasn't had that kind of effect on them. How about you? Have you been bothered by any of those things because of the war, or hasn't the war affected you like that?

CBS/NYT: Since the terrorist attacks, have you felt nervous or edgy?

CBS (10/8/01): Some people say that because of the terrorist attacks on the United States and the U.S. military response, they are edgy or short-tempered or are having trouble sleeping. Others say the attacks haven't had that kind of effect on them. How about you? Have you been bothered by any of those things because of the attacks, or haven't the attacks affected you like that?

Depressed

PSRA/PEW, PSRA/TM: Have you yourself felt depressed by the Gulf War/terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

Insomnia

PSRA/PEW, PSRA/TM: (Among those reporting depression) Have you had any trouble sleeping because of the way you feel about the war/terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

CBS/NYT: Americans are reacting to the terrorist attack in various ways. What about you? Since the terrorist attack, have you had any trouble sleeping?

Difficulty Concentrating

PSRA/PEW, PSRA/TM: (Among those reporting depression) Have you had any difficulty concentrating on your job or your normal activities because of the way that you feel about the war/terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A.</i>	<i>N</i>
	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	
Nervous or edgy:				
1/91 (CBS)	39	61	0	1,173
2/91 (CBS/NYT)	38	60	2	1,060
10/8/01 (CBS)	37	61	2	436
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	34	66	0	1,024
Depressed:				
1/91 (PSRA/TM)	50	49	1	924

9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	71	27	2	1,002
Insomnia:				
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	17	83	0	1,024
Among depressed—insomnia:				
1/91 (PSRA/TM)	26	74	...	456
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	42	58	...	845
Among depressed—difficulty concentrating:				
1/91 (PSRA/TM)	30	70	...	924
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	59	41	...	845

15. BEHAVIORAL CHANGE

General Changes

GALLUP (4/95, 9/11/01): Do you think you will change any aspect of your personal life or activities in order to reduce your chances of being a victim of terrorist attacks—or will you not make any changes in your personal life?

GALLUP (10/5–6/01): Have you changed, or do you think you will change, any aspect of your personal life or activities in order to reduce your chances of being a victim of terrorist attacks—or will you not make any changes in your personal life?

Travel

ROPER: Have you or has anyone in your family recently changed travel or vacation plans because of the threat of terrorism?

ABC/WP: Have you personally canceled any specific plans to travel by air in the future because of the danger of terrorist attacks, or not?

CBS/NYT: Have you canceled any trips because of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

Avoid Crowds

ABC/WP, ABC: Since September 11, have you or has anyone in your household . . . started avoiding crowded places such as shopping malls because of the chance of terrorism or not?

GALLUP: Next, I'm going to read you some things people may do because of their concern about terrorism. For each one, please tell me if it is something you have done, something you are seriously considering, something you are not seriously considering, or something you haven't even thought about . . . avoiding public events or crowded areas?

Bioterrorism

ABC/WP: Since September 11, have you or has anyone in your household . . . bought a supply of antibiotics in case of biological attack, started to exercise caution in opening your mail, or gathered information about what to do in case of an anthrax or other biological attack or not?

Other Precautions

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Next, I'm going to read you some things people may do because of their concern about terrorism. For each one, please tell me if it is something you have done, something you are seriously considering, something you are not seriously considering, or something you haven't even thought about . . . purchasing a gas mask or other protective clothing, stockpiling food or water, purchasing a weapon, or consulting a Web site or other source of information about terrorism preparedness.

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A.</i>	<i>N</i>
	(%)	(%)	(%)	
General changes:				
4/20/95 (GALLUP)	16	83	1	601
9/11/01 (GALLUP)	36	61	3	619
10/5–6/01 (GALLUP)	27	73	<.5	1,032
Travel:				
4/86 (ABC/MM)	12	88	0	500
9/13/01 (ABC/WP)	9	91	0	609
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	8	91	1	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	8	91	1	805
1/5–6/02 (CBS/NYT)	10	90	0	1,060
Avoid crowds:				
10/17–21/01 (ABC/WP)	8	91	1	1,023
10/19–21/01 (GALLUP)	8	90 ^a	2	1,006
10/24/01 (ABC)	14	86	0	508
Caution with mail:				
10/17–21/01 (ABC/WP)	40	60	1	1,023
10/24/01 (ABC/WP)	44	56	1	508
Information on anthrax:				
10/17–21/01 (ABC/WP)	35	65	1	1,023
10/24/01 (ABC/WP)	35	63	2	508
Bought antibiotics:				
10/15/01 (ABC/WP)	1	99	...	509
10/17–21/01 (ABC/WP)	2	96	2	1,023
10/24/01 (ABC/WP)	4	95	1	508
Other precautions:				
Gas mask: 10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	2	98 ^a	...	1,006
Stockpile goods: 10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	9	91 ^a	...	1,006
Weapon: 10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	8	92 ^a	...	1,006
Web site: 10/19–21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	10	89 ^a	1	1,006

^a Includes seriously considering, not seriously considering, and haven't thought about it.

Military Action and Afghanistan

16. SUPPORT MILITARY ACTION

OD/FOX: Do you support or oppose the U.S. military action being taken in response to the terrorist attacks?

PSRA/NEWS: Do you approve or disapprove of the current U.S. military action against terrorism?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Support/ Approve (%)</i>	<i>Oppose/ Disapprove (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/11–12/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	89	8	3	1,004
10/17–18/01 (OD/FOX) ^a	89	6	5	900
10/18–19/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	88	9	3	1,006
10/25–26/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	88	8	4	1,005
10/31–11/1/01 (OD/FOX) ^a	87	8	5	900
11/1–2/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	86	10	4	1,001
11/8–9/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	88	10	2	1,001
11/14–15/01 (OD/FOX) ^a	91	6	3	900
11/15–16/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	88	11	1	1,000
11/28–29/01 (OD/FOX) ^a	91	5	4	900
11/29–30/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	89	7	4	1,002
12/6–7/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	88	9	3	1,003
12/12–13/01 (OD/FOX) ^a	91	6	3	900
1/9–10/02 (OD/FOX) ^a	90	5	5	900
1/30–31/02 (OD/FOX) ^a	89	7	4	900
2/26–27/02 (OD/FOX) ^a	82	11	7	900
3/12–13/02 (OD/FOX) ^a	91	6	3	900

^a Registered voters only.

17. MILITARY ACTION IN AFGHANISTAN

GALLUP/CNN/USA (10/7/01): As you may know, the United States and Great Britain launched attacks on at least three cities in Afghanistan today in retaliation for the terrorist attacks that occurred in the United States on September 11. Do you approve or disapprove of the United States taking military action in Afghanistan today?

ABC (10/07/01): Today the United States led air strikes on targets in Afghanistan, including military sites of the Taliban government and training camps of the Al Qaeda terrorist group led by Osama bin Laden. Do you support or oppose these U.S.-led air strikes on Afghanistan?

CBS (10/8/01): Do you approve or disapprove of the military attacks led by the United States that began Sunday against targets in Afghanistan?

ABC/WP (10/8–9/01): Do you support or oppose the U.S.-led air strikes on Afghanistan that began this week?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (post-10/7/01): Do you approve or disapprove of the current U.S. military action in Afghanistan?

CBS, CBS/NYT: Do you approve or disapprove of the current U.S. military action in Afghanistan?

ABC/WP (post-10/7/01): Do you support or oppose the U.S. military action in Afghanistan?

	<i>Support/ Approve (%)</i>	<i>Oppose/ Disapprove (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/7/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	90	5	5	660
10/7/01 (ABC/WP)	94	4	2	506
10/8-9/01 (CBS)	90	6	4	870
10/8-9/01 (ABC)	92	6	1	1,009
10/11-14/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	92	7	1	1,011
10/19-21/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	88	10	2	1,006
10/25-28/01 (CBS/NYT)	88	8	4	1,024
11/2-4/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	86	11	3	1,012
11/5-6/01 (ABC/WP)	90	9	1	756
11/13-14/01 (CBS)	89	7	4	805
11/26-27/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	92	6	2	1,025
11/27/01 (ABC/WP)	91	7	2	759
12/6-9/01 (GALLUP)	88	9	3	1,002
12/7-10/01 (CBS/NYT)	91	5	4	1,052
1/5-6/02 (CBS)	89	8	3	1,060
1/15-17/02 (CBS)	87	10	3	1,030
1/21-25/02 (CBS)	87	9	4	1,034
1/25-27/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	89	9	2	1,011
2/24-26/02 (CBS)	87	8	5	861
3/7-10/02 (ABC/WP)	90	8	1	1,008

18. AMERICAN MILITARY CASUALTIES

PSRA/PEW: Do you favor or oppose taking military action, including the use of ground troops, to retaliate against whoever is responsible for the terrorist attacks, even if it means that U.S. armed forces might suffer thousands of casualties?

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Would you support or oppose the United States taking military action if you knew each of the following would happen? How about if 1,000 American troops would be killed?

CBS/NYT: What if that meant that thousands of American military personnel will be killed, then do you think the United States should take military action against whoever is responsible for the attacks?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Support/ Favor/ Yes (%)</i>	<i>Oppose/ Disapprove/ No (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
9/13-17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	77	9	14	452
9/14-15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	65	30	5	518
9/20-23/01 (CBS/NYT)	72	18	10	1,216
11/13-19/01 (PSRA/PEW)	77	14	9	731

19. CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

CBS, CBS/NYT: Do you think the United States should take military action against whoever is responsible for the attacks, even if it means that innocent people are killed?

PSRA/NEWS (9/13–14/01): Thinking about a possible U.S. military response to the terrorist attacks, would you favor or oppose attacking terrorist bases and the countries that allow or support them EVEN IF there is a high likelihood of civilian casualties?

PSRA/NEWS (9/20–21/01): Thinking about a possible U.S. military response to last week’s terrorist attacks, would you favor or oppose attacking terrorist bases and the countries that allow or support them even if there is a high likelihood of civilian casualties?

PSRA/NEWS (9/27–28/01): Thinking about a possible U.S. military response to the terrorist attacks on September 11, would you favor or oppose attacking terrorist bases and the countries that allow or support them even if there is a high likelihood of civilian casualties?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Yes/Favor (%)</i>	<i>No/Oppose (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
9/11/01 (CBS) ^a	66	20	14	402
9/11–12/01 (CBS)	71	18	11	1,041
9/13–14/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	71	21	8	1,001
9/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	68	17	15	959
9/20–21/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	71	21	8	1,005
9/20–23/01 (CBS/NYT)	67	23	10	1,216
9/27–28/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	65	24	11	1,000

^a This is the subsample of individuals from the 9/11–12/01 CBS/NYT study that were interviewed on September 11.

20. SUPPORT USE OF GROUND TROOPS

GALLUP (8/98): Would you generally approve or disapprove of future attacks by the United States using . . . ground troops . . . to attack terrorist groups or their facilities?

GALLUP/CCFR: In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures. How about attacks by U.S. ground troops against terrorist training camps and other facilities?

PSRA/PEW: Do you favor or oppose taking military action, including the use of ground troops, to retaliate against whoever is responsible for the terrorist attacks?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (9/14–15/01): Would you support or oppose the United States taking military action if you knew each of the following would happen? How about if U.S. ground troops would be used in an invasion?

HARRIS/TIME/CNN: Do you favor or oppose the use of U.S. ground troops in Afghanistan?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (10/7/01): Looking ahead, would you favor or oppose the United States taking additional direct military action in Afghanistan if U.S. ground troops were to be used?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (10/19–21/01): Do you favor or oppose the United States using ground troops in Afghanistan?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (11/26–27/01): Do you approve or disapprove of the presence of U.S. ground troops in Afghanistan?

	<i>Approve/ Favor/ Support/ Yes (%)</i>	<i>Disapprove/ Oppose/ No (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11:				
8/98 (GALLUP)	65	30	5	872
10/98 (GALLUP/CCFR)	57	34	9	1,507
Post-9/11:				
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	82	8	10	600
9/14–15/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	80	18	2	518
9/27–28/01 (HARRIS/TIME/CNN)	64	28	8	1,055
10/7/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	77	17	6	660
10/12/01 (HARRIS/TIME/CNN)	71	21	8	1,044
10/19–21/02 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	80	18	2	1,006
11/13–19/01 (PSRA/PEW)	85	8	7	769
11/26–27/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	91	7	2	1,025
3/13–14/02 (HARRIS/TIME/CNN)	80	16	4	1,014

21. PROGRESS OF WAR

CBS, CBS/NYT: What is your impression of how the war is going for the United States right now: very well, somewhat well, somewhat badly, or very badly?

	<i>Very Well (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Well (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Badly (%)</i>	<i>Very Badly (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/9/01 (CBS)	36	44	7	1	12	434
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	25	58	11	2	4	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	41	48	5	2	4	805
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	51	42	4	1	2	1,052
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	43	49	4	2	2	1,060
1/15–17/02 (CBS)	40	49	6	2	3	1,030
1/21–24/02 (CBS)	38	51	7	2	2	1,034

22. WHO IS WINNING WAR ON TERRORISM

GALLUP, GALLUP/CNN/USA: Who do you think is currently winning the war against terrorism: the United States and its allies, neither side, or the terrorists?

	<i>United States/ Allies (%)</i>	<i>Neither Side (%)</i>	<i>Terrorists (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/11–14/01 (GALLUP)	42	44	11	3	521
11/8–11/01 (GALLUP)	53	33	11	3	1,005

Poll Trends: Reactions to September 11

445

12/6–9/01 (GALLUP)	64	28	5	3	521
01/7–9/02 (GALLUP)	66	25	7	2	521
3/22–24/02 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	51	35	12	2	1,011

23. APPROVAL OF PRESIDENT BUSH’S HANDLING OF THE WAR ON TERRORISM

ABC/WP: Do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling the U.S. campaign against terrorism?

CBS, CBS/NYT: Do you approve or disapprove of the way that George W. Bush is handling the campaign against terrorism?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Approve/ Support (%)</i>	<i>Disapprove/ Oppose (%)</i>	<i>Don’t Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/15/01 (ABC/WP)	92	6	3	509
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	88	9	3	805
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	90	6	4	1,052
1/5–6/02 (CBS)	88	9	3	1,060
1/15–17/02 (CBS)	87	10	3	1,030
1/24–26/02 (CBS)	87	9	4	1,034
1/24–27/02 (ABC/WP)	88	10	2	1,507
2/24–26/02 (CBS)	82	13	5	861
3/7–10/02 (ABC/WP)	86	10	2	1,008

Osama bin Laden

24. WAR A SUCCESS WITHOUT CAPTURING/KILLING BIN LADEN

ABC/WP, ABC: Do you think the United States has to capture or kill Osama bin Laden for the war on terrorism to be a success, or do you think the war on terrorism can be a success without Osama bin Laden being killed or captured?

	<i>Success without bin Laden (%)</i>	<i>Not a Success without bin Laden (%)</i>	<i>Don’t Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
11/5–6/01 (ABC/WP)	30	64	6	756
12/18–19/01 (ABC)	34	64	2	755
1/24–27/02 (ABC/WP)	51	46	3	1,507
3/7–10/02 (ABC/WP)	53	44	4	1,008

25. CONFIDENT WILL CAPTURE BIN LADEN

CBS, CBS/NYT: How much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to capture or kill Osama bin Laden, who is believed to have planned the September 11 attacks on the United States? Would you say you're very confident he will be caught, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident?

GALLUP/CNN/USA (11/2-4/01): How confident are you that each of the following will happen—very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident? How about . . . the United States will capture or kill Osama bin Laden.

GALLUP/CNN/USA (11/26-27/01, 12/14-16/01, 3/8-9/02): How likely is it that the United States will be able to capture or kill Osama bin Laden—very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?

	<i>Very Confident/ Likely (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident/ Likely (%)</i>	<i>Not Too Confident/ Likely (%)</i>	<i>Not at All Confident/ Likely (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/8/01 (CBS)	38	38	16	5	3	436
10/25-28/01 (CBS/NYT)	28	42	20	7	3	1,024
11/2-4/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	27	39	22	9	3	1,012
11/13-14/01 (CBS)	33	37	18	9	3	805
11/26-27/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	34	44	15	6	1	1,025
12/7-10/01 (CBS/NYT)	37	41	15	6	1	1,052
12/14-16/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	43	33	16	6	2	1,019
1/5-6/02 (CBS)	34	42	15	7	2	1,060
1/15-17/02 (CBS)	34	38	19	8	1	1,030
1/21-25/02 (CBS)	29	44	17	8	2	1,034
2/24-26/02 (CBS)	22	42	21	12	3	861
3/8-9/02 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	16	39	29	13	3	802

26. TREATMENT OF BIN LADEN

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Suppose Osama bin Laden is captured alive and put on trial, which of the following would you prefer—that he be put on a public trial by an international court with judges from different countries, put on trial by a secret military tribunal by the United States, or put on a public trial in a regular civilian court in the United States, or would it make no difference to you?

OD/FOX: When Osama bin Laden or other terrorists are brought to trial, in which

court do you think they should be tried? . . . the World Court, a regular U.S. court, or a U.S. military tribunal?

CBS/NYT: If Osama bin Laden is captured alive, should he be tried by a military court in the United States, tried by a criminal court in the United States, or tried by an international court?

<i>Date</i>	<i>International/ World Court (%)</i>	<i>Regular/ Criminal U.S. Court (%)</i>	<i>U.S. Military Tribunal (%)</i>	<i>No Difference/ Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
11/26–27/01 (GALLUP/ CNN/USA)	41	17	29	13	1,025
11/28–29/01 (OD/FOX)	29	22	36	13	900
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	42	18	34	6	1,052

Military Action Beyond Afghanistan

27. ACT AGAINST OTHER COUNTRIES

GALLUP/CNN/USA: Do you believe the United States should—or should not—take military action against other countries that the United States believes are harboring terrorists?

ABC: Would you support or oppose U.S. military action against other countries that assist or shelter terrorists?

ABC/WP: Do you think that the United States should limit its military action only to those groups or nations responsible for last month’s terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, or should the United States mount a broader war against terrorist groups and the nations that support them?

PSRA/NEWS: In the fight against terrorism, the United States might also consider using military force against targets in other countries. In general, would you support using military force against . . . suspected terrorists in countries outside the Middle East, such as the Sudan and the Philippines, or not?

PIPA: I would now like you to consider a list of possible approaches for trying to reduce the problem of terrorism. For each one I would like to know if you favor or oppose this approach. What about using American military force against groups in other countries that have committed international terrorist acts but were NOT behind the September 11 attacks?

CBS/NYT: Do you approve or disapprove of the United States leading military attacks in other countries where it believes terrorists are hiding, like Iraq, Somalia, and the Philippines?

OD/FOX: Would you support or oppose the United States taking military action against any nation found to be aiding or hiding terrorists?

	<i>Support/ Favor/ Should/ Approve (%)</i>	<i>Oppose/ Should Not/ Disapprove (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ Not Sure/ No Opinion (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/7/01 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	78	16	6	660
10/8–9/01 (ABC)	87	10	2	1,009
10/11–12/01 (PSRA/NEWS)	71	23	6	1,004
10/17–18/01 (OD/FOX)	84	11	5	900
11/1–4/01 (PIPA)	77	20	3	602
11/27/01 (ABC/WP)	81	15	4	759
1/21–24/02 (CBS/NYT)	74	18	8	1,034
1/30–31/02 (OD/FOX)	80	12	8	900

28. REMOVE SADDAM HUSSEIN FROM POWER WITH MILITARY FORCE

YANK/TIME/CNN (4/91): Do you favor or oppose using military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power (in Iraq)?

GALLUP/CNN/USA, YANK/TIME/CNN (8/92, 10/94, 9/4–5/96, 2/98, 12/98): Do you favor or oppose using military force now to remove Saddam Hussein from power?

HARRIS/TIME/CNN: Do you think that the United States should or should not use military action to attempt to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq as part of the war against terrorism?

ABC/WP, OD/FOX (11/28–29/01): Would you favor or oppose having U.S. forces take military action against Iraq to force Saddam Hussein from power?

OD/FOX (12/12–13/01, 1/30–31/02): Do you support or oppose U.S. military action to remove Iraqi President Saddam Hussein?

CBS: Do you approve or disapprove of the United States taking military action against Iraq to try and remove Saddam Hussein from power?

	<i>Approve/Favor/ Support/Yes/ Act Now (%)</i>	<i>Disapprove/ Oppose/No (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11/01:				
4/91 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	58	34	8	1,000
8/92 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	56	32	12	1,250
10/94 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	72	20	8	800
9/96 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	65	28	7	2,080
2/98 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	65	26	9	1,023
2/98 (GALLUP/CNN/USA)	61	35	4	650
12/98 (YANK/TIME/CNN)	76	18	6	1,031
2/99 (GALLUP)	74	24	2	1,014
Post-9/11/01:				
10/12/01 (HARRIS/TIME/ CNN)	71	19	10	1,044
11/27/01 (ABC/WP)	78	17	6	759
11/28–29/01 (OD/FOX)	78	17	6	900

1/30–31/02 (OD/FOX)	74	15	11	900
2/24–26/02 (CBS)	74	18	8	861
3/13–14/02 (HARRIS/TIME/ CNN)	70	23	7	1,014
3/7–10/02 (ABC/WP)	72	24	4	1,008

29. ASSASSINATE TERRORISTS

GALLUP/CCFR: In order to combat international terrorism, please say whether you favor or oppose each of the following measures. How about assassination of individual terrorist leaders?

CBS/NYT: Currently it is against U.S. law for the government to seek out and assassinate people in foreign countries who commit terrorist acts in the United States and elsewhere. Do you think this law should be changed so the U.S. government can assassinate people in foreign countries who commit terrorist acts, or should the current law not be changed?

PSRA/PEW: Would you favor or oppose the following measures to curb terrorism? Allowing the CIA to conduct assassinations overseas when pursuing suspected enemies of the United States.

H&T/NBC/WSJ: Currently, there is an executive order that prohibits U.S. military and intelligence agencies from conducting assassinations of enemies abroad. Do you think that the United States military and intelligence agencies should or should not be allowed to conduct assassinations of enemies abroad?

GALLUP: Would you be willing—or not willing—to have the U.S. government do each of the following, if the government thought it were necessary to combat terrorism? How about . . . assassinate known terrorists?

	<i>Favor/ Change Law/ Should/ Willing (%)</i>	<i>Oppose/ Not Change/ Should Not/ Not Willing (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Pre-9/11/01:				
10–11/98 (GALLUP/CCFR)	54	35	11	1,507
Post-9/11/01:				
9/13–14/01 (CBS/NYT)	65	23	12	959
9/13–17/01 (PSRA/PEW)	67	22	11	1,200
9/15–16/01 (H&T/NBC/ WSJ)	70	20	10	821
10/5–6/01 (GALLUP)	77	20	3	408

30. LIKELY LENGTH OF WAR

ABC/WP: Again, just your best guess: do you think the U.S. military action to come will last for a few weeks, a few months, a year or so, or several years?

CBS/NYT (10/25–28/01): How long do you think the U.S. war on terrorism will last—several months, about a year, between 1 and 2 years, or longer than that?

H&T/NBC/WSJ: Do you think that the duration of a campaign against terrorism will be short, that is, it will last for a few months; medium, meaning that it will last 1 or 2 years; or do you think that a campaign will be long and will last for several years or longer?

	<i>A Few More Weeks (%)</i>	<i>A Few More/ Several Months (%)</i>	<i>A Year or 2 (%)</i>	<i>More than 2/ Several Years (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know/ N.A. (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
09/20/01 (ABC/WP)	2	14	22	57	5	526
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	...	6	28	60	6	1,024
11/9–11/01 (H&T/ NBC/WSJ)	...	4	35	58	3	809

International Coalition

3 I. CONFIDENT GOVERNMENT CAN MAINTAIN ALLIANCE

CBS, CBS/NYT: How much confidence do you have in the ability of the U.S. government to maintain the international alliance of countries who are supporting U.S. military efforts? Would you say that you're very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident, or not at all confident the alliance will hold together?

	<i>Very Confident (%)</i>	<i>Somewhat Confident (%)</i>	<i>Not Too Confident (%)</i>	<i>Not at All Confident (%)</i>	<i>Don't Know (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
10/8/01 (CBS)	46	44	7	0	3	436
10/25–28/01 (CBS/NYT)	29	55	11	2	3	1,024
11/13–14/01 (CBS)	24	59	10	3	4	805
12/7–10/01 (CBS/NYT)	33	57	8	1	1	1,052

References

- Arian, Asher. 1989. "A People Apart: Coping with National Security Problems in Israel." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 33:605–31.
- Downes-Le Guin, Theodore, and Bruce Hoffman. 1993. "The Impact of Terrorism on Public Opinion, 1988 to 1989." Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Huddy, Leonie, Stanley Feldman, Theresa Capelos, and Colin Provost. 2002. "The Consequences of Terrorism: Disentangling the Effects of Personal and National Threat." *Political Psychology* 23:485–509.
- Kuzma, Lynn M. 2000. "The Polls—Trends: Terrorism in the United States." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(1):90–105.