Date: Wed, 28 Aug 2002 11:20:27 -0700
Sender: AAPORnet American Association for Public Opinion Research
< AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf < shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>
Subject: December 2001 archive - one BIG message

This is the USC listproc archive of aapornet messages for this entire month. It is one big message, just the way the USC archive stored it. You can search within this month with your browser's search function.

Turning this into individual messages that Listserv can index and sort means a lot of reformatting. We will do this as time permits. Meanwhile, the search function works, so we have as much functionality as before. New messages are of course automatically formated correctly--See August & September 2002.

Some of the early months have been completed. Take a look at them for an idea of how AAPORNET got started. (Thanks, Jim!)

Shap Wolf
shap.wolf@asu.edu

Begin archive:

Archive aapornet, file log0112.
Part 1/1, total size 1366051 bytes:

---------------------------------- Cut here ----------------------------------

>From jblair@srcmail.umd.edu Sun Dec 2 18:23:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
    id fB32Nte03984 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Dec 2001
  18:23:55 -0800 (PST)
Received: from srcmail.umd.edu (srcnotes2.umd.edu [128.8.179.41])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with SMTP
    id SAA13173 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Dec 2001 18:23:52 -0800
(PST)
Received: from srcmail.umd.edu (srcnotes2.umd.edu [128.8.179.41])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with SMTP
    id SAA13173 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 2 Dec 2001 18:23:52 -0800
(PST)
From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu
Received: by srcmail.umd.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v1.2 (600.1 3-26-1998)) id
  85256B17.000D27E6 ; Sun, 2 Dec 2001 21:23:41 -0500
X-Lotus-FromDomain: SRC
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256B17.000CFE7A.00@srcmail.umd.edu>
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2001 21:23:38 -0500
Subject: Re: Survey Center closing

The University of Maryland, College Park, has made a decision to close the Survey Research Center. The Center which was established twenty years ago will cease operations on or about February 28, 2002.

>From lcarlson@nsf.gov Mon Dec 3 06:05:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
johnny--what will you be doing??

Lynda T. Carlson, Ph.D.
Director, Division of Science Resources Statistics
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 965
Arlington, VA 22230
Tel: 703-292-7766
Fax: 703-292-9092

All SRS products are available at
http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs

-- Original Message --
From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu [SMTP:jblair@srcmail.umd.edu]
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2001 9:24 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Center closing

The University of Maryland, College Park, has made a decision to close the Survey Research Center. The Center which was established twenty years ago will cease operations on or about February 28, 2002.

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec  3 08:24:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
 by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
 id fB3G0Ne27837 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
08:24:23 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
 by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
This reporting (way below) by Benedict Carey, a Los Angeles Times health writer, appears at the very top of the front page of today's Times, column one.

-- Jim

---------

ABSTRACT (for AAPORNETters): Scant Research on Emotion

How we will act as a result of the anger triggered by Sept. 11 is difficult for mental health researchers to predict, because there's little scientific research to draw on. Anger can be fleeting, and it often is accompanied by a welter of emotions that are nearly impossible to measure: anxiety, fear, grief. What experts do know is that hostility often is associated with drug use, binge drinking and some mood disorders, including anxiety. Fits of anger also can knock recovering alcoholics, drug users and smokers off the wagon, according to health professionals. "People tend to make use of such substances as mood regulators, trying to regulate negative moods, and anger is certainly one of those," said June Tangney, a psychologist who studies anger response at George Mason University in Fairfax, Va. In the months after the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, a survey found that 44% of residents there reported feeling angry "very often, fairly often or some of the time," compared with 35% of those surveyed in Indianapolis, a city of similar size and population distant from the crime. Compared with the people in Indiana, smokers and drinkers in Oklahoma City were twice as likely to drink and smoke more after the bombing. The rate at which people took up
smoking for the first time was four times higher in Oklahoma City. Already, substance abuse clinics in the New York metropolitan area are reporting increased demand for services and heightened irritability among clients, said Dr. H. Westley Clark, director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, a federal agency that funds U.S. treatment clinics. "This is an entirely new phenomenon, as far as I can tell, and my worry is that, if it goes on and on, people will just say 'Enough!' and act out," said Dr. Fred Gusman, director of the education division of the National Center for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Palo Alto. "I don't think we'll be able to know what the effects are for a couple of years." Meanwhile, millions of Americans are changing their lives to accommodate a sensation far more powerful than those to which they are accustomed.

###

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times


December 3 2001

COLUMN ONE

Letting the Anger Seep Out

THE UNPRECEDENTED NATURE OF THE SEPT. 11 ATTACKS FUELS HOSTILITY, EXPERTS SAY. RATHER THAN BEING A STATE OF RECKLESS CONFUSION, RAGE DRIVES THE WILL TO FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL.

By BENEDICT CAREY
TIMES HEALTH WRITER

The wide eyes and swollen features, the twitching around the mouth: Anger may be the most frightening of our elemental emotions. Yet many Americans have felt it deeply since Sept. 11 and say the sensation has intruded on their thoughts, affected their relationships and remained surprisingly strong, even months after the events.

"The feeling goes so deep inside, I don't know if the word 'anger' even
covers it," said Joyce Glenn, 50, a Roman Catholic lay minister and peace activist in Omaha.

Marian Gaston, 30, a public defender in San Diego, recognizes the feeling. While talking with her husband about U.S. goals in Afghanistan, she heard herself say: "I don't care what the goals are, I'm ready to go slit [Osama bin Laden's] throat myself." She shuddered at the recollection. "I don't think I have ever said anything like that." In interviews during the last several weeks, dozens of counselors, psychiatrists and clergy across the country said they were seeing evidence of increased anger among clients, friends and neighbors.

"We have seen enormous anger response throughout our whole system," said James Pruett, executive director of Methodist Counseling and Consultation Services, which runs 18 clinics in the Charlotte, N.C., area. "People are angry that their lives are disrupted, they're angry when they have to travel, angry at their bosses." The vast majority connect their anger to the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the aftermath.

Public displays of anger have been numerous: hate crimes against Arab Americans, the spectacle of New York firefighters cursing terrorists on TV, the tremor in the voices of President Bush and other leaders after the attacks. But therapists say most of this passion is playing out in private, in conversations about military strategy and ethics, in arguments among friends, in outbursts after the evening news--eruptions directed at anyone from the Taliban to the U.S. military command to the anchorman.

"I've had couples come in, and the woman says, 'He's been pounding around the house, talking about bombing things, and I'm scared,' " said Dr. William Callahan, an Irvine psychiatrist who was an Air Force flight surgeon and specializes in anger issues.

Callahan's office has fielded dozens of calls in recent weeks from people whose anxiety and grief are mingled with rising levels of fury. "It's amazing how
many people are terrified by their own anger because they feel they'll lose control and act on it. But it's important to know that anger is a normal response. It's protective, and feeling it deeply does not mean you are going to lose control."

Contrary to some common depictions, anger is not a state of reckless confusion. In its raw form, it is a sensation of power and clarity that gives us the will and energy to fight for our lives. The body goes on full alert: Levels of "fight-or-flight" hormones such as adrenaline spike, the heart rate quickens, blood rushes to the muscles.

"All senses are heightened, vision is clearer, colors are sharper," Callahan said. "It has none of the fuzziness that anxiety or stress cause. Anger is a motivator. It wants us to act."

Scant Research on the Emotion

How we will act as a result of the anger triggered by Sept. 11 is difficult for mental health researchers to predict, because there's little scientific research to draw on. Anger can be fleeting, and it often is accompanied by a welter of emotions that are nearly impossible to measure: anxiety, fear, grief.

What experts do know is that hostility often is associated with drug use, binge drinking and some mood disorders, including anxiety.

Fits of anger also can knock recovering alcoholics, drug users and smokers off the wagon, according to health professionals. "People tend to make use of such substances as mood regulators, trying to regulate negative moods, and anger is certainly one of those," said June Tangney, a psychologist who studies anger response at George Mason University in Fairfax, Va.

In the months after the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, a survey found that 44% of residents there reported feeling angry "very often, fairly often or some of the time," compared with 35% of those surveyed in Indianapolis, a city of similar size and population distant from the crime.

Compared with the people in Indiana, smokers and drinkers in Oklahoma City
were
twice as likely to drink and smoke more after the bombing. The rate at which people took up smoking for the first time was four times higher in Oklahoma City.

Already, substance abuse clinics in the New York metropolitan area are reporting increased demand for services and heightened irritability among clients, said Dr. H. Westley Clark, director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, a federal agency that funds U.S. treatment clinics.

"We expect to see this increased demand across the country," he said. "The fact of the matter is that terrorism can strike anywhere now. This is not like an earthquake or a tornado, which lasts a few seconds or minutes and then it's over."

The unprecedented nature of the attacks is what makes thoughts of lashing out so urgent, trauma experts say. The attacks in New York and near Washington, and the anthrax scare that has followed, were not an act of war by one state against another, as was the case at Pearl Harbor. Nor were they an attack on U.S. military forces, such as the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983 or the attack on the destroyer Cole last year in the Yemeni port city of Aden. And unlike the Oklahoma City bombing, the attacks were not an isolated crime after which the perpetrators were quickly caught.

Rather, they seemed to come from nowhere--from the sky, in the mail--creating the sense of vulnerability that often drives people to frustration and fury.

"This is an entirely new phenomenon, as far as I can tell, and my worry is that, if it goes on and on, people will just say 'Enough!' and act out," said Dr. Fred Gusman, director of the education division of the National Center for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in Palo Alto. "I don't think we'll be able to know what the effects are for a couple of years."

Meanwhile, millions of Americans are changing their lives to accommodate a sensation far more powerful than they are accustomed to.

"The sight of those people jumping from the towers because they'd rather fall than be burned . . . I just can't get it out of my head," said Jack Copas, 47, a Methodist minister and lifelong pacifist in Totowa, N.J. He said that since Sept. 11
he has been more furious than ever before in his life. "I keep asking: Why didn't they attack at night—when the buildings weren't full?"

Copas' anger has prompted him to reassess friendships. One longtime friend, a Christian fundamentalist, recently remarked that the attacks were a great wake-up call from God. "He said, 'We need to get right with Jesus.' When he said that to me, I became incensed. I said: 'This is God? God did this'?"

Copas broke off the relationship. His differences with his friend probably were there all along, he suspects, but the response to the attack brought them to the surface.

Gaston, the public defender, has put her anger to practical use. She has been exploring the CIA's Internet site to see if there is some way she can help in the war on terrorism.

"It makes me laugh," she said. "I don't speak any foreign languages; I certainly wouldn't blend in, and all along I'm thinking, 'What on Earth am I doing looking at a [Web] site of people I've been opposed to all my life?'"

For Glenn, the Catholic peace activist in Nebraska, the turmoil of recent months has prompted a rethinking of the principles that have defined her life.

"When it's a matter of self-preservation, I think we need to ask ourselves when it's OK to harm others," she said. While Glenn has not abandoned her commitment to peace, she says she won't march in local demonstrations against the operation in Afghanistan.

"If I'm going to stand somewhere with a sign that says, 'peace now,' I want it to say: 'stop using planes as weapons; stop using anthrax--peace now.' If there's a madman shooting people in McDonald's, do we have a rally outside saying, 'peace now'?"

A Counterbalance of Shame

Struggling with the emotion in these ways is far better than trying to
ignore it, psychologists say. What often prevents us from acknowledging the depth of our anger, they say, is an equally powerful counterbalance: shame. Revenge fantasies evoke feelings of shame; they seem to reveal an underlying depravity, even mental instability.

"People feel much more comfortable grieving deeply than expressing anger," said Robert W. Cromey, a former therapist who is rector of Trinity Episcopal Church in San Francisco. "I think the grief that people are pouring out now is deeply related to anger. It's much more acceptable in our society to be sad than to be really mad."

Yet having Rambo-like visions after Sept. 11 does not imply anything about a person's moral character, mental health researchers say.

"There's part of me that wants to go over [to Afghanistan] and pick up a gun and start killing people," Gaston said. "But I think it's important that we not let this attack turn us into something we don't want to be. On a personal level, I don't want to be the person wearing a T-shirt showing Osama bin Laden with a target. . . . It seems to trivialize the whole thing."


Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

******

>From lcohen@bic.sri.com Mon Dec  3 11:00:46 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB3J0je09821 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
11:00:45 -0800 (PST)
Received: from bic.sri.com (bic.SRI.COM [128.18.35.100])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA25947 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 11:00:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: from [130.33.206.16] (account lcohen HELO bic.sri.com)
Does anyone know of any articles that speak to the issue of selecting either the individual or the household when designing a survey? Since we started surveying consumer financial services we have always looked at the (economic) household as the basic unit since decisions about most financial services orient towards that grouping. However, a client recently asked us for some references and we couldn't think of any. Any ideas? (Please respond off-line.) Larry

--
Larry Cohen
Consumer Financial Decisions
SRI Consulting Business Intelligence
201 Washington Road
Princeton, NJ 08543
609 734 2048 TEL
609 734 2094 FAX
mailto:lcohen@bic.sri.com
http://future.sri.com/CFD
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

I have attached a copy of the paper we published on the impact of the Oklahoma City bombing in WordPerfect format. (Sorry, don't even ask if I can supply it in Word.) This was published in the Journal of the Oklahoma Medical Society at the request of the society which devoted the issue to research on the impact of the bombing. A great deal of this research was on the injury epidemiology of the event.

I am involved in some public health research on the impact of the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11. NORC appears to have the most immediate results on these events, with some information on health impact.


Cordially,
David Smith

45 The Crossway
Delmar, NY 12054

518-439-6421

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2001 11:23 AM
Subject: Letting the Anger Seep Out (B Carey LATimes)
FIDH (International federation of human rights), Human Rights Watch, and Reporters sans frontières have created this website to document what they consider "arbitrary or legalised restrictions of human rights, press freedom and information on the Internet."

http://www.enduring-freedoms.org/welcome.php3
FIDH (International federation of human rights), Human Rights Watch, and Reporters sans frontières have created this website to document what they consider "arbitrary or legalised restrictions of human rights, press freedom and information on the Internet."
http://www.enduring-freedoms.org/welcome.php3
We have been asked to include teens aged 13 to 19 in a telephone survey about domestic violence. Those 18 and 19 are no problem, but I recognize we need parental consent for those 13 to 17. Survey Sampling can only sell us samples of those 12 to 17 and 18 to 24. (We would usually get those 19 and 20 from the adult sample, but the questionnaires are slightly different.)

We have never done this before. Does anyone have any models for screening for young people and getting parental consent? I'm looking for specific wording if possible, not being at all inclined with no experience to reinvent the wheel.

Thanks!

Jennifer D. Franz
JD Franz Research, Inc.
I thought this might entertain folks here. Apologies if you have already seen it...

-----Original Message-----

Who Reads What and Why?

1. The Wall Street Journal is read by people who run the country.

2. The New York Times is read by people who think they run the country.

3. The Washington Post is read by people who think they should run the country.

4. USA Today is read by people who think they ought to run the country but don't really understand the Washington Post. They do, however, like their smog statistics shown in pie charts.

5. The Los Angeles Times is read by people who wouldn't mind running the country, if they could spare the time, and if they didn't have to leave L.A. to do it.

6. The Boston Globe is read by people whose parents used to run the country, and they did a far superior job of it, thank you veddy much.
7. The New York Daily News is read by people who aren't too sure who's running the country, and don't really care, as long as they can get a seat on the train.

8. The New York Post is read by people who don't care who's running the country either, as long as they do something really scandalous, preferably while intoxicated.

9. The San Francisco Chronicle is read by people who aren't sure there is a country, or that anyone is running it; but whoever it is, they oppose all that they stand for. There are occasional exceptions if the leaders are handicapped, minority, feminist, atheist dwarfs, who also happen to be illegal aliens from any country or galaxy as long as they are democrats.

10. The Miami Herald is read by people who are running another country but need the baseball scores.

>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Mon Dec 3 21:36:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB45aMe25255 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 21:36:23 -0800 (PST),
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id VAA16736 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 21:36:24 -0800 (PST)
From: tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa21109;
   4 Dec 2001 0:36 EST
Received: from bam8v95.virginia.edu (ppp-069016.cho.cstone.net [209.145.69.16])
   by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id AAA28104;
   Tue, 4 Dec 2001 00:35:08 -0500 (EST)
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Hartman, David" <deh9q@virginia.edu>
Subject: Surveying truckers
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10112040030.D@bam8v95.virginia.edu>
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 00:36:30 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Fellow 'netters:
We're being asked by a client if we could develop a survey of truck drivers in our state, including out-of-state drivers who use our highways. We want to ask them about their experience with weigh stations and enforcement of load restrictions and the like.
Anyone have a suggestion on successful ways to accomplish such a task?
We are uncertain as to mode or sampling approach and want to hear the experiences of others. We've discussed mail-outs, telephone, and various forms of intercept. We are certain that there are companies out there that do serious research on this occupational group... how do they do it?

Kindly send your advice to me off-list.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 234-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>From edithl@xs4all.nl Tue Dec  4 01:15:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fB49FYe28363 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
01:15:34 -0800 (PST)
Received: from smtpzilla5.xs4all.nl (smtpzilla5.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.141])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id BAA14153 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 01:15:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from hera.xs4all.nl (s340-isdn103.dial.xs4all.nl [194.109.180.103])
  by smtpzilla5.xs4all.nl (8.12.0/8.12.0) with ESMTP id fB49F981093190
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:15:13 +0100 (CET)
Message-Id: <5.0.2.1.2.2001120104315.02343ec0@pop.xs4all.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@pop.xs4all.nl
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2001 10:46:57 +0100
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: Re: Survey Center closing
In-Reply-To: <85256B17.000CFE7A.00@srcmail.umd.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Here at the other side of the ocean we regret that the SRC at College Park will close down.
We enjoyed our visits there and were impressed by the expertise!

Dr. Edith de Leeuw
Prof. dr. Joop Hox
University Utrecht
At 09:23 PM 12/2/01 -0500, you wrote:

> The University of Maryland, College Park, has made a decision to close
> the Survey Research Center. The Center which was established twenty
> years ago will cease operations on or about February 28, 2002.

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw
President RC33, Research Committee on Logic and Methodology

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam, The Netherlands
tel +31.20.3302596  fax + 31.20.3302597
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
The following is a position announcement. If you are interested, please send cover letter and resume to the following address only:

resume@westat.com

Please include the job code (AA/BA/1003) in your letter.

Thank you.

Career Opportunities
WESTAT
AN EMPLOYEE-OWNED RESEARCH CORPORATION

WESTAT, located in Rockville, MD, is one of the foremost contract research corporations in the United States. We conduct surveys and provide statistical research and related services to the agencies of the U.S. Government and to a broad
Methods Researcher/Survey Operations Manager
Job Code AA/BA/1003

We have an opening in our Telephone Research Center for a social science researcher to conduct methods research and manage survey operations for large, national studies. Duties include participation on inter-disciplinary teams to design and budget data collection, develop training plans and materials, design and manage survey operations, and conduct methods research. Successful candidate will have an advanced degree in social sciences or survey methodology, 5+ years experience in social science survey research, coursework or relevant experience in experimental design, and excellent oral and written communication skills. Most work is conducted in teams; excellent collaboration skills are essential.

WESTAT offers excellent growth opportunities and an outstanding benefits package including life and health insurance, an Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP), a 401(k) plan, flexible spending accounts, professional development, and tuition assistance.

For immediate consideration, please send your cover letter, indicating the Westat Job Code, and resume, by one of the following methods to:

Job Code is REQUIRED to apply.

WESTAT
Attn: Resume System
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850-3195
Fax: (888) 201-1452
Email: resume@westat.com

We are an equal opportunity employer.
WESTAT
www.westat.com
We are looking for publications that explore the impact that certain types of package designs, incentives, and protocols have on mail survey response rates, especially on surveys of physicians.

Specifically, we are interested in learning if placing a stamp on the return envelope, as opposed to using a business reply envelope, increases response rates. Similarly, does including a dollar bill affect response rates? What about placing a phone call to the physician, informing him/her of the coming survey and urging him/her to complete it?

Any information on relevant research would be appreciated.

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC  20005

Voice: 202-454-3031
Fax:  202-347-4000
E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org
you can call me at 415-597-9161...joe catania

> From: Jennifer Franz
> Reply To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Sent: Monday, December 3, 2001 2:49 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Surveying Teenagers
>
> We have been asked to include teens aged 13 to 19 in a telephone survey about domestic violence. Those 18 and 19 are no problem, but I recognize we need parental consent for those 13 to 17. Survey Sampling can only sell us samples of those 12 to 17 and 18 to 24. (We would usually get those 19 and 20 from the adult sample, but the questionnaires are slightly different.)
>
> We have never done this before. Does anyone have any models for screening for young people and getting parental consent? I'm looking for specific wording if possible, not being at all inclined with no experience to reinvent the wheel.
>
> Thanks!
>
> Jennifer D. Franz
> JD Franz Research, Inc.
>
> >From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Tue Dec 4 10:23:22 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB4INLe27834 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:23:21 -0800
(PST)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
How are you?
When I saw this screen saver, I immediately thought about you.
I am in a hurry, I promise you will love it!

-----Original Message-----
From: Colleen Porter [mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:07 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Hi

How are you?
When I saw this screen saver, I immediately thought about you.
I am in a hurry, I promise you will love it!

------Original Message------
> From: Colleen Porter [SMTP:cporter@hp.ufl.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:07 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Hi

How are you?
When I saw this screen saver, I immediately thought about you. I am in a hurry, I promise you will love it! <<alert.txt>>

------=_NextPart_000_01C17CF1.B72396D0
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
   name="alert.txt"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: attachment;
   filename="alert.txt"

******** Network Associates GroupShield Exchange =
**********0D
******** Virus Alert generated at: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 =
01:25:48 PM
*****************************************************************************

The file or attachment has been quarantined as it contains the = W32/Goner@MM (ED) virus. Please contact the sender and request the file = be cleaned before sending.
Thank you.

Action Taken: The attachment could not be repaired, so the attachment = was quarantined=20 in the quarantine folder: GroupShield Quarantine Folder =0D =0D

------=_NextPart_000_01C17CF1.B72396D0--
This info was sent out by our IT net security office this morning. The message to AAPORNET from Colleen Porter contains this Worm. Do not open. Jim Caplan Arlington

Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: RSS DMDCE Systems Helpdesk
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 12:21 PM
To: MLA dd-DMDCE Everyone
Cc: MLA dd-DHRA Sysadmins
Subject: A Note of Very Special Concern
Importance: High

Please be advised that we have received an emergency virus warning from the Pentagon. This concerns a virus tentatively named the Goner.A worm. This virus may arrive as a message with the subject of Hi with an attachment that may be named gone.scr. The message body alleges that the attachment is a screensaver. Full analysis is pending. Please exercise caution. Please shift-delete any suspicious e-mail messages. Please be very careful when using e-mail on your home PCs.

As always, please be careful when receiving unexpected messages from people you don't know, people you haven't heard from in a long time, blank senders, etc. Be particularly careful of any e-mail that contains an attachment that you did not expect to receive.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec  4 10:44:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB4Ii0e01057 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:44:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA29170 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:44:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB4IhN004702 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:43:23 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:43:23 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
The effect of Internet use on television viewership has been an often-debated topic over the past three years, and we've published articles on studies that examine every angle of the TV-Internet relationship on CyberAtlas. But it's not something we've touched on lately.

There are those studies that look for signs of convergence, who believe that as TV and the Internet become one device, we'll see an era of iTV ushered in, and this could be the future of the Internet. Others see the two media as opposites - with TV as the passive medium and the Internet as the responsive medium. Many of the early studies on the Internet-TV relationship were looking for signs of cannibalization, especially to examine whether advertisers should shift spending from the television to the Internet and follow the eyeballs if indeed that's where they were going.

The disparities among surveys on this topic show us there has been no mass movement away from one medium toward another:

* A February 2000 article found that people liked to use both the Internet
and TV simultaneously.

cyberatlas.com/big_picture/traffic_patterns/article/0,,5931_298551,00.html

* An October 1999 survey found the Internet wasn't impacting TV viewership.
cyberatlas.com/big_picture/traffic_patterns/article/0,,5931_214791,00.html

* A February 1999 article found Internet users watching less TV.
cyberatlas.com/big_picture/demographics/article/0,,5901_150391,00.html

* Finally, a November 2000 article found what is likely the most popular way people use the Internet and television, that is, they use them together.
cyberatlas.com/big_picture/traffic_patterns/article/0,,5931_516081,00.html

The UCLA Internet Report, which examines how the Internet impacts people's lives, also examined the TV-Internet relationship this year. Its report was released last week. (It's a 95-page PDF file, but those who want to download it can get it at http://www.ccp.ucla.edu/pages/internet-report.asp.)

The UCLA report found that Internet users more media in general than non-Internet users. But television is the only medium used more often by non-Internet users (used by 97.4 percent of Internet users and 97.7 percent of non-Internet users).

Radio, for example, is used by 91.6 percent of Internet users and 85.3 percent of non-Internet users. Internet users even read more (83.6 percent of Internet users vs. 74.1 percent of non-Internet users).

As far as using the Internet and watching television simultaneously is concerned, Internet users with five or more years online are more likely than Internet users with less than one year online to watch television while on the Internet.

But when it comes to the amount of time that Internet users and non-users spend with other media, the biggest gap is in TV viewing time. Internet users and non-users have access to television in almost equal numbers, but in both of the UCLA studies over the past two years, Internet users watch significantly less television than non-users. In the 2001 study, Internet users watched 4.5 hours per week less
television than non-users.

It's possible Internet users are finding the time to go online at the expense of television. But the UCLA study also examines social interaction (it's easier to watch TV with other people) and use of the Internet by children (especially for homework) as one of the reasons for declining TV viewership among Internet users.

http://cyberatlas.internet.com

From Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Tue Dec 4 11:04:56 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB4J4ue04239 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
11:04:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ddsmttayz003.sam.pentagon.mil (ddsmttayz003.sam.pentagon.mil
[140.185.1.132])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id LAA21872 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:04:55 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ddsmttayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <Y2FGH9KA>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:00:41 -0500
Message-ID:
    <F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBB0245E9228@dmsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R ,,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Announcement of DMDC survey specialist position(s)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:58:52 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

Reply to Tim Elig (see below)
Jim Caplan

Positions available, Arlington VA, Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC)

The Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) is the most comprehensive repository of personnel, manpower, training, and financial data in the Department of Defense. DMDC
conducts surveys in support of DoD management of a large and diverse employee population. Survey data are used for program evaluation purposes and to understand better the effects of policies and programs on various DoD populations, e.g., military members, spouses of military members, civilian employees, and retirees. Survey topics in the last five years have included compensation, sexual harassment, job satisfaction, racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, financial (banking) services, schools, career decisions, retention/separation, family benefits, family support, and other quality of life issues. DMDC is also initiating a new program of quarterly DoD employee surveys conducted via the Web. For further information on DMDC surveys please see http://www.dmdc.osd.mil/surveys/index.html

We have social science program specialist positions for project officers to work with internal DoD clients to design, plan, and analyze surveys. We contract out and monitor some design and analysis work. DMDC project officers write specifications for survey administration and monitor data collection operations performed under contract. Position(s) may also include an emphasis on survey database development and management. These jobs can be filled from junior to senior level, depending on background and experience.

DMDC’s Arlington office is convenient to public transportation (bus and rail) and is located across the Key bridge from the Georgetown section of Washington, DC. In addition, there is an excellent benefit program and heavy support for employee development activities.

Applications for first consideration are due no later than January 14, 2002. Applications after that date will be considered as vacancies occur. For information on qualifications and application procedures please visit http://www.usajobs.opm.gov/wfjic/jobs/XA1030.HTM

Timothy W. Elig, Ph.D.
Chief, Survey and Program Evaluation Division
Defense Manpower Data Center
1600 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22209-2593
703.696.5858 (DSN 426-5858)
eligtw@osd.pentagon.mil <mailto:eligtw@osd.pentagon.mil>
Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

******
Perhaps you're looking for a journal article with more specific findings, but I think Dillman would recommend doing all three of those. His several books (and his philosophy of the "total design method") would be worth investigating, if you haven't seen them. Fabulous stuff!

Ellis

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
> Of Christopher Fleury
> Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 9:15 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Research on Response Rates
> 
> We are looking for publications that explore the impact that certain
> types of package designs, incentives, and protocols have on mail
> survey response rates, especially on surveys of physicians.
> 
> Specifically, we are interested in learning if placing a stamp on the
> return envelope, as opposed to using a business reply envelope,
> increases response rates. Similarly, does including a dollar bill
> affect response rates? What about placing a phone call to the
> physician, informing him/her of the coming survey and urging him/her
> to complete it?
> 
> Any information on relevant research would be appreciated.
> 
>
Instead of the brothel metaphor, how about we just say that AAPORNENET is a petri dish?

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001, James Beniger wrote:
Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments.

Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

*******
Past research may not fully relate to the present climate of delays in mail delivery, receiving letters and opening mail. Issues such as the logo on an outside envelope, the nature of a return envelope, etc. may affect response rates in the present climate. For instance, it took me 11 days to receive an envelope from Philadelphia to Silver Spring, MD when the envelope had enough postage (but was delayed by going through the Trenton, NJ post office). Four days was expected, not 11 for the delivery.

Milton R. Goldsamt, Ph.D.
Research Statistician
U. S. Dept. of Justice
Washington, DC
miltgold@aol.com
Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically opening themselves – at least in my setup (outlook express) – tho my virus checker has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the instruction to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the viewer. This seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.

So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.

Rick Weil, LSU Sociology

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu> 
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM 
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim
This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0000_01C17CDD.4FD7BD80
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

This does not address the virus issue, but I'm interested in learning more about
spyware. I recently came across this free download that detects spyware on ones
system and allows you to delete it. The link below explains what spyware is and
does. Has anyone used this or have an opinion about it? (I installed it and
identified a large number of programs on my system that were collecting data and
sending it over the Internet without my knowledge.)

Ad-aware 5.62
Get rid of spyware now!
Download the most recent version of our award winning, free multi spyware removal utility.

More information and download: http://www.lavasoftusa.com/index.html

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.
2610 Woodley Place NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20008
202/ 347-8822
202/ 347-8825 FAX
mark@bisconti.com
This does not address the virus issue, but I'm interested in learning more about spyware.
I recently came across this free download that detects spyware on one's system and allows you to delete it. Has anyone used this or have an opinion about it? (I installed it and identified a large number of programs on my system that were collecting data and sending it over the Internet without my knowledge.)

Ad-aware 5.62

Get rid of spyware now!

Download the most recent version of our award winning, free multi-spyware removal utility.

More information and download:
http://www.lavasoftusa.com/index.html

Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist

Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.

2610 Woodley Place NW
At 03:05 PM 12/4/01 -0600, Rick Weil wrote:
>
> So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at
> least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If
> anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
>
> I've opted for years to use Eudora freeware. I'll admit, it is primitive
> compared to Outlook, but I've never had a problem that wasn't due to "user error"
> (technical term
> for "my own stupidity").

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
Jim Wolf                Jim-Wolf@att.net
>From paolo@survey.ucsb.edu Tue Dec  4 13:24:07 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
      id fB4LO6e00978 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:24:06 -0800
(PST)
Received: from isber.ucsb.edu (research.isber.ucsb.edu [128.111.147.5])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id NAA01360 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:24:05 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost ([127.0.0.1] helo=research.isber.ucsb.edu)
   by isber.ucsb.edu with esmtp (Exim 3.32 #6)
      id 16BN2R-000PxN-00; Tue, 04 Dec 2001 13:23:39 -0800
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:23:39 -0800 (PST)
From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@survey.ucsb.edu>
Sender: <paolo@isber.ucsb.edu>
To: Rick Weil <fweil@lapop.lsu.edu>
cc: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
In-Reply-To: <003a01c17d07$5f2f8f40$28132782@socl.lsu.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.BSF.4.33.0112041323110.96727-100000@isber.ucsb.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001, Rick Weil wrote:
>
> So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at
> least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If
> anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.

Easy: dump Microsoft "Lookout" and get a safer mailer

Cheers

--
Paolo A. Gardinali
Associate Director
UCSB Social Science Survey Center
http://www.survey.ucsb.edu
Folks,

The section of the reporting below which I have highlighted between two lines of ******* give a recent exception my own oft-repeated claim, posted here again just a short time ago, that one cannot be infected by a virus via simple email alone, but only by attachments. For those too rushed to read this in context, which makes it much easier to understand, I repeat it--entirely out of context--here:

* Kakworm made it possible for Internet users on Microsoft's Outlook or * Outlook Express with Internet Explorer 5 to become infected just by * viewing infected e-mail. Mr Hruska said that software patches * protecting against this infection were freely available online, but * Kakworm persisted because of the complacency of users in regularly * updating individual or corporate computer security.

If this makes little sense, starting from the very beginning of Bien Perez's report below ought to remedy the problem.  

-- Jim

--------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 -- South China Morning Post Publishers Ltd
--------------------
http://technology.scmp.com/ZZZAVPVCQUC.html
More viruses on the way

Demand for always-on Net access and lack of computer checks add to risk

BIEN PEREZ

Computer virus activity across the Asia-Pacific is forecast to rise next year as old strains continue to make their way through the Internet and new, mass-mailing mutations spread infection faster, according to industry experts.

Senior officials from anti-virus software makers Sophos and Symantec projected this yesterday amid efforts within their industry to tighten co-operation against destructive computer virus attacks.

"There is the potential for increased vulnerability in this region because of the growing demand for always-on, broadband Internet connection at home, where users do not always follow even the most basic precautions," said Sophos chief executive Jan Hruska.

He said lapses in computer security vigilance at home and in enterprises worldwide led to the continued proliferation of old virus strains.

Although this year saw a string of high-profile virus incidents, named after anything from tennis stars to soft drinks, researchers at Sophos found that Kakworm, a worm program first detected in 1999, was still the seventh most commonly encountered virus worldwide.

Kakworm made it possible for Internet users on Microsoft's Outlook or Outlook Express with Internet Explorer 5 to become infected just by viewing infected e-mail.

Mr Hruska said that software patches protecting against this infection were freely available online, but Kakworm persisted because of the complacency of users in regularly updating individual or corporate computer security.

Nimda, a hybrid Trojan horse/worm program, topped Sophos' ranking of the
world's 10
most detected viruses this year.

Sophos said Nimda's effectiveness came from its ability to infect computers using a
variety of techniques that used to be profiled separately as either a Trojan horse
or worm program characteristic.

David Banes, Symantec's Asia-Pacific security response manager, said Nimda and the
earlier-detected Code Red viruses made it likely that more multi-pronged virus
attacks would occur this year.

"Corporate networks and consumer systems are being compromised more frequently by
what we call blended Internet security threats.

"Nimda, the Code Red viruses and the Sircam worm showed how individual
security categories have merged and have the potential of mutating in the process," Mr
Banes said.

In their basic form, worms create exact copies of themselves and use communication
between computers to spread.

Trojan horses are programs that appear legitimate but carry a hidden, harmful
payload of functions, including spreading virus infection or allowing other computer
users to take control of another's computer over the Internet.

As an earlier form of hybrid virus, Sircam duped thousands of users into
double-clicking on infected e-mail attachments because it had the ability to change
the e-mail subject line each time it replicated.

Mr Hruska said all anti-virus vendors - whether focused on corporate or individual
security issues, or both - had been co-operating against virus incidents through a
system called Revs (rapid exchange of virus samples).

Formed last year with the help of The WildList Organisation International and
acknowledged as the world's main source of virus information, Revs allows an
anti-virus researcher to forward a secure copy of a virus to all anti-virus software
vendors within minutes of the virus being discovered.

Further developments in anti-virus software vendor co-operation and potential virus
threats are the main focus of the two-day Avar (Association of Anti-Virus
Asia Researchers) conference, which starts tomorrow in Hong Kong.

This is an annual event organised by Avar, an independent, non-profit association, since 1998, according to conference chairman Allan Dyer.

He said this year's conference was co-organised by the Information Security Special Interest Group of the Hong Kong Computer Society.

Avar features prominent experts on computer viruses from Australia, China, Hong Kong, India, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and the United States.

http://technology.scmp.com/ZZZAVPVCQUC.html

*******

>From HFienberg@stats.org Tue Dec  4 13:29:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB4LTJe01529 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:29:19 -0800 (PST)
Received: from cmpa01.workgroup (w042.z209220225.was-dc.dsl.cnc.net [209.220.225.42])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id NAA18711 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:29:18 -0800 (PST)
Received: by CMPA01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <X8NZ2RJJ>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:37:35 -0500
Message-ID: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E5B12028CMPA01>
From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: '"AAPORNET"' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:37:34 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.

If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier. Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:

WINDOWS 95/98/ME
Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the large
WINDOWS
startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize that you're in
Safe Mode
by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of the desktop.
Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER
Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER
Delete the following files (if they exist):

KERN32.EXE
KERNEL32.EXE
KDLL.DLL
HKSDLL.DLL

Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER

Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE
Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE
Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT
Click the (+) next to WINDOWS
Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION
Click RUNONCE

Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard

Restart the computer

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Rick
Weil
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically opening
themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus checker
has
stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the instruction to run the
virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the viewer. This seems to
be a new
escalation. You can filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard
to
filter
email from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.

So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at least in some
setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone knows how to
Deal with this, I for one would like to know.

Rick Weil, LSU Sociology

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

******

> From beth@schapiroresearchgroup.com Tue Dec  4 13:32:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
   id fB4LWKe01581 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:32:20 -0800 (PST)
Received: from imf13bis.bellsouth.net (mail213.mail.bellsouth.net
 [205.152.58.153])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
   id NAA21007 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:31:42 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from schapiroresearchgroup.com ([65.80.90.190])
   by imf13bis.bellsouth.net
We conducted a survey of teens on sex ed issues last year. I'd be happy to discuss methodology, etc. Call me at 404-584-5215. Beth Schapiro

Jennifer Franz wrote:

> We have been asked to include teens aged 13 to 19 in a telephone survey about domestic violence. Those 18 and 19 are no problem, but I recognize we need parental consent for those 13 to 17. Survey Sampling can only sell us samples of those 12 to 17 and 18 to 24. (We would usually get those 19 and 20 from the adult sample, but the questionnaires are slightly different.)
> We have never done this before. Does anyone have any models for screening for young people and getting parental consent? I'm looking for specific wording if possible, not being at all inclined with no experience to reinvent the wheel.
> Thanks!
> Jennifer D. Franz
> JD Franz Research, Inc.

--
Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
President
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, Suite 812
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
404-584-5215 (voice)
404-581-0058 (fax)
http://www.schapiroresearchgroup.com
Thanks, Rick—I just finished posting a news report from tomorrow (it comes from China) on the latest developments in protecting against the newest generation of viruses and worms. My own correction of my previous and standard AAPORNENET message can be found in it, which you have probably already seen, by the time I finish typing this line.

-- Jim

On Tue, 4 Dec 2001, Rick Weil wrote:

> Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically opening themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus checker has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the instruction to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the viewer. This seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.
>
> So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
>
> Rick Weil, LSU Sociology
>
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> To: "AAPORNENET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM
> Subject: AAPORNENET still up and running, despite virus
>
> Folks,
>
> This message is to reassure you that AAPORNENET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.
Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

******

Since several people have pointed that the best solution is to drop Microsoft Outlook or Microsoft generally I'd just like to say that it is easier said than done in many
organizations. While it is not my personal choice I do have to use it at work.

Don't forget it is possible to alter the security settings in Outlook so that it does not automatically open an attachment.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Dec  4 14:40:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB4Meie08878 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
14:40:44 -0800 (PST)
Received: from elf.soc.qc.edu (elf.soc.qc.edu [149.4.70.237])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id OAA13615 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:40:41 -0800 (PST)
Received: from troll.soc.qc.edu (troll [149.4.70.239])
   by elf.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA11275
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 17:37:29 -0500 (EST)
Received: from localhost (andy@localhost)
   by troll.soc.qc.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) with ESMTP id RAA11230
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 17:37:29 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 17:37:29 -0500 (EST)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.05.10112041735500.11192-100000@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear All:

For those running windows, I would suggest changing the view or options in Windows explorer to "show known file extensions."

By doing that you can tell if something maybe a virus. For instance, a file named:
   something.doc.pif
   something.txt.exe

If you hide know extensions you will only see doc or txt and not realize it is a virus.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge                 Home Office
209 Kissena Hall              50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology             Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY     Phone: 914-337-6237
On Tue, 4 Dec 2001, James Beniger wrote:

> 
> Folks,
> 
> This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running,
> despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from
> our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.
> 
> Information and Caution
> 
> You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from
> attachments.
> Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open
> attachments
> from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient
> safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also,
> do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which
> provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.
> 
> If it makes you feel any better...
> 
> To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and
> other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s:  Even nice
> people can catch VD (or a virus)!
> 
> -- Jim
> 
> *****
> 
>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec  4 16:17:49 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
    id fB50Hne18795 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
16:17:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
    id QAA27249 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:17:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
    id fB50HCK18235 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:17:12 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:17:12 -0800 (PST)
College-Survey Firm Quietly Peddles Student Information to Big Marketer

By DANIEL GOLDEN
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Each year, more than one million U.S. high-school students take time out of their school day to fill out a survey asking their names, addresses, grade-point averages, races, religions and social views. The organization that sponsors the survey, the National Research Center for College and University Admissions, tells the schools it will broaden students' higher-education options by distributing their names and profiles to hundreds of colleges and universities across the country.

But colleges aren't the only recipients of the survey results. Generally unknown to high schools, colleges, students and their parents, National Research for at least a decade has also sold the personal information it gathers to the country's leading supplier of young people's names to commercial marketers, American Student List LLC.

American Student List pays for the information by helping to fund the National Research survey. American Student List then sells student names and other information to companies that solicit students for a wide array of goods and services. Companies that buy student names from American Student List include shaving giant Gillette Co.; credit-card purveyors American Express Co. and Capital One Financial Corp.; Kaplan Inc., the Washington Post Co. unit that is the largest
admissions test-coaching chain; Primedia Inc.'s Seventeen Magazine; and Columbia
House Record Club, which is owned by AOL Time Warner Inc. and Sony Corp.

Huge Influence

From its base in Lee's Summit, Mo., National Research -- a little-known company
with just 30 employees -- has become a hugely influential force in a
burgeoning industry surrounding college admissions in which companies and colleges buy
names and detailed information about young people. Publicly presenting itself as a
service to students and colleges, National Research doesn't readily disclose its
role in helping commercial marketers pitch their products to an impressionable and
highly valued audience.

Marketers obtain teenagers' names and addresses from many other sources, such as
magazine-subscription lists and Web sites. What distinguishes National Research is
that it gathers student names in a classroom survey that many school officials
believe will be made available only to educational institutions, but which
then is sold to commercial marketers.

National Research has also made its presence widely felt as it competes with
the influential College Board to sell student information to colleges and as it lobbies
Congress to kill legislation that would restrict collection of some student information.

Many teachers and educational officials express anger and disbelief when
told that National Research sells student names to commercial marketers. "It's so
disgusting," says Barbara Henry, admissions director at Oglethorpe University in Atlanta, which
buys student information from National Research. "Everybody's upset when their
children are solicited" without parental approval.

http://interactive.wsj.com/articles/SB1007345870354311480.htm
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THE NATION

Recession Seeps Into the Corners

ECONOMY: UNLIKE THE SPOTTY NATURE OF PREVIOUS DOWNTURNS, THIS SLUMP HAS SPREAD EVENLY IN THE U.S., BIT BY BIT.

By WARREN VIETH and STEPHANIE SIMON
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

ST. LOUIS -- Long before the recession made its national debut, it paid an early visit last year to Elkhart, Ind., a little industrial city that lives at the cutting edge of U.S. economic cycles.

Weeks went by before the chill winds swept through St. Louis and Chicago, as demand
for a wide range of manufactured goods began to subside in late 2000. The downturn didn't arrive in Dallas until the spring of 2001, when the technology sector's travails descended on the city's "telecom corridor." It avoided Las Vegas altogether until Sept. 11, when the Strip suffered collateral damage from the attacks in New York and on the Pentagon.

A Wide Slump

This U.S. recession has struck virtually every region. Metropolitan areas with the biggest numerical job losses over the last 12 months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs lost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>58,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>38,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>27,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>27,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>27,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>17,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan, P.R.</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------

Note: Payroll jobs lost for the 12 months ending October 2001

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics

Many economists expect this recession to be relatively shallow. Even so, the scar it leaves will be unusually wide. Unlike previous downturns that walloped some regions and left others untouched, this one has advanced in waves, spreading its pain to virtually every city, state and region in America. "The defining characteristic of this recession is that it is so broad-based, across industries, across regions, across demographic groups and income groups," said Mark Zandi, chief economist with Economy.com in West Chester, Pa. "Everyone has been touched,
from the wealthiest to the poorest, from Boston to the Bay Area, from aerospace to the vehicle industry."

To some extent, the broad contours of the downturn reflect successful diversification campaigns.

"Regional economies look a lot more like each other today than 10, 20, 30 years ago," Zandi said. "We produce things now that have low transportation costs. You have chips in Phoenix, insurance in Des Moines, financial services in Jacksonville, [Fla.], credit cards in South Dakota. Businesses have set up shop everywhere."

That could prove beneficial if it deters migration of people and businesses from one region to another, as occurred in the early 1990s as Southern California lost people to places such as Seattle and Denver, and the early 1980s, when huge numbers left Detroit for Houston.

Last week, the recession-dating committee of the National Bureau of Economic Research announced that the current contraction began in March, the point at which national employment started to decline. But its roots go much further.

Early last year, rising interest rates and higher energy prices were beginning to cool an economy that had grown like gangbusters for seven years. The turning point was the bursting of the high-tech bubble in March 2000, which ended the investment euphoria surrounding dot-com ventures and dampened expectations about profit growth in other industries.

Signs of Slowdown in Fall of 2000

The first wave of the slowdown rolled out in the fall of 2000 as consumers cut back on discretionary spending and businesses stopped buying equipment and started liquidating inventories. The effect was concentrated in the industrial Midwest and South, where layoffs gradually spread through traditional sectors such as autos, steel, textiles, furniture, paper and chemicals. Detroit, St. Louis, Birmingham, Ala., and Jackson, Miss., were among the initial victims.

Probably nobody felt the pain sooner than the 43,627 residents of Elkhart,
where manufacturing accounts for more than 50% of the local job market.

Besides being the "band instrument capital of the world," Elkhart churns out more recreational vehicles and mobile homes than just about anyplace else in America. Those are the kinds of big-ticket items that people stop buying first when the economy turns bad.

The recession knocked on Elkhart's door a little more than a year ago.

"You had this company saying they were going to lay off 30 people and that company saying they would lay off 40. Then you would hear about another 50 or 60 jobs gone," said Jerry Quatman, president of the United Way of Elkhart County. "It's been a gradual thing."

Two years ago, union workers in Elkhart went on strike because they were being forced to work too much overtime. Today, they are lucky to log 30 hours on their weekly time cards, if they can find work at all.

"Production fell off the table," said Phil Harbert, regional president of 1st Source Bank in Elkhart. "There was a nervousness in the country about making big purchases."

The pink slips started to proliferate in September and October last year. Sixty workers at the Coachmen Industries RV plant. More than 100 at Gunite, where workers machine wheel assemblies for big trucks. Thirty or so at CTS Corp., which makes electrical components for cars and computers. The list continues to grow.

Elkhart's unemployment rate has more than doubled since the cycle began, from 2.4% in September 2000 to 5.7% last month. The number of homeless families has increased to 689 from fewer than 100, according to relief agencies.

"It's going to be a long, hard winter," said Chris Pollock of Heritage Group, an Elkhart financial services firm.

The second recessionary wave was caused by the virtual collapse of the nation's information, computer and telecommunications industries in early 2001. Their
rapid implosion clobbered technology-dependent metro areas such as San Jose, Portland, Ore., Boston, Austin, Texas, and Raleigh, N.C.

The tech downturn swept through the Dallas-Fort Worth area, where more than 600 telecommunications firms are clustered along U.S. 75 between Dallas and Richardson. Although the region is less reliant on technology than some others, the rout wiped out 15,000 jobs and pushed the local unemployment rate from 2.8% to 5.3%.

The layoffs began at telecom giants AT&T Corp., and MCI, progressed to Nokia Corp., Ericsson, Nortel Networks, Lucent Technologies, Texas Instruments Inc. and WorldCom Inc. and finally cascaded to a host of smaller start-ups and support companies.

"It was pretty swift," said Scott Grout, president of Chorum Technologies, a fiber-optics firm in Richardson that has weathered the storm.

The recession's final wave was unleashed by the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, which devastated the nation's transportation and tourism industries along with much of lower Manhattan.

Besides New York, the casualties included tourist hot spots such as Orlando, Fla., and Honolulu, airline hubs such as Fort Worth and Denver, cargo hubs such as Memphis, Tenn., and Louisville, Ky., and aircraft manufacturing sites such as Seattle and Wichita, Kan.

The mono-economy of Las Vegas felt the effect in spades. Air traffic dropped, casino revenues fell and hotel occupancy declined to about 50%. Hotels and casinos laid off or cut the hours of about 15,000 workers.

"We were just standing around doing nothing," said David Fusaro, a bellman at the Paris hotel-casino. "A lot of people became really concerned for their jobs."

Altogether, the attacks have cost Las Vegas an estimated $20 million a day in lost revenues. While the visitor count has begun to recover in response to big reductions in room rates, it remains far below normal.
"Never before has this city taken such an economic hit," said Keith Schwer, director of the Business and Economic Research Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Besides the direct damage to travel and tourism, the shock of Sept. 11 has caused consumers to curtail their spending even more, leading to another round of production and employment cuts among traditional manufacturers.

Some metropolitan areas, such as Chicago, Nashville and Los Angeles, have been touched by more than one recessionary wave. In some cases, the cumulative damage has been substantial.

In Chicago, employment declined in the fall and winter of 2000, recovered in early 2001 and then took big hits in June and September. By October, its 12-month job losses totaled 27,700, exceeded only by New York and Detroit.

"Chicago typifies what's happened to this economy," said Zandi, whose firm specializes in regional analyses. "It got pulled down notch by notch. Now it's in a full-blown recession."

Atlanta, which shed 27,100 jobs over the last year, is not far behind. The city's technology industry took a big hit in the spring, and its transportation and tourism sectors suffered after Sept. 11. Delta Air Lines alone has cut 3,500 positions.

Portland, with its heavy concentration of high-tech employers, was hurt badly by this year's tech meltdown. But the first signs of trouble actually appeared in mid-2000, when the Northwest's aluminum industry was jolted by electricity price spikes and Freightliner, a big truck manufacturer, began laying off employees.

Recession Felt Before Announcement

By the time the National Bureau of Economic Research got around to certifying the recession, 263 of the nation's 331 metropolitan areas were recording higher jobless rates than a year earlier. Unemployment rose in all but one of the 50 biggest metropolitan areas. The largest increase was recorded in San Jose, where the technology bust boosted the jobless rate from 1.6% in October 2000 to 6.4% last month.
In a report issued last week, all 12 of the Federal Reserve's district banks cited signs of widespread economic weakness in October and early November: Attendance at a North Carolina furniture expo was down 30%. West Coast home builders reported cancellation rates of 20% to 40%. A car rental firm in South Florida filed for bankruptcy protection. Traffic at a Montana airport fell to a 20-year low. A wood products plant in Wisconsin shut down. The Gulf Coast drilling rig count plummeted. Layoffs, furloughs and pay freezes were prevalent from coast to coast.

The egalitarian nature of this recession contrasts with the slumps of the mid-1970s and of 1980-82, which were caused in large part by higher energy prices that dealt a heavy blow to the industrial Midwest but boosted the fortunes of states with oil and gas production. Similarly, the recession of 1990-91, which featured overbuilt real estate markets and shrinking aerospace and defense work, hurt California and the Northeast but left the Mountain and Southwest states largely unaffected.

This time, Zandi said, "we're all sharing in the pain, and no one's bearing the preponderance of the suffering."

------
Vieth reported from Washington and Simon from St. Louis. Times staff writer Tom Gorman in Las Vegas and researchers Edith Stanley in Atlanta, Lianne Hart in Houston, Lynn Marshall in Seattle and John Beckham in Chicago contributed to this report.
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******
You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments.
Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

A couple more pieces of advice:

1) don't put distribution lists like AAPORNET on your senders' list

2) get another mailer, one which is designed to counter these attacks. I have used The Bat! for several months with great success

http://circum.com/cgi/nouveautes.cgi?type=exact&an=2001&mois=09&jour=16&lang=a

Benoît Gauthier, mailto:gauthier@circum.com
I'm really tempted to say something about Outlook and recent computer viruses, but Microsoft has far better attorneys than I can afford, and so I won't. "Coincidence" is just another name for never having to say "null hypothesis rejected," I suppose.

-- Jim
Email virus 'worse than lovebug'

Anti-virus company MessageLabs says the Goner computer virus is spreading almost as fast as the lovebug virus.

The company's anti-virus technologist, Alex Shipp, said the company saw 32,500 copies of the email screensaver stopped around the world.

The email causes disruption through Microsoft Outlook and has a message which reads: "When I saw this screensaver I thought of you."

Alex Shipp said the first copy they saw was from the US but added it may have originated in Europe.

He said: "We have seen it coming from lots of companies in the UK and a lot of big ones have been badly affected."

He said the cost to affected companies will be big because the email removes anti-virus software which will have to be replaced.

Mr Shipp added the virus got a hold before software picked it up.

He said: "It will be really big for the rest of today and perhaps for tomorrow, and then it will be over."

-------
Story filed: 20:38 Tuesday 4th December 2001


-----
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>From edithl@xs4all.nl Wed Dec  5 02:54:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB5AsHe05929 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
02:54:17 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtpzilla3.xs4all.nl (smtpzilla3.xs4all.nl [194.109.127.139])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id CAA06013 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 02:54:17 -0800
(PST)
Received: from hera.xs4all.nl (s340-isdn370.dial.xs4all.nl [194.109.181.114])
Try Eudora-pro: You pay a little bit and get a lot of Nice features (not primitive at all) Eudora is not in fashion and not easy for virus-designers!
Microsoft outlook is far too easy to tamper with, a five year old can make a virus for outlook

Take care, and do not forget to update all your virusscanners.

With warm greetings, from cold and windy Amsterdam,
Edith

p.s. I do not have shares or are related to any computer or software company

At 04:16 PM 12/4/01 -0500, you wrote:
> At 03:05 PM 12/4/01 -0600, Rick Weil wrote:
> >
> > >So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at
> > >least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If
> > >anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
> > >
> >
> >I've opted for years to use Eudora freeware. I'll admit, it is
>primitive compared to Outlook, but I've never had a problem that wasn't
>due to "user error" (technical term for "my own stupidity").
>>
>>
>=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
>Jim Wolf        Jim-Wolf@att.net

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel/fax + 31 20 622 34 38  e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl
========================================================================
You are a child of the universe,
No less than the trees and the stars

>From jwerner@jwp.com Wed Dec 5 04:01:46 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB5C1je07286 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
04:01:45 -0800
This is very dangerous advice indeed!!!

People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament are also the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus makers count on.

If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in a command-line environment.

Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who does this regularly.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Howard Fienberg wrote:
>
> I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.
>>
> If you have virus protection software that didn’t intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier. Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:
>>
> WINDOWS 95/98/ME
> Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the
> large WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can
> recognize that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4
> corners of the desktop. Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER
> Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)
> Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER
> Delete the following files (if they exist):
> KERN32.EXE
> KERNEL32.EXE
> KDLL.DLL
> HKSDLL.DLL
> Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER
> Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE
> Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE
> Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT
> Click the (+) next to WINDOWS
> Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION
> Click RUNONCE
> Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard
> Restart the computer
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
> On Behalf Of Rick Weil
> Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
> Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically
> opening themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my
> virus checker has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain
> the instruction to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the
> email in the viewer. This seems to be a new escalation. You can
> filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard to filter email
> from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.
> So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at
> least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If
> anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
> Rick Weil, LSU Sociology
>
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments.

Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is
mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base. (The product description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky

****************************************
Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when either you or your answering machine answers the phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected.

Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your adapter. It's that simple. The
Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.

Mike Agar did some ethnographic interviews with truck drivers and wrote a book about it years ago. He used to be at the University of Maryland in the Sociology Dept. But, I'm not sure if he is still there. Also, he was teaching at the Summer Institute at Univ of Michigan.

Anyway, he lives in Takoma Park, Maryland and may be interesting to talk to about your project.

Kate Stewart
Partner
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street, NW
Suite 700
> Fellow 'netters:
> We're being asked by a client if we could develop a survey of truck drivers
> in our state, including out-of-state drivers who use our highways. We want
> to ask them about their experience with weigh stations and enforcement
> of load restrictions and the like.
> Anyone have a suggestion on successful ways to accomplish such a task? We are uncertain as to mode or sampling approach and want to
> hear the experiences of others. We've discussed mail-outs, telephone, and various forms of intercept. We are certain that there are
> companies out there that do serious research on this occupational group . . . how
do they do it?
> Kindly send your advice to me off-list.
> Tom
>
> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
> NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
> University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
> P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
> Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
>
>From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Wed Dec  5 07:52:51 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB5Fqpe19678 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
07:52:51 -0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-r07.mx.aol.com (imo-r07.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.103])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA05446 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 07:52:51 -0800
(PST)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
   by imo-r07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.179.3d46c2 (3973)
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:52:28 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <179.3d46c2.293f9cbc@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:52:28 EST
Subject: Research on Research
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_179.3d46c2.293f9cbc_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118
We all face the challenge of declining response rates and this board has entertained a number of threads on the pitfalls of doing what's easiest rather than what's best.

I've been asked to consider heading up an industry team of thinkers to produce a white paper on research methods and what field methods produce the "best" response. Part of the job is to define what "best" means, part is to evaluate a priori what field methods should be included in a test, or rejected as unsuitable, and part is to actually run a test using multiple methods of contact to compare response rates and the quality of response.

I'm looking for your thoughts, warnings, ideas. Respond to me privately, if you like.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines 515.271.5700
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
Greetings,
I regret very much that SRC of UMD is closing!
As an alumnus of SRC research staff, I would miss much of great
survey methods works SRC has done!

Hope some publicly available SRC data would remain in the data archive
like ICPSR.

Recalling pleasant memory of SRC,

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist,  ychun@AIR.org
American Institutes for Research  http://www.air.org
"More than 50 years of behavioral and social science research"
1000 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 944-5325

-----Original Message-----
From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu [mailto:jblair@srcmail.umd.edu]
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2001 9:24 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Center closing

The University of Maryland, College Park, has made a decision to close the Survey
Research Center. The Center which was established twenty years ago will cease operations on or about February 28, 2002.
I am going to go way out on a limb here and say "It depends."

How does the National Research Center for College and University Admissions tell the students and the high schools how the data will be used?

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
> Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 7:17 PM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: Something for AAPOR's Standards Committee to Consider?
> 
> --------------------------------------------------------------
> ------------
>       Copyright 2001 The Wall Street Journal (WSJ.com OpinionJournal)
> --------------------------------------------------------------
> http://interactive.wsj.com/articles/SB1007345870354311480.htm
> 
> December 3, 2001
>
> College-Survey Firm Quietly Peddles
> Student Information to Big Marketer
>
> By DANIEL GOLDEN
> Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
Each year, more than one million U.S. high-school students take time out of their school day to fill out a survey asking their names, addresses, grade-point averages, races, religions and social views. The organization that sponsors the survey, the National Research Center for College and University Admissions, tells the schools it will broaden students' higher-education options by distributing their names and profiles to hundreds of colleges and universities across the country.

But colleges aren't the only recipients of the survey results. Generally unknown to high schools, colleges, students and their parents, National Research for at least a decade has also sold the personal information it gathers to the country's leading supplier of young people's names to commercial marketers, American Student List LLC.

American Student List pays for the information by helping to fund the National Research survey. American Student List then sells student names and other information to companies that solicit students for a wide array of goods and services. Companies that buy student names from American Student List include shaving giant Gillette Co.; credit-card purveyors American Express Co. and Capital One Financial Corp.; Kaplan Inc., the Washington Post Co. unit that is the largest admissions test-coaching chain; Primedia Inc.'s Seventeen Magazine; and Columbia House Record Club, which is owned by AOL Time Warner Inc.

Huge Influence

From its base in Lee's Summit, Mo., National Research -- a little-known company with just 30 employees -- has become a hugely influential force in a burgeoning industry surrounding college admissions in which companies and colleges buy names and detailed information about young people. Publicly presenting itself as a service to students and colleges, National Research doesn't readily disclose its role in helping commercial marketers pitch their products to an impressionable and highly valued audience.

Marketers obtain teenagers' names and addresses from many other sources, such as magazine-subscription lists and Web sites. What distinguishes National Research is that it gathers student names in a classroom survey that many school officials believe will be made available only to educational institutions, but which then is sold to commercial marketers.

National Research has also made its presence widely felt as
it competes with the influential College Board to sell student information to colleges and as it lobbies Congress to kill legislation that would restrict collection of some student information.

Many teachers and educational officials express anger and disbelief when told that National Research sells student names to commercial marketers. "It's so disgusting," says Barbara Henry, admissions director at Oglethorpe University in Atlanta, which buys student information from National Research. "Everybody's upset when their children are solicited" without parental approval.

http://interactive.wsj.com/articles/SB1007345870354311480.htm

Copyright 2001 The Wall Street Journal (WSJ.com OpinionJournal)

I've done some cursory research and the Telezapper would indeed, if widely adopted, have a skewing effect. What skew is unclear though. There was a some research presented at last year's AAPOR conference showing that the populations which use
screening devices range throughout demo, age, income and geographic characteristics. The skew would likely not be income only. Have you seen the upswing in TV ads for the Telezapper this month?

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
humanvoice, inc.
2155 North Freedom Blvd.
Provo, Utah 84601
p: +1 801 344 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008
e: kfeld@humanvoice.com

Karl's next speaking engagement is ESOMAR Net Effects 5 in Berlin, Germany on February 3-5. Learn more at http://www.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm

-----Original Message-----
From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: TeleZapper

Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a TeleZapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base. (The product description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky
****************************************
Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat
your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's
how it works: Knowing that more
than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with
computer assistance, when
the Telezapper emits a
special tone that tells the computer your number has
been permanently disconnected.
Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing
systems typically remove
callers are unaffected, but as
your phone number is eliminated from more and more
telemarketing lists, telemarketers
will simply stop calling.
Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper
into your
phone line and your
adapter. It's
that simple. The
Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter,
instructions, and a one-year
warranty.
From: Susan Losh <slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu>  
Subject: Re: Paranoid & happier safe than sorry

You can not only set your email package not to open attachments automatically.
You can also set it so that you must manually open the email itself. For example, some packages will automatically open the next email after the one that you just deleted. Reset the options so that you must open the next email yourself.

If I see something coming in with an attachment under the circumstances discussed on list earlier, I just delete the entire email without opening it.

Susan

At 01:36 PM 12/4/2001 -0800, you wrote:

> > Thanks, Rick--I just finished posting a news report from tomorrow (it comes from China) on the latest developments in protecting against the newest generation of viruses and worms. My own correction of my previous and standard AAPORNET message can be found in it, which you have probably already seen, by the time I finish typing this line.
> >
> > -- Jim
> >
> >
> >On Tue, 4 Dec 2001, Rick Weil wrote:
> >
> >> Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically opening themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus checker has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the instruction to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the viewer. This seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.
> >>
> >> So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
> >>
> >> Rick Weil, LSU Sociology
> >
Susan Carol Losh, PhD  
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh//Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research  
307L Stone Building  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453
Hi Joanne - This sounds interesting and challenging -- and useful!  

I'd like to make sure that issues related to accessibility of survey methods for people with various disabilities be considered, both in terms of maximizing response rates, and in terms of how to count non-responses that result from lack of attention to accessibility of the survey technique to the particular type of impairment someone might have, e.g., hard of hearing persons receiving telephone contacts, visually impaired persons receiving print or some internet-based contacts, and so on.
Let me know if I can be of assistance in pursuing that angle.

Sincerely,

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation
American Foundation for the Blind - 212-502-7640

Visit <a href="http://www.afb.org/" eudora="autourl">www.afb.org</a>

At 10:52 AM 12/05/2001 -0500, you wrote:

We all face the challenge of declining response rates and this board has entertained a number of threads on the pitfalls of doing what's easiest rather than what's best.

I've been asked to consider heading up an industry team of thinkers to produce a white paper on research methods and what field methods produce the "best" response. Part of the job is to define what "best" means, part is to evaluate a priori what field methods should be included in a test, or rejected as unsuitable, and part is to actually run a test using multiple methods of contact to compare response rates and the quality of response.

I'm looking for your thoughts, warnings, ideas.

Respond to me privately, if you like.

JAS
J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
515.271.5700
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 5 08:31:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB5GVMe29806 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:31:22 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id IAA08003 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:31:23 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB5GUjo04292 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:30:45 -0800 (PST)
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:30:45 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: New York Times finds AAPORNET virus/worm news fit to print
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112050828010.3005-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
A new malicious computer virus named Goner began making the rounds of the online world yesterday like an Internet IQ test. Anyone who has not learned the most important computer security message of the last two years -- do not open any unexpected files that come attached to e-mail messages -- ends up infecting the computer.

Once installed, the Goner program -- technically known as a worm -- looks for and deletes a number of programs, including Internet security programs like ZoneAlarm. If the victim uses the Microsoft Outlook e-mail program, Goner sends itself to those in the e-mail address book. It can also be spread through ICQ, an Internet instant-message system.

Like several predecessors, the new virus spread quickly, affecting companies and individuals using Microsoft Outlook, according to experts at several computer security companies. One, Network Associates, said customers had reported more than 100,000 infected machines.

Because it is new, Goner is not automatically blocked by many security screens looking for features of older viruses. Most antivirus companies had patches ready yesterday.

The program arrives in an e-mail message that says, "When I saw this screen saver, I immediately thought about you," and, "I am in a harry [sic], I promise you will love it!" The file attached to the message is named "Gone.scr."
"If that doesn't look like a virus, nothing does," scoffed David M. Perry, the global director of education for Trend Micro (news/quote), a computer security company based in Tokyo. Despite extensive warnings, he said, people still open unexpected attachments. "They call and say, 'I downloaded it and I clicked on it -- what should I have seen?'"

"'Your pink slip,' " he explained in a mock response, "'because you're an idiot.'"

http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/05/technology/05VIRU.html

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

*****

>From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Wed Dec  5 09:12:55 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fB5HCte02822 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
09:12:55 -0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-r04.mx.aol.com (imo-r04.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.100])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id JAA14844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:12:55 -0800 (PST)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
  by imo-r04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.27.1f33e470 (3973)
  for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 12:12:21 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <27.1f33e470.293faf75@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 12:12:21 EST
Subject: Re: Research on Research
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
  boundary="part1_27.1f33e470.293faf75_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

--part1_27.1f33e470.293faf75_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Great list of concerns. Thanks! JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
Great list of concerns.

Thanks!

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines

Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
SACRAMENTO -- The birth records of more than 24 million Californians have been sold by the state and posted on the Internet, offering easy access to critical information needed to create fake identities.

By logging onto a genealogy Web site, people can gain access to such personal data as someone's place of birth and mother's maiden name, which can then potentially be used to access bank records and other sensitive material.

While the sale of the database was legal, a leading state senator and expert on privacy said Wednesday that she was "appalled" by the news and wanted to find ways to restrict access to such information.

"The time has come for us to recognize that identity theft has become a big problem," said state Sen. Jackie Speier, D-San Mateo. "The fact that this information is public should raise a red flag."

The ongoing war on terrorism has sparked a renewed nationwide debate over how to balance personal privacy and national security. Since the Sept. 11 attacks, experts from Washington to San Jose have been discussing everything from a national identity card to extensive background checks for people who buy airline tickets.

Concerns about false IDs were heightened by news that several of the alleged Sept. 11 hijackers were able to get fake driver's licenses in Florida and Virginia. Several states have already started to tighten rules for getting driver's licenses.

At a special hearing Wednesday on privacy, state leaders demonstrated how easy it is to get the building blocks for identity theft. Using the free genealogy Web site with the California birth information, a legislative aide typed in the name of California Attorney General Bill Lockyer and quickly came up with his
mother's maiden name, along with the date and county of his birth.

That could provide a thief with enough information to check Lockyer's bank accounts or get a new birth certificate, Speier said. In most cases, however, a person would need at least one other piece of information -- such as a bank account number or Social Security number -- to access a financial account.

Under current law, California sells birth and death records. The site, Rootsweb.com, claims to be the oldest and largest free genealogy Web site. The site lists 24.5 million California birth records and 9 million death records from the state.

One other state, Texas, has provided similar information to the company.

Lea Brooks, a spokeswoman for the state Department of Health Services, said birth records from 1909 to 1995 sell for about $900 and that just two people had bought the information in the past year. She could not identify the buyers.

California is one of just a few states that make birth certificates easily available, one privacy expert said.

Making it more difficult to get that information seems both reasonable and necessary, said Jamie Love, director of the Consumer Project on Technology, a Washington, D.C.-based privacy protection group created by Ralph Nader.

``If identity theft wasn't a problem, this wouldn't be a problem,'' he said.
``But, given the limited number of data points that banks and other institutions ask for before they grant access to your information, it seems like this creates a problem.''

Not everyone was as concerned about the database.

State Sen. Debra Bowen, a Redondo Beach Democrat and member of the Senate Privacy Committee, said there was little evidence to suggest that thieves are taking such information to create fake identities.

Bowen said that the Internet site contains only basic information and that anyone can legally get any California birth certificate across the state.
Unless you can answer the question that crooks are going down to get the birth certificate and using that fraudulently, what’s the problem?’ she asked.

Hi Kate:
Thanks for the great lead!

Tom

cc: Dave Hartman, CSR

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:03:26 -0500 Kate Stewart <katestewart@brspoll.com> wrote:

> Mike Agar did some ethnographic interviews with truck drivers and wrote a book about it years ago. He used to be at the University of Maryland in the Sociology Dept. But, I'm not sure if he is still there. Also, he was teaching at the Summer Institute at Univ of Michigan.
>
> Anyway, he lives in Takoma Park, Maryland and may be interesting to talk to about your project.
Fellow 'netters:

We're being asked by a client if we could develop a survey of truck drivers in our state, including out-of-state drivers who use our highways. We want to ask them about their experience with weigh stations and enforcement of load restrictions and the like. Anyone have a suggestion on successful ways to accomplish such a task? We are uncertain as to mode or sampling approach and want to hear the experiences of others. We've discussed mail-outs, telephone, and various forms of intercept. We are certain that there are companies out there that do serious research on this occupational group . . . how do they do it?

Kindly send your advice to me off-list.
FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to see if it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work. PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: TeleZapper

Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base. (The product description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could it skew
Phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky

************************************************

Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected.

Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your phone into the Telezapper and then connect the AC adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.

>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Wed Dec 5 15:58:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB5Nwce08869 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
    15:58:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id PAA17886 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:58:30 -0800
(PST)
From: tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Thanks to the multitude of folks who responded to my query about how to survey truckers. Some of you, it turns out, have spent time at truck stops and rest areas carefully sampling from among this group. Others had some very creative ideas on other ways to find 'em, or knew folks who would know how. Thanks to all who responded.

Our current plan is to do an intercept at weigh stations to which we will have access; truckers would be handed a self-administered mail-back questionnaire as they stop their rigs to be weighed. Drawback: this works only on the old-fashioned scales, not on the new 'weigh-in-motion' scales. And: no follow-up reminders would be possible. We may do some on-site interviews at truck stops for exploratory interviews in advance, and for tests of the self-administered instrument.

One consistent piece of advice we got that I'm sure you'll all appreciate: whether at the rest area or at the truck stop, never attempt the intercept when the trucker is on the way IN to the restroom . . .

We'll be following up on some of our many new leads from our AAPORnet colleagues and will most probably improve on this initial design.

Again, thanks to all, and keep on truckin'.

Tom

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE  CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research                  FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia       EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767                                      Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767        e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu
On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

> FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to
> see if it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to
> work. PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to
do if the TeleZapper did indeed `zap' calls placed by your dialer.

-- Jim

********

-----Original Message-----
> From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: TeleZapper
>
> Greetings List,
>
> Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who
> is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a TeleZapper. Its a small,
> $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal
> RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing
> the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base.
> (The product description is below.)
>
> After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it
> worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes
> popular, could it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it
> would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated
> households? Any thoughts aapornet?
>
> -Sarah Zapolsky
> ****************************************
> Product Description
> When you've had your dinner interrupted by a
> telemarketer one too many times, treat
> your phone line and yourself to the TeleZapper.
> Here's how it works: Knowing that more
than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected. Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your phone into the Telezapper and then connect the AC adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.
Jim,

I cannot speak for the management of our survey center operations, but I would suspect they would have worked on (and successfully found) a technological solution to circumvent the TeleZapper workings if in fact the device had been able to screen calls placed by our dialer. We also would have looked into setting up a means (e.g., new disposition code) to track the outcome of dialings that appeared to be "zapped" so as to start to understanding the prevalence of the technology and its possible effects in our large national RDD samples.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 10:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

> FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to
> see
> if
> it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work.
> PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to do if the TeleZapper did indeed `zap' calls placed by your dialer.

-- Jim

******

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: TeleZapper
>
Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base.

(The product description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky

Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when either you or your answering machine answers the phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected. Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.

From mikemassaglia@mediaone.net Thu Dec 6 06:30:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fB6EUve26481 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
On a different note, there may be simple things that one can do to thwart the inadvertent spread of these viruses, even if you fail to protect yourself from receiving them. A PCWorld tip from not too long ago suggested that creating a bad address at the beginning of your address book would help, e.g. in Outlook Express you could create a new contact called: *virustrap, with the e-mail address: <nogoodaddress

This contact would be the first in your address book, and the virus or worm that inserts it in a mailing list will supposedly fail to spread itself because of the error in the e-mail syntax.

Anyone know if this works? Or have alternative suggestions?

+++++++++++++++++
Mike Massagli
mikemassagli@mediaone.net
+++++++++++++++++
This is very dangerous advice indeed!!!

People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament are also the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus makers count on.

If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in a command-line environment.

Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who does this regularly.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
_____________________

Howard Fienberg wrote:

> I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.

> If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier. Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:

> Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the large WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of the desktop.
> Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER
> Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)
> Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER Delete the following files (if they exist):
> KERN32.EXE
> KERNEL32.EXE
> KDLL.DLL
> HKSDL.DLL
> Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER
> Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE
> Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE
> > Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT
> > Click the (+) next to WINDOWS
> > Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION
> > Click RUNONCE
> > Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard
> > Restart the computer
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
> > On Behalf Of Rick Weil
> > Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
> > To: AAPORNET
> > Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
> > Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically
> > opening
> > themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus
> > checker
> > has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the
> > instruction
to
> > run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the
> > viewer.
This
> > seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or disable html,
> > of course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly
> > sources, which
> > is
> > how these viruses travel.
> > So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at
> > least
> > in
> > some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone
> > knows
> > how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
> > Rick Weil, LSU Sociology
> >
> > ----- Original Message -----
> > From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> > To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM
> > Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
> > Folks,
> > This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running,
> > despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from
> > our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.
Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments.
Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

******

> From Norman_Trussell@tvratings.com Thu Dec  6 06:33:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB6EXJe27030 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
06:33:19 -0800 (PST)
Received: from scf-fs.usc.edu (root@scf-fs.usc.edu [128.125.253.183])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA07994 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:33:18 -0800
(PST)
Received: from reliant.nielsenmedia.com (endeavor.nielsenmedia.com
[63.114.249.68])
   by scf-fs.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB6EKsm21661 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:20:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com (nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com
[10.9.11.119])
   by reliant.nielsenmedia.com (8.11.5/8.11.5) with ESMTP id fB6EKSR02965
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:28 -0500 (EST)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com (unverified) by
nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com (Content Technologies SMTPRS 4.2.5) with ESMTP
id <T57a7dcd3820a090b778e8@nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:21 -0500
Received: by nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
   id <XZZF4BJS>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:25 -0500
Message-ID: <0BC5187E59E2D411A81000508BB09569E43742@nmrusdunsx6.nielsenmedia.com>
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman_Trussell@tvratings.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: TeleZapper
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:20:24 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

I am reposting this earlier message that has a good work around to counteract the
TeleZapper if it had proved effective.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kay, Ward (NIAAA) [mailto:wkay@mail.nih.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2001 9:52 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper call blocking device

While this device may make life difficult, it could have been worse. The solution
for this device is a hand dial of all disconnected numbers to verify that they
are disconnected. Not a bad waste of time and the number can be detected early in the
interview period and put into a special pool of hand dialed numbers. Imagine if the
product sent a busy signal instead. You'd get a much larger pool of numbers to verify
and you may not check them until late in the interviewing period. Anyone using
predictive dialers for interviewing need to self-test the connect time. I know that
I am not alone in hanging up if I say "Hello" and there is dead air before a person answers.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 6:59 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Jim,

I cannot speak for the management of our survey center operations, but I would
suspect they would have worked on (and sucessfully found) a technological solution to
circumvent the TeleZapper workings if in fact the device had been able to screen
calls placed by our dialer. We also would have looked into setting up a means
(e.g., new disposition code) to track the outcome of dialings that appeared to be
"zapped"
so as to start to understanding the prevalence of the technology and its possible
effects in our large national RDD samples.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 10:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

>FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to see
>it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work.
>PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to do if the TeleZapper did indeed `zap' calls placed by your dialer.

******

-- Jim

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: TeleZapper
>
> Greetings List,
> Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who
> is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small,
> $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal
> RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing
> the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base.
> (The product
> description is below.)
> After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked
> on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could
> it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely
> be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts
Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when either you or your answering machine answers the phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected. Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your phone into the Telezapper and then connect the AC adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.

From wilson@roanoke.edu Thu Dec  6 06:47:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fB6El4e28058 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:47:04 -0800 (PST)
Received: from penguin.roanoke.edu (IDENT:root@penguin.roanoke.edu [199.111.154.8]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA15715 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:47:02 -0800 (PST)
Received: from roanoke.edu (152-89.roanoke.edu [199.111.152.89]) by penguin.roanoke.edu (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTP id fB6Ee14e28058 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:46:28 -0500
Message-ID: <3C0F8267.C8CDC959@roanoke.edu>
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2001 09:36:23 -0500
From: Harry Wilson <wilson@roanoke.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
I contacted the College IT "guru" who suggested installing Norton Antivirus 2002. As far as I know he has no proprietary interest in the product, so I plan to heed his advice. We don't run Outlook at the College, but I do at home.

Harry Wilson

"Michael P. Massaglia" wrote:

> On a different note, there may be simple things that one can do to thwart the inadvertent spread of these viruses, even if you fail to protect yourself from receiving them. A PCWorld tip from not too long ago suggested that creating a bad address at the beginning of your address book would help,
> e.g. in Outlook Express you could create a new contact called:
> *virus*trap, with the e-mail address: <nogoodaddress
> This contact would be the first in your address book, and the virus or worm that inserts it in a mailing list will supposedly fail to spread itself because of the error in the e-mail syntax.
> Anyone know if this works? Or have alternative suggestions?
>
> ++++++++++++++
> Mike Massaglia
> mikemassaglia@mediaone.net
> ++++++++++++++
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:01 AM
> Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus 
> 
> >> This is very dangerous advice indeed!!
> >> People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament are also the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus makers count on.
> >> If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in a command-line environment.
Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who does this regularly.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Howard Fienberg wrote:

I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.

If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier. Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:

WINDOWS 95/98/ME

Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the large WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of the desktop.

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER
Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER Delete the following files (if they exist):
KERN32.EXE
KERNEL32.EXE
KDLL.DLL
HKSDL.DLL

Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER
Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE
Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE
Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT
Click the (+) next to WINDOWS
Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION
Click RUNONCE
Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard
Restart the computer

-----Original Message-----
Rick Weil, LSU Sociology

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu> 
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM 
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus 

Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. 

Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments).

Also,
do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely. If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

*****

> > >   do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely. If it makes you feel any better...
> > >   To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!
> > >   -- Jim
> > >   ******
> > >
> > From efreelan@Princeton.EDU Thu Dec  6 07:00:01 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fB6F00ee28991 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 07:00:00 -0800 (PST)
> Received: from Princeton.EDU (postoffice.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.120]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id GAA22034 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:59:59 -0800 (PST)
> Received: from smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (mail.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.14]) by Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA18366 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:59:41 -0500 (EST)
> Received: from princeton.edu (wws-lq71j01.Princeton.EDU [128.112.150.51]) by smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA09093 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:59:40 -0500 (EST)
> Message-ID: <3COF87DA.B26FF9C1@princeton.edu>
> Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2001 09:59:38 -0500
> From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@Princeton.EDU>
> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
> X-Accept-Language: en
> MIME-Version: 1.0
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: TeleZapper
> References: <0BC5187E59E2D411A81000508BB09569E43742@nmrusdunsx6.nielsenmedia.com>
> Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----------
> 70ABDDB9D76A3013C4ED28D"
> This is a multi-part message in MIME format. ----------
> 70ABDDB9D76A3013C4ED28D
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
> There are two issues here:
> 1. Does telezapper only affect calls placed through a predictive dialer?
> 2. Does telezapper use caller id to trigger a disconnect tone to non-identified calls?
If the answer to the first question is Yes, you only need to worry if you are using a predictive dialing system. We use autodialers here, but all our calls are "live" and dialed one at a time.

If the answer to the second question is Yes, then you need to make sure your long-distance carrier is properly signalling the identity of all your outbound calls. We think (hope?) we've been able to get our carrier to consistently identify us as "Princeton Univ. 609-258-3000", which has significantly improved our response rates. However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its sub-carriers will do the same.

Ed

"Trussell, Norman" wrote:

> I am reposting this earlier message that has a good work around to counteract the Telezapper if it had proved effective.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Kay, Ward (NIAAA) [mailto:wkay@mail.nih.gov]
> Sent: Monday, September 24, 2001 9:52 AM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: TeleZapper call blocking device
> 
> While this device may make life difficult, it could have been worse. The solution for this device is a hand dial of all disconnected numbers to verify that they are disconnected. Not a bad waste of time and the number can be detected early in the interview period and put into a special pool of hand dialed numbers. Imagine if the product sent a busy signal instead. You'd get a much larger pool of numbers to verify and you may not check them until late in the interviewing period. Anyone using predictive dialers for interviewing need to self-test the connect time. I know that I am not alone in hanging up if I say "Hello" and there is dead air before a person answers.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
> Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 6:59 AM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: TeleZapper
> 
> Jim,
> 
> I cannot speak for the management of our survey center operations, but I would suspect they would have worked on (and sucessfully found) a technological solution to circumvent the TeleZapper workings if in fact the device had been able to screen calls placed by our dialer. We also would have looked into setting up a means (e.g., new...
disposition code) to track the outcome of dialings that appeared to be
"zapped" so as to start to understanding the prevalence of the
technology and its possible effects in our large national RDD samples.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 10:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to
see if
it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work.
PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to
do if the TeleZapper did indeed `zap' calls placed by your dialer.

-- Jim

*******

-----Original Message-----
From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: TeleZapper

Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father,
who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a TeleZapper. Its a
small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to
signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected,
thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its
data base. (The product
description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it
worked
on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes
popular,
could
it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most
likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any
thoughts
aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky
Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper. Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when either you or your answering machine answers the phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected. Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists. Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.

Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your phone into the Telezapper and then connect the AC adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.

--------------70ABDDEB9D76A3013C4ED28D
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="efreelan.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Ed Freeland
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="efreelan.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Freeland;Edward
tel;fax:609-258-0549
tel;work:609-258-1854
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Princeton University;Survey Research Center
adr:;;169 Nassau Street;Princeton;NJ;08542-7007;
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu
title:Associate Director
fn:Edward Freeland
end:vcard

--------------70ABDDEB9D76A3013C4ED28D--
There have been numerous postings to AAPORNet about the murders of September 11, 2001, and their aftermath. Most have been, as would be expected, focused on polling data. There is at least one other way that social science can help find meaning in these events: through the use of its concepts, theories, and knowledge of other countries.

I write to call your attention to a Web site under expansion at the Social Science Research Council in NYC. See:
http://www.ssrc.org/
The link to the specific Web site is on the left.

This Web site already contains dozens of essays, many by prominent scholars. Some are ideologically biased; some approach being indecipherable; and some contain predictions that have proved laughably wrong. But there are many others that are serious attempts to understand what is happening and what might be done about it. Many of the authors are far more informed about the Muslim world than certainly I am. This is one of the best projects that I have seen the social sciences undertake in a long time. I wish that it had more quantitative content, however.

Many of the essays have hyperlinks to fundamental literature (e.g., there is a link to all six volumes of Gibbon's Decline and Fall. This is how the Web can be used most effectively, I think. In the near future, we will all be including hyperlinks to references in the Web versions of our articles, if copyright owners permit.

--------------------------------------

There have been numerous postings to AAPORNet about the murders of September 11, 2001, and their aftermath. Most have been, as would be expected, focused on polling data. There is at least one other way that social science can help find meaning in these events: through the use of its concepts, theories, and knowledge of other countries.

I write to call your attention to a Web site under expansion at the Social Science Research Council in NYC. See:

http://www.ssrc.org/

The link to the specific Web site is on the left.

This Web site already contains dozens of essays, many by prominent scholars. Some are ideologically biased; some approach being indecipherable; and some contain predictions that have proved laughably wrong. But there are many others that are serious attempts to understand what is happening and what might be done about it. Many of the authors are far more informed about the Muslim world than certainly I am. This is one of the best projects that I have seen the social sciences undertake in a long time. I wish that it had more quantitative content, however.

Many of the essays have hyperlinks to fundamental literature (e.g., there is a link to all six volumes of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*). This is how the Web can be used most effectively, I think. In the near future, we will all be including hyperlinks to references in the Web versions of our articles, if copyright owners permit.
From what I saw in the commercial for the product, the Telezapper hears a tone that some dialers send out to determine if the line is a working line. It then mimics the response a non-working or disconnected line gives. For a telemarketing company, the obvious action would be to remove the number from their dialing list because future dials—whether by machine or by hand—will be fruitless. The household is signaling its unwillingness to have a telemarketer call. The same is not necessarily true about survey researchers who are a bit more welcome to call than telemarketers. A while back I saw some data that supported that claim—does anyone know the source or have an update?

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

In a message dated 12/6/01 9:00:38 AM Central Standard Time,
efreelan@Princeton.EDU writes:

> There are two issues here:
> 1. Does telezapper only affect calls placed through a predictive dialer?
> 2. Does telezapper use caller id to trigger a disconnect tone to non-identified calls?
> If the answer to the first question is Yes, you only need to worry if you are using a predictive dialing system. We use autodialers here, but all our calls are "live" and dialed one at a time.
> If the answer to the second question is Yes, then you need to make sure your long-distance carrier is properly signalling the identity of all your outbound calls. We think (hope?) we've been able to get our carrier to consistently identify us as "Princeton Univ. 609-258-3000", which has significantly improved our response rates. However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its sub-carriers will do the same.
> Ed

--part1.fc.103807ad.2940eb21_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

From what I saw in the commercial for the product, the Telezapper hears a tone that some dialers send out to determine if the line is a working line. It then mimics the response a non-working or disconnected line gives. For a telemarketing company, the obvious action would be to remove the number from their dialing list because future dials--whether by machine or by hand--will be fruitless. The household is signaling its unwillingness to have a telemarketer call. The same is not necessarily true about survey researchers who are a bit more welcome to call than telemarketers.
A while back I saw some data that supported that claim--does anyone know the source or have an update?

JAS
J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
In a message dated 12/6/01 9:00:38 AM Central Standard Time, efreelan@Princeton.EDU writes:

1. Does telezapper only affect calls placed through a predictive
dialer?
2. Does telezapper use caller id to trigger a disconnect
tone to
non-identified calls?

If the answer to the first question is Yes, you
only need to worry if you are using a predictive dialing system. We use
autodialers here, but all our calls are "live" and dialed one at a
time.

If the answer to the second question is Yes, then you need to make sure
your long-distance carrier is properly signalling the identity of all your
outbound calls. We think (hope?) we've been able to get our carrier to
consistently identify us as "Princeton Univ. 609-258-3000", which has significantly
improved our response rates. However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its sub-carriers will do the same.

Ed
An expert told me that most viruses would not stop at the first undeliverable address, but that putting yourself as the first address can give you a little warning of what is going on... The best thing one can do is to protect your assets by keeping everything backed up and have a good antiviral program that scans incoming and outgoing e-mail, and update it every day. After the LoveBug fiasco, I took aapornet out of my address book and installed Norton Systemworks ... it has worked very well and has identified and isolated every virus that has arrived ... you can set it to automatically update virus definitions if you are connected to the Internet. It also has other features that are nice for system maintenance.

Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Michael P. Massagli
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 9:33 AM
To: Jan Werner; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

On a different note, there may be simple things that one can do to thwart the inadvertent spread of these viruses, even if you fail to protect yourself from receiving them. A PCWorld tip from not too long ago suggested that creating a bad address at the beginning of your address book would help,

e.g. in Outlook Express you could create a new contact called: *virustrap, with the e-mail address: <nogoodaddress

This contact would be the first in your address book, and the virus or worm that inserts it in a mailing list will supposedly fail to spread itself because of the error in the e-mail syntax.

Anyone know if this works? Or have alternative suggestions?
> This is very dangerous advice indeed!!!
> People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament are also
> the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying
> very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus
> makers count on.
> If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be
> able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk
> beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you
> can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in
> a command-line environment.
> Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the
> registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who
> does this regularly.
> Jan Werner
> jwerner@jwdp.com
> ________________
> Howard Fienberg wrote:
> >
> > I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the
> problem.
> > If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you
> can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software
> supplier. Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual
> removal:
> > WINDOWS 95/98/ME
> > Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the
> large
> WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize
> that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of
> the
desktop.
> Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER
> Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)
Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER Delete the following files (if they exist):

KERN32.EXE
KERNEL32.EXE
KDLL.DLL
HKSDL.L.DLL

Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER

Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE

Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE

Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT

Click the (+) next to WINDOWS

Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION

Click RUNONCE

Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard

Restart the computer

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Rick Weil
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are automatically opening themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus checker has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the instruction to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in the viewer. This seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or disable html, of course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly sources, which is how these viruses travel.

So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open attachments: at least in some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If anyone knows how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.

Rick Weil, LSU Sociology
Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

******

>From DKulp@M-S-G.com Thu Dec  6 09:35:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fB6HZ4e18238 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
  09:35:04 -0800 (PST)
Received: by SARATOGA with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <XJT48SQ0>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 12:35:47 -0500
Message-ID: <D70EED068093D51A50000508B9522941DEC1A@SARATOGA>
From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.com>
To: "AAPORNET@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: TeleZapper
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 12:35:46 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Ed,

The TeleZapper works by emitting a single tone within the range of the tri-tone pulses one normally hears at the beginning of a "non-Working" or "this number has been disconnected" message. These are also known as SIT tones. "Smart" computerized dialing systems, operating predictively or not, listen for the SIT tones returned by your long distance carrier and classify those tones based on frequency. Because the TeleZapper emits only a single tone, it can be ignored by more sophisticated systems, since they are looking for three distinct tones in specific frequency ranges. If the SIT tone pattern varies from the standard the call would be switched to an interviewer as any normal connect would be.

The implication is that any call disposition classification system that is based on the tone detected/heard could be fooled - and that may even include an interviewer who is a little too quick on the disposition trigger. Autodialers should not be affected unless they are of the more sophisticated variety that incorporates an auto-disposition capability to detect non-workings or busy signals. But just an outbound autodialer will not be impacted.

Maybe I shouldn't offer this, but the most effective method we've ever encountered for accomplishing the same thing is rather simple: incorporate the tri-tone recording at the beginning of your answering machine message. If this recording is done well, it will fool almost everything - including most interviewers.

Researchers who uses "screened" RDD sample should insure that their sample suppliers systems have been tested against the TeleZapper technology. Paul Lavrakas mentioned, that his company vetted their dialer. We did the same for our two sample screening systems and our computerized dialing systems.

Dale W. Kulp

Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems
There are two issues here:

1. Does TeleZapper only affect calls placed through a predictive dialer?

2. Does TeleZapper use caller ID to trigger a disconnect tone to non-identified calls?

If the answer to the first question is Yes, you only need to worry if you are using a predictive dialing system. We use autodialers here, but all our calls are "live" and dialed one at a time.

If the answer to the second question is Yes, then you need to make sure your long-distance carrier is properly signalling the identity of all your outbound calls.

We think (hope?) we've been able to get our carrier to consistently identify us as "Princeton Univ. 609-258-3000", which has significantly improved our response rates.

However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its sub-carriers will do the same.

Ed

"Trussell, Norman" wrote:

> I am reposting this earlier message that has a good work around to counteract the TeleZapper if it had proved effective.
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Kay, Ward (NIAAA) [mailto:wkay@mail.nih.gov]
> Sent: Monday, September 24, 2001 9:52 AM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: TeleZapper call blocking device
> 
> While this device may make life difficult, it could have been worse. The solution for this device is a hand dial of all disconnected numbers to verify that they are disconnected. Not a bad waste of time and the number can be detected early in the interview period and put into a special pool of hand dialed numbers. Imagine if the product sent a busy signal
instead. You'd get a much larger pool of numbers to verify and you may not check them until late in the interviewing period.
Anyone using predictive dialers for interviewing need to self-test the connect time. I know that I am not alone in hanging up if I say "Hello" and there is dead air before a person answers.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 6:59 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Jim,

I cannot speak for the management of our survey center operations, but I would suspect they would have worked on (and successfully found) a technological solution to circumvent the TeleZapper workings if in fact the device had been able to screen calls placed by our dialer. We also would have looked into setting up a means (e.g., new disposition code) to track the outcome of dialings that appeared to be "zapped" so as to start to understanding the prevalence of the technology and its possible effects in our large national RDD samples.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 10:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

> FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to see if it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work.

> PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to do if the TeleZapper did indeed 'zap' calls placed by your dialer.

-- Jim

******

-----Original Message-----
From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to signal RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus causing the machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base. (The product description is below.)

After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if it worked on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes popular, could it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most likely be adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts aapornet?

-Sarah Zapolsky

****************************************

Product Description

When you've had your dinner interrupted by a telemarketer one too many times, treat your phone line and yourself to the Telezapper.

Here's how it works: Knowing that more than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are placed with computer assistance, when either you or your answering machine answers the phone, the Telezapper emits a special tone that tells the computer your number has been permanently disconnected.

Telemarketing companies that use automated dialing systems typically remove disconnected numbers from their calling lists.

Regular callers are unaffected, but as your phone number is eliminated from more and more telemarketing lists, telemarketers will simply stop calling.
Installation takes just seconds. Plug the Telezapper into your phone line and your AC adapter. It's that simple. The Telezapper includes a phone cord, power adapter, instructions, and a one-year warranty.
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Thursday, December 6, 2001

COMPUTER VIRUS MAKING TO BE PROSECUTED
AS HATE CRIME FOR TARGETING STUPID PEOPLE

Systems Administrators Now On Front Lines of Bias Crime

Washington, D.C. (SW.com) -- With yet another email virus spreading across the globe, 41 U.S. states and six European countries today announced that creating an attachment-based computer virus will now be considered a hate crime because it intentionally targets stupid people.
"In a hate crime, the offender is motivated by the victim's personal characteristics, and in the case of email viruses, the maker is clearly singling out those who open email attachments when they've been told a thousand times not to," said California Attorney General Bill Lockyer. "Like any other segment of the population, people of stupidity need protection from bias."

The decision, however, is already causing a firestorm of controversy. In the United States, the American Civil Liberties Union vehemently opposed the action, arguing it runs counter to the spirit of hate crime laws.

"Hate crime statutes are specifically designed to protect minority groups," said ACLU President Nadine Strossen. "I'm not sure the number of stupid computer users meets that criterion."

France, meanwhile, said it would not prosecute anyone willing to write a virus in French.

But in London, the British Civil Idiots Union applauded the move, arguing that virus-based hate crimes cause victims to suffer psychological harm. "Every time we pass on one of these emails, our self-esteem is shattered when we are forced to publicize our condition," said CIU President Michael Overly. "It's always a shock to my system every time I have to write, "Hey everybody, if you get an email attachment from me, don't open it! I just found out my computer got infected by a virus! Sorry!"

In identifying virus-based hate crime activity, U.S. and European law enforcement authorities said they will focus on anyone creating a virus delivered via email attachment that contains either no subject line or a vague subject line such as "Hey, check this out!" "I saw this and thought of you!" or "I am wanting to get your opinion on this."

Congressional leaders also said they will amend the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act and require the FBI to track data on crimes based on race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or stupidity. As a result, some experts expect the annual number of hate crimes in the U.S. alone to jump from 6,500 to 132 million.
Others believe the actual number will be higher, but say many crimes will go unreported because the victim refuses to recognize what has happened. Dallas, Texas resident Mike Smith is a case in point.

"I am not a victim of a hate crime because I am not stupid," said Smith. "I got an email with an attachment from my buddy in Phoenix, so naturally, I opened it. What's so stupid about that?"

What, Smith was asked, did the email say?

"It said, 'I_love_you.' Why?"

In Moline, Ill., police have already made their first arrest under the expanded laws. Matthew Spere, a 17-year-old high school senior, was taken into custody this morning after police said he had created and propagated a variant of the "Goner" virus. In a phone interview, Spere denied the charges. "My virus wasn't targeting stupid computer users specifically, just anyone using Microsoft's Outlook Express or AOL," he said. "Oh... damn."
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*****
That's funny!
For an education on Internet security issues, check out this site... "The CERT Coordination Center (CERT/CC) is a center of Internet security expertise, at the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center operated by Carnegie Mellon University. We study Internet security vulnerabilities, handle computer security incidents, publish security alerts, research long-term changes in networked systems, and develop information and training to help you improve security at your site."

http://www.cert.org
http://www.cert.org/tech_tips/

mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of James Beniger
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 1:55 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Virus Making to be Hate Crime (SW.com)
Systems Administrators Now On Front Lines of Bias Crime

Washington, D.C. (SW.com) -- With yet another email virus spreading across the globe, 41 U.S. states and six European countries today announced that creating an attachment-based computer virus will now be considered a hate crime because it intentionally targets stupid people.

"In a hate crime, the offender is motivated by the victim's personal characteristics, and in the case of email viruses, the maker is clearly singling out those who open email attachments when they've been told a thousand times not to," said California Attorney General Bill Lockyer. "Like any other segment of the population, people of stupidity need protection from bias."

The decision, however, is already causing a firestorm of controversy. In the United States, the American Civil Liberties Union vehemently opposed the action, arguing it runs counter to the spirit of hate crime laws.

"Hate crime statutes are specifically designed to protect minority groups," said ACLU President Nadine Strossen. "I'm not sure the number of stupid computer users meets that criterion."

France, meanwhile, said it would not prosecute anyone willing to write a virus in French.

But in London, the British Civil Idiots Union applauded the move, arguing that virus-based hate crimes cause victims to suffer psychological harm. "Every time we pass on one of these emails, our self-esteem is shattered when we are forced to publicize our condition," said CIU President Michael Overly. "It's always a shock to my system every time I have to write, "Hey everybody, if you get an email attachment from me, don't open it! I just found out my computer got infected by a virus! Sorry!"

In identifying virus-based hate crime activity, U.S. and European law enforcement authorities said they will focus on anyone creating a virus delivered via email attachment that contains either no subject line or a vague subject line such
as
"Hey, check this out!" "I saw this and thought of you!" or "I am wanting to get your opinion on this."

Congressional leaders also said they will amend the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act and require the FBI to track data on crimes based on race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or stupidity. As a result, some experts expect the annual number of hate crimes in the U.S. alone to jump from 6,500 to 132 million.

Others believe the actual number will be higher, but say many crimes will go unreported because the victim refuses to recognize what has happened. Dallas, Texas resident Mike Smith is a case in point.

"I am not a victim of a hate crime because I am not stupid," said Smith. "I got an email with an attachment from my buddy in Phoenix, so naturally, I opened it. What's so stupid about that?"

What, Smith was asked, did the email say?

"It said, 'I_love_you.' Why?"

In Moline, Ill., police have already made their first arrest under the expanded laws. Matthew Spere, a 17-year-old high school senior, was taken into custody this morning after police said he had created and propagated a variant of the "Goner" virus. In a phone interview, Spere denied the charges. "My virus wasn't targeting stupid computer users specifically, just anyone using Microsoft's Outlook Express or AOL," he said. "Oh... damn."
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>From jsheppard@cmor.org Thu Dec 6 12:57:18 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fB6KvHe27709 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
12:57:17 -0800
Here it is....most of this Larry hasn't seen......I just got up from a nap and feel so much better....a slight headache and dull ache in my arm, but not as bad as last night.....rest is what I need....I'm using a heating pad instead of ice also....seems to help.

Jane

----- Original Message ----- From: "Dale Kulp" <DKulp@M-S-G.com> To: <aapornet@usc.edu> Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 12:35 PM Subject: RE: TeleZapper

> Ed,
>
> The TeleZapper works by emitting a single tone within the range of the tri-tone pulses one normally hears at the beginning of a "non-Working" or "this number has been disconnected" message. These are also known as SIT tones. "Smart" computerized dialing systems, operating predictively or not, listen for the SIT tones returned by your long distance carrier and classify those tones based on frequency. Because the TeleZapper emits only a single tone, it can be ignored by more sophisticated systems, since they are looking for three distinct tones in specific frequency ranges. If the
SIT tone pattern varies from the standard the call would be switched to an interviewer as any normal connect would be.

The implication is that any call disposition classification system that is based on the tone detected/heard could be fooled - and that may even include an interviewer who is a little too quick on the disposition trigger. Autodialers should not be affected unless they are of the more sophisticated variety that incorporates an auto-disposition capability to detect non-workings or busy signals. But just an outbound autodialer will not be impacted.

Maybe I shouldn't offer this, but the most effective method we've ever encountered for accomplishing the same thing is rather simple: incorporate the tri-tone recording at the beginning of your answering machine message. If this recording is done well, it will fool almost everything - including most interviewers.

Researchers who uses "screened" RDD sample should insure that their sample suppliers systems have been tested against the TeleZapper technology. Paul Lavrakas mentioned, that his company vetted their dialer. We did the same for our two sample screening systems and our computerized dialing systems.

Dale W. Kulp

Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS Sampling Systems

-----Original Message-----
From: Ed Freeland [mailto:efreelan@Princeton.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 10:00 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: TeleZapper

There are two issues here:

1. Does telezapper only affect calls placed through a predictitive dialer?

2. Does telezapper use caller id to trigger a disconnect tone to non-identified calls?

If the answer to the first question is Yes, you only need to worry if you are using a predictive dialing system. We use autodialers here, but all our calls are "live" and dialed one at a time.
If the answer to the second question is Yes, then you need to make sure your long-distance carrier is properly signalling the identity of all your outbound calls. We think (hope?) we’ve been able to get our carrier to identify us as "Princeton Univ. 609-258-3000", which has significantly improved our response rates. However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its sub-carriers will do the same.

Ed

"Trussell, Norman" wrote:

I am reposting this earlier message that has a good work around to counteract the Telezapper if it had proved effective.

While this device may make life difficult, it could have been worse. The solution for this device is a hand dial of all disconnected numbers to verify that they are disconnected. Not a bad waste of time and the number can be detected early in the interview period and put into a special pool of hand dialed numbers. Imagine if the product sent a busy signal instead. You'd get a much larger pool of numbers to verify and you may not check them until late in the interviewing period. Anyone using predictive dialers for interviewing need to self-test the connect time. I know that I am not alone in hanging up if I say "Hello" and there is dead air before a person answers.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lavrakas, Paul [mailto:pjlavrakas@tvratings.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 6:59 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Jim,

I cannot speak for the management of our survey center operations, but I would suspect they would have worked on (and successfully
found) a technological solution to circumvent the TeleZapper workings if in fact, the device had been able to screen calls placed by our dialer. We also would have looked into setting up a means (e.g., new disposition code) to track the outcome of dialings that appeared to be "zapped" so as to start to understanding the prevalence of the technology and its possible effects in our large national RDD samples.

PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [mailto:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 10:09 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

On Wed, 5 Dec 2001, Lavrakas, Paul wrote:

FYI -- Our company bought one a few months ago and then tested it to see if it would "zap" calls placed by our dialer and found it not to work.

PJL

Paul,

I'm pretty sure I'm not alone in wondering what your company planned to do if the TeleZapper did indeed 'zap' calls placed by your dialer.

--
Jim

******

-----Original Message-----
From: Zapolsky, Sarah E. [mailto:SZapolsky@aarp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:04 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: TeleZapper

Greetings List,

Here is a question for you. For Christmas I bought my father, who is mercilessly pursued by telemarketers, a Telezapper. Its a small, $49 thingy that you plug your phone into, and it purports to
signal
> > > RDD machines that the number is permanently disconnected, thus
> > > causing
> > > the
> > > machine to hang up, and remove that number from its data base.
> > > (The
> > > product
> > > description is below.)
> > >
> > > After I bought it, I thought, gee, wouldn't this be bad news if
> > > it
> > > worked
> > > on RDD surveys too? My question is; if the telezapper becomes
> > > popular,
> > > could
> > > it skew phone surveys toward the middle market as it would most
> > > likely
> > > be
> > > adopted by upper income, higher educated households? Any thoughts
> > > aapornet?
> > >
> > > -Sarah Zapolsky
> > >
> > > ****************************************
> > > Product Description
> > > When you've had your dinner interrupted by a
telemarketer one too many times, treat
> > > your phone line and yourself to the
> > > Telezapper.
> > > Here's
> > > how it works: Knowing that more
> > > than 90 percent of telemarketing calls are
> > > placed
> > > with
> > > computer assistance, when
> > > either you or your answering machine answers
> > > the
> > > phone,
> > > the Telezapper emits a
> > > special tone that tells the computer your
> > > number
> > > has
> > > been permanently disconnected.
> > > Telemarketing companies that use automated
dialing
> > > systems typically remove
> > > disconnected numbers from their calling
> > > lists.
> > > Regular
> > > callers are unaffected, but as
> > > your phone number is eliminated from more and
> > > more
> > > telemarketing lists, telemarketers
> > > will simply stop calling.
> > > Installation takes just seconds. Plug the
> > > Telezapper
> > > into your phone line and your
> > >  phone into the Telezapper and then connect
> > >  the AC adapter. It's that simple. The
> > >  Telezapper includes a phone cord, power
> > >  adapter, instructions, and a one-year
> > >  warranty.
> > >
> > >
>From shap.wolf@asu.edu Thu Dec  6 13:01:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fB6llze28508 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
13:01:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: from post2.inre.asu.edu (post2.inre.asu.edu [129.219.110.73])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id NAA00630 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 13:01:33 -0800
(PST)
Received: from conversion.post2.inre.asu.edu by asu.edu (PMDF V6.1 #40111)
  id <0GNX00801WTWHRD@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 06 Dec 2001 13:56:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: from mainex1.asu.edu (mainex1.asu.edu [129.219.10.200]) by asu.edu
  (PMDF V6.1 #40111) with ESMTP id <0GNX00858WTVOA@asu.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
  Thu, 06 Dec 2001 13:56:20 -0700 (MST)
Received: by mainex1.asu.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
  id <YL9PD2F>; Thu, 06 Dec 2001 13:44:57 -0700
Content-return: allowed
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2001 13:52:19 -0700
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>
Subject: RE: TeleZapper
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Message-id: <B6426E926476D411B8E800B0D03D5C1A01031714@mainex2.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="Boundary_(ID_mJuojcpSgidtO1HUSk9RCQ)"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this
format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--Boundary_(ID_mJuojcpSgidtO1HUSk9RCQ)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

There is a recording of the three-tone SIT sequence available at:
http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html

Apparently they were marketing a TeleZapper-style device; site now says it was
withdrawn (pending changes) due to a patent dispute.

When this thread came up earlier this year, someone was going to test playing back a
recording of the SIT tones to see if computerized dialers characterized that
as a non-working number. Did anyone try this?

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL

more phone sounds are available at:
http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/
http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.htm

--Boundary_(ID_mJuojcpSgidtOlHUSk9RCQ)
Content-type: Text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<html>
<head>
<meta http-equiv=3D"Content-Type" content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<meta name=3D"Generator" content=3D"MS Exchange Server version =
5.5.2655.35">
<title>RE: TeleZapper</title>
</head>
<body>

<p><font size=3D2>There is a recording of the three-tone SIT sequence =

<p><font size=3D2>Apparently they were marketing a TeleZapper-style = device; site
now says it was withdrawn (pending changes) due to a = patent dispute.</font></p>

<p><font size=3D2>When this thread came up earlier this year, someone = was going to
test playing back a recording of the SIT tones to see if = computerized dialers
characterized that as a non-working number. Did = anyone try this?</font></p>

<p><font size=3D2>Shap Wolf</font></p>
<br><font size=3D2>Arizona State University SRL</font></p>

<p><font size=3D2>more phone sounds are available at:</font> <br><font size=3D2><a href=3D"http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/" target=3D"_blank">http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/</a></font>
</p>

Shap,

We do this routinely (i.e., that is generating our own SIT tones). It is easy
to fool any device "trained" to react to a certain pattern of tones - also easy for
interviewers to mistake.

I am very interested in what the "patent dispute" is all about and whether there may
be due to some legalities involved in sending an FCC regulated standard set of
SIT tones across the public telephone network. Maybe that's why the TeleZapper only
sends one tone in the range and consequently becomes easy to intercept. I will
look into this further.

Thanks for reminding me of this site and this other potential threat.
There is a recording of the three-tone SIT sequence available at:
http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html

Apparently they were marketing a TeleZapper-style device; site now says it was
withdrawn (pending changes) due to a patent dispute.

When this thread came up earlier this year, someone was going to test playing
back a
recording of the SIT tones to see if computerized dialers characterized that as a
non-working number. Did anyone try this?

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL

more phone sounds are available at:
http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/
http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.htm

-----=_NextPart_001_01C17E9E.6118C3B0
Content-Type: text/html;
   charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN" <HTML><HEAD>
<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; = charset=3DISO-8859-1">
<TITLE>RE: TeleZapper</TITLE>

<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4807.2300" name=3D"GENERATOR"></HEAD> <BODY>
<br />

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL

More phone sounds are available at:
http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/
http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.htm
I am very interested in what the "patent dispute" is all about and whether there may be due to some legalities involved in sending an FCC regulated standard set of SIT tones across the public telephone network. Maybe that's why the TeleZapper only sends one tone in the range and consequently becomes easy to intercept. I will look into this further.

Thanks for reminding me of this site and this other potential threat.

Dale W. Kulp

---

There is a recording of the three-tone SIT sequence available at: [http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html](http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html)

Apparently they were marketing a TeleZapper-style device; site now says it was withdrawn (pending changes) due to a patent dispute. When this thread came up earlier this year, someone was going to test playing back a recording of the SIT tones to see if computerized dialers characterized that as a non-working number. Did anyone try this?
AAPORNETters: While we are still on the topic of the costs of Internet viruses, check out the box I have highlighted below...

-- Jim

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
http://www.press.org/programs/cybersecurity.html
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Mark Rasch, VP of Cyberlaw, Predictive Systems

*****************************************************************************
* *
* ** TALKING POINTS: Lloyds of London estimates that the Love Bug virus
* ** cost the world $15 billion, and security experts say that we're on
* ** track to have twice as many security incidents this year as last. And
* ** with the attacks of September 11, there is a new realization that
* ** critical networks could be the focus of terrorist attacks.
* *
*****************************************************************************

What do businesses and personal computer users really need to be
worried about? And what are the best ways for the public and private
sectors to protect themselves, whether from sophisticated cyberattack
or the latest Love Bug? These issues and more will be discussed when a
panel of cybersecurity experts gather for the next CyberCocktail
lecture.

http://www.press.org/programs/cybersecurity.html

******

>From mikemassagli@mediaone.net Sat Dec  8 19:00:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fB930iee28253 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Dec 2001
19:00:44 -0800 (PST)
Received: from chmls06.mediaone.net (chmls06.mediaone.net [24.147.1.144])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id TAA04308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Dec 2001 19:00:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from chmls06.mediaone.net (chmls06.mediaone.net [24.147.1.144])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id TAA04308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 8 Dec 2001 19:00:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from hppav (h0010b50cc0af.ne.mediaone.net [24.60.211.137])
   by chmls06.mediaone.net (8.11.1/8.11.1) with SMTP id fB930xQ15238;
Sat, 8 Dec 2001 22:01:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <003001c1805e$0b446f40$89d33c18@mshome.net>
From: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
To: <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3C0E0CA9.ACDA9143@jwdp.com>
<003501c17e623fa07e240589d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C112235.6051D084@jwdp.com> <001701c17f91$3032b6e0$89d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C12065E.3C19709F@jwdp.com>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Thank you for your reply.

Regarding my original message on this topic, it is the case that an e-mail to any list of addresses containing the address with the syntax error contained in the example I suggested will not be sent by Outlook Express, but will return the following error:

"The message could not be sent because one of the recipients was rejected by the server. The rejected e-mail address was '<nogoodaddress>'. Subject 'test', Account: 'pop.ne.mediaone.net', Server: 'smtp.ne.mediaone.net', Protocol: SMTP, Server Response: '553 5.0.0 <<nogoodaddress>> Unbalanced '<', Port: 25, Secure(SSL): No, Server Error: 553, Error Number: 0x800CCC79"

Of course if I'm already infected with a virus that's trying to do that, I may not in a position to read it, but it does seem that I would not have sent the offending e-mail to everyone residing in my address book. Am I missing something?

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
To: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>  
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2001 7:23 AM  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

> The best-known site is Bob Rosenberger's Vmyths site  
> (http://www.Vmyths.com/), although it has gone aggravatingly  
> commercial lately.
>
> The Finnish anti--virus software maker F-Secure has a virus info site  
> (http://www.europe.datafellows.com/virus-info/) with lists of known  
> hoaxes as well as other virus information.
>
> Woody's Office Watch (http://www.woodyswatch.com/) is a newsletter  
> with information and tips about MS Office which often covers viruses  
> and how they propagate through Outlook and other Office programs. If  
> you search through their archives, you should find several discussions  
> of why the specific suggestion you mentioned does not work to stop  
> email viruses.
>
"Michael P. Massagli" wrote:

Would you mind directing me to such a site?

----- Original Message -----
From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2001 3:10 PM
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

These types of suggestions crop up repeatedly, in spite of the fact that they do not work, as documented on various web sites that debunk Internet myths.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"Michael P. Massagli" wrote:

On a different note, there may be simple things that one can do to thwart the inadvertent spread of these viruses, even if you fail to protect yourself from receiving them. A PCWorld tip from not too long ago suggested that creating a bad address at the beginning of your address book would help, e.g. in Outlook Express you could create a new contact called: *virustrap, with the e-mail address: <nogoodaddress
This contact would be the first in your address book, and the virus or worm that inserts it in a mailing list will supposedly fail to spread itself because of the error in the e-mail syntax.

Anyone know if this works? Or have alternative suggestions?

Mike Massagli
mikemassagli@mediaone.net

+++++++
This is very dangerous advice indeed!!!

People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament are also the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus makers count on.

If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in a command-line environment.

Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who does this regularly.

Howard Fienberg wrote: I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.

If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier.

Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:

WINDOWS 95/98/ME
Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the large WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of the desktop.

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER Delete the following files (if they exist):
- KERN32.EXE
- KERNEL32.EXE
- KDLL.DLL
- HKSDL2.DLL

Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER

Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE

Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE

Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT

Click the (+) next to WINDOWS

Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION

Click RUNONCE

Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard

Restart the computer

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Rick Weil
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus automatically
Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are opening themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho my virus
checker
has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the
instruction
to run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in
the
viewer.
This
seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or
disable
html,
of
course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly
sources,
which
is
how these viruses travel.
So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open
attachments:
at
least
in
some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves. If
anyone
knows
how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.
Rick Weil, LSU Sociology

----- Original Message -----  
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>  
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM  
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Folks,

This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up
and
despite having received the single largest number of virus
alerts
our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only*
from
attachments.
Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open
attachments
from people you do not both know and trust (not always a
sufficient
safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open
attachments).
Also, do not send or—even worse—forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely. If it makes you feel any better... To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

*****

This scenario relies on the smtp server checking ALL the email addresses for vailidity before sending ANY of them. This may be true of some smtp servers, but my
own experience has been that the email will be sent to the valid addresses and an error message, such as the one you quote, will be generated and sent to the originator if it cannot be sent to one or more recipients.

Even if the smtp server stops sending as soon as it reaches the first invalid address, you cannot guarantee the order in which the addresses are loaded by the virus. You don't even know the order in which addresses are stored in the Outlook Express address book. All you know is the order in which the program displays them, which is sorted on some selected field.

But even if your smtp server is capable of checking the entire list before sending to any recipients, this whole concept relies on the virus NOT performing a simple validity check of its own on the addresses before forwarding itself to them, a trivial task compared to the other functions performed by the current crop of script-driven email viruses.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"Michael P. Massagli" wrote:
>
> thanks.
>
> Regarding my original message on this topic, it is the case that an e-mail to any list of addresses containing the address with the syntax error contained in the example I suggested will not not be sent by Outlook Express, but will return the following error:
>
> "The message could not be sent because one of the recipients was rejected by the server. The rejected e-mail address was '<nogoodaddress>'. Subject 'test', Account: 'pop.ne.mediaone.net', Server: 'smtp.ne.mediaone.net', Protocol: SMTP, Server Response: '553 5.0.0 <<nogoodaddress>>... Unbalanced '<', Port: 25, Secure(SSL): No, Server Error: 553, Error Number: 0x800CCC79"
>
> Of course if I'm already infected with a virus that's trying to do that, I may not in a position to read it, but it does seem that I would not have sent the offending e-mail to everyone residing in my address book. Am I missing something?
> ----- Original Message -----  From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> To: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
> Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2001 7:23 AM
> Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
>
> The best-known site is Bob Rosenberger's Vmyths site
> (http://www.Vmyths.com/), although it has gone aggravatingly
commercial lately.

The Finnish antivirus software maker F-Secure has a virus info site (http://www.europe.datafellows.com/virus-info/) with lists of known hoaxes as well as other virus information.

Woody's Office Watch (http://www.woodyswatch.com/) is a newsletter with information and tips about MS Office which often covers viruses and how they propagate through Outlook and other Office programs. If you search through their archives, you should find several discussions of why the specific suggestion you mentioned does not work to stop email viruses.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"Michael P. Massagli" wrote:

Would you mind directing me to such a site?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2001 3:10 PM
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

These types of suggestions crop up repeatedly, in spite of the fact that they do not work, as documented on various web sites that debunk Internet myths.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

"Michael P. Massagli" wrote:

On a different note, there may be simple things that one can do to thwart the inadvertent spread of these viruses, even if you fail to protect yourself from receiving them. A PCWorld tip from not too long ago suggested that creating a bad address at the beginning of your address book would help.

e.g. in Outlook Express you could create a new contact called: *virustrap,* with the e-mail address: <nogoodaddress>

This contact would be the first in your address book, and the virus would...
that inserts it in a mailing list will supposedly fail to spread because of the error in the e-mail syntax. Anyone know if this works? Or have alternative suggestions?

++++++++++++
Mike Massagli
mikemassagl@mediaone.net

++++++++++++

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2001 7:01 AM 
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus 

This is very dangerous advice indeed!!! People who are likely to find themselves in this predicament also are the ones most likely to make the problem worse by mistakes in applying very precise operating system level corrections, something the virus makers count on. 

If you delete KERNEL32.DLL, instead of KERNEL32.EXE, you will not be able to start Windows at all, unless you had prepared a boot disk beforehand, and you will not be able to repair the system unless you can access your Windows setup .CAB files and can restore that file in a command-line environment. 

Unless you have experience in playing with Windows internals and the registry, you are better off leaving this kind of fix to someone who does this regularly. 

Jan Werner 
jwerner@jwdp.com

_________________
Howard Fienberg wrote:

I think Windows has a security update which can help prevent the problem.

If you have virus protection software that didn't intercept it, you can remove it by downloading the latest update from your software supplier.

Alternatively, here are the instructions for manual removal:

Restart Windows in Safe Mode (reboot your computer, just before the large WINDOWS startup screen comes up, hit the F5 key). You can recognize that you're in Safe Mode by the text Safe Mode in the 4 corners of the desktop.

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR% and hit ENTER Delete the INETD.EXE file (if present)

Click START | RUN, type %WINDIR%\SYSTEM and hit ENTER Delete the following files (if they exist):

KERN32.EXE
KERNEL32.EXE
KDLL.DLL
HKSDLL.DLL

Click START | RUN, type REGEDIT and hit ENTER

Click the (+) next to HKEY_LOCAL_MACHINE

Click the (+) next to SOFTWARE

Click the (+) next to MICROSOFT

Click the (+) next to WINDOWS

Click the (+) next to CURRENTVERSION

Click RUNONCE

Click on KERNEL32 on the right and hit DELETE on the keyboard
Restart the computer

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]
On Behalf Of
Rick Weil
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 4:05 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Jim, some of the current rash of virus-attachments are
automatically
opening
themselves - at least in my setup (outlook express) - tho
my
virus
checker
has stopped them so far. Some html emails now contain the
instruction
to
run the virus-attachment as soon as you view the email in
the
viewer.
This
seems to be a new escalation. You can filter email or
disable
html,
of
course, but it's hard to filter email from known/friendly
sources,
which
is
how these viruses travel.
So it's evidently no longer sufficient to not open
attachments:
at
least
in
some setups, they seem to be opening/running themselves.
If
knows
how to deal with this, I for one would like to know.

Rick Weil, LSU Sociology

----- Original Message -----
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 1:15 PM
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Folks,
This message is to reassure you that AAPORNET is still up and running, despite having received the single largest number of virus alerts from our local system that I have ever seen on the Internet.

Information and Caution

You *cannot* catch a virus from plain email text--*only* from attachments. Do not open attachments (I don't) or, failing that, do not open attachments from people you do not both know and trust (not always a sufficient safeguard, unfortunately--which is why I do not open attachments). Also, do not send or--even worse--forward attachments to Internet lists, which provide the perfect means for spreading viruses widely.

If it makes you feel any better...

To paraphrase the old venereal disease warnings that ran on WBZ and other Boston-area music radio stations in the late '60s: Even nice people can catch VD (or a virus)!

-- Jim

*****
NEW TYPE OF COMPUTER VIRUS

Dear friends and contacts,

I apologize for bothering you if you are already familiar with these matters, but a new type of virus seems to represent a significant enough danger that a timely warning may save some of you from a lot of hassle. I have received more than 50 messages containing this virus over the last two weeks, so I assume that it is being widely disseminated.

As most of you are aware, you USUALLY cannot get a virus merely by receiving an email. The virus is generally in a file that is attached to an email message. If you click to open that file, the virus can then spread into your computer, doing damage there and/or causing your computer to send copies of itself to other addresses. If you receive a message with an attached file, you can USUALLY safely read the message as long as you do not open the attached file.

The reason for the word "usually" is that a new type of virus has taken advantage of a flaw in the Windows Outlook program. The moment you begin to look at this type of message (even merely in the Preview screen),

the attached virus file automatically begins to download into your computer. A box may appear saying "You have chosen to download the following file..." If this happens, you should immediately click "Cancel".

Then do a virus scan of your entire computer to make sure that no infected files had a chance to be loaded.
In the messages containing this type of virus, the Subject line usually simply reads "Re: " (with no text following the colon). Less often, but more insidiously, if someone you know has his or her computer infected, it is also possible for the message to seem to be a "response" to some message you have sent that person, with the Subject line repeating the Subject line that you used in your original message.

If your screen shows the size of each message, you may notice that the size of this type of virus message is almost invariably 41K.

As most of you are aware, almost all the virus warnings that are continually being forwarded around on the Net are old hoaxes. One way you can tell whether a virus warning is a hoax or not is that any legitimate warning will include a link to some major website where you can confirm the information. In the present case, you can find more information on this family of viruses by going to the following page of the website of the McAfee company (one of the leading antivirus companies): http://vil.mcafee.com/dispVirus.asp?virus_k=99069&. That page will tell you what to do if you suspect that your computer has been infected by one of these viruses.

The basic method for guarding against this particular type of virus is to update your Windows system. The latest Windows Update package includes a patch to correct the flaw in the Outlook program that permits attached files to open automatically. These updates are free and can be easily downloaded directly onto your computer. Click the "Start" button on your computer desktop, then click "Windows Update" and follow the instructions.

The two basic methods for guarding against viruses in general are:

1) Do not open files attached to emails unless you know who sent them AND the email message contains a SPECIFIC mention of the file (not just some generic phrase like "Thought you might find this of interest").

2) Subscribe to an antivirus program such as McAfee or Norton, preferably one that automatically downloads updates to your computer every few days.

If you want to find out more about virus hoaxes, go to the bottom of the following page -- http://www.research.ibm.com/antivirus/SciPapers.htm -- and find the article "How To Spot a Virus Hoax."

Again, I apologize for bothering those of you who already know about these things.

Regards,

Ken Knabb

BUREAU OF PUBLIC SECRETS
PO Box 1044, Berkeley CA 94701, USA
http://www.bopsecrets.org
knabb@slip.net
I would like about 10 questions on social support, including family, friends, or both, for use in a telephone survey. I would prefer questions that have been used periodically and for which the historical rates are published. I also need to obtain any available information about the development or validation of the questions.
Either print sources or Internet links would be useful.

Thanks in advance,
David

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.

45 The Crosway
Delmar, NY 12054
dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com

>From smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu Mon Dec 10 05:08:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBAD8bel8537 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001
    05:08:37 -0800 (PST)
Received: from genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (norcmx.uchicago.edu
[128.135.209.78])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id FAA01515 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 05:08:37 -0800
(PST)
From: smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu
Received: from norcmail.uchicago.edu (norcmail.uchicago.edu [128.135.45.4])
    by genesis1.norc.uchicago.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA25796
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 07:11:13 -0600
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)
    id A1007989729; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 07:08:51 -0600
Message-Id: <0112101007.AA1007989729@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2001 07:08:46 -0600
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: social support questions
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

The General Social Surveys have some possible items. Go to
www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss

______________________________ Reply Separator

Subject: social support questions
Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET
Date: 12/10/01 8:05 AM

I would like about 10 questions on social support, including family, friends, or
both, for use in a telephone survey. I would prefer questions that have been
used
periodically and for which the historical rates are published. I also need
to obtain any available information about the development or validation of the questions.

Either print sources or Internet links would be useful.

Thanks in advance,
David

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
45 The Crosway
Delmar, NY 12054
dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com

If interested, please reply to Barry Seltser (see below) and NOT to AAPORNET.

The U.S. General Accounting Office, an independent agency of the U.S. Congress,
is seeking applicants for two types of research positions for GAO’s Applied Research and Methods Team:
1) social science analyst (GAO-400-ARM-2002-15), and 2) Statistician or Mathematical Statistician (GAO-800-ARM-2002-16). Survey research skills are highly desirable qualifications for the social science analyst. U.S. citizenship is required for both positions.

Salaries for both positions are $53,273 to $97,195, depending on qualifications.

GAO is an equal opportunity employer. You must have the job announcement in order to apply. For the job announcements with details on the positions and the application procedures, please visit GAO’s web site www.gao.gov (access "Employment Opportunities").

Applications close on January 23, 2002. However, there is a rolling process so that the earlier you apply, the sooner you will be considered. Also, due to the uncertainty of the U.S. mail, e-mail applications can be sent to recruit@gao.gov.
You must

For questions about the positions, please contact Barry Seltser (by e-mail: seltserb@gao.gov, by phone: 202-512-3234).

>From FeatherstonF@GAO.GOV Mon Dec 10 06:46:49 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBAEkne22721 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001
06:46:49 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mailexchange.gao.gov (gao-cp.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA05123 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 06:46:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gaotvcs1.gao.gov (gaotvcs1.gao.gov [161.203.15.2])
   by mailexchange.gao.gov (8.12.1/GAO ESMTP) with SMTP id fBAEisH2008509
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:44:54 -0500
Received: from 10.1.0.66 by gaotvcs1.gao.gov (InterScan E-Mail VirusWall NT); Mon, 10
Dec 2001 09:44:54 -0500
Received: from GWIADOM-Message_Server by GAOGWIA1.GAO.GOV with Novell GroupWise; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:44:54 -0500
Message-Id: <sc148416.096@GAOGWIA1.GAO.GOV>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.4
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:44:49 -0500
From: "Fran A Featherston" <FeatherstonF@GAO.GOV>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Joan R Clark" <ClarkJR@GAO.GOV>, "Barry J Seltser" <SeltserB@GAO.GOV>
Subject: Re: Job opportunities at the U.S. GAO/Washington, DC
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
There was a hanging phrase "You must" at the end of a paragraph in the announcement that should not have been there, so please pass along this version instead. Thanks.

If interested, please reply to Barry Seltser (see below) and NOT to AAPORNET.

The U.S. General Accounting Office, an independent agency of the U.S. Congress, is seeking applicants for two types of research positions for GAO's Applied Research and Methods Team:
1) social science analyst (GAO-400-ARM-2002-15), and 2) Statistician or Mathematical Statistician (GAO-800-ARM-2002-16). Survey research skills are highly desirable qualifications for the social science analyst. U.S. citizenship is required for both positions.
Salaries for both positions are $53,273 to $97,195, depending on qualifications.

GAO is an equal opportunity employer. You must have the job announcement in order to apply. For the job announcements with details on the positions and the application procedures, please visit GAO's web site www.gao.gov (access "Employment Opportunities").
Applications close on January 23, 2002. However, there is a rolling process so that the earlier you apply, the sooner you will be considered. Also, due to the uncertainty of the U.S. mail, e-mail applications can be sent to recruit@gao.gov.

For questions about the positions, please contact Barry Seltser (by e-mail: seltserb@gao.gov, by phone: 202-512-3234).

>From robert_putnam@harvard.edu Mon Dec 10 08:04:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBAG4De26544 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 08:04:13 -0800 (PST)
08:04:13 -0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp4.fas.harvard.edu (IDENT:root@smtp4.fas.harvard.edu [140.247.34.54])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA11327 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 08:04:11 -0800 (PST)
Received: from HARVARD-90KRPXX.harvard.edu (slip-32-100-244-79.ma.us.prerv.net [32.100.244.79]) by smtp4.fas.harvard.edu with ESMTP id fBAG3kM30726; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 11:03:47 -0500 (EST)
In addition to the GSS, you might find some useful questions in the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, at http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/scc_bench.html. These questions were asked of a nationwide set of samples totalling 30k last year. Virtually all the questions were, in turn, selected from prior survey instruments that had been administered to national samples. In constructing the questionnaire, we, like you, sought questions of clear provenance and longevity.

Bob Putnam

At 08:05 AM 12/10/2001 -0500, you wrote:
> I would like about 10 questions on social support, including family, friends, or both, for use in a telephone survey. I would prefer questions that have been used periodically and for which the historical rates are published. I also need to obtain any available information about the development or validation of the questions.
> Either print sources or Internet links would be useful.
> Thanks in advance,
> David
>
> David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.
> 45 The Crosway
> Delmar, NY 12054
> dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com
Marlene,
Help! I need to submit the individual papers for a PANEL for the Conference but only put in the abstract of the whole thing. Can I edit it? Can you modify the abstract to include the whole thing. Here it is if you can. Otherwise, tell me what to do.
Thanks.

Jim
<<AAPOR ISSCC Abstract.doc>>
Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil <mailto:caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
------=_NextPart_000_01C18253.246EEB70--
>From Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Tue Dec 11 06:55:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBBEtAe16888 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
06:55:10
-0800 (PST)
Received: from ddmfitayz003.sam.pentagon.mil (ddmfitayz003.sam.pentagon.mil
[140.185.1.133])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id GAA17975 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 06:55:09 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ddmfitayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
   id <YWCG7MYX>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:54:17 -0500
Message-ID:
<FS5DSDEAE9D02BD511B23800805FBB0245E9275ddsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R., DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Sorry, folks. Wrong AAPOR address <blush>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:54:15 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

---

>From daves@startribune.com Tue Dec 11 07:43:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBBFhke02037 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
07:43:46
-0800 (PST)
Received: from firewall1.startribune.com (firewall1.startribune.com
[132.148.80.210])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id HAA20323 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 07:43:46 -0800
Colleagues...

In the form of Jim Beniger, who regularly shares interesting stuff from the LA Times with the list, I thought many of you would be interested in the following story in the Star Tribune this morning. You can find the complete version at http://www.startribune.com.

On another note, for those of you interested in Minnesota doings, Gov. Jesse Ventura's job approval rating has dropped to a new low * but still, a majority approve of the way he's handling his duties. It's at http://www.startribune.com/poll.

All best wishes....

Rob Daves

Mayo study puts prayer to the test

Josephine Marcotty

Star Tribune

Published Dec 11 2001

Some Mayo Clinic researchers believe that prayer helps patients, but their scientific study into the power of prayer didn't prove it.

Cardiologist Dr. Stephen Kopecky and other researchers
followed 799 Mayo Clinic heart disease patients. Half of whom were prayed for by others, although they didn't know it, and half of whom were not. After six months, researchers found no significant differences between the two groups in the number of deaths, heart attacks, hospitalizations or strokes. The research is published today in the Mayo Clinic Proceedings, a journal published by the Mayo Clinic.

>From leobogart@worldnet.att.net Tue Dec 11 09:29:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBBHTMel2206 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
09:29:22 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.50])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA08142 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:29:22 -0800 (PST)
Received: from worldnet ([12.88.120.241]) by mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net
   (InterMail VM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP
   id <20011211172830.MANS15547.mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net@worldnet>
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:28:30 +0000
Message-ID: <010701c18269$b0e8ac60$f178580c@worldnet.att.net>
From: "leobogart" <leobogart@worldnet.att.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <sc15d4ed.038@mail.startribune.com>
Subject: Re: Mayo clinic study on efficacy of prayer
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 12:31:38 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Don't send this to the local newspaper in Lourdes.
----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2001 10:41 AM
Subject: Mayo clinic study on efficacy of prayer

> Colleagues...
> 
>
In the form of Jim Beniger, who regularly shares interesting stuff from the LA Times with the list, I thought many of you would be interested in the following story in the Star Tribune this morning. You can find the complete version at http://www.startribune.com.

On another note, for those of you interested in Minnesota doings, Gov. Jesse Ventura's job approval rating has dropped to a new low but still, a majority approve of the way he's handling his duties. It's at http://www.startribune.com/poll.

All best wishes....

Rob Daves

Mayo study puts prayer to the test

Josephine Marcotty
Star Tribune
Published Dec 11 2001

Some Mayo Clinic researchers believe that prayer helps patients, but their scientific study into the power of prayer didn't prove it.

Cardiologist Dr. Stephen Kopecky and other researchers followed 799 Mayo Clinic heart disease patients. Half of whom were prayed for by others, although they didn't know it, and half of whom were not.

After six months, researchers found no significant differences between the two groups in the number of deaths, heart attacks, hospitalizations or strokes. The research is published today in the Mayo Clinic Proceedings, a journal published by the Mayo Clinic.

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 11 09:43:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBBHde13851 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:43:39 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id JAA22284 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:43:40 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id fBBHgqU18334 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:42:52 -0800 (PST)
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:42:52 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
December 11, 2001

The War for Public Opinion
Tamara Straus, Senior Editor
AlterNet.org.

In 1922, social critic Walter Lippmann wrote, "Decisions in modern states tend to be made by the interaction, not of Congress and the executive, but of public opinion and the executive."

Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism. The Bush administration has justified its bombing campaign against Afghanistan not with a Congressional declaration of war, but with polls indicating that close to 90 percent of Americans want military action. How easy it must be to point at those numbers and claim, "The public made us do it!"

Public opinion polls have become a kind of Fifth Estate in American politics. As soon as they are released, poll results become fodder to justify policies, attack opponents or wage wars. When the numbers hover around 90 percent, as do Bush's current approval ratings, they are political gospel. After all, when 9 out of 10 Americans agree, the country's resolve must be strong as steel ... Or is it?

Therein lies the rub. Public opinion is a fickle thing, sometimes turning on as
little as one horrific image or triumphant speech. A few well placed media messages
can cause sea changes in national opinion: think of Southern cops turning
dogs and fire hoses loose on desegregation marches; or the videotape of Rodney King;
or napalmed villagers in Vietnam.

The Bush administration knows this media truism all too well. They also know
its corollary -- that with the right pressure, public opinion can be manipulated.
And so, as bombs began to fall on Kabul, the administration launched an equally aggressive front here at home: the war for America's approval of war.

Like recruiting its allies abroad, the U.S. government quickly recruited friends
and institutions for its domestic battle. Back in 1922, Lippmann noted that public
opinion tends to solidify during times of war and that the media, becoming more patriotic, aides in this solidification. This was the case during World Wars I and II, when news items smelled heavily of government propaganda and Hollywood's most talented filmmakers were hired to make inspirational war movies.

This was also the case during the Persian Gulf War. Had the U.S. government allowed reporters to file from the front lines, showing the effect of the war on civilians and the region, public opinion might have been different. Instead, the Gulf War came into Americans' living rooms as a series of fuzzy Defense Department abstractions. What happened in Iraq looked, from the couch, like a video game. Unlike the images that poured into the tube during Vietnam, there was very little to get upset about. The campaign seemed clean, technologically efficient. The majority of the public came away with a favorable impression, even if they failed to feel the war was a moral victory, as was the case during World War II.

That was the media success story of George I. Now along comes George II, waging a more complicated war that is a descendent of his father's. Since the first shots were fired, the Bush administration has successfully squelched negative news reports from Afghanistan. Asked at an October press conference how he would handle the media's war coverage, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld quoted Winston Churchill's
statement about disinformation around the D-day invasion. "Sometimes the truth is so precious it must be accompanied by a bodyguard of lies," he said. "They plan to fight the war and then tell the press and the public how it turned out afterwards," said CNN correspondent Jamie McIntyre, according to the Center for Public Integrity.

The Pentagon's tactics in the media war have been less than subtle. For starters, they bought up access to all commercial satellite photographs of the region, preventing any news outlets from obtaining them. They also have prevented journalists from accompanying soldiers or airmen on most missions, or even from interviewing them afterward. Meanwhile, television news has been behaving more like a wing of the military than an objective Fourth Estate, with anchors like CBS Dan Rather pledging his allegiance on air: "Wherever [Bush] wants me to line up, just tell me where." CNN Chairman Walter Isaacson ordered news staff to limit reports of Afghan war casualties and use World Trade Center deaths to justify the killings. Newspaper editors have admitted to taking dead civilian Afghans off their front pages for fear of appearing unpatriotic.

In other words, so far, so good. Bush has never strayed from framing the war on terrorism as fight of good against evil. Thus the further destruction of Afghanistan is just retribution against "evil doers," whether majority of them -- the Al Qaeda -- are in Afghanistan or not, whether military retaliation will quell terrorism or not. It's a message that domestic media outlets seem to like far more than reports of civilian casualties.

However, the Bush administration has had to contend with a new set of media forces arising from the "Information Revolution." The war on terrorism is the world's first war for the Internet and foreign news outlets. Never before have so many people ostensibly had access to so much news and opinion from so many sources. Never before has it been possible to gauge so many views -- not only in the U.S. -- but from Europe and the Middle East. That is the quandary the Bush administration faces in "winning the war on ideas," as Bush phrased it. Public opinion is now
vulnerable to what is reported outside the U.S.'s news borders.

In fact, of the 10 percent that don't approve of Phase I of the terror war, many have probably taken to surfing the Internet for their information, reading critical reports on the progress and logic of the campaign from sites like the UK's Guardian, Dawn (Pakistan's English daily) and AlterNet.org (whose readership soared 500 percent in the days after Sept. 11). London's BBC has reported a record number of Americans tuning in to their Web site, radio and television broadcasts.

There is plenty of stomach-turning information out there to be found. In a Dec. 3 New York Times story, an Afghan man named Khalil, who survived U.S. bombs in the Tora Bora area, was quoted as saying, "The village is no more. All my family, 12 people were killed. I am the only one left in this family. I have lost my children, my wife. They are no more." According to AlterNet's David Corn, other Afghan refugees have reported similar slaughters; one said she had lost 38 relatives in a U.S. attack; another estimated up to 200 were dead in her village.

So what will Phase II of the war hold? According to a December Harris poll, more than eight of 10 Americans said the U.S. government's actions should be assisted by many countries, and that it is important to get support from the U.N. Security Council to expand the war. If this is true -- if multilateralism becomes increasingly important to Americans -- then views from Europe and the Middle East may suddenly become relevant.

In Europe, public approval of America's war in Afghanistan waned significantly in the month of November. In England, from a peak on par with U.S. public opinion right after the attacks, support for the bombing campaign fell to two-thirds. In France, support dropped from two-thirds to half, and, in Germany and Italy, well over half the population wanted the attacks on Afghanistan to stop, according to the European press.

The reason for this wane in European support was fairly clear: the Europeans
saw disturbing images of civilian casualties from the U.S. bombing campaign that Americans did not. "The public sees continuous bombing of buildings and they see pictures from Al Jazeera of small villages that have made things immensely difficult," Helmut Lippelt, a German Green Party legislator, told the New York Times. This kind of negative opinion could come to haunt Americans if the war is widened or American troops get bogged down in civil unrest in Afghanistan.

Harder still to ignore will be views from the Middle East, where negative opinion about the war on terrorism has been of huge concern to the U.S. government. Never before in wartime has the U.S. had to work so hard to contain the views of its enemies. And that has everything to do with telecommunication advances as well as the growth of Middle Eastern news media. Back in August 1990, in the prelude to the Gulf War, news of Iraq's conquest of Kuwait did not hit the Arab world through official media for three entire days. There were no 24-hour news Arab news networks and Middle Eastern media were tightly controlled by government. Today, there are five pan-Arab new networks, including Al Jazeera, the 24-hour Qatar-based news station, which is watched by 35 million viewers in 20 Arab countries and airs sharp critiques of American policy in the region.

The Bush administration is well aware of the powers these news outlets possess, and has gone into high gear to convince Middle East citizens that the war on terrorism is aimed not at them, but at terrorists in their midst. As part of this effort, the Pentagon has hired the Reardon Group, a public relations firm in Washington, D.C., to help explain the U.S. military strikes to global audiences. The administration also has established a "coalition of information centers" in Washington, London and Islamabad to disseminate war news to Middle Eastern reporters -- a hard task since those on the ground in Afghanistan and elsewhere are 10 hours ahead of Washington.

Yet even with these recent moves, U.S. government officials have been quick to admit that, so far, they have lost the battle for Middle Eastern public opinion. The U.S. has almost no cultural organizations in the Middle East and its main
broadcasting arm, Voice of America had, as of Sept. 11, an audience share of 2 percent in the region.

The chief problem is that the U.S. has little credibility in the Arab world -- not in Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan or Iran and certainly not in Iraq and Palestine. In order to explain the Afghan bombing campaign, officials of the Bush administration, such as Condoleeza Rice and Colin Powell, have appeared on Al Jazeera. But, according to many news critics the effect has not been positive. "Every time I see an American official speaking on Al Jazeera, I think of how much that person is inciting sentiment against America by promoting the American view," said Lamis Andoni, a Jordanian journalist who has covered the Middle East for 20 years. "It backfires. What does the U.S. have to say? That in order to get bin Laden it has to bomb all of Afghanistan and cause more misery in Afghanistan? This doesn't sell in the Arab world."

What does seem to sell is bin Laden's message -- not necessarily that a jihad should be waged against America -- but that the U.S. is at fault for the economic, political and social problems of the Arab world. On Arab TV, bin Laden has listed the very issues that the U.S. government refuses to address: support of repressive regimes like Saudi Arabia, which permit the stationing of U.S. troops; the economic sanctions against Iraq, which have stifled Middle Eastern trade; and globalization, which has weakened the cultural traditions of Islam and caused a stark awareness of the haves and the have-nots.

Indeed, bin Laden has proved to be the U.S.'s chief foe not only because he presents a terrorist threat but because he is the savviest of media manipulators, the fiercest of propagandists. His chief weapon on Sept. 11 was not so much the bodily damage that can be achieved with jetliners but the psychological impact of watching those jetliners take out America's most important economic and military symbols. Bin Laden understood well in advance that the destruction would be watched over and over again on American television.
The question now remains: What is the level of support for bin Laden in the Arab world? If he is captured and executed by the U.S. military will there be blowback--will it unleash a new wave of terrorism in the U.S. and abroad? And if that happens, will the U.S. media remain as devout to government propaganda as it has been thus far, or focus on what is being said in Europe and the Middle East? The answers to those questions will shape inevitably the public opinion war to come.

* * * * *

Okay, I feel compelled to flog this (dead or otherwise) horse. There might be a split between American public opinion and world opinion generally. One would
think that in the final analysis the U.S. does itself no good by walling itself off from images the rest of the world receives, for fear it might affect U.S. opinion. One also wonders about the motivation; I suspect that Americans' feelings run so high that even the harshest images will have little effect on public support for the war.

That having been said, I think the larger question was addressed by Kofi Annan in a speech on October 1 at the UN. He argued that the prerequisites for world opinion were in place for the struggle on terrorism, since the attacks on the US were "acts of terrible evil which shocked the conscience of the entire world." He also noted, however, that the momentum for this struggle must be kept up if it is going to be successful. It remains to be seen whether world opinion will, in fact, sustain the efforts needed to at least limit terroristic activities; as Annan notes, perhaps the most difficult problem is reaching a consensus on how one defines "terrorism."

At any rate, isolating ourselves from images the rest of the world is, at best, an unnecessary reaction, and seems hardly seems a means to accomplish this larger task.

James Beniger wrote:

> This piece by Tamara Straus relies heavily on poll data, including some likely collected with the help of people on our humble list.  -- Jim

> ---------------------------------------------------------------------------
> Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute
> ---------------------------------------------------------------------------
> http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=12050
> December 11, 2001
> The War for Public Opinion
> Tamara Straus, Senior Editor AlterNet.org.
> In 1922, social critic Walter Lippmann wrote, "Decisions in modern states tend to be made by the interaction, not of Congress and the executive, but of public opinion and the executive."
Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism. The Bush administration has justified its bombing campaign against Afghanistan not with a Congressional declaration of war, but with polls indicating that close to 90 percent of Americans want military action. How easy it must be to point at those numbers and claim, "The public made us do it!"

Public opinion polls have become a kind of Fifth Estate in American politics. As soon as they are released, poll results become fodder to justify policies, attack opponents or wage wars. When the numbers hover around 90 percent, as do Bush's current approval ratings, they are political gospel. After all, when 9 out of 10 Americans agree, the country's resolve must be strong as steel ... Or is it?

Therein lies the rub. Public opinion is a fickle thing, sometimes turning on as little as one horrific image or triumphant speech. A few well placed media messages can cause sea changes in national opinion: think of Southern cops turning dogs and fire hoses loose on desegregation marches; or the videotape of Rodney King; or napalmed villagers in Vietnam.

The Bush administration knows this media truism all too well. They also know its corollary -- that with the right pressure, public opinion can be manipulated. And so, as bombs began to fall on Kabul, the administration launched an equally aggressive front here at home: the war for America's approval of war.

Like recruiting its allies abroad, the U.S. government quickly recruited friends and institutions for its domestic battle. Back in 1922, Lippmann noted that public opinion tends to solidify during times of war and that the media, becoming more patriotic, aides in this solidification. This was the case during World Wars I and II, when news items smelled heavily of government propaganda and Hollywood's most talented filmmakers were hired to make inspirational war movies.

This was also the case during the Persian Gulf War. Had the U.S. government allowed reporters to file from the front lines, showing the effect of the war on civilians and the region, public opinion might have been different. Instead, the Gulf War came into Americans' living rooms as a series of fuzzy Defense Department abstractions. What happened in Iraq looked, from the couch, like a video game.

Unlike the images that poured into the tube during Vietnam, there was very little to get upset about. The campaign seemed clean, technologically efficient. The majority of the public came away with a favorable impression, even if they failed to feel the war was a moral victory, as was the case during World War II.

That was the media success story of George I. Now along comes George II, waging a more complicated war that is a descendent of his father's. Since the first shots were fired, the Bush administration has successfully squelched negative news reports from Afghanistan. Asked at an October press conference how he would handle the media's war coverage, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld quoted Winston Churchill's statement about disinformation around the D-day invasion: "Sometimes the truth is so precious it must be accompanied by a
bodyguard of lies," he said. "They plan to fight the war and then
tell the press and the public how it turned out afterwards," said CNN
correspondent Jamie McIntyre, according to the Center for Public
Integrity.

The Pentagon's tactics in the media war have been less than subtle.
For starters, they bought up access to all commercial satellite
photographs of the region, preventing any news outlets from obtaining
them. They also have prevented journalists from accompanying soldiers
or airmen on most missions, or even from interviewing them afterward.
Meanwhile, television news has been behaving more like a wing of the
military than an objective Fourth Estate, with anchors like CBS Dan
Rather pledging his allegiance on air: "Wherever [Bush] wants me to
line up, just tell me where." CNN Chairman Walter Isaacson ordered
news staff to limit reports of Afghan war casualties and use World
Trade Center deaths to justify the killings. Newspaper editors have
admitted to taking dead civilian Afghans off their front pages for
fear of appearing unpatriotic.

In other words, so far, so good. Bush has never strayed from framing
the war on terrorism as fight of good against evil. Thus the further
destruction of Afghanistan is just retribution against "evil doers,"
whether majority of them -- the Al Qaeda -- are in Afghanistan or not,
whether military retaliation will quell terrorism or not. It's a
message that domestic media outlets seem to like far more than
reports of civilian casualties.

However, the Bush administration has had to contend with a new set of
media forces arising from the "Information Revolution." The war on
terrorism is the world's first war for the Internet and foreign news
outlets. Never before have so many people ostensibly had access to so
much news and opinion from so many sources. Never before has it been
possible to gauge so many views -- not only in the U.S. -- but from
Europe and the Middle East. That is the quandary the Bush
administration faces in "winning the war on ideas," as Bush phrased
it. Public opinion is now vulnerable to what is reported outside the
U.S.'s news borders.

In fact, of the 10 percent that don't approve of Phase I of the
terror war, many have probably taken to surfing the Internet for
their information, reading critical reports on the progress and logic
of the campaign from sites like the UK's Guardian, Dawn (Pakistan's
English daily) and AlterNet.org (whose readership soared 500 percent in the days
after Sept. 11). London's BBC has reported a record number of Americans
tuning in to their Web site, radio and television broadcasts.

There is plenty of stomach-turning information out there to be found.
In a Dec. 3 New York Times story, an Afghan man named Khalil, who
survived U.S. bombs in the Tora Bora area, was quoted as saying, "The
village is no more. All my family, 12 people were killed. I am the
only one left in this family. I have lost my children, my wife. They
are no more." According to AlterNet's David Corn, other Afghan
refugees have reported similar slaughters; one said she had lost 38
relatives in a U.S. attack; another estimated up to 200 were dead in
her village.
So what will Phase II of the war hold? According to a December Harris poll, more than eight of 10 Americans said the U.S. government's actions should be assisted by many countries, and that it is important to get support from the U.N. Security Council to expand the war. If this is true -- if multilateralism becomes increasingly important to Americans -- then views from Europe and the Middle East may suddenly become relevant.

In Europe, public approval of America's war in Afghanistan waned significantly in the month of November. In England, from a peak on par with U.S. public opinion right after the attacks, support for the bombing campaign fell to two-thirds. In France, support dropped from two-thirds to half, and, in Germany and Italy, well over half the population wanted the attacks on Afghanistan to stop, according to the European press.

The reason for this wane in European support was fairly clear: the Europeans saw disturbing images of civilian casualties from the U.S. bombing campaign that Americans did not. "The public sees continuous bombing of buildings and they see pictures from Al Jazeera of small villages that have made things immensely difficult," Helmut Lippelt, a German Green Party legislator, told the New York Times. This kind of negative opinion could come to haunt Americans if the war is widened or American troops get bogged down in civil unrest in Afghanistan.

Harder still to ignore will be views from the Middle East, where negative opinion about the war on terrorism has been of huge concern to the U.S. government. Never before in wartime has the U.S. had to work so hard to contain the views of its enemies. And that has everything to do with telecommunication advances as well as the growth of Middle Eastern news media. Back in August 1990, in the prelude to the Gulf War, news of Iraq's conquest of Kuwait did not hit the Arab world through official media for three entire days. There were no 24-hour news Arab news networks and Middle Eastern media were tightly controlled by government. Today, there are five pan-Arab new networks, including Al Jazeera, the 24-hour Qatar-based news station, which is watched by 35 million viewers in 20 Arab countries and airs sharp critiques of American policy in the region.

The Bush administration is well aware of the powers these news outlets possess, and has gone into high gear to convince Middle East citizens that the war on terrorism is aimed not at them, but at terrorists in their midst. As part of this effort, the Pentagon has hired the Reardon Group, a public relations firm in Washington, D.C., to help explain the U.S. military strikes to global audiences. The administration also has established a "coalition of information centers" in Washington, London and Islamabad to disseminate war news to Middle Eastern reporters -- a hard task since those on the ground in Afghanistan and elsewhere are 10 hours ahead of Washington.

Yet even with these recent moves, U.S. government officials have been quick to admit that, so far, they have lost the battle for Middle Eastern public opinion. The U.S. has almost no cultural organizations in the Middle East and its main broadcasting arm, Voice of America, had, as of Sept. 11, an audience share of 2 percent in the region.

The chief problem is that the U.S. has little credibility in the Arab
world -- not in Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan or Iran and certainly not in 
Iraq and Palestine. In order to explain the Afghan bombing campaign, 
officials of the Bush administration, such as Condoleezza Rice and 
Colin Powell, have appeared on Al Jazeera. But, according to many 
news critics the effect has not been positive. "Every time I see an 
American official speaking on Al Jazeera, I think of how much that 
person is inciting sentiment against America by promoting the 
American view," said Lamis Andoni, a Jordanian journalist who has 
covered the Middle East for 20 years. "It backfires. What does the 
U.S. have to say? That in order to get bin Laden it has to bomb all 
of Afghanistan and cause more misery in Afghanistan? This doesn't 
sell in the Arab world."

What does seem to sell is bin Laden's message -- not necessarily that 
a jihad should be waged against America -- but that the U.S. is at 
fault for the economic, political and social problems of the Arab 
world. On Arab TV, bin Laden has listed the very issues that the U.S. 
government refuses to address: support of repressive regimes like 
Saudi Arabia, which permit the stationing of U.S. troops; the 
economic sanctions against Iraq, which have stifled Middle Eastern 
trade; and globalization, which has weakened the cultural traditions 
of Islam and caused a stark awareness of the haves and the have-nots.

Indeed, bin Laden has proved to be the U.S.'s chief foe not only 
because he presents a terrorist threat but because he is the savviest 
of media manipulators, the fiercest of propagandists. His chief 
weapon on Sept. 11 was not so much the bodily damage that can be 
achieved with jetliners but the psychological impact of watching 
those jetliners take out America's most important economic and 
military symbols. Bin Laden understood well in advance that the 
destruction would be watched over and over again on American 
television.

The question now remains: What is the level of support for bin Laden 
in the Arab world? If he is captured and executed by the U.S. 
military will there be blowback -- will it unleash a new wave of 
terrorism in the U.S. and abroad? And if that happens, will the U.S. 
media remain as devout to government propaganda as it has been thus 
far, or focus on what is being said in Europe and the Middle East? 
The answers to those questions will shape inevitably the public 
opinion war to come.
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On Tue, 11 Dec 2001, leobogart wrote:

> Don't send this to the local newspaper in Lourdes.
> ----- Original Message ----- 
> From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2001 10:41 AM
> Subject: Mayo clinic study on efficacy of prayer

Folks,

I am most heartened by the findings reported by Rob Daves and, contrary to Leo Bogart, I believe that the good people at Lourdes would share my own feelings.

If one's faith could be substantiated by empirical science, after all, it would no longer be a faith—now would it?

So if the findings Rob reports had gone the other way, the good people at Lourdes would have been instantly transformed into applied scientists. Do we really need any more applied scientists at the Mayo Clinic? Judging by the study which the Clinic has just completed, as reported by Rob, I'd say that what the place really needs is much more faith—faith being a much better comfort to those dying, and to those whose loved ones are about to die—than are, say, sedatives, barbiturates or tranquilizers.

Me, I'm not a very religious person myself, except in a very general sense, but I do indeed have faith in faith. People who have faith in something—anything—I find, are almost always much better off than those who do not.

I'm also impressed by how many of those mere mortals who in fact have pioneered Western science—since the Enlightenment—have been people of often intense faith in things still to this day beyond all science.

For the many methodologists on our humble list, allow me to
suggest this: If we start with the individual respondent, and work outwards from that person, I think we will almost always end up on faith in something. If we begin with only a general sense of "faith" in the abstract, however, and work inwards toward individual respondents, I think we will very rarely end up with anything at all. Sartre and Camus pioneered something like this methodological approach, I do believe, but it's only my opinion.

And all of the above is merely my typically elaborate introduction to tell you this:

My best wishes to you all, on this most ancient of holiday seasons, in which we can pause to honor those deeply hidden and mysterious features of being human that go back almost to the time when one of our collective ancestors first had the cheeky idea to climb out of the bog and then the swamp. Whatever this same idea might look like today, and whatever label you yourself might put on it, I do think it's well worth keeping around, in as many different forms as we can.

Seasons greetings to you all!

-- Jim

******
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   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBBJ00e28847 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
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Subject: Mayo Study on Prayer Preceded by Francis Galton in 1872
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

All best wishes.

Those amused by the Mayo study may wish to know that Francis Galton published
"Statistical Inquiries into the Efficacy of Prayer"
in 1872.

Put the title into Google to get the text.

Cheers, -Mike K.
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Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:21:23 EST
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Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless Bush, a la Clinton, did some private polling to see what kind of response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would lead to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is: Bush response leads to public response. Thus her statement, "Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism" smacks more of leftish sophistry than of reasoned analysis. Furthermore, it is not just "a bombing campaign against Afghanistan", but rather a very successful internationally co-ordinated military assault against a particular regime that Afghanistan seems happy to be rid of. Polls could hardly play a role in such an operation.

Do we really need to hear this stuff?

Ray Funkhouser
>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Dec 11 14:08:08 2001
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Received: from WARREN.mindspring.com (63-216-231-13.sds1.cais.net [63.216.231.13])
Ray,

Do you really think the Bush administration would not do a poll to find out the public reaction to bombing Afghanistan? Any administration would poll in those circumstances, Republican or Democratic. It might not influence their decision on whether or not to bomb, but it certainly would inform them on how they needed to respond to the public.

warren mitofsky

At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:
>Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless
>Bush, a la Clinton, did some private polling to see what kind of
>response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to
>indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would
>lead to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is:
>Bush response leads to
>public response. Thus her statement, "Never has this been truer than in the
>war on terrorism" smacks more of leftish sophistry than of reasoned analysis.
>Furthermore, it is not just "a bombing campaign against
>Afghanistan", but rather a very successful internationally co-ordinated
>military assault against a particular regime that Afghanistan seems
>happy to be rid of. Polls could hardly play a role in such an
>operation.
>
>Do we really need to hear this stuff?
>
>Ray Funkhouser
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Do you really think the Bush administration would not do a poll to find out the public reaction to bombing Afghanistan? Any administration would poll in those circumstances, Republican or Democratic. It might not influence their decision on whether or not to bomb, but it certainly would inform them on how they needed to respond to the public.

Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless Bush, a la Clinton, did some private polling to see what kind of response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would lead to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is: Bush response leads to public response. Thus her statement, "Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism," smacks more of leftish sophistry than of reasoned analysis. Furthermore, it is not just a bombing campaign against Afghanistan, but rather a very successful internationally co-ordinated military assault against a particular regime that Afghanistan seems happy to be rid of. Polls could hardly play a role in such an operation.

Do we really need to hear this stuff?
Warren,

I thought what Ray meant was that a policy was formulated, and the public then OK'ed it. Way back then there were some announcements hinting at such a policy, and it is perfectly possible that some poll results were looked at that confirmed public support for those policies before the final announcements as to what the administration was planning.

The question is: do some respondents reply that they agree with or approve the policy even though, if another policy had been put forward by the administration, they would have agreed with or approved that one.

There really hasn't been a strong public statement of an alternative to the "bomb Aghanistan" (alternatively, "form an international coalition to deal with terrorism by means of force"), and with the present mood of unity, it is not surprising that a huge percent of poll respondents endorse the policy that *is.*

Jeanne Anderson

Warren Mitofsky wrote:
Ray,

Do you really think the Bush administration would not do a poll to find out the public reaction to bombing Afghanistan? Any administration would poll in those circumstances, Republican or Democratic. It might not influence their decision on whether or not to bomb, but it certainly would inform them on how they needed to respond to the public. Warren Mitofsky

At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:

>> Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless Bush, a la Clinton, did some private polling to see what kind of response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would lead to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is: Bush response leads to public response. Thus her statement, "Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism" smacks more of leftish sophistry than of reasoned analysis.

Furthermore, it is not just "a bombing campaign against Afghanistan", but rather a very successful internationally co-ordinated military assault against a particular regime that Afghanistan seems happy to be rid of. Polls could hardly play a role in such an operation.

Do we really need to hear this stuff?

Ray Funkhouser

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031 Phone
212 980-3107 FAX
mitofsky@mindspring.com
http://www.MitofskyInternational.com

Warren,

I thought what Ray meant was that a policy was formulated, and the public then OK'd it. Way back then there were some announcements hinting at such a policy, and it is perfectly possible that some poll results were looked at that
confirmed
public support for those policies before the final announcements as to what the
administration was planning. <p>The question is: do some respondents reply that they
agree with or approve the policy even though, if another policy had been put forward
by the administration, they would have agreed with or approved that one. <p>There
really hasn't been a strong public statement of an alternative to the "bomb Aghanistan" (alternatively, "form an international coalition to deal with terrorism
by means of force"), and with the present mood of unity, it is not surprising that a
huge percent of poll respondents endorse the policy that *is.* <p>Jeanne
Anderson <p>Warren Mitofsky wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>&nbsp;Ray, <br>Do you
really think the Bush administration would not do a poll to find out the public reaction to
bombing Afghanistan? Any administration would poll in those circumstances, Republican
or Democratic. It might not influence their decision on whether or not to bomb, but
it certainly would inform them on how they needed to respond to the public.<br>warren mitofsky <p>At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:
Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless Bush , a la Clinton, did some private polling to see
what kind of response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to
indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would lead
to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is: Bush
response leads to public response. Thus her statement, "Never has
this been truer than in the war on terrorism" smacks more of leftist sophistry
than of reasoned analysis. &nbsp;&nbsp;Furthermore, it is not just "a bombing
campaign against Afghanistan", but rather a very successful internationally
co-ordinated military assault against a particular regime that Afghanistan
seems happy to be rid of. Polls could hardly play a role in such an operation.<br>Do we really need to hear this stuff? <p>Ray Funkhouser</blockquote>

Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
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Johnny Blair
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I personally felt the Tamara Straus piece was shallow nonsense, but since it seems to have sparked a debate about the Bush administration justifying its behavior by quoting polls, I thought it would be appropriate to post here a letter from Humphrey Taylor that was published in last Saturday's NY Times.

I believe that Humphrey speaks for all, or at least most of us here.

----------

To the Editor:

Anthony Lewis and William Safire (columns, Dec. 4 and 6) have done an eloquent job of critiquing the government's recent actions and proposals regarding military courts and other measures to make it easier for law enforcement agencies to investigate, try and convict potential terrorists.

In response to such criticisms, supporters of the administration have quoted the polls, including ours, which show that their actions and proposals enjoy the support of large majorities of the public.

As a pollster, I am always concerned when policy makers argue that something is right because majorities of the public support it. In times of war and national emergencies - from John Adams's Sedition Act to Franklin D. Roosevelt's rounding up of Japanese-Americans - most people have probably approved of draconian measures that we later came to regret. The founding fathers did not favor direct democracy.

Our legislators should certainly be well informed about public opinion. But they should make up their own minds on the merits of the case, with one eye on how history will judge them.

HUMPHREY TAYLOR
Jeanne Anderson Research wrote:
>
> Warren,
> I thought what Ray meant was that a policy was formulated, and the public then OK'ed it. Way back then there were some announcements hinting at such a policy, and it is perfectly possible that some poll results were looked at that confirmed public support for those policies before the final announcements as to what the administration was planning.
>
> The question is: do some respondents reply that they agree with or approve the policy even though, if another policy had been put forward by the administration, they would have agreed with or approved that one.
>
> There really hasn't been a strong public statement of an alternative to the "bomb Afghanistan" (alternatively, "form an international coalition to deal with terrorism by means of force"), and with the present mood of unity, it is not surprising that a huge percent of poll respondents endorse the policy that *is.*
>
> Jeanne Anderson
>
> Warren Mitofsky wrote:
>
> > Ray,
> > Do you really think the Bush administration would not do a poll to find out the public reaction to bombing Afghanistan? Any administration would poll in those circumstances, Republican or Democratic. It might not influence their decision on whether or not to bomb, but it certainly would inform them on how they needed to respond to the public. warren mitofsky
>
> > At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:
>
> >> Seems to me, Tamara Straus is being too clever by half here. Unless Bush, a la Clinton, did some private polling to see what kind of response to 9-11 would fly with the public (I have heard nothing to indicate that he did, and I can't imagine any kind of poll that would lead to the policies he put into effect), the cause-effect relationship here is: Bush response leads to public response. Thus her statement, "Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism" smacks more of leftish sophistry than of
> reasoned analysis.
> Furthermore, it is not just "a bombing campaign against
> Afghanistan", but
> rather a very successful internationally co-ordinated military
> assault
> against a particular regime that Afghanistan seems happy to be rid
> of. Polls
> could hardly play a role in such an operation.
> DO we really need to hear this stuff?
> Ray Funkhouser
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
> 212 980-3031 Phone
> 212 980-3107 FAX
> mitofsky@mindspring.com
> http://www.MitofskyInternational.com

> From wendylanders@hotmail.com Tue Dec 11 16:19:59 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id fBC0Jxe04926 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
> 16:19:59 -0800 (PST)
> Received: from hotmail.com (law2-f78.hotmail.com [216.32.181.78])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id QAA26643 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:19:57 -0800
> (PST)
> Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC;
> Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:19:06 -0800
> X-Originate-IP: [63.149.125.129]
> From: "Wendy Landers" <wendylanders@hotmail.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: survey research in the UK
> Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 19:19:06 -0500
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/html
> Message-ID: <LAW2-F78atwD43oFLaq000003e8@hotmail.com>
> X-OriginalArrivalTime: 12 Dec 2001 00:19:06.0677 (UTC)
> FILETIME=[9C9A8650:01C182A2]

<html>
<div style='background-color:'></div>
<div>
<h1>Hi,</h1>
<p>Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's going on currently in survey research in the UK? &nbsp; Anyone out there from the UK willing to answer some basic questions?</p>
</div>
</div>
</html>

Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile
At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> Do we really need to hear this stuff?
> 
> Ray Funkhouser

-------

Ray,

What I think each one of us needs to hear are views different from our own, and also a wide range of views--at least if we are to be of any use whatsoever, to one another.

-- Jim

*****
Hi,

Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's going on currently in survey research in the UK? Anyone out there from the UK willing to answer some basic questions?

Thanks,

Wendy Landers
Hi,

Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's going on currently in survey research in the UK? Anyone out there from the UK willing to answer some basic questions?

Thanks,
Wendy Landers
My colleagues and I are planning a large national telephone survey of political engagement, with an oversample of young people aged 15-25. We need advice on making sure that our sample design adequately covers people currently enrolled in colleges and universities, or, at the least, estimating the size and nature of noncoverage bias we face if we try to use RDD to reach this population.

We would appreciate suggestions about articles or other materials that have addressed this issue, or advice from anyone who has undertaken this task before.

Thanks very much. I'll be happy to summarize private responses for the list.

--
Scott Keeter
Dept. of Public and International Affairs
George Mason University MSN 3F4
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
Voice 703 993 1412
Department fax 703 993 1399
Personal fax 703 832 0209
Table 239 of the 2000 Statistical Abstract gives projected school enrollment for 2002. The tables that follow give actual figures by race, gender, etc. for 1999. These data could be used to estimate the proportion of students in the population. Unfortunately, their age groups are '14 and 15 years old' then '16 and 17 years old'. So you are in a box for 15 to 25. Good luck.

Steve Dienstfrey
Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.
Scott -

This site will be helpful.

Digest Of Education Staisitics, 2000 http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/digest/Tables:
http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/digest/list_tables.html

Scott Keeter wrote:

> My colleagues and I are planning a large national telephone survey of political engagement, with an oversample of young people aged 15-25. We need advice on making sure that our sample design adequately covers people currently enrolled in colleges and universities, or, at the least, estimating the size and nature of noncoverage bias we face if we try to use RDD to reach this population.
We would appreciate suggestions about articles or other materials that have addressed this issue, or advice from anyone who has undertaken this task before.

Thanks very much. I'll be happy to summarize private responses for the list.

--
Scott Keeter
Dept. of Public and International Affairs
George Mason University MSN 3F4
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
Voice 703 993 1412
Department fax 703 993 1399
Personal fax 703 832 0209
E-mail skeeter@gmu.edu
Web site http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But
counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

>From igem100@iupui.edu Wed Dec 12 08:15:08 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBCGF8e27747 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:15:08 -0800 (PST)
08:15:08
-0800 (PST)
Received: from hermes.iupui.edu (hermes.iupui.edu [134.68.220.31])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA23409 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:15:05 -0800
(PST)
Received: from iupui.edu ([134.68.45.22])
   by hermes.iupui.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/IUPUIPO.20010926) with ESMTP id
LAA05098;
   Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:14:29 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3C1782A2.CE9F4677@iupui.edu>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:15:30 -0500
From: Brian Vargus <igem100@iupui.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.6 [en] (Win98; I)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
References: <3f.34180f2.2948d6f2@aol.com>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----------
40C90652A7FA6970661448B9"

--------------40C90652A7FA6970661448B9
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached." While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a
fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as
Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way
Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be
appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be
said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch
so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> Jim --
> > Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of
diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since
general perceived, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions
that differ from my own.
> > BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have
been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11.
Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high
approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that
Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who
overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high
ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have
somehow managed to spin the story
> > negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive
agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches.
But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional
intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.
> > In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical
called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you
mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the
Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity!
But
> > let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to
include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we
> > pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed;
> > otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?
> > Ray Funkhouser

--------------40C90652A7FA6970661448B9
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html> As C.
Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached." While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out. 

RFunk787@aol.com wrote: 

"Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own. BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to. In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford
department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity!

But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

You sir, unable to remove the partisan political prism through which you view all things, read beyond the data. Approval ratings DO NOT necessarily translate into a) votes or b) thankfulness that the other candidate lost. GWB is NOT up for election, so no choice is offered, nor are approval ratings of other possibly competing figures (e.g., Senate majority leader Daschle) offered for comparison. I dare say the high levels of approval are NOT unprecedented, but actually typical of true national emergencies. Finally, I am tired of people who trumpet approval ratings for "their guy" but undercut such ratings for the "other guy" (e.g., the "unexpectedly" high ratings for Clinton during the impeachment imbroglio) even though the methodology for obtaining these figures is identical!

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
-----Original Message-----
From: RFunk787@aol.com [SMTP:RFunk787@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:51 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: reply to Jim B.

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of
diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its
inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that
differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been
dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite
numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval
ratings;
large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost;
the
latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted
against
Bush, now preponderantly give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two
mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the
story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such
interpretive
agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches.
But
counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional
intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical
called
for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a
Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the
Stanford
psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity!
But
let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to
include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we
pollsters
are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why
should
the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Wed Dec 12 08:24:49 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

> As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached."
> While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my
> own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also
> much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it
> appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the
> comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments
> betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history.
> See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and
> Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh,
> claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a
> religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said
> for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late
> Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites,
> many of us have sold out.
>
Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

>> Jim --
>>
>> Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

>> BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

>> In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

--------------0124DC47ACC3302E0DE387F3
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html>
Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this? <p>Nick <p>Brian Vargus wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached."
While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's &nbsp;87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. &nbsp; As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. &nbsp; See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. &nbsp; I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. &nbsp; Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. &nbsp; But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in <u>The Revolt of the Elites</u>, many of us have sold out. <p>Brian Vargus &nbsp;
<p>RFunk787@aol.com wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>Jim -- <p>Once again we are in total agreement. &nbsp; I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own. <p>BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. &nbsp; Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; &nbsp; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). &nbsp; Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. &nbsp; Perhaps you
are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity!

But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

---

---

There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both asked Nov. 27 (a split sample):

Do you think non-U.S. (United States) 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?
It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military tribunal, where trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge and jury, and there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would protect ongoing investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may fear for their lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way. 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?

The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a criminal court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.

Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.

Lydia Saad

The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached." While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he
is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters
are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

>From dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com Wed Dec 12 08:43:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
   id fBCGhle02680 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:43:47
-0800 (PST)
Received: from kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com (mail.smartrevenue.com
[164.109.30.90])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/uscd) with ESMTP
   id IAA18795 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:43:45 -0800
(PST)
Received: from danlaptop (cp150604-a.mtgmry1.md.home.com [65.1.245.130]) by
kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com (Rockliffe SMTPRA 3.4.5) with SMTP id
<B0000222981@kopl550145.db.smartrevenue.com> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec
2001 11:38:07 -0500
Reply-To: <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
From: "Dan Navarro" <dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Mailing houses
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:44:15 -0500
Message-ID: <LPBBINMPOBMDDJCBNLJGEEOBENAA.dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
In-Reply-To: <LPBBINMPOBMDDJCBNLJGEEBOENAA.dan.navarro@smartrevenue.com>

Dear Aapornet:

Does anyone know of a dependable mailing house? We have a potential 500,000 survey
invitation mailing and would like to get some service pricing.

Thanks,
Dan

Dan Navarro
Director, Project Management and Operations
SmartRevenue.com
Tel:  301-770-8600 x403
Fax:  240-465-0572
Web:  www.smartrevenue.com

>FromKFeld@humanvoice.com Wed Dec 12 08:45:29 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/uscd) with ESMTP
Wendy,

The primary research organization in the UK is the Market Research Society. You can obtain their contact info at http://www.marketresearch.org.uk. Their magazine, Research, is the best way I've found to keep up on trends in the British research industry. Do you have an interest in a particular type of research? If so, let me know and I can probably point you to a couple of UK researchers who can speak to your topic of interest.

Regards,

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
humanvoice, inc.
2155 North Freedom Blvd.
Provo, Utah 84601
p: +1 801 344 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008
e: kfeld@humanvoice.com

Karl's next speaking engagement is ESOMAR Net Effects 5 in Berlin, Germany on February 3-5. Learn more at http://www.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm
Hi,

Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's going on currently in survey research in the UK? Anyone out there from the UK willing to answer some basic questions?

Thanks,

Wendy Landers

The primary research organization in the UK is the Market Research Society. You can obtain their contact info. at [http://www.marketresearch.org.uk](http://www.marketresearch.org.uk)

Their magazine, Research, is the best way I've found to keep up on trends in the field.
British research industry. Do you have an interest in a particular type of =20
research? If so, let me know and I can probably point you to a couple of =20
UK researchers who can speak to your topic of interest.

---

Karl G. Feld
Vice President, Research Development
human voice, inc.
2155 North Freedom Blvd.
Provo, Utah 84601
p: +1 801 344 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008
e: kfeld@humanvoice.com

Karl's next speaking engagement is ESOMAR Net Effects 5 in Berlin, Germany on February 3-5. Learn more at http://www.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm

---

Wendy Landers
wendylanders@hotmail.com

Hi,

Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's going on currently in survey research in the UK? Anyone out there from the UK willing to answer some basic questions?

Thanks,

Wendy Landers

Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile device: Click Here
The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Civil Liberties survey asks about military tribunals. The results can be found here:


Stephen Pelletier
court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.

Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.

Lydia Saad

The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached."

While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity--your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion.

But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of
diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

Stephen R. Pelletier, Ph.D.
Assistant Director for Administration
Harvard Opinion Research Program
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston MA 02115

(Phone) 617-432-7032
(Fax) 617-432-0092
SPelleti@hsph.harvard.edu
www.hsph.harvard.edu/horp
My personal feeling is that the ABC description goes much too far.

> From pollingreport.com, here is a Fox poll that yields a mirror
> opposite result
> from the "special military tribunal" questions now is use.


"Do you think suspected terrorists should be tried in a non-public military tribunal, in which the names of the defendants and the evidence is withheld, or should they be tried in the normal justice system?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A non-public military tribunal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The normal justice system</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I believe others have said, perhaps these opinions are not strongly held.

Nick

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

> There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both
> asked Nov. 27 (a split sample):
> > Do you think non-U.S. (United States) 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?
> > It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are
charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military tribunal, where trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge and jury, and there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would protect ongoing investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may fear for their lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way. 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?

The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a criminal court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.

Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.

Lydia Saad

The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached."
While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

> From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 12 09:03:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
      id fBCH2xe06809 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:02:59
 -0800 (PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
      id JAA08894 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:03:00 -0800 (PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
   id <YX7AS09X>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 12:01:50 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227F90AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 12:01:49 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:52 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
> 
> My personal feeling is that the ABC description goes much too far.
> 
> >From pollingreport.com, here is a Fox poll that yields a mirror opposite result
> >from the "special military tribunal" questions now is use.
> >
> >
> > "Do you think suspected terrorists should be tried in a non-public military tribunal, in which the names of the defendants and the evidence is withheld, or should they be tried in the normal justice system?"
> >
> > A non-public military tribunal 30
> > The normal justice system 57
> > Not sure 13
> >
> > As I believe others have said, perhaps these opinions are not strongly held.
> >
> > Nick
> >
> > Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:
> >
> > > There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both asked
> > > Nov. 27 (a split sample):
> > >
> > > Do you think non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in the regular U.S.
It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military tribunal, where trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge and jury, and there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would protect ongoing investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may fear for their lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way. 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?

The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a criminal court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.

Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.

Lydia Saad

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached." While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana
polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.
In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed; otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser
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Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

I think the case against tribunals as stated is pretty weak: "Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way."

Leo Simonetta wrote:
I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

My personal feeling is that the ABC description goes much too far.

From pollingreport.com, here is a Fox poll that yields a mirror opposite result from the "special military tribunal" questions now is use.


Do you think suspected terrorists should be tried in a non-public military tribunal, in which the names of the defendants and the evidence is withheld, or should they be tried in the normal justice system?%  

A non-public military tribunal 30
The normal justice system 57
Not sure 13

As I believe others have said, perhaps these opinions are not strongly held.

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both asked Nov. 27 (a split sample):  

Do you think non-U.S. (United States) 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?  

It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military
tribunal, where
trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge
and jury, and
there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would
protect ongoing
investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may
fear for their
lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military
close trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this
way. 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?

The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a
criminal court
and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.
Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at
the state or
national level, have produced.
Lydia Saad

The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Re: "there is also much concern about things such as
military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as
"special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you
add
specificity to
the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:
As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not
detached." While
there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in
my own Indiana
polling he is at Gallup's
87% approval, there is also much concern about things such
as military
tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and
comment on what we
find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a
Ray Funkhouser's posting below requires me to say something I think most of us already know, and which I have said several times already, over the past seven years.....

AAPORNET is neither an edited nor a moderated list. This means that each and every member of our humble list has precisely the same powers: to post whatever we wish, whenever we wish, and to post just as often as we wish. With these powers comes one obligation: to complain directly to any member whom you think posts too often, or who posts material not relevant to AAPOR, or the to professional interests of its members, as we personally might construe them. My personal view is that very few such complaints are necessary, because I find AAPORNET to be an
exceptionally cordial, well-behaved, and sharing list—which can be a credit to no one except us all.

That established, once again, let me respond to Ray's message here. Although he touches on many topics, I wish to concentrate on just one underlying one, best captured by his sentence:

> BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11.

Ray has indeed indicated this feeling to me several times, over the years, and each time I have answered him as I shall now again:

Ray, your phrase "AAPORNET's coverage" perfectly captures your misunderstanding here. AAPORNET is not a mass medium, and it does not have a "coverage" of anything, simply because AAPORNET is not any one individual, nor any one group, nor a corporation, nor does it attempt to speak for all of its members, nor for AAPOR the organization--nor should it be or do any of these things, in my opinion.

AAPORNET is really much more like, say, an all-night bull session, or a daily seminar among friends with common interests, or an argument about politics--supported by the latest poll data--in an up-scale bar.

This means, Ray, that whenever you might find important news, or the report of a new poll release, or one particular side of a political argument, missing from AAPORNET, this is certainly not at the wishes of any person, group, cabal, conspiracy, or junta. And even if it were, you already have the perfect remedy--one which would be envied by once-free people now in chains everywhere around the world: You yourself can post that information to AAPORNET, immediately, to every last member of the list, and without any fear of editing or censorship by anyone. What more could anyone ask than this? You need not storm the radio station with grenades, because we hand each one of you your own mike, and let you broadcast whenever you wish.

That established, whenever anyone on our humble list should be "dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11," for example, the enemy is easy to find, and it is all of us, collectively, because we constitute the sum total of all content providers. If anyone should desire a more personal culprit than this, just go into your bathroom, turn on the light, and peer into the mirror above your sink.

Me, I do usually post all the new poll data that I can find to our list. Unfortunately, I can find only a small part of it, because I have many other things I must do, and also many other human failings. I can promise you, however, that I do not select polls according to my own political beliefs or other petty prejudices, if that is the charge, even though such behavior would be one freedom perfectly acceptable, according to the rules which do govern all internet lists. I've always found empirical results to be more enlightening than my own prejudices however, which is why I am on AAPORNET. And besides, even if I were to act with aggravated prejudice, there are today 936 other editors on our list, able to post their own counter opinions, in a matter of minutes.

-- Jim
P.S. If I never have to say all this to our list, yet again, I really wouldn't mind at all. If any of you can help me out with this problem of "AAPORNENET's coverage," I would appreciate that very much.

******

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001 RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> Jim --
>
> Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of
diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since
its inception, AAPORNENET has been an unrelenting source of opinions
that differ from my own.
>
> BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have
been dismayed at AAPORNENET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11.
Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high
approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that
Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who
overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high
ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNENET have
somehow managed to spin the story
> negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive
> agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches.
> But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional
> intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.
>
> In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical
> called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you
> mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the
Stanford
> psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity!
But
> let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to
> include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we
> pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed;
> otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?
>
> Ray Funkhouser

>From rusciano@rider.edu Wed Dec 12 10:08:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBCI8Xe21132 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
10:08:33
-0800 (PST)
Received: from enigma.rider.edu (enigma.rider.edu [192.107.45.2])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id KAA22890 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:08:31 -0800
(PST)
This discussion, like many on the AAPORnet, seems to run between the practical and the philosophical. In that spirit, I would like to raise a question about our obligations as survey researchers. Put simply, should issues of civil liberties be decided on the basis of public opinion polls? Wouldn't that, in fact, defeat the purpose of having such liberties in the first place? As one individual once stated, in defense of the ACLU, "If I had to wait around for only the popular people [or opinions] to defend, it would be too late."

I'm not, of course, arguing that we should not ask these questions-- we definitely should, and often. I just think that we should also ask how the results may be interpreted by those who wish to use public approval as a means of deciding who should receive Constitutional protection of their liberties. I recall that the declaration of Independence stated that it was a "self-evident" truth that individuals have "certain rights endowed by their creator"; these words suggest that one has certain rights by virtue of their personhood, and is not allocated these rights by a government or a popular majority.

(Of course that was the Declaration, and not the Constitution).

At any rate, I think this is one reason for my colleagues discomfort on interpreting these results.
Frank Rusciano

Stephen Pelletier wrote:

> The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Civil Liberties survey asks about military tribunals. The results can be found here:
>
> Stephen Pelletier
>
> At 10:32 AM 12/12/01 -0600, you wrote:
> >There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both asked Nov. 27 (a split sample):
> >
> >Do you think non-U.S. (United States) 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?
> >
> >It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military tribunal, where trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge and jury, and there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would protect ongoing investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may fear for their lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way. 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?
> >
> >The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a criminal court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.
> >
> >Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.
> >
> >Lydia Saad
> >
> >The Gallup Organization
> >
> >
> >-----Original Message-----
> >From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
> >Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu
> >Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
> >
> >
> >Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."
> >
> >I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?
Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached." While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical
Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

*******
On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be
> an even bigger influence -
> > I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"
> > This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com

>From mark@bisconti.com Wed Dec 12 10:36:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
      id fBCIaXe24622 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
10:36:33 -0800 (PST)
Received: from janus.hosting4u.net (janus.hosting4u.net [209.15.2.37])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
      id KAA25648 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:36:34 -0800 (PST)
Received: (gmail 22931 invoked from network); 12 Dec 2001 18:36:04 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
   by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 12 Dec 2001 18:36:04 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
12:35:44 -0600
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 13:29:48 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEBLDMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112111647550.23985-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Tamara Straus wrote, "Public opinion polls have become a kind of Fifth Estate
in American politics." This is a flattering evaluation of the power of opinion
polls, but stretches the idea of "Estate" a bit far. (The media is referred to as a
"Fourth Estate," keeping an eye on the other three U.S. "Estates"—the Executive,
Legislative, and Judiciary. See The Mass Media as Fourth Estate:
http://www.cultsock.ndirect.co.uk/MUHome/cshml/index.html, in the A-Z index
click on "MA" and then on Fourth Estate, scroll to bottom and click on further
details of Fourth Estate.) If one buys this Estate analogy, I expect opinion polls are more a tool of the Fourth Estate and other competing interest groups than an Estate of its own.

In my top-of-mind thinking, opinion research plays a role in dialogue (mirroring, comparing and contrasting views) and decision-making, but is not an organized interest. The influence of opinion research findings on public policy – especially foreign policy – is, I think, marginal. (How often do policymakers change goals based on opinion research findings? How often do elites throw out civil liberties even if there is widespread public support? Leaders are more likely to view the findings as an early warning, highlight research that supports their positions, or reframe an issue in support of a goal rather than modify a goal. When citizens take to the streets in large numbers and start pulling up the cobblestones, that is another story!). Groups that could qualify as Estates may be those that have enough power to "set" public policy goals... perhaps public and special interest groups who target decision-makers??

Straus also says, "Public opinion is a fickle thing" that it can be manipulated. Well, companies advertise their products and ideas in hopes they are persuasive enough to influence opinion, but I don't think opinion is as fickle as Straus implies–change in opinion occurs, but seems to be rather slow in most cases. This opinion is a bit contemptuous of the public. Of course, when someone blows up the World Trade Towers and puts a big hole in the side of the Pentagon and murders thousands in their ranks, the public has an instant opinion... but I wouldn't call that fickle or easy to manipulate.

If the American public is not hearing all the information that could be useful for making judgments about the current approach being taken by their leadership, that is a problem more related to the Fourth Estate than to survey research. I can't tell from this article exactly what Straus wants or is proposing, but I expect Americans
will side with their elected leadership, for better or worse. If the leadership begins to publicly fragment, that will likely be a reflection of-or reflected in-public opinion.

Enough rambling. Cheers, Mark Richards

And speaking of the PR Front....

The Best Defense
Donald Rumsfeld's Overwhelming Show of Force on the Public Relations Front

following Franck Rusciano... as an example,

To my knowledge, even in countries where the death penalty has been abolished, there has never been a majority in public opinion polls favouring abolition of the death penalty. As an example of the distinction to be made between public opinion and public decision by elected representatives.

Claire Durand

At 13:07 2001-12-12 -0500, you wrote:
> This discussion, like many on the AAPORnet, seems to run between the
practical and the philosophical. In that spirit, I would like to raise a question about our obligations as survey researchers. Put simply, should issues of civil liberties be decided on the basis of public opinion polls? Wouldn't that, in fact, defeat the purpose of having such liberties in the first place? As one individual once stated, in defense of the ACLU, "If I had to wait around for only the popular people [or opinions] to defend, it would be too late."

I'm not, of course, arguing that we should not ask these questions—we definitely should, and often. I just think that we should also ask how the results may be interpreted by those who wish to use public approval as a means of deciding who should receive Constitutional protection of their liberties. I recall that the Declaration of Independence stated that it was a "self-evident" truth that individuals have "certain rights endowed by their creator"; these words suggest that one has certain rights by virtue of their personhood, and is not allocated these rights by a government or a popular majority.

(Of course that was the Declaration, and not the Constitution).

At any rate, I think this is one reason for my colleagues discomfort on interpreting these results.

Frank Rusciano

Stephen Pelletier wrote:

> The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Civil Liberties survey asks about military tribunals. The results can be found here:
> Stephen Pelletier
> At 10:32 AM 12/12/01 -0600, you wrote:
> There are two ABC/WP questions on this subject archived at Roper, both asked
> Nov. 27 (a split sample):
> Do you think non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in the regular U.S. criminal court or in a special military tribunal?
It's been proposed that non-U.S. (United States) citizens who are charged with terrorism should be put on trial in a special military tribunal, where trials can be closed to the public, with a military judge and jury, and there's no right to an appeal. Some people say this would protect ongoing investigations and avoid the use of civilian jurors who may fear for their lives. Others say it would be wrong to let the military conduct closed trials under new rules, and to single out non-citizens this way. 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?

The results were almost identical, with 37%/38% favoring a criminal court and 59%/58% preferring the military tribunal.

Would be interesting to see what other wordings, either at the state or national level, have produced.

Lydia Saad
The Gallup Organization

-----Original Message-----
From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 10:25 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Re: "there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals."

I find that when military tribunals are described simply as "special military tribunals" they get good support. But - as you add specificity to the description - support drops. Has any one else noticed this?

Nick

Brian Vargus wrote:

As C. Wright Mills wrote: "I may be objective, but I am not detached."

While there certainly is much public support for Bush--indeed in my own Indiana polling he is at Gallup's 87% approval, there is also much concern about things such as military tribunals. Thus, I think it appropriate to report and comment on what we find. As far as the comments about higher education and opinion diversity---your comments betray a fondness for the current conservative rewriting of history. See things such
as Radosh's recent "Commies" or works by Klehr and Weinstein. I personally find the way Fox news, much like Limbaugh, claims to be the only real source of "truth" to be appropriate for a religious order but not professionals. Perhaps the same could be said for those who measure public opinion. But then, as the late Christopher Lasch so eloquently argued in The Revolt of the Elites, many of us have sold out.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

Jim --

> > > Once again we are in total agreement. I have always been in favor of diversity, and it has been deeply gratifying to me that, ever since its inception, AAPORNET has been an unrelenting source of opinions that differ from my own.

> > > BUT, as I have indicated to you both publicly and privately, I have been dismayed at AAPORNET's coverage of polls in the wake of 9-11. Despite numerous polls showing GWB enjoying unprecedentedly high approval ratings; large percentages of Democrats now thankful that Gore/Lieberman lost; the latest LATimes poll showing that blacks, who overwhelmingly voted against Bush, now preponderately give him high ratings, etc etc, the only two mentions of polls posted on AAPORNET have somehow managed to spin the story negatively toward GWB (no easy thing). Perhaps you deem such interpretive agility newsworthy. Perhaps you are trying to spare us from cliches. But counter-intuitiveness really ought to be leavened by occasional intuitiveness, so that we know what it is counter to.

> > > In the late 60s, while I was a grad student at Stanford, some radical called for "more diversity on campus." I thought at the time, you mean, like a Republican in the psych department? As of a couple years ago, the Stanford psych department still boasted no Republicans. Long live diversity! But let's make sure that we open our scanning mechanisms broadly enough to include the other half of the political spectrum. After all, we pollsters are supposed to be neutral, objective and even-handed;
otherwise, why should the public take us seriously?

Ray Funkhouser

Stephen R. Pelletier, Ph.D.
Assistant Director for Administration
Harvard Opinion Research Program
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston MA 02115

(Phone) 617-432-7032
(Fax) 617-432-0092
SPelleti@hsph.harvard.edu
www.hsph.harvard.edu/horp

Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement à Paris : 01-45-81-58-52

> From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 12 14:55:58 2001
> Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
> id fBCMtve23126 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
> 14:55:57 -0800 (PST)
> Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
> id OAA24573 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 14:55:58 -0800
> (PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
> id <YX7ATAK7>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:54:51 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322B010AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:54:50 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty
much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.

resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)
Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.

Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.

Leo

> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim
> *******
>
> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:
>
> > I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -
> >
> > I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"
> >
> > This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.
> > --
> > Leo G. Simonetta
> > Art & Science Group, LLC
> > simonetta@artsci.com
>
> >From jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com Wed Dec 12 15:27:12 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBCNRCe26826 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:27:12 -0800 (PST)
Received: from c001.snv.cp.net (c001-h008.c001.snv.cp.net [209.228.32.122]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id PAA00546 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:27:12 -0800 (PST)
X-Sent: 12 Dec 2001 23:26:10 GMT
Message-ID: <008c01c18364$88a57e80$9bf8c3d1@default>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 18:27:13 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.

> Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)
> Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.
> Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they thought of as like them.
> Leo
>
>> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim
>> ******
>>
>> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:
>> I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -
>> I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"
>> This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.
>> --
>> Leo G. Simonetta
>> Art & Science Group, LLC
>> simonetta@artsci.com
Folks,

I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language? The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

> I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
> Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does. resident aliens (even worse, possibly) people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?) Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.

Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.

Leo

Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

********

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 12 17:23:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBD1NMe17233 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:23:22 -0800 (PST)
From almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id RAA06009 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:23:21 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
    by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBD1MV308721 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:22:31 -0800 (PST)
David,

I give up, you've found me out—I admit my guilt!

To make up for my methodological errors, allow me to offer--free of charge--the suggestion that we extend your essential idea to such binary categories as male-female and liberal-conservative, to be immediately changed to male - non male and liberal - non liberal.

Leo and I both found such categories potentially biasing of responses, a topic certainly worthy of further study, it seemed to me at the time, but that was before at least I had heard your own call for "clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language."

I only wish that I could have thought of that solution myself--it really saves us all from a lot of bickering over question wording.

With your paradigm firmly in mind, however, I think I might well be able to do much, much better next time, if only you'll give me a second chance.

Thank you for setting both Leo and me on the proper path.

Now, if you'll forgive me, I must get back to those "circles" of my own that you find so scary.

-- Jim

******

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Dittman Research Corporation wrote:

> Folks,
> > I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S.
> > so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language? The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely normal process.
> >
> > David L. Dittman
> >
> > James P. Murphy wrote:
> > > I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't
> > > give up so easily.
> Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does. resident aliens (even worse, possibly) people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?) Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase. Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them. Leo

>> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

>> ******

>> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

>> I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

>> I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

>> This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

>> --

>> Leo G. Simonetta

>> Art & Science Group, LLC

>> simonetta@artsci.com
I may be jumping in to a discussion in which I haven't followed carefully, but I am wondering why the emphasis is on ways of characterizing individuals here by their nationality.

President Bush apparently made it clear that he would not apply military tribunals to U.S. citizens, regardless of whether they had been charged with terrorist-type activities since 9/11 or not. Since U.S. citizens, other than Walker who appears to have a mental or emotional problem, are not likely to be charged, the question is whether (the vast majority of) people charged with terrorist-type activity should be tried in civil courts or military tribunals.

It seems to me that introducing a question with "President Bush has sought (or been given) authority to decide whether try non-citizens charged with (terrorist-type activity) in military tribunals or civil courts... what do you think?" would place the emphasis where it was intended by the President -- on the charge. Which is where it belongs. For Bush did not ask for, nor receive, authorization to decide to
try
non-citizens charged with, say, robbery or rape or any other crime in
tribunals. And
he specifically excluded tribunals for citizens (even though I'm sure most
people
feel that that in practice will not occur in connection with terrorist-type
activities).

I failed to get the point a day or two ago. Hope that isn't the case now.

Jeanne

>From mark@bisconti.com Wed Dec 12 19:09:22 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBD39Me15765 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
19:09:22
-0800 (PST)
Received: from pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net (pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.122])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id TAA11304 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 19:09:22 -0800
(PST)
Received: from dialup-209.244.230.25.dial1.washington1.level3.net
([209.244.230.25]
heo=mark)
    by pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
    id 16EMF1-0001D3-00
    for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 19:08:59 -0800
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: reply for aliens
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 22:03:10 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBDEENLLCIIIIBKRECEDMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
In-Reply-To: <3C17F168.9B3A7C43@alaska.net>

Clear, clean, accurate, descriptive—all are important in question wording.
But
isn't it also important to look at the variations (if there are any) resulting from
word choice, not to mention context and question order? Unfortunately, sometimes
clean categories aren't accurate. For example, I think of my friends who are loyal
"resident aliens," on their way to citizenship, going through a long process
involving significant sacrifices (often with their children in mind...),
paying full federal and Social Security taxes... while it is technically accurate that
they are
not U.S. citizens, they have made a commitment to be a part of the nation and participate and contribute to the greater good like full-fledged U.S. citizens do.
These people live under the social pressures of not being full-fledged citizens, sometimes in fear that they will not be treated with the same level of justice the nation demands for itself. If they are of Arabic or Persian decent, the social stigma right now is significant. Everyone wants to get the bad guys, but at what cost? Public opinion can miss subtleties if we don't think about wording effects.
Survey researchers have to think about these issues - for the very reason of trying to be accurate when using a methodology that can create polarities that, in reality, are not so clean. Ask more questions with different wording, put all the questions on the table, and look at the big picture - we learn from that. And who knows what will be "proven." I guess for me the issue in this case is more about the standards and degree of openness under which we determine guilt. The U.S. has a long history of defending the rule of law, regardless of majority opinion. Transparency has some advantages in a democratic Republic that claims to value human rights and wishes to set a world example. I personally think an American jury anywhere in the country is as trustworthy as a military court, and I'm not afraid of the lawyers who will defend those accused of crimes. Perhaps that is faith! Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Dittman Research Corporation
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Folks,

I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language? The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles,
what they
are attempting do to is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

> I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some
> question
> wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so
> easily.
> >
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> > Voice (610) 408-8800
> > Fax (610) 408-8802
> > jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
> > Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
> >
> > Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think
> > of
> > carry
> > pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> > >
> > > resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> > > people living in the US who are not citizens  (perhaps a bit better?)
> > >
> > > Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous
> > phrase.
> > >
> > > Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as
> > long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to
> > place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the
> > other/not like me
> > group
> > you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the
> > tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.
> > >
> > > Leo
> > >
> > >> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call
> > >> them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim
> > >>
> > >> ******
> > >>
> > >> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:
> > >>
> > >> I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed
> > >> what might be an
> > >> even bigger influence -
> > >>
> > >> I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US
> > >> citizens?"
> > >>
> > >>
I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference.

Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax" - or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.
As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
> 
> 
> Folks,
> 
> I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language? The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely normal process.
> 
> David L. Dittman
> 
> James P. Murphy wrote:
> 
> > I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.
> >
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> > Voice (610) 408-8800
> > Fax (610) 408-8802
> > jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
> > Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
> >
> > Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> >
> > resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)

Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.

Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they thought of as like them.

Leo

Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence - I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

From elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov Thu Dec 13 08:06:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBDG6Oe27126 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 08:06:24 -0800 (PST)

From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
Received: from dispatch.tco.census.gov (dispatch.tco.census.gov [148.129.129.22])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id IAA11739 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 08:06:24 -0800 (PST)
It sounds like an experimental test of the effects of varying the question wording is in order, and might shed light on the nature of public opinion on this important issue.

Betsy Martin

Leo Simonetta

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'",

Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference.

Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax" - or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.

As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
> > Folks,
> > I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S.
> > so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly
The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

> I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
> From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
> Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
>
> > Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> > resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> > people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)
> > Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.
> >
> > Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.

Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

*******
> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:
> >> I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed
> >> even bigger influence -
> >> I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase
> >> "Non-Us citizens?"
> >> --
> >> Leo G. Simonetta
> >> Art & Science Group, LLC
> >> simonetta@artsci.com

> >

>From r.perloff@csuohio.edu Thu Dec 13 08:30:49 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBDGUme00933 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
08:30:46 -0800 (PST)
Received: from sims.csuohio.edu (csu-mail0.csuohio.edu [137.148.5.58])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA03377 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 08:30:46 -0800
(PST)
Received: from perloff.csuohio.edu (artsfac207-122.dhcp.csuohio.edu
[137.148.207.122]) by sims.csuohio.edu (Sun Internet Mail Server
sims.4.0.1999.09.28.17.31.p2) with SMTP id <0GOA009IJJEK4D@sims.csuohio.edu>
for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:35:08 -0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:31:22 -0500
From: "Richard M. Perloff" <r.perloff@csuohio.edu>
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
In-reply-to: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112110909590.7892-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-Sender: r.perloff@popmail.csuohio.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3.0.3.32.20011213113122.007f7a8c@popmail.csuohio.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Although perceptions of bias frequently tell us more about
the observer than the observed, in the case of the (controversial) Tamara
Straus war
for public opinion article, I believe questions about overall
fairness/completeness
of the reporter's news analysis can be raised. They include:

   a) assumption that the Bush administration is "manipulating" public
opinion, questionable in light of Page's demonstrations of the relentless rationality of citizens, and Straus's first paragraph in which she praises the seeming ability of the public to make up its own mind;

b) use of the value-laden word "propaganda" which implies there is something nefarious about Bush administration (or Roosevelt administration) efforts, when one can argue they are legitimate attempts of government to promote a war effort;

c) quoting Rumsfeld selectively; he also pledged in a NYT op ed to tell the truth, saying there were many ways to give information without lying explicitly (ethicists like Bok would approve of this stand);

d) assumption that there is little in the news media that is critical of the war when this is not empirically demonstrated, and a MAPOR paper by David Fan and associates showed plenty of negative coverage of the war in (Straus's simplistically-hegemonic) media;

e) assumption that Europeans' drop in support for war says something profound, when these citizens are themselves self-interested, and some nations have poor ethical records in the past (Vichy, 1940);

f) lack of defense of the Pentagon's point of view, if only to give balance, and assumption that this is NOT a war of good versus evil (even The Nation has suggested this is the first just war since WWII)

-- Richard M. Perloff

At 09:42 AM 12/11/2001 -0800, you wrote:
> 
> This piece by Tamara Straus relies heavily on poll data, including some likely collected with the help of people on our humble list. -- Jim
> 
> _________________________________________________________________
> Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute
> http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=12050
> 
> December 11, 2001
> 
> The War for Public Opinion
> 
> Tamara Straus, Senior Editor
> AlterNet.org.
In 1922, social critic Walter Lippmann wrote, "Decisions in modern states tend to be made by the interaction, not of Congress and the executive, but of public opinion and the executive."

Never has this been truer than in the war on terrorism. The Bush administration has justified its bombing campaign against Afghanistan not with a Congressional declaration of war, but with polls indicating that close to 90 percent of Americans want military action. How easy it must be to point at those numbers and claim, "The public made us do it!"

Public opinion polls have become a kind of Fifth Estate in American politics. As soon as they are released, poll results become fodder to justify policies, attack opponents or wage wars. When the numbers hover around 90 percent, as do Bush’s current approval ratings, they are political gospel. After all, when 9 out of 10 Americans agree, the country's resolve must be strong as steel ... Or is it?

Therein lies the rub. Public opinion is a fickle thing, sometimes turning on as little as one horrific image or triumphant speech. A few well placed media messages can cause sea changes in national opinion: think of Southern cops turning dogs and fire hoses loose on desegregation marches; or the videotape of Rodney King; or napalmed villagers in Vietnam.

The Bush administration knows this media truism all too well. They also know its corollary -- that with the right pressure, public opinion can be manipulated. And so, as bombs began to fall on Kabul, the administration launched an equally aggressive front here at home: the war for America's approval of war.

Like recruiting its allies abroad, the U.S. government quickly recruited friends and institutions for its domestic battle. Back in 1922, Lippmann noted that public opinion tends to solidify during times of war and that the media, becoming more patriotic, aides in this solidification. This was the case during World Wars I and II, when news items smelled heavily of government propaganda and Hollywood's most talented filmmakers were hired to make inspirational war movies.

This was also the case during the Persian Gulf War. Had the U.S. government allowed reporters to file from the front lines, showing the effect of the war on civilians and the region, public opinion might have been different. Instead, the Gulf War came into Americans' living rooms as a series of fuzzy Defense Department abstractions. What happened in Iraq looked, from the couch, like a video game. Unlike the images that poured into the tube during Vietnam, there was very little to get upset about. The campaign seemed clean, technologically efficient. The majority of the public came away with a favorable impression, even if they failed to feel the war was a moral victory, as was the case during World War II.

That was the media success story of George I. Now along comes George II, waging a more complicated war that is a descendent of his father's. Since the first shots were fired, the Bush administration has successfully squelched negative news reports from Afghanistan.
> Asked at an October press conference how he would handle the media's
> war coverage, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld quoted Winston
> Churchill's statement about disinformation around the D-day invasion.
> "Sometimes the truth is so precious it must be accompanied by a
> bodyguard of lies," he said. "They plan to fight the war and then tell
> the press and the public how it turned out afterwards," said CNN
> correspondent Jamie McIntyre, according to the Center for Public
> Integrity.
>
> The Pentagon's tactics in the media war have been less than subtle.
> For starters, they bought up access to all commercial satellite
> photographs of the region, preventing any news outlets from obtaining
> them. They also have prevented journalists from accompanying soldiers
> or airmen on most missions, or even from interviewing them afterward.
> Meanwhile, television news has been behaving more like a wing of the
> military than an objective Fourth Estate, with anchors like CBS Dan
> Rather pledging his allegiance on air: "Wherever [Bush] wants me to
> line up, just tell me where." CNN Chairman Walter Isaacson ordered
> news staff to limit reports of Afghan war casualties and use World
> Trade Center deaths to justify the killings. Newspaper editors have
> admitted to taking dead civilian Afghans off their front pages for
> fear of appearing unpatriotic.
>
> In other words, so far, so good. Bush has never strayed from framing
> the war on terrorism as fight of good against evil. Thus the further
> destruction of Afghanistan is just retribution against "evil doers,"
> whether majority of them -- the Al Qaeda -- are in Afghanistan or not,
> whether military retaliation will quell terrorism or not. It's a
> message that domestic media outlets seem to like far more than reports
> of civilian casualties.
>
> However, the Bush administration has had to contend with a new set of
> media forces arising from the "Information Revolution." The war on
> terrorism is the world's first war for the Internet and foreign news
> outlets. Never before have so many people ostensibly had access to so
> much news and opinion from so many sources. Never before has it been
> possible to gauge so many views -- not only in the U.S. -- but from
> Europe and the Middle East. That is the quandary the Bush
> administration faces in "winning the war on ideas," as Bush phrased
> it. Public opinion is now vulnerable to what is reported outside the
> U.S.'s news borders.
>
> In fact, of the 10 percent that don't approve of Phase I of the terror
> war, many have probably taken to surfing the Internet for their
> information, reading critical reports on the progress and logic of the
> campaign from sites like the UK's Guardian, Dawn (Pakistan's English
> daily) and AlterNet.org (whose readership soared 500 percent in the
> days after Sept. 11). London's BBC has reported a record number of
> Americans tuning in to their Web site, radio and television
> broadcasts.
>
> There is plenty of stomach-turning information out there to be found.
> In a Dec. 3 New York Times story, an Afghan man named Khalil, who
> survived U.S. bombs in the Tora Bora area, was quoted as saying, "The
> village is no more. All my family, 12 people were killed. I am the
> only one left in this family. I have lost my children, my wife. They
> are no more." According to AlterNet's David Corn, other Afghan
refugees have reported similar slaughters; one said she had lost 38 relatives in a U.S. attack; another estimated up to 200 were dead in her village.

So what will Phase II of the war hold? According to a December Harris poll, more than eight of 10 Americans said the U.S. government's actions should be assisted by many countries, and that it is important to get support from the U.N. Security Council to expand the war. If this is true -- if multilateralism becomes increasingly important to Americans -- then views from Europe and the Middle East may suddenly become relevant.

In Europe, public approval of America's war in Afghanistan waned significantly in the month of November. In England, from a peak on par with U.S. public opinion right after the attacks, support for the bombing campaign fell to two-thirds. In France, support dropped from two-thirds to half, and, in Germany and Italy, well over half the population wanted the attacks on Afghanistan to stop, according to the European press.

The reason for this wane in European support was fairly clear: the Europeans saw disturbing images of civilian casualties from the U.S. bombing campaign that Americans did not. "The public sees continuous bombing of buildings and they see pictures from Al Jazeera of small villages that have made things immensely difficult," Helmut Lippelt, a German Green Party legislator, told the New York Times. This kind of negative opinion could come to haunt Americans if the war is widened or American troops get bogged down in civil unrest in Afghanistan.

Harder still to ignore will be views from the Middle East, where negative opinion about the war on terrorism has been of huge concern to the U.S. government. Never before in wartime has the U.S. had to work so hard to contain the views of its enemies. And that has everything to do with telecommunication advances as well as the growth of Middle Eastern news media. Back in August 1990, in the prelude to the Gulf War, news of Iraq's conquest of Kuwait did not hit the Arab world through official media for three entire days. There were no 24-hour news Arab news networks and Middle Eastern media were tightly controlled by government. Today, there are five pan-Arab new networks, including Al Jazeera, the 24-hour Qatar-based news station, which is watched by 35 million viewers in 20 Arab countries and airs sharp critiques of American policy in the region.

The Bush administration is well aware of the powers these news outlets possess, and has gone into high gear to convince Middle East citizens that the war on terrorism is aimed not at them, but at terrorists in their midst. As part of this effort, the Pentagon has hired the Reardon Group, a public relations firm in Washington, D.C., to help explain the U.S. military strikes to global audiences. The administration also has established a "coalition of information centers" in Washington, London and Islamabad to disseminate war news to Middle Eastern reporters -- a hard task since those on the ground in Afghanistan and elsewhere are 10 hours ahead of Washington.

Yet even with these recent moves, U.S. government officials have been quick to admit that, so far, they have lost the battle for Middle Eastern public opinion. The U.S. has almost no cultural organizations
in the Middle East and its main broadcasting arm, Voice of America
had, as of Sept. 11, an audience share of 2 percent in the region.

The chief problem is that the U.S. has little credibility in the Arab
world -- not in Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan or Iran and certainly not in
Iraq and Palestine. In order to explain the Afghan bombing campaign,
officials of the Bush administration, such as Condoleeza Rice and
Colin Powell, have appeared on Al Jazeera. But, according to many news
critics the effect has not been positive. "Every time I see an
American official speaking on Al Jazeera, I think of how much that
person is inciting sentiment against America by promoting the American
view," said Lamis Andoni, a Jordanian journalist who has covered the
Middle East for 20 years. "It backfires. What does the U.S. have to
say? That in order to get bin Laden it has to bomb all of Afghanistan
and cause more misery in Afghanistan? This doesn't sell in the Arab
world."

What does seem to sell is bin Laden's message -- not necessarily that
a jihad should be waged against America -- but that the U.S. is at
fault for the economic, political and social problems of the Arab
world. On Arab TV, bin Laden has listed the very issues that the U.S.
government refuses to address: support of repressive regimes like
Saudi Arabia, which permit the stationing of U.S. troops; the economic
sanctions against Iraq, which have stifled Middle Eastern trade; and
globalization, which has weakened the cultural traditions of Islam and
cause a stark awareness of the haves and the have-nots.

Indeed, bin Laden has proved to be the U.S.'s chief foe not only
because he presents a terrorist threat but because he is the savviest
of media manipulators, the fiercest of propagandists. His chief weapon
on Sept. 11 was not so much the bodily damage that can be achieved
with jetliners but the psychological impact of watching those
jetliners take out America's most important economic and military
symbols. Bin Laden understood well in advance that the destruction
would be watched over and over again on American television.

The question now remains: What is the level of support for bin Laden
in the Arab world? If he is captured and executed by the U.S. military
will there be blowback -- will it unleash a new wave of terrorism in
the U.S. and abroad? And if that happens, will the U.S. media remain
as devout to government propaganda as it has been thus far, or focus
on what is being said in Europe and the Middle East? The answers to
those questions will shape inevitably the public opinion war to come.

--------------------
Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute
--------------------
An well thought-out experiment on the wording of this type of question would be ideal, otherwise we are reduced to triangulating public opinion by reporting "When you ask it this way people respond this way, but when you ask it this way . . . ."

Speaking of which, here are a couple more data points, from a recently released NYT/CBS poll:

38. In general, do you think United States citizens and those who are not citizens but are here legally should be treated the same way under the law, or should they be treated differently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The same way</th>
<th>Differently</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Some people say that in order to preserve national security and intelligence and protect jurors, suspected terrorists who are foreigners should be tried in military courts. There would be a military judge and there would NOT have to be a unanimous verdict. Trials could be held in secret and evidence against the suspect could be kept secret from the defense. Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right way</th>
<th>Not the right way</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the story http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/12/national/12POLL.html

For the complete results

They did some split half experimenting on the effects of using the term "terrorist" vs. "criminal" or "murderer" in a couple of questions.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
> [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 11:06 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
> >
> >
> > It sounds like an experimental test of the effects of varying the question wording is in order, and might shed light on the nature of public opinion on this important issue.
> >
> > Betsy Martin
> >
> >
> >
> > Leo Simonetta
> ><simonetta@art To:
> >ändig;"aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > sci.com> cc:
> >
> > Sent by: Subject: RE:
> > reply to Jim B.
> > owner-aapornet
> >
> > @usc.edu
> >
> >
> >
> > 12/13/2001
> > 09:33 AM
> > Please respond
> > to aapornet
I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference. Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax" - or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.

As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Folks,
I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language?
The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting to do is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

> > I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.
> >
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> > Voice (610) 408-8800
> > Fax (610) 408-8802
> > jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
> > To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
> > Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
> >>
> > Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> > resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> > people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)
> >
> > Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.
> >
> > Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group, you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they thought of as like them.
> >
> > Leo

Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

> >
> >
> >
On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

Can anyone direct me to any surveys done on the Finance Department of a city government. We have looked through our collection of citizen perception surveys to pull out specific questions relating to a finance department (water services,
taxes, etc) and had no luck. I would appreciate any suggestion.

Thanks,
Terrie

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Thu Dec 13 09:42:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBDHgke14269 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
09:42:46
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id JAA24138 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:42:45 -0800
(PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
(PMDF V6.1 #39146) id <OGOA00N01MIL2C@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:42:21 -0500 (EST)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145]) by
    usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA15081 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:59:16 -0800

Sorry, there's more... we are also looking for questions/surveys given to
other departments in city government asking them to rate the finance department
based on satisfaction of department services. In addition to a survey of the employees
of the finance department rating their employee satisfaction. I know this is a lot
but we aren't having any luck elsewhere.

Thanks,
Terrie

>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Thu Dec 13 09:59:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBDHxHe16456 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
09:59:17
-0800 (PST)
Received: from fuji.hp.ufl.edu (hp.ufl.edu [128.227.11.145])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
    id JAA15081 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:59:16 -0800
Seeing as today is the deadline for AAPOR submissions, I just wanted to offer some encouragement to those folks who hadn't quite gotten around to writing a proposal yet.

I gotta confess, last year I wrote mine the evening of the deadline, in between cooking dinner and waiting for the guests to arrive. But I'd been thinking about it beforehand, and I was serious about finishing the analysis before May, and I did.

Mine was accepted as a poster presentation. If you haven't done this lately, it is so much fun. Last year, the posters were conveniently located and well attended. I gave away 60 handouts, and had some interesting conversations with folks. So often when we give more formal talks, Q & A time is short, or people are racing off after to get to the next session, so you don't have as much time as you'd like to discuss your research with colleagues. So having time to really talk was a pleasure. And I learned who follows intercollegiate football: a few guys who saw the ugly colors I'd selected for my graphs (orange and blue) and snickered, "Gator colors, huh?!" And people came close enough for me to read their nametags, which seemed to be in notoriously small type last year.

So just do it!

Colleen

P.S. Although I know everyone understands how these things can happen, I still wanted to apologize for having a computer that sent out that virus last week.
Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109  
University of Florida,  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
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things can happen, I still wanted to apologize for having a computer that sent out that virus last week.

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
<mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
Phone: 352/392-6919,
Fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida, Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

"undocumented workers" is a term that I have heard -- one could probably make it more inclusive by saying "undocumented immigrants".

Lynda Voigt
Here the NYT/CBS Poll Q38 uses "those who are not" (not "United States citizens"—a term presented two words earlier).

NYT/CBS Poll Q41, by contrast, uses "foreigners" directly—but so many words ahead of the question asked that its effect is undoubtedly muted, at least somewhat.

[I've long thought that those who construct survey instruments do not pay enough attention to how far the pivotal or key word in a question (here "foreigners"—the only category to be "tried in military courts," which is the topic of the question asked and the opinion to be measured) are placed from the actual question itself, here: "Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?" Replacing the initial "suspected terrorists who are foreigners," used near the beginning, with just plain "terrorists" at the end, does nothing to enhance my faith in Q41. Which of the five quite different groups that you mention in a single question,

suspected terrorists
terrorists
foreigners
suspected terrorists who are foreigners
suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the US

would you have me consider, in answering your question? If all five, have you distributed equally each of the 120 different orderings, or not?]

My own guess, after having drowned in news coverage of terrorism since 9/11, is that—between "foreigners" and "those who are not"—(comparing now Q41 with Q38) the latter would draw a more forgiving response from a national sample. To the extent that the marginals in Q38 and Q41 are any test at all, they do tend to support my own guess—but this is far from a clean test, I admit.

And so I still agree with Leo that "non-US citizen" ought to be investigated as potentially biasing of responses, as compared to the many alternative phrasings, including all of those discussed here.

My thanks to Betsy Martin, for helping to turn this into a serious discussion, and also to Leo, for picking up on Betsy's lead.
On Thu, 13 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> An well thought-out experiment on the wording of this type of question
> would be ideal, otherwise we are reduced to triangulating public
> opinion by reporting "When you ask it this way people respond this
> way, but when you ask it this way . . . ."
>
> Speaking of which, here are a couple more data points, from a recently
> released NYT/CBS poll:
>
> 38. In general, do you think United States citizens and those who are
> not citizens but are here legally should be treated the same way under
> the law, or should they be treated differently?
>    The same way    Differently    DK/NA
> 12/7-10/01    78              19            3
>
> 41. Some people say that in order to preserve national security and
> intelligence and protect jurors, suspected terrorists who are
> foreigners should be tried in military courts. There would be a
> military judge and there would NOT have to be a unanimous verdict.
> Trials could be held in secret and evidence against the suspect could
> be kept secret from the defense. Do you think this is the right way of
> dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United
> States, or not?
>    Right way    Not the right way    DK/NA
> 12/7-10/01    40              51              10
>
> For the story http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/12/national/12POLL.html
>
> For the complete results
>
> They did some split half experimenting on the effects of using the
> term "terrorist" vs. "criminal" or "murderer" in a couple of
> questions.
>
> --

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com
question wording is in order, and might shed light on the nature of public opinion on this important issue.

Betsy Martin

Leo Simonetta

To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu> sci.com>

cc: 

Sent by: 

Subject: RE:

reply to Jim B.

owner-aapornet

@usc.edu

12/13/2001

09:33 AM

Please respond

to aapornet

I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference. Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted
that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax"

- or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.

As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Folks,

I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language?
The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does. resident aliens (even worse, possibly) people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?) Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.

Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.

Leo

>> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim

******

On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence - I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?" This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

From mail@marketsharescorp.com Thu Dec 13 13:19:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
There is another variable at work here other than wording. Time.

Bush signed the executive order regarding military tribunals on November 11. Debate followed. Another factor likely to lead to different poll results is that the issue was debated publicly over the last few weeks, in Congress and in the media.

Nick

James Beniger wrote:

> Here the NYT/CBS Poll Q38 uses "those who are not" (not "United States citizens"--a term presented two words earlier).
> 
> NYT/CBS Poll Q41, by contrast, uses "foreigners" directly--but so many words ahead of the question asked that its effect is undoubtedly muted, at least somewhat.
> 
> [I've long thought that those who construct survey instruments do not pay enough attention to how far the pivotal or key word in a question (here "foreigners"--the only category to be "tried in military courts," which is the topic of the question asked and the opinion to be measured) are placed from the actual question itself, here: "Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?" Replacing the initial "suspected terrorists who are foreigners," used near the beginning, with just plain "terrorists" at the end, does nothing to enhance my faith in Q41. Which of the five quite different groups that you mention in a single question,
suspected terrorists
terrorists
foreigners
suspected terrorists who are foreigners
suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the US

would you have me consider, in answering your question? If all five, have you distributed equally each of the 120 different orderings, or not?

My own guess, after having drowned in news coverage of terrorism since 9/11, is that--between "foreigners" and "those who are not"--(comparing now Q41 with Q38) the latter would draw a more forgiving response from a national sample. To the extent that the marginals in Q38 and Q41 are any test at all, they do tend to support my own guess--but this is far from a clean test, I admit.

And so I still agree with Leo that "non-US citizen" ought to be investigated as potentially biasing of responses, as compared to the many alternative phrasings, including all of those discussed here.

My thanks to Betsy Martin, for helping to turn this into a serious discussion, and also to Leo, for picking up on Betsy's lead.

-- Jim

******

On Thu, 13 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> An well thought-out experiment on the wording of this type of question would be ideal, otherwise we are reduced to triangulating public opinion by reporting "When you ask it this way people respond this way, but when you ask it this way . . . ."

> Speaking of which, here are a couple more data points, from a recently released NYT/CBS poll:

> 38. In general, do you think United States citizens and those who are not citizens but are here legally should be treated the same way under the law, or should they be treated differently?

> The same way Differently DK/NA

> 12/7-10/01 78 19 3

> 41. Some people say that in order to preserve national security and intelligence and protect jurors, suspected terrorists who are foreigners should be tried in military courts. There would be a military judge and there would NOT have to be a unanimous verdict. Trials could be held in secret and evidence against the suspect could be kept secret from the defense. Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?

> Right way Not the right way DK/NA
For the story http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/12/national/12POLL.html
For the complete results
They did some split half experimenting on the effects of using the
term "terrorist" vs. "criminal" or "murderer" in a couple of
questions.
--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
[mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 11:06 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.

It sounds like an experimental test of the effects of varying the
question wording is in order, and might shed light on the nature
of public opinion
on this important issue.

Betsy Martin

Leo Simonetta

To:

"aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
sci.com> cc:

Sent by: Subject: RE:
reply to Jim B.
owner-aapornet
@usc.edu

12/13/2001
09:33 AM

Please respond
I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference. Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax" - or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.

As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
 Folks,

I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and
Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language?
The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and shameless, as if, in their circles, what they are attempting to do is a completely normal process.

David L. Dittman
James P. Murphy wrote:
I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to find some question wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't give up so easily.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.

> Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I can think of carry pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US citizen" does.
> resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> people living in the US who are not citizens (perhaps a bit better?)
> Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more felicitous phrase.
> Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to expect as long as the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents to place those who are subject to the military tribunals into the other/not like me group you are going to get vastly different responses than you would if the tribunals were happening to people they though of as like them.
> Leo

Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what then do we call them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim
On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:

I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence -

I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?"

This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

From vector@sympatico.ca Thu Dec 13 13:36:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBDLa9e09272 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:36:09 -0800 (PST)
Received: from tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts14.bellnexxia.net [209.226.175.35]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id NAA26147 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:36:06 -0800 (PST)
Received: from i7s1u9 ([64.228.110.18]) by tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net (InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP id <20011213213513.GOHK6216.tomts14-srv.bellnexxia.net@i7s1u9> for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 16:35:13 -0500
Message-ID: <001201c1841e$1442ec20$b126ee440017@slu9>
Reply-To: "Marc Zwelling" <marc@vectorresearch.com>
From: "Marc Zwelling" <vector@sympatico.ca>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3C18E85C.77D890D0@wright.edu>
Subject: Re: finance survey
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 16:35:25 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSNMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4522.1200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

Teresa: MORI (UK) does lots of customer care surveys with questions in this area.
From: "Teresa Hottle" <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 12:41 PM
Subject: finance survey

> Sorry, there's more... we are also looking for questions/surveys given
> to other departments in city government asking them to rate the
> finance department based on satisfaction of department services. In
> addition to a survey of the employees of the finance department rating
> their employee satisfaction. I know this is a lot but we
> aren't having any luck elsewhere.
>
> Thanks,
> Terrie
>
>From ulisesb@internet.com.mx Thu Dec 13 18:30:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBE2U3e15764 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
18:30:03 -0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp.prodigy.net.mx ([148.235.168.22])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id SAA16429 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 18:30:01 -0800
   (PST)
Received: from vaio (du-200-65-32-245.prodigy.net.mx [200.65.32.245]) by
SMTP.Prodigy.Net.mx (Sun Internet Mail Server sims.4.0.2001.07.26.11.50.p9)
   with
SMTP id <0GOB00E6EAV3VJ@SMTP.Prodigy.Net.mx>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 20:28:22 -
0600 (CST)
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 21:30:50 -0600
From: Ulises Beltran <ulisesb@internet.com.mx>
Subject: Parents satisfaction with public schools
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Reply-to: Ulises Beltran <ulisesb@internet.com.mx>
Message-id: <006701c1844f$cc138a40$0701a8c0@vaio>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-NMIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
Content-type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0064_01C1841D.74ADOA60"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-priority: Normal
Hi,

We were invited to participate in a group to develop a good index of parents satisfaction with the education their children receive in public schools in Mexico City. The idea is to combine this information with actual estimates of school performance using standardized tests to reorient incentives. Any help or orientation?

Ulises Beltran
BGC, Beltran y Asocs., S. C.
Saltillo 63
Col. Hipodromo-Condesa
Mexico, D. F., 06100
525- 52113044
The full CBS News/New York Times study Leo Simonetta mentions below offers a wealth of valuable information. The CBS News press release includes political party differences and comparative historical data. CBS News also released a study with MTV of 14-24 year olds, also excellent.

>From the telephone survey of 1,052 adults, December 7-10, 2001:

86% approve of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as President (100% Republicans, 83% Independents, 78% Democrats); 90% approve of the way he is handling the campaign against terrorism (99% Republicans, 88% Independents, 84% Democrats).

57% approve of the way Congress is handling its job (59% Republicans, 55% Independents, 57% Democrats);

57% report being more in sympathy with Israel with regard to the situation in
the Middle East at the present time; 13% Arab nations, 10% neither (vol.), 3% both (vol.)
17% don't know.

39% favor the establishment of a Palestinian homeland in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, 27% oppose, 34% don't know.

69% think it is at least somewhat likely (21% very) that the fighting in Afghanistan will spread to a larger war between Western countries and Muslim countries.

49% said they don't know enough to say if the Bush Administration's proposed measures that might affect the civil liberties of some people go too far (12%), are about right (29%), or don't go far enough (9%).

After being told that the government says it has to or may have to do things that it would not ordinarily do in order to catch terrorists, 42% said the U.S. government should be allowed to routinely question Middle Eastern men who have come to the U.S. in the past two years and are here legally, even if they are not suspected of any crime and there is no evidence against them (52% Republicans, 40% Independents, 34% Democrats); 54% said that violates people's rights (45% Republicans, 55% Independents, 61% Democrats).

When told that the Justice Department has said it intends to conduct interviews with as many as 5,000 young Middle Eastern men who are legal residents of the U.S., based on their age and the country they came from, 61% said they think this is a good idea (72% of Republicans, 60% Independents, and 52% Democrats), and 31% said bad idea (20% of Republicans, 32% Independents, and 41% Democrats).

52% said this action does not violate civil rights (63% Republicans, 48% Independents, 46% Democrats).

When asked which concerns you more right now—that the government will fail to enact strong anti-terrorism laws, or that the government will enact new anti-terrorist laws which excessively restrict the average person's civil liberties... 43% said fail to enact (52% Republicans, 42% Independents, 35% Democrats), 45% said restrict liberties (34% Republicans, 46% Independents, 53% Democrats).
59% think legal immigration into the U.S. should be decreased; 29% said kept at its present level; 9% increased.

53% think that most of the people who have moved to the U.S. in the last few years are here illegally; 29% said legally.

51% said that most recent immigrants to the U.S. contribute to this country, 31% said cause problems. In 1994, 53% said cause problems.

Mark Richards

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 11:58 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.

An well thought-out experiment on the wording of this type of question would be ideal, otherwise we are reduced to triangulating public opinion by reporting "When you ask it this way people respond this way, but when you ask it this way . . . ."

Speaking of which, here are a couple more data points, from a recently released NYT/CBS poll:

38. In general, do you think United States citizens and those who are not citizens but are here legally should be treated the same way under the law, or should they be treated differently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The same way</th>
<th>Differently</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/7-10/01</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Some people say that in order to preserve national security and intelligence and protect jurors, suspected terrorists who are foreigners should be tried in military courts. There would be a military judge and there would NOT have to be a unanimous verdict. Trials could be held in secret and evidence against the suspect could be kept secret from the defense. Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Right way</th>
<th>Not the right way</th>
<th>DK/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/7-10/01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the story http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/12/national/12POLL.html
For the complete results

They did some split half experimenting on the effects of using the term "terrorist" vs. "criminal" or "murderer" in a couple of questions.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
> [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 11:06 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
> 
> It sounds like an experimental test of the effects of varying the question wording is in order, and might shed light on the nature of public opinion on this important issue.
> 
> Betsy Martin
> 
> Leo Simonetta
> 
> "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu> sci.com> 12/13/2001 09:33 AM
> Please respond to aapornet
>
I'd just like to point out that this discussion started out with people posting or referencing two poll results that found fairly substantial differences in opinion on whether military tribunals were appropriate. I noted that one of the two examples used the phrase "non-US (United States) citizen" while the other did not. I hypothesized that this wording made for at least part of the difference. The arguments pro and con used in one question might also make up part of the difference. Jim wondered if there was a way to ask the question without what he and I thought might be potential biasing wording. I made a couple possible suggestions and noted that any wording that allows people to think that this is only happening to other types of people were likely to produce similar results.

Part of what we do (I thought) was talk about how question wording effects results - Remember our discussions on the "death tax" vs. "inheritance tax" - or how the two conflicting polls on stem cell research worded their questions differently - same thing.

As far as I know neither Jim nor I have some secret plan to use tricky wording and conduct a poll showing that the majority of American oppose military tribunals.

(Jim, if we do please let me know!)

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Dittman Research Corporation [mailto:dittman@alaska.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 7:08 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.

Folks,

I'm in total agreement with Prof. Murphy. Why are Jim B. and Leo S. so determined to avoid clear, clean, accurate and perfectly descriptive language?

The scary thing is, they appear to be totally oblivious and
shameless, as if, in
their circles, what they are attempting do to is a completely
normal process.

David L. Dittman

James P. Murphy wrote:

I'm sure if you think on it long enough you'll be able to
find some question
wording that will produce the result you desire. Don't
give up so easily.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu' <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 5:57 PM
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.

Aye, there the rub. All the accurate designations that I
can think of
carry
pretty much the same connotative freight that "non-US
citizen" does.
>
> resident aliens (even worse, possibly)
> people living in the US who are not citizens  (perhaps a
> bit better?)
>
> Perhaps a better wordsmith than I can come up with a more
> felicitous
> phrase.
>
> Though my training as a social psychologist leads me to
> expect as long as
> the phrase allows the vast majority of readers/respondents
> to place those
> who are subject to the military tribunals into the
> other/not like me group
> you are going to get vastly different responses than you
> would if the
> tribunals were happening to people they thought of as like them.
>
> Leo
>
> Nice point, Leo--I hadn't thought of this. But what
> then do we call
> them? Anyone have any ideas? -- Jim
>
> *******
>
> On Wed, 12 Dec 2001, Leo Simonetta wrote:
I liked the ABC/WP wording better myself then I noticed what might be an even bigger influence - I wonder if it is the effect of that magic phrase "Non-US citizens?" This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsSci.com

From PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu Fri Dec 14 07:47:20 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBEFlKe26368 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 07:47:20 -0800 (PST)
    Received: from comm1.umaryland.edu (comm1.umaryland.edu [134.192.1.5])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id HAA06414 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 07:47:21 -0800 (PST)
    Received: from somex04.SOM.umaryland.edu (som.umaryland.edu [134.192.148.73])
    by comm1.umaryland.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id KAA16394 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:46:58 -0500 (EST)
    Received: by somex04 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    id <YW40T9PN>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:44:08 -0500
    Message-ID: <0532A6D56F30F24798DE4697CAFB347F024FEBAB8@somex04>
    From: "Commiskey, Patricia" <PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu>
    To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
    Subject: A question...
    Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:44:08 -0500
    MIME-Version: 1.0
    X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
    Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Hi! I know this was covered sometime this year via AAPORnet, so I apologize in advance for re-posting the question. Does anyone know the legalities involved with calling for CATI surveys after 9pm? I thought that only applied to sales, not research, but can't remember the legal specifications. Are there any other restrictions (i.e. weekends or weekdays before a certain time)?

Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
There are no legal restrictions on research vis-a-vis time of day for placing calls, but there certainly are prudent "rules" to follow and it seems that many think 9pm is the last local time to dial RDD numbers. PJL

-----Original Message-----
From: Commiskey, Patricia [mailto:PCommiskey@som.umaryland.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2001 10:44 AM
To: AAPORnet (E-mail)
Subject: A question...

Hi! I know this was covered sometime this year via AAPORnet, so I apologize in
advance for re-posting the question. Does anyone know the legalities involved with calling for CATI surveys after 9pm? I thought that only applied to sales, not research, but can’t remember the legal specifications. Are there any other restrictions (i.e. weekends or weekdays before a certain time)?

Thanks! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA
Research Director - CATI Facility
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research
University of Maryland School of Medicine
(410) 706-6753 / fax: (410) 706-4702 pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

---

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, fax: 352/392-7109
University of Florida,
Department of Health Services Administration
Location:  1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-015
Mailing Address:  P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL  32610-0195

There are no legal restrictions on research vis-a-vis time of day for placing calls, but there certainly are prudent "rules" to follow and it seems that many think 9pm is the last local time to dial RDD numbers.
I think a lot of us try to follow that rule, but figuring out the local time is not always simple. In Indiana, part of the state is on Central time, part on Eastern, and during part of the year, only part of the state goes on daylight savings time.

Colleen
Colleen,

Do you use Wincati (I can't remember)? A nice function of Wincati is that it does it for you.

Terrie

All of the major CATI systems offer this capability. Those that update their
zone
tables in a timely manner have all the newest area codes. The area codes are
tied
into the time zones. I know that our system, Survent, goes down to prefix for
those
areas that do not observe Daylight Savings Time.

Joyce Ratchelson, VP
CfMC

Teresa Hottle wrote:
>
> Colleen,
> Do you use Wincati (I can't remember)? A nice function of Wincati is
> that it does it for you.
>
> Terrie

--
"We do not see things as they are, we see things as we are." - The Talmud
"People
demand the freedom of speech to make up for the freedom of thought which they
avoid"
- Kirkegarde "Software without support is hardware" - JR/1999

>From simonetta@artsci.com Fri Dec 14 10:24:22 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBEIOMel3114 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
10:24:22
-0800 (PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA27237 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:24:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
    id <Y606H2PI>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 13:22:02 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F332281B0AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Teensites.com
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 13:22:01 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

While as far as I can tell there was no primary opinion research involved in
the
production of this report it may be of interest of those who are interested in
the
impact of the Internet on culture

> CENTER FOR MEDIA EDUCATION
>
> FOR RELEASE: December 12, 2001
From Sales Pitches to Civics Lessons: Something for Everyone Online

New CME Study Explores the Online World of Teens

Washington, D.C. -- The Center for Media Education (CME) today released a new study that surveys the burgeoning new-media culture directed at--and in some cases created by--teens. TeenSites.com-A Field Guide to the New Digital Landscape examines the uniquely interactive nature of the new media, and explores the ways in which teens are at once shaping and being shaped by the electronic culture that surrounds them.

With nearly three-quarters of 12- to 17-year-olds online, the Internet is having a profound and far-reaching impact on the lives of today's youth. "Young people are as comfortable growing up with digital media as their parents' generation was with the telephone and TV," explained Kathryn Montgomery, Ph.D., president of the Center for Media Education. The book-length report examines this online teen world, from the glitzy commercial sites designed by marketers to capture the lucrative online teen demographic, to civic youth sites that promote political, cultural, and community engagement. And with an eye toward the future of the new media, the report also looks at some of the next-generation technology that is transforming the digital landscape.

But for the teens themselves, the impact of the new technology is often much more immediate. As they grappled with the September 11 attacks, for example, many teens turned to the Internet as a forum in which to sort out the facts--and to share their feelings. "For many teens the Web surpassed television as the medium of choice in dealing with this crisis," Montgomery pointed out. "Within this unfiltered space, young people could speak out in their own online communities and join with others in their struggle to make sense of the suddenness and severity of this national tragedy."

In many ways young people are the defining users of this new digital media culture. "Teenagers have embraced the new online world with great enthusiasm," Montgomery explained, "responding eagerly to its invitation to share ideas, contribute content, and otherwise place their stamp on a media system that they themselves create and manage. However, even as this new medium is becoming a pervasive presence in teens' lives, it remains largely under the radar of parents, scholars, and policymakers."

Thus Teensites.com is designed to shed light on the new digital media culture, which is often overshadowed by sensational stories about the alleged dangers of cyberspace, or about the rise and fall of various dot-com empires. But Internet usage continues to grow, and young people are at the center of that revolution. "How today's young people consume and participate in new media," explained Montgomery, "will help determine the future shape and direction of the media system."

Among its findings, the study highlights the following aspects of the new media culture:
The economic underpinnings of the teen Web sites—advertising, e-commerce, market research, and data collection.

The prospects for a teen "civic culture" that subordinates profits to public service.

An assessment of future directions in the new media as the Internet reaches further into everyone's life through a variety of wired and wireless devices.

"Conducting a study of such a volatile industry was not without its challenges," Montgomery explained. "During the period when we were researching the online marketplace, the dot-com crash claimed a number of casualties, including some of the teen sites we were examining. Even as the final report was in production, several of the sites we wrote about closed, and there were further consolidations in the online teen market," she added. "But these stops and starts in the dot-com business should not divert our attention from the inexorable movement of digital media into the lives of teens."

In its new study CME calls for academic researchers to look more closely at the impact of new media on youth. "Much of what is known about how teens are interacting with the new digital media," the report notes, "is confined to the proprietary domain of market research, which is either completely off-limits to outsiders or priced so prohibitively as to be inaccessible to the public." CME also points to a combination of government policy, responsible industry self-regulation, public education, and citizen activism as the best means of realizing the full potential of the digital revolution.

The study makes a number of recommendations for policymakers, industry, scholars, health professionals, and parents, including calls for the following:

- Research on new media and teens, especially policy-relevant, focused research that addresses specific issues and needs, and which is broadly disseminated in a much more timely fashion than is the norm for most academic studies.
- Consumer protection policies ensuring that teens are not taken unfair advantage of in the new-media marketplace, either through deceptive marketing or exploitative advertising practices.
- Policies that ensure equitable access, not simply to the most basic Internet services, but also to the emerging broadband environment that will bring increasing amounts of multimedia resources into homes and schools.
- Support for a quality civic media culture, one that serves teens not simply as consumers, but also as citizens, with a robust array of civic content and opportunities for teens themselves to contribute to a new "electronic commons."

The full study, Teensites.com-A Field Guide to the New Digital Landscape, is available at http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/

The Center for Media Education (CME) is a national nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to creating a quality electronic...
media culture for children and youth. CME's cutting-edge studies on
the new-media marketplace have had major impacts on a number of key
public policy decisions during the past decade. Its documentation of
online marketing and data collection practices targeted at children
established the groundwork for the Children's Online Privacy Protection
Act (COPPA). CME's Research and Public Education Initiative on New
Media, Children and Youth is designed to stimulate research on digital
media and serve as a clearinghouse of research and policy developments
for academics, industry, the public, and policymakers. The
organization's current research and public education project, "Youth as
E-Citizens: The Internet and Youth Civic Engagement," will help ensure
that the Internet serves young people as a bridge to community and
civic engagement.

Ellen O'Brien eobrien@CME.org

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC

Position at American Cancer Society Behavioral Research Center in Atlanta

The Behavioral Research Center of the American Cancer Society is seeking applicants
for Director of Sampling, Surveys and Statistics. Please share this employment
cportunity with others you feel may be qualified.
DIRECTOR, Sampling, Surveys, & Statistics: The Behavioral Research Center, an intramural research department at the National Home Office of the American Cancer Society, invites applications for the position of director for sampling, surveys, and statistics. The responsibilities of this position include providing support and direction in sampling design, survey construction, and statistical programming and analysis for Behavioral Research Center (BRC) research studies including quality of life studies, studies of cancer survivors, special populations research and other BRC research projects. Particular areas of BRC research focus include: health behavior change, health communication, and quality of life of cancer survivors. Experience analyzing data from complex sample surveys using SUDAAN or a similar software package that accounts for sampling design in estimation of variance is required. Salary and benefits are competitive and commensurate with experience and credentials. Applicants should have a Ph.D. in biostatistics, survey research or behavioral science and relevant research experience and publications. Send CV & contact information for three references to Frank Baker, Ph.D., Vice President for Behavioral Research, Director of the Behavioral Research Center, American Cancer Society, 1599 Clifton Road, NE, Atlanta, GA 303-29-4251, 404-329-7795, E-mail: fbaker@cancer.org.

*******

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Dec 14 12:56:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
      id fBEKuAe22289 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:56:11 -0800 (PST)
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:56:11 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNENT <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: TeenSites.com - A Field Guide to the New Digital Landscape
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112141233540.2304-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
This is what you will find at the homepage of "TeenSites.com--A Field Guide to the New Digital Landscape" a new report by the Center for Media Education.

-- Jim

TEENSITES.COM <http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/>

http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/

TEENSITES.COM

A FIELD GUIDE TO THE NEW DIGITAL LANDSCAPE

From Sales Pitches to Civics Lessons:
Something for Everyone Online

CME Report Explores the Online World of Teens

A new report from the Center for Media Education surveys the burgeoning new media culture directed at--and in some cases created by--teens. TeenSites.com-A Field Guide to the New Digital Landscape examines the uniquely interactive nature of the new media, and explores the ways in which teens are at once shaping and being shaped by the electronic culture that surrounds them.

To download the full report in Adobe PDF format, you will need the free Adobe Acrobat Reader. Click the button below if you do not have it.
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http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/
I haven't used Ad-aware, but the January 2002 issue of Smart Computing magazine has several articles on spyware. In the article, "Is Your Computer Talking to Strangers?" the author says, "Ad-aware, ZoneAlarm, and Spy Blocker help secure your PC....Each uses a different protection strategy. Ad-aware finds and destroys, but may prevent freeware* from working. Zone Alarm blocks access to the Internet, and SpyBlocker misdirects the collected data. Each is effective; used together they offer better protection than any single one can."

Smart Computing is my favorite computing magazine. It is more about using your computer than about the latest new products. And it is written in understandable English.

*Some freeware comes with the programs that track your web activities.

Eleanor Hall, Ph.D.
Survey Research Associate
RCF Economic and Financial Consulting
www.rcfecon.com

--- Mark David Richards <mark@bisconti.com> wrote:
> This does not address the virus issue, but I'm interested in learning
> more about spyware. I recently came across this free download that
detects spyware on ones system and allows you to delete it. The link
> below explains what spyware is and does. Has anyone used this or have
> an opinion about it? (I installed it and identified a large number of
> programs on my system that were collecting data and sending it over
> the Internet without my knowledge.)
> 
> Ad-aware 5.62
> Get rid of spyware now!
> Download the most recent version of our award winning, free multi
> spyware removal utility.

> More information and download: http://www.lavasoftusa.com/index.html
Here is our latest poll for the Chicago Tribune conducted Dec 9-11 in Illinois.


On tribunals, the choices we offered to respondents read:
Do you think non-U.S. citizens who are accused of terrorism should be tried in
secret military tribunals...or should they be tried in the U.S. criminal court system?

  Military tribunals 37%
Other than the passage of time since the executive order was first signed and subsequent public debate, the operative word here (and in the NY Times poll) is "secret" military trials as opposed to "special" military tribunals used in previous poll questions. As for characterizing citizenship, we used "non-U.S." and the NY Times used "foreigners".

Nick

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> An well thought-out experiment on the wording of this type of question would be ideal, otherwise we are reduced to triangulating public opinion by reporting "When you ask it this way people respond this way, but when you ask it this way . . . ."

> Speaking of which, here are a couple more data points, from a recently released NYT/CBS poll:

> 38. In general, do you think United States citizens and those who are not citizens but are here legally should be treated the same way under the law, or should they be treated differently?
>  
> The same way | Differently | DK/NA
> 12/7-10/01 | 78 | 19 | 3

> 41. Some people say that in order to preserve national security and intelligence and protect jurors, suspected terrorists who are foreigners should be tried in military courts. There would be a military judge and there would NOT have to be a unanimous verdict. Trials could be held in secret and evidence against the suspect could be kept secret from the defense. Do you think this is the right way of dealing with suspected terrorists involved in attacks against the United States, or not?
>  
> Right way | Not the right way | DK/NA
> 12/7-10/01 | 40 | 51 | 10

> For the story http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/12/national/12POLL.html

> For the complete results http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/011212poll-results2.html

> They did some split half experimenting on the effects of using the term "terrorist" vs. "criminal" or "murderer" in a couple of questions.

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 17 10:32:55 2001
This reporting, which appears on the front page of today's Washington Post, draws on survey results from recent work by the Post-ABC News poll and the Pew Research Center.

-- Jim

(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company


National ID Card Gaining Support

By Robert O'Harrow Jr. and Jonathan Krim
Washington Post Staff Writers

Second in a series of occasional articles

Navy Petty Officer Wellington Jimenez walked into the identification room at Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn one day recently and gave his name, rank and fingerprint. In return, he got a token of the future: a plastic ID card embedded with a computer chip.

The card -- with two photos, two bar codes, a magnetic stripe and the etched
gold chip -- looks like a driver's license on steroids. More than 120,000 active duty military personnel, selected reserves, Defense Department civilians and some contractors have received the cards in recent months. About 4 million are to be issued over the next two years.

When Jimenez sits down at a computer on his next ship, the USS George Washington, he will slip the card into a device that will electronically scramble, or encrypt, his e-mail to prevent outsiders from reading it. The same card will automatically give him access to secure rooms across the world. At a military hospital, its chip will one day summon his medical records. Used as a debit card, it may even buy him a sandwich at a base cafeteria.

And more than ever, the cards will enable Defense Department officials to look into their databases and know the doorways he passes through, the computer he accesses, the doctor he sees, all of which is fine with Jimenez.

"I know the government will have more access to my information," Jimenez said. "But I know it's going to be used in the right way. I feel protected."

The high-tech IDs, the latest in "smart cards," were designed for tracking personnel across the globe and running more secure and efficient military operations. But now they are models for something that was unthinkable before Sept. 11: national identification cards for all U.S. citizens.

Almost from the day the planes hit the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, members of Congress, security experts and high-tech executives have endorsed the idea of some new form of identification system as a critical weapon in the fight against terrorism. They believe the cards, linked to giant databases, would be invaluable in preventing terrorists from operating under assumed names and identities.

Any such proposals in the past foundered on a distrust of centralized government as old as the American republic. Opponents raised the specter of prying bureaucrats with access to databases full of personal information, of Gestapo-like stops on the street and demands to produce papers, and the kind of unchecked police authority
that would erode constitutional protections.

The nation's new consciousness of terrorism, a product of both the fear and anger engendered by Sept. 11, has markedly changed the way Americans think about security, surveillance and their civil liberties. For many people, the trade-off of less privacy for more security now seems reasonable.

As Alan M. Dershowitz, a Harvard University law professor, wrote in October in endorsing a national ID card, the "fear of an intrusive government can be addressed by setting criteria for any official who demands to see the card."

"Even without a national card, people are always being asked to show identification," he said. "The existence of a national card need not change the rules about when ID can properly be demanded."

Airport Security Needs

The new enthusiasm for ID cards is not the only example of a changed attitude toward privacy issues. Face recognition systems that link computers and cameras to watch passing crowds spurred so much controversy last summer that many public officials refused to consider using the technology. Now airports across the country are clamoring to test and install such systems. Congress in October approved a sweeping anti-terrorism bill that gives authorities much broader powers to monitor e-mail, listen to telephone calls and secretly gather records. And the Bush administration, led by Attorney General John D. Ashcroft, has proposed a series of other measures with wide public support.

In a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll, almost 3 of 4 people said they support government eavesdropping on telephone conversations between terrorist suspects and their lawyers. For the first time, there is also strong support for secret tribunals for terrorist suspects and more government wiretapping. On the specific question of a national ID card, about 70 percent of those recently polled by the Pew Research Center said they favor a system that would require people to show a card to authorities who request it.

"We're willing to accept this immense flow of data to law enforcement and their proxies to make sure we feel safe and secure," said Marty Abrams, an
information technology specialist at the law firm Hunton & Williams and former senior credit bureau executive. "The equilibrium point shifted. It was a massive movement by society."

Abrams, privacy advocates and some lawmakers wonder whether all the implications are being considered. "We haven't really looked at what this means in the long run," Abrams said. "In our rush to make ourselves feel safer, have the appropriate due processes been worked out?"

To be sure, the political hurdles to a national ID card remain huge. President Bush has publicly downplayed their benefits, saying they're unnecessary to improve security. Bush's new cyberspace security chief, Richard Clarke, recently said he does "not think it's a very smart idea."

Logistical problems and the potentially enormous costs make it unlikely that a mandatory, national ID system could soon be adopted. In recent testimony before Congress, former Wyoming senator Alan Simpson, a supporter of more secure identification methods, warned against using the phrase "national ID" at all because of the political sensitivities. "That's a diversion for people who like to talk about . . . Nazi Germany," he said.

But a range of steps now underway could lead to a de facto national ID system that could accomplish many of the same goals.

The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, for example, a group of state officials, is devising a plan to create a national identification system that would link all driver databases to high-tech driver's license cards with computer chips, bar codes and biometric identifiers.

Technology specialists at the Justice Department and General Services Administration have acknowledged they are working with motor vehicle officials and commercial vendors to develop a standard for some sort of ID system, mandatory or not.

The Air Transport Association, meanwhile, has called for the creation of a voluntary travel card for passengers that would include a biometric
identifier. They proposed linking the card to a system of government databases that would include criminal, intelligence and financial records. Passengers who agree to use the card would have easier access to airplanes.

A bill introduced in Congress by Rep. Stephen Horn (R-Calif.), would establish a Commission on Homeland Security to study the federal government's efforts to protect U.S. security, including the use of national identification systems.

"This commission is not intended to resolve the national identification issue," said Horn. "It is merely to advance the debate in light of the September 11 attacks and the changed world in which we now live."

Fighting Fraud

Much of the momentum for a card has been generated by the fact that five of the 19 terrorists involved in the attacks on New York and at the Pentagon were able to obtain Social Security numbers, even with false identities. The other 14 probably made up or appropriated other numbers and used them for false identification, according to Social Security officials.

At least seven of the hijackers also obtained Virginia state ID cards, which would serve as identification to board a plane, even though they lived in Maryland motels. "If we can't be sure when interacting that someone is who they purport to be, where are we?" said James G. Huse Jr., the Social Security Administration's inspector general.

Over the years, the government has found myriad ways to get involved in the identity business -- passports, for one, or state-issued driver's licenses. A Social Security number is a ubiquitous identifier, now used far beyond its original purpose.

Still, there is broad recognition that existing forms of identification are inadequate, an awareness that has been fueled by an explosion in the number of financial crimes in which fraud artists adopt the identity of their victims.
Social Security cards contain no authenticating information, such as pictures, and they can be easily forged. Pilot licenses are often printed on paper. Driver's licenses, even those now designed to be tamper-proof, also are vulnerable to abuse because they can be obtained with fraudulent birth certificates, Social Security cards and other documentation.

Tamper-proof smart cards don't necessarily worry privacy advocates, who have made identity theft a banner issue in recent years. What does trouble them is the more complex question of whether a national ID system should go beyond simple authentication of an individual's identity.

Proponents argue that security can be achieved only with a smart card that can cross-check various storehouses of personal data to determine whether someone should be viewed with suspicion. That would mean, for example, that an airline ticket agent swiping a card would be warned, by law enforcement, intelligence and some private databases, about an individual who overstayed a tourist visa, is on a government watch list or who is wanted for a crime.

In the world before Sept. 11, a large majority of Americans expressed concerns about personal privacy in surveys, and those concerns focused on the increasing collection of data -- names, addresses, buying habits and movements -- by businesses interested in developing ever more sophisticated marketing campaigns.

At the same time, they also demonstrated a willingness to surrender personal information for discounts or conveniences, such as cheaper groceries, faster passage through toll booths and upgrades on airline travel, one reason for an enormous growth in databases in recent years.

"It's massive," said Judith DeCew, a Clark University professor and author of "In Pursuit of Privacy: Law, Ethics and the Rise of Technology." "It's financial information. It's credit information. It's medical records, insurance records, what you buy, calls you make. Almost every action or activity you participate in while living a normal life potentially generates a huge database about you."
Tapping Data

State and federal governments also expanded their data networks and use of personal information. Nearly every time police make a traffic stop, for example, they tap into National Crime Information Center databases to check whether the driver is a known criminal or suspect. And as part of a new and aggressive effort to track down parents who owe child support, the federal government created a vast computerized data-monitoring system that includes all individuals with new jobs and the names, addresses, Social Security numbers and wages of nearly every working adult in the United States. Under the system, banks are obligated to search through lists of accounts for deadbeats, or turn the data over to the government.

Government agencies have also contracted with private companies for information. The Internal Revenue Service, for example, hired a data company called ChoicePoint Inc. to give about 20,000 employees instant access to 10 billion public records containing housing, financial and other personal information about individuals. ChoicePoint provides data to the FBI and other agencies as well.

Privacy groups are troubled by the evolving uses agencies, marketers and others find for the new databases. Law enforcement authorities and private attorneys, for instance, regularly use subpoena power now to gain access to grocery, toll and a bonanza of other kinds of privately collected data for use in civil and criminal cases. And many of the databases that grew so quickly in recent years are now being studied for their potential value to law enforcement authorities.

Acxiom Corp. is lobbying Congress to change a relatively new law that limits their use of driver's license numbers. Acxiom wants to use those numbers to create a new authentication system at airports, improving the ability of clerks to ask travelers personal questions about their lives that would help verify who they are.

A centralized ID database system would dramatically speed verification and make life more convenient for travelers, airlines and others. The disadvantage, according
to civil liberties activists, is that agencies would gain access to unprecedented amounts of aggregated data. They also would have to be relied upon to ensure the database is current and accurate. Questions about who would maintain the database and gain access to it would be thorny ones.

An alternative would be to configure databases to allow certain pieces of information, or fields of data, to be accessed by the smart card. This approach would limit the amount of information contained in a single database.

"Any national ID system, regardless of who controls it, has a tremendous potential for misuse and abuse," said John Berthoud, president of the National Taxpayers Union in Alexandria.

Even a de facto national ID system, of the sort proposed by motor vehicle administrators, would dramatically ease the collection of sensitive personal information about individuals by linking it all to a single, unique identifier: A smart card with a fingerprint or other biometric.

Simon Davies, director of Privacy International, a London-based advocacy group that has studied national IDs, said the computers and networks in a centralized system would also become targets of hackers. In recent years, scores of private and government databases, containing financial, medical and other personal information, have been breached by hackers, some who publicized the data or used it in fraud schemes.

It also could make it easier for a successful forger or hacker to maintain a false identity, since authorities would be so trusting in a new, high-tech system. A lost or stolen card under such a system "will paralyze your card or your identity for days or weeks," he said.

"At this point, you created a huge technological infrastructure of such massive proportions it trips over its own shoelaces," he said.

Global Roots

More than 100 nations have a form of national identification and use them in a variety of ways to improve security, assist law enforcement and make the delivery of
services more efficient.

In Spain, for example, an ID card is mandatory for all citizens older than 14, and they're required for many government programs. Argentinians must get a card when they turn 8 and then re-register at 17. Kenya requires its citizens to carry an ID at all times. Germany likewise requires all citizens over 16 to carry a card that's similar to a passport.

Belgium first used ID cards during the German occupation in World War I. Today every citizen older than 15 has to carry one, and it is used as proof of age and identity for an array of consumer and financial transactions. It also allows Belgians to travel to several countries without a passport. Police officers in Belgium can request to see the card for any reason, at any time.

Finland has one of the most sophisticated systems in the world, including a voluntary smart card that comes with a computer chip and serves as a travel card, or "mini-passport," in at least 15 European countries.

Much like the Defense Department card, which is officially called the Common Access Card, the Finnish ID enables users to electronically sign and encrypt online documents. Eventually, it would allow users to improve the security of cell phones by scrambling calls. To protect against fraud or misuse, officials limit the amount of personal information contained on the chip.

If a new ID card system is developed in the United States the initial users are likely to be immigrants and foreign visitors. Last month, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) and Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) introduced legislation that would require foreign nationals to use high-tech visa cards containing a fingerprint, retinal scan or other unique identifier. It also would create a centralized "lookout database" containing information about known terrorists and other U.S. visitors deemed threatening.

Larry Ellison, chief executive of Oracle Corp., the world's largest database software maker, favors a voluntary card for all citizens, much like what the Air Transport Association endorsed. But he agrees that such a system might ultimately serve the same purpose as a national ID, if people found that travel and other
activity was too inconvenient without it.

To critics such a card would open the door to a host of difficult questions over when and where it would be used. Could Greyhound require it, even if a person wants to pay cash? A hardware store? A hardware store if you buy only certain things, such as large quantities of fertilizer? Who decides? How would an individual's name be shared? And what if a database is mistaken -- what kind of access and recourse would an individual have?

"Those are political decisions that need to be made," said Ellison, who was among the first to promote a national ID system and pledged to donate computer software to make it possible. "I just think people need to ask themselves who they trust more, terrorists or the government?"

The driver's license proposal stands as an alternative to a single national card. A technical standard would define the security features of the card, but it would allow states the freedom of creative design and put the burden on them for administering it. Proponents of this approach acknowledge it could easily assume all the features of a national ID card once other government agencies and private companies begin tailoring their computers to capture information from the card.

And even if it were approved today, proponents say, the card would take years to unveil, as motor vehicle administrators arranged funding and drivers reapplied for licenses.

Deirdre Mulligan, director of the Samuelson Law, Technology and Public Policy Clinic at the University of California at Berkeley, said she believes a single ID system would be overly intrusive and ineffective. She said any decision to adopt such a system should be made by elected officials, not motor vehicle bureaucrats or private companies. "The debate about a national ID card is not something that should occur in the darkroom of some administrative process," Mulligan said.

Robert Ellis Smith, a lawyer and privacy specialist, said the push for a national ID card is based on the false belief there can be a simple, high-tech
solution to an immensely complex problem. "One way to predict the effectiveness of a national ID number or document is to look at environments where the true identity of all residents is known: prisons, the military, many workplaces, many college campuses," he writes in a new paper about national ID cards. "And yet these places are far from crime free."

A national identification system would raise privacy questions, said Tate Preston, vice president at Datacard Group, which creates high-tech IDs. But the need for a better identification system is beyond question.

"In the 19th century, it was sufficient to ask who you are," he said. "In the 20th century, it was sufficient to show who you are," he said. "In the 21st century, you will have to prove who you are."
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I should add that having this card sure beats carrying around your personnel and medical records in hard copy form. As for being on steroids, it's the same size as all the other plastic cards but a tiny bit thicker.

Anyone coming to the National Conference wanting to see one of these smart cards can see mine, if you ask nice.

Jim Caplan
Arlington

Reply to:
James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
703.696.5848
caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil <mailto:caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>

-----Original Message-----
From: James Beniger [SMTP:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2001 1:32 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: National ID Card Gaining Support (WashPost)

This reporting, which appears on the front page of today's Washington Post, draws on survey results from recent work by the Post-ABC News poll and the Pew Research Center.

-----
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etched gold
chip—looks like a driver’s license on steroids. More than 120,000 active duty
military personnel, selected reserves, Defense Department civilians and some
contractors have received the cards in recent months. About 4 million are to be
issued over the next two years.

When Jimenez sits down at a computer on his next ship, the USS George
Washington, he will slip the card into a device that will electronically
scramble, or encrypt, his e-mail to prevent outsiders from reading it. The same card will
automatically give him access to secure rooms across the world. At a military
hospital, its chip will one day summon his medical records. Used as a debit
card, it may even buy him a sandwich at a base cafeteria.

And more than ever, the cards will enable Defense Department officials to look
into their databases and know the doorways he passes through, the computer he
accesses, the doctor he sees, all of which is fine with Jimenez.

"I know the government will have more access to my information,"
Jimenez said.
"But I know it's going to be used in the right way. I feel protected."

The high-tech IDs, the latest in "smart cards," were designed for tracking
personnel across the globe and running more secure and efficient military
operations. But now they are models for something that was unthinkable before Sept. 11: national
identification cards for all U.S. citizens.

Almost from the day the planes hit the World Trade Center and the Pentagon,
members of Congress, security experts and high-tech executives have endorsed the idea
of some new form of identification system as a critical weapon in the fight against
terrorism. They believe the cards, linked to giant databases, would be invaluable in
preventing terrorists from operating under assumed names and identities.

Any such proposals in the past foundered on a distrust of centralized government as old as the American republic. Opponents raised the specter of prying
bureaucrats with access to databases full of personal information, of Gestapo-like
stops on the street and demands to produce papers, and the kind of unchecked police
authority that would erode constitutional protections.

The nation's new consciousness of terrorism, a product of both the fear and
anger engendered by Sept. 11, has markedly changed the way Americans think about
security, surveillance and their civil liberties. For many people, the trade-off of
less privacy for more security now seems reasonable.

As Alan M. Dershowitz, a Harvard University law professor, wrote in October in
endorsing a national ID card, the "fear of an intrusive government can be
Addressed by setting criteria for any official who demands to see the card.

"Even without a national card, people are always being asked to show identification," he said. "The existence of a national card need not change the rules about when ID can properly be demanded."

Airport Security Needs

The new enthusiasm for ID cards is not the only example of a changed attitude toward privacy issues. Face recognition systems that link computers and cameras to watch passing crowds spurred so much controversy last summer that many public officials refused to consider using the technology. Now airports across the country are clamoring to test and install such systems. Congress in October approved a sweeping anti-terrorism bill that gives authorities much broader powers to monitor e-mail, listen to telephone calls and secretly gather records. And the Bush administration, led by Attorney General John D. Ashcroft, has proposed a series of other measures with wide public support.

In a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll, almost 3 of 4 people said they support government eavesdropping on telephone conversations between terrorist suspects and their lawyers. For the first time, there is also strong support for secret tribunals for terrorist suspects and more government wiretapping. On the specific question of a national ID card, about 70 percent of those recently polled by the Pew Research Center said they favor a system that would require people to show a card to authorities who request it.

"We're willing to accept this immense flow of data to law enforcement and their proxies to make sure we feel safe and secure," said Marty Abrams, an information technology specialist at the law firm Hunton & Williams and former senior credit bureau executive. "The equilibrium point shifted. It was a massive movement by society."

Abrams, privacy advocates and some lawmakers wonder whether all the implications are being considered. "We haven't really looked at what this means in the long run," Abrams said. "In our rush to make ourselves feel safer, have the appropriate due processes been worked out?"

To be sure, the political hurdles to a national ID card remain huge. President Bush has publicly downplayed their benefits, saying they're unnecessary to improve security. Bush's new cyberspace security chief, Richard Clarke, recently said he does "not think it's a very smart idea."
Logistical problems and the potentially enormous costs make it unlikely that a mandatory, national ID system could soon be adopted. In recent testimony before Congress, former Wyoming senator Alan Simpson, a supporter of more secure identification methods, warned against using the phrase "national ID" at all because of the political sensitivities. "That's a diversion for people who like to talk about . . . Nazi Germany," he said.

But a range of steps now underway could lead to a de facto national ID system that could accomplish many of the same goals. The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, for example, a group of state officials, is devising a plan to create a national identification system that would link all driver databases to high-tech driver's license cards with computer chips, bar codes and biometric identifiers. Technology specialists at the Justice Department and General Services Administration have acknowledged they are working with motor vehicle officials and commercial vendors to develop a standard for some sort of ID system, mandatory or not.

The Air Transport Association, meanwhile, has called for the creation of a voluntary travel card for passengers that would include a biometric identifier. They proposed linking the card to a system of government databases that would include criminal, intelligence and financial records. Passengers who agree to use the card would have easier access to airplanes.

A bill introduced in Congress by Rep. Stephen Horn (R-Calif.), would establish a Commission on Homeland Security to study the federal government's efforts to protect U.S. security, including the use of national identification systems. "This commission is not intended to resolve the national identification issue," said Horn. "It is merely to advance the debate in light of the September 11 attacks and the changed world in which we now live."

Fighting Fraud
Much of the momentum for a card has been generated by the fact that five of the 19 terrorists involved in the attacks on New York and at the Pentagon were able to obtain Social Security numbers, even with false identities. The other 14 probably made up or appropriated other numbers and used them for false identification,
according to Social Security officials.

At least seven of the hijackers also obtained Virginia state ID cards, which would serve as identification to board a plane, even though they lived in Maryland motels. "If we can't be sure when interacting that someone is who they purport to be, where are we?" said James G. Huse Jr., the Social Security Administration's inspector general.

Over the years, the government has found myriad ways to get involved in the identity business—passports, for one, or state-issued driver's licenses. A Social Security number is a ubiquitous identifier, now used far beyond its original purpose.

Still, there is broad recognition that existing forms of identification are inadequate, an awareness that has been fueled by an explosion in the number of financial crimes in which fraud artists adopt the identity of their victims.

Social Security cards contain no authenticating information, such as pictures, and they can be easily forged. Pilot licenses are often printed on paper. Driver's licenses, even those now designed to be tamper-proof, also are vulnerable to abuse because they can be obtained with fraudulent birth certificates, Social Security cards and other documentation.

Tamper-proof smart cards don't necessarily worry privacy advocates, who have made identity theft a banner issue in recent years. What does trouble them is the more complex question of whether a national ID system should go beyond simple authentication of an individual's identity.

Proponents argue that security can be achieved only with a smart card that can cross-check various storehouses of personal data to determine whether someone should be viewed with suspicion. That would mean, for example, that an airline ticket agent swiping a card would be warned, by law enforcement, intelligence and some private databases, about an individual who overstayed a tourist visa, is on a government watch list or who is wanted for a crime.

In the world before Sept. 11, a large majority of Americans expressed concerns about personal privacy in surveys, and those concerns focused on the increasing collection of data—names, addresses, buying habits and movements—by businesses interested in developing ever more sophisticated marketing campaigns.

At the same time, they also demonstrated a willingness to surrender
personal information for discounts or conveniences, such as cheaper groceries, faster passage through toll booths and upgrades on airline travel, one reason for an enormous growth in databases in recent years.

"It's massive," said Judith DeCew, a Clark University professor and author of "In Pursuit of Privacy: Law, Ethics and the Rise of Technology." "It's financial information. It's credit information. It's medical records, insurance records, what you buy, calls you make. Almost every action or activity you participate in while living a normal life potentially generates a huge database about you."

Tapping Data
State and federal governments also expanded their data networks and use of personal information. Nearly every time police make a traffic stop, for example, they tap into National Crime Information Center databases to check whether the driver is a known criminal or suspect. And as part of a new and aggressive effort to track down parents who owe child support, the federal government created a vast computerized data-monitoring system that includes all individuals with new jobs and the names, addresses, Social Security numbers and wages of nearly every working adult in the United States. Under the system, banks are obligated to search through lists of accounts for deadbeats, or turn the data over to the government.

Government agencies have also contracted with private companies for information. The Internal Revenue Service, for example, hired a data company called ChoicePoint Inc. to give about 20,000 employees instant access to 10 billion public records containing housing, financial and other personal information about individuals. ChoicePoint provides data to the FBI and other agencies as well.

Privacy groups are troubled by the evolving uses agencies, marketers and others find for the new databases. Law enforcement authorities and private attorneys, for instance, regularly use subpoena power now to gain access to grocery, toll and a bonanza of other kinds of privately collected data for use in civil and criminal cases. And many of the databases that grew so quickly in recent years are now being studied for their potential value to law enforcement authorities.
Acxiom Corp. is lobbying Congress to change a relatively new law that limits their use of driver's license numbers. Acxiom wants to use those numbers to create a new authentication system at airports, improving the ability of clerks to ask travelers personal questions about their lives that would help verify who they are.

A centralized ID database system would dramatically speed verification and make life more convenient for travelers, airlines and others. The disadvantage, according to civil liberties activists, is that agencies would gain access to unprecedented amounts of aggregated data. They also would have to be relied upon to ensure the database is current and accurate. Questions about who would maintain the database and gain access to it would be thorny ones.

An alternative would be to configure databases to allow certain pieces of information, or fields of data, to be accessed by the smart card. This approach would limit the amount of information contained in a single database.

"Any national ID system, regardless of who controls it, has a tremendous potential for misuse and abuse," said John Berthoud, president of the National Taxpayers Union in Alexandria.

Even a de facto national ID system, of the sort proposed by motor vehicle administrators, would dramatically ease the collection of sensitive personal information about individuals by linking it all to a single, unique identifier: A smart card with a fingerprint or other biometric.

Simon Davies, director of Privacy International, a London-based advocacy group that has studied national IDs, said the computers and networks in a centralized system would also become targets of hackers. In recent years, scores of private and government databases, containing financial, medical and other personal information, have been breached by hackers, some who publicized the data or used it in fraud schemes.

It also could make it easier for a successful forger or hacker to maintain a false identity, since authorities would be so trusting in a new, high-tech system. A lost or stolen card under such a system "will paralyze your card or your identity for days or weeks," he said.

"At this point, you created a huge technological infrastructure of such massive proportions it trips over its own shoelaces," he said.
Global Roots
More than 100 nations have a form of national identification and use them in a variety of ways to improve security, assist law enforcement and make the delivery of services more efficient.

In Spain, for example, an ID card is mandatory for all citizens older than 14, and they're required for many government programs. Argentinians must get a card when they turn 8 and then re-register at 17. Kenya requires its citizens to carry an ID at all times. Germany likewise requires all citizens over 16 to carry a card that's similar to a passport.

Belgium first used ID cards during the German occupation in World War I. Today every citizen older than 15 has to carry one, and it is used as proof of age and identity for an array of consumer and financial transactions. It also allows Belgians to travel to several countries without a passport. Police officers in Belgium can request to see the card for any reason, at any time.

Finland has one of the most sophisticated systems in the world, including a voluntary smart card that comes with a computer chip and serves as a travel card, or "mini-passport," in at least 15 European countries. Much like the Defense Department card, which is officially called the Common Access Card, the Finnish ID enables users to electronically sign and encrypt online documents. Eventually, it would allow users to improve the security of cell phones by scrambling calls. To protect against fraud or misuse, officials limit the amount of personal information contained on the chip.

If a new ID card system is developed in the United States the initial users are likely to be immigrants and foreign visitors. Last month, Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) and Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) introduced legislation that would require foreign nationals to use high-tech visa cards containing a fingerprint, retinal scan or other unique identifier. It also would create a centralized "lookout database" containing information about known terrorists and other U.S. visitors deemed threatening.

Larry Ellison, chief executive of Oracle Corp., the world's largest database software maker, favors a voluntary card for all citizens, much like what the Air Transport Association endorsed. But he agrees that such a system might ultimately
serve the same purpose as a national ID, if people found that travel and other
activity was too inconvenient without it.

To critics such a card would open the door to a host of difficult questions
over when and where it would be used. Could Greyhound require it, even if a person
wants to pay cash? A hardware store? A hardware store if you buy only certain things,
such as large quantities of fertilizer? Who decides? How would an individual's
name be shared? And what if a database is mistaken—what kind of access and recourse
would an individual have?

"Those are political decisions that need to be made," said Ellison, who was
among the first to promote a national ID system and pledged to donate computer
software to make it possible. "I just think people need to ask themselves who they
trust more, terrorists or the government?"

The driver's license proposal stands as an alternative to a single national
card. A technical standard would define the security features of the card, but it
would allow states the freedom of creative design and put the burden on them for
administering it. Proponents of this approach acknowledge it could easily assume all
the features of a national ID card once other government agencies and private companies begin tailoring their computers to capture information from the card.

And even if it were approved today, proponents say, the card would take years
to unveil, as motor vehicle administrators arranged funding and drivers reapplied for licenses.

Deirdre Mulligan, director of the Samuelson Law, Technology and Public Policy
Clinic at the University of California at Berkeley, said she believes a single
ID system would be overly intrusive and ineffective. She said any decision to adopt
such a system should be made by elected officials, not motor vehicle bureaucrats or
private companies. "The debate about a national ID card is not something that should
occur in the darkroom of some administrative process," Mulligan said.

Robert Ellis Smith, a lawyer and privacy specialist, said the push for a
national ID card is based on the false belief there can be a simple, high-tech
solution to an immensely complex problem. "One way to predict the
effectiveness of a national ID number or document is to look at environments where the true identity of all residents is known: prisons, the military, many workplaces, many college campuses," he writes in a new paper about national ID cards. "And yet these places are far from crime free."

A national identification system would raise privacy questions, said Tate Preston, vice president at Datacard Group, which creates high-tech IDs. But the need for a better identification system is beyond question. "In the 19th century, it was sufficient to ask who you are," he said. "In the 20th century, it was sufficient to show who you are," he said. "In the 21st century, you will have to prove who you are."
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>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 17 11:06:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBHJ6le28936 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:06:47 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id LAA21296 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:06:46 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
   by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBHJ5mN17348 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:05:48 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:05:46 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Refugees meeting proposal would register every person on Earth
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112171058130.16333-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Speaking of national registration and identity cards, such narrow ideas are apparently already outmoded (see below). Who among us will cast the first global sample using such
Geneva, Dec 13 AAP -- Every person in the world would be fingerprinted and registered under a universal identification scheme to fight illegal immigration and people smuggling outlined at a United Nations meeting today.

The plan was put forward by Pascal Smet, the head of Belgium's independent asylum review board, at a roundtable meeting with ministers including Australian Immigration Minister Philip Ruddock this afternoon.

Mr Smet said the European Union was already considering a Europe-wide system, using either fingerprints or eye scanning technology, to identify citizens.

But he said the plan could be extended worldwide.

"There are no technical problems. It is only a question of will and investment," he said.

"If you look to our societies, we are already registered from birth until death. Our governments know who we are and what we are. But one of the basic problems is the numbers of people in the world who are not registered, who do not have a set identity, and when these people move with real or fake passports, you cannot identify them.

"It's a basic rule of management that if you want to manage something, you measure it. It's the same with human beings and migration.

"But instead of measuring it, you have to register them."

Mr Smet said the scheme would give people dignity by giving them an identity if their papers had been lost or destroyed.

And he said it would allow countries to open their borders to genuine
travellers or asylum seekers, because they would be able to prove the identity of any overstayers and deport them without argument from their home country.

Mr Ruddock appeared unconvinced by the merits of the plan.

"In principle we would be supportive of a system which would crack down on multiple asylum claims, but a universal identification system would be taking it too far," he said through a spokeswoman.


Copyright (c) 2001 -- The Sydney Morning Herald

*****

>From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Mon Dec 17 11:29:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBHJT4e09570 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001
11:29:05 -0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-d01.mx.aol.com (imo-d01.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.33])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id LAA20337 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:29:04 -0800
   (PST)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
   by imo-d01.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.26.2035f815 (4413)
   for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 14:27:57 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <26.2035f815.294fa13d@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 14:27:57 EST
Subject: Panels
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
   boundary="part1_26.2035f815.294fa13d_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

--part1_26.2035f815.294fa13d_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm looking for city markets with a pre-recruited panels already in place. I'm looking for panels of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed. If you know of such a panel, please send me information about when it was recruited, how many studies have been conducted using this panel, how it is refreshed and/or maintained, how
many active participants it have, and how the local market is defined geographically. This is for use in an industry study of methodologies. As always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

--part1_26.2035f815.294fa13d_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<html><font face=arial,helvetica><body bgcolor="#ffffff"><font style="BACKGROUND-COLOR: #ffffff" size=2>
I'm looking for city markets with a pre-recruited panels already in place. I'm looking for panels would of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed. If you know of such a panel, please send me information about when it was recruited, how many studies have been conducted using this panel, how it is refreshed and/or maintained, how many active participants it have, and how the local market is defined geographically. This is for use in an industry study of methodologies. As always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later.

JAS
J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</font></font></body></html>
WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the Republican Party is up for debate.

Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition.

If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.

In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush's 19 percent.

Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.

"Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.

Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis.

Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with
his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.

But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews.

Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."

"Every year we hear the magic word `realignment,'" said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council.

Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.

The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Among the key findings:

* Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;

* Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat;

* Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.

Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism, Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic
agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush’s handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove.

In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein Center of American Jewish History at Temple University and director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.

Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.

But what’s important about the approval ratings in this week’s survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he’s still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
This is rather interesting........... but the findings which you can find on the web site suggest a bias based on a self selected sample. If I can I will try to reproduce them at a later date

Dick Halpern

Web Test Measures Prejudice Against Arab Muslims

American attitudes about Arab Muslims may have changed or been colored as a result of the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. How much they changed is difficult to assess, but individuals have the opportunity to measure their own level of unconscious prejudice toward Arab Muslims by taking a test on the Internet developed by University of Washington and Yale University psychologists.

The anonymous test, which can be completed in about five minutes, can be accessed by clicking on the tolerance.org Web site of the Southern Poverty Law Center at http://www.tolerance.org, and then clicking on the link for "new hidden bias tests launched."

The new test is a spin-off of a psychological tool called the Implicit Association Test created by UW psychology professor Anthony Greenwald and developed in collaboration with Yale psychology professor Mahzarin Banaji and Brian Nosek, a Yale doctoral student.

The Arab Muslims test, like other IATs, measures unconscious or automatic associations that underlie prejudice. In taking the test, people are asked to identify a collection of names from around the world as either Arab Muslim or other. They also are asked to classify a list of words such as "love" or "hate" as good or bad. Then they are asked to respond to all of the names and words again, this time associating each with one of two categories, such as "Arab Muslim or good" or "Other People or bad." The test is scored on the basis of the speed with which it is done.

The new test is one of nine that can be found on the tolerance.org Web
site. The other tests on the site, also developed by the UW-Yale team, rate people's unconscious prejudice against blacks and Asians and bias about gender, age and body image.

"Like all of the IATs, the new test is a way of acquiring self-knowledge," said Greenwald. "It offers people the opportunity to find out what's inside their heads that they didn't know exists. We encourage people to try the test as away of learning about themselves."

The Arab Muslims test was posted on the Web site shortly before Thanksgiving Day and the researchers have had the opportunity to roughly analyze data from the first 700 people who took it.

"Americans are more willing to be explicit about their negativity toward Arab Muslims than toward other groups," said Greenwald.

Thirty-three percent of the initial respondents indicated they had some degree of explicit or conscious reaction against Arab Muslims, while 62 percent said they were neutral and 5 percent indicated a positive reaction. The percentage explicitly against Arab Muslims was noticeably higher than that found for African Americans or elderly in other tests on the tolerance.org site.

The number of people who showed some degree of unconscious or automatic negative reaction (slight, moderate or strong) to Arab Muslims was 53 percent. Twenty-five percent were neutral and 22 percent showed some positive reaction. The level of negativity was not as strong as that recorded in racial and age tests. But the researchers cautioned that the tests should not be compared in this respect. The Arab Muslims test compared this group broadly to "other peoples" which the researchers said may not be as attractive a category as "young" with which "old" or "European American" with which "African Americans" were contrasted in the other tests.

"Our minds may be more contaminated than we recognize," said Banaji. "We present these tests not to be critical of those who show a bias, but rather to serve as a catalyst for asking questions about the discordance between the beliefs of fairness people consciously uphold and the biases in their assessments that unconsciously creep in.

"What is unique and important about this test, is that it gives us a sense of our bias at a time when civil liberties are directly under threat from the introduction of the U.S. Patriot Act," she added. "Given that the unconscionable acts of Sept. 11 appear to be performed by Arab Muslims, to what extent can we treat Arab Muslim (of American or other nationalities) fairly? To the extent that we harbor negative attitudes and such attitudes are not always consciously detectable, the question of fair treatment becomes ever more urgent."

The tolerance.org Web site also contains information about counteracting prejudice and hate, as well as coverage of the backlash against American Arabs, Muslim and Sikhs since the Sept. 11 attacks. It also has a tutorial on how to take the Arab Muslims and other IAT tests.

---University of Washington
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American attitudes about Arab Muslims may have changed or been colored as a result of the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. How much they changed is difficult to assess, but individuals have the opportunity to measure their own level of unconscious prejudice toward Arab Muslims by taking a test on the Internet developed by University of Washington and Yale University psychologists.

The anonymous test, which can be completed in about five minutes, can be accessed by clicking on the tolerance.org Web site of the Southern Poverty Law Center at http://www.tolerance.org, and then clicking on the link for new hidden bias tests launched.

The new test is a spin-off of a psychological tool called the Implicit Association Test created by UW psychology professor Anthony Greenwald and developed in collaboration with Yale psychology professor Mahzarin Banaji and Brian Nosek, a Yale doctoral student.

The Arab Muslims test, like other IATs, measures unconscious or automatic associations that underlie prejudice. In taking the test, people are asked to identify a collection of names from around the world as either Arab Muslim or other. They also are asked to classify a list of words such as love or hate as good or bad. Then they are asked to respond to all of the names and words again, this time associating each with one of two categories, such as Arab Muslim or good or Other People or bad. The test is scored on the basis of the speed with which it is done.

The new test is one of nine that can be found on the tolerance.org Web site. The other tests on the site, also developed by the UW-Yale team, rate people's unconscious prejudice against blacks and Asians and bias about gender, age and body image.

Like all of the IATs, the new test is a way of acquiring
"self-knowledge," said Greenwald. "It offers people the opportunity to find out what's inside their heads that they didn't know exists. We encourage people to try the test as away of learning about themselves."
The Arab Muslims test was posted on the Web site shortly before Thanksgiving Day and the researchers have had the opportunity to roughly analyze data from the first 700 people who took it.

"Americans are more willing to be explicit about their negativity toward Arab Muslims than toward other groups," said Greenwald.

Thirty-three percent of the initial respondents indicated they had some degree of explicit or conscious reaction against Arab Muslims, while 62 percent said they were neutral and 5 percent indicated a positive reaction. The percentage explicitly against Arab Muslims was noticeably higher than that found for African Americans or elderly in other tests on the tolerance.org site.

The number of people who showed some degree of unconscious or automatic negative reaction (slight, moderate or strong) to Arab Muslims was 53 percent. Twenty-five percent were neutral and 22 percent showed some positive reaction. The level of negativity was not as strong as that recorded in racial and age tests. But the researchers cautioned that the tests should not be compared in this respect. The Arab Muslims test compared this group broadly to "other peoples" which the researchers said may not be as attractive a category as "young" or European American" or African American" and hence was contrasted in the other tests. Our minds may be more contaminated than we recognize," said Banaji. "We present these tests not to be critical of those who show a bias, but rather to serve as a catalyst for asking questions about the discordance between the beliefs of fairness people consciously uphold and the biases in their assessments that unconsciously creep in.

What is unique and important about this test, is that it gives us a sense of our bias at a time when civil liberties are directly under threat from the introduction of the U.S. Patriot Act," she added. "Given that the unconscionable acts of Sept. 11 appear to be performed by Arab Muslims, to what extent can we treat Arab Muslim (of}
American or other nationalities) fairly? To the extent that we harbor negative attitudes and such attitudes are not always consciously detectable, the question of fair treatment becomes ever more urgent. The tolerance.org Web site also contains information about counteracting prejudice and hate, as well as coverage of the backlash against American Arabs, Muslim and Sikhs since the Sept. 11 attacks. It also has a tutorial on how to take the Arab Muslims and other IAT tests.
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>From sid.grc@verizon.net Tue Dec 18 08:31:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBIGVne01212 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
08:31:49 -0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp006pub.verizon.net (smtp006pub.verizon.net
[206.46.170.185])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id IAA06485 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:31:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Dell4300 (pool-151-200-44-232.res.east.verizon.net
[151.200.44.232])
   by smtp006pub.verizon.net with SMTP
   for <aapornet@usc.edu> id fBIGUsd18584
   Tue, 18 Dec 2001 10:30:55 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <000501c187e1$5e065830$6601a8c0@Dell4300>
From: "Sid Groeneman" <sid.grc@verizon.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112172215300.10969-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:18:16 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this problem for years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this - short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD screening - that yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major problems to be worked out. I'm guessing
that Luntz used some form of listed sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with relatively strong religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to explain the surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm expecting too much, but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned the sampling.

Sid Groeneman
Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid.grc@verizon.net (NEW!)
www.groeneman.com

* One exception might be using phone numbers from previous RDD surveys where the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are also expensive and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 1:17 AM
Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

> WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the Republican Party is up for debate.
> Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition.
> If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.
In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush’s 19 percent.

Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey’s significance.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.

"Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.

Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush’s approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis.

Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.

But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews.

Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."

"Every year we hear the magic word ‘realignment,’” said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council.

Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.

The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Among the key findings:

* Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;

* Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush’s policy toward Yasser Arafat;

* Some 27 percent said Bush’s performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush’s present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.
Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism, Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove.

In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein Center of American Jewish History at Temple University and director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.

Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.

But what's important about the approval ratings in this week's survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he's still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp

(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People <www.jta.org>
Bioterrorism Fears Lingering

Survey Finds 20% of D.C. Area Residents Directly Affected

By Richard Morin
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, December 18, 2001; Page A11

Two of 10 Washington area residents report that they or someone they know was exposed to anthrax, was tested for exposure to the deadly bacteria or had their workplace closed at least temporarily because of anthrax-related concerns, according to a Harvard University research team. The survey also found that a third of all residents worry that they might contract anthrax through the mail. And almost 17 percent of Washington adults fear that they or a family member will contract anthrax in the next year, said Robert Blendon, professor of health policy and political analysis at Harvard's School of Public Health. A companion survey in the Trenton and Princeton, N.J., areas also found that about one in five residents there report being
directly or indirectly affected by the discovery of anthrax on an area mailbox and on mail-handling equipment. In Boca Raton, Fla., where the first victim of the recent wave of bioterrorism died in early October, one in 10 residents report being affected. Nationally, Harvard researchers said, 4 percent of those interviewed said they or someone they knew had been affected directly by anthrax. "Though most Americans across the nation were relatively untouched by the anthrax incidents, a significant share of the people in Washington and the Trenton area find themselves scared and forced to change the way they're living," Blendon said. In their analysis, researchers defined individuals as affected by bioterrorism if they, a relative or a friend had been exposed or tested for anthrax or had their workplaces closed because of the presence or suspicion of anthrax. The attitudes and behaviors of affected residents were then compared with those of people who had not been as directly involved. The survey found that 21 percent of all Washington area residents were directly or indirectly affected by the recent anthrax emergency, including 5 percent who said they or someone they know well had been exposed to the disease. About 12 percent -- one in eight -- reported that they or someone they know had been tested for exposure to the anthrax bacteria. About 14 percent -- one in seven -- said their workplaces or the workplace of someone they know had been closed, at least temporarily. The proportions add up to more than 21 percent because some individuals were affected in two or more ways, Blendon said. The impact of anthrax is lingering, particularly among residents most directly touched by the recent emergency. Overall, 37 percent of local residents said they are taking extra precautions when handling their mail. But that proportion rises to 47 percent among individuals who were most affected by the anthrax incidents. Nationally, 32 percent of those interviewed said they are handling their mail more cautiously. A third of area residents said they are worried that they could contract anthrax through the mail at home or work, a view shared by 43 percent of most affected area residents and 24 percent nationally. Almost 17 percent of all Washington residents -- one in six -- said they fear
that they or a member of their family might contract anthrax in the next year, a proportion that increased to 26 percent among affected residents. Five percent of all local residents said they or someone in their households had purchased or obtained a prescription for antibiotics in response to the anthrax emergency. Slightly more than 500 adults were interviewed at random in each area. A total of 1,009 adults were interviewed for the national survey. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 4 percentage points in each of the local surveys and 3 percentage points for the national poll. The surveys were co-sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. 1
2001 The Washington Post Company
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Bioterrorism Fears Lingering

Survey Finds 20% of D.C. Area Residents Directly Affected =
By Richard Morin<br>Washington Post Staff Writer<br>Tuesday, December 18, 2001; Page A11

Two of 10 Washington area residents report that they or someone they know was exposed to anthrax, was tested for exposure to the deadly bacteria or had their workplace closed at least temporarily because of anthrax-related concerns, according to a Harvard University research team.

The survey also found that a third of all residents worry that they might contract anthrax through the mail. And almost 17 percent of Washington adults fear that they or a family member will contract anthrax in the next year, said Robert Blendon, professor of health
policy
and political analysis at Harvard's School of Public Health.</p><p>A companion survey in the Trenton and Princeton, N.J., areas also found that about one in five residents there report being directly or indirectly affected by the discovery of anthrax on an area mailbox and on mail-handling equipment.</p><p>In Boca Raton, Fla., where the first victim of the recent wave of bioterrorism died in early October, one in 10 residents report being affected.</p><p>Nationally, Harvard researchers said, 4 percent of those interviewed said they or someone they knew had been affected directly by anthrax.</p><p>"Though most Americans across the nation were relatively untouched by the anthrax incidents, a significant share of the people in Washington and the Trenton area find themselves scared and forced to change the way they're living," Blendon
said.</p><p>In their analysis, researchers defined individuals as affected by bioterrorism if they, a relative or a friend had been exposed or tested for anthrax or had their workplaces closed because of the presence or suspicion of anthrax. The attitudes and behaviors of affected residents were then compared with those of people who had not been as directly involved.</p><p>The survey found that 21 percent of all Washington area residents were directly or indirectly affected by the recent anthrax emergency, including 5 percent who said they or someone they know well had been exposed to the disease. About 12 percent -- one in eight -- reported that they or someone they know had been tested for exposure to the anthrax bacteria. About 14 percent -- one in seven -- said their workplaces or the workplace of someone they know had been closed, at least temporarily. The proportions add up to more than 21 percent because some individuals were affected in two or more ways, Blendon said.</p>
The impact of anthrax is lingering, particularly among residents most directly touched by the recent emergency.

Overall, 37 percent of local residents said they are taking extra precautions when handling their mail. But that proportion rises to 47 percent among individuals who were most affected by the anthrax incidents. Nationally, 32 percent of those interviewed said they are handling their mail more cautiously.

A third of area residents said they are worried that they could contract anthrax through the mail at home or work, a view shared by 43 percent of most affected area residents and 24 percent nationally. Almost 17 percent of all Washington residents -- one in six -- said they fear that they or a member of their family might contract anthrax in the next year, a proportion that increased to 26 percent among affected residents.
Five percent of all local residents said they or someone in their households had purchased or obtained a prescription for antibiotics in response to the anthrax emergency.

Slightly more than 500 adults were interviewed at random in each area. A total of 1,009 adults were interviewed for the national survey. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 4 percentage points in each of the local surveys and 3 percentage points for the national poll. The surveys were co-sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.
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Let me offer another possibility. Disregarding that Luntz does not always offer up how he does his polls (grumble, snarl), we get to guess.

It is possible that he took advantage of the lists of the United Jewish Federation. In looking at how religion affiliations are counted, I found that organizational source data on Jews was usually obtained from UJF lists. I am told that UJF lists are extremely thorough, because they demand to know how to contact every single Jew in America for their fund raising. And certainly UJF does not discriminate between a Jew who thinks himself Orthodox and one who simply feels an ethnic attachment -- they just want the money. Of course, one can argue that that definition is too broad...

But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests.

As I said, perhaps.

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg
STATS

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Sid Groeneman
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 11:18 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this problem for years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this - short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD screening - that yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some form of listed sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with relatively strong religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to explain the surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm expecting too much, but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned the sampling.

Sid Groeneman
Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid.grc@verizon.net (NEW!)
www.groeneman.com

* One exception might be using phone numbers from previous RDD surveys where the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are also expensive and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 1:17 AM
Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

> > Poll shows Jews support Bush;
> > parties clash on interpretation
> > By Sharon Samber
> > Washington, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the
< Republican Party is up for debate.
> Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition.
> If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.
> In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush's 19 percent.
> Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance.
> Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.
> "Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.
> Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis.
> Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.
> But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews.
> Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."
> "Every year we hear the magic word 'realignment,'" said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council.
> Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.
> The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.
> Among the key findings:
> * Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;
> * Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat;
> * Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to
vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35
percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and
sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young
Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for
the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.

Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman
Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee
representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he
has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism,
Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next
elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for
Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on
domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as
abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic
issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent
disapprove.

In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a
Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for
some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein
Center of American Jewish History at Temple University and director
of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.

Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the
Democratic base is in the Jewish community.

But what's important about the approval ratings in this week's survey
is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who
served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at
Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he's still a leader and president in
his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
########################################################################
----
(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People <www.jta.org>
########################################################################
----
My organization is planning a small survey on public reactions to the anthrax issue. This is for the US Postal Service, to find out whether people are changing in their mailing behavior (switching to electronic bill-paying, etc.). So far, although a few people are using the mail less, most are mailing as usual.

What would you think of questions used to attempt to predict the public's reactions to future events? For example, for those who have not changed in their mailing behavior, would they use the mail less:

a. If there were more anthrax deaths in another part of the country?
b. If there was an anthrax death in your city?

For those who are using the mail less:
Would you go back to using the mail if:

a. There were no more anthrax deaths?
b. The anthrax mailer were caught?

Of course, the Postal Service would like to be able to anticipate future reactions.
I'd appreciate your feedback on the advisability of asking such questions in a survey, asap since we need to start this survey soon.

Thanks!

Eleanor Hall, Ph.D.
Survey Research Consultant
Do You Yahoo!?  
Check out Yahoo! Shopping and Yahoo! Auctions for all of your unique holiday gifts! Buy at http://shopping.yahoo.com or bid at http://auctions.yahoo.com
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Received: from NwTest0.ci.boulder.co.us (nwtest0.ci.boulder.co.us [161.98.81.122])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
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    with Novell GroupWise; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:06:21 -0700
Message-Id: <sc1f232d.069@NwTest0.ci.boulder.co.us>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.4.1
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Have you looked at Knowledge Networks' system for obtaining panel data? Might be applicable to your needs.

Terry Westover
Evaluation Coordinator
Audit & Evaluation
City of Boulder
303-441-3143

>>> JAnnSelzer@aol.com 12/17/01 12:27PM >>>
I'm looking for city markets with a pre-recruited panels already in place.
I'm looking for panels would of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed. If you know of such a panel, please send me information about when it was recruited, how many studies have been conducted using this panel, how it is refreshed and/or maintained, how many active participants it have, and how the local market is defined geographically. This is for use in an industry study of methodologies. As
always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com
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MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

My organization is planning a survey for the Postal
Service on public reactions to anthrax.

Hypothetical questions have been suggested along the
following lines, for those who haven't lessened the
amount of mail that they send:
Would you change the mail you send if there was
another anthrax death in another part of the country?
Would you change the mail you send if there was
another anthrax death in this city?

And for those who have lessened the amount of mail
they send (gone to electronic bill paying, sent e-mail
greeting cards, etc.)
If the anthrax terrorist were caught and was found to
be a single individual, would you go back to using the
mail?
If the anthrax terrorist were caught and was found to
be a member of a group, would you go back to using the
mail?

I'd appreciate feedback, asap, on the desirability of
this type of question. If not recommended, any
suggestions as to how to get at what the Post Office
is concerned about (the effects of future events on the volume of mail)?

Thanks!

Eleanor Hall, Ph.D.
Survey Research Associate
RCF Economic and Financial Consulting
333 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 804
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 431-1540
ehall@rcfecon.com
www.rcfecon.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Check out Yahoo! Shopping and Yahoo! Auctions for all of your unique holiday gifts! Buy at http://shopping.yahoo.com or bid at http://auctions.yahoo.com

My personal favorite finding is:

> * Some 27 percent said Bush’s performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

So about the same number of people said Bush's performance is LESS likely to make them vote for other Republicans as said Bush's performance is MORE likely to
make them vote for other Republicans.

This does not look like a political realignment to me.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 12:43 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
> 
> Let me offer another possibility. Disregarding that Luntz does not always offer up how he does his polls (grumble, snarl), we get to guess.
> 
> It is possible that he took advantage of the lists of the United Jewish Federation. In looking at how religion affiliations are counted, I found that organizational source data on Jews was usually obtained from UJF lists.
> 
> I am told that UJF lists are extremely thorough, because they demand to know how to contact every single Jew in America for their fund raising. And certainly UJF does not discriminate between a Jew who thinks himself Orthodox and one who simply feels an ethnic attachment -- they just want the money. Of course, one can argue that that definition is too broad...
> 
> But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests.
> 
> As I said, perhaps.
> 
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg
> STATS
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
> [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Sid Groeneman
> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 11:18 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
> 
> I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this problem for years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this - short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD
screening - that
yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major
problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some
form of listed
sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with
relatively strong
religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to
explain the
surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm
expecting too much,
but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned
the sampling.

Sid Groeneman
Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid.grc@verizon.net (NEW!)
www.groeneman.com

* One exception might be using phone numbers from previous
RDD surveys where
the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are
also expensive
and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.

----- Original Message -----
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 1:17 AM
Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

Poll shows Jews support Bush; parties clash on interpretation

By Sharon Samber

WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is
high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the
Republican Party is up for debate.

Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent,
According to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition.

If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.

In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush's 19 percent.

Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.

"Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.

Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis.

But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews.

Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."

"Every year we hear the magic word 'realignment,'" said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council.

Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.
The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Among the key findings:
- Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;
- Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat;
- Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.

Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism, Bookbinder said, but it is too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove. In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for some
time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein Center of
American Jewish History at Temple University and director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.
Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.
But what’s important about the approval ratings in this week’s survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.
"Even if the numbers go down, he’s still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.
http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
---
(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People
<www.jta.org>
My firm is planning a study on minority recruiting for police departments for a major law enforcement association.

I would appreciate any leads to how public defense and safety institutions (military, police, fire, etc.) recruit from minority communities using public opinion data. We are particularly interested in studies that have measured minority confidence in, and likelihood to join such an agency. While the vast majority of Americans do not serve in these positions, we hope to demonstrate different levels of attachment and openness to family members joining these services.

Thanks in advance for your help, and happy holidays!

----------------------------------------------------
Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.
Vice President for Public Affairs
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates
915 King Street, Second Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
mcohen@fabmac.com
(703) 684-4510 Phone
(703) 739-0664 Fax

--part1_15f.5d5651e.2950f654_boundary
Thank you for your response. Can you give me more contact information on this? When I search the web, I get a lot of hits, but mostly not what I'm looking for. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

Just found the guts of the RJC poll on their website:
The Luntz analysis: http://www.rjchq.org/RJCAtribution_Final.html
The questions: http://www.rjchq.org/FINAL_RJC_Topline.html
A cute powerpoint presentation of the results:
http://www.rjchq.org/sld001.htm

I've not had a chance to dissect them yet.

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg
STATS

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 12:43 PM
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

> Let me offer another possibility. Disregarding that Luntz does not 
> always offer up how he does his polls (grumble, snarl), we get to 
> guess.
> 
> It is possible that he took advantage of the lists of the United 
> Jewish Federation. In looking at how religion affiliations are 
> counted, I found that organizational source data on Jews was usually 
> obtained from UJF 
> lists. 
> I am told that UJF lists are extremely thorough, because they demand 
> to 
> know 
> how to contact every single Jew in America for their fund raising. And 
> certainly UJF does not discriminate between a Jew who thinks himself 
> Orthodox and one who simply feels an ethnic attachment -- they just 
> want 
> the 
> money. Of course, one can argue that that definition is too broad...
> 
> But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests.
> 
> As I said, perhaps.
> 
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg
> STATS
> 
> -----Original Message----- 
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf 
> Of Sid Groeneman 
> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 11:18 AM 
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
> 
> I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz 
> developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this 
> problem
for years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this - short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD screening - that yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some form of listed sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with relatively strong religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to explain the surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm expecting too much,

but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned the sampling.

Sid Groeneman
Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid.grc@verizon.net (NEW!)
www.groeneman.com

* One exception might be using phone numbers from previous RDD surveys where the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are also expensive and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.

----- Original Message -----
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 1:17 AM
Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

Poll shows Jews support Bush;
parties clash on interpretation
By Sharon Samber

WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the
Republican Party is up for debate.

Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition. If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.

In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush's 19 percent. Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance. Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.

"Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC. Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis. Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.

But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews. Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."

"Every year we hear the magic word `realignment,'" said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council. Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.
The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Among the key findings:

* Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;

* Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat;

* Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.

Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism, Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove.

In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein Center of American Jewish History at Temple University and director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.
Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.

But what is important about the approval ratings in this week's survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he's still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
Can anyone point me to a questionnaire that includes a module on assessing past history with bad debt/bankruptcy/loan defaults etc?

Thanks in advance.

Jennifer Parsons
Assistant Director
Survey Research Laboratory
University of Illinois at Chicago (MC 336)
412 S. Peoria Street, 6th floor
Chicago, IL 60607
312-413-0216 (ph)
312-996-3358 (fax)
jparsons@srl.uic.edu
www.srl.uic.edu

Does anyone know how many U.S. citizens are Muslims, or immigrants or descendants of immigrants from predominately Muslim countries? They might constitute a voting block which should be studied too. The problem of pulling together a good sample would be serious, but the method of drawing on past large-scale surveys on which people
reported religious identification or ethnic origins would be applicable for research organizations which conduct frequent large surveys. Given Clinton's (belated) efforts to promote a peace agreement which recognized a Palestinian state, and the Republicans' historic bias for the expansionist Likud party in Israel, I would expect a tendency of Muslims to support the Democrats (although some Democratic candidates have tried to outdo the Republicans in truckling to the Israeli rightist in demanding total Israeli control of Jerusalem.)

Allen Barton
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Let's discuss a quick short reply saying more to come. thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@artsci.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 2:28 PM
My personal favorite finding is:

> * Some 27 percent said Bush=B4s performance makes them more likely =
> to
> vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 =
> percent
> said no difference.

So about the same number of people said Bush's performance is LESS = likely
to
make
them vote for other Republicans as said Bush's performance is MORE likely to
make
them vote for other Republicans.

This does not look like a political realignment to me.

---
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 12:43 PM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
> =20
> Let me offer another possibility. Disregarding that Luntz=20
does not always
> offer up how he does his polls (grumble, snarl), we get to guess.
> It is possible that he took advantage of the lists of the=20
> United Jewish
> Federation. In looking at how religion affiliations are=20
counted, I found
> that organizational source data on Jews was usually obtained=20
> from UJF lists.
> I am told that UJF lists are extremely thorough, because they=20
demand to know
> how to contact every single Jew in America for their fund raising. =

And
> certainly UJF does not discriminate between a Jew who thinks himself
> Orthodox and one who simply feels an ethnic attachment --=20 they just
> want the money. Of course, one car argue that that definition is too
> broad... =20
> But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests.
> As I said, perhaps.
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg
I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this problem for years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD screening - that yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some form of listed sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with relatively strong religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to explain the surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm expecting too much, but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned the sampling.

---

* One exception might be using phone numbers from previous RDD surveys where the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are also expensive and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.
WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 (JTA) -- Jewish support for President Bush is high, but whether it will translate into sustained support for the Republican Party is up for debate.

Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition.

If the election were held today, the survey found, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent.

In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote to Bush's 19 percent.

Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance.

Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community.

"Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.

Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis.

Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.
But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews.

Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration."

"Every year we hear the magic word `realignment,'" said Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council.

Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples.

The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Among the key findings:

* Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations;

* Nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat;

* Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs."

It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party.

Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington.

Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism,
Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove.

In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Feinstein Center of American Jewish History at Temple University and director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.

Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.

But what's important about the approval ratings in this week's survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he's still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?

(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People

-----------------------------
Let's discuss a quick short reply saying more to come. thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@artsci.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 2:28 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

My personal favorite finding is:

> * Some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

So about the same number of people said Bush's performance is LESS likely to make them vote for other Republicans as said Bush's performance is MORE likely to make them vote for other Republicans.

This does not look like a political realignment to me.
Let me offer another possibility. Disregarding that Luntz does not always offer up how he does his polls (grumble, snarl), we get to guess. It is possible that he took advantage of the lists of the United Jewish Federation. In looking at how religion=affiliations are counted, I found that organizational source data on Jews was usually obtained from UJF lists. I am told that UJF lists are extremely thorough, because they demand to know how to contact every single Jew in America for their fund raising. And certainly UJF does not discriminate between a Jew who thinks himself Orthodox and one who simply feels an ethnic attachment -- money. Of course, one can argue that that definition is too broad... But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests. As I said, perhaps.

Cheers,
Howard Fienberg

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu
[mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Sid Groeneman

Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 11:18 AM

Re: Poll
shows Jews support Bush (S = Samber, JTA.org)
I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with this problem for years — and am convinced that there is no way to do this — short of spending very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD screening — that yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some form of listed sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with relatively strong religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to explain the surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm expecting too much, but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned the sampling.

One exception might be using phone numbers from previous RDD surveys where the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are also expensive and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.

---

Original Message

From: "James Beniger" 
To: "AAPORNET" 
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 1:17 AM  
Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S = Samber, JTA.org)
Poll shows Jews support Bush; parties clash on interpretation

Jews give the president an approval rating of nearly 80 percent, according to a survey released Thursday by the Republican Jewish Coalition. If the election were held today, more Jews would vote for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential candidate Al Gore, who received 39 percent. In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish vote, Bush 19 percent. Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a shift of Jewish support.
political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey's significance. Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll for the RJC, said the survey suggests a possible political realignment within the Jewish community. "Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer a lock in the Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC. Observers across the political spectrum did not find Bush's approval ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in times of national crisis. Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many American Jews with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and his pressure on the Palestinians to crack down on terror. But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a president at his peak, rather than a clear indication of major political shifts among Jews. Mark Mellman, a Democratic pollster, called the survey a "publicity stunt" and said the realignment was a "gross exaggeration." Every year we hear the magic word 'realignment,'" said Ira Forman.
Forman said aspects of the survey were "hokum" and sounded "bogus," adding that the survey appeared to draw conclusions from statistically insignificant samples. The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29. The margin of error was 4.9 percent.

Two-thirds approve of the way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli relations; nearly 80 percent approve of Bush's policy toward Yasser Arafat; some 27 percent said Bush's performance makes them more likely to vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely, and 35 percent said no difference.

Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an active and sustained outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young Jewish voters are "up for grabs." It was not clear what impact Bush's present support might mean for the future of his presidency or the Republican Party. Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey, said Hyman.
Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee representative in Washington, Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community because he has done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism, Bookbinder said, but it's too soon to count votes for the next elections.

Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable ratings for Bush's domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on domestic issues now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as abortion and school prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.

In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush's handling of domestic issues such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove. In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have supported a Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.

The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative direction for some time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the Mid-Atlantic region for the AJCommittee.

Democrats say the results of the 2000 election show how strong the Democratic base is in the Jewish community.
But what’s important about the approval ratings in this week’s survey is that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall Breger, who served in the Reagan administration and is now a law professor at Catholic University in Washington.

"Even if the numbers go down, he’s still a leader and president in his own right," Breger said.

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp
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(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
NORC at the University of Chicago, is a social science research nonprofit organization seeking qualified candidates to fill two open positions:

Vice President, Production Center Operations

The VP, Production Center Operations is responsible for leading and directing the production center operations including telephone interviewing, mail outs, receipt control, editing, coding, and computer assisted data entry (CADE) at its two Chicago locations, One North State Street and Downers Grove. The scope of the position entails developing and implementing innovative and cost effective methods for production, establishing standard operating procedures and providing leadership for quality assurance and continued improvement, with significant direct and indirect supervisory responsibilities.

Qualified candidates will possess a Master's degree in Social Sciences, Survey Methodology or Business Management or its equivalent in experience. A minimum of ten (10) years of significant experience in survey research and production, e.g., telephone interviewing, coding, and CADE. Ability to handle personnel management responsibilities, including recruiting, allocating human resources, training and staff development, and handling performance issues. This position requires an individual with the ability to make sound decisions that may have significant financial implications to the organization. Experience with budget management and proposal development essential.

Quality Leader

NORC is seeking a dynamic, analytical Quality Leader to develop, facilitate, and cultivate quality improvement programs and initiatives for its survey research activities as well as its internal business processes. Responsibilities include assessing and evaluating current processes, leading project specific cross-department teams, identifying variables influencing quality and working with key personnel in formulating and implementing
corrective actions.

Qualified candidates will possess a minimum of a Bachelor's degree with 5 years of significant experience in a professional environment, preferably in survey research, and 2 years direct quality assurance experience. Previous experience in project planning and management required. Knowledge of and experience with quality improvement methods such as root cause analysis, process design, measurement and management, and statistical analysis required. Strong computer skills required. Must possess the ability to lead and facilitate group/team meetings.

To apply confidentially, send letter of interest and resume (electronic submissions preferred) to

Tylus-sharon@norcmail.uchicago.edu or

Sharon Tylus
NORC, Inc.,
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637.
Please identify the position of interest.

NORC offers a competitive compensation and benefits package including medical, dental and vision care, as well as life insurance, 403 (b) retirement fund, and tuition assistance.

NORC is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer (M/F/D/V) who values and actively seeks diversity in the workforce.
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Somehow I thought it got lost the first time. Yahoo performed better than I thought it did.
Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern

December 18, 2001

<http://www.newyorker.com/PRINTABLE/?talk/011224ta_talk_hertzberg
/THE_TALK_OF_THE_TOWN/>THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT
by Hendrik Hertzberg
Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31
Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on
September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when
J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.
because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.<br><br>The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.<br><br>The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.<br><br>It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would
have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel. In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly"; of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar"; ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy. The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national
discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice. The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.
I attach a recent column I wrote on this topic for the Gotham Gazette. My guess is that not very many are citizens.

Andy Beveridge

A nasty dispute recently broke out about the number of Muslims in the United States. One study (available online in pdf format) claims six to seven million. Funded by four Muslim organization and directed by Ishan Bagby of Shaw University, it counted Muslims by contacting mosques and using various assumptions. The American Religious Identification Survey conducted by Barry Kosmin and Egon Mayer through the City University of New York Graduate Center found at most three million Muslims using a telephone survey. About one-quarter of all Muslims make New York State their home, according to Kosmin and Mayer.

Kosmin is one of the leading students of religious demography, and is co-author of "One Nation Under God," based upon a similar study done 10 years ago. The American Jewish Committee commissioned Tom Smith to assess the available estimates and make one of his own. His independent estimate largely agrees with that of the CUNY Graduate Center team.

Who is right? Why is it so difficult to count the number of Muslims? First, the Census Bureau is actually prohibited from counting Muslims. Islam is a religion rather than an ethnicity or a national origin, and the bureau is barred from asking about religion. Muslims and supporters of civil liberties might be especially thankful for this at this particular moment in American history. In a notorious chapter of their history, the Census Bureau assisted the US government in rounding up
the Japanese-Americans at the beginning of World War II by using the agency's very
detailed block-by-block tabulations. At a recent conference, a Bureau official
said
that they had received over 150 requests from other governmental bodies for
information about Arabs (which are considered an ancestry) and immigrants from
Muslim countries.

Since Muslims, whatever their number, are a small part of the United States
population they are hard to count. They are also hard to define. Considering just
adults, what does one need to do to be counted as a Muslim? Go to a mosque? Pray
several times per day? Observe Ramadan? Have made a pilgrimage to Mecca? Eat
Halal foods? Those trying to count Jews face similar problems. One definition of
Jewish, for instance, is "Feeling you should go to High Holiday services." By such a
definition apparently, it is enough to either go to the services or to feel guilty
about not going.

When Bagby released his study in April, many reporters noted that if his figures were
right then Muslims outnumbered Jews in the United States. This relatively unimportant
fact in April that might add to Muslim bragging rights over Jews took on added
significance with the September 11th attack. The American Jewish Committee
commissioned Smith, and Egon Mayer is head of CUNY's Center for Jewish Studies, so
some suspicion has greeted the release of their reports.

However, when one compares Bagby's methods and assumptions with those of Smith
and Kosmin, it is plain that Bagby's is severely and fatally flawed. He enumerates
all American mosques (1209 he says) and then interviews mosque representatives
from a sample of 631. His response rate is a respectable two-thirds. But plainly big
well-organized mosques with a well-staffed office would be much more likely to
respond than smaller less well-funded mosques with part-time office staffs. He finds
that on the average more than 1,600 people are involved with each Mosque, and then
multiples that figure by all 1209 Mosques, claiming that about 2 million are
involved. He then asserts that two thirds of Muslims are missing from the
mosques, so he multiplies by three and announces that there are between six and seven
Muslims in
the United States.

Kosmin and Mayer by contrast base their estimate on the 219 Muslims contacted, while they were phoning about 50,000 people. Weighting their estimate appropriately they find 1.1 million Muslim adults, which is double what they found in 1991. Including children this would make the Muslim population about 1.5 million. Since there is sampling error they admit that the total could be as much as three million. Smith by ransacking available data comes up with an estimate of 1.4 million, 1.9 million including children. Looking at standard errors, his upper bound is very similar to that of Kosmin and Mayer. An analysis that my associates and I did for the New York Times of immigrants or children of immigrants from Muslim countries comes up with similar numbers. (It is true, of course that some immigrants from Muslim countries are not Muslim, and other Muslim immigrants come from non-Muslim counties. Other Muslims are native born.)

It seems that Bagby, along with many "ethnic group researchers" is willing to bend every effort to increase the count of his group. Kosmin and Smith, both renowned and careful social scientists, do as much as possible to base their counts on established methods. But even they give the benefit of the doubt to their highest possible count.

No matter how many Muslim there are, all researchers agree that the Muslim community, as with the Arab community (discussed here in September) are doing quite well in America. They are highly educated, many are quite prosperous, and they occupy a wide variety jobs. But it is also the case that they are Americanizing. As one of my students, an American citizen and the son of the Bangladeshi Islamic religious leader, told me: "My brothers and I are very observant, but my nieces and nephews seem much more American. I don't know if they will all continue to be Muslim."

So like other groups, being successful in the United States may increase the group's influence and prosperity, while ultimately diminishing its size.
Does anyone know how many U.S. citizens are Muslims, or immigrants or descendants of immigrants from predominately Muslim countries? They might constitute a voting block which should be studied too. The problem of pulling together a good sample would be serious, but the method of drawing on past large-scale surveys on which people reported religious identification or ethnic origins would be applicable for research organizations which conduct frequent large surveys. Given Clinton's (belated) efforts to promote a peace agreement which recognized a Palestinian state, and the Republicans' historic bias for the expansionist Likud party in Israel, I would expect a tendency of Muslims to support the Democrats (although some Democratic candidates have tried to outdo the Republicans in truckling to the Israeli rightist in demanding total Israeli control of Jerusalem.)

Allen Barton

From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Wed Dec 19 06:37:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBJEbue29135 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 06:37:56 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mailserv.wright.edu (mailserv.wright.edu [130.108.128.60])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id GAA28878 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 06:37:57 -0800 (PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
    (PMDF V6.1 #39146) id <0GOL00I01HYLJ3@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
    Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:37:33 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (al131039.wright.edu [130.108.131.39]) by
    mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.1 #39146) with ESMTP id
    <0GOL00H4PHYLX9@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:37:33 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:36:57 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: purchasing card surveys
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C20A609.438F74E5@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; I)
Does anyone know of any surveys of departments who use purchasing cards or DPO's. Questions regarding their efficiency and if they are good for budgets. Thanks in advance.

Terrie

begin:vcard
n:Hottle;Teresa
x-mozilla-html:FALSE
org:Wright State University;Center for Urban and Public Affairs adr:;;3640 Colonel Glenn Hwy;Dayton;Ohio;45435;937-775-3436
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:Teresa.Hottle@wright.edu
title:Research Associate
fn:Teresa Hottle
end:vcard

--Boundary_(ID_L6Lq1v/bMnBRI6K4Kt2Y0A) --

Some questions.

Are you concerned about consumer use of the mail or business?

Does the USPS know whether consumer use or business use has increased, declined, or remained the same over past three months? If so, are there other factors which could lead to declining use (if use has declined) such as postal rates, service, the economy, factors other than the so-called anthrax scare.

Has the anthrax scare affected the behavior of senders of mail or the recipients of mail?

What does "change the mail you send" mean?

Eleanor Hall wrote:

> My organization is planning a survey for the Postal Service on public reactions to anthrax.
> Hypothetical questions have been suggested along the following lines, for those who haven't lessened the amount of mail that they send:
> Would you change the mail you send if there was another anthrax death in another part of the country?
> Would you change the mail you send if there was another anthrax death in this city?
> And for those who have lessened the amount of mail they send (gone to electronic bill paying, sent e-mail greeting cards, etc.) If the anthrax terrorist were caught and was found to be a single individual, would you go back to using the mail?
> If the anthrax terrorist were caught and was found to be a member of a group, would you go back to using the mail?
> I'd appreciate feedback, asap, on the desirability of this type of question. If not recommended, any suggestions as to how to get at what the Post Office is concerned about (the effects of future events on the volume of mail)?
> Thanks!
Will all this talk about how to survey low incidence groups and the beliefs of various ethnic groups I perked up when I heard a brief clip on National Public Radio this morning about a recent poll released by Zogby International of American Muslims. The only number that I can recall is that 49% favored the sending of troops to Afghanistan. I headed over to their website (http://www.zogby.com/ - nice t-shirt) to see if there was anything posted about the study or the methodology. Unfortunately, it has not yet appeared on their website and all that the NPR site (actually Morning Edition) says is "Muslim Report A new poll by Zogby International details the diversity of culture, religiosity and political beliefs of Muslims in
America. Monique Parsons reports from Chicago, Muslims groups are trying to look past cultural differences and rely on Islam as the foundation of unity. (5:11)

I wonder if it is part of this series of polls http://www.zogby.com/features/features.dbm?ID=117

With Andrew's posting on estimating the number of Muslims it seems even more timely.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com

>From mcohen@fabmac.com Wed Dec 19 09:25:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBJHPue10200 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:25:56
-0800 (PST)
Received: from maill.radix.net (maill.radix.net [207.192.128.31])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP id JAA08291 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:25:58 -0800
(PST)
Received: from b2n2e7 (chris.fabmac.com [207.192.151.80])
    by maill.radix.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id MAA12608
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:25:33 -0500 (EST)
From: "Michael Cohen" <mcohen@fabmac.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Citations needed for challenges in contacting minorities for survey research
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:27:24 -0500
Message-ID: <000501c188b2$6d178a20$5097c0cf@b2n2e7>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To:
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

As a follow up to my previous request (see below), I was wondering if anyone had recent citations for the particular challenges for contacting minority communities.
I appreciate your help!

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Cohen [mailto:mcohen@fabmac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 2:43 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: Study of minority recruitment for public safety institutions

My firm is planning a study on minority recruiting for police departments for a major
law enforcement association.

I would appreciate any leads to how public defense and safety institutions (military, police, fire, etc.) recruit from minority communities using public opinion data. We are particularly interested in studies that have measured minority confidence in, and likelihood to join such an agency. While the vast majority of Americans do not serve in these positions, we hope to demonstrate different levels of attachment and openness to family members joining these services.

Thanks in advance for your help, and happy holidays!

----------------------------------------------------
Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.
Vice President for Public Affairs
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates
915 King Street, Second Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
mcohen@fabmac.com
(703) 684-4510 Phone
(703) 739-0664 Fax

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Wed Dec 19 09:33:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBJHXPe10873 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001
09:33:25 -0800 (PST)
Received: from jwdp.com (europa.your-site.com [140.186.45.14])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
   id JAA16045 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:33:26 -0800 (PST)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:32:58 -0500
Message-ID: <3C20CF7D.B6066333@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:33:49 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Zogby Poll
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322846@AS_SERVER>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The t-shirt is a rip-off of an AAPOR Conference t-shirt from a few years back, although the phrasing was more elegant in the AAPOR version, if I recall correctly.
You might try contacting the Arab-American Institute (http://www.aaiusa.org) since most of Zogby's research on Muslims in America is conducted for them. John Zogby's brother James is president of the AAI.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Leo Simonetta wrote:
> Will all this talk about how to survey low incidence groups and the beliefs of various ethnic groups I perked up when I heard a brief clip on National Public Radio this morning about a recent poll released by Zogby International of American Muslims. The only number that I can recall is that 49% favored the sending of troops to Afghanistan. I headed over to their website (http://www.zogby.com/ - nice t-shirt) to see if there was anything posted about the study or the methodology. Unfortunately, it has not yet appeared on their website and all that the NPR site (actually Morning Edition) says is "Muslim Report A new poll by Zogby International details the diversity of culture, religiosity and political beliefs of Muslims in America. Monique Parsons reports from Chicago, Muslims groups are trying to look past cultural differences and rely on Islam as the foundation of unity. (5:11)"
> I wonder if it is part of this series of polls http://www.zogby.com/features/features.dbm?ID=117
> With Andrew's posting on estimating the number of Muslims it seems even more timely.
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> simonetta@artsci.com
>

From Mark.Lamias@grizzard.com Wed Dec 19 10:27:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136]) by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP id fBJIR5e15649 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 10:27:05 -0800 (PST)
Received: by atl_intmail.grizzard.com ([208.178.112.229]) by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP id KAA13703 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 10:27:05 -0800 (PST)
Received: byatl_intmail.grizzard.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
   id <2GXCGWMK>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 13:26:43 -0500
Message-ID: <16484F90DE05BB478A0CA3336AE307B13C3270@atl_mail.griz-main.com>
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@grizzard.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FW: New Virus
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
FYI

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Mike Bostardi
> Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2001 1:16 PM
> To: All Mailing Avenue, ATL; All International Tower, ATL
> Subject: New Virus
>
> There is a new virus called Reeezak. It appears as follows: "Happy New
> Year" and a message body text:
> "Hii
> I can't describe my feelings
> But all i can say is
> Happy New Year ;)
> bye"
> and the attachment:
> "Christmas.exe"
> Please delete this if you see this. As always, you should never open up
> attachments if you don't know who sent them. I will update the e-mail
> server with the "fix" as soon as it becomes available.
>
> Thanks for your cooperation,
>
> Mike Bostardi
> Communications Admin.
>
>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Fri Dec 21 07:18:26 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fBLFIPe29483 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
  07:18:25 -0800 (PST)
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (mail.Virginia.EDU [128.143.2.9])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
  id HAA17997 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 07:18:25 -0800
  (PST)
From: tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aal1655;
  21 Dec 2001 10:18 EST
Received: from gj9k20b.Virginia.EDU (d-128-55-134.bootp.Virginia.EDU
  [128.143.55.134])
  by tetra.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id KAA23520;
  Fri, 21 Dec 2001 10:16:25 -0500 (EST)
To: AAPORNet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: mm5k@virginia.edu
Subject: Opinion leaders and the mass media <fwd>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10112211029.B@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 10:18:29 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
X-Mailer: Simeon for Win32 Version 4.1.4 Build (40)
X-Authentication: IMSP
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Fellow 'netters:
An esteemed colleague of mine in Sociology has asked me the following
question, which I'm not able to answer very well. What should I tell Murray Milner about this issue? What would be a good reference to recommend? Wasn't it Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee who posited the "two-step process" of mass communication? My memories from grad school are, alas, fading all too quickly.

If you don't wish to clutter the net with your answers, you can answer directly to me and feel free to cc: to Murray Milner at mm5k@virginia.edu. I'll be checking e-mail again after Christmas.

Thanks and holiday greetings to all,
Tom

--- Begin Forwarded Message ---
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 00:09:51 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
From: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Subject: Opinion leaders and the mass media
Sender: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
To: tmglp@virginia.edu
Reply-To: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10112210051.A@mm5k98.config.mail.virginia.edu>

Tom

Have an intellectual question. In the early work on the formation of public opinion it was argued that particular individuals, opinion leaders, were often the crucial link in the spread of ideas and the adoption of particular behaviors. If I remember correctly this was a key story in many of the early studies of voting, e.g., Lazarsfeld's "The People's Choice," diffusion studies, e.g. Coleman, Katz, and Menzel on drugs adoption and the studies on hybrid corn adoption, Frank Staunton and Gallup on radio, etc.

My question: is this still considered an important process? Or do the mass media influence people more directly, making interpersonal forms of influence less important. Is there a good textbook or review article discussion of the development of these ideas that you could point me to (or better yet loan me)?

Murray

Murray Milner, Jr.
Department of Sociology
University of Virginia, Cabell 539
P.O. Box 400766
Charlottesville VA 22904-4766
(804) 924-6520  Fax 924-7028
Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann did an interesting piece on opinion leaders in (I believe) the mid-1980s. It used a content analysis to create indicators of who opinion leaders were. Sorry, but I don't remember the exact reference, but it should be available somewhere.

Frank Rusciano

mm5k@virginia.edu
--- End Forwarded Message ---
Murray Milner about this issue? What would be a good reference to recommend? Wasn't it Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McFee who posited the "two-step process" of mass communication? My memories from grad school are, alas, fading all too quickly.

If you don't wish to clutter the net with your answers, you can answer directly to me and feel free to cc: to Murray Milner at mm5k@virginia.edu. I'll be checking e-mail again after Christmas.

Thanks and holiday greetings to all,

Tom

--- Begin Forwarded Message ---
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 00:09:51 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
From: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Subject: Opinion leaders and the mass media
Sender: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
To: tmg1p@virginia.edu

Reply-To: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10112210051.A@mm5k98.config.mail.virginia.edu>

Tom

Have an intellectual question. In the early work on the formation of public opinion it was argued that particular individuals, opinion leaders, were often the crucial link in the spread of ideas and the adoption of particular behaviors. If I remember correctly this was a key story in many of the early studies of voting, e.g., Lazarfeld's "The People's Choice," diffusion studies, e.g. Coleman, Katz, and Menzel on drugs adoption and the studies on hybrid corn adoption, Frank Staunton and Gallup on radio, etc.

My question: is this still considered an important process? Or do the mass media influence people more directly, making interpersonal forms of influence less important. Is there a good textbook or review article discussion of the development of these ideas that you could point me to (or better yet loan me)?

Murray

Murray Milner, Jr.
Department of Sociology
University of Virginia, Cabell 539
P.O. Box 400766
Charlottesville VA 22904-4766
(804) 924-6520 Fax 924-7028
mm5k@virginia.edu
--- End Forwarded Message ---

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223
NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222
Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233
University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave
P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

From Kathleen.Tobin-Flusser@marist.edu Fri Dec 21 11:01:14 2001
We currently have a few projects that require contact with low incidence populations and are considering putting together a Low Incidence Omnibus National Survey for this Spring. This is a feeler to AAPORnet to see if there is any interest in an omnibus of this nature.

This would be a very short survey that would ask a few quick questions upfront — ie.
Is there anyone in your household who is (fill in the blank) followed by a few demographic questions, followed by a request/permission to recontact. The goal here is to provide a list for recontact and/or panel development. Pricing would be reflective of incidence and sample size.

I realize there are a lot of kinks to work out but right now I just want to see if there is any interest at all (there does seem postings now and then on this very issue.)

Happy holidays, KT

Kathleen Tobin Flusser
Director, Survey Center
Marist College Institute for Public Opinion www.maristpoll.marist.edu
845.575.5050

>From jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu Fri Dec 21 11:02:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP
   id fBLJ2bel1835 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
11:02:37
-0800 (PST)
it is from "The People's Choice," Lazarsfeld, Berelson and Gaudet, 1944.

At 01:16 PM 12/21/2001 -0500, you wrote:
> Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann did an interesting piece on opinion leaders in
> (I
> believe) the
> mid-1980s. It used a content analysis to create indicators of who opinion
> leaders were.
> Sorry, but I don't remember the exact reference, but it should be available
> somewhere.
> >
> > Frank Rusciano
> >
> > tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu wrote:
> >
> >> Fellow 'netters:
> >> An esteemed colleague of mine in Sociology has asked me the following
> >> question, which I'm not able to answer very well. What should I tell
> >> Murray Milner about this issue? What would be a good reference to
> >> recommend? Wasn't it Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McFee who posited the
> >> "two-step process" of mass communication? My memories from grad
> >> school are, alas, fading all too quickly.
> >> If you don't wish to clutter the net with your answers, you can
> >> answer directly to me and feel free to cc: to Murray Milner at
> >> mm5k@virginia.edu. I'll be checking e-mail again after Christmas.
> >>
> >> Thanks and holiday greetings to
> >> all,
> >>
> >> --- Begin Forwarded Message ---
> >> Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 00:09:51 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)
> >> From: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
> >> Subject: Opinion leaders and the mass media
> >> Sender: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
> >> To: tmglp@virginia.edu
> >>
> >> Reply-To: "Murray Milner, Jr" <mm5k@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Tom

Have an intellectual question. In the early work on the formation of public opinion it was argued that particular individuals, opinion leaders, were often the crucial link in the spread of ideas and the adoption of particular behaviors. If I remember correctly this was a key story in many of the early studies of voting, e.g., Lazarfeld's "The People's Choice," diffusion studies, e.g. Coleman, Katz, and Menzel on drugs adoption and the studies on hybrid corn adoption, Frank Staunton and Gallup on radio, etc.

My question: is this still considered an important process? Or do the mass media influence people more directly, making interpersonal forms of influence less important. Is there a good textbook or review article discussion of the development of these ideas that you could point me to (or better yet loan me)?

Murray

Murray Milner, Jr.
Department of Sociology
University of Virginia, Cabell 539
P.O. Box 400766
Charlottesville VA 22904-4766
(804) 924-6520 Fax 924-7028
mm5k@virginia.edu
--- End Forwarded Message ---
While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

> In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com
COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT
by Hendrik Hertzberg
Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31
Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on
September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion
Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned
from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand
uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the
news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise
occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was
the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses
of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has
ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th.
Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk
about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was
the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor
well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium
of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the
Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the
Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated
Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the
consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that
the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of
the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by
Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize
the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned
out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is
applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced
with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would
have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The
reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a
crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court
had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry
Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of
"undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of
"overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one
candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers,
would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was
uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the
old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the
fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a
contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters
intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some
eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design
(the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions
(the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters
to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and
the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that
were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every
scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and
thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller,
more, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the
winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was
unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living
memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand
votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about
the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of
twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral
College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7
million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a
serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969,
the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional
amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself
endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it
was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977,
President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But
at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of
the participants took it for granted that the election of a President
who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to
democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in
2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable
happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it.
The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the
Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate
might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue,
obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the
political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was
at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the
Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of
appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same
token, the sitting President could float benignly above the
conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was
the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the
last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into
question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who
needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against
terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had
already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of
picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental
American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy
of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than
ever. From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Dec 21 11:50:58 2001
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Non-sampling error can sometimes be estimated, particularly in a case like this where three coders looked at every ballot. Their measurement error could be inferred from the amount of disagreement. I don't know if NORC attempted to do this. Such errors were probably random and countervailing because the end result was pretty much the same as that obtained by The Miami Herald and USA Today months earlier.
There are a couple of places to view more information about the Zogby poll of American Muslims. It was funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts through "Project MAPS (Muslims in the American Public Square)" at Georgetown.

According to the Pew Trusts web site, "Project MAPS: Muslims in the American Public Square seeks to document the role and contribution of the Muslim community in the American public square. It is a three-year research project, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts that began in 1999 and housed at Georgetown University's Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding."

The complete questionnaire and some methodological information is provided at the Pew Trusts web site (sorry this URL is so long; you can also get to the study from the Pew Trusts home page at www.pewtrusts.com):
http://www.pewtrusts.com/ideas/ideas_item.cfm?content_item_id=861&content_type_id=8&palette=8&issue=17&issue_name=Religion%20in%20public%20life&name=Grantee%20Reports

Additional information about Project MAPS can be found at:
http://www.projectmaps.com/

Larry McGill

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Will all this talk about how to survey low incidence groups and the beliefs of various ethnic groups I perked up when I heard a brief clip on National Public Radio this morning about a recent poll released by Zogby International of American Muslims. The only number that I can recall is that 49% favored the sending of troops to Afghanistan. I headed over to their website (http://www.zogby.com/ - nice t-shirt) to see if there was anything posted about the study or the methodology. Unfortunately, it has not yet appeared on their website and all that the NPR site (actually Morning Edition) says is "Muslim Report A new poll by Zogby International details the diversity of culture,
Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if
Hertzberg
was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated
with
the
Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence.

Larry McGill

Jan Werner wrote:
While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

_______________________

dick halpern wrote:

> Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

> Dick Halpern

> December 18, 2001

> THE TALK OF THE TOWN

> COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT

> by Hendrik Hertzberg

> Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31

> Posted 2001-12-17

> Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

> The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the
Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibusted to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic
national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for
granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular
vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target
in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable
happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about
it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First,
the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger
debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only
issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this
time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical,
President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to
abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the
burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future.
By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above
the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he
was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished
the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call
into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full
and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the
struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to
democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic
system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the
fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An
unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems
more distant than ever.
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(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company
Washington Post-ABC News Poll: America at War

The latest Washington Post-ABC News poll is based on telephone interviews with 755 randomly selected adults nationwide and was conducted Dec. 18 - 19, 2001. The margin of sampling error for overall results is plus or minus 4 percentage points. Sampling error is only one of many potential sources of error in this or any other public opinion poll. Interviewing was conducted by TNS Intersearch of Horsham, Pa.

* = less than 0.5 percent

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling his job as president? Do you approve/disapprove STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/01</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/01</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/01</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/01</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bush is handling the nation's economy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/01</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/01</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/01</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Do you approve or disapprove of the way the U.S. Congress is doing its job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/01</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/01</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/99</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/98</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/98</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/98</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/98 LV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/98 LV</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/98 LV</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/98</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/98 LV</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/30/98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/97</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24/97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5/96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/96</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/95</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/95</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do you think the country should go in the direction (Bush wants to lead it), go in the direction (the Democrats in Congress want to lead it), or what?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Neither Bush</th>
<th>Democrats (vol.)</th>
<th>No (vol.)</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/01</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/01</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/01</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What would you say is the one most important problem you would like to see Congress deal with next year?

- Economy/Unemployment: 34%
- Terrorism/Fear of war/Homeland security: 13%
- Education: 8%
- Health care/prescription drug benefits: 8%
- Social Security/Medicare: 6%
- Taxes: 5%
- Poverty/Homelessness/Hunger: 3%
6. Based on what you know or have heard, do you think Congress has paid too much, too little, or about the right amount of attention to (INSERT ITEM). How about (NEXT ITEM)?

12/19/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too much</th>
<th>Too little</th>
<th>About the right amount</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Terrorist threats in this country</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The war in Afghanistan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The economy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Health care</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling the U.S. campaign against terrorism? Do you approve/disapprove STRONGLY or SOMEWHAT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approve---------------</th>
<th>Disapprove-----------</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NET Strongly Somewhat</td>
<td>NET Strongly Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>89 67 22 9 5 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/01</td>
<td>92 75 17 5 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In terms of U.S. military action in Afghanistan, do you think the most difficult part is (over), or do you think the most difficult part is (yet to come)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Yet to come</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How about in terms of the broader U.S. war on terrorism - do you think the most difficult part is (over), or do you think the most difficult part is (yet to come)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Yet to come</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10. How confident are you that the United States will capture or kill Osama Bin Laden: are you very confident, somewhat confident, not too confident or not at all confident?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Not too Confident</th>
<th>Not at all Confident</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/01</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. 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)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>US Must Capture/ Kill bin Laden</th>
<th>War Can Succeed Without bin Laden</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which would you personally prefer - having bin Laden (killed), or (captured)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Captured</th>
<th>Neither (vol)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Would you favor or oppose:

a. having U.S. forces take military action against Iraq to force Saddam Hussein from power?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/94*</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/93**</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/92 RV</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/92</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/91</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/91</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10/11/94 and previous: Gallup
**1/15/93 and previous: Would you support or oppose having U.S. forces resume military action . . .? 

b. U.S. military strikes against suspected terrorist bases in other countries, such as Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you think (the United States has to remove Iraqi President Saddam Hussein from power for the war on terrorism to be a success), or do you think (the war on terrorism can be a success without removing Iraqi President Saddam Hussein from power)? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Must remove Hussein</th>
<th>Can succeed w/o removing</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. On another subject, these days do you think the activities of the federal government pose a threat to your constitutional rights, or not? Is that as serious threat, or not serious? 

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>----------</th>
<th>----------</th>
<th>----------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>NET</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/95*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LA Times Poll

16. How concerned are you about the possibility there will be more major terrorist attacks in the United States - is that something that worries you a great deal, somewhat, not too much or not at all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--------</th>
<th>----------</th>
<th>--------</th>
<th>--------</th>
<th>----------</th>
<th>--------</th>
<th>No op.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>NET</td>
<td>Grt.deal</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>NET</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/01</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/01</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9/27/01 and previous: "How concerned are you about the possibility there will be more major terrorist attacks in this country . . ."

17. 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>US doing all it can</th>
<th>US should do more</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/01</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/01</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/01</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. As it conducts the war on terrorism, do you think the United States government is doing enough to protect the rights of (READ ITEM), or not? How about the rights of (NEXT ITEM)?

12/19/01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Average Americans</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Arab-Americans and American Muslims</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trend:

a. Average Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Arab-Americans and American Muslims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Have September's terrorist attacks made you personally more suspicious of people who you think are of Arab descent, or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/01</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/01**</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/01*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"last month's terrorist attacks"
*"Do you think the attacks this week will make you personally more suspicious . . .?"


(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company

******

Dear AAPORNETers,

I'm trying to find national-level demographic distributions for the English-speaking population in order to develop a weighting plan for a survey where interviews...
were conducted only in English. I realize that his distinction is often finessed, but in
my particular instance, using total pop vs. English-speaking pop targets is likely to
make a big difference in the weighted results. (And, the goal is to project to the
English-speaking population.)

The key data from the 2000 census is not yet available, with no certain target
date for release. The 1995 CPS has a "language of interview" variable, but initial
examination of this source suggests that it may be inadequate for our use. Can
anyone out there direct me to other sources which might serve the purpose? Marginal
(univariate) distributions would be satisfactory.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, MD
sid.grc@verizon.net  (NEW!)
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com
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From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: Politically correct seasons's greetings
To: "Aapornet@UsC. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>,
   "Y1967-L@AYa. Yale. Edu" <y1967-l@aya.yale.edu>,
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To Each of You:

Best wishes for an environmentally conscious, socially responsible, low stress, non-addictive, gender neutral winter solstice holiday, practiced within the most joyous traditions of the religious persuasion of your choice, and with respect for the religious persuasions of others, or their choice not to practice a religion at all. And a fiscally successful, personally fulfilling, and medically uncomplicated recognition of the generally accepted calendar year 2002, but not without due respect for the calendars of choice of other cultures whose contributions to our society have helped make our nations great, without regard to the race, creed, color, religious, or sexual orientation of the wishes. This greeting is subject to clarification or withdrawal. It implies no promise by the wisher to actually implement any of the wishes for her/himself or others.

Andy Beveridge
Here's an often over-looked and I think quite interesting application of survey research, conducted by The Financial Times with assistance from Price Waterhouse Coopers. If any of you know about the design, methods or execution of this work, I'm sure many of us on AAPORNET would welcome learning what you know. I'll try to post what little is available from the Financial Times, URL immediately below.

Season's greetings!

-- Jim

---

© Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2001

http://specials.ft.com/wmr2001/FT3M3WW95VC.html

Published: December 12 2001 15:00 GMT
Last Updated: December 14 2001

Company rankings - 2001

World's most respected companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sony</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t35</td>
<td>t13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nokia</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Electrical/Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Citigroup</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>t38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>AIG</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t9</td>
<td>t29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hewlett-Packard</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>DaimlerChrysler</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nestlé</td>
<td>Switz</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Southwest Airlines</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t17</td>
<td>t29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>t21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Berkshire Hathaway</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Ticker</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Energy/Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Federal Express</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disney</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Media/Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exxon Mobil</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Energy/Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Procter &amp; Gamble</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Royal Dutch/Shell</td>
<td>Netherl/UK</td>
<td>Energy/Chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ABB</td>
<td>Switz/Swed</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>L'Oreal</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Virgin</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Airbus Industrie</td>
<td>Fr/Ger/UK/Sp</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Siemens</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Electrical/Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Allianz</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Volkswagen</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AOL Time Warner</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Media/Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>UK/Hong Kong</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bombardier</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Philip Morris</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Porsche</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Axa</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unilever</td>
<td>Netherl/UK</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Consumer Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NTT DoCoMo</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Telecoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Singapore Airlines</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://specials.ft.com/wmr2001/FT3M3WW95VC.html

Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2001

*****

>From kaih@uwindsor.ca Sun Dec 23 22:21:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
   by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
   id fBO6LCe10021 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Dec 2001
22:21:12 -0800 (PST)
Received: from internet2.uwindsor.ca (firewall2.uwindsor.ca [137.207.233.22])
   by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
   id WAA10848 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Dec 2001 22:21:13 -0800
(PST)
From: kaih@uwindsor.ca
Received: id BAA22189; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 01:11:20 -0500
Received: by gateway id BAA57683 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
01:11:17 -0500 (EST)
Subject: Kai Hildebrandt/University of Windsor is out of the office.
To: aapornet@usc.edu

*****
I will be out of the office starting 2001-12-22 and will not return until 2002-01-02.

K.H.

James Beniger wrote:
>
> Here's an often over-looked and I think quite interesting application
> of survey research, conducted by The Financial Times with assistance from Price Waterhouse Coopers. If any
> of you know about the design, methods or execution of this work, I'm sure many of us on AAPORNET would welcome learning
> what you know. I'll try to post what little is available from the Financial Times, URL immediately below.
>
> Season's greetings!
>
> -- Jim

Here is the FT methodology description, available from:
http://specials.ft.com/wmr2001/FT3OLNBQ6VC.html
Note that "respect" is measured only among CEO’s of major corporations.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

World’s most respected companies - Business excellence

Value gets a crucial vote By Peter Barker
Published: December 13 2001 15:50GMT
Last Updated: December 13 2001 15:52GMT

This is the fourth year we have conducted this global survey of CEO opinion, and we have achieved a record number of respondents - 914 CEOs from 65 different countries. As in previous years, these respondents come not just from publicly-quoted organisations but also from state-owned enterprises, large subsidiaries and private companies.

The core of the survey remains consistent over time, identifying those companies and business leaders most respected by their peers and the reasons for those choices.

First, chief executives were asked to nominate which three companies in the world they most respected, and why. They were then asked to select three companies that they most respected in their industry sector in the world, and to state why. Next, each chief executive was asked to identify which three business leaders they most respected and why. Each of these questions was asked in the previous surveys.

For the first time this year, however, CEOs were also asked to name companies that best delivered on specific value areas. Three questions were asked. First, which three companies created the most value for their consumers? Second, which three companies created the most value for their shareholders? And third, which three companies best managed environmental resources? In each case respondents were asked to give reasons for their nominations.

For each of these three "value" questions, we also surveyed a relevant stakeholder group to provide a contrast to CEO opinion. The question on consumer value was posed to 6,000 members of the general public in a global omnibus survey; the question on shareholder value was asked of 100 fund managers world-wide; and 110 media commentators and non-governmental organisations (NGO) officers were asked the question on environmental resources.

The fieldwork was undertaken between June and October 2001, principally by telephone interview but in some cases by written questionnaire or face-to-face interviews.

As in previous years, we were faced with the choice of weighting the data by gross domestic product of the respondent's country (the only measure available across all respondents), or leaving it untouched. Once again, we decided to weight the data, both to...
ensure consistency with prior years' results, and to reflect that,
rightly or wrongly, there are different levels of global impact
achieved by views expressed in different economies.

This approach applies to the CEO, fund manager and media/NGO
surveys, but in the case of the general public survey we felt it
was more appropriate to weight the data by population size rather
than GDP.

To ensure that we smooth out any single country bias, we have once
again applied a minimum qualification level of five nominations to
each table, apart from the World's Most Respected Companies by
Industry Sector, where a minimum of three nominations was
required.

Importantly, we have again analysed the unprompted reasons given
behind nominations, providing a valuable insight into what factors
drive respect for companies and business leaders. For the
questions on company and business leader respect we have analysed
the answers into the same categories as last year, enabling
comparisons to be made over time. In the case of each of the
"value" questions, we have analysed the CEO and other stakeholder
group findings into the same categories, enabling the reasonings
of the two different groups to be compared.

In summary, the methodology allows for an in-depth and credible
look at global CEO and other relevant stakeholder group opinion,
and for differences over time and/or between respondent groups to
be measured.

Email Peter Barker at peter.barker@uk.pwcglobal.com
This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

------=_NextPart_000_01C18CA4.8F1B9800
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C18CA4.8F1B9800"

------=_NextPart_001_01C18CA4.8F1B9800
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Terry,

Thanks for the mention. Let me know if I can ever provide you with additional information.

all the best,

Bill McCready

Knowledge
   N  E  T  W  O  R  K  S

William C. McCready, Ph.D.
Director, Client Development
Government, Academic & Non-Profit Research
<http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp>
10 South Riverside Plaza, 18th Floor, Chicago, IL  60606
   Phone 312.474.6464    Fax 708.524.1241    Cell 708.203.8941
<mailto:bmccready@knowledgenetworks.com>

-----Original Message-----
From: Terry Westover [mailto:WestoverT@ci.boulder.co.us]
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 12:06 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Panels

Have you looked at Knowledge Networks' system for obtaining panel data? Might be applicable to your needs.

Terry Westover
Evaluation Coordinator
Audit & Evaluation
City of Boulder
303-441-3143

>>> JAnnSelzer@aol.com 12/17/01 12:27PM >>>
I'm looking for city markets with a pre-recruited panels already in place. I'm looking for panels would of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed. If you know of such a panel,
please send me information about when it was recruited, how many studies have been conducted using this panel, how it is refreshed and/or maintained, how many active participants it have, and how the local market is defined geographically. This is for use in an industry study of methodologies. As always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later.

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines
JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

------=_NextPart_001_01C18CA4.8F1B9800
Content-Type: text/html;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
    <META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">
    <META NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2653.12">
    <TITLE>RE: Panels</TITLE>
</HEAD>

<BODY>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Terry,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Thanks for the mention. Let me know if I can ever provide you with additional information. </FONT> </P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>all the best,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Bill McCready</FONT></P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Knowledge</FONT>

BR><FONT SIZE=2>&nbsp;&nbsp;N&nbsp;&nbsp; E&nbsp;&nbsp; T&nbsp;&nbsp; W&nbsp;&nbsp; O&nbsp;&nbsp; R&nbsp;&nbsp; K&nbsp;&nbsp; S</FONT> </P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>&nbsp;&nbsp;William C. McCready, Ph.D.</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=2>&nbsp;&nbsp;Director, Client Development</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=2>&nbsp;&nbsp;Government, Academic &amp; Non-Profit Research</FONT> <BR><A HREF="http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp" TARGET="_blank">http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp</A>&gt;</P>

<P>&nbsp;&nbsp;Phone 312.474.6464&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp; Fax 60606</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>
708.524.1241 &nbsp; Cell 708.203.8941 <br>bmccready@knowledgenetworks.com <br>-----Original Message----- <br>From: Terry Westover [WestoverT@ci.boulder.co.us] <br>Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 12:06 PM <br>To: aapornet@usc.edu <br>Subject: Re: Panels <br> <br>Have you looked at Knowledge Networks' system for obtaining panel data? Might be applicable to your needs. </p> <br>Terry Westover <br>Evaluation Coordinator <br>Audit & Evaluation <br>City of Boulder <br>303-441-3143 <br>&gt;&gt;&gt; JAnnSelzer@aol.com 12/17/01 12:27PM &gt;&gt;&gt; &gt;&gt;&gt; I'm looking for city markets with a pre-recruited panels already in place. I'm looking for panels would of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed. If you know of such a panel, please send me information about when it was recruited, how many studies have been conducted using this panel, how it is refreshed and/or maintained, how many active participants it have, and how the local market is defined. geographically. This is for use in an industry study of methodologies. As always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later. JAS
<p>J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.</p>
<p>Selzer &amp; Company, Inc.</p>
<p>Des Moines</p>
<p>JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com</p>
<p>Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</p>

<p>&nbsp;</p>
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Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
  name="William C  McCready.vcf"
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  filename="William C  McCready.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD
VERSION:2.1
N:McCready;William;C.
FN:William C. McCready
ORG:Knowledge Networks
TITLE:Director, Client Development
TEL;WORK;VOICE:(708) 848-4296
TEL;WORK;VOICE:(312) 474-6464
TEL;CELL;VOICE:(708) 203-8941
TEL;WORK;FAX:(708) 524-1241
ADR;WORK:;;1046 N. Taylor Avenue;Oak Park;IL;60302;United States of America
LABEL;WORK;ENCODING=QUOTED-PRINTABLE:1046 N. Taylor Avenue=0D=0AOak Park, IL 60302=0D=0AUnited States of America
EMAIL;PREF;INTERNET:bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com
REV:20010831T151034Z
END:VCARD

-----=_NextPart_000_01C18CA4.8F1B9800--

From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 24 10:08:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBOI83e01591 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
  10:08:03 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id KAA18433; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:08:03 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBOI7sf19800; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:07:54 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:07:54 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: World's most respected companies 2001 (FT.com)
Thanks, Jan, for bothering to reproduce this for all of us on AAPORNET to read.

I read this at the time of my visit to the site, and wrote Peter Barker for more details on his methodology, using the automatic mailer at the site. Because I did this only about 12 hours ago, however, I cannot expect to hear back from him soon. And I just now sent much this same message to Bob Worcester, who was also kind enough to reply.

I wished to post the results to our humble list as quickly as possible simply because I find the table so interesting—especially the trends in rankings over the past three surveys, and these trends especially by sectors of the global economy.

My best wishes to all friends and their families and loved ones who might read this message. May all your own trends be vertical upward!

And all my best to you, Jan—for helping to call attention to this I think too often overlooked area of survey and market research.

-- Jim

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Jan Werner wrote:

> James Beniger wrote:
> >
> > Here's an often over-looked and I think quite interesting application of survey research, conducted by The Financial
> > Times with assistance from Price Waterhouse Coopers. If any of you know about the design, methods or execution of this work, I'm sure many of us on AAPORNET would welcome learning what you know. I'll try to post what little is available from the Financial Times, URL immediately below.
> >
> > Season's greetings!
> >
> >---------------------------------------------------------------
> >--------
> >> Here is the FT methodology description, available from:
> > http://specials.ft.com/wmr2001/FT3OLNBQ6VC.html
> >> Note that "respect" is measured only among CEO's of major corporations.
World's most respected companies - Business excellence

Value gets a crucial vote By Peter Barker
Published: December 13 2001 15:50GMT
Last Updated: December 13 2001 15:52GMT

This is the fourth year we have conducted this global survey of CEO opinion, and we have achieved a record number of respondents - 914 CEOs from 65 different countries. As in previous years, these respondents come not just from publicly-quoted organisations but also from state-owned enterprises, large subsidiaries and private companies.

The core of the survey remains consistent over time, identifying those companies and business leaders most respected by their peers and the reasons for those choices.

First, chief executives were asked to nominate which three companies in the world they most respected, and why. They were then asked to select three companies that they most respected in their industry sector in the world, and to state why. Next, each chief executive was asked to identify which three business leaders they most respected and why. Each of these questions was asked in the previous surveys.

For the first time this year, however, CEOs were also asked to name companies that best delivered on specific value areas. Three questions were asked. First, which three companies created the most value for their consumers? Second, which three companies created the most value for their shareholders? And third, which three companies best managed environmental resources? In each case respondents were asked to give reasons for their nominations.

For each of these three "value" questions, we also surveyed a relevant stakeholder group to provide a contrast to CEO opinion. The question on consumer value was posed to 6,000 members of the general public in a global omnibus survey; the question on shareholder value was asked of 100 fund managers world-wide; and 110 media commentators and non-governmental organisations (NGO) officers were asked the question on environmental resources.

The fieldwork was undertaken between June and October 2001, principally by telephone interview but in some cases by written questionnaire or face-to-face interviews.

As in previous years, we were faced with the choice of weighting the data by gross domestic product of the respondent's country (the only measure available across all respondents), or leaving it untouched. Once again, we decided to weight the data, both to ensure consistency with prior years' results, and to reflect that,
rightly or wrongly, there are different levels of global impact achieved by views expressed in different economies.

This approach applies to the CEO, fund manager and media/NGO surveys, but in the case of the general public survey we felt it was more appropriate to weight the data by population size rather than GDP.

To ensure that we smooth out any single country bias, we have once again applied a minimum qualification level of five nominations to each table, apart from the World's Most Respected Companies by Industry Sector, where a minimum of three nominations was required.

Importantly, we have again analysed the unprompted reasons given behind nominations, providing a valuable insight into what factors drive respect for companies and business leaders. For the questions on company and business leader respect we have analysed the answers into the same categories as last year, enabling comparisons to be made over time. In the case of each of the "value" questions, we have analysed the CEO and other stakeholder group findings into the same categories, enabling the reasonings of the two different groups to be compared.

In summary, the methodology allows for an in-depth and credible look at global CEO and other relevant stakeholder group opinion, and for differences over time and/or between respondent groups to be measured.

Email Peter Barker at peter.barker@uk.pwcglobal.com
HERRIOT AWARD NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

Nominations are sought for the 2002 Roger Herriot Award for Innovation in Federal Statistics.

After the sudden death in May 1994 of Roger Herriot, an Associate Commissioner for Statistical Standards and Methodology at the National Center for Education Statistics, the Washington Statistical Society, the Social Statistics and Government Statistics Sections of the American Statistical Association established an award in his memory to recognize individuals who develop unique approaches to the solution of statistical problems in Federal data collection programs.

The award is intended to reflect the special characteristics that marked Roger Herriot's career: dedication to the issues of measurement; improvements in the efficiency of data collection; programs; and improvements and use of statistical data or policy analysis.

The award is not restricted to senior members of an organization; nor is it to be considered as a culmination of a long period of service. Individuals at all levels, from entry to senior, Federal employees, private sector employees, or employees of the academic community, may be nominated on the basis of the significance of the specific contribution.

The recipient of the 2002 Roger Herriot Award will be chosen by a committee of representatives of the Social Statistics Section and Government Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association and a representative of the Washington Statistical Society. Roger Herriot was associated with and strongly supportive of these organizations during his career. The award consists of an honorarium of $500 and a framed citation. Joseph Waksberg (Westat), Monroe Sirken (National Center for Health Statistics), Constance Citro (National Academy of Sciences), Clyde Tucker (BLS), Thomas Jabine (SSA, EIA, CNSTAT), Donald Dillman (Washington State University), and Jeanne Griffith (OMB, NCES, NSF) are previous recipients of the Herriot Award.
A nomination form can be obtained by contacting Ed Spar by phone: (703) 836-0404; fax (703) 684-3410; or email: copafs@aol.com. The form can also be downloaded from the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics web site at http://www.copafs.org. All nomination forms should be returned either to copafs@aol.com or the Roger Herriot Award Committee c/o COPAFS, 1429 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. Completed nomination forms must be received by May 10, 2002.

******

> From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 24 12:17:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
  by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fBOKHJe08125 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
12:17:19 -0800 (PST)
Received: from almaak.usc.edu (beniger@almaak.usc.edu [128.125.253.167])
  by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
  id MAA02029 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 12:17:17 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
  by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
  id fBOKHB401506 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 12:17:11 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 12:17:11 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: FLASH! NEWSWEEK: John Walker Met with bin Laden
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.01122412215410.26950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

---

(C) 2001 Newsweek, Inc


Monday, December 24, 2001

NEWSWEEK

National News

Walker's Brush With bin Laden

The American Taliban says he fought alongside Al Qaeda. Will that get him the death penalty?
By Daniel Klaidman and Michael Isikoff

Jan. 7 issue -- As an American among the Taliban, John Walker Lindh was an oddity, to say the least. But the young convert to radical Islam repeatedly proved his loyalty to the cause, undergoing spiritual education in Pakistan, then moving up to weapons and explosives training in two separate Qaeda camps in Afghanistan. NEWSWEEK has learned that he was eventually trusted enough to live in the secretive Farouk camp in the mountains near Kandahar, where bin Laden often moved among the troops -- and where at least one of the September 11 hijackers had trained. There Walker was once invited to a small meeting with bin Laden himself.

THEN, IN THE MONTHS before September 11, sources tell NEWSWEEK, Walker was presented with a choice: according to statements Walker gave FBI interrogators after his capture, Al Qaeda leaders told him he could either begin an intensive round of terrorist instruction -- "martyrdom training," a Justice Department official called it -- or take to the battlefield and fight as a Qaeda soldier against the Northern Alliance.

Walker told U.S. interrogators he chose to fight, a decision that is now at the center of the debate over his fate. He fought willingly alongside the Taliban and voiced approval of the September 11 attacks; but if Walker is to be believed, he avoided training that could have sent him to kill Americans. That has complicated the government's attempts to find the right charge to fit his alleged crimes. Attorney General John Ashcroft recommended that Walker be handed over to U.S. Marshals and tried in civilian court -- most likely under a federal law prohibiting support to terrorist groups. That crime carries a potential life sentence, but not the death penalty. Late last week, however, some officials were pushing for charges that could result in execution. "There's still a lot of missing pieces," says one official working on the case. "We're trying to figure out exactly what he did."
Walker is now being held in solitary confinement aboard the USS Peleliu in the middle of the Arabian Sea, virtually unaware of the chaos his capture has caused. As cable-TV shows endlessly play video of his bearded, soot-stained face, Walker may not even be aware that his anguished parents have written him a supportive letter—and hired a high-priced lawyer to defend him. Since his capture on Dec. 2, Walker has been extensively questioned, first by U.S. military officials and then by the FBI. On Dec. 9, agents were dispatched to read Walker his Miranda rights. But the government says Walker waived his right to counsel, and continued to spin out details of his six-month odyssey as a holy warrior—even referring to bin Laden with a respectful honorific. Has he shown any remorse? "Not much," says one official familiar with Walker's account.

Walker's case wasn't helped last week when CNN aired a gripping tape of an interview with Walker conducted right after his capture. In a heavily affected Arabic accent, Walker distanced himself from the prison riot that led to the death of CIA agent Mike Spann. He said his captured colleagues had made a "mistake" and committed a "sin against Islam" when they violated their promise to surrender and unleashed hand grenades against their Northern Alliance guards. But he went on to describe himself as a member of Ansar, a group of non-Afghan fighters who, he said matter-of-factly, were "funded by Osama bin Laden." That statement alone could make it hard for Walker's lawyers to argue that he didn't know what he was doing—or whose orders he was following.

Some administration officials still believe that Walker should be tried for treason, since he allegedly took up arms against Americans. But treason is hard to prove. The Constitution requires two witnesses to an "overt act." To get around that problem, some lawyers have floated the idea of invoking an obscure statute allowing civilians to be court-martialed for "aiding the enemy." The law was last used during the Civil War, when two Missouri women were convicted of supplying "victuals" to Confederate bushwhackers.
President George W. Bush, who said last week that Walker faces a "grim future," seems in no rush to make a decision. (The president's father took a hard line. "Make him leave his hair the way it is and his face as dirty as it is," George H. W. Bush mused in an ABC interview, "and let him go wandering around this country and see what kind of sympathy he would get.") Administration sources tell NEWSWEEK that officials may want to delay charging Walker if he has information that could help prosecute Qaeda leaders, or even bin Laden. For now, at sea and beyond his lawyer's reach, the American Taliban may be more useful as a witness than as a defendant.

-------

With Karen Breslau in San Francisco and Tamara Lipper in Washington


----------------------------------------------------------------------

(C) 2001 Newsweek, Inc

----------------------------------------------------------------------

*****

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Dec 24 12:25:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
    by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
    id fBOKPZe09004 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
12:25:35 -0800 (PST)
Received: from barry.mail.mindspring.net (barry.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.25])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
    id MAA04496 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 12:25:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from pool0032.cvx32-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net ([209.179.157.32]
helo=x.mindspring.com)
    by barry.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
    id 16Ibej-0003hr-00; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 15:25:05 -0500
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224151235.03d6d670@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 15:23:32 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu, jwerner@jwdp.com
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the New Yorker
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <3C23AC43.2987ED7B@princeton.edu>
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224151235.03d6d670@pop.mindspring.com>
    <3C238EEE.1E53EF9@jwdp.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of "margin of error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be counted accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.

This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances.

warren mitofsky

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:
> Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered
> if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of
> error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred
> from his previous sentence.
> >
> > Larry McGill
> >
> > Jan Werner wrote:
> >
> > > While I agree with with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I
> > > would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:
> > >
> > > In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is
> > > too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller
> > > than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush
> > > officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.
> > >
> > > In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the
> > > actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always
> > > be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random
> > > error due to the sampling process.
> > >
> > > Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some
> > > pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.
> > >
> > > Jan Werner
> > > jwerner@jwdp.com
> > >
> > >
> > > dick halpern wrote:
> > >
> > > >> Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount
> > > >> in this week's New Yorker magazine.
> > > >>
> > > >

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the
fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our
anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.

Warren Mitofsky
******************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
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Warren,

Your statistical reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable. I think the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters." This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at--and disillusioned with--democracy, in such an event.

So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius--and also a danger to society.
To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so—or at least not in America, bless her—any time soon.

Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote—won through countless wars against those who would enslave us—for whomever they damn well please, has much power indeed as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human societies have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer societies as large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super Bowl Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.

Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the world safe for statistical inference—it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it could work for us.

-- Jim

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of "margin of error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be counted accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.
>
> This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances. warren mitofsky
>
> At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:
> >Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence.
> >
> >Larry McGill
> >
> >Jan Werner wrote:
While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

dick halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern
December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT
by Hendrik Hertzberg
Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31
Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell.

Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the
New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969,
the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
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Jim,<br><br>This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:<br><br><dl><dd>Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.</dd></dl><br><br>How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.<br><br>At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:<br><br>&nbsp; Warren,<br> &nbsp; &nbsp; Your statistical reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable. I think the major
hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters." This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at--and disillusioned with--democracy, in such an event. So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius--and also a danger to society. To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so--or at least not in America, bless her--any time soon. Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote-- won through countless wars against those who would enslave us--for whomever they damn well please, has much power indeed as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human societies have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer societies as large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super Bowl Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade. Perhaps AAPORNET
could launch a crusade to make the world safe for statistical inference—it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it could work for us.

---

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of margin of error. I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be counted accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.

This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances.

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote: Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence. ---

Larry McGill
Jan Werner wrote:

While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call.

In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical margin of error will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner

Dick Halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT by Hendrik Hertzberg

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand...
uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time.

But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The
reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush. It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel. In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern
times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the...
Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice. The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done.

Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.

---

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
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Although respect was measured only among CEO’s of major corporations, questions on which companies best delivered on specific value areas were put to relevant stakeholder groups as well as to CEO’s. For example, a question on best management of environmental resources was put to 110 media commentators and non-governmental organization (NGO) officers and yielded the following ranking.

Happy holidays!

Rob Simmons
rsimm32573@aol.com

Company rankings - 2001

Media/NGOs - companies that best manage and effect environmental resources
Published: December 12 2001 17:15GMT | Last Updated: December 14 2001 15:31GMT

Rank 2001   Name    Company Sector
1   BP  UK  Energy/Chemicals
2   Body Shop   UK  Retail
3   Honda   Japan   Engineering
4   Ford   US  Engineering
5   Royal Dutch/Shell   Netherlands/UK  Energy/Chemicals
6   Ben & Jerry's (Unilever)   Netherlands/UK  Food/Beverages
7   Vivendi Universal   France  Utilities & Media/Leisure
8   Toyota   Japan   Engineering
9   Otto-Versand   Germany  Retail
=9  Siemens Germany  Electrical/Electronics
11  Patagonia   US  Retail
12  Procter & Gamble   US  Food/Beverages
13  Interface   US  Resources
14  McDonald's   US  Media/Leisure
15  General Motors   US  Engineering
16  Greenpeace   UK
17  Ikea   Sweden  Retail
=18 Co-operative Group   UK  Retail & Finance
=18 GlaxoSmithKline   UK  Healthcare
20  Microsoft   US  IT
Although respect was measured only among CEO's of major corporations, questions on which companies best delivered on specific value areas were put to relevant stakeholder groups as well as to CEO's. For example, a question on best management of environmental resources was put to 110 media commentators and non-governmental organization (NGO) officers and yielded the following ranking.

Happy holidays!

Rob Simmons
rsimm32573@aol.com

Company rankings - 2001

1. BP UK Energy/Chemicals
2. Body Shop UK Retail
3. Honda Japan Engineering
4. Ford US Engineering
5. Royal Dutch/Shell Netherlands/UK Energy/Chemicals
6. Ben & Jerry's (Unilever) Netherlands/UK Food/Beverages
7. Vivendi Universal France Utilities & Media/Leisure
8. Toyota Japan Engineering
9. Otto-Versand Germany Retail
9. Siemens Germany Electrical/Electronics
11. Patagonia US Retail
12. Procter & Gamble US Food/Beverages
13. Interface US Resources
14. McDonald's US Media/Leisure
15. General Motors US Engineering
16. Greenpeace UK
17. Ikea Sweden Retail
Warren,

I certainly don't wish to argue with you, all I'm trying to do is to guess the likely public response to what you propose.

In response to what you propose here, I can imagine many citizens and voters (not to mention stand-up comedians) saying something like this:

"My sixth-grade teacher taught us that the numbers go on and on, higher and higher and still higher, and on and on forever. She also taught us that once we learned the progression of number names--ones, tens, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions, and so on--each one of us could count on forever, never stopping. And even if I couldn't go on forever, I know I could count to at least a hundred thousand--why can't the Election Board find a few local people to count 25 thousand votes correctly?" (or whatever the number might be)

I think that everyone on AAPORNET understands the fallacy of the argument I've just presented, but I doubt that many voting
citizens would, not because they are stupid (they are in fact applying logic properly), but rather because the statistical idea of random variation or "error" is foreign to them, as it would be in, say, counting the number of fingers on one hand.

The one place I do find this intuition outside of formal statistics is in the traditional seamstress-tailor culture, with its saying, "measure twice, cut once."

For many years, in teaching statistics, I've used a traditional joke to make much the same point:

Two guys drive into a big city to run a few errands. During the day, one guy observes his friend go from one bank to another, until he finally visits every bank in town. At the first bank, the friend exchanges a hundred dollar bill for ten tens. At the second bank, he exchanges the ten tens for 20 fivers. At the third bank, he exchanges these 20 bills for 100 ones. At yet another bank, he exchanges the 100 ones for 400 quarters. And on and on he continues, bank after bank, getting a thousand dimes, two thousand nickels, and eventually ten thousand pennies. Having only pennies, the friend then retraces his steps, exchanging the ten thousand pennies for two thousand nickels, and so on. When he finally arrives back at the bank he first visited that day, he exchanges ten tens for a hundred dollar bill, the very transaction with which he began the day.

Puzzled by such odd behavior, the other guy asks his friend to explain why he chooses to spend his free time in this peculiar activity.

"Because," replies his friend, "someday, sooner or later, someone, somewhere, somehow, is going to make a mistake--and it ain't going to be me." (audience laughs here, please)

Aside from this particular joke--long in the public domain--and also the traditional seamstress-tailor culture, I see little evidence that the popular culture is ever going to understand why votes--whether tens or hundreds or thousands or even millions of votes--cannot simply be counted, one by one, right down to the very last one, with the exact correct result, every last time.

The best remedy, for the rest of human civilization, would be to teach probability theory and statistical inference before simple arithmetic (beyond mere counting). This isn't going to happen any time soon, however, or at least not so far as I can see, and so I'm afraid we are going to be counting and recounting vote totals "precisely" for at least a few more generations.

One last and quite different argument which I think all of us liberals (caring, feeling, sensitive intellectuals, that is) can appreciate: Convincing the public at large that close votes will be decided by coin toss will help the bad guys a lot more than us good guys, would be my own
guess. The widespread feeling that everyone's vote "counts" in a democracy is one of the major things we have left to keep the bad guys at bay, it seems to me.

I'm of course kidding here, a bit--but not really all that much...

-- Jim

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Jim,
> This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:
> Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.
> How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.
> warren
> At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:
> 
> Your statistical reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable. I think the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters." This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American
could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at--and disillusioned with--democracy, in such an event.

So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius--and also a danger to society.

To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so--or at least not in America, bless her--any time soon.

Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote--won through countless wars against those who would enslave us--for whomever they damn well please, has much power indeed as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human societies have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer societies as large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super Bowl Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.

Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the world safe for statistical inference--it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it could work for us.

-- Jim

******

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:
I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of "margin of error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.

This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances.

warren mitofsky

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:
> Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence.
> > Larry McGill
> > > Jan Werner wrote:
> > > > While I agree with with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:
> > > > In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.
In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process. Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

__________________________

dick halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern
December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT
by Hendrik Hertzberg
Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31
Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th.
Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush. It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers,
would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was unveiled by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel. In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself
endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental
American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.
This "solution" reminds me of an old joke about a mathematician, an economist and a statistician who go hunting together. They come across a deer and the mathematician shoots, missing by 10 feet to the left. The economist shoots and is off to the right by 10 feet. The statistician throws down his gun and yells "We got him! We got him!"

Likewise, in an election, votes are discrete objects in a finite population, and it is inappropriate to substitute an approximation to a continuous probability distribution function for actual measurement of the results. This is NOT the same thing as forecasting results from a sample.
Other than lack of will or incompetence, there is no reason why the votes in any election cannot be counted with a zero tolerance for error. The utter unreliability of pre-scored punchcard ballots has been known for decades and the continued use of them in Florida stemmed from a political decision not to allocate adequate resources to elections in certain areas.

Florida was not a tied election. The NORC study made clear that, had ALL ballots been counted, Gore would have won, and therefore, any discussions about the results boil down to legal arguments about which ballots should have been counted or not. The winner was decided by legal rulings with which one may or may not agree. Statistics had nothing to do with it.

Finally, a law would have to provide an exact threshold at which the kind of solution Warren proposes would kick in. In our litigious society, this would simply shift the battle lines in a close election from the exact count of the results to a wider band of "probable error" surrounding it. In other words, it would lead to more, rather than less, wrangling over the results.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Jim,
> This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:
> 
> Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping of a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.

> How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.
> warren
Dear Warren, Jan and Jim:

As an ex-political activist/operative in Westchester and as someone who has tried to explain statistical results in court cases to judges, as well as an "official" observer in recounts I think that some of you are missing the point. The study that was done for the Newspaper consortium (which I looked at carefully and consulted with the Times people about when the analysis was being done) showed the following thing:

1) A statewide recount ignoring Overvotes would have resulted in a Gore Victory (albeit narrow) based upon any scenario.

2) The mis-ballotting by voters in Palm Beach (based upon the butterfly ballot) meant that a large number
of votes were accidentally cast for Buchanan.

3) Taking into account the overvotes (some of these also were the result of Ballot design) including those in Palm Beach, but also Jacksonville (a two card punch card ballot) thousands intended to vote for Gore rather than Bush, but had their ballots spoiled.

4) Though the average error rate was higher on the punch card ballot, than on optical scan it was exactly somewhat higher on another system that made marks mechanically. But the error rate went to as high as 30% in some precincts. Though there was strong association with race in the precinct, first time voter, older, low education, etc. with spoiled ballots, there was a large unexplained variation that could have something to do with how the election was administered.

Putting it another way, what happened in Florida was that a flawed system controlled by the GOP (largely) denied many voters the chance to have their preference registered. Gore challenged aspects of this.

But it seems to me that if statistics has a use it is in attempting to figure out voter intent "post-hoc," as in Palm Beach, or in having the whole election voided.

I think what should have happened in Fla is that Florida's electors should have been thrown out because either: 1) that there were enough spoiled ballots to make the result hard to assess and their was not time to re-run it; 2) the counting mechanism in FLA were not adequate to declare a winner.

We wouldn't need a coin toss, what we needed was a "fair election." I truly believe that the discussion of this has been undercut by the "War Against Terrorism." No one is willing to say out loud any more, the Bush's election was illegitimate, but it was.

Banning everything but Optical Scan ballot systems (or other systems with audit trails) that have a method to "check the vote" before the voter leaves would be a start. (By the way some precincts had turned off the checking system because of turn out.)

The counting of absentees is another issue!
Andy

--Boundary_(ID_6a4FebjBTMUhCnQTttLT5w)
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3) Taking into account the overvotes (some of these also were the result of Ballot design) including those in Palm Beach, but also Jacksonville (a two card punch card ballot) thousands intended to vote for Gore rather than Bush, but had their ballots spoiled.

4) Though the average error rate was higher on the punch card ballot, than on optical scan it was exactly somewhat higher on another system that made marks mechanically. But the error rate went to as high as 30% in some precincts. Though there was strong association with race in the precinct, first time voter, etc. with spoiled ballots, there was a large unexplained variation that could have something to do with how the election was administered.

Putting it another way, what happened in Florida was that a flawed system controlled by the GOP (largely) denied many voters the chance to have their preference registered. Gore challenged aspects of this.

It seems to me that if statistics has a use it is in attempting to figure out voter intent "post-hoc," as in...
Palm Beach, or in having the whole election voided.

I think what should have happened in Fla is that Florida's electors should have been thrown out because

either: 1) that there were enough spoiled ballots to make the result hard to assess and their was not

time to re-run it; 2) the counting mechanism in FLA were not adequate to declare a winner.

We wouldn't need a coin toss, what we needed was a "fair election." I truly believe that the

discussion of this has been undercut by the "War Against Terrorism." No one is willing to say

out loud any more, the Bush's election was illegitimate, but it was.

Banning everything but Optical Scan ballot systems (or other systems with audit trails) that have a method to "check the vote" before the voter leaves would be a start. (By the way some precincts had turned off the checking system because of turn out.)

The counting of absentees is another issue!

Andy
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This report by Kevin Sack appears on the front page of today's New York Times, and mentions several polls dating back to the first modern exit polls in 1972, and including exit polls in the November 2000 presidential election, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll (Dec. 7), and the Gallup survey fielded Dec. 14-16.

If you subscribe to the National Edition of the Times, however, you might have received only the first six paragraphs of this story, where at least the copy that landed in our driveway this morning jumps to page A20, which contains a full-page ad for Sprint PCS, with the top half given over to a photograph of an attractive young woman holding a telephone, and with "OUT OF TOUCH" stamped across her forehead—thereby mocking my own predicament, cut off for good in my early morning reading at the words "The latest New York Times/CBS..."

Did Sprint pay the Times extra to shunt all of us front-page news readers to its full-page ad by this clever ruse? Or is Ebenezer Scrooge himself in charge of layout for the Times Christmas morning edition? Which is my segue to wishing all of you, and your families and friends, both season's greetings and a most happy winter solstice!

-- Jim
BLACKS WHO VOTED AGAINST BUSH OFFER SUPPORT TO HIM IN WARTIME

By KEVIN SACK

JACKSONVILLE, Fla., Dec. 19 -- Steven Price, the proprietor of the Wise Choice Barber Shop on Jacksonville's north side, was none too happy with George W. Bush this time last year. In this city's heavily black and Democratic neighborhoods, like the one where Mr. Price wields his trimmer, one of every five votes was thrown out because of confusion over the ballot, and folks here were street-marching mad.

It was, in the eyes of Mr. Price and many other African-Americans, an outrageous disenfranchisement of black voters in a state where Mr. Bush won the thinnest of majorities and, as a result, the presidency. "I thought he was a crook, that he bought the election," Mr. Price said. "I just thought it was fixed."

But listen to Mr. Price now, as he assesses Mr. Bush's performance since the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Not only does he approve wholeheartedly of the war in Afghanistan, he also has no qualms about the civil liberties implications of the government's antiterrorism measures, including the Bush administration's interrogation of Middle Easterners and its possible use of military tribunals to try terrorism suspects.

"I think he's handled the situation properly and he's showing that he's a strong president," Mr. Price, 31, said on a quiet afternoon in his shop. "I don't even look at him now as having bought the presidency. I just look at him as president."

As Mr. Bush's father can attest, a president's wartime popularity can be ephemeral, particularly if war is followed by recession. But for the moment, a striking component of Mr. Bush's immense public approval is his high level of support from black Americans, hardly any of whom voted for him.

Pollsters and black political leaders say that Mr. Bush's ratings reflect the patriotism and unity felt by all Americans, and may demonstrate black support
for the country more than for Mr. Bush himself. But they also note that the distance Mr. Bush has traveled with black Americans says much about the influence of a foreign conflict on public opinion.

The latest New York Times/CBS News poll, taken from Dec. 7 to 10, found that nearly three of every four blacks and nine of every 10 whites approved of Mr. Bush's performance.

The poll's sampling of blacks was not large enough to measure the support for Mr. Bush with precision. But its general findings are reinforced by other polls, including a Gallup survey taken Dec. 14-16 that found that more than two-thirds of blacks approved of the president's performance. In early October, Mr. Bush's approval ratings among blacks exceeded 80 percent in the Gallup poll.

By contrast, surveys of voters leaving the polls in November 2000 found that Mr. Bush received only 8 percent of the black vote, the worst showing of any Republican presidential candidate since at least 1972, when modern exit polling began.

Until Sept. 11, Mr. Bush's ratings among blacks remained relatively low. In the Times/CBS and Gallup polls, he never received positive marks from more than half of the blacks surveyed, and typically no more than a third were approving.

Some of Mr. Bush's newfound popularity with blacks may be a product of the war's power to obscure concerns about the economy and other domestic issues. Some blacks also have been impressed by the high-profile roles being played by members of minorities in Mr. Bush's cabinet, like Secretary of State Colin L. Powell and Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser.

Whatever the reasons, Mr. Bush is finding support these days in the unlikeliest of places.

"I think he's done a tremendous job in managing the war on terrorism," said Donna Brazile, a leading black Democratic strategist and the manager of Al Gore's presidential campaign in 2000. "He's rallied the country, kept us focused on goals and kept us informed. I don't have any beef with him."

Like many other black Americans, Ms. Brazile said she had put aside her
bitterness over the Florida recount "because it looked quite trivial when put next to Sept. 11."

"I still believe Al Gore won the election," she said, "but it doesn't matter anymore."

Ms. Brazile and other political analysts predicted that the warm feelings of African-Americans toward Mr. Bush would not last, and that he was unlikely to win many black votes in the 2004 election.

After all, former President Bush, who won 12 percent of the black vote in his 1988 victory, had a job approval rating of 72 percent from blacks at the height of the Persian Gulf war in March 1991. Twenty months later, he won only 10 percent of the black vote in losing to Bill Clinton.

George W. Bush's support among blacks "is as broad as could be but it doesn't run deep and he doesn't have coattails," said Ms. Brazile, who pointed out that blacks voted overwhelmingly last month for the winning Democratic candidates for governor in New Jersey and Virginia.

But she said Democratic polling and focus groups before those elections suggested that blacks would not have responded well to attacks on Mr. Bush.

"They wanted to hear about issues and comparisons" she said, "but nothing anti-Bush."

Julian Bond, the chairman of the N.A.A.C.P., said Mr. Bush had benefited because the war on terrorism had "driven most of the radical conservative agenda both out of the headlines and out of present-day politics."

And David A. Bositis, a leading analyst of black voting behavior for the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, said blacks would eventually become discontented with Mr. Bush because of rising unemployment, which stood at 10.1 percent for blacks in November, double the rate for whites. Spending on defense and domestic security will leave little for education, health care and Social Security, he said, and blacks will then remember the impact of the Bush tax cuts.
That is already true for some blacks here in Jacksonville, a city of 780,000
where
blacks make up 28 percent of the population. Fred R. Taylor, a 48-year-old
construction worker, was laid off two weeks ago and blames the president.

"We had eight good years under Clinton and now we've had this guy in office
for one
year and there's no money left in the economy," Mr. Taylor said.

As for the war, Mr. Taylor seems satisfied with the way it has been
conducted, but
says he thinks Mr. Bush's "father is telling him what to do."

Similarly, the Rev. George A. Price, the longtime pastor of St. Matthew
Baptist
Church here, said Mr. Bush had simply made the obvious moves in leading the
war
effort.

"The bottom line is that in these times you've got to support your leader,"
Mr.
Price said. "Would I vote for him? No. But do I think that there should be
any overt
opposition? Not at a time like this."

But others in Jacksonville seemed almost sheepish in admitting that they
had
voted
for Mr. Gore last year. They said that Mr. Bush had shown them something
during the
last three months, and that they would at least consider voting for him in the
future.

"I've got all good things to say about him right now," said Robert K.
Hickson, a
22-year-old firefighter who voted for Mr. Gore. "From what I get, he's keeping cool,
he's showing good leadership, he's supporting all the troops. So far it seems
like it's working."

Margaret A. Izevbizua, a 40-year-old nurse, said Mr. Bush had impressed her
enough
to have earned her consideration in 2004.

"He went forward with action, not just talk," Ms. Izevbizua said. "I didn't vote
for Bush. I voted for Gore. I was born and raised a Democrat. But after all this
happened, I said, 'Well, you know, he turned out to be different.' I don't look at
him as being Republican or Democrat."
Some polls have suggested that blacks, presumably because of their history as victims of civil rights abuses, are more concerned than whites about ethnic profiling and other civil liberties issues growing out of the war on terrorism. But little of that showed up in interviews in Jacksonville.

Several people said the magnitude of the Sept. 11 attacks and the threat of future terrorism left the government little choice but to put the rights of Middle Easterners second to security concerns.

"From my view, it's like, Welcome to my world," said Steven Price, the barber. "Blacks go through that every day. I wouldn't say it's right. But with people's lives being wasted like that, it's worth giving them a little more attention."

And many of those interviewed seemed to feel that if it had been permissible for years to mistreat African-Americans because of their ethnicity, the same should now hold true for Middle Easterners.

"If it involves the civil liberties of African-Americans, we get involved," said George Price, the pastor, who is a veteran of civil rights protests here. "If it involves the civil liberties of anybody else, we tend to sit on the sidelines."
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Kai,

Usualyy getting people's out-of-pocket memos simply produces an automatic delete. But I saw yours and had to respond and just ask how you are doing. I have been at William and Mary even longer than you have been at Windsor. It would be great to see you sometime if you get out this ay ever.

Ron

Quoting kaih@uwindsor.ca:

> I will be out of the office starting  2001-12-22
> and will not return until
> 2002-01-02.
>  
> K.H.
> 
>
Warren,

Upon further reflection, and without intending to withdraw any of my earlier comments on coin-tosses to decide American elections, I think that I have been too generally dismissive of your essential idea.

Here's the example that came first to mind to persuade me of a good use for your idea:

Let's say that, in a New York State gubernatorial election, and after the official count is in, candidate A leads candidate B by, say, 6 votes (or 16--I have no idea how high it could be before your plan would not be publicly accepted, but I think we both agree that its acceptability would be inversely correlated with the size of the difference in the counts for each candidate; in the limiting case of a draw, for example, the coin toss is already accepted).

Under current law, I believe, a recount would be mandatory, even though most people with at least one statistics course would not bet that the margin of difference in the recount would vary much from 6--plus or minus 3 or 4, let's say (assuming all counts are honest, and conducted by the same means). I think most taxpayers could be convinced--confronted with an example like this--that recounting, and recounting, and recounting again, in a very tight election, is not likely to converge on any firm winner, but is more likely to be no more (nor less) enlightening than was the very first count.

That established, and in the name of saving tax money (or reducing taxes--let's shoot the load), I think your idea could be written into New York State law as something like this: "Whenever the official final vote count of any statewide election has the winner less than two percent of the total vote behind the runner-up, the winner will be decided by a coin toss, between these two front-running candidates." (something like this--we can all quibble over the details)

Serious statisticians might want the percentage in this law to vary according to the size of the total vote, but I think there is a limit to how technical a law decided by a coin toss can be, for public consumption, and I prefer my simpler version as written above.

So, I've changed my mind, and find there is indeed a useful place for your essential idea in the real world, Warren, and I think that saving tax dollars is a powerful incentive for its further consideration.
Other problems still remain, however, not the least being the legitimation problems for any candidate made, say, governor of New York by virtue of the flip of a coin. On the other hand, in times of grave crisis, I'd rather leave the fate of the government to a coin toss than to prolonged squabbling and legal action over which of two candidates had at least one more vote than the other, in an extremely large election.

In short, I'm guessing that your law would not be needed nor used very often, Warren, which would be a good thing, but whenever it was called into use, it could well do no less than to avert a major governmental crisis.

I welcome responses, as I'm sure does Warren, but of course.

-- Jim

*******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 21:37:18 -0500
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker

Jim,
This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:
Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.

How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.
warren

At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:

Warren,

Your statistical reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable. I think
the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters." This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at—and disillusioned with—democracy, in such an event.

So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius—and also a danger to society.

To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so—or at least not in America, bless her—any time soon.

Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote—won through countless wars against those who would enslave us—for whomever they damn well please, has much power indeed as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human societies have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer societies as large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super Bowl Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.

Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the world safe for statistical inference—it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it could work for us.

-- Jim

******
On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of "margin of error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be counted accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.
> This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances.

warren mitofsky

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:
> Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence.
> > Larry McGill
> > > Jan Werner wrote:
> > > > While I agree with with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:
> > > > In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.
In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process. Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

dick halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern
December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT
by Hendrik Hertzberg
Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31
Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk...
The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush. It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was
uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same
fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy. The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.
The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.

Warren Mitofsky
NL NEWS ARCHIVE

Despite rising cost of living many Americans reluctant to die

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A startling new study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates a majority of Americans would still prefer to continue
on with their lives despite the high costs.

Of the 100,000 people polled, 89% stated that the cost of living was rising faster than their annual income. Of that number, however, an infinitesimal 0.08% cited death as a viable solution to their economic hardship.

"These numbers are unexpected. It would appear that more and more people are putting off dying until the very last minute," said Pamela Pham, Labor Statistics Bureau analyst.

But the reasons for the nation's procrastination may surprise you. As it turns out, it's not the cost of living that has people concerned, but the cost of dying. Pham continues, "Many Americans simply do not have the financial resources to die even if they wanted to. In a country as wealthy as ours, death should be made available to anyone who wants it, regardless of whether or not they can afford it. Dying isn't a privilege. It's our right."

Participants in the study cited a variety of monetary barriers they feel prevent them from succumbing to the welcome embrace of the grave. Hefty funeral expenses took the top spot for over 55% of respondents. One survey analyst explained the results as a cost/return issue: "At least with living, when you pay for something, you actually get that something in return. But with death, I mean...you're already dead. So who needs it?"

With even the most modest funerals ranging upwards of $6K, many expressed an inclination towards cheaper options: having their remains devoured by dogs or simply being abandoned by the roadside. Additionally, in an effort to meet rising demand, Ninety-nine Cent Stores, inc. recently began offering a variety of alternative post-mortem disposal solutions such as "Piranha Tank" and "Complete Cadaver Combustion."

However, death costs aren't the only thing that have people worried. 34% of those polled said they must forgo the alleged pleasures of the afterlife because mortgages, credit card payments, and other bills would undoubtedly overwhelm their
survivors (8% of which cited inescapable Columbia House memberships or massive video rental late charges as primary reasons to go on living).

Wall Street analysts maintain that in the context of current market trends the prospect of dying is particularly grim. The cessation of life, analysts say, can be the death knell of earning potential. "Salary and wages lost after death are irrecoverable," says Duncan Kote, chief economist with Barney-Barnes and Barnes Financial Services. "Without a steady infusion of capital derived from employment, individual financial stability decreases markedly, particularly in a down economy."

Interestingly, only 2% of those polled expressed an unwillingness to die due to more traditional reasons (such as [the Wrath of God], or [Fear of the Unknown]).

"People aren't scared to die," says Pham, "they just can't afford to. For too many of the American people death is a luxury beyond their means, and that is a national tragedy."


(c) 2000 National Lampoon

*****
Jim,

I did not mean to suggest we do away with recounts and court challenges. As far as I am concerned they are part of the process. My proposal is follows those actions. If the final count has a small margin, say under 0.2%, then flip a coin. In the Florida election 0.2% was about 12,000 votes.

One other comment, on the Kevin Sack article in the NY Times. The modern era of exit polling started in 1967 in the Kentucky gubernatorial race, not 1972 as Sack says.

warren

At 03:25 PM 12/25/01 -0800, you wrote:

> Warren,
> 
> Upon further reflection, and without intending to withdraw any of my earlier comments on coin-tosses to decide American elections, I think that I have been too generally dismissive of your essential idea.
> 
> Here's the example that came first to mind to persuade me of a good use for your idea:
> 
> Let's say that, in a New York State gubernatorial election, and after the official count is in, candidate A leads candidate B by, say, 6 votes (or 16--I have no idea how high it could be before your plan would not be publicly accepted, but I think we both agree that its acceptability would be inversely correlated with the size of the difference in the counts for each candidate; in the limiting case of a draw, for example, the coin toss is already accepted).
> 
> Under current law, I believe, a recount would be mandatory, even though most people with at least one statistics course would not bet that the margin of difference in the recount would vary much from 6--plus or minus 3 or 4, let's say (assuming all counts are honest, and conducted by the same means). I think most taxpayers could be convinced--confronted with an example like this--that recounting, and recounting, and recounting again, in a very tight election, is not likely to converge on any firm winner, but is more likely to be no more (nor less) enlightening than was the very first count.
> 
> That established, and in the name of saving tax money (or reducing taxes--let's shoot the load), I think your idea could be written into New York State law as something like this:
Whenever the official final vote count of any statewide election has the winner less than two percent of the total vote behind the runner-up, the winner will be decided by a coin toss, between these two front-running candidates." (something like this--we can all quibble over the details)

Serious statisticians might want the percentage in this law to vary according to the size of the total vote, but I think there is a limit to how technical a law decided by a coin toss can be, for public consumption, and I prefer my simpler version as written above.

So, I've changed my mind, and find there is indeed a useful place for your essential idea in the real world, Warren, and I think that saving tax dollars is a powerful incentive for its further consideration.

Other problems still remain, however, not the least being the legitimation problems for any candidate made, say, governor of New York by virtue of the flip of a coin. On the other hand, in times of grave crisis, I'd rather leave the fate of the government to a coin toss than to prolonged squabbling and legal action over which of two candidates had at least one more vote than the other, in an extremely large election.

In short, I'm guessing that your law would not be needed nor used very often, Warren, which would be a good thing, but whenever it was called into use, it could well do no less than to avert a major governmental crisis.

I welcome responses, as I'm sure does Warren, but of course.

-- Jim

********

-------- Forwarded message --------
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 21:37:18 -0500
>From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
>
>Jim,
>This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:
>
>Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.
How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.

warren

At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:

Warren,

Your statistical reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable.

I think the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters."

This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at--and disillusioned with--democracy, in such an event.

So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius--and also a danger to society.

To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so--or at least not in America, bless her--any time soon.

Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote--won through countless wars against those who would enslave us--for whomever they damn well please, has much power
indeed
as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human
societies
have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer
societies as
large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super
Bowl
Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.
Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the world safe for
statistical inference--it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it
could
work
for us.

--
Jim

******

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of
> "margin of
> error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an
> error in it,
> and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by
> the
> newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in
> the
> counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be
> counted
> accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.
> This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way
> election
> laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in
> case of a
> tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty
> of getting
> an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts,
> why not flip
> a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two
> candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but
> that is
> not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small
> margin is
> as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral
> strategy under such circumstances.
> warren mitofsky

> At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:
> Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I
> wondered if
> Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin
While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

__________________

dick Halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern

December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT

by Hendrik Hertzberg

Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31

Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the
right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell.

Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable. The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was
It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel. In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an
Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice.

The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who...
needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.
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Warren,

My feeling is that one is forced to choose between two positions: One must either believe--as it seems we both do, along with many generations of seamstresses and tailors--that all counts and measurements are stochastic processes, and therefore subject to random error, or else one believes that counts and measurements are determinate and absolute, that is, knowable in precisely the same way to all who care to know them honestly (I can’t imagine that very many who understand the value and many applications of probability theory could believe this).

That said, I think it important to separate legal processes from any evaluation of the closeness or accuracy of the vote, if the vote itself is counted by a body authorized by law to do so, and if the honesty of its members is not in question. My argument was that the conditions under which the vote count reverts to a coin toss must be precisely encoded *in* the law, and therefore not *itself* subject to further recounts or court challenges.

The problem with recounts I think is obvious--just how many are we to have? The statisticians will, of course, tell us that the greater the number of recounts, the more accurate the count--let the final count go to the means for each candidate, as the number of counts goes to infinity. I don't think anyone wants this--we simply don't have time to wait around for the last of an infinite number of counts (nor even for a number of counts even crudely approximating that number).

And that said, I think it's obvious that I do agree with you about the importance and central role of the law here--my only hope is that the law comes into play *before* the fact (the election in question), and not afterward, in which case I would much prefer living with the candidate who wins the certified count by even a single vote (thereby swallowing all of my statistical inferences for my love of democratic process).

-- Jim

******

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Jim,
> I did not mean to suggest we do away with recounts and court challenges. As far as I am concerned they are part of the process. My proposal is follows those actions. If the final count has a small margin, say under 0.2%, then flip a coin. In the Florida election 0.2% was about 12,000 votes.
One other comment, on the Kevin Sack article in the NY Times. The modern era of exit polling started in 1967 in the Kentucky gubernatorial race, not 1972 as Sack says.

At 03:25 PM 12/25/01 -0800, you wrote:

Warren,

Upon further reflection, and without intending to withdraw any of my earlier comments on coin-tosses to decide American elections, I think that I have been too generally dismissive of your essential idea.

Here's the example that came first to mind to persuade me of a good use for your idea:

Let's say that, in a New York State gubernatorial election, and after the official count is in, candidate A leads candidate B by, say, 6 votes (or 16--I have no idea how high it could be before your plan would not be publicly accepted, but I think we both agree that its acceptability would be inversely correlated with the size of the difference in the counts for each candidate; in the limiting case of a draw, for example, the coin toss is already accepted).

Under current law, I believe, a recount would be mandatory, even though most people with at least one statistics course would not bet that the margin of difference in the recount would vary much from 6--plus or minus 3 or 4, let's say (assuming all counts are honest, and conducted by the same means). I think most taxpayers could be convinced--confronted with an example like this--that recounting, and recounting, and recounting again, in a very tight election, is not likely to converge on any firm winner, but is more likely to be no more (nor less) enlightening than was the very first count.

That established, and in the name of saving tax money (or reducing taxes--let's shoot the load), I think your idea could be written into New York State law as something like this: "Whenever the official final vote count of any statewide election has the winner less than two percent of the total vote behind the runner-up, the winner will be decided by a coin toss, between these two front-running candidates." (something like this--we can all quibble over the details)

Serious statisticians might want the percentage in this law to vary according to the size of the total vote, but I think there is a limit to how technical a law decided by a coin toss can be, for public consumption, and I prefer my simpler version as
written above.

So, I've changed my mind, and find there is indeed a useful place for your essential idea in the real world, Warren, and I think that saving tax dollars is a powerful incentive for its further consideration.

Other problems still remain, however, not the least being the legitimation problems for any candidate made, say, governor of New York by virtue of the flip of a coin. On the other hand, in times of grave crisis, I'd rather leave the fate of the government to a coin toss than to prolonged squabbling and legal action over which of two candidates had at least one more vote than the other, in an extremely large election.

In short, I'm guessing that your law would not be needed nor used very often, Warren, which would be a good thing, but whenever it was called into use, it could well do no less than to avert a major governmental crisis.

I welcome responses, as I'm sure does Warren, but of course.

-- Jim

********

---------- Forwarded message ----------
>Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 21:37:18 -0500
>From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
>Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
>
>Jim,
>How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.
>warren
>
>At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:
>
Your statistical reasoning here is—no surprise—unassailable. I think the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters."

This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at— and disillusioned with—democracy, in such an event.

So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius—and also a danger to society.

To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so—or at least not in America, bless her—any time soon.

Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote—won through countless wars against those who would enslave us—for whomever they damn well please, has much power indeed as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few human societies have lasted long without such things as this, and far fewer societies as large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be reduced to Super Bowl Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving Day parade.
Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the world safe for statistical inference—it worked for ol' Thomas Woodrow, it could work for us.

-- Jim

*******

On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use of "margin of error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has an error in it, and that the margin of victory any way the votes were counted by the newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the likely error in the counting process. To say it another way, elections cannot be accurately enough to know who has won when the margin is small.

This leads me to something I have thought for some time. The way election laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner in case of a tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the difficulty of getting an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and recounts, why not flip a coin when ever there is only a small margin between the top two candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be defined, but that is not my point here. I want to establish a principle that a small margin is as uncertain as tie and that elections should be decided by a neutral strategy under such circumstances.

warren mitofsky

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:

Initially, I reacted to this statement as Jan did. But then I wondered if Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to the margin of error associated with the Florida exit poll, which might be inferred from his previous sentence.

Larry McGill

Jan Werner wrote:
While I agree with much of what Hendrik Hertzberg says here, I would like to point out one egregious error. The author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an election, even if the actual error is large, the statistical "margin of error" will always be zero, because there is no sampling, and therefore, no random error due to the sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how journalists (and some pollsters) use the expression "margin of error" inappropriately.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

____________________

dick halpern wrote:

Interesting editorial comment about the presidential recount in this week's New Yorker magazine.

Dick Halpern

December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT by Hendrik Hertzberg

Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31

Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and
seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th. Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end. Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida
Supreme Court

had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel.

In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions. (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed, and smaller, too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7.
> million. Each of these close calls, as it happens,
> precipitated a
> > > > > serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral
> > College. In 1969,
> > > > > the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a
> > constitutional
> > > > > amendment calling for direct popular election;
> > President Nixon himself
> > > > > endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators
> > favored it, but it
> > > > > was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the
> > Senate. In 1977,
> > > > > President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met
> > the same fate. But
> > > > > at least there was an energetic national discussion,
> > in which most of
> > > > > the participants took it for granted that the election
> > of a President
> > > > > who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an
> > affront to
> > > > > democracy.
> > > > > The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found
> > their target in
> > > > > 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The
> > unthinkable
> > > > > happened, and the almost universal response was to not
> > think about it.
> > > > > The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are
> > three. First, the
> > > > > Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a
> > larger debate
> > > > > might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only
> > issue,
> > > > > obliterating the question of who won America. Second,
> > this time the
> > > > > political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical,
> > President was
> > > > > at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to
> > abolish the
> > > > > Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of
> > appearing to replay the past as well as reform the
> > > > > future. By the same
> > > > > token, the sitting President could float benignly above the
> > > > > conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however
> > narrowly, he was
> > > > > the people's choice.
> > > > > The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which
> > extinguished the
> > > > > last traces of any appetite for a discussion that
> > might call into
> > > > > question the legitimacy of a President who has his
> > hands full and who
> > > > > needs, and has, the support of a nation united in the
> > > > > struggle against
terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to
democracy had
already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic
system of
picking Presidents will be brought into line with the
fundamental
American idea of political equality among citizens. An
unhappy legacy
of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems
distant than
ever.
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Dear Warren and Jim:

The law, at least in NY, has the following provisions:

1) With an exact tie one flips a coin.

2) If one can prove that there are enough questionable votes to affect the outcome of the election one can have another election. This has happened. It actually does not require that many votes to make an election certain. Absent real fraud but just a few irregularities, the outcome of an election becomes certain with about 100-200 votes separating the candidates. This assumes that all votes are counted and there is no systematic fraud or bias. (I was involved in a case, where we used Private Investigators and asked people who had voted in error, who they voted for. We won and it was upheld on appeal by the state courts.)

What Warren is proposing is that in the latter case, flip a coin. This might make sense in the Presidential election since time is compressed, but I think barring the electors makes more sense, since for a given state if one does not know the outcome, then drop those electors.

The problem in Florida was different. We know that more people intended
and/or

thought they voted for Gore than voted for Bush. The counting was thwarted. Many

votes that plainly were intended for Gore were "unreapable."

VNS had it right by survey, it was too close to call. But it wasn’t too close
to
count, it just wasn’t completely counted.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
209 Kissena Hall
Queens College
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Home Phone: 914-337-6237
Home FAX: 914-337-8210

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
> Of James Beniger
> Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2001 12:07 PM
> To: Warren Mitofsky
> Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the
> NewYorker
> 
>   Warren,
>   
>   My feeling is that one is forced to choose between two positions: One
> must either believe--as it seems we both do, along with many generations
> of seamstresses and tailors--that all counts and measurements are
> stochastic processes, and therefore subject to random error, or else one
> believes that counts and measurements are determinate and absolute, that
> is, knowable in precisely the same way to all who care to know them
> honestly (I can't imagine that very many who understand the value and
> many applications of probability theory could believe this).
> 
>   That said, I think it important to separate legal processes from any
> evaluation of the closeness or accuracy of the vote, if the vote itself
> is counted by a body authorized by law to do so, and if the honesty of
> its members is not in question. My argument was that the conditions
> under which the vote count reverts to a coin toss must be precisely
> encoded *in* the law, and therefore not *itself* subject to further
> recounts or court challenges.
> 
>
The problem with recounts I think is obvious--just how many are we to have? The statisticians will, of course, tell us that the greater the number of recounts, the more accurate the count--let the final count go to the means for each candidate, as the number of counts goes to infinity. I don't think anyone wants this--we simply don't have time to wait around for the last of an infinite number of counts (nor even for a number of counts even crudely approximating that number).

And that said, I think it's obvious that I do agree with you about the importance and central role of the law here--my only hope is that the law comes into play *before* the fact (the election in question), and not afterward, in which case I would much prefer living with the candidate who wins the certified count by even a single vote (thereby swallowing all of my statistical inferences for my love of democratic process).

--

Jim

*******

On Tue, 25 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Jim,
> I did not mean to suggest we do away with recounts and court challenges. As far as I am concerned they are part of the process. My proposal is follows:
> those actions. If the final count has a small margin, say under 0.2%, then flip a coin. In the Florida election 0.2% was about 12,000 votes.

> One other comment, on the Kevin Sack article in the NY Times. The modern era of exit polling started in 1967 in the Kentucky gubernatorial race, not 1972 as Sack says.

warren

At 03:25 PM 12/25/01 -0800, you wrote:

> Warren,
> Upon further reflection, and without intending to withdraw any of my earlier comments on coin-tosses to decide American elections, I think that I have been too generally dismissive of your essential idea.

> Here's the example that came first to mind to persuade me of a good use for your idea:

> Let's say that, in a New York State gubernatorial election, and
after the official count is in, candidate A leads candidate B by, say, 6 votes (or 16--I have no idea how high it could be before your plan would not be publicly accepted, but I think we both agree that its acceptability would be inversely correlated with the size of the difference in the counts for each candidate; in the limiting case of a draw, for example, the coin toss is already accepted).

Under current law, I believe, a recount would be mandatory, even though most people with at least one statistics course would not bet that the margin of difference in the recount would vary much from 6--plus or minus 3 or 4, let's say (assuming all counts are honest, and conducted by the same means). I think most taxpayers could be convinced--confronted with an example like this--that recounting, and recounting, and recounting again, in a very tight election, is not likely to converge on any firm winner, but is more likely to be no more (nor less) enlightening than was the very first count.

That established, and in the name of saving tax money (or reducing taxes--let's shoot the load), I think your idea could be written into New York State law as something like this: "Whenever the official final vote count of any statewide election has the winner less than two percent of the total vote behind the runner-up, the winner will be decided by a coin toss, between these two front-running candidates." (something like this--we can all quibble over the details)

Serious statisticians might want the percentage in this law to vary according to the size of the total vote, but I think there is a limit to how technical a law decided by a coin toss can be, for public consumption, and I prefer my simpler version as written above.

So, I've changed my mind, and find there is indeed a useful place for your essential idea in the real world, Warren, and I think that saving tax dollars is a powerful incentive for its further consideration.

Other problems still remain, however, not the least being the legitimation problems for any candidate made, say, governor of New York by virtue of the flip of a coin. On the other hand,
in times of grave crisis, I'd rather leave the fate of the government to a coin toss than to prolonged squabbling and legal action over which of two candidates had at least one more vote than the other, in an extremely large election.

In short, I'm guessing that your law would not be needed nor used very often, Warren, which would be a good thing, but whenever it was called into use, it could well do no less than to avert a major governmental crisis.

I welcome responses, as I'm sure does Warren, but of course.

-- Jim

*******

-- Jim

This is a bargain that must be struck in advance of an election. Not after. The legislature should say something like this to the electorate as a rationale for its new law for deciding close elections:

Try as we may we know we just are not able to count votes accurately to the last vote. We try to be fair, but we just cannot get the count right. We think there are bound to be errors of (say) at least 0.2% in any attempt to count the vote. Therefore, what we will do after all attempts to verify and check the vote count is declare any election within a margin of 0.2% to be a tossup. All tossup elections will be decided by the flipping a coin. Or, all tossup elections will require a new election until one candidate wins by more than 0.2%.

How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded. warren

At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:

Warren,

Your statistical reasoning here is--no
surprise—unassailable. I think the major hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school systems teach our students about democracy long before our colleges (and some high schools, I would hope) teach them about statistical inference. And public service announcements and ads in the mass media only reinforce the public school slogans like "every vote counts" and "your vote matters." This being the case, I personally cannot see how the American public could be sold on the idea that if, say, A beats B by "only" 17 votes in a big city mayoral election, that election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin. Most people who voted for A, should she lose the coin toss under such circumstances, would be outraged at--and disillusioned with--democracy, in such an event. So if you can figure out how to sell your idea in a series of 20-second spots, I would consider you a genius--and also a danger to society. To put the same argument slightly differently but more concisely: "each person, one vote" is legitimating on its face, while statistical inference, though the most scientific approach we have under probabilistic conditions or uncertainty, is not in the least legitimated for elections today, nor can I envision it ever being so—or at least not in America, bless her--any time soon. Not even to mention that the mere act of "all" citizens of a democratic republic as large and as old as our own going to a neighborhood polling place on the same day to close behind them a curtain and secretly cast their precious vote--won through countless wars against those who would enslave us--for whomever they damn well please, has
much power indeed
as ceremony, rite, and collective public ritual. Few
human societies
have lasted long without such things as this, and far
greater
large as our own. Without voting days, we'd be
reduced to Super Bowl
Sunday, the Fourth of July, and Macy's Thanksgiving
Day parade.
Perhaps AAPORNET could launch a crusade to make the
world safe for
statistical inference--it worked for ol' Thomas
Woodrow, it could
work
for us.
-- Jim
*****
On Mon, 24 Dec 2001, Warren Mitofsky wrote:
I had a completely different reaction to Hertzberg's use
of "margin of
error." I assumed he meant that any counting operation has
an error in it,
and that the margin of victory any way the votes were
counted by the
newspaper consortium was too small to exceed the
likely error in the
counting process. To say it another way, elections
cannot be counted
accurately enough to know who has won when the margin
is small.
This leads me to something I have thought for some
time. The way
election
laws are written now a coin is tossed to decide the winner
in case of a
tie. I think that should be changed to recognize the
difficulty
of getting
an accurate vote count. After all the challenges and
recounts, why not flip
a coin when ever there is only a small margin between
the top two
candidates. The size of the small margin needs to be
defined, but
not my point here. I want to establish a principle
that a small
margin is
as uncertain as tie and that elections should be
decided by a neutral
strategy under such circumstances.

warren mitofsky

At 04:40 PM 12/21/01 -0500, Lawrence T McGill wrote:

But then I

wondered if

Hertzberg was referring (perhaps not too clearly) to

the margin

of error

associated with the Florida exit poll, which might

be inferred

from his

previous sentence.

Larry McGill

Jan Werner wrote:

While I agree with much of what Hendrik

Hertzberg says

here, I

would like to point out one egregious error. The

author writes:

In terms of those votes that were arguably

valid, Florida

still is

smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes

by which Bush

officially prevailed and smaller, too, than

the margin of

error.

In fact, when counting the votes cast in an
election, even if

the actual

error is large, the statistical "margin of error"

will always

be zero,

because there is no sampling, and therefore, no

random error

due to the

sampling process.

Unfortunately, this is all too typical of how

journalists (and some

pollsters) use the expression "margin of error"
inappropriately.

Jan Werner

jwerner@jwdp.com

____________________________
Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote recount in this week’s New Yorker magazine. Dick Halpern December 18, 2001

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

COMMENT -- RECOUNTED OUT

by Hendrik Hertzberg

Issue of 2001-12-24 and 31

Posted 2001-12-17

Is it O.K. to talk about the recount yet? It wasn't the right time on September 10th, because the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center had only just finished organizing the data gleaned from its meticulous examination of a hundred and seventy-five thousand uncounted Florida ballots. It wasn't on September 12th, because the news organizations that had commissioned the study were otherwise occupied. It was the right time on November 12th, apparently: that was the day the news organizations got around to publishing their analyses of the results. But, judging from the lack of discussion that has ensued, it abruptly became the wrong time again on November 13th.

Maybe it'll never be the right time. But what the hell. Let's talk about it anyway.

The first thing to say about the media recount (its formal name was the Florida Ballots Project) is that it was a praiseworthy endeavor well designed, unbiased, thorough, and public spirited. The consortium of news organizations its eight members were the New York Times, the
Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the Tribune Company, the Palm Beach Post, the St. Petersburg Times, CNN, and the Associated Press did something admirable.

The second thing to say is that the courage that spurred the consortium into existence, a year ago, flagged at the end.

Given that the consortium's goal was to catalogue all, or as many as possible, of the votes that had been cast by Florida citizens but not recorded by Florida authorities, one might have expected its members to emphasize the finding that corresponded to its goal. That finding, it turned out, was that, no matter what standard or combination of standards is applied, Al Gore got a handful more votes than George W. Bush. Faced with this conclusion, the consortium changed the question to who would have won if the original statewide recount had not been aborted. The reassuring answer to that question, again by a handful, was Bush.

It soon developed, however, that the news organizations had missed a crucial detail: if the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court had in fact gone forward, the circuit judge supervising it, Terry Lewis, probably would have directed the counting not only of "undervotes" (on which machines could detect no vote) but also of "overvotes" (on which machines detected markings for more than one candidate). The overvotes, according to the consortium's own numbers, would have yielded a hair-breadth victory for Gore. This news was uncovered by the Orlando Sentinel (which got its scoop the
old-fashioned way: a reporter picked up the phone and called the fellow) and by Michael Isikoff, of Newsweek, who found a contemporaneous memo from Lewis confirming what he told the Sentinel. In any case, there is no longer any doubt that more Florida voters intended to vote for Gore than for Bush: according to the Times, some eight thousand Gore overvotes, net, were lost because of bad design (the notorious "butterfly" of Palm Beach) or confusing instructions (the two-page Duval County "caterpillar" ballot, which directed voters to "vote all pages"). But those votes were irredeemably spoiled, and the consortium did not consider them. In terms of those votes that were arguably valid, Florida still is too close to call. In every scenario, the margins are smaller than the five hundred and thirty-seven votes by which Bush officially prevailed and smaller, too, than the margin of error. We do know, without question, that the losing candidate outpolled the winning one in the nation at large. In modern times this was unprecedented, but it had almost happened three times within living memory: in 1960, when J.F.K.'s plurality was barely a hundred thousand votes; in 1968, when Richard Nixon's margin was half a million (about the same as Gore's in 2000); and in 1976, when a geographic shift of twenty thousand votes would have given Gerald Ford an Electoral College victory despite Jimmy Carter's popular majority of 1.7 million. Each of these close calls, as it happens, precipitated a serious bipartisan effort to abolish the Electoral College. In 1969, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a constitutional
amendment calling for direct popular election; President Nixon himself endorsed it and a substantial majority of senators favored it, but it was filibustered to death after an epic debate in the Senate. In 1977, President Carter proposed the same idea, and it met the same fate. But at least there was an energetic national discussion, in which most of the participants took it for granted that the election of a President who had lost the popular vote would be in some way an affront to democracy.

The dodged bullets of the sixties and seventies found their target in 2000. Yet no real national discussion ensued. The unthinkable happened, and the almost universal response was to not think about it. The reasons for this are pretty obvious. There are three. First, the Florida imbroglio burned up all the oxygen in which a larger debate might have occurred. "Who won Florida?" became the only issue, obliterating the question of who won America. Second, this time the political legitimacy of an actual, not a hypothetical, President was at stake. After 1960, 1968, and 1976, those seeking to abolish the Electoral College could pursue their aim without the burden of appearing to replay the past as well as reform the future. By the same token, the sitting President could float benignly above the conversation, secure in the knowledge that, however narrowly, he was the people's choice. The third reason, of course, is September 11th, which extinguished the last traces of any appetite for a discussion that might call into question the legitimacy of a President who has his hands full and who needs, and has, the support of a nation united in
the struggle against terror. But by then, it must be said, the damage to democracy had already been done. Someday, perhaps, our anachronistic system of picking Presidents will be brought into line with the fundamental American idea of political equality among citizens. An unhappy legacy of the election of 2000 is that that day now seems more distant than ever.
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Poll: 71% of Palestinians support return to talks

By Lamia Lahoud

JERUSALEM (December 27) - A majority of Palestinians supports the call for a cease-fire and a return to negotiations with Israel, according to a new Palestinian public opinion poll published yesterday by the Palestinian Center for Survey and Policy Research.

Some 71% of Palestinians favor the immediate return to negotiations and some 60% support Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat's call for a cease-fire.

The poll was conducted between December 19 and 24 in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. A total of 1,357 people were interviewed face to face, and the poll has a margin of error of about 3%.

Another Palestinian poll released yesterday by the Palestinian Center for Public Opinion shows 54.4% support the call for a cease-fire, and demand that all political parties abide by Arafat's call to end the violence.

An almost equal amount of Palestinians, 54.2%, support the continuation of
the intifada.

This poll was conducted between December 12 and December 19 in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, and east Jerusalem sampling 1,212 Palestinians. It had a 2.8% margin of error.

Both polls show that a large majority opposes the arrests of Palestinian militants by the PA.

According to the PSR poll, 76% oppose the arrests and according to the second poll, 62.4% attribute the arrests to Israeli and US pressure.

This poll also indicates that a slight majority of 50.2% opposes Israeli-Palestinian security cooperation. However, the majority does not believe that a Palestinian civil war could break out as a result of the arrests.

According to the PSR poll, 61% of Palestinians believe that armed confrontation have helped achieve Palestinian rights "in ways that negotiations could not do," despite the fact that the Palestinians are much further away from a final-status agreement based on UN resolutions than during and after the Camp David talks under the government of Ehud Barak.

While over a third of those polled (37%) believe that circumstances sometimes justify the use of terror, and an overwhelming majority (no number available) does not view suicide bombings against Israeli civilians as terror, 73% support reconciliation following an agreement over a Palestinian state.

Both polls show an increase in Arafat's popularity over the past months.

The PSR poll states that Arafat's popularity reached 36%, up from 33% in July.

According to the Palestinian Center for Public Opinion Research, 54.5% of those polled support Arafat.

Senior West Bank Fatah leader Marwan Barghouti also gained a lot of popularity, scoring 11% when those polled were asked to rate their most popular leader in the PSR poll. During the first months of the intifada, only 2% considered him the most popular leader. Barghouti now rates third on the list of most popular
leaders, behind Arafat and Hamas spiritual leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin (14%).

Both polls show a decline in Hamas's popularity. According to the PSR poll, Hamas has the support of 25% of the Palestinians, compared to 27% in July. The second poll states that about 20.1% would vote for Hamas if elections were held immediately, while Fatah would gain 30% of the votes.

West Nank Preventive Security chief Jibril Rajoub said most of the Palestinians support the return to negotiations, and want to end the occupation through peaceful means. The positive reaction to Arafat's cease-fire orders on the ground show that the majority wants to move forward politically, and end the confrontation.

He said polls that showed an overwhelming support for attacks on Israelis and the continuation of the intifada in past weeks are a result of the population's frustration with their situation and living conditions, and a loss of hope.

Palestinian Authority officials said Arafat's speech has helped convince a majority of Palestinians that the cease-fire serves their interests. The crack-down on Islamic militants following the speech which led to clashes also reinforced the PA's authority, and made it clear to militants that the PA is serious this time, a senior Palestinian source said. That led to the declaration by Hamas saying the movement will freeze terror attacks inside Israel and mortar fire, the source added.

---

Copyright (C) 1995-2001 The Jerusalem Post - http://www.jpost.com
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(I ran across this on Drudgereport.com this a.m., is no doubt available on websites of the sponsors. There are a few more details, but this summarizes it)

Source: USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll of 1,019 adults conducted Dec. 14-16.
Margin of error: +/-3 percentage points

CRAWFORD, Texas - President Bush is admired by more Americans than any man since the Gallup Poll began asking "What man do you admire most?" in 1948. When the USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll asked respondents to name the living man they admired most, 39% chose Bush. Last year, President Clinton and Pope John Paul II tied for first place with 6%.
The poll was conducted Dec. 14-16. The margin of sampling error is +/-3 percentage points.
Among women, first lady Laura Bush was the most admired with 12%. Her predecessor, New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, came in second at 8%. Last year, before Bush took office, 5% identified him as the man they most admired, and his wife got too few mentions to be ranked. "Typically, the president wins," says Frank Newport, editor in chief of The Gallup Poll, "but the president doesn't usually dominate. That's why this 39% is unusual."
The previous record for men was set by John F. Kennedy, who received 32% in 1961, the end of his first year as president. The overall record was set in 1963, when Jacqueline Kennedy received 60% the month after her husband was assassinated.
Bush's response to the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington and the U.S. efforts in routing Osama bin Laden's supporters and sympathizers in Afghanistan are responsible for the strong showing, Newport says. "You've got a president who, in this time of crisis, has rallied the country. This is the classic rally effect."
Stephen Hess, a presidential scholar at the Brookings Institution in Washington, calls the results "quite remarkable." If the survey "had been taken on Sept. 12th, you could in a sense dismiss it. It would be a rally-round-the-flag issue. But when it is taken three months later, it factors in performance as well as symbolism. George W. Bush has the bully pulpit, and ... this is a huge vote of confidence for the way he has used it," Hess says.
Michael Hooper, who teaches political science at Temple University in Philadelphia and specializes in public opinion, notes that Americans are not viewing Bush as a political leader. "He's being looked at and evaluated right
now as the leader of the nation."
Most political experts were cautious about the long-range implications of Bush's standing for next year's congressional races and the presidential contest in 2004. They noted that the president's father had record approval ratings in the wake of the Persian Gulf War victory in 1991, only to see it erode into an election loss in 1992 because of a faltering economy.

Bush's position is even more remarkable when it is considered that mentions of political leaders in general and presidents in particular had waned over the last fifty years (Tom W. Smith, "Most Admired Man and Woman," POQ 50 (1986), 573-583).

Also, while only the future will tell whether Bush's high job approval ratings will continue or evaporate as his father's equally stratospheric ratings did, Bush is in a class by himself in regards to admiration. His current 39% rate is double his father's top rates in 1990 (16%) and 1991 (21%).

(I ran across this on Drudgereport.com this a.m., is no doubt available on websites of the sponsors. There are a few more details, but this summarizes it)
CRAWFORD, Texas - President Bush is admired by more Americans than any man since the Gallup Poll began asking "What man do you admire most?" in 1948. When the USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll asked respondents to name the living man they admired most, 39% chose Bush. Last year, President Clinton and Pope John Paul II tied for first place with 6%. The poll was conducted Dec. 14-16. The margin of sampling error is +/-3 percentage points.

Among women, first lady Laura Bush was the most admired with 12%. Her predecessor, New York Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, came in second at 8%. Last year, before Bush took office, 5% identified him as the man they most admired, and his wife got too few mentions to be ranked. "Typically, the president wins," says Frank Newport, editor in chief of The Gallup Poll, "but the president doesn't usually dominate. That's why this 39% is unusual."

The previous record for men was set by John F. Kennedy, who received 32% in 1961, the end of his first year as president. The overall record was set in 1963, when Jacqueline Kennedy received 60% the month after her husband was assassinated.

Bush's response to the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington and the U.S. efforts in routing Osama bin Laden's supporters and sympathizers in Afghanistan are responsible for the strong showing, Newport says. "You've got a president who, in this time of crisis, has rallied the country. This is the classic rally effect."

Stephen Hess, a presidential scholar at the Brookings Institution in Washington, calls the results "quite remarkable." If the survey "had been taken on Sept. 12th, you could in a sense dismiss it. It would be a rally-round-the-flag issue. But when it is taken three months later, it factors in performance as well as symbolism. George W. Bush has the bully pulpit, and ... this is a huge vote of confidence for the way he has used it," Hess says.

Michael Hooper, who teaches political science at Temple University in Philadelphia and specializes in public opinion, notes that Americans are not viewing Bush as a political leader. "He's being looked at and evaluated right now as the leader of the nation."

Most political experts were cautious about the long-range implications of Bush's standing for next year's congressional races and the presidential contest in 2004. They noted that the president's father had record approval ratings in the wake of the Persian Gulf War victory in 1991, only to see it erode into an election loss in 1992 because of a faltering economy.
CONSUMER CONFIDENCE JUMPS MORE THAN EIGHT POINTS

28 December 2001

The Conference Board's Consumer Confidence Index, which had declined dramatically over the past three months, rebounded in December. The Index now stands at 93.7 (1985=100), up from 84.9 in November. The Expectations Index rose sharply, from 77.3 to 91.5. The Present Situation Index increased slightly, from 96.2 to 96.9.

The Consumer Confidence Survey is based on a representative sample of 5,000 U.S. households. The monthly survey is conducted for The Conference Board by NFO WorldGroup, a member of The Interpublic Group of Companies (NYSE: IPG).

"The deterioration in current economic conditions appears to be reaching a plateau, led by a stabilizing employment scenario," says Lynn Franco, Director of The Conference Board's Consumer Research Center. "Consumers' short-term optimism is no longer at recession levels, and the upward trend signals that the economy may be close to bottoming out and that a rebound by mid-2002 is likely."

Consumers' appraisal of current economic conditions was slightly more positive than last month. Consumers rating conditions as "good" increased from 16.8 percent to 17.0 percent. However, those rating current business conditions as "bad" rose from 20.7 percent to 21.7 percent. Those reporting jobs were plentiful edged up from 17.5 percent to 17.6 percent. Those claiming jobs were "hard to get" declined from 22.7 percent to 21.8 percent.
Consumers are more optimistic about economic prospects six months from now. Those expecting an improvement in business conditions increased from 17.7 percent to 22.2 percent. Those anticipating conditions to worsen declined from 16.9 percent to 11.6 percent.

The employment outlook was also more positive. Currently, 16.1 percent of consumers expect more jobs to become available in the next six months, up from 14.4 percent last month. Those expecting fewer jobs to become available decreased from 26.3 percent to 19.3 percent. Regarding income expectations, 20.7 percent of consumers anticipate a gain, down from 22.0 percent in November.

http://www.conference-board.org/search/dpress.cfm

Copyright (C) 2001 - The Conference Board Inc
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An interesting commentary about the Consumer Confidence Index -- from this week's New Republic.
WHY NO ONE REALLY KNOWS HOW CONSUMERS FEEL. The New Republic
Confidence Game
by Rob Walker
Post date 12.13.01 | Issue date 12.24.01

Late last month the nation's newspapers offered yet another in what has
seemed a relentless series of bad economic tidings: The Consumer Confidence
Index had fallen yet again, from 85.3 to 82.2, its lowest level since 1994.
This was bad news indeed--bad enough to make the Dow Jones drop 110 points.
Indeed, in the twitchy postSeptember 11 economy, consumer confidence has
become the It Statistic. With business investment shrinking and the markets
on the fritz, free-spending shoppers are considered the last line of
defense against a disastrous economic slide. An ongoing crumbling of
consumer confidence--despite White House exhortations to get out there and
spend for the sake of the commonweal--spelled real trouble.

Or did it? After all, just a few days earlier, a different gauge, the Index
of Consumer Sentiment, had risen, suggesting a rebound in consumer
confidence. Actual retail sales, moreover, had spiked in October--up 7.1
percent over the previous month after having fallen 2.2 percent in
September. Finally, this news of deepening consumer doubt came right after
we'd all seen the footage on the evening news of American shoppers lining
up at 3 a.m. for the annual after-Thanksgiving sprint through department
stores to buy up discounted television sets and so on. Admittedly, those
early-morning shoppers were just snapping up bargains, and the October
retail sales jump could be explained largely by cheap auto-financing deals.
But that shouldn't matter if all you're trying to measure are what John
Maynard Keynes called "animal spirits." And however you explain it,
American consumers were looking a good deal more spirited than they had in
September.

All of which means that when you hear a concept as vague as "consumer
confidence" attached to a number as specific as 82.2, it's a good idea to
start asking questions.

The Consumer Confidence Index (CCI) is compiled by an arm of a nonprofit
business-research organization (annual budget: about $50 million) with the
pleasingly vague but officious-sounding name The Conference Board. A
marketing-firm subcontractor, NFO Worldwide, conducts the underlying survey
by mail. Although it's routinely described as a survey of 5,000 households,
only about 3,500 generally return the form. The form essentially asks for a
positive, negative, or neutral response to five questions about current and
future business conditions.

So it's a poll.

Polls have their place, of course, but simply reporting that "x" percent of
Americans surveyed feel "positive" about business conditions doesn't really
seem like the kind of news that should be dominating business coverage and
roiling the stock market. After all, polls from Harris and Gallup also
address basic consumer confidence issues, and they never make the same
splash that the confidence indexes do. Which goes to show that when you're
trying to numberize a slippery idea like sentiment, an "index" trumps a
"poll" every time.

How does the Conference Board convert its poll into an index? By combining the responses to its five questions and converting the resulting figure into a composite number "relative" to a benchmark score of 100.0 for 1985. (Why does 1985 equal 100 on this scale? Because it was "a basic, noneventful year," explains Lynn Franco, director of the Conference Board's Consumer Research Center, offering some insight into the formal science of consumer confidence.) The upshot is a number that can be easily compared over time, and seems conclusive. In August consumer confidence was flying high at 114.3; following the terrorist attacks and three months of bad economic news, it had dropped to 82.2, a decline of 28 percent. See how scientific that was?

The Conference Board's chief rival in this confidence game is the University of Michigan's Index of Consumer Sentiment. In this case, 500 households are surveyed by phone, and the questionnaire is longer and more detailed. Nevertheless, the answers here are also boiled down to five categories and finessed into an index similar to the Conference Board's. (Michigan's "base" year is 1966.) Most of the time the two indexes move in sync, but the Michigan survey, after dipping to 81.8 in September, rose slightly in October and November, and then again this month, to stand at 85.8.

Why do the two indexes show the confidence trend moving in opposite directions? It depends whom you ask. The Conference Board's Franco--after noting that the Michigan survey draws on a smaller sample--suggests the difference might be that two of her survey's five questions deal with employment, compared with only one of Michigan's. (This means, by the way, that when cnbc anchor Tyler Mathison exclaims, "Confidence is all about jobs," in the course of interviewing someone from the Conference Board, as he did recently, what he's articulating is not a fundamental truth the CCI has revealed about the economy, but rather a fundamental truth about the CCI's methodology.) Meanwhile, Michigan survey director Richard Curtin--after noting that the Conference board's less-nuanced survey is outsourced and conducted by mail--suggests the difference might also stem from the fact that Michigan's future-looking questions have a one-year, not a six-month, time horizon, and that its inquiries about assumed spending-power take inflation, or the apparent lack of it, into account.

Both the University of Michigan and the Conference Board claim their surveys have predictive value--which is why they get so much attention. But which is the more accurate predictor? In 1998 the New York Fed compared the two surveys and generally found the CCI to be more predictive of future consumption growth. (Not surprisingly, Franco pointed me to this study.) But here's where things get interesting. Because the Fed's survey also indicated that the CCI is less predictive than some of the component numbers that make it up. That is to say, the arithmetic rigmarole that goes into producing the complicated, "scientific" index numbers arguably makes them less accurate.

Although it doesn't get much attention, both the Conference Board and the Michigan indexes are each made up of two sub-indexes, one concerning present conditions and one concerning future conditions. In the case of the Conference Board's survey, respondents are asked to give a positive,
negative, or neutral "appraisal of current business conditions" and "appraisal of current employment conditions." Answers to those two questions are numberized, benchmarked to 1985, and reported as the Present Situation Index. Three more questions ask respondents for a positive, negative, or neutral take on "expectations regarding business conditions," "expectations regarding employment conditions," and "expectations regarding their total family income." Those answers become the numerical Expectations Index. The two sub-indexes are combined to create the overall Consumer Confidence Index. (The Michigan survey does more or less the same thing, making one sub-index from its two present-focused categories, and another from its three future-focused ones, and combining the two to come up with its overall figure.)

A good example of how the sub-indexes get glossed over (despite being more predictive in at least some cases) came in the Conference Board's November report. It found that although the all-important CCI number was down, the Expectations Index had actually risen. This latter finding seems to make more sense, given the evidence--and it would jibe with the findings of the Michigan index. But it was largely ignored at the time. (Though it's worth noting that now the Conference Board can claim its findings are vindicated regardless of whether things get better or worse.)

So why do the overall indexes get all the attention? Presumably because they cover more territory, encompassing the way consumers feel about today and tomorrow--never mind that the additional vagueness may make them less useful. Michigan, which has been running its survey since late 1946 (20 years before the CCI was launched), actually didn't begin pouring its data into a single, clean index number until 1952. Curtin explains that "the media didn't want to hear" some complex set of survey answers that were subject to interpretation; "they wanted to know, `Is [consumer confidence] better or worse?'" Curtin himself refers to the resulting index as "a communication device."

Indeed, if you look closely at the surveys that make up the two indexes, you discover not only that the parts are more interesting than the sum, but that other data--which doesn't even go into the final index numbers--are the most interesting of all. When Michigan's monthly number is announced, the release also highlights assorted nuggets culled from the phone survey--for example, consumers expect inflation over the next year to be its lowest since the 1950s and anticipate an unemployment rate of 6.5 percent--which are largely ignored in the press. Similarly, in addition to its vague multiple-choice questions, the Conference Board's mail survey also makes several specific queries about recipients' spending plans--whether they intend to buy a car (new or used), a house, or various appliances (TV set, refrigerator, etc.). Despite being more specific and, presumably, more predictive than responses to the general questions--after all, any given respondent probably has a better idea of whether she's going to buy a car in the next six months than she does of overall employment trends--none of this information winds up in the overall indexes.

Of course, none of this means that consumer confidence, as a concept, doesn't matter, or that it's not worth trying to gauge. But the importance the indexes have taken on lately is almost farcical. (Apparently stocks sold off after the most recent Conference Board announcement partly because economists "expected" the index to come in at 86.5; the idea that there are economists actually trying to predict what this figure will be is too dismal to dwell on.) The attraction of the all-in-one composite index
numbers is not just that they seem to take everything into account, but that they're expressed so decisively--they sound like facts, like the sorts of figures that deserve a place next to weekly jobless claims, monthly nonfarm payroll reports, or quarterly GDP. But of all the information that Michigan and the Conference Board gather, that official-seeming number is probably the least interesting. Too bad it gets all the attention.

ROB WALKER writes the "Moneybox" column for Slate.com.

 late last month the nation's newspapers offered yet another in what has seemed a relentless series of bad economic tidings: The Consumer Confidence Index had fallen yet again, from 85.3 to 82.2, its lowest level since 1994. This was bad news indeed--bad enough to make the Dow Jones drop 110 points. Indeed, in the twitchy postSeptember 11 economy, consumer confidence has become the It Statistic. With business investment shrinking and the markets on the fritz, free-spending shoppers are considered the last line of defense against a disastrous economic slide. An ongoing crumbling of consumer confidence--despite White House exhortations to get out there and spend for the sake of the commonweal--spelled real trouble.

 Or did it? After all, just a few days earlier, a different gauge, the Index of Consumer Sentiment, had risen, suggesting a rebound in consumer confidence. Actual retail sales, moreover, had spiked in October--up 7.1 percent over the previous month after having fallen 2.2 percent in September. Finally, this news of deepening consumer doubt came right after we'd all seen the footage on the evening news of American shoppers lining up at 3 a.m. for the annual after-Thanksgiving sprint through department stores to buy up discounted television sets and so on. Admittedly,
those early-morning shoppers were just snapping up bargains, and the October retail sales jump could be explained largely by cheap auto-financing deals. But that shouldn't matter if all you're trying to measure are what John Maynard Keynes called "animal spirits." And however you explain it, American consumers were looking a good deal more spirited than they had in September. All of which means that when you hear a concept as vague as "consumer confidence" attached to a number as specific as 82.2, it's a good idea to start asking questions.

The Consumer Confidence Index (CCI) is compiled by an arm of a nonprofit business-research organization (annual budget: about $50 million) with the pleasingly vague but officious-sounding name The Conference Board. A marketing-firm subcontractor, NFO Worldwide, conducts the underlying survey by mail. Although it's routinely described as a survey of 5,000 households, only about 3,500 generally return the form. The form essentially asks for a positive, negative, or neutral response to five questions about current and future business conditions.

So it's a poll. Polls have their place, of course, but simply reporting that "x" percent of Americans surveyed feel "positive" about business conditions doesn't really seem like the kind of news that should be dominating business coverage and roiling the stock market. After all, polls from Harris and Gallup also address basic consumer confidence issues, and they never make the same splash that the confidence indexes do. Which goes to show that when you're trying to numberize a slippery idea like sentiment, an "index" trumps a "poll" every time. How does the Conference Board convert its poll into an index? By combining the responses to its five questions and converting the resulting figure into a composite number "relative" to a benchmark score of 100.0 for 1985. (Why does 1985 equal 100 on this scale? Because it was a basic, noneventful year," explains Lynn Franco, director of the Conference Board's Consumer Research Center, offering some insight into the formal science of consumer
confidence.) The upshot is a number that can be easily compared over time, and
seems conclusive. In August consumer confidence was flying high at 114.3; following the
terrorist attacks and three months of bad economic news, it had dropped to 82.2, a
decline of 28 percent. See how scientific that was? <br>The Conference Board's chief rival in this confidence game is the University of Michigan's Index of Consumer Sentiment. In this case, 500 households are surveyed by phone, and the questionnaire is longer and more detailed. Nevertheless, the answers here are also boiled down to five categories and finessed into an index similar to the Conference Board's. (Michigan's "base" year is 1966.) Most of the time the two indexes more or less move in sync, but the Michigan survey, after dipping to 81.8 in September, rose slightly in October and November, and then again this month, to stand at 85.8.<br>Why do the two indexes show the confidence trend moving in opposite directions? It depends whom you ask. The Conference Board's Franco--after noting that the Michigan survey draws on a smaller sample--suggests the difference might be that two of her survey's five questions deal with employment, compared with only one of Michigan's. (This means, by the way, that when cnbc anchor Tyler Mathison exclaims, "Confidence is all about jobs," in the course of interviewing someone from the Conference Board, as he did recently, what he's articulating is not a fundamental truth the CCI has revealed about the economy, but rather a fundamental truth about the CCI's methodology.) Meanwhile, Michigan survey director Richard Curtin--after noting that the Conference board's less-nuanced survey is outsourced and conducted by mail--suggests the difference might also stem from the fact that Michigan's future-looking questions have a one-year, not a six-month, time horizon, and that its inquiries about assumed spending-power take inflation, or the apparent lack of it, into account. <br>Both the University of Michigan and the Conference Board claim their surveys have predictive value--which is why they get so much attention. But which is the more accurate predictor? In 1998 the New York Fed compared the two surveys and generally found the CCI to be more predictive of future consumption growth. (Not surprisingly, Franco pointed me to this study.) But here's where things
get interesting. Because the Fed's survey also indicated that the CCI is less predictive than some of the component numbers that make it up. That is to say, the arithmetic rigmarole that goes into producing the complicated, "scientific" index numbers arguably makes them less accurate. Although it doesn't get much attention, both the Conference Board and the Michigan indexes are each made up of two sub-indexes, one concerning present conditions and one concerning future conditions. In the case of the Conference Board's survey, respondents are asked to give a positive, negative, or neutral "appraisal of current business conditions" and "appraisal of current employment conditions." Answers to those two questions are numberized, benchmarked to 1985, and reported as the Present Situation Index. Three more questions ask respondents for a positive, negative, or neutral take on "expectations regarding business conditions," "expectations regarding employment conditions," and "expectations regarding their total family income." Those answers become the numerical Expectations Index. The two sub-indexes are combined to create the overall Consumer Confidence Index. (The Michigan survey does more or less the same thing, making one sub-index from its two present-focused categories, and another from its three future-focused ones, and combining the two to come up with its overall figure.) A good example of how the sub-indexes get glossed over (despite being more predictive in at least some cases) came in the Conference Board's November report. It found that although the all-important CCI number was down, the Expectations Index had actually risen. This latter finding seems to make more sense, given the evidence--and it would jibe with the findings of the Michigan index. But it was largely ignored at the time. (Though it's worth noting that now the Conference Board can claim its findings are vindicated regardless of whether things get better or worse.) So why do the overall indexes get all the attention? Presumably because they cover more territory, encompassing the way consumers feel about today and tomorrow--never mind that the additional vagueness may make them less useful. Michigan, which has been running its survey since late 1946 (20 years before the CCI was launched), actually didn't begin pouring its data into a single, clean
index number until 1952. Curtin explains that “the media didn't want to hear some complex set of survey answers that were subject to interpretation; they wanted to know, ‘Is [consumer confidence] better or worse?’ Curtin himself refers to the resulting index as “a communication device.” Indeed, if you look closely at the surveys that make up the two indexes, you discover not only that the parts are more interesting than the sum, but that other data—which doesn't even go into the final index numbers—are the most interesting of all. When Michigan's monthly number is announced, the release also highlights assorted nuggets culled from the phone survey—for example, consumers expect inflation over the next year to be its lowest since the 1950s and anticipate an unemployment rate of 6.5 percent—which are largely ignored in the press. Similarly, in addition to its vague multiple-choice questions, the Conference Board's mail survey also makes several specific queries about recipients' spending plans—whether they intend to buy a car (new or used), a house, or various appliances (TV set, refrigerator, etc.). Despite being more specific and, presumably, more predictive than responses to the general questions—after all, any given respondent probably has a better idea of whether she's going to buy a car in the next six months than she does of overall employment trends—none of this information winds up in the overall indexes. Of course, none of this means that consumer confidence, as a concept, doesn't matter, or that it's not worth trying to gauge. But the importance the indexes have taken on lately is almost farcical. (Apparently stocks sold off after the most recent Conference Board announcement partly because economists “expected” the index to come in at 86.5; the idea that there are economists actually trying to predict what this figure will be is too dismal to dwell on.) The attraction of the all-in-one composite index numbers is not just that they seem to take everything into account, but that they're expressed so decisively—they sound like facts, like the sorts of
figures that deserve a place next to weekly jobless claims, monthly nonfarm payroll reports, or quarterly GDP. But of all the information that Michigan and the Conference Board gather, that official-seeming number is probably the least interesting. Too bad it gets all the attention. ROB WALKER writes the "Moneybox" column for Slate.com.
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Growing Apart

The mathematical evidence for Congress' growing polarization.

By Jordan Ellenberg

The bipartisan era didn't last long. Three months after 9/11, the unity that Congress promised has evaporated. Should we be surprised? Political scientists Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal are not. According to their research, there's no evidence that a national crisis -- Pearl Harbor, World War I, the Kennedy assassination -- can produce even a short spike in legislative fellow-feeling, let alone a lasting change in political culture. So it's to be expected that the shockwave of September, while big enough to upend a tyranny on another continent, will not create a ripple -- statistically speaking -- in the business of Washington.

Poole and Rosenthal found that the House and Senate grew steadily less polarized from around 1900 to 1980. Then something happened; polarization has been sharply increasing ever since.

Can "polarization" really be quantified? Poole and Rosenthal argue
convincingly that it can and that even more delicate information about the political universe can be coaxed out of raw statistics. In order to explain what I mean, I have to tell you why we make maps of New Jersey.

We make maps of New Jersey because doing so is a superlatively concise way of organizing the vast amount of geographical data that New Jersey embodies. Glancing at the map, one sees instantly that Trenton is about 10 miles from Princeton but 70 miles from Hackensack; that Hackensack in turn is just 6 miles from Passaic but 70 miles from Frenchtown. If you'd never heard of maps, you could certainly store in a spreadsheet the numerical data of the distances between every pair of cities in New Jersey. You'd have exactly the same information. But you wouldn't know what New Jersey looks like.

When it comes to visualizing American politics, Poole and Rosenthal believe, we're a lot like the person navigating New Jersey with the massive spreadsheet but no map. Anyone can tell you that Barbara Boxer is politically closer to Dianne Feinstein than she is to Zell Miller. One could even quantify this "closeness" by computing the proportion of roll-call votes on which Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein agreed. But can we use all this numerical information to produce a "map" of the U.S. Senate? Put another way, if we know the distance between each pair of cities, can we reproduce the map of New Jersey?

Yes, and much more. Using a mathematical technique called multidimensional scaling (MDS), we can make a map of any set of points if we know how "close" each pair of points is supposed to be. Researchers have used MDS to make maps of family relationships (scroll down to Figure 5, "Example"), emotions, and even rock bands.

Poole and Rosenthal don't use MDS but a technique of their own and a computer program called DW-NOMINATE to produce a two-dimensional map of the House and the Senate.

A statistical method is fundamentally sound only if it tells you things you
already know. The DW-NOMINATE maps tell us, first of all, that throughout the last 100 years both houses of Congress have split into two grand clusters, Democrats and Republicans. Within the Democrats, the Northern and Southern members form two clusters. Sometimes the Northern and Southern Democrats meld into each other without a gap, and other times (especially in the 1940s and '50s) the two clusters are so distant that they seem to constitute two different parties.

The other thing about Congress we already know is that politicians naturally fall on a left-right axis. And indeed, the legislators on the left-hand side of the DW-NOMINATE maps are precisely the ones we think of as "furthest left." In the 106th Senate, for instance, the senator furthest to the left is Barbara Boxer, followed by Paul Wellstone and Tom Harkin. The rightmost senator is Phil Gramm, followed by Oklahoma's James Inhofe and Colorado's Wayne Allard. The rightmost Democrat? Easily Zell Miller of Georgia. The leftmost Republican? Arlen Specter just beats out Jim Jeffords. To see the numbers for every senator and member of the House, look at the data pages.

We don't need mathematics to tell us that Wellstone and Inhofe are far apart. But the mathematics assigns quantities to these qualitative observations based on their roll-call votes, allowing us to answer more fine-grained questions. We can, for instance, assign a numerical value to the "polarization level" of the House and Senate and track the changes in this number over time. Poole and Rosenthal have taken this analysis still further. They show that legislatures become more polarized not when individual politicians adopt more extreme views, but when they are unseated by more extreme politicians. Polarization, as they put it, is an effect of replacement, not conversion.

Still more impressive than the numbers are the pictures. As you watch the animated GIF of the House and Senate from 1879 through the present, you can see the two great clusters circle each other, trying to capture the center. You can see that the two chambers of Congress move in tandem, belying the Senate's supposed immunity
to the winds of fashion that bat

the House around. And around 1985, something -- nobody is exactly sure what -- happened, with polarization sharply increasing ever since. On

the animated GIF, you can see the Democrats and the Republicans jerk apart, leaving an empty space between them that persists, war or no war, to the present day.

But the most startling finding isn't visible in the pictures. Let's go beyond left and right for a moment and ask: What does the vertical axis on the DW-NOMINATE map mean? Senators at the top of the map include John Breaux and Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Peter Fitzgerald of Illinois, and George Voinovich of Ohio. At the bottom we find Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins of Maine, Arlen Specter again, and Robert Byrd. Poole and Rosenthal theorize that the vertical dimension describes a legislator's stance on race, with Northeastern, pro-civil rights politicians near the bottom and Southerners near the top. That seems somewhat right -- but then, Byrd is no one's image of a modern racial liberal. The reason the vertical axis doesn't seem to say that much, Poole and Rosenthal suggest, is that race is no longer the polarizing issue it was 30 years ago. Today's Congress is governed by the calculus of left and right -- that and not much else.

To be more precise, let's go back to New Jersey. Suppose you had data for only three towns, called A, B, and C. Let's say the distance between towns A and B was 1 mile, between B and C was 1 mile, and between A and C was 2 miles. A minute's thought should convince you that towns A, B, and C must lie on a straight line. On the other hand, suppose there were four towns, A, B, C, and D, and suppose the distance between any pair of towns is exactly 1 mile. Try to draw four points on a map with this property -- you'll find it's impossible. In fact, the only way to situate four points such that each is 1 mile from all the others is to place the four points in three-dimensional space, in a configuration called a regular tetrahedron.

In the first situation, the two dimensions of a map are superfluous. One
dimension would suffice to describe the locations of the three towns along the line. In the second situation, the two dimensions are not enough. We need to introduce more dimensions to obtain the desired distances. In both cases, the data tells us the "true dimension" of the configuration of towns.

With this picture in mind, we can state Poole and Rosenthal's most remarkable finding: For the last 40 years, both houses have been one-dimensional. That is, you can pretend that Congress is a set of points on a straight line with Barbara Boxer at one end and Phil Gramm at the other, and you can pretend that each vote is a mark on that line. Everyone to the left of the mark will vote one way, and everyone to the right the other way. It turns out that this crude model -- which knows nothing about geography, gender, race, lobbies, exigencies, ideas, or history -- correctly predicts more than 80 percent of votes cast. In the last 15 years, as Democrats and Republicans have drifted further apart, the one-dimensionality of Congress has increased apace. At the moment, the one-dimensional model gets over 85 percent of roll-call votes right. "People were surprised," Rosenthal says, "that such a simple model can explain so much of the data."

Surprised, and maybe disappointed, too. You might want to think your representative is, at every moment, incorporating your interests into a delicate and ever-shifting computation -- something more nuanced than "As a 70 percent liberal, 30 percent conservative senator, my position is clear." You might get depressed if you think that American politics has degenerated into a straight-up dialectic between two weird agglomerates: affirmative action, teachers unions, and Social Security over here, the defense budget, tax cuts, and cheerleading for heterosexuality over there.

But Poole and Rosenthal's work, which now extends to many different countries and many different times, shows that one-dimensional legislatures are not degenerations of normal politics. They are normal politics. There have been two periods in American history when the legislature wasn't one-dimensional. One was the
1950s, when the Democrats split over civil rights. The other was the period after the Compromise of 1850 fell apart. One-dimensional voting breaks down, it seems, with the arrival of a new issue so divisive as to stretch the political world along its own axis and so fundamental as to strain the bonds of convention that keep the government running smoothly. Maybe we don't want the war on terrorism to be an issue like that. Maybe we should be thankful that, for the moment, Paul Wellstone is staying Paul Wellstone and James Inhofe, James Inhofe. In times like ours, partisanship could be an underrated virtue.

What About Barry Bonds? Many people have written me about my assertion in July that "Barry Bonds isn't going to hit 72 home runs," and asked what went wrong with my analysis. Answer: Nothing. In July, it was extremely unlikely that Bonds would break the home run record. One great thing about baseball is that players sometimes accomplish the unlikely. (Ask Tony Womack.) If you bet a hundred bucks at the All-Star Break that Bonds would hit 73 home runs, you made a dumb bet. Now you've got a hundred bucks; it was still a dumb bet.

Related on the Web

What happened in the 1980s to re-polarize the Congress? The competing theories are discussed in Poole and Rosenthal's article, "The Polarization of American Politics," one of many good reads at Poole's page. You can also read about the mathematics of the Clinton impeachment and see where recent presidents fit on the left-right dimension. Elsewhere on Poole's Web page you can learn more about the technicalities of DW-NOMINATE and even download data and software to play with on your own.

If you can map Congress, you should also be able to map the Supreme Court; Bernard Grofman and Timothy Brazill have done just that.

-------

Jordan Ellenberg is an assistant professor of mathematics at Princeton University.
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Islamic states lag on freedom, global survey finds
December 18, 2001 Posted: 9:29 AM EST (1429 GMT)
By Claire Soares
WASHINGTON -- Islamic states lag behind the rest of the world when it comes to freedom, with a non-Islamic country three times more likely to be democratic, a report on worldwide human rights showed on Tuesday.
Freedom House, in its annual report, found 75 percent of non-Islamic nations were
electoral democracies, compared with 23 percent of Islamic states. "There is a growing chasm between the Islamic community and the rest of the world," Freedom House President Adrian Karatnycky said in a statement. "Democratic voices are opposed not only by tyrannical regimes but also by powerful Islamic political forces, some of them supported by the power of the mosque," Karatnycky added. Mali was the only country with an Islamic majority rated "free" by Freedom House. The Washington-based nonprofit, non-partisan group, which issues its human rights list every year, was founded nearly 60 years ago by former U.S. first lady Eleanor Roosevelt, among others. It includes business and labor leaders, scholars, writers and U.S. government officials. This year, the group tagged 18 Islamic countries "partly free" and 28 "not free." The latter group included Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia and Afghanistan." ... For the full story see: http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/meast/12/18/rights.freedom.survey.reut/index.html /// How Islam Lost Its Way
Yesterday's Achievements Were Golden; Today, Reason Has Been Eclipsed
By Pervez Amir Ali Hoodbhoy
Sunday, December 30, 2001; Page B04
The Washington Post, Outlook section
ISLAMABAD, Pakistan -- If the world is to be spared what future historians may call the "century of terror," we will have to chart a perilous course between the Scylla of American imperial arrogance and the Charybdis of Islamic religious fanaticism. Through these waters, we must steer by a distant star toward a careful, reasoned, democratic, humanistic and secular future. Otherwise, shipwreck is certain. For nearly four months now, leaders of the Muslim community in the United States, and even President Bush, have routinely asserted that Islam is a religion of peace that was hijacked by fanatics on Sept. 11. These two assertions are simply untrue. First, Islam -- like Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism or any other religion -- is not about peace. Nor is it about war. Every religion is about absolute belief in its own superiority and the divine right to impose its version of truth upon others. In medieval times, both the Crusades and the Jihads were soaked in blood. Today, there are Christian fundamentalists who attack abortion clinics in the
United States and kill doctors; Muslim fundamentalists who wage their sectarian wars against each other; Jewish settlers who, holding the Old Testament in one hand and Uzis in the other, burn olive orchards and drive Palestinians off their ancestral land; and Hindus in India who demolish ancient mosques and burn down churches. The second assertion is even further off the mark. Even if Islam had, in some metaphorical sense, been hijacked, that event did not occur three months ago. It was well over seven centuries ago that Islam suffered a serious trauma, the effects of which refuse to go away. Where do Muslims stand today? Note that I do not ask about Islam; Islam is an abstraction. Maulana Abdus Sattar Edhi, Pakistan's preeminent social worker, and the Taliban's Mohammad Omar are both followers of Islam, but the former is overdue for a Nobel Peace Prize while the latter is an ignorant, psychotic fiend. Palestinian writer Edward Said, among others, has insistently pointed out that Islam holds very different meaning for different people. Within my own family, hugely different kinds of Islam are practiced. The religion is as heterogeneous as those who believe and follow it. There is no "true Islam." Today, Muslims number 1 billion. Of the 48 countries with a full or near Muslim majority, none has yet evolved a stable democratic political system. In fact, all Muslim countries are dominated by self-serving corrupt elites who cynically advance their personal interests and steal resources from their people. None of these countries has a viable educational system or a university of international stature. Reason, too, has been waylaid. You will seldom see a Muslim name as you flip through scientific journals, and if you do, the chances are that this person lives in the West. There are a few exceptions: Pakistani Abdus Salam, together with Americans Steven Weinberg and Sheldon Glashow, won the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1979. I got to know Salam reasonably well; we even wrote a book preface together. He was a remarkable man, terribly in love with his country and his religion. And yet he died deeply unhappy, scorned by Pakistan, declared a non-Muslim by an act of the Pakistani parliament in 1974. Today the Ahmadi sect, to which Salam belonged, is considered heretical and harshly persecuted. (My
next-door neighbor, an Ahmadi physicist, was shot in the neck and heart and died in my car as I drove him to the hospital seven years ago. His only fault was to have been born into the wrong sect.) Though genuine scientific achievement is rare in the contemporary Muslim world, pseudo-science is in generous supply. A former chairman of my department has calculated the speed of heaven: He maintains it is receding from Earth at one centimeter per second less than the speed of light. His ingenious method relies upon a verse in the Islamic holy book, which says that worship on the night on which the book was revealed is worth a thousand nights of ordinary worship. He states that this amounts to a time-dilation factor of 1,000, which he puts into a formula of Einstein's theory of special relativity. A more public example: One of two Pakistani nuclear engineers recently arrested on suspicion of passing nuclear secrets to the Taliban had earlier proposed to solve Pakistan's energy problems by harnessing the power of genies. He relied on the Islamic belief that God created man from clay, and angels and genies from fire; so this highly placed engineer proposed to capture the genies and extract their energy. Today's sorry situation contrasts starkly with the Islam of yesterday. Between the 9th and 13th centuries -- the Golden Age of Islam -- the only people doing decent work in science, philosophy or medicine were Muslims. Muslims not only preserved ancient learning, they also made substantial innovations. The loss of this tradition has proven tragic for Muslim peoples. Science flourished in the Golden Age of Islam because of a strong rationalist and liberal tradition, carried on by a group of Muslim thinkers known as the Mutazilites. But in the 12th century, Muslim orthodoxy reawakened, spearheaded by the Arab cleric Imam Al-Ghazali. Al-Ghazali championed revelation over reason, predestination over free will. He damned mathematics as being against Islam, an intoxicant of the mind that weakened faith. Caught in the viselike grip of orthodoxy, Islam choked. No longer would Muslim, Christian and Jewish scholars gather and work together in the royal courts. It was the end of tolerance, intellect and science in the Muslim world. The last great Muslim thinker, Abd-
Rahman Ibn Khaldun, belonged to the 14th century. Meanwhile, the rest of the world moved on. The Renaissance brought an explosion of scientific inquiry in the West.

This owed much to translations of Greek works carried out by Arabs and other Muslim contributions, but they were to matter little. Mercantile capitalism and technological progress drove Western countries -- in ways that were often brutal and at times genocidal -- to rapidly colonize the Muslim world from Indonesia to Morocco.

It soon became clear, at least to some of the Muslim elites, that they were paying a heavy price for not possessing the analytical tools of modern science and the social and political values of modern culture -- the real source of power of their colonizers. Despite widespread resistance from the orthodox, the logic of modernity found 19th-century Muslim adherents. Some seized on the modern idea of the nation-state. It is crucial to note that not a single Muslim nationalist leader of the 20th century was a fundamentalist. However, Muslim and Arab nationalism, part of a larger anti-colonial nationalist current across the Third World, included the desire to control and use national resources for domestic benefit. The conflict with Western greed was inevitable. The imperial interests of Britain, and later the United States, feared independent nationalism. Anyone willing to collaborate was preferred, even the ultraconservative Islamic regime of Saudi Arabia. In 1953, Mohammed Mosaddeq of Iran was overthrown in a CIA coup, replaced by Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. Britain targeted Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser. Indonesia's Sukarno was replaced by Suharto after a bloody coup that left hundreds of thousands dead. Pressed from outside, corrupt and incompetent from within, secular Muslim governments proved unable to defend national interests or deliver social justice. They began to frustrate democracy to preserve their positions of power and privilege. These failures left a vacuum that Islamic religious movements grew to fill -- in Iran, Pakistan and Sudan, to name a few. The lack of scruple and the pursuit of power by the United States combined fatally with this tide in the Muslim world in 1979, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. With Pakistan's Mohammed Zia ul-Haq as America's foremost ally, the CIA openly recruited Islamic holy warriors from Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Sudan...
and
Algeria. Radical Islam went into overdrive as its superpower ally and mentor
funneled
support to the mujaheddin; Ronald Reagan feted them on the White House lawn.
The rest
is by now familiar: After the Soviet Union collapsed, the United States
walked away
from an Afghanistan in shambles. The Taliban emerged; Osama bin Laden and his
al Qaeda made Afghanistan their base. What should thoughtful people infer from this
whole narrative? For Muslims, it is time to stop wallowing in self-pity: Muslims are
not helpless victims of conspiracies hatched by an all-powerful, malicious West. The
fact is that the decline of Islamic greatness took place long before the age of
mercantile imperialism. The causes were essentially internal. Therefore Muslims must
be introspective and ask what went wrong. Muslims must recognize that their societies
are far larger, more diverse and complex than the small homogeneous tribal society in
Arabia 1,400 years ago. It is therefore time to renounce the idea that Islam can
survive and prosper only in an Islamic state run according to sharia, or Islamic law.
Muslims need a secular and democratic state that respects religious freedom and human
dignity and is founded on the principle that power belongs to the people. This
means confronting and rejecting the claim by orthodox Islamic scholars that, in an
Islamic state, sovereignty belongs to the vice-regents of Allah, or Islamic jurists, not to
the people. Muslims must not look to the likes of bin Laden; such people have no real
answer and can offer no real positive alternative. To glorify their terrorism is a
hideous mistake: The unremitting slaughter of Shiites, Christians and Ahmadis in
their places of worship in Pakistan, and of other minorities in other Muslim
countries, is proof that all terrorism is not about the revolt of the dispossessed.
The United States, too, must confront bitter truths. The messages of George W.
Bush and Tony Blair fall flat while those of bin Laden, whether he lives or dies, resonate
strongly across the Muslim world. Bin Laden's religious extremism turns off many
Muslims, but they find his political message easy to relate to: The United States
must stop helping Israel in dispossessing the Palestinians, stop propping up corrupt
and despotic regimes across the world just because they serve U.S. interests. Americans will also have to accept that their triumphalism and disdain for international law are creating enemies everywhere, not just among Muslims. Therefore they must become less arrogant and more like other peoples of this world. Our collective survival lies in recognizing that religion is not the solution; neither is nationalism. We have but one choice: the path of secular humanism, based upon the principles of logic and reason. This alone offers the hope of providing everybody on this globe with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Pervez Hoodbhoy is a professor of nuclear and high-energy physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad.

\textcopyright 2001 The Washington Post Company

---

and despotic regimes across the world just because they serve U.S. interests. Americans will also have to accept that their triumphalism and disdain for international law are creating enemies everywhere, not just among Muslims. Therefore they must become less arrogant and more like other peoples of this world. Our collective survival lies in recognizing that religion is not the solution; neither is nationalism. We have but one choice: the path of secular humanism, based upon the principles of logic and reason. This alone offers the hope of providing everybody on this globe with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Pervez Hoodbhoy is a professor of nuclear and high-energy physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad.

\textcopyright 2001 The Washington Post Company

---

and despotic regimes across the world just because they serve U.S. interests. Americans will also have to accept that their triumphalism and disdain for international law are creating enemies everywhere, not just among Muslims. Therefore they must become less arrogant and more like other peoples of this world. Our collective survival lies in recognizing that religion is not the solution; neither is nationalism. We have but one choice: the path of secular humanism, based upon the principles of logic and reason. This alone offers the hope of providing everybody on this globe with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Pervez Hoodbhoy is a professor of nuclear and high-energy physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad.

\textcopyright 2001 The Washington Post Company
At least the President's Cabinet appears to be quite unified! Here's some trivia for a holiday party... One September 11 past, there was a shockwave that resulted in the nation having three Presidents in just a few months. On September 11, 1841 President Martin Van Buren's entire Cabinet resigned over his third national bank veto http://www.ipl.org/ref/POTUS/mvanburen.html A book I'm reading from that time shows that the nation's leaders were deeply divided over establishing a national bank. The resignation of the full Cabinet was precipitated after the New York press published private information from a Cabinet meeting. Cabinet members determined that the President had leaked the information and resigned. President Van Buren lost the election that year to William Henry Harrison http://www.ipl.org/ref/POTUS/whharrison.html According to Potus, the Internet Public Library, President Harrison "Deleviered [sic] the longest inaugural address on March 4. It was an extremely cold day and Harrison did not wear a hat while
delivering the 105 minute speech. He contracted pneumonia and died in the White House one month later. "105 minutes is the longest inaugural speech ever delivered by an American President. John Tyler, known as the "Accidental President" and "His Accidency" became the 10th President of the United States. Mark Richards
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 DO THE MATH A mathematician's guide to the news.

Growing Apart
The mathematical evidence for Congress' growing polarization.
By Jordan Ellenberg

The bipartisan era didn't last long. Three months after 9/11, the unity that Congress promised has evaporated. Should we be surprised? Political scientists Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal are not. According to their research, there's no evidence that a national crisis -- Pearl Harbor, World War I, the Kennedy assassination -- can produce even a short spike in legislative fellow-feeling, let alone a lasting change in political culture. So it's to be expected that the shockwave of September, while big enough to upend a tyranny on another continent, will not create a ripple -- statistically speaking -- in the business of Washington.
Poole and Rosenthal found that the House and Senate grew steadily less polarized from around 1900 to 1980. Then something happened; polarization has been sharply increasing ever since.

Can "polarization" really be quantified? Poole and Rosenthal argue convincingly that it can and that even more delicate information about the political universe can be coaxed out of raw statistics. In order to explain what I mean, I have to tell you why we make maps of New Jersey.

We make maps of New Jersey because doing so is a superlatively concise way of organizing the vast amount of geographical data that New Jersey embodies. Glancing at the map, one sees instantly that Trenton is about 10 miles from Princeton but 70 miles from Hackensack; that Hackensack in turn is just 6 miles from Passaic but 70 miles from Frenchtown. If you'd never heard of maps, you could certainly store in a spreadsheet the numerical data of the distances between every pair of cities in New Jersey. You'd have exactly the same information. But you wouldn't know what New Jersey looks like.

When it comes to visualizing American politics, Poole and Rosenthal believe, we're a lot like the person navigating New Jersey with the massive spreadsheet but no map. Anyone can tell you that Barbara Boxer is politically closer to Dianne Feinstein than she is to Zell Miller. One could even quantify this "closeness" by computing the proportion of roll-call votes on which Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein agreed. But can we use all this numerical information to produce a "map" of the U.S. Senate? Put another way, if we know the distance between each pair of cities, can we reproduce the map of New Jersey?

Yes, and much more. Using a mathematical technique called multidimensional scaling (MDS), we can make a map of any set of points if we know how "close" each pair of points is supposed to be. Researchers have used MDS to make maps of family relationships (scroll down to Figure 5, "Example"), emotions, and even rock bands.
Poole and Rosenthal don't use MDS but a technique of their own and a computer program called DW-NOMINATE to produce a two-dimensional map of the House and the Senate.

A statistical method is fundamentally sound only if it tells you things you already know. The DW-NOMINATE maps tell us, first of all, that throughout the last 100 years both houses of Congress have split into two grand clusters, Democrats and Republicans. Within the Democrats, the Northern and Southern members form two clusters. Sometimes the Northern and Southern Democrats meld into each other without a gap, and other times (especially in the 1940s and '50s) the two clusters are so distant that they seem to constitute two different parties.

The other thing about Congress we already know is that politicians naturally fall on a left-right axis. And indeed, the legislators on the left-hand side of the DW-NOMINATE maps are precisely the ones we think of as "furthest left." In the 106th Senate, for instance, the senator furthest to the left is Barbara Boxer, followed by Paul Wellstone and Tom Harkin. The rightmost senator is Phil Gramm, followed by Oklahoma's James Inhofe and Colorado's Wayne Allard. The rightmost Democrat? Easily Zell Miller of Georgia. The leftmost Republican? Arlen Specter just beats out Jim Jeffords. To see the numbers for every senator and member of the House, look at the data pages.

We don't need mathematics to tell us that Wellstone and Inhofe are far apart. But the mathematics assigns quantities to these qualitative observations based on their roll-call votes, allowing us to answer more fine-grained questions. We can, for instance, assign a numerical value to the "polarization level" of the House and Senate and track the changes in this number over time. Poole and Rosenthal have taken this analysis still further. They show that legislatures become more polarized not when individual politicians adopt more extreme views, but when they are unseated by more extreme politicians. Polarization, as they put it, is an effect of replacement, not conversion.
Still more impressive than the numbers are the pictures. As you watch the animated GIF of the House and Senate from 1879 through the present, you can see the two great clusters circle each other, trying to capture the center. You can see that the two chambers of Congress move in tandem, belying the Senate's supposed immunity to the winds of fashion that bat the House around. And around 1985, something -- nobody is exactly sure what -- happened, with polarization sharply increasing ever since. On the animated GIF, you can see the Democrats and the Republicans jerk apart, leaving an empty space between them that persists, war or no war, to the present day.

But the most startling finding isn't visible in the pictures. Let's go beyond left and right for a moment and ask: What does the vertical axis on the DW-NOMINATE map mean? Senators at the top of the map include John Breaux and Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Peter Fitzgerald of Illinois, and George Voinovich of Ohio. At the bottom we find Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins of Maine, Arlen Specter again, and Robert Byrd. Poole and Rosenthal theorize that the vertical dimension describes a legislator's stance on race, with Northeastern, pro-civil rights politicians near the bottom and Southerners near the top. That seems somewhat right -- but then, Byrd is no one's image of a modern racial liberal. The reason the vertical axis doesn't seem to say that much, Poole and Rosenthal suggest, is that race is no longer the polarizing issue it was 30 years ago. Today's Congress is governed by the calculus of left and right -- that and not much else.

To be more precise, let's go back to New Jersey. Suppose you had data for only three towns, called A, B, and C. Let's say the distance between towns A and B was 1 mile, between B and C was 1 mile, and between A and C was 2 miles. A minute's thought should convince you that towns A, B, and C must lie on a straight line. On the other hand, suppose there were four towns, A, B, C, and D, and suppose the distance between any pair of towns is exactly 1 mile. Try to draw four points on a
map with this property -- you'll find it's impossible. In fact, the only way to situate four points such that each is 1 mile from all the others is to place the four points in three-dimensional space, in a configuration called a regular tetrahedron.

In the first situation, the two dimensions of a map are superfluous. One dimension would suffice to describe the locations of the three towns along the line. In the second situation, the two dimensions are not enough. We need to introduce more dimensions to obtain the desired distances. In both cases, the data tells us the "true dimension" of the configuration of towns.

With this picture in mind, we can state Poole and Rosenthal's most remarkable finding: For the last 40 years, both houses have been one-dimensional. That is, you can pretend that Congress is a set of points on a straight line with Barbara Boxer at one end and Phil Gramm at the other, and you can pretend that each vote is a mark on that line. Everyone to the left of the mark will vote one way, and everyone to the right the other way. It turns out that this crude model -- which knows nothing about geography, gender, race, lobbies, exigencies, ideas, or history -- correctly predicts more than 80 percent of votes cast. In the last 15 years, as Democrats and Republicans have drifted further apart, the one-dimensionality of Congress has increased apace. At the moment, the one-dimensional model gets over 85 percent of roll-call votes right. "People were surprised," Rosenthal says, "that such a simple model can explain so much of the data."

Surprised, and maybe disappointed, too. You might want to think your representative is, at every moment, incorporating your interests into a delicate and ever-shifting computation -- something more nuanced than "As a 70 percent liberal, 30 percent conservative senator, my position is clear." You might get depressed if you think that American politics has degenerated into a straight-up dialectic between two weird agglomerates: affirmative action, teachers unions, and Social Security over here, the defense budget, tax cuts, and cheerleading for heterosexuality over
there.

But Poole and Rosenthal's work, which now extends to many different countries and many different times, shows that one-dimensional legislatures are not degenerations of normal politics. They are normal politics. There have been two periods in American history when the legislature wasn't one-dimensional. One was the 1950s, when the Democrats split over civil rights. The other was the period after the Compromise of 1850 fell apart. One-dimensional voting breaks down, it seems, with the arrival of a new issue so divisive as to stretch the political world along its own axis and so fundamental as to strain the bonds of convention that keep the government running smoothly. Maybe we don't want the war on terrorism to be an issue like that. Maybe we should be thankful that, for the moment, Paul Wellstone is staying Paul Wellstone and James Inhofe, James Inhofe. In times like ours, partisanship could be an underrated virtue.

What About Barry Bonds? Many people have written me about my assertion in July that "Barry Bonds isn't going to hit 72 home runs," and asked what went wrong with my analysis. Answer: Nothing. In July, it was extremely unlikely that Bonds would break the home run record. One great thing about baseball is that players sometimes accomplish the unlikely. (Ask Tony Womack.) If you bet a hundred bucks at the All-Star Break that Bonds would hit 73 home runs, you made a dumb bet. Now you've got a hundred bucks; it was still a dumb bet.

Related on the Web

What happened in the 1980s to re-polarize the Congress? The competing theories are discussed in Poole and Rosenthal's article, "The Polarization of American Politics," one of many good reads at Poole's page. You can also read about the mathematics of the Clinton impeachment and see where recent presidents fit on the left-right dimension. Elsewhere on Poole's Web page you can learn more about the technicalities of DW-NOMINATE and even download data and software to play with on your own. If you can map Congress, you should also be able to map the Supreme Court; Bernard Grofman
and Timothy Brazill have done just that.

-------

Jordan Ellenberg is an assistant professor of mathematics at Princeton University.
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ACLU Exec Voices Concerns

By Ben Polen

WASHINGTON -- The year 2001 was not a great one to be a civil libertarian.
Polls taken after Sept. 11 suggest overwhelming support for Attorney General John Ashcroft’s strong police measures, and Ashcroft recently claimed his most strident critics are practically "aiding terrorists."

Even the famous American Civil Liberties Union, founded in 1920, has had a mixed history of defending liberty in times of national crisis.

When Japanese-Americans were interned during World War II, the ACLU's initial response was supportive. In the 1950s, the ACLU board surreptitiously provided intelligence information on its members to J. Edgar Hoover's FBI and voted to condemn the Communist Party as an "international conspiracy to seize power."

More recently, the ACLU has been a fierce champion of free expression and a stalwart opponent of more government surveillance authority. It led much of the opposition to the Bush administration’s anti-terrorism legislation enacted after the Sept. 11 attacks.

Wired News interviewed Barry Steinhardt, associate director of the ACLU and former president of the Electronic Frontier Foundation, for his perspective on civil liberties in the 21st century.

Wired News: With the Bush administration's war on terrorism underway, what's the outlook for civil liberties in 2002?

Barry Steinhardt: We are now on a war footing in this country. There are attempts to apply the laws of war domestically with very little security benefit but also without an end. We are told by the attorney general it's an ongoing war that has no end, that it's a war against terrorism that will go on for years. We are now in a grave period for civil liberties.

WN: What are some of the things that Attorney General Ashcroft has done that worry you?

Steinhardt: Well, it's not exclusively Attorney General Ashcroft, but certainly he has been at the forefront to apply the ironically named USA Patriot Act. It's ironically named -- to call something that attacks fundamental American
values
"patriotic."

(The government has detained) more than 1,000 Arab-Americans, sometimes without counsel. It appears there are secret hearings and secret incarcerations -- 5,000 persons who are being subjected to interrogation, a roundup. (It's) based on ethnic profiling; that if you're Arab-American or of Arab descent, you might be tied to terrorism without any specific cause that these individuals need to be questioned. You've got all these things happening -- debates over national IDs, increased surveillance without security benefits at airports, increased profiling at airports without benefits in security. That's in the short term. We don't know what the long-term consequences will be.

WN: It doesn't seem that there's been much public outrage or dissent. Why?

Steinhardt: Well, there is a veneer of public support, but if you go down a level it shows that Americans are very skeptical about government intrusions into their rights. When you get past the veneer of support and deserved show of patriotism that all of us feel, and you look at specific proposals that have been made and concerns whether government is going too far, you find a different perception out there.

You're beginning to see it in Congress. Even fairly conservative members like Reps. Dan Burton (R-Indiana) and Bob Barr (R-Georgia) are questioning tactics and the rhetoric coming out. We're at the very beginning here. I expect that as more and more people are affected by the war against terrorism and loss of liberty, you will see more protest.

I think that will emerge as time goes on. They are skeptical because of past exaggerated claims by the Justice Department.

WN: When the FBI and the Justice Department said they wanted to interrogate thousands of Arab-Americans, some local police departments said that they wouldn't go along. What does this represent?

Steinhardt: William Webster and other former FBI officials were quoted in the Washington Post as saying that the questioning of 5,000 men violated
fundamental American values and was ineffective. They now recognize there have been diversion of resources and exaggeration of claims that are being made.

The consequence is not only a loss of liberty but also a diversion from the real hard work of preventing (another) Sept. 11. It's not a particularly effective way to conduct an investigation. We're all concerned about protecting our safety, but as we attempt to draw a balance between rights and safety, we should get some safety benefits. Most of what we see gives us no safety, but it infringes on rights.

WN: To go back to something you said earlier, can you talk about what exaggerated claims the Justice Department has made?

Steinhardt: We now know that for a number of years the Justice Department has been labeling things as "terrorism" that no common-sense American would label as (such). A disruptive drunk person on an airplane is labeled as a terrorist, while this person is not a terrorist. It doesn't do us much good to divert our attention to people who don't threaten our national security, which are just run-of-the-mill ordinary criminal cases. The ironically named USA Patriot Act, although styled as anti-terrorist, applies to ordinary criminal offenses.

WN: Can we expect to see any legislation along the same lines?

Steinhardt: There probably will be. One would have thought that we would have been at the end of the cycle with USA Patriot, but in the new intelligence authorization bill (H.R. 2883, sent to the president on Dec. 18) -- that's the authorizing act for expenditure of funds -- there were once again attempts to expand foreign intelligence.

For example, blank warrants under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, when you didn't know the person's name or who the person was. There were things (that weren't present) in the original legislation they were putting in through the back door on this authorization bill. We expect more legislation on border security and
forms of national identification. There is likely to be additional aviation security legislation, which would rewrite foreign and domestic security laws to increase the power... intelligence agencies have and to write the courts out of the process.

WN: Don't the courts have some oversight? What do you mean when you say the law would "write them out of the process?"

Steinhardt: A perfect example of this in the USA Patriot Act is the application of wiretap laws to the Internet, where you get Internet protocol addresses and URLs. The role of the courts couldn't be more limited. They are rubber-stamping. All law enforcement has to do is come in and say they are doing an investigation and the court has to stamp it.

WN: What kind of surveillance will be conducted?

Steinhardt: Certainly over the next year or two we are going to see more application of Carnivore and the Magic Lantern worm that is functioning as a keystroke logger. We are not even going to know for 18 to 24 months, until we see prosecutions and reports made.

The actual numbers will come in during 2003 and 2004. That's when we will get a real sense of what the numbers are. As for now, we will have no way to know it except anecdotally. I have spoken with Internet service providers who are receiving dozens of requests from the FBI to monitor. We will know about the use of increased surveillance in two ways: broad numbers from reports they are likely to make and prosecutions that are likely to be brought.

It will be a considerable period of time before that picture will begin to fill in. The law certainly authorizes a great deal more surveillance, and it appears they are using it, particularly in Internet communications.

WN: Is there notification if someone has been under surveillance?

Steinhardt: A long time after the fact. It could be as much as six months to a year. If it's real-time monitoring and there was no prosecution made, it could be many months -- many years -- before the subject is notified. We're moving beyond the
We've moved beyond the days of FBI agents sitting in a darkened room somewhere, listening to a conversation that was picked up because someone put up alligator clips on a line.

WN: What technology can people use to avoid surveillance?

Steinhardt: There are some technologies that people can apply, but if law enforcement is interested in you, there may be a limited effectiveness. Look at the Scarfo case in Philadelphia. They literally placed a keystroke monitor on the fellow's computer to intercept his communication.

They now go beyond that -- they now have a virus or worm that electronically invades your system. It can function as a keystroke logger. Encryption is one thing you can do. You can use anonymous surfing, but the counter technologies are being developed by law enforcement.

-------
Declan McCullagh contributed to this report.