

=====
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 formatted 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/usc) with ESMTTP
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/usc) 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])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB3E5Ye14636 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
06:05:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from malus.nsf.gov (firewall-user@malus.nsf.gov [198.181.231.37])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id GAA18558 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 06:05:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: by malus.nsf.gov; id JAA15150; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 09:05:14 -0500
Received: from notel.nsf.gov(128.150.11.1) by malus.nsf.gov via smap (V5.5)
id xma014918; Mon, 3 Dec 01 09:04:50 -0500
Received: from nsfmail04.nsf.gov (nsfmail04.nsf.gov [128.150.130.43])
by notel.nsf.gov (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id JAA22106
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 09:04:50 -0500
Received: by nsfmail04.nsf.gov with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <X1F6W7YG>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 09:04:50 -0500
Message-ID: <4C37F04B2C2FD411B0B9009027CCC7B903D969E5@nsfmail04.nsf.gov>
From: "Carlson, Lynda" <lcarlson@nsf.gov>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Survey Center closing
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 09:04:40 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

johnny--what will you be doing??Lynda

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 ESMTTP
id fB3GONe27837 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 ESMTTP

id IAA25662 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 08:24:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FB3GNnu29827 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 08:23:49 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 08:23:48 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Letting the Anger Seep Out (B Carey LATimes)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112030805310.28100-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

<http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/la-000096198dec03.story>

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. Cromeey, 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."

<http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/la-000096198dec03.story>

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)

by bic.sri.com (CommuniGate Pro SMTP 3.4.7)
with ESMTP id 994221 for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 03 Dec 2001 10:59:34 -0800
Message-ID: <3C0BCB53.F5CD700F@bic.sri.com>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2001 13:58:27 -0500
From: Larry Cohen <lcohen@bic.sri.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Households vs. Individuals
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

>From dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com Mon Dec 3 11:37:45 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 fB3Jbie22574 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
11:37:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mailout5.nyroc.rr.com (mailout5-1.nyroc.rr.com
[24.92.226.169])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA12488 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 11:37:42 -0800
(PST)
Received: from david (alb-66-66-192-21.nycap.rr.com [66.66.192.21])
by mailout5.nyroc.rr.com (8.11.6/Road Runner 1.12) with SMTP id
fB3JbEx13786
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 14:37:14 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <002401c17c32\$1be3af80\$15c04242@mshome.net>
From: "David Smith" <dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112030805310.28100-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Letting the Anger Seep Out (B Carey LATimes)
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 14:38:39 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0021_01C17C08.32D3ABC0"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C17C08.32D3ABC0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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.

An important resource is the work of Fran Norris at Georgia State University,
<http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwpsy/faculty/norris.htm>. See Also:
http://www.ncptsd.org/facts/disasters/fs_domestic.html,
<http://www.musc.edu/cvc/norris1.html>.

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)

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C17C08.32D3ABC0
Content-Type: application/octet-stream;
name="OKC paper.wpd"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="OKC paper.wpd"
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u
UpCN2ZO6XMdQaaUoJYQwdlFM1NY3a+ktDdyx6R2slr3ZE1YZeeElWs+LdC4qrs0d9DGVmfoq
UpCN2ZO6XMdQaaUoJYQwdlFM1NY3a+ktDdyx6R2slr3ZE1YZeeElWs+jrcC
AIMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgjAQAAAMEBAAAqCQAACSUBAAAAABgAAAOsKAAACCAEAAACLAgAA8QoAAAsw
BQAAACgAAAB8DQAAAFUKAAAAOgAAAKQNAAAI dwEAAAAEAAAA3g0AAAg0AQAAABQAAADiDQAACAIB
AAAAADwAAAPYNAAITgEAAAAACAAAABQ4AAAheAQAAAAwAAAAHDgAACBABAAAAAgAAABMOAAAJbQE
AAAXAAAAFQ4AAABmAQAAAAIAAAAsDgAAAGEBAAAAFAAAAC4OAAACCAEAAAAABAQAAQg4AAAswCQAA
AEQAAABDDwAACzAJAAAwwAAAIcPAAAVQcAAAA6AAAA4g8AAAI I AQAAALUBAAAcEAAAAGgBAAAA
wAEAAANERAAACCAEAAAC6AQAAkRMAAABmAQAAAAIAAABLQAAAGEBAAAAFAAAAE0VAAAAZgEAAAAC
AAAAAYRUAABhAQAAABQAAABjFQAAAGgBAAAA0QEAAHcVAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAdxUAAAswAQAAFAA
AABI FwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEgXAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAASBcAAA1CBAAAAB0AAACYFwAAAGgBAAAALgIA
ALUXAAACCAEAAADZAAQAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADj
GQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZ
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAA
AAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAA
AAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAA
AADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAA
AOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAA
4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADjGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA4xkAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADj
GQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAOMZAAALMAIAAABEAAAavBsAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAC8GwAAAAAAAAAAAAALWb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A
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AAABAAUAJQIBAAoAAACBAGAA3QoQAIMBEQADAKjgJRAA3doQCwADAQAACwDaMdoRCgADAAKANou
3QsLAAMAAQLAN3UXxAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU4BEMAAAAAgHDADg1BoFAICBEgAIAUCUD2kaACUC
AAA1AgUAJQIAAB8A1Ex1ZYBMRSyAgEZvbnN1Y2GAViyAgEjyZXR0gEtNLIcAU2FuY2hleobKLIBN

dWxsZW6AUkMsgNRfEAAABgAFAAAAAAEQANRRdWVuZW1vZW7UXxAAAAAYABAAAAAAABEADUGExFLIDU
XxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADUR3Jvc2VjbG9zZdrfEAAABgAEAAAAAAEQANSAU0ws0AEVAAALAAKAAWgG
uAEAAAEgFQDQSG9wa2luc4BSUy6AgEFjdG12ZYBtb3JiaWRpdHmAc3VydmVpbGxhbmNlGfmdGVy
gEh1cnJpY2FuZyBBbmRyZXctLUZsb3JpZGEGsgDE5OTIsgNRfEAAABgAFAAAAAAEQANRKQU1B1F8Q
AAAGAAQAAAAAARAA1C6A0AEVAAALAAKAAUEHkQIBAAEGFQDQMjcwKDUPOjU5MS00LIAxOTkzLIBB
dWeANC7UGiMAhgEFAAgAJQIPaQAAJQIAACUCEgAlAg9pTgAAACMA1NQaHwCHARIACAAlAg9pAAA1
AgAAJQIFACUCD2kfANSAXHB1Ymxcpc2hlZIB1cnJhdHVtGfGfWcGVhcn0AaW6A1F8QAAAGAAUAAAA
ARAA1EpBTUHUXxAAAAAYABAAAAAAABEADULIAXOTkzLIBOb3aAMTc7gDI3MCgxOSk6MjMwMiku1Boj
AIYBBQAIACUCD2kAACUCAAA1AhIAJQIPad4BAAAjANQBAAAABAAoAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAESAgAKAKEAAACHAAAAALACGH3IQiQcAABZBAAAAGWgAHCACLFCAIQQByAGkAYQBsACAAUGBlAGcA
dQBsAGEACgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABTjMrAAAAAHgArAB4AHgAbAA8AAgzfAB4AAACAAAAAAAAAAwIA
QIRaK+ICAAAAAAkAEACAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/1Uai/8AAMDawKhFFAAAAFQAQQBCAEWARQAg
QIRaK+AEIA
AAABAAoAAAD3AAAA3QoQAIMBEQADAKjgJRAA3doQCwADAQAACwDaONoRCgADAAAKANou3QsLAAMA
AAQLAN3UXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU1BsFAIABBQAIACYCD2kAACUCAAA1AgUAJQIAAB8A1ICAVS6A
Uy6AQnVyZWf1gG9mgHRoZYBDZW5zdXMSgPII81N0YXRpc3RyY2FsgEFic3RyYWN0gG9mgHRoZYBV
bml0ZWSAU3RhdGVzOoAxOTky8wjzLIAoMTEy8gXydGjzBfOAZWRpdGlvbikugNABFQAACwAJAAGt
Hf0YAAABIBUA0Fdhc2hpbmd0b24sgERDL0AxOTkyLgEAAAAEACgAAAADAAAAGQAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
ARMk0yQAKQAAAJEAAADyBfLaEAsAAwEAAAAs2jDaEQoAAwAACgDa8wXzAQAAAAQAKAAAABWAAAAAX
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABM6jgJAC1AAAAPQAAAN0KEACDAQAAwACACEQAN3dCwwAAwEAAAQMAN3aEAsA
AwEAAAAs2jDaEQoAAwAACgDaLi0ABRzVEQoLAAAWQQAAAFoAFwgAixQiAEEACgBpAGEABAAgAFIA
ZQBNAHUABABhAHIAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAoAAACrAQAA3QoQAIMBEQADAKjgJRAA3doQCwADAQAACwDa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A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0x
Mdc0LTcs0AEVAAALAAKAAeAXMBMBAAEGFQDQMTk4N4BBdWcuqEUUAAAAVABBAEIAATABFACAAQgAA
AKhFFAAAAFQAQQBCAEWARQAgAEIAAAABAAoAAADHAQAA3QoQAIMBEQADAKjgJRAA3doQCwADAQAAC
wDaN9oRCgADAAAKANou3QsLAAMAAAQLAN3UXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU4BEMAAAAAGHDADgR3JL
ZW6AQkwsGExpbmR5gEpELIBHcmFjZYBNQyyA1F8QAAAGAAUAAAAAARAA1EdsZXN1ctRfEAAABgAE
AAAAAAEQANSAR0MmsgEx1b25hcmSAQUMsgNRfEAAABgAFAAAAAAEQANRLb3JvbNRfEAAABgAEAAAA
AAEQANSATSyA1F8QAAAGAAUAAAAAARAA1Fdpbmd1dNRfEAAABgAEAAAAAAEQANSAGEMugEJ1ZmZh
bG/QARUAAAACQABWhqqFQAAASAVANBDcmVla4BzdXJ2aXZvcn0AaW6AdGh1gHN1Y29uZIBkZWNh
ZGU6gHN0YWJpbG10eYBvZoBzdHJlc30Ac31tcHRvbXMSgEftZXJpY2FugEpvdXJuYWyAb2bQARUA
AAsACQABMxuDfGAAASAVANDUXxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADUT3J0aG9wc31jaG1hdHJ51F8QAAAGAAQA
AAAAAARAA1C6AgDYwKDEpOjQzLTU0LIAxOTkwgEphbi4BAAAABAAoAAAAKAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAEzL1EkAKsAAACrAAAA3QoQAIMBBAADAAIAIRAA3d0LDAADAQAABAWA3dQZDAAAAQAZZAWA1AAA
GQAEAAABAAAAAAQAAELAAQABAAAAAAZAAAAQAKAAAAJAIAAN0KEACDAREAAwCo4CUQAN3aEAsA
AwEAAAAs2jTaEQoAAwAACgDaLt0LCwADAAAEcWdD1F8QAAAGAAMAAAAAARAA1OARDAAAAAIBwWA

4NqAHwCHARIACAALAg9pAAAALAgAAJQIFACUCAAAfANRXb29kgEpNLIDUXxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADU
Qm9vdHppbtrfEAAAABgAEAAAAAAEQANSAU1IsgNRfEAAAABgAFAAAAAAEQANRSb3N1bmbhbtRfEAAA
BgAEAAAAAAEQANSARCYa1F8QAAAGAAUAAAAAARAA1E5vbGVu1F8QAAAGAAQAAAAAARAA1C3UXxAA
AAYABQAAAAABEADUSG91a3N1bWHUXxAAAAAYABAAAAAAABEADUgFMsgNRfEAAAABgAFAAAAAAEQANRK
b3VyZGVu1F8QAAAGAAQAAAAAARAA1BGLoBFZmZlY3RzG9mgHRoZYAxOTg50AEVAAALAAkAAWEQ
sQsAAAEgFQDQU2FugEZYyW5jaXNjb4B1YXJ0aHF1YWt1gG9ugGZyZXF1ZW5jeYBhbmSAY29udGVu
dIBvZoBuaWdodG1hcmVzLoBk3VybmFsgG9mgEFibm9ybWFs0AEVAAALAAkAAAToRigwBAAEgFQDQ
UHN5Y2hvbG9neS6AgDEwMSgyKToyMTktMjQsgDE5OTKATWF5LtQaIwCGAQUACAALAg9pAAAALAgAA
JQISACUCD21OAAAAIwDUAQAKAAAAzWEAAN0KEACDAREAAwCo4CUQAN3aEAsAAwEAAAAs2jXaEQoA
AwAACgDaLt0LCwADAAAECwDd1F8QAAAGAAMAAAAAARAA1OARDAAAAAIBwWA4NqAHwCHARIACAAL
Ag9pAAAALAgAAJQIFACUCAAAfANREZXEATUEsgIDUXxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADUQnJvbWV01F8QAAAG
AAQAAAAAARAA1IDUXxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADURURUXxAAAAAYABAAAAAAABEADULOBCmVkaWN0b3Jz
gG9mgHR1bXBvcmlkYXNjaW50cmVudG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRz
FQAACwAJAAG0EwQPAABIBUA0H11YXJzG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRz
YXSAVGHYzZWwATW1sZYBjc2xhbmQsgFNvY21hbIBQc31jaG1hdHJ5GCaUHN5Y2hpYXRyaWpQARUA
AAsACQABjRtdDwEASAVANBFcG1kZW1pb2xvZ3kugIAYOCgyKTo0OS01NSyAMtk5M4BBCHIu1Boj
AIYBBQAIACUCD2kaACUCAAAALAhIAJQIPaU4AAAAjANQBAAAABAAoAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAEzrxckAKMAAACjAAAA3QoQAIMBBAADAAIAIRAA3d0LDAADAQAABAWA3QEAYwB5AAQAAAD6/wEA
ABAAAAANAAABAg0AAAA8DwE8Dz0AAAMK0AAAAAABAAAAEAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAH8AwAAA
AAAAAAAAAP//AAD//wAA//8AAP//AAD//wcaakMC//8AAAUAAAIAAAFAAACAAAAAgAABGIAAADd
ChAAgweEAAAMAAGhEADD3QsLAAMAAAQLAN3UXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU0wESAAEAACAAQAAAAEA
EgDTVELUTEU6gFBvCHVsYXRpb26ARWZmZWN0c4BvZoB0aGWAQm9tYmluZ4BvZoBPa2xhaG9tYYBD
aXR50AQVAAALAAkAAABAEAAAAAAEgFQDQU1VOTk1OR4BIRUFEOoBQb3B1bGF0aW9ugEVmZmVjdhOA
b2aAdGh1gEJvbWJpbnFQBBUAAAACQAB9QVFAQIAASAVANBSRVZJU01PToBEQVRF0oBGZwJydwFy
eYA0LIAxOTk50AQVAAALAAkAAAToHigIEAAEgFQDQ4DAMAAAAAGHDADg4AAMAAAAALAEADdGRGF2
aWSAVy6AU21pdGsgfBoLkQuLIBNL1AuSC4sgERlcGFydg11bnSAb2a1F8QAAAGAAUAAAAAARAA
1EJpb3N0YXRpc3RyY3PUXxAAAAAYABAAAAAAABEADUGGFuZIBFcg1kZW1pb2xvZ3ksgENvbGx1Z2WA
b2aAUHVibGlj0AEVAAALAAkAAAX8IzwmGAAEgFQDQSGVhbHRoLIBVbml2ZXJzaXR5G9mgE9rbGFo
b21h0AQfAAAVABMAACQJFAUIAAECCACOiwgHKCMCIB8A0EFVsYwluZyBILoBdaHJpc3RyYw5zZW4s
gFBoLkQuLIBUaGWAR2FsbHVwG9yZ2FuaXphdG1vbtAEFQAACwAJAAEJC1kGCgABIBUA0FJvYmVy
dIBWaw5jZW50LIBQaC5ELiyAT2tsYWhvbWGAU3RhdGwARGVwYXJ0bWVudIBvZoBIzWFsdGjQBBUA
AAsACQABTgyeBwWAASAVANDgMAwAAAAACACMAODgAAwAAAAAsAQMAOBOZw1sgEUugNRfEAAAABgAF
AAAAAAEQANRIYw5u1F8QAAAGAAQAAAAAARAA1CyATS5QLkguLIDUXxAAAAAYABQAAAAABEADUQ0hF
U9RfEAAAABgAEAAAAAAEQANQsgE9rbGFob21hgFN0YXR1gERlcGFydg11bnSAb2aASGVhbHRo0AQf
AAAVABMAAZMN4wgOAAECCACOiwgHKCMCIB8A0MxQdWJsaXNoZWTUGh8AhwESAAGAJQIPaQAAJQIA
ACUCBQALAgAAHwDU1BsfaIcBEgAIACYCD2kaACUCAAAALAhIAJQIPaR8A1IBpboDUXxAAAAAYAAgAA
AAABEADU1F8QAAAGAAMAAAAAARAA1NRfEAAAABgACAAAAAAEQANTUXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU1F8Q
AAAGAAIAAAAAAARAA1NRfEAAAABgADAAAAAAEQANTUXxAAAAAYAAgAAAAABEADU1F8QAAAGAAMAAAA
ARAA1NRfEAAAABgACAAAAAAEQANR0aGXUXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU1F8QAAAGAAIAAAAAAARAA1NRf
EAAAABgADAAAAAAEQANTUXxAAAAAYAAgAAAAABEADU1F8QAAAGAAMAAAAAARAA1NRfEAAAABgACAAA
AAEQANTUXxAAAAAYAAwAAAAABEADU1F8QAAAGAAIAAAAAAARAA1NRfEAAAABgADAAAAAAEQANSA8g7y
Sm91cm5hbIBvZoB0aGWAT2tsYWhvbWGAU3RhdGwATWvkaWNhbIBBc3NvY21hdG1vbvM08yyAOTIo
NCk6MTkzkhDE5NyyAQXByaWwsgDE5OTku1BojAIYBBQAIACYCD2kaACUCAAAALAhIAJgIPaUUDAAAj
ANTUGyMAhgEFAAGAJQIPaQAAJQIAACUCBQAmAg9pZAMAACMA1NAEFQAACwAJAAEdEG0LEgABIBUA
0MxBZGRyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRzZG9mZ3RyZXRz
BwWA4OARDAAAAABgCQwA4ERhdmlkgFcgFntaXRoLIBQaC5ELiyATS5QLkgu0AQfAAAVABMAAewT
PA8YAAECCACOiwgHKCMCIB8A0AwDAAAAAIBwWA4OARDAAAAABgCQwA4ERlcGFydg11bnSAb2a1F8Q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p
gDI3MYQyMDY40AQVAAALAAkAAAc8cHxgmAAEgFQDQRYRNYW1sOuAwDAAAAABgCQwA4ERhdmlkhFNt
aXR0QG91aHNjLmVkdDAEHwAAFQATAAEUHMZKAABAmAJKCNgCSgjAiAfANBOVU1CRVKAT0aAV09S

FQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAABIBUA0OARDAAAAAIBwwA4EGAZG1zYXN0ZXKAb2aAdGhlgG1hZ25pdHVk
ZYBvZoB0aGWAYm9tYoBleHBSb3Npb26AYXSAdGhlgE11cnJhaIBGZWR1cmFsgEJ1aWxkaW5ngGlu
0AEVAAALAAKAAWgGuAECAAEgFQDQT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210eYBvboBBChJpbIAxOSyAMTk5NYBhZmZl
Y3RzgG1hbnmAbWVtYmVyc4BvZoB0aGWAY29tbXVuaXR5gGFzGhd1bGyAYXOAZGlyZWN00AEVAAAL
AAKAAARoIagMEAAEgFQDQdmljdGltcy6ASW6AdGhlgGFmdGVybwWF0aIBvZoB0aGWAZxHwbG9zaW9u
LIB3ZYBjb25kdWN0ZWSAdHdvGHN1cnZleXOAb2aAdGhlgE9rbGFob21hgENpdHnQARUAAAAsACQAB
zAkcbQYAASAVANbtZXRYb3BvbG10YW6AYXJlYyB0b4BtZWFzdXJlGHRoZYBpbXBhY3SAb2aAdGh1
gGJvbWJpbmeAb26AdGhlgGdlbmVYyWYAcG9wdWxhdGlvbi6AgFdl0AEVAAALAAKAAAX4LzGyYIAAEg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90
aW9uYWYAZWZmZWN0cy6A0AQVAAALAAKAAfGTA8SAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAAGHDADgUG9zdIRkaXNh
c3Rlc0BpbXBhY3SAC3R1ZG1lc4BoYXZlGJlZW6AY29uZHVjdGVkgHByZXZpb3VzbHksgGluY2x1
ZGluZ4BodXJyaWwNhbMvZLNcCDQCDAAQMAAANANfdChAAgweQAAMAJNMREADd8gXy2hALAAMBAAAL
ANox2hEKAAMAAAoA2vMF890LCwADAAAACwDdlwMKAAMAAAoA1/IF8izzBfPXAg0AgwETAAADQDX
3QoQAIMBEAADACTTERAA3fIF8toQCwADAQAACwDaMtoRCgADAAAKANrzBfPdCwsAAwAAAAAsA3dcD
CgADAAAKANfQARUAAAAsACQABqhX6EBQAASAVANB1YXJ0aHF1YWt1cyzXAg0AgwEUAAAADQDX3QoQ
AIMBEAADACTTERAA3fIF8toQCwADAQAACwDaM9oRCgADAAAKANrzBfPdCwsAAwAAAAAsA3dcDCgAD
AAAKANfyBfIs8wXz1wINAIMBIAAAAA0A190KEACDARAAAwAk0xEQAN3yBfLaEAsAAwEAAAAsA2jTa
EQoAAwAACgDa8wXz3QsLAAMAAAALAN3XAWoAAwAACgDXG51Y2x1YXKAcmVhY3RvcnMs8gXyLPMF
89cCDQCDASEAAAAANANfdChAAgweQAAMAJNMREADd8gXy2hALAAMBAAALANo12hEKAAMAAAoA2vMF
890LCwADAAAACwDdlwMKAAMAAAoA1/IF8izzBfPXAg0AgwEVAADQDX3QoQAIMBEAADACTTERAA
3fIF8toQCwADAQAACwDaNtoRCgADAAAKANrzBfPdCwsAAwAAAAAsA3dcDCgADAAAKANeAYW5kgGRh
bXMs1wINAIMBGGAAAA0A190KEACDARAAAwAk0xEQAN3yBfLaEAsAAwEAAAAsA2jfaEQoAAwAACgDa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t
ZWFzdXJlG1vcmXQARUAAAAsACQABJB50GR4AASAVANBzdWJ0bGWAb3KAaW5kaXJlY3SAZWZmZWN0
cyYAYXOAdGhleYBtdXN0gGJlGZvcoBwZW9wbGWAd2hvgGFyZYBub3SAZGlyZWN0gHZpY3RpbXMu
0AQVAAALAAKAAAdYfJhsgAAEgFQDQzPIM8k1FVEhPRFPzDPPQBBAUAAAAsACQAB0iOKHiQAASAVANDM
8g7yRVhQT1NFRIBBTkSAQ09OVFJPTIBQT1BVTEFUSU9OU/MO89AEFQAACwAJAAGkVjQhKAABIBUA
0OARDAAAAAIBwwA4FRoZYB0YXJnZXSAcG9wdWxhdGlvboB3YXOAdGhlgGFkdWx0gChhZ2VkgDE4
gG9ygG92ZXIpgHBvcHVsYXRpb26Ab2aANzA0LDAwMIBpboB0aGWAc2140AEVAAALAAKAAVYopiMq
AAEgFQDQY291bnR5gE9rbGFob21hgE1ldHJvcG9saXRhboBTdGF0aXN0aWwNhbIBBcmVhLoCAGChQ
b3B1bGF0aW9ugGluZm9ybWF0aW9ugHdhc4B0YDwtlboBmcm9tgHRoZdABFQAACwAJAAEIKlglLAAB
IBUA0DE5OTCAQ2Vuc3VzKS7XAg0AgwEPAAAAADQDX3QoQAIMBEAADACTTERAA3fIF8toQCwADAQA
CwDaONoRCgADAAAKANrzBfPdCwsAAwAAAAAsA3dcDCgADAAAKANeAgFRoZYBjbmRyYW5hcG9saXO
A2V0cm9wb2xpdGFugFN0YXRpc3RyY2FsgEFyZWGAd2FzGHN1bGVjdGVkgGFzGGAAY29udHJvbIBh
cmVh0AEVAAALAAKAAAborCicuAAEgFQDQd210aIBhboBhZHVsdIBwb3B1bGF0aW9ugG9mgDkyMSww
MDCaA6A0YBjb3VudG11cy6AgChUdWxzYSyAd210aIBhboBhZHVsdIBwb3B1bGF0aW9ugG9mgGF
b3V00AMVAAALAAKAAWwtvCgAAEgFQDQNTe5LDAwMIBpboBmaXZlG1vGNvdW50aWVzLIB3YXOAnV
kZ2VkgG5vdIBhY2N1cHRhYmxlgGJlY2F1c2WAaXSAaXOAY2xvc2WAdG+AT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210
Z2VkgG5vdIBhY2N1cHRhYmxlgGJlY2F1c2WAaXSAaXOAY2xvc2WAdG+eYBh
bmTQARUAAAAsACQABsAQAAAAASAVANBoYXOAY2xvc2WAc29jaWFsgGNvbm51Y3Rpb25zLimAgE9r
bGFob21hgENpdHmAd2FzGHRoZYA0MvIF8m5k8wXzGgXhcmdlc3SATVNBgG1ugDE5OTCAyW5kgGhh
ZIBncm93btABFQAACwAJAAFiBrIBAgABIBUA0DExLjQlGHNpbmNlgDE5ODAsGhdoawXlgEluZG1h

bmFwb2xpc4B3YXOAMzHyBfJzdPMF84BhbmSAaGFkgGdyb3dugDcuMSUugIBUaGWAChJvcG9ydGlv
boBvZoBhbGzQARUAAAAsACQABFAhKAwQAASAVANBtaW5vcm10aWVzGhdhc4AxOSWAaW6AT2tsYWhv
bWGAQ210eSyAaW5jbHVkaW5ngDEWJYBBZnJpY2FuhEftZXJpY2FugGFuZiA1JYBBbWVyaWNhboBJ
bmRpYW7QARUAAAAsACQABxgkWBQYAASAVANB3aXRogHRoZYByZW1haW5kZXKAbmVhcmx5gGFsbIBI
aXNwYW5pY/II8vMI8y6AgFRoZYBwcm9wb3J0aW9ugG9mgG1pbm9yaXRpZXOAd2FzGDE1JYBpboBJ
bmRpYW5hcG9saXMs0AEVAAALAAkAAxGLyAYIAAEgFQDQbmVhcmx5gGFsbIBBZnJpY2FuhEftZXJp
Y2FuLoCAVGhlgHVuZW1wbG95bWVudIByYXRlglugE9rbGFob21hgENpdHmAd2FzGDUuNCWAYW5k
gHRoZdABFQAACwAJAAEQDXoICgABIBUA0GF2ZXJhZ2WAYW5udWFsgHBheYB3YXOAJDIXLDawMIB3
aG1sZYBjbmRpYW5hcG9saXOAaGFkgGFugHVuZW1wbG95bWVudIByYXRlglugE9mgDQuMiWAYW5k0AEV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bWJlciYaa25vd26AYXOAYYDwIATwYmxvY2vwHwTwhIRmcm9tgGFtb25ngGFsbIBzdWNogGJsb2Nr
c4BpboB0aGWAT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210eYBhbmTQARUAAAAsACQAB0B8gGyAAASAVANBjbmRpYW5hcG9s
aXOATVNBc4B3aG1jaIBjb250YwluZWSAYXSABGVhc3SAB251gGxpc3RlZIByZXNpZGVudG1hbIBu
dW1iZXIugFRoZYBsYXN0gHR3b4BudW1iZXJz0AEVAAALAAkAAAYIh0hwiAAEgFQDQd2VyZYByYW5k
b21seYBzWx1Y3RlZIB0b4BvYnRhaW6AYYBmdWxsLIB0ZW6EZG1naXQsgHR1bGVwaG9uZYBudW1i
ZXIugIBXaXRoaW6AZWFjaIBjb250YWN0ZWTQARUAAAAsACQABNCOEHIQAASAVANBob3VzZWVvbGQs
gG9uZYByZXNpZGVudIB3YXOAc2VsZWN0ZWSAcMFuZG9tbHmAdG+AYmWAaW50ZXJ2aWV3ZWQu
gG9uZYByZXNpZGVudIB3YXOAc2VsZWN0ZWSAcMFuZG9tbHmAdG+gIDQ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B
FQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAABIBUA0FRodXMsGvYhY2iAcMvzCG9uZGVudIB3YXOAd2VpZ2h0ZWSAdG+A
cmVmbGVjdIBoaXOAb3KAaGVyGNoYw5jZYBvZoBzWx1Y3Rpb26AYW5kgGhpc4BvcoBoZXLQARUA
AAsACQABYgayAQIAASAVANBkZW1vZ3JhcGhpY4BjaGFyYWN0ZXJpc3Rpy3Mu0AQVAAALAAkAAARQI
ZAMEAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAAGHDADgSW6AMTksNSyAaW50ZXJ2aWV3c4BzdGFydGVkgGluGep1bHma
YW5kgGVuZGVkgGluGep1Z3VzdC6AgEFsbIBpbnR1cnZpZXdzGhd1cmWAZG9uZYBieYAxMNABFQA
CwAJAAGCRYFBgABIBUA0G1udGVydm1ld2Vyc4BhdIBvbmWAbG9jYXRpb26Ab2aAVGhlgEdhbGx1
cIBPcmdhbm16YXRpb26AKExpbnNvbG4sgE51YnJhc2thKYB3aG+Ad2VyZYBzWx1Y3RlZnAB
cIBPcmdhbm16YXRpb26AKExpbnNvbG4sgE51YnJhc2thKYB3aG+FQAA
CwAJAAF4C8gGCAABIBUA0HNwZWNpZmljYWxsYBmb3KAdGhlc2WAaW50ZXJ2aWV3cy6AgFRoZXJl
gHdlcmWAYYB0b3RhbIBvZoAxMDEwgHJlc3BvbmlbnRzG1glugHRoZYBPa2xhaG9tYyBdaXR50AEV
AAALAAkAAASoNeggKAAEgFQDQTVNBgGFuZiA3NTCAaW6AdGhlgEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BNU0GAd210
aIByZXNwb25zZYByYXRlc4BvZoA0NiWAaW6AYm90aIBhcmVhcy6AgFRoZdABFQAACwAJAAHcDiwK
DAABIBUA0HByb3BvcnRpb25zgG9mgG11boBhbmSAd29tZW6AaW50ZXJ2aWV3ZWSAd2VyZTqANDM1

gG1lboBhbmSANTcIlgHdvbWVugGlugE9rbGFob21hgGFuZNABFQAACwAJAAGOEN4LDgABIBUA0DQ2
JYBtZW6AYW5kgDU0JYB3b211boBpboBjBmRpyW5hcG9saXMugIBUaGWAYXZ1cmFnZYBhZ2VzgHd1
cmWAc21taWxhciyANDIuOIB5ZWFyc9ABFQAACwAJAAFAEpANEAABIBUA0ChTRD0xNi44gH11YXJz
KYBpboBPa2xhaG9tYYBdaXR5gGFuZIA0Mi44gH11YXJzGChTRD0xNS4ygH11YXJzKYBpboBjBmRpy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v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My4xJYBhdIBhgDk1JYBsZXZ1bIBvZoBjb25maWR1bmn1LoBUaG1zgG1heYBiZYBpbnR1cnByZXR1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No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A
CQABVhemEhYAASAVANBzdHJlc3OAZG1zb3JkZXkAd2VyZYBpbmNsdWR1ZC7QBBUAAAACQABCB1Y
FBgAASAVANDM8g7yTUVBU1VSRVPzDvPQBBUAAAACQABbBy8FfxwAASAVANBFWFBPU1VSRdAEFQAA
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J
AAF4C8gGCAABIBUA0G5vbnNtb2t1cnOAb3KAc21va2Vycy7QBBUAAAsACQABKgl6CAoAASAVANBT
VFJFU1PQBBUAAAsACQAB3A4sCgWAASAVANDgEQWAAAAACAcMAOBjboAxOTk1LIB3ZYBhc2t1ZIB0
d2+AcXVlc3Rpb25zgGFib3V0gG92ZXJhbGyAc3RyZXNzLoCAVGHlgGZpcnN0gHF1ZXN0aW9u
d2+gHdh
c4BhgHB1cnNvbmFs0AEVAAALAAkAAY4Q3gsOAAEgFQDQcmF0aW5ngGFib3V0gGhvd4BtdWNogHN0
cmVzc4B3YXOAZXhwZXJpZW5jZWSAc2luY2WAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmc6gEGAbG90LIBhgG1vZGVyYXRl
gGFtb3VudCzQARUAAAsACQABQBKQDRAAASAVANByZWxhdG12ZWx5gGxpDHRsZSYAb3KAYWxtb3N0
gG5vbmUugIBUaGWAac2Vjb25kgHF1ZXN0aW9uGhdhc4Bjb21wYXJhdG12ZTqAd2hldGhlcob0aGWA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ZYBpdGVtc4Aoc2VlgXpc3SAYWJvdmUp0AEVAAALAAkAAYIh0hwiAAEgFQDQZXhwZXJpZW5jZWSA
YnmAZWFjaIByZXNwb25kZW50gGlugE9rbGFob21hgENpdHkugIBXZYByZXBvcnSAdGhlgGxpVh
coByZWxhdGlvbnNoaXCAYmV0d2VlbtABFQAACwAJAAE0I4QeJAABIBUA0HN0cmVzc4BhbmSAZXhw
b3N1cmWAdXNpbmeAcuVncmVzc21vboBhbmFseXNpc4BhbmSAY29ycmVsYXRpb24u0AQVAAALAAkA
AeYkNiAmAAEgFQDQU0VFS01OR4BIRUxQ0AQVAAALAAkAAZgm6CEoAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAGHDADg
V2WAYXNrZWSAd2hldGhlcobYzxNwb25kZW50c4BoYWSAc291Z2h0gGFueYBoZwXwgZvcoBhbnmA
cGVyc29uYwYAb3KAZW1vdG1vbmFs0AEVAAALAAkAAUoomiMqAAEgFQDQcHJvYm1bXOAc2luY2WA
dGhlgGJvbWJpbmcugIBXZYBhbHNvgGFza2VkgGlmLIBvdGhlcob0aGFugHNlZWTpmeAaGVscCYA

cmVzcG9uZGVudHOAaGFk0AEVAAALAAkAAfwpTCUsAAEgFQDQY29uc2Npb3VzbHmAdGFrZW6AYW55
gHN0ZXBzGHRVgHJlZHVjZyBzdHJlc3MugIBXZYBhc2t1ZlBib3RogHF1ZXN0aW9uc4BpboAxOTk1
gGFuZlAxOTk2LoCAV2XQARUAAAACQABriv+Ji4AASAVANByZXBvcnSAdGhlgHJhdGVzG9m
gGFuZlAxOTk2LoCAV2XQARUAAAACQABriv+gHN1
ZWtpbmeAaGVscIBhbmSAb2aAdGFraW5ngHN0ZXBzGHRVgHJlZHVjZyBzdHJlc3MugIBXZYBhbHNv
gGNvbXB1dGVk0AMVAAALAAkAAWatsCgwAAEgFQDQd2hldGh1coBvcoBub3SAYYByZXNwb25kZW50
gHNvdWdodIBoZWxwG9yGHRvb2uAc3RlcHOAdG+AcMvkdWNlGHN0cmVzc4BhbmSAd2WAcMvW
gHNvdWdodIBoZWxwG9yGHRvb2uAc3RlcHOAdG+b3J0
gHROzDABFQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAABIBUA0HByb3BvcnRpb26Ad2hvgHRvb2uAZWl0aGVyG9mgHRO
ZXNlGfjdGlvbnMu0AQVAAALAAkAAWIGsgECAAEGFQDQUFNZQ0hPTE9HSUNBTIBESVNUUkVTU9AE
FQAACwAJAAEUCGQDBAABIBUA0OARDAAAAAAIBWwA4FJlc3BvbmRlbnRzGhd1cmWAYXNrZWSADG+A
ZXZhbHVhdGWAAC2V2ZW6AaXRlbXOAcmVsYXRlZlB0b4Bwc3ljaG9sb2dpY2FsgGRpc3RyZXNzLoDQ
ARUAAAACQABxgkWBQYAAASAVANBUaGVzZYB3ZXJlGhBocmFzZWSA8CAE8FNpbmNlGHRoZYBib21i
aW5nLlBib3eAb2Z0ZW6AZG+AEw91gZlZWw6gDEpgHNVgHNhZlB0aGF0gG5vdGhpbmeAY291
aW5nLlBib3eAb2Z0ZW6AZG+bGTQ
ARUAAAACQABeAvIBggAASAVANbjAgVlcoB5b3WAdXAsgDIpgG5lcnZvdXMsGDMpgHJlc3RsZXNz
gG9yGZpZGdlDHksgDQpgGhvcGVsZXNzLlIA1KYB0aGF0gGV2ZXJ5dGhpbmeAd2FzGfGfGVMz9y
dCyANinQARUAAAACQABKgl6CAoAASAVANB3b3J0aGxlcm3MgGFuZlA3KYBhbmdyeS7wHwTwgIBB
bnN3ZXJzGhd1cmU6gGFsbIBvZoB0aGWAdGltZSYAbW9zdIBvZoB0aGWAdGltZSYAc29tZYBvZoB0
aGWAdGltZSYAyDABFQAACwAJAAHcDiwKDAABIBUA0GxpDHRsZYBvZoB0aGWAdGltZSYAb3KAbm9u
ZYBvZoB0aGWAdGltZS6AgEZvcoB1YWNogHJlc3BvbnNlG9mgGFsbCyAbW9zdCYAb3KAc29tZYBv
ZoB0aGWAdGltZSsZARUAAAACQABjhDeCw4AASAVANByZXNwb25kZW50c4B3ZXJlGfGsc2+A
ZoB0aGWAdGltZSsZARUAAAACQABjhDeCw4AASAVANByZXNwb25kZW50c4B3ZXJlGfGsc2+YXNr
ZWSA8CAE8FdvdWxkgHlvdYBzYXmAeW91gGhhdMwAZmVsdIBbZm9yGHRoZYBnaXZlboBpdGVtXYBt
b3JlG9mDGvugHRoYW7QARUAAAACQABQBKQDRAAASAVANBiZWZvcMwAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmcsGx1
c30Ab2Z0ZW6AdGhhboBiZWZvcMwAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmcsG9yGfGfGfGf3V0gHROZYBzYW1lGfGfGfJ1
Zm9yZYB0aGXQARUAAAACQAB8hNCDxIAASAVANBib21iaW5nP/AfBPCAgFdlGHRvdGFsbGVkGHRo
ZYBudW1iZXKAb2aAaXRlbXOAAdGhhdIBhgHJlc3BvbmRlbnSAdGhvdWdodIBoYWSAb2NjdxJyZWSA
YWxsLIBtb3N0LNBABFQAACwAJAAGkFfQqFAAABIBUA0G9yGHNvbWWAb2aAdGhlgHRpbWUugICAV2WA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l
gHlvdYBmZWx00AEVAAALAAkAAR4ebhkeAAEgFQDQZWFzaWx5gGFubm95ZWSAb3KAaXJyaXRhdGVk
LlIA1KYBkaWSAeW91gGxvc2WAeW91coB0ZW1wZXIsGDIpgGRpZlB5b3WAaGF2ZYB0cm91YmxlGHNs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b3VyG9mgHROZYBzaXiAaXRlbXMu0AQVAAALAAkAAZgm6CEoAAEgFQDQSU5U1VTSU900AQVAAAL
AAkAAUoomiMqAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAGHDAAGV2WAYXNrZWSAZm91coBxdWVzdGlvbnOAYWJvdXSA
cmVtaW5kZXJzG9mgHROZYBib21iaW5ngGluGDE5OTU6gDEpgGhhdMwAdGhpbmdzGh1vddABFQA
CwAJAAH8KUw1LAABIBUA0GhhdMwAc2VlboBvcoBoZWFyZlBzdWRkZW5seYByZW1pbmRlZlB5b3WA
b2aAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmcsGDIpgGhhdMwAeW91gHROb3VnaHSAYWJvdXSAAdGh10AEVAAALAAkAAa4r
/iYuAAEgFQDQYm9tYmluZ4B3aGVuGh1vdYBkaWSAbm90gG1lYW6AdG8sgDMpgGhhdMwAeW91gGh
ZlBkcmVhbXOAAb3KAbmlnaHRtYXJlc4BhYm91dIB0aGWAYm9tYmluZyZQAxUAAAACQABYc2wKDA
ASAVANBhbmSANCmAaGF2ZYB5b3WAYXZvaWRlZlBzaXRlYXRpb25zGHRoYXSACmVtaW5kgH1vdYBv
ZoB0aGWAYm9tYmluZy6AgEFsbIBmb3VyGfHF1ZXN0aW9uc4Bhc2t1ZlBmb3LQARUAAAACQABsAQA

AAAAASAVANBhbnN3ZXJzG9mgG51dmVyLIBhbG1vc3SAbmV2ZXIsgHNvbWV0aW1lcyyAZmFpcmX5
gG9mdGVuLIBvcoB2ZXJ5gG9mdGVuLoCAVGHlgHF1ZXN0aW9uc4BhYm91dNABFQAACwAJAAFiBrIB
AgABIBUA0GRyZWFtc4BvcoBuaWdodG1hcmVzGgFuZIBhdm9pZGluZ4BzaXR1YXRpb25zgHdlcmWA
cmVwZWF0ZWSAAw6AMTK5Ni6AgFdlgHJlCG9ydIB0aGWAcMF0ZXOAb2bQARUAAAAsACQABFAhKAwQA
ASAVANBzb21ldGltZXMsgGZhaXJseYBvZnR1biYAb3KAadmVyeYBvZnR1boBmb3KAZWFjaIBpdGVt
LtAEFQAACwAJAAHGCryfBgABIBUA0MzyDPJSRVNVTFRt8wzz0AQVAAALAAkAAASoNeggKAAEgFQDQ
8g7yzEVYUE9TVVJF8w7z0AQVAAALAAkAAZQQ5AsOAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAGHDADgT2aAdGhlgGfK
dWx0c4BpboB0aGWAT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210eYBNU0EsgDYxLjUlGChiZXR3ZWVugDU4LjUlGHRvgDY0
LjUlGhdPdGiAOTU10AEVAAALAAkAAUYS1g0QAAEgFQDQY29uZmlkZW5jZSMAcmVwb3J0ZWSAZXhw
ZXJpZW5jaW5ngGF0gGx1YXN0gG9uZYBkaXJlY3SACmVzdWx0gG9mgHRoZYBib21iaW5nLoCASW6A
cG9wdWxhdGlvboB0ZXJtcyZARUAAAAsACQAB+BNIDxIAASAVANBhYm91dIA0MzOAdGhvdXNh
cG9wdWxhdGlvboB0ZXJtcyZARUAAAAsACQAB+bmSA
YWR1bHRZgChiZXR3ZWVugDQxMoB0aG91c2FuZIBhbmSANDU3gHRob3VzYW5kgHdPdGiAOTU1gGNv
bmZpZGVuY2Up0AEVAAALAAkAAaov+hAUAAEgFQDQ8gjy8wjzd2VyZYBLEHBvc2VkgHRvgG9u
bmZpZGVuY2Up0AEVAAALAAkAAaov+ZYBv
coBtb3JlG9mgHRoZYBjb25zZXFlZW5jZXOAb2aAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmcugIBBgGxhcmDlGhByb3Bv
cnRpb24sgDM4LjUlLNABFQAACwAJAAFcF6wSfGABIBUA0HJlCG9ydGVkgGtub3dpbmeAc29tZW9u
ZYB3aG+Ad2FzGgluanVyZWSAb3KAa21sbGVkgGglugHRoZYBLEHBsb3Npb26AYW5kgDE5LjAl
ZYB3aG+gHJl
cG9ydGVk0AEVAAALAAkAAQ4ZXhQYAAEgFQDQYXR0ZW5kaW5ngG9uZYBvcoBtb3JlGZ1bmVyYXxz
gGZvcoB2aWN0aW1zgG9mgHRoZYBib21iaW5nLoCATWvtb3JpYwYAc2VydmljZXOAb2aAb3RoZXKA
a2luZHPQARUAAAAsACQABwBoQFhoAASAVANB3ZXJlGnVbW1vboBpboBPa2xhaG9tYyBhbmSAMzku
MiWAb2aAcMvzcG9uZGVudHOAcGFydG1jaXBhdGVkgGglugHRoZW0ugIBTdWNogHN1cnZpY2Vz0AEV
AAALAAkAAAXIcwhccAAEgFQDQd2VyZYBoZWxkgG5hdGlvbndpZGWAYW5kgG9ugG5hdGlvbmFsgHRl
bGV2aXNpb26AYW5kgDE3LjQlG9mgHJlCG3BvbmR1bnRzGglugEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc9ABFQAACwAJ
AAEkHnQZHgABIBUA0HJlCG9ydGVkgHBhcnRpY2lwYXRpbmcugIBFbGV2ZW6AcGVyY2VudIBvZoB3
b3JrZXJzGg2NyWAb2aAcMvzcG9uZGVudHMpgHJlCG9ydGVkgHRoZXmAd2VyZdABFQAACwAJAAHW
HyYbIAABIBUA0HVuYwJsZYB0b4B3b3JrgGR1ZYB0b4B0aGWAYm9tYmluZy6AgFNtYwXsgG51bWJl
cnOAb2aAcMvzcG9uZGVudHOAcMvwb3J0ZWSAdGhlgGZvbGxvd2luZ9ABFQAACwAJAAGIIdgcIgab
IBUA0G10ZW1z0oAxJYBjZWluZ4BwZXJzb25hbG5gGluanVyZWSAYnmAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmc7gDEl
gGhdmluZ4BoaXOAb3KAaGVyGhvbWwAZGFtYwdlZDUAMyXQARUAAAAsACQABoiOKHiQAASAVANBo
YXZpbmeAYYBmYw1pbHmAbWvtYmVygGluanVyZWSAb3KAa21sbGVk04A0JYBoYXZpbmeAYW5vdGh1
coBob3VzZWhvbGSAbWvtYmVygGluanVyZWSAb3LQARUAAAAsACQAB7CQ8ICYAASAVANBraWxsZWQu
0AQVAAALAAkAAZ4m7iEoAAEgFQDQ8g7yRFJtktJTkeAQU5EgFNNT0tJTkfzDvPQBBUAAAAsACQAB
UCigIyoAASAVANDgEQwAAAAACAcMAOBPa2xhaG9tYyByZXNwb25kZW50c4ByZXBvcnRlZIBhgGhp
Z2hlcoByYXRlgG9mgGluY3JlYXNlZIBhbGNvaG9sgHVzZSYANS4wJYBpboAxOTk10AEVAAALAAkA
AQIqUiUsAAEgFQDQYw5kgDMuMCWAaW6AMTK5NoBjb21wYXJlZIB3aXRogDIuMCWAYW5kgDAuOSWA
aW6ASW5kaWfuYXBvbG1zLlByZXNwZWN0aXZlbnhkgIBJboBPa2xhaG9tYSzQARUAAAAsACQABtCsE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J
boAxOTk1gHRoZYBPa2xhaG9tYyBDAxR5gHJhdGWAZm9ygGgAbG90gG9mgHN0cmVzc4B3YXOAb3Zl
ctABFQAACwAJAAEgDxOICgABIBUA0HR3aWNlGHRoYXSAb2aASW5kaWfuYXBvbG1zLlBhbmSAdGh1
gHJhdGWAZm9ygG1vZGVyYXRlgG9ygGgAbG90gG9mgHN0cmVzc4BpboBPa2xhaG9tYyBDAxR5gHdh
c4AxLjUlGnABFQAACwAJAAHcDiwKDAABIBUA0HRpbWVzGHRoYXSAb2aASW5kaWfuYXBvbG1zLoCA
VGhlgHJhdGVzGGRlY2xpbnVkgGZyb22AMTK5NYB0b4AxOTk2gGx1YXZpbmeAYYB0b3RhbIBYXRl
gGlu0AEVAAALAAkAAAY4Q3gsOAAEgFQDQT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210eYBhbG1vc3SAdHdpY2WAdGhhdIBv
ZoBjbmRpYW5hcG9saXMugIDQBBUAAAAsACQABQBKQDRAAASAVANDyDvJSRUxBVElPT1NISVCAQkVU
V0VFTtoBTVFJFU10AQU5EgEVYUE9TVVJF8w7z0AQVAAALAAkAAfITQg8SAAEgFQDQ4BEMAAAAAGH
DADgVGh1cmWAd2FzGgGAC3Ryb25ngGxpbnVhcoByZWxhdGlvbnNoaXCAYmV0d2VlboB0aGWAc3Ry

ZXNzghNjb3JlGgFuZIB0aGWAdG90YWyAbnVtYmVygG9m0AEVAAALAAkAAaQV9BAUAAEgFQDQZXhw
b3N1cmWAAxR1bXOAb3V0gG9mgGvPz2h0gHBvc3NpYmxlgHdPdGiAYYBjb3JyZWxhdGlvboBvZoAu
MzSAKHn1gD2ALjAyOCkugIBSZWdyZXNzaW9u9gGFuYwX5c2lZ0AEVAAALAAkAAVYXphIWAEEgFQDQ
KHVud2VpZ2h0ZWQpgG9mgHN0cmVzc4BvboB1eHBvc3VyZYB5aWVsZGVkgGFugGluDGVyY2VwdIBv
ZoAxLjE2N4Aoc2WAPYAUMDU1KYBhbmSAYYBzbG9wZYBvZtABFQAACwAJAAEIGVgUGAABIBUA0DAu
Mzc4gChzZYA9gC4wMzQsgHSAPYAxMS4zLlBwPC4wMDAxKS6AgNAEFQAACwAJAAG6GgoWGgABIBUA
0PIO8lNFRUtJTkeASEVMUPMO89AEFQAACwAJAAFsHLwXHAABIBUA0OARDAAAAAIBwWA4FJhdGVz
gGZvcoB0aGWAc2Vla2luZ4BoZWxwG9yGHRha2luZ4BzdGVvc4B0b4ByZWR1Y2WAc3RyZXNzGgFy
ZYBzaG93boBmb3KAYm90aIBjaXRpZXOAZm9y0AEVAAALAAkAAAR4ebhkeAAEgFQDQYm90aIBzdXJ2
ZXmAeWVhcnOAAW6AVGFibGWAMi6AgElugDE5OTWAdGhlgHJhdGWAb2aAc2Vla2luZ4BoZWxwGlu
gE9rbGFob21hgENpdHmAd2FzGg92ZXXKAdGhyZWXQARUAAAACQAB0B8gGyAAASAVANB0aXW1lc4B0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A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O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YWQsgGluY2x1ZGluZ4B3ZWxsgG92ZXXKAAgFsZoB0aGWAYWR1bHRzGgGluGHRoZdABFQAACwAJAAGI
IdgcIgABIBUA0G1ldHJvcG9saXRhboBhcmVhGHN1cnJvdW5kaW5ngE9rbGFob21hgENpdHkugIBJ
dIBpc4ByZW1hcmthYmxlgHRoYXSAY29udGFjdIB3aXRogHRoZYBib21iaW5nLNABFQAACwAJAAE6
I4oeJAABIBUA0G1vc3RseYBieYBrbm93aW5ngGRpcmVjdIB2aWN0aW1zLlB3YXOAc2+Ad21k
I4oeJAABIBUA0G1vc3RseYBieYBrbm93aW5ngGRpcmVjdIB2aWN0aW1zLlB3YXOAc2+ZXNw
cmVhZC6AgFRoaXOAc2hvd3OAdGhhdIBwaH1zaWNpYW5zLlBwYXJ0aWN1bGFybnHnQARUAAAACQAB
7CQ8ICYAASAVANBwcm1tYXJ5gGNhcmWAcHJhY3RpdGlvbmVyc4BzaG91bGSAC2NyZWVugHRoZWly

gHBhdG11bnRzGZvcoBkaXJ1Y3SAYW5kgGluZG1yZWN0gGNvbnRhY3RzGhdpdGjQARUAAAACQAB
nibuISgAASAVANBkaXNhc3R1cnMsgHdoZXR0ZXXAY2F1c2VkgGJ5gHR1cnJvcmlzdHMsgG5hdHVy
YWwsgG9ygG1hboRtYWR1gGJ1dIBpbnR1bnRpb25hbC6AgFRoZYBlZmZ1Y3RzGg9mgHRoZdABFQAA
CwAJAAAFQKKAjKgABIBUA0GJvbWJpbmeAb26AcGVvcGxlC/AcBPCAd2VsbIRiZWluZyyAbWVhc3Vy
ZWSAYnmAc3RyZXXnzLIbpbmRydXNpdmVuZXXnzLIbBbmSAb3RoZXXAY2hhcmFjdgVyaXN0aWNzLNAB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u
ZIBpbnRydXNpdmWAdGhvdWdodHMugIBDb21wYXJlZIB3aXRogEluZG1hbmFwb2xpcyYAZXZ1cnMA
bWVhc3VyZyBvZtABFQAACwAJAAAF4C8gGCAABIBUA0HBzeWNob2xvZ21jYWyAaW1wYWN0gHRoYXSA
d2WAZXhhbWluZWSAd2FzGhpZ2hlcoBpboBPa2xhaG9tYyBdaXR5gGJvdGiAYYBmZXEAbW9udGhz
gGFmdGVy0AEVAAALAAKAAASoNeggKAAEgFQDQdGhlgGJvbWJpbmeAYW5kgGFib3V0gGGAeWVhcoBh
bmSAYYBoYWxmgGxhdGVyLtaEFQAACwAJAAHCdiwKDAABIBUA0OARDAAAAAIBwwA4FN0cmVzc4Bs
ZXZ1bHOAd2VyZyBzdHJvbmDseYByZWxhdGVkHRvGv4cG9zdXJlLoCAU3RyZXXnzGxldmVsc4B3
ZXJlG11Y2iaAaG1naGVyGlu0AEVAAALAAKAAAY4Q3gsOAAEgFQDQ2tsYWhvbWGAQ210eYB0aGFu
gGluGluEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BpboBib3RogDE5OTWAYW5kgDE5OTYugIBXaXRoaW6AT2tsYWhvbWGA
Q210eSyAdGh10AEVAAALAAKAAUASka0QAAEgFQDQcmVsYXRpb25zaGlwGJldHdlZW6AZXhwb3N1
cmVzGgGFuZIBzdHJlc3OAd2FzghN0cm9uZy6AgNAEFQAACwAJAAHyE0IPEgABIBUA0OARDAAAAAIB
wwA4FJhdGVzGg9mgHN1ZWtpbmeAaGVscIBmb3KAc3RyZXXnzGg9ygHRha2luZ4BvdGhlc0BzdGVw
c4B0b4ByZWR1Y2WAc3RyZXXnzGhdlcmWaaG1naGVyGlu0AEVAAALAAKAAaQV9BAUAAEgFQDQ2ts
YWhvbWGAQ210eYB0aGFugGluGluEluZG1hbmFwb2xpcy6AgENoYW5nZXOAb3Z1coB0aW1lgGluGxl
dmVsc4BvZoBzdHJlc3OAYW5kgHN1ZWtpbmeAaGVscIBmb3LQARUAAAACQABVhemEhYAASAVANBz
dHJlc3OAYXJlGHBcnRpy3VsYXJseYByZXZ1YXpbcmcvIBQcmV2YWxlbnNlGHN0cmVzc4BkZWNY
ZWFzZWSAaW6AYm90aIBjaXRpZXOAZnJvbYAXOTk1gHRvGvDE5OTYugNABFQAACwAJAAEIGVUGAAB
IBUA0EVmZm9ydHOAdG+Ac2Vla4BoZWXwgG9ygHJlZHVjZyBzdHJlc3OAAW6Ab3RoZXXAd2F5
IBUA0EVmZm9ydHOAdG+c4Bp
bmNyZWFzZWSAb3Z1coB0aW1lgGluG9rbGfob21hgENpdHmAYnV00AEVAAALAAKAAboaChYaAAEg
FQDQcmVtYWluZWSAcXVpdGWAAC3RhYmxlgGluGluEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BkZXNwaXRlGhJlZHVjdGlv
bnOAAW6Ac3RyZXXnzLoCAU3RyZXXnzGxldmVsc4ByZW1haW51ZIBoaWdo0AEVAAALAAKAAWwcvBcc
AAEgFQDQYw5kgHB1cnNvbFsgGvMz9ydHOAdG+AY29wZYB3aXRogHN0cmVzc4Bjb250aW51
AAEgFQDQYw5kgHB1cnNvbFsgGvMz9ydHOAdG+ZWSA
bW9yZyB0aGFugGGAeWVhcoBhZnR1coB0aGWAYm9tYmluZy6A0AEVAAALAAKAAAR4ebhkeAAEgFQDQ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z
YXN0ZXXAdG+AdGhlgGR1YWSAYW5k0AEVAAALAAKAAfwpTCUsAAEgFQDQaW5qdXJlZC6AgFRo
YXN0ZXXAdG+ZYBo
ZWFsdGiAYW5kgHdlbGyEYmVpbmeAb2aAbWFueYBvdGhlc0OAY2FugGJlgGFmZmVjdGvKLIBjb21w

cm9taXNpbmeAdGhlaXKAZGFpbHnQARUAAAAsACQABriv+Ji4AASAVANBSaXZlcyYAb2Z0ZW6A
cm9taXNpbmeAdGhlaXKAZGFpbHnQARUAAAAsACQABriv+cmVx
dWlYaW5ngHRyZWF0bWVudIBmb3KAdGhlaXKAY2hhbmdlZlBsaXZlcy6AgERpc2FzdGVyGHBsYW5u
aW5ngG11c3SAYmVnaW6AdG+AAW5jbHVkZdADFQAACwAJAAFGlBaAoMAABIBUA0GFzc2Vzc211
aW5ngG11c3SAYmVnaW6AdG+bnSA
b2aAcHN5Y2hvbG9naWNhbIBuZWVkc4BhbmSACHJvdmlkZYBmb3KAc2Vydm1jZyBkZWxpdmVyeSyA
Ym90aIBzaG9ydlR0ZXJtGfFuZlBsb25nNAUFQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAABIBUA0HR1cm0ugIBUaG1z
gHJlcXVpcmVzGhZhbG1kgHBvcHVvYXRpb26AbWVhc3VyZXMgHNjcmVlbnluZ4BhbmSACmVmZXJy
YWYAcHJvY2VkdXJlc4Bmb3LQARUAAAAsACQABYgayAQIAASAVANBpbmRpdmlkdWFscyyAYW5kgHBs
YW5zgGFuZlBwcm9jZWR1cmVzGHRvGHRyYwluGHBvY2ZlZl3Npb25hbHOAZm9yG1ham9yGGRpc2Fz
dGVyYyZ0CRUAAAAsACQABFAhkAwQAASAVANDyDPJFTkROT1RFU/MM89AEFQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAAB
IBUA0NMUFgADAAAIAAAA+hgAABYC2QAWANO50xUOAAAMAAGGgYh8OANPQCRUAAAAsACQABYh+A
IBUA0NMUFgADAAAIAAAA+hgAABYC2QAWANO50xUOAAAMAAGGgYh8OANPQCRUAAAAsACQABYh+BQgA
ASAVANBUYWJsZYAxLoCAUmF0ZXOAb2aAZXhwZXJpZW5jaW5ngPAgBPBhgGxvdIBvZoBzdHJlc3Ms
8B8E8IBvcoDwIATwbW9kZXJhdGwAc3RyZXNz8B8E8IBvcoBlaxRoZXKAZm9yGHRoZYBPa2xhaG9t
YdABFQAACwAJAAGwBAAAAAABIBUA0ENpdHmAYW5kgEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BNU0FzG1ugDE5OTWA
YW5kgDE5OTYy0AQVAAALAAkAAWIGsgECAAEgFQDQ1CqLAIMEFgAAAB8AFwASAAACAAAAAABkAgAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABkAGQAAAAAACBYAgAAAAAAAAAAZABkAAAAAAAgWAIAAAAA
AAAAAGQAZAAAAAAAI FgCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwBCgjsAQoI4sA1NQs
GwAAEQAAqAZkAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAAcZkAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAA
EQAA+ArkAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQrCgADAAAKANTQCx8AABUADwABFAhkAwQAAR8UCGQD
EQAA+HyCF
AQKFHwDQ0AocAAAAGBoAAXgIyAMFAAEFAghktwC3AAAAAAAAAAAAABSCFAGGFKgDQTWV0cm9wb2xp
dGFugEFyZWHQCxwAABIADAAABeAjIAwYAARwCHCCFGqGFHADQ0AoYAAAOAAwAAyEJ0QQGAAEcgrWg
GADQT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210edAKFQAACwAJAAH1CTUFBwABIBUA0EluZG1hbmFwb2xpc9ALOWAAMQAJ
AAH1CTUFCAABIIEEXAA8AHgAAAAAALJ9ABAAxOTk1FwCBhQMBhYkAAAAAACyfQACJOWDQMTk5NdAL
OQAALwAtAAFSC6IGCQABCRcADwAeAAAAAAAAsn0AEADE5OTUXAAkOAAAAAAAAsn0AOHAMcIDka0EGA
TG90gG9mgFN0cmVzc9AKFQAACwAJAAG/DA8ICgABIBUA0DEzLjcl0AoVAAALAAkAA8MDwgLAAEg
FQDQNS44JdALFQAACwAJAAG/DA8IDAABIBUA0E1vZGVyYXRlGfFN0cmVzc9AKFQAACwAJAAsDnwJ
DQABIBUA0DQyLjU10AoVAAALAAkAA8SwOfAkOAAEgFQDQMzAuMSXQCxUAAAAsACQABLA58CQ8AASAV
ANBUb3RhbNAKFQAACwAJAAGZD+kKEAABIBUA0DU2LjI10AoVAAALAAkAAAZkP6QoRAAEgFQDQ
ANBUb3RhbNAKFQAACwAJAAGZD+MzUu
OSXQCzsAADEACQABmQ/pChIAASCBFwAPAB4AAAAAADcfQAQAMT5NhcAgYUDAYWJAAAAAAAwN0AA
iTsa0DE5OTbQCzkaAC8ALQABBhFWDBMAAQkXAA8AHgAAAAAAMJ9ABAAxOTk2FwAJDgAAAAAAMJ9A
DhwDHA5ANBBGExvdIBvZoBTdHJlc3PQChUAAAAsACQABcXDDRQAASAVANazLjI10AoVAAALAAkA
AXMSw0VAAEgFQDQMi44JdALFQAACwAJAAfZEsMNFgABIBUA0E1vZGVyYXRlGfFN0cmVzc9AKFQAA
CwAJAAHgEzAPFwABIBUA0DE5Ljkl0AoVAAALAAkAAeATMA8YAAEgFQDQMTAuMyXQCxUAAAAsACQAB
4BMwDxkaASAVANBUb3RhbNAKFQAACwAJAAFNfZ0QGgABIBUA0DIzLjEl0AoVAAALAAkAAU0VnRab
AAEgFQDQMTMuMSXQERkAAA8ADQABTRWdEBwAAQ0JAA0gGDQzNAJFQAACwAJAAHhGDEUHgABIBUA
0FRhYmxlGDIugFJhdGVzG9mgHJlc3BvbmR1bnRzGhdob4ByZXBvcnRlZlB0aGVzG9mHNvdWdodIB0
cmVhdG11bnQsgHRvb2uAc3RlcHOAdG+AcMvkdWNlGHN0cmVzcycZARUAAAAsACQABsAQAAAAA
cmVhdG11bnQsgHRvb2uAc3RlcHOAdG+ASAV
ANBvcoBkaWSAZWl0aGVyG9uZYBmb3KAdGhlgE9rbGFob21hgENpdHmAYW5kgEluZG1hbmFwb2xp
c4BNU0FzG1ugDE5OTWAYW5kgDE5OTYy0AQVAAALAAkAAWIGsgECAAEgFQDQ1CqLAIMEGAAAAAB8A
GQASAAACAAAAAABkAgAAAAAAAAMACgAAAAIAAAAAAGQAqAZkAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAAKgGAAoG
ZABkAAAAAAAASAAAAAAKbgD4BGQAZAAAAAAAEgAAAAAA+AQWAAAAHwAXAAAAAAA
ZABkAAAAAAAASAAAAAAKbgD4BGQAZAAAAAAAEgAAAAAA+AAAA
AACwBCgjsAQoI4sA1NQsGwAAEQAA1gdKAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAAcZkAGQAAAAA
ABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAA+ArkAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQrCgADAAAKANTQCx8AABUA
ABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAA+DwAB
FAhkAwQAAR8UCGQDHyCFAQKFHwDQ0AocAAAAGBoAAXgIyAMFAAEFAghktwC3AAAAAAAAAAAAABSCF
AgGFKgDQTWV0cm9wb2xp dGFugEFyZWHQCxwAABIADAAABeAjIAwYAARwCHCCFGqGFHADQ0AoYAAAO
AAwAAyEJ0QQGAAEcgrWgGADQT2tsYWhvbWGAQ210edAKFQAACwAJAAH1CTUFBwABIBUA0EluZG1h
bmFwb2xpc9ALOWAAMQAJAAH1CTUFCAABIIEEXAA8AHgAAAAAALJ9ABAAxOTk1FwCBhQMBhYkAAAAA
ACyfQACJOWDQMTk5NdALQQAALwAtAAFSC6IGCQABCRcADwAeAAAAAAAAsn0AEADE5OTUXAAkOAAAA
AAAAsn0AOHAMcIDka0FNvdWdodIBIZWxw0AoVAAALAAkAA8MDwgKAAEgFQDQOC41JdAKFQAACwAJ
AAG/DA8ICwABIBUA0DIuNSXQCxUAAAAsACQABvwwPCAwAASAVANBSZWR1Y2VkgFN0cmVzc9AKFQAA

CwAJAAEsDnwJDQABIBUA0DIzLjQl0AovAAALAAkAASwOfAkOAAEgFQDQMTUuNyXQCxUAAAAsACQAB
LA58CQ8AASAVANBFaXRozXKAb2aAdGhlgEFib3Zl0AovAAALAAkAAZkP6QoQAAEgFQDQMjYuOSXQ
ChUAAAAsACQABmQ/pChEAASAVANAxNy41JdALOWaAMQAJAAGZD+kKEgABI IEXAA8AHgAAAAAAMJ9A
BAAxOTk2FwCBhQMBhYkAAAAAADcfQACJOWDQMTk5NtALoQAALwAtAAEGEVYMEwABCRCADwAeAAAA
AAAwN0AEADE5OTYXAAkOAAAAAAAwN0AOHAMcIDKa0FNvdWdodIBIZWxw0AovAAALAAkAAAXMSwW0U
AAEgFQDQOC41JdAKFQAACwAJAAfzEsMNFQABIBUA0DQuMiXQCxUAAAAsACQABcxLDDRYAASAVANBS
ZWR1Y2VkgFN0cmVzc9AKFQAACwAJAAHgEzAPFwABIBUA0DI4LjEl0AovAAALAAkAAeATMA8YAAEg
FQDQMTQuMSXQCxUAAAAsACQAB4BMwDxkAASAVANBFaXRozXKAb2aAdGhlgEFib3Zl0AovAAALAAkA
AU0VnRaaAAEgFQDQMzEuMCXQChUAAAAsACQABTRWdEBsAASAVANAxNy42JdARGQAADwANAfNFZ0Q
HAABDQkADSANZANDM0AkVAAALAAkAAeEYMRQeAAEgFQDQVGFibGWAMy6AgFJhdGVzgzGzvcobZdWRk
ZW6AcmvtaW5kZXJzLlBpbNrydXNpdmWAdGhvdWdodHMsgG9ygGRyZWFTc4BvcoBuaWdodG1hcmVz
gGFib3V0gHRoZdABFQAACwAJAAgWBAAAAAABIBUA0GJvbWJpbmcsgG9ygGF2b2lkaW5ngHNpdHVh
dG1vbnOAYWJvdXSAdGhlgGJvbWJpbmeAYXJlghNob3dudGZvcobPa2xhaG9tYYBDaXR5gGFuZNAB
FQAACwAJAAFiBrIBAgABIBUA0EluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BpboAxOTk1LoCAUmF0ZXOAZm9ygGRyZWFT
c4BvcoBuaWdodG1hcmVzgzGFib3V0gHRoZYBib2liaW5ngG9ygGF2b2lkaW5ngHNpdHVhdG1vbnPQ
ARUAAAAsACQABFAhkAwQAASAVANBhYm91dIB0aGWAYm9tYmluZ4BhcmWAc2hvd26AZm9yge9rbGFo
b21hgENpdHmAYW5kgEluZG1hbmFwb2xpc4BpboAxOTk2LoCA4BEMAAAAAHgeDADg0AQVAAALAAkA
AcYJFgUGAAEgFQDQ1CqLAIMEDQAAAB8ADgASAAACAAAAAABkAgAAAAAAMACgAAAAIAAAAA
AGQAlgdKAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAAJYHAAoGZABkAAAAAASAAAAAAKbgD4BGQAZAAAAAAAEgAAAAAA
+AQYAAAAHwAZAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACwBCgjsAQoI4sA1NQsGwAAEQAAxghkAGQAAAAA
+ABIA
AAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAAcGzKAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAA+ARkAGQAAAAAABIA
AAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAAcGzKAGQAAAAAABIAAAAAABsA1NQsGwAAEQAA+AAAA
ABsA1NQrCgADAAAKANTQCx8AABUADwABeAvIBggAAR94C8gGHYCFaQKfHwDQ0AocqAAAgABoAAadwL
LAcJAAEFAGvItwC3ABkAAAAAMAAABSCFAgGfKGDQTwV0cm9wb2xpdGFugEFyZWHQCxwAABIADAAB
3AssBwoAARwCHCCFgQGfHADQ0AoYAAAOAAwAAeUMNQgKAAEcgrWgGADQT2tsYWhvbWGAQ2l0edAK
FQAACwAJAAfJDZkICwABIBUA0EluZG1hbmFwb2xpc9ALOWaAMQAJAAGZDkIDAABI IEXAA8AHgAA
AAAALJ9ABAAxOTk1FwCBhQMBhYkAAAAAACyFQACJOWDQMTk5NdALoQAALwAtAAG2DgYKdQABCRCa
DwAeAAAAAAAsn0AEADE5OTYXAAkOAAAAAAAwN0AOHAMcIDKa0FN1ZGR1bmx5gFJlbWluZGVk0AoV
AAALAAkAAASMQcwsOAAEgFQDQNZAuNCXQChUAAAAsACQABIXBzCw8AASAVANA0NS42JdALFQAACwAJ
AAEjEHLMEAAABIBUA0FVuaW50ZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5kZW5k
JdAKFQAACwAJAAQEEAMEgABIBUA0DQ2LjQl0AsVAAALAAkAAZAR4AwTAAEgFQDQRHJlYw1zgG9y
gE5pZ2h0bWfYzXPQChUAAAAsACQAB/RJNDhQAASAVANAxNC4xJdAKFQAACwAJAAH9Ek0OFQABIBUA
0DYuNCXQCxUAAAAsACQAB/RJNDhYAASAVANBBdm9pZGVkgFNpdHVhdG1vbnPQChUAAAAsACQABahS6
DxcAASAVANazMC43JdAKFQAACwAJAAfQfLoPGAABIBUA0DE1LjMl0As7AAAxAAkAAWoUug8ZAAEg
gRcADwAeAAAAAAAwN0AEADE5OTYXAIgFAwGFiqAAAAAAMJ9AAIk7ANaxOTk20As5AAAvAC0AAdcV
JxEaAAEJfWAPAB4AAAAAADcfQAQAMT5NhcACQ4AAAAAADcfQA4cAxwgOQDQU3VkgZGVubHmUmVt
aW5kZWtQChUAAAAsACQABRBeUEhsAASAVANBOQdAKFQAACwAJAAFEF5QSHAABIBUA0E5B0AsVAAAL
AAkAAUQXl1BIdaAEgFQDQVW5pbNrlbmRlZIBUaG91Z2h0c9AKFQAACwAJAAgXGAEUHGABIBUA0E5B
0AoVAAALAAkAAAbEYARQFAAEgFQDQTKhQCxUAAAAsACQABsRgBFCAASAVANBEcmVhbXOAb3KATmln
aHRtYXJlcl9AKFQAACwAJAAEeGm4VIQABIBUA0DUuNCXQChUAAAAsACQABHhpuFSIAASAVANyLjIl
0AsVAAALAAkAAAR4abhUjAAEgFQDQXZvaWRlZIBTaXRlYXRpb25z0AoVAAALAAkAAAYsb2xYkAAEg
FQDQMTMuOSXQChUAAAAsACQABixvbFiUAASAVANA3LjAl0BEZAAAPAA0AAYsb2xYmAAENCwANIBkA
0Mw=

-----=_NextPart_000_0021_01C17C08.32D3ABC0--

>From mark@bisconti.com Mon Dec 3 14:52:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB3MqXel2570 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
14:52:33 -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 OAA05895 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 14:52:29 -0800
(PST)

Received: (qmail 27091 invoked from network); 3 Dec 2001 22:52:09 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 3 Dec 2001 22:52:09 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Mon, 03 Dec 2001
16:52:04
-0600

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: enduring-freedoms.net
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 17:46:24 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBKEJPD LAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0047_01C17C22.6CFE4520"
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
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0047_01C17C22.6CFE4520
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

FIDH (International federation of human rights), Human Rights Watch, and
Reporters
sans frontiè;res 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>

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

-----_NextPart_000_0047_01C17C22.6CFE4520
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```

<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>
<meta http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; = charset=3Diso-8859-
1">
<meta
name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document> <meta name=3DGenerator
content=3D"Microsoft
Word 9"> <meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9"> <link
rel=3DFile-List
href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C17C22.694F6DF0">
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
    <o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
  </o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <w:WordDocument>
    <w:View>Normal</w:View>
    <w:Zoom>0</w:Zoom>
    <w:DocumentKind>DocumentEmail</w:DocumentKind>
    <w:EnvelopeVis/>
  </w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
<style>
<!--
  /* Font Definitions */
@font-face
  {font-family:"Book Antiqua";
  panose-1:2 4 6 2 5 3 5 3 3 4;
  mso-font-charset:0;
  mso-generic-font-family:roman;
  mso-font-pitch:variable;
  mso-font-signature:647 0 0 0 159 0;}
@font-face
  {font-family:Verdana;
  panose-1:2 11 6 4 3 5 4 4 2 4;
  mso-font-charset:0;
  mso-generic-font-family:swiss;
  mso-font-pitch:variable;
  mso-font-signature:536871559 0 0 0 415 0;}
  /* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
  {mso-style-parent:"";
  margin:0in;
  margin-bottom:.0001pt;
  mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
  font-size:12.0pt;
  font-family:"Book Antiqua";
  mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
  mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
  color:black;}
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
  {color:blue;
  text-decoration:underline;
  text-underline:single;}

```

```

a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
    {color:purple;
    text-decoration:underline;
    text-underline:single;}
p.MsoAutoSig, li.MsoAutoSig, div.MsoAutoSig
    {margin:0in;
    margin-bottom:.0001pt;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
span.EmailStyle15
    {mso-style-type:personal-compose;
    mso-ansi-font-size:10.0pt;
    mso-ascii-font-family:Arial;
    mso-hansi-font-family:Arial;
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
span.textel
    {mso-style-name:textel1;
    mso-ansi-font-size:8.0pt;
    mso-bidi-font-size:8.0pt;
    mso-ascii-font-family:Verdana;
    mso-hansi-font-family:Verdana;
    font-weight:normal;
    font-style:normal;}
@page Section1
    {size:8.5in 11.0in;
    margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;
    mso-header-margin:.5in;
    mso-footer-margin:.5in;
    mso-paper-source:0;}
div.Section1
    {page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dpurple = style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3Dtextel1><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack
face=3D"Times
New Roman"><span = style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-ansi-font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-bidi-font-family:Arial'><span
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-size:8.0pt'>FIDH (International federation of = human
rights),
Human Rights Watch, and Reporters sans fronti=E8res have = created this
website to
document what they consider &#8220;arbitrary or legalised = restrictions of
human
rights, press freedom and information on the =
Internet.&#8221;</span></span></font></span><span
class=3Dtextel1><font color=3Dblack face=3D"Times New Roman"><span =

```

style=3D'mso-ansi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:"Times New = Roman";mso-bidi-font-
family:Arial;color:black;
mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 =
color=3Dblack
face=3D"Times New Roman"><span = style=3D'font-size:12.0pt;mso-ansi-font-
size:12.0pt;
font-family:"Times New Roman";mso-bidi-font-family:Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><span
class=3DEmailStyle15><span
style=3D'mso-ansi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:"Times New =
Roman";mso-bidi-font-family:
Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></sp=
an></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><a = href=3D"http://www.enduring-
freedoms.org/welcome.php3">http://www.endurin=
g-freedoms.org/welcome.php3<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:

Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><!--[if supportFields]><span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-begin'><span=20
style=3D'mso-spacerun: yes'> AUTOTEXTLIST \s "E-mail=20
Signature" <span = style=3D'mso-element:field-
separator'><![endif]-->Mark
David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, =
Inc.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>2610 Woodley Place =
NW<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>Washington, District of Columbia =
20008<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>202/ 347-8822<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>202/ 347-8825 = FAX<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>mark@bisconti.com<o:p></o:p></p>=

<p class=3DMsoNormal><!--[if supportFields]><span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-end'><![endif]--><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0047_01C17C22.6CFE4520--

>From jdfranz@earthlink.net Mon Dec 3 15:04:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB3N41e24451 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
15:04:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net (hawk.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.22])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA17658 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 15:04:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from sdn-ar-020casfrmp084.dialsprint.net ([158.252.248.86]
helo=earthlink.net)
by hawk.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16B27g-0001MS-00; Mon, 03 Dec 2001 15:03:40 -0800
Message-ID: <3C0C0161.87D19F4E@earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2001 14:49:05 -0800
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@earthlink.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.74 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Surveying Teenagers
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 godard@virginia.edu Mon Dec 3 17:06:55 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 fB416se05726 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001
17:06:54 -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 RAA15268 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 17:06:54 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa22431;
3 Dec 2001 20:06 EST
Received: from Jose (vsat-148-64-3-185.c4.sb4.mrt.starband.net
[148.64.3.185])
by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id UAA35146
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 3 Dec 2001 20:06:26 -0500
From: Ellis Godard <godard@virginia.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: FW: Newspaper Funnies
Date: Mon, 3 Dec 2001 17:06:30 -0800
Message-ID: <NCEELGJNGFLOAJBFAFFOKEOLDMAA.godard@virginia.edu>
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 V5.50.4133.2400

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 vedy 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 tmglp@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 ESMTTP
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: tmglp@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?

>From ALLENB1@WESTAT.com Tue Dec 4 08:07:00 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 fB4G70e14533 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
08:07:00 -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 IAA00833 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 08:07:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtp.westat.com (smtp.westat.com [198.232.249.95])
by scf-fs.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTP
id fB4G6cm01244 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 08:06:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtp.westat.com (smtp1.westat.com) by smtp.westat.com (LSMTP
for
Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0004EDC6@smtp.westat.com>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
10:56:43
-0500
Received: from 10.1.0.184 by smtp.westat.com (InterScan E-Mail VirusWall NT);
Tue, 04
Dec 2001 10:56:42 -0500
Received: by reconnnt1.westat.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <VTSG0D16>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:56:59 -0500
Message-ID: <9B425F151083D311A218009027B00EA60296DF0A@remailnt1-
re01.westat.com>
From: Bruce Allen <ALLENB1@WESTAT.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Position Announcement
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:56:45 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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

range of institutional and business clients. We are a rapidly growing employee-owned corporation with over 1,400 research, technical, and administrative staff and a more than 35-year history of technical and managerial excellence.

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

>From cfleury@cssresearch.org Tue Dec 4 09:16:02 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

id fB4HG2e20670 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
09:16:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mail.checkbook.org (mail.checkbook.org [209.249.111.33])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA25483 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 09:16:02 -0800
(PST)
Received: by mail.checkbook.org from localhost
(router,slmail V5.1); Tue, 04 Dec 2001 12:21:29 -0500
for <aapornet@usc.edu>
Received: from cssresearch.org [209.249.111.156]
by mail.checkbook.org [209.249.111.33] (SLmail 5.1.0.4415) with ESMTTP id
C75DAE03D20C11D5814700000000000 for <aapornet@usc.edu> plus 1 more; Tue, 04
Dec
2001 12:21:28 -0500
Message-ID: <3C0D04A8.B18E9928@cssresearch.org>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 12:15:21 -0500
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@cssresearch.org>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Research on Response Rates
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-SLUIDL: AE919BE0-E2AA11D5-81470000-00000000

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

>From JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu Tue Dec 4 09:37:29 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 fB4HbSe22552 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
09:37:28 -0800
(PST)
Received: from psg.ucsf.edu (psg.ucsf.edu [128.218.6.65])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id JAA16174 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 09:37:29 -0800
(PST)
From: JCatania@psg.ucsf.edu
Received: by psg.ucsf.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
id <XZAFYGL3>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 09:37:09 -0800
Message-ID: <F4A1925B9E39D511B1320090272A5F2E1E4DAC@psgenet2-113.ucsf.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Surveying Teenagers
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 09:37:05 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.0.1460.8)
Content-Type: text/plain

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

id KAA05896 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:23:21 -0800
(PST)
Received: from HPDom-Message_Server by fuji.hp.ufl.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 04 Dec 2001 13:07:58 -0500
Message-Id: <sc0ccaae.033@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 13:07:22 -0500
From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Hi
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_A7FA9BEE.2041242A"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

---_A7FA9BEE.2041242A
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline

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!

---_A7FA9BEE.2041242A
VIRUS REMOVED
---_A7FA9BEE.2041242A--
>From LHargraves@hschange.org Tue Dec 4 10:25:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4IPGe28575 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
10:25:16 -0800
(PST)
Received: from math3d.mprdc.com ([65.206.255.223])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA08319 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:25:16 -0800
(PST)
Received: by MATH3d with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <Y2B90LTT>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:21:28 -0500
Message-ID: <3D883144FFDA8E41A02853BFB8CF67296DECEA@MATH3d>
From: Lee Hargraves <LHargraves@hschange.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Hi
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:21:27 -0500
X-Priority: 5
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

This is a worm, do not open this email.

-----Original Message-----
From: Colleen Porter [mailto: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!

>From lcarlson@nsf.gov Tue Dec 4 10:32:05 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fB4IW5e29834 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001

10:32:05 -0800

(PST)

Received: from malus.nsf.gov (firewall-user@malus.nsf.gov [198.181.231.37])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP

id KAA15515 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:32:04 -0800

(PST)

Received: by malus.nsf.gov; id NAA07992; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:31:38 -0500

Received: from notel.nsf.gov(128.150.11.1) by malus.nsf.gov via smap (V5.5)

id xma007681; Tue, 4 Dec 01 13:30:13 -0500

Received: from nsfmail04.nsf.gov (nsfmail04.nsf.gov [128.150.130.43])

by notel.nsf.gov (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id NAA26724

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:30:13 -0500

Received: by nsfmail04.nsf.gov with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <X1F6W93N>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:30:14 -0500

Message-ID: <4C37F04B2C2FD411B0B9009027CCC7B903D96A36@nsfmail04.nsf.gov>

From: "Carlson, Lynda" <lcarlson@nsf.gov>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: FW: Hi

Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:30:14 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="----_=_NextPart_000_01C17CF1.B72396D0"

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_01C17CF1.B72396D0

Content-Type: text/plain

there is a virus attached to this message

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: 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
*****=0D=

=0D
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--
>From: Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Tue Dec 4 10:43:15 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fB4IhEe00804 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
10:43:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ddsmttayz007.sam.pentagon.mil (ddsmttayz007.sam.pentagon.mil
[140.185.74.6])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
id KAA28308 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 10:43:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ddsmttayz007 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <Y21L132K>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:38:20 -0500
Message-ID:
<F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBBC0245E9225@ddsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: HI is a WORM. Use Shift/Delete
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:38:07 -0500
X-Priority: 1
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

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 <mailto: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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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>

Subject: Internet Infringing on TV Time? (M Pastore CyberAtlas)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041042190.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

-
--
Copyright (c) 2001 - The CyberAtlas Newsletter - INT Media Group,
Incorporated

-
--
<http://cyberatlas.internet.com>

December 4, 2001

Internet Infringing on TV Time?

By Michael Pastore

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 use 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>

-
--
Copyright (c) 2001 - The CyberAtlas Newsletter - INT Media Group, Incorporated

-
--

>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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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:
<F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBBC0245E9228@ddsmttayz066.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>

<<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>

<<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>>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 4 11:15:45 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

id fB4JFie07546 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
11:15:45 -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 ESMTTP
id LAA05314 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:15:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4JF7s09471 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:15:07 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:15:07 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 godard@virginia.edu Tue Dec 4 11:38:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4Jcde13988 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
11:38:39 -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 LAA00998 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:38:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id ab22048;
4 Dec 2001 14:38 EST
Received: from Jose (vsat-148-64-3-185.c4.sb4.mrt.starband.net
[148.64.3.185])
by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA17314
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:36:58 -0500
From: Ellis Godard <godard@virginia.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Research on Response Rates
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:37:03 -0800
Message-ID: <NCEELGJNGFLOAJBFAFFOEEAIDNAA.godard@virginia.edu>
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 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <3C0D04A8.B18E9928@cssresearch.org>

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.
>

>
> _____
> 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
>
>
>
>

>From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Tue Dec 4 11:47:31 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
id fB4JlVe14948 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
11:47:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.138])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA10320 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:47:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from login3.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login3.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.100])
by smtpsrv1.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id OAA28984
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:47:08 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost)
by login3.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) id OAA55140;
Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:47:05 -0500
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 14:47:05 -0500 (EST)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login3.isis.unc.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.A41.4.21L1.0112041444450.13920-100000@login3.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Instead of the brothel metaphor, how about we just say that AAPORNET 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:

> Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 11:15:07 -0800 (PST)
> From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf-fs.usc.edu>
> Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
> To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
> 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 MILTGOLD@aol.com Tue Dec 4 12:46:34 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP

id fB4KkYe24290 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001

12:46:34 -0800

(PST)

Received: from imo-m04.mx.aol.com (imo-m04.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.7])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP

id MAA14159 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 12:46:33 -0800

(PST)

From: MILTGOLD@aol.com

Received: from MILTGOLD@aol.com

by imo-m04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.128.8b73821 (15901)

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 15:45:31 -0500 (EST)

Received: from web47.aolmail.aol.com (web47.aolmail.aol.com [205.188.161.8])

by
air-id09.mx.aol.com (v82.22) with ESMTTP id MAILINID94-1204154530; Tue, 04 Dec
2001
15:45:30 -0500
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 15:45:29 EST
Subject: Re: Research on Response Rates
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: Unknown (No Version)
Message-ID: <128.8b73821.293e8feb@aol.com>

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

>From fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu Tue Dec 4 13:04:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4L40e27653 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:04:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mail241.lsu.edu (bat114a.ocs.lsu.edu [130.39.187.24])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA03973 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:04:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from stubbs302 ([130.39.19.40])
by mail241.lsu.edu (Lotus Domino Release 5.0.8)
with SMTP id 2001120415035853:7548 ;
Tue, 4 Dec 2001 15:03:58 -0600
Message-ID: <003a01c17d07\$5f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
Reply-To: "Rick Weil" <fweil@lapop.lsu.edu>
From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@pabulum.lapop.lsu.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 15:05:12 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 mark@bisconti.com Tue Dec 4 13:10:25 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 fB4LAOe28646 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:10:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net (epimetheus.hosting4u.net
[209.15.2.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id NAA11994 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:10:23 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 19484 invoked from network); 4 Dec 2001 21:09:57 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 4 Dec 2001 21:09:57 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Tue, 04 Dec 2001
15:09:52
-0600
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Spyware removal utility
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:04:11 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBCEKMDLAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0000_01C17CDD.4FD7BD80"
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
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

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

```
-----=_NextPart_000_0000_01C17CDD.4FD7BD80
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
```

```
<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">
```

```
<head>
<meta http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; = charset=3Diso-8859-
1">
<meta
name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document> <meta name=3DGenerator
content=3D"Microsoft
Word 9"> <meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9"> <link
rel=3DFile-List
href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C17CDD.4CDBBB90">
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
    <o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
  </o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <w:WordDocument>
    <w:View>Normal</w:View>
    <w:Zoom>0</w:Zoom>
    <w:DocumentKind>DocumentEmail</w:DocumentKind>
    <w:EnvelopeVis/>
  </w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
<style>
<!--
  /* Font Definitions */
@font-face
    {font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    panose-1:2 4 6 2 5 3 5 3 3 4;
    mso-font-charset:0;
    mso-generic-font-family:roman;
    mso-font-pitch:variable;
```

```

        mso-font-signature:647 0 0 0 159 0;}
/* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
    {mso-style-parent:"";
    margin:0in;
    margin-bottom:.0001pt;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
    {color:blue;
    text-decoration:underline;
    text-underline:single;}
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
    {color:purple;
    text-decoration:underline;
    text-underline:single;}
p.MsoAutoSig, li.MsoAutoSig, div.MsoAutoSig
    {margin:0in;
    margin-bottom:.0001pt;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
span.EmailStyle15
    {mso-style-type:personal-compose;
    mso-ansi-font-size:10.0pt;
    mso-ascii-font-family:Arial;
    mso-hansi-font-family:Arial;
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
@page Section1
    {size:8.5in 11.0in;
    margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;
    mso-header-margin:.5in;
    mso-footer-margin:.5in;
    mso-paper-source:0;}
div.Section1
    {page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dpurple = style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial'>This does not address the virus issue, but =
I&#8217;m
interested in learning more about spyware.<span style=3D"mso-spacerun:

```


10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color==
alt:
windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><a =
href=3D"http://www.lavasoftusa.com/index.html">http://www.lavasoftusa.com=
/index.html<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><!--[if supportFields]><span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-begin'><span=20
style=3D'mso-spacerun: yes'> AUTOTEXTLIST \s "E-mail=20
Signature" <span = style=3D'mso-element:field-
separator'><![endif]-->Mark
David RICHARDS, Ph.D., Sociologist<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, =
Inc.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>2610 Woodley Place =
NW<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>Washington, District of Columbia =
20008<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>202/ 347-8822<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>202/ 347-8825 = FAX<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><font size=3D3 color=3Dblack face=3D"Book =
Antiqua"><span
style=3D'font-size:12.0pt'>mark@bisconti.com<o:p></o:p></p>=

<p class=3DMsoNormal><!--[if supportFields]><span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-end'><![endif]--><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0000_01C17CDD.4FD7BD80--

>From Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net Tue Dec 4 13:18:40 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
id fB4LIde29851 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:18:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net
[204.127.131.46])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA25404 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:18:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from oemcomputer ([12.85.9.190]) by mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP
id <20011204211749.QAGN5540.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@oemcomputer>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 21:17:49 +0000
Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.20011204161647.006c57b8@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
X-Sender: Jim-Wolf@postoffice.worldnet.att.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 16:16:47 -0500
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
In-Reply-To: <003a01c17d07\$5f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

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>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 4 13:27:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4LRaE01501 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:27:10 -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 ESMTTP
id NAA16534 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:27:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4LQY626817 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:26:34 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:26:33 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: More viruses on the way (B Perez SoChinaMornngPost)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041304210.23636-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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>

Wednesday, December 5, 2001

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>

Copyright (C) 2001 -- South China Morning Post Publishers Ltd

>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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E5B1202@CMPA01>
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/usc) with ESMTTP
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/usc) with ESMTTP
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

(InterMail vM.5.01.04.00 201-253-122-122-20010827) with ESMTTP
id
<20011204213201.SGNF23718.imf13bis.bellsouth.net@schapiroresearchgroup.com>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:32:01 -0500
Message-ID: <3C0D4014.C456C2B7@schapiroresearchgroup.com>
Date: Tue, 04 Dec 2001 16:28:52 -0500
From: Beth Schapiro <beth@schapiroresearchgroup.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Surveying Teenagers
References: <3C0C0161.87D19F4E@earthlink.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 4 13:37:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4Lbie01803 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:37:44 -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 ESMTTP
id NAA28992; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:36:52 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB4LaFs28197; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:36:15 -0800 (PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:36:15 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.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: <003a01c17d075f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041329240.23636-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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
>
> ----- 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 simonetta@artsci.com Tue Dec 4 13:42:16 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
id fB4LgFe02394 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
13:42:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA09749 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 13:42:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <YHMOV35MK>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:42:01 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227BB@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:42:00 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 ESMTMP

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 ESMTMP

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 ESMTMP 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 ESMTMP 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

209 Kissena Hall

Department of Sociology

Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY

Home Office

50 Merriam Avenue

Bronxville, NY 10708

Phone: 914-337-6237

Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
Fax: 718-997-2820

Fax: 914-337-8210
E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Website: <http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps>

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/usc) with ESMTTP
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/usc) with ESMTTP
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/usc) with ESMTTP
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)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Something for AAPOR's Standards Committee to Consider?
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041610550.10316-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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. 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>

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

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 4 16:52:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB50qZe21514 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
16:52:35 -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 ESMTTP
id QAA02715 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:52:36 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB50q0H22179 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:52:00 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 16:52:00 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Recession Seeps Into the Corners (LATimes)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041651120.10316-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

<http://latimes.com/news/printedition/la-000096520dec04.story>

December 4 2001

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:

Jobs lost

New York	58,700
Detroit	38,200
Chicago	27,700
San Jose	27,300
Atlanta	27,100
Portland, Ore.	17,900
St. Louis	16,500
San Juan, P.R.	15,100
Phoenix	14,600
Milwaukee	12,500

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.

<http://latimes.com/news/printedition/la-000096520dec04.story>

Copyright 2001 Los Angeles Times

>From gauthier@circum.com Tue Dec 4 17:38:39 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fB51cce24692 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
17:38:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: from circum.com ([66.46.84.84])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id RAA18489 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 17:38:37 -0800
(PST)
Received: from BENOIT (modemcable172.5-200-24.hull.mc.videotron.ca
[24.200.5.172])
by circum.com (8.11.6/8.11.2) with ESMTTP id fB51bla29634
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 20:37:48 -0500
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 20:38:08 -0500
From: Benoît Gauthier <gauthier@circum.com>
X-Mailer: The Bat! (v1.53d) Business
Reply-To: Benoît Gauthier <gauthier@circum.com>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
Message-ID: <9138925051.20011204203808@circum.com>
To: James Beniger <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>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fB51cce24693

(2001.12.04, 20:36)

> 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>
a
n

Benoît

=====

Benoît Gauthier, <mailto:gauthier@circum.com>

Riçseau Circum inc. / Circum Network Inc.

Enregistrez votre adresse içlec. pour içtre informiç(e)
des nouvelles de Circum iç l'URL <http://circum.com>

Register your e-mail to be informed of Circum news at <http://circum.com>

74, rue du Val-Perçç, Hull, Quiçbec (Canada) J8Z 2A6
+1 819.770.2423 tiçlec. fax: +1 819.770.5196

=====

* * * Essayez des options : courriel avec The Bat!, Web avec Opera
* * * Try alternatives : e-mail with The Bat!, Web with Opera
http://www.ritulabs.com/the_bat/ <http://www.opera.com/>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 4 18:14:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fB52EYe26405 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001
18:14:34 -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 ESMT
id SAA13503 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 18:14:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fB52Dus29919 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 4 Dec 2001 18:13:56 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 4 Dec 2001 18:13:56 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Email virus 'worse than lovebug' (Ananova)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041754050.28063-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

Copyright (C) 2001 Ananova Ltd

http://www.ananova.com/news/story/sm_465446.html?menu=news.latestheadlines

Tuesday, December 4, 2001

Ananova:

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

http://www.ananova.com/news/story/sm_465446.html?menu=news.latestheadlines

Copyright (C) 2001 Ananova Ltd

>From edith1@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@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])

by smtpzilla3.xs4all.nl (8.12.0/8.12.0) with ESMTTP id fB5Arq1L098179
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:53:53 +0100 (CET)
Message-Id: <5.0.2.1.2.20011205113440.0233bce0@pop.xs4all.nl>
X-Sender: edithl@pop.xs4all.nl
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2001 11:38:31 +0100
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
In-Reply-To: <3.0.1.32.20011204161647.006c57b8@postoffice.worldnet.att.n
et>
References: <003a01c17d07\$5f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
<Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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@jwdp.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 ESMTTP
id fB5C1je07286 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
04:01:45 -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 EAA00011 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 04:01:46 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Wed, 05 Dec 2001
07:01:25
-0500

Message-ID: <3C0E0CA9.ACDA9143@jwdp.com>
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2001 07:01:45 -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: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
References: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E5B1202@CMPA01>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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>

> 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 SZapolsky@aarp.org Wed Dec 5 06:04:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5E4ae13433 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
06:04:36 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gatekeeper.aarp.org (gatekeeper.aarp.org [204.254.118.1])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA10045 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 06:04:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: by gatekeeper.aarp.org; (8.8.8/1.3/10May95) id IAA24846; Wed, 5 Dec
2001
08:44:07 -0500 (EST)
Received: by imc01dc.aarp.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <XJA4QDHX>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:04:14 -0500
Message-ID: <7EDC131491CBD411AE1200508BB01EFE02DE8057@mbs02dc.aarp.org>
From: "Zapolsky, Sarah E." <SZapolsky@aarp.org>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: TeleZapper
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:04:14 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 katestewart@brspoll.com Wed Dec 5 06:05:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5E50e13481 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
06:05:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ntserver.masnet.com (host.domain.com [66.22.24.140] (may be
forged))
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA10297 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 06:05:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ntserver.masnet.com from localhost
(router,SLMail V4.3); Wed, 05 Dec 2001 09:03:11 -0500
for <aapornet@usc.edu>
Received: from user2 [209.9.139.85]
by ntserver.masnet.com [66.22.24.140] (SLmail 4.3.0.3454) with SMTP id
5D4080243BAF4C4EA6D00F6DC5FD1BCC for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 05 Dec 2001
09:03:09
-0500
Message-ID: <002a01c17d95\$9c011400\$558b09d1@brs.com>
From: "Kate Stewart" <katestewart@brspoll.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <SIMEON.10112040030.D@bam8v95.virginia.edu>
Subject: Re: Surveying truckers
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:03:26 -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 5.00.3018.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.3018.1300
X-SLUIDL: DC0FF32E-D9224DFC-B4749712-10BF2E3D

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

Washington, D.C. 20036
202-822-6090

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

From: <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
To: "AAPORnet List server" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Hartman, David" <deh9q@virginia.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2001 12:36 AM
Subject: Surveying truckers

> 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 fB5Fqpel19678 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

--part1_179.3d46c2.293f9cbc_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

--part1_179.3d46c2.293f9cbc_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<HTML><BODY BGCOLOR="#ffffff">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</HTML>

--part1_179.3d46c2.293f9cbc_boundary--
>From YChun@air.org Wed Dec 5 08:10:28 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
id fB5GARE25783 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
08:10:27 -0800
(PST)
Received: from dcl.air.org ([208.246.68.150])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA20089 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:10:27 -0800
(PST)
Received: by dcl.air.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <YJ42XT8K>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:01:28 -0500
Message-ID: <1D09884C7BCAD211A82F00902730151B04E16B21@dc2.air.org>
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@air.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Survey Center closing
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:58:38 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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.

>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 5 08:15:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5GFZe26568 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
08:15:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA24365 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:15:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <YJ3S57FX>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:14:43 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227BF@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Something for AAPOR's Standards Committee to Consider?
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:14:41 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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.
> 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>
> -----
> -----

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

> *****
>
>

>From KFeld@humanvoice.com Wed Dec 5 08:17:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5GHDe27130 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
08:17:13 -0800
(PST)

Received: from nehor.office.humanvoice.net ([216.20.237.78])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA26015 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:17:13 -0800
(PST)

Received: by nehor.office.humanvoice.net with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
id <XT8AP56T>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:16:53 -0700

Message-ID:

<C7D496BDFDBEE745BB21226605670F510B2E9C@nehor.office.humanvoice.net>

From: Karl Feld <KFeld@humanvoice.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 09:16:52 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 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 slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu Wed Dec 5 08:24:40 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
    id fB5GOee28012 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
08:24:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet.acns.fsu.edu (gmhub.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.30])
    by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
    id IAA02078 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:24:40 -0800
(PST)
Received: from garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (garnet3.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.2.23])
    by garnet.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id LAA64374
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:24:19 -0500
Received: from fsu.edu.fsu.edu (dial069.acns.fsu.edu [146.201.32.69])
    by garnet3.acns.fsu.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA44318
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:24:18 -0500
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 11:24:18 -0500
Message-Id: <200112051624.LAA44318@garnet3.acns.fsu.edu>
X-Sender: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
```

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

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776

>From corinne@afb.net Wed Dec 5 08:28:14 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 fB5GSEe28698 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
08:28:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from urdvg002.cms.usa.net (urdvg002.cms.usa.net [165.212.11.2])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id IAA05090 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 08:28:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 8843 invoked from network); 5 Dec 2001 16:27:39 -0000
Received: from uadvgl31.cms.usa.net (165.212.11.131)
by corprelay.cms.usa.net with SMTP; 5 Dec 2001 16:27:39 -0000
Received: (qmail 28561 invoked by uid 0); 5 Dec 2001 16:27:49 -0000
Received: USA.NET MXFirewall, messaging filters applied; Wed, 05 Dec 2001
16:27:48 GMT
Received: from Corinne K.afb.net [208.36.95.170] by cm27
(ASMTTP/corinne@afb.net) via mtad (53CM.1001.1.06)
with ESMTP id 059FLeqbr0245M27; Wed, 05 Dec 2001 16:27:43 GMT
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011205111907.00a375c0@pophub.afb.net>
X-Sender: corinne//afb.net@pophub.afb.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Wed, 05 Dec 2001 11:24:44 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@afb.net>
Subject: Re: Research on Research
In-Reply-To: <179.3d46c2.293f9cbc@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

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

 Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.
 Director of Policy Research
&

Program Evaluation
 American Foundation for the Blind - 212-502-7640

<i>Visit</i> www.afb.org

 At

10:52 AM 12/05/2001 -0500, you wrote:
 <blockquote type=cite class=cite
cite><font

face="arial" size=2>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 <a
href="http://www.selzerco.com/"

eudora="autourl">www.SelzerCo.com<font

face="arial"> </blockquote></html>

>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 ESMTTP

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 ESMTTP

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 ESMTTP

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>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

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

December 5, 2001

THEY LOOKED, THEY CLICKED, A NEW E-MAIL VIRUS CONQUERED

By JOHN SCHWARTZ

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 (news/quote) 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 (news/quote), 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 hurry [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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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

JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com
Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com

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

<HTML><BODY BGCOLOR="#ffffff"><FONT
style="BACKGROUND-COLOR: #ffffff" SIZE=2>Great list of concerns.
Thanks!
JAS

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

JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise,
JASelzer@SelzerCo.com

Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</HTML>

--part1_27.1f33e470.293faf75_boundary--
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 5 10:05:19 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5I5Je07104 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
10:05:19 -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 ESMTTP
id KAA05295 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:05:20 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB5I4gL14148 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:04:42 -0800
(PST)
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 10:04:42 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: State sells birth data to Web site, raising fears
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112050941100.10138-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Folks,

News stories like this one hardly help to boost survey
response rates, I would imagine. Why anyone reveals
anything at all to a total stranger--in these troubled
times--I cannot imagine. Do we have any good macro-level
studies of trends in survey response rates, over the
years--studies with good controls to make the rates
comparable across years?

-- Jim

(C) 2001 The Mercury News <www.bayarea.com>

<http://www0.mercurycenter.com/premium/local/docs/privacy29.htm>

Thursday, Nov. 29, 2001

State sells birth data to Web site, raising fears

BY DION NISSENBAUM
Mercury News Sacramento Bureau

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.

<http://www0.mercurycenter.com/premium/local/docs/privacy29.htm>

(C) 2001 The Mercury News <www.bayarea.com>

>From tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu Wed Dec 5 12:51:11 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 fB5KpBe21635 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001
12:51:11 -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 MAA28031 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 12:51:10 -0800
(PST)
From: tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id ab22273;
5 Dec 2001 15:49 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 PAA27713;
Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:48:16 -0500 (EST)
To: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Hartman, David" <deh9q@virginia.edu>
Subject: Re: Surveying truckers
In-Reply-To: <002a01c17d95\$9c011400\$558b09d1@brs.com>
Message-ID: <SIMEON.10112051555.V@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 15:49:55 -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

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.

>

id OAA27357 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 14:17:05 -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 ESMTTP id FB5MG2R00269 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 17:16:02 -0500 (EST)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com (unverified) by nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com (Content Technologies SMTPRS 4.2.5) with ESMTTP id
<T57a469d2500a090b778e8@nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com> for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Wed,
5 Dec 2001 17:15:53 -0500
Received: by nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <XZZFT7Y9>; Wed, 5 Dec 2001 17:15:56 -0500
Message-ID:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B05BFA593@nmrusnysx1.nielsenmedia.com>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: TeleZapper
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 17:15:55 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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. PJJ

-----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 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

(PST)
Date: Wed, 5 Dec 2001 19:09:13 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: TeleZapper
In-Reply-To:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B05BFA593@nmrusnysx1.nielsenmedia.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112051904380.26972-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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. PJJ

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 pjlavrakas@tvratings.com Thu Dec 6 04:05:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB6C5Ye19450 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
04:05:34 -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 ESMTTP
id EAA26879 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 04:05:34 -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 ESMTTP
id fB6C5Em27015 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 04:05:15 -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 ESMTTP id fB6BweR17632
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:58:40 -0500 (EST)
Received: from nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com (unverified) by
nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com (Content Technologies SMTPRS 4.2.5) with ESMTTP
id
<T57a75b0ae60a090b778e8@nmrusdunsxg1.nielsenmedia.com> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu,
6 Dec 2001 06:58:36 -0500
Received: by nmrusdunsxg2.nielsenmedia.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
id <XZZFT06H>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:58:40 -0500
Message-ID:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B05BFA59F@nmrusnysx1.nielsenmedia.com>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:58:37 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 mikemassagli@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 ESMTTP
id fB6EUve26481 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001

06:30:57 -0800

(PST)

Received: from chmls16.mediaone.net (chmls16.mediaone.net [24.147.1.151])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA06138 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 06:30:56 -0800

(PST)

Received: from hppav (h0010b50cc0af.ne.mediaone.net [24.60.211.137])
by chmls16.mediaone.net (8.11.1/8.11.1) with SMTP id fB6EUaT19024;
Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:30:36 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <003501c17e62\$fa07e240\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
From: "Michael P. Massagli" <mikemassagli@mediaone.net>
To: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <3C0E0CA9.ACDA9143@jwdp.com>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:33:24 -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

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
++++

----- 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
> > 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 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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP 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 ESMTTP
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 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 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 ESMTTP
 id fB6E14e28058 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 ESMTTP
 id GAA15715 for <aapornet@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 ESMTTP id fB6EkSA17157
 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

References: <3C0E0CA9.ACDA9143@jwdp.com>
<003501c17e62\$fa07e240\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Virus-Scanned: by amavisd-milter (<http://amavis.org/>)

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. 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
> ++++++
>
> ----- 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
> > > 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 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 ESMTTP
id fB6F00e28991 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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP id JAA18366
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:59:41 -0500 (EST)
Received: from princeton.edu (wvs-1q71j01.Princeton.EDU [128.112.150.51])
by smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id JAA09093
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:59:40 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3C0F87DA.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="-----
70ABDDEB9D76A3013C4ED28D"

This is a multi-part message in MIME format. -----
70ABDDEB9D76A3013C4ED28D
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 reponse 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.
>
> PJJ
>
> -----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.
> > PJJ
>
> 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
email;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu
title:Associate Director
fn:Edward Freeland
end:vcard
```

```
-----70ABDDEB9D76A3013C4ED28D--
```

>From richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu Thu Dec 6 07:16:49 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
id fB6FGme00246 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
07:16:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ropercenter.uconn.edu (mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
[137.99.36.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA01039 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 07:16:46 -0800
(PST)
Received: from richard-nt.ropercenter.uconn.edu (d37h91.public.uconn.edu
[137.99.37.91])
by ropercenter.uconn.edu (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id KAA21617
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:13:02 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.0.20011206100757.01bd8d40@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu>
X-Sender: richard@mail.ropercenter.uconn.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Thu, 06 Dec 2001 10:17:48 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@ropercenter.uconn.edu>
Subject: Social Science Perspectives on September 11, 2001
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041651120.10316-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_262914921==_ .ALT"

-----_262914921==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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.

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center &
Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
University of Connecticut
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440
F +1 860 486-6308
Richard.Rockwell@uconn.edu -----_262914921==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
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 <i>Decline and Fall</i>. 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.
 <x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>

Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center &
Institute for Social Inquiry
Professor of Sociology
University of Connecticut
341 Mansfield Road, U-164
Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA
V +1 860 486-4440

F +1 860 486-6308

Richard.Rockwell@uconn.edu</html>

-----_262914921==_.ALT--

>From JAnnSelzer@aol.com Thu Dec 6 07:39:47 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB6Fdke01554 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
07:39:46 -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 ESMTTP
id HAA12961 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 07:39:45 -0800
(PST)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
by imo-r07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.fc.103807ad (1320)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:39:13 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <fc.103807ad.2940eb21@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:39:13 EST
Subject: Re: TeleZapper
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_fc.103807ad.2940eb21_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

--part1_fc.103807ad.2940eb21_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; 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.
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

<HTML><BODY BGCOLOR="#ffffff"><FONT
style="BACKGROUND-COLOR: #ffffff" SIZE=2>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:

 <BLOCKQUOTE TYPE=CITE style="BORDER-LEFT: #0000ff 2px solid;

MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">There are two issues here:

 1. Does telezapper only affect calls placed through a predicitive

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 reponse rates. However, the main carrier still cannot guarantee that its

sub-carriers will do the same.

 Ed
 </HTML>

--part1_fc.103807ad.2940eb21_boundary--

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Dec 6 08:12:20 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 fB6GCJe04621 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001

08:12:20 -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 IAA03431 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 08:12:18 -0800

(PST)

Received: (qmail 11193 invoked from network); 6 Dec 2001 16:12:02 -0000

Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)

by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 6 Dec 2001 16:12:02 -0000

Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Thu, 06 Dec 2001 10:11:56

-0600

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 11:06:15 -0500

Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBKEMFDLAA.mark@bisconti.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 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <003501c17e62\$fa07e240\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

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?

+++++++
Mike Massagli
mikemassagli@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
> > 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 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 ESMTTP
id fB6HZ4e18238 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
09:35:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from saratoga.m-s-g.com (saratoga.m-s-g.com [207.106.212.10])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA19160 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 09:35:03 -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: <D70EED068093D511A50000508B9522941DEC1A@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

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="ISO-8859-1"

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 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.
> >
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 6 10:56:07 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB6Iu6e10105 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
10:56:06 -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 ESMTTP
id KAA17413 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:56:07 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB6ItU129210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:55:30 -0800
(PST)
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 10:55:29 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Virus Making to be Hate Crime (SW.com)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112061054180.21870-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

All contents Copyright (C) 1999-2001, SatireWire, LLC

http://www.satirewire.com/news/0112/hate_crime.shtml

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."

http://www.satirewire.com/news/0112/hate_crime.shtml

All contents Copyright (C) 1999-2001, SatireWire, LLC

>From mark@bisconti.com Thu Dec 6 11:31:52 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
id fB6JVpel16048 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
11:31:51 -0800
(PST)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net (epimetheus.hosting4u.net
[209.15.2.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id LAA25804 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 11:31:46 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 23707 invoked from network); 6 Dec 2001 19:31:10 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 6 Dec 2001 19:31:10 -0000
Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Thu, 06 Dec 2001
13:31:09
-0600

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Virus Making to be Hate Crime (SW.com)
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 14:25:27 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBCEMJDLAA.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)
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112061054180.21870-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

That's funny!

For an education on Internet security issues, check out this site... "The CERT(r) 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)

All contents Copyright (C) 1999-2001, SatireWire, LLC

http://www.satirewire.com/news/0112/hate_crime.shtml

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."

http://www.satirewire.com/news/0112/hate_crime.shtml

All contents Copyright (C) 1999-2001, SatireWire, LLC

>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 ESMTTP
id fB6KvHe27709 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
12:57:17 -0800

(PST)

Received: from mail.saturn5.net (mail.intraclub.net [207.122.105.6])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id MAA26676 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 12:57:15 -0800

(PST)

Received: from preferrc ([204.210.213.52]) by mail.saturn5.net
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-68437U1600L100S0V35)
with SMTP id net for <aapornet@usc.edu>;
Thu, 6 Dec 2001 16:03:07 -0500

Message-ID: <011901c17e97\$dd9d0060\$34d5d2cc@neo.rr.com>

Reply-To: "Jane Sheppard" <jsheppard@cmor.org>

From: "Jane Sheppard" <jsheppard@cmor.org>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

References: <D70EED068093D511A50000508B9522941DEC1A@SARATOGA>

Subject: Re: TeleZapper

Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 15:52:04 -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 6.00.2600.0000

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

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 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 reponse 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.
> >
> > PJJ
> >
> > -----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.
PJJ
> >
> > 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 ESMTTP
id fB6L1Ze28508 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 ESMTTP
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
<0GNX00801WTWRD@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 ESMTTP 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 <YL9PJJD2F>; 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_mJuojcpcSgidt01HUSk9RCQ)"

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_mJuojcpcSgidt01HUSk9RCQ)
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_mJuojcPsgidt01HUSk9RCQ)
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 =
available
at:</FONT> <BR><FONT SIZE=3D2><A HREF=3D"http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html"
=
TARGET=3D"_blank">http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html</A></FONT>
</P>
```

```
<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>
<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>
<BR><FONT SIZE=3D2><A =
HREF=3D"http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.=
htm" =
TARGET=3D"_blank">http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_c=
onditions.htm</A></FONT>
```

</P>

</BODY>

</HTML>=

--Boundary_(ID_mJuojcpSgidt01HUSk9RCQ)--

>From DKulp@M-S-G.com Thu Dec 6 13:39:18 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fB6LdIe06581 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
13:39:18 -0800

(PST)

Received: from saratoga.m-s-g.com (saratoga.m-s-g.com [207.106.212.10])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id NAA09065 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 13:39:16 -0800
(PST)

Received: by SARATOGA with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <XJT48S6P>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 16:38:44 -0500

Message-ID: <D70EED068093D511A50000508B9522941DEC1F@SARATOGA>

From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: TeleZapper

Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 16:38:44 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C17E9E.6118C3B0"

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_001_01C17E9E.6118C3B0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="ISO-8859-1"

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.

Dale W. Kulp

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

From: Shapard Wolf [mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2001 3:52 PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: TeleZapper

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?

Shap Wolf
Arizona State University SRL

more phone sounds are available at:
<http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/>
<<http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/>>
http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.htm
<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=3DGENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY>  
<DIV><SPAN  
class=3D230161821-06122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff=20  
size=3D2>Shap,</FONT></SPAN></DIV>  
<DIV><SPAN class=3D230161821-06122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff=20  
size=3D2></FONT></SPAN>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><SPAN class=3D230161821-06122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff  
size=3D2>We do=20 this routinely (i.e., that is generating our own SIT  
tones).&nbsp;</DIV>  
It = is easy to=20 fool any device "trained" to react to a certain pattern of  
tones -  
also = easy for=20 interviewers to mistake.&nbsp;</FONT></SPAN></DIV>  
<DIV><SPAN
```

class=3D230161821-06122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff=20
size=3D2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff
size=3D2>I
am=20 very interested in what the "patent dispute" is all about and whether =
there
may=20 be due to some legalities involved in sending an FCC regulated
standard
= set
of=20 SIT tones across the public telephone network. <nbsp;< Maybe that's why =
the=20
TeleZapper only sends one tone in the range and consequently becomes = easy
to=20
intercept. <nbsp;< I will look into this further.</DIV>
<DIV><SPAN
class=3D230161821-06122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff=20
size=3D2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff
size=3D2>Thanks=20 for reminding me of this site and this other potential
threat.=20
</DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial
=
color=3D#0000ff=20 size=3D2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff
size=3D2>Dale=20 W. Kulp </DIV> <BLOCKQUOTE dir=3Dltr
style=3D"MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px">
<DIV class=3DOutlookMessageHeader dir=3Dltr align=3Dleft><FONT =
face=3DTahoma=20
size=3D2>-----Original Message-----
From: Shapard Wolf=20
[mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, = 2001
3:52=20
PM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE:=20
TeleZapper

</DIV>
<P>There is a recording of the three-tone SIT sequence =
available=20
at:
<A target=3D_blank=20
= href=3D"http://www.sandman.com/tmstop.html">http://www.sandman.com/tmsto=
p.html=20
</P>
<P>Apparently they were marketing a TeleZapper-style =
device;
site=20
now says it was withdrawn (pending changes) due to a patent=20
dispute.</P>
<P>When this thread came up earlier this year, someone = was
going=20
to test playing back a recording of the SIT tones to see if =
computerized=20
dialers characterized that as a non-working number. Did anyone try =
this?=20
</P>
<P>Shap Wolf
Arizona State =
University=20
SRL </P>
<P>more phone sounds are available at: =
<FONT
size=3D2><A=20
target=3D_blank=20

= href=3D"http://phworld.netfirms.com/sounds/modern/">http://phworld.netfi=
rms.com/sounds/modern/=20

<A target=3D_blank=20
= href=3D"http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.=
htm">http://www.navyrelics.com/tribute/signal_and_circuit_conditions.htm=
=20
</P></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

----- = NextPart_001_01C17E9E.6118C3B0--
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Thu Dec 6 19:59:52 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
id fB73xqe04771 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001
19:59:52 -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 ESMTTP
id TAA24474 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 19:59:52 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB73xC825467 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 6 Dec 2001 19:59:12 -0800
(PST)
Date: Thu, 6 Dec 2001 19:59:12 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Love Bug virus cost the world \$15 billion
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112061940450.23571-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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>

The State of Cybersecurity

Thursday, December 6, 2001

Press Club, Washington, D.C.

Panel Forum - 6:30 - 7:30 p.m.

Cocktail reception & technology displays - 7:30 p.m.

LECTURE PANELISTS:

Moderator: Declan McCullagh, Wired News Washington bureau chief
Tim Belcher, CTO and co-founder of Ripstech
Richard Forno, CTO, Shadowlogic
Christopher Painter, Deputy Chief of the Computer Crime and
Intellectual Property Section at the Department of Justice

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 fB930ie28253 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 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>
<003501c17e62\$fa07e240\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C112235.6051D084@jwdp.com> <001701c17f91\$3032b6e0\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C12065E.3C19709F@jwdp.com>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus

Date: Sat, 8 Dec 2001 22:03:08 -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

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 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.
>

> 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
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
> > > > ++++++
> > > >
> > > > ----- 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
> > > > > 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 jwerner@jwdp.com Sun Dec 9 09:09:00 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 fB9H90e13372 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Dec 2001
09:09:00 -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 JAA10723 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Dec 2001 09:08:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Sun, 09 Dec 2001
12:07:52
-0500
Message-ID: <3C139A83.5E0200D1@jwdp.com>
Date: Sun, 09 Dec 2001 12:08:19 -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: AAPORNET still up and running, despite virus
References: <3C0E0CA9.ACDA9143@jwdp.com>
<003501c17e62\$fa07e240\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C112235.6051D084@jwdp.com> <001701c17f91\$3032b6e0\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
<3C12065E.3C19709F@jwdp.com> <003001c1805e\$0b446f40\$89d33c18@mshome.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This scenario relies on the smtp server checking ALL the email addresses for
vailability 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 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.
> >
> > 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

> 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
> > > > ++++++
> > > >
> > > > ----- 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
> > > > > 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 beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Dec 9 21:55:03 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 fBA5t2e17870 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Dec 2001
21:55:02 -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 VAA24721 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Dec 2001 21:55:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)

by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBA5sIb27883 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 9 Dec 2001 21:54:18 -0800
(PST)
Date: Sun, 9 Dec 2001 21:54:18 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: New type of computer virus
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112092133080.19188-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

-
--
BUREAU OF PUBLIC SECRETS, PO Box 1044, Berkeley CA 94701
<www.bopsecrets.org>

-
--

December 9, 2001

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

###

-
--
BUREAU OF PUBLIC SECRETS, PO Box 1044, Berkeley CA 94701
<www.bopsecrets.org>

-
--

>From dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com Mon Dec 10 05:04:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBAD4he17762 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001
05:04:43
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mailout5.nyroc.rr.com (mailout5-1.nyroc.rr.com
[24.92.226.169])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA29267 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 05:04:43 -0800
(PST)
Received: from david (alb-66-66-193-221.nycap.rr.com [66.66.193.221])
by mailout5.nyroc.rr.com (8.11.6/Road Runner 1.12) with SMTP id
fBAD4JE01753
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 08:04:19 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <001401c1817b\$68268540\$ddc14242@mshome.net>
From: "David Smith" <dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <003a01c17d07\$5f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
<Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
<5.0.2.1.2.20011205113440.0233bce0@pop.xs4all.nl>
Subject: social support questions
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2001 08:05:56 -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

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 Crossway
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 ESMTMP
      id fBAD8bel18537 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 ESMTMP
      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 Crossway
Delmar, NY 12054

dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com

>From FeatherstonF@GAO.GOV Mon Dec 10 06:36:51 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBAEaoe22009 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001
06:36:51
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mailexchanger.gao.gov (gao-cp.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA00196 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 06:36:50 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gaotvcs1.gao.gov (gaotvcs1.gao.gov [161.203.15.2])
by mailexchanger.gao.gov (8.12.1/GAO ESMTTP) with SMTP id fBAEYuh2007520
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:34:56 -0500
Received: from 10.1.0.66 by gaotvcs1.gao.gov (InterScan E-Mail VirusWall NT);
Mon, 10
Dec 2001 09:34:56 -0500
Received: from GWIADOM-Message_Server by GAOGWIA1.GAO.GOV
with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:34:56 -0500
Message-Id: <sc1481c0.080@GAOGWIA1.GAO.GOV>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.4
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2001 09:34:49 -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: Job opportunities at the U.S. GAO/Washington, DC
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBAEape22010

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 ESMTMP

id fBAEkne22721 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001

06:46:49

-0800 (PST)

Received: from mailexchanger.gao.gov (gao-cp.gao.gov [161.203.16.1])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTMP

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 mailexchanger.gao.gov (8.12.1/GAO ESMTMP) 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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBAEkne22722

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 ESMTTP
id fBAG4De26544 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 10 Dec 2001
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 ESMTTP
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.prserve.net
[32.100.244.79]) by smtp4.fas.harvard.edu with ESMTTP id fBAG3kM30726; Mon, 10
Dec
2001 11:03:47 -0500 (EST)

Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011210105227.036110b8@pop.fas.harvard.edu>
X-Sender: rputnam@pop.fas.harvard.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2001 11:00:04 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Robert D. Putnam" <robert_putnam@harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: social support questions
In-Reply-To: <001401c1817b\$68268540\$ddc14242@mshome.net>
References: <003a01c17d07\$5f2f8f40\$28132782@soc1.lsu.edu>
<Pine.GSO.4.33.0112041053530.27724-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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 Crossway
>Delmar, NY 12054
>
>dwsmith2@nycap.rr.com

Robert D. Putnam
Malkin Professor of Public Policy
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
<<http://ksgwww.harvard.edu/saguaro/>>

>From Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Tue Dec 11 06:51:17 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBBEpFe14935 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
06:51:15

-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 ESMTTP
id GAA15181 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 06:51:08 -0800 (PST)
Received: by ddsmttayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <YT8WS4SG>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:50:16 -0500

Message-ID:
<F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBBC0245E9273@ddsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "AAPORnet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject:
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:50:14 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_000_01C18253.246EEB70"

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_01C18253.246EEB70
Content-Type: text/plain

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
Content-Type: application/msword;
name="AAPOR ISSCC Abstract.doc"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="AAPOR ISSCC Abstract.doc"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAAOwAAAAAAAAAA
EAAAPQAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAADoAAAD////////////////////////////////////
EAAAPQAAAAEAAAD+////
////////////////////////////////////

aXRpb24sIHRoZSBjbnN0aXR1dGUgZm9yIE9yZ2FuaXphdGlvbmFsIEFzc2Vzc211bnQgYXQgdGhlIE5hdnkgUGVyc29ubmVsIFJlc2VhcmNoLCBTdHVkaWVzLCBhbmQgVGVjaG5vbG9neSBEXBhcnRtZW50IChOUFJTVCKgaXMGYWN0aXZ1bHkgcHVyc3VpbmcmgaW4gYSB2YXJpZXR5IG9mIHJlc2VhcmNoIG9uIHRoZSBmZWfzaWJpbG10eSwgdmFsaWRpdHkgYW5kIHJlbG1hYmlsaXR5IG9mIGxhcmdlLXNjYWxlIEludGVybmV0LWJhc2VkJHB1cnNvbml1bCBzdXJ2ZX1zLiAgQXQgdGhlIHByZXN1bnQsIHJlc2VhcmNoZXJzIGluIHRoZSBOYXZ5IGhhdmUgY29uZHVjdGvkiHn0dWRpZXMgZXZhbHVhdGluZyB0aGUgaW1wYWN0IG9mIG1vZGUgby2YgYWRtaW5pc3RyYXRpb24gby24gcmVzcG9uc2UgcmlF0ZXMsIGRh dGEgcXVhbG10eSwgYW5kIHNvY21hbCBkZXNpcmlFiaWxpdkHkuICBGdXR1cmUgcmlVzZWfYy2ggd21s bCBmb2N1cyBvbiBzdWNoIGlzc3VlcYBhcyBpbmR1cm5hbCBxdWVzdGlvbm5haXJlIGxvZ21jLCBy ZXNwb25zZS1zZXQgYmVoYXZpb3IsIG9wdGltYWwgc3VydmV5IGxlbmd0aCwgYnJlYWstb2ZmIHhhdHR1cm5zLCBhbmQgdGhlIGl1cGFjdCBvZiBjb2xvciBhbmQgZGVzaWduIGZlYXR1cmVzIG9uIHJlc3BvbnN1IHhhdHR1cm5zLg1JbnR1cm5ldC1iYXN1ZCBzdXJ2ZXkgcmVzZWfYy2ggcHJlc2VudHMg YSBudW1iZXIgb2YgY2hhbGxlbmdlcyBmb3IgtmF2eSBYzXN1YXJjaGVycy4gIFNvbWUgby2YgdGhl IG1ham9yIGNoYWxsZW5nZXMgaW5jbHVkZSB1bmV2ZW4gZG1zdHJpYnV0aW9uIG9mIEludGVybmV0 IGFjY2VzcywgdmFyeWluZyBsZXZ1bHMgb2YgZXhwZXJpZW5jZSB3aXRoIHRoZSBjbnR1cm5ldCwg bGFjayBvZiBhIGN1bnRyYWwgcGF0YWJhc2Ugby2YgZW1haWwgcYWRkcmVzc2VzLCBhbmQgRGVwYXJ0 bWVudCBvZiBEZlZ1bnN1IEludGVybmV0IHN1Y3VyaXR5IHJlc3RyaWN0aW9ucy4gIEluIGfkgZG10 aW9uLCBiZWNhdXN1IGF0IGFueSBnaXZ1biB0aW1lIGFwcHJveGltYXR1bHkgaGFsZiBvZiB0aGUg Zm9yY2UgaXMGZm9yY2FyZCBkZXBsb31lZCBvciBvbiB0ZW1wb3JhcnkgdHJhaW5pbmcmgYXNzaWdu bWVudHMgaXQgaXMGZxh0cmVtZWx5IGRpZmZpY3VsdCB0byBjb250YWN0IGFsbCBtZW1iZXJzIG9m IGEgc3VydmV5IHNhbXBsZS4gIFRvIGl1cHJvdmlUgcHJvYmFiaWxpdkHkgb2Ygc3VjY2VzcyBvZiBs YXJnZS1zY2FsZSBjbnR1cm5ldC1iYXN1ZCBwZXJzb25uZWwgc3VydmV5IHJlc2VhcmNoLCByZXN1 YXJjaGVycyBhcmUgYWN0aXZ1bHkgd29ya2luZyB3aXRoIE5hdnkgcG9saWN5IG1ha2VycyB0byBk ZXZ1bG9wIGEGY29tchJlAGVuc212ZSBzdHJhdGVneSB0byBtZWV0IHRoZXR1IGNoYWxsZW5nZXMu DVRoXMGcHJlc2VudGF0aW9uIHdpbGwgY292ZXIgbWfqb3IgzmluZGluZ3MgZnJvbSBOYXZ5IElu dGVybmV0LWJhc2VkJHN1cnZleSBYzXN1YXJjaCwgZGVzY3JpYmUgdGhlIGN1cnJlbnQgTmF2eSBz dXJ2ZXkgc3RyYXR1Z3ksIGFuZCBwcm92aWRlIGFuIG92ZXJ2aWV3IG9mIHRoZSBtYwpvciBwcmFj dG1jYWwgcYm9yZ2FuaXphdGlvbmFsIGlzc3VlcYBmYWN1ZCBieSBOYXZ5IHJlc2VhcmNoZXJz Lg0NDELudGVybmV0LWJhc2VkJFuuIFMuIEFpcibG3JjZSBtZXJ2ZX1zDUNoYXJzZXMGSC4gSGft aWx0b24gYW5kIEVxdW1zIE0uIERhdGtvDUFpciBGb3JjZSBQZXJzb25uZWwgc3VydmV5IHNvbWVudGVyDVJhbmRv bH0IEFGQIBUWCBU0ENS9obiBCZWXsLCBMDCBDb2wsIFVTQUYNSFEgVVBnRiwgVGVzdGluZyBh bmQgU3VydmV5IFBvbiBjeQ1YXNoaW5ndG9uIERDIFVTQQ1BbiBBaXIGRm9yY2UgZ29hbCBpcyB0 byBsZXZ1cmFnZSB3ZW1tYmFzZWQgdGVjaG5vbG9neS4gIFRoZSBBaXIGRm9yY2UgU3VydmV5IEJy YW5jaCBoYXMGbWfkbZSBncmVhdCBzdHJpZGVzIHRvIGNvbml1bnQsIHdoZW5ldmVYIHhvc3NpYmxl LCBwYXBlciBhZG1pbmlzdHJhdGlvbiBvZiBzdXJ2ZX1zIHRvIHdlYi1iYXN1ZCBhZG1pbmlzdHJh dGlvbi4gIFRoZSBdAg1lZiBvZiBTdGFmZiBvZiB0aGUgQWlyIEZvcmlFF1YwXpdHkgb2YgTGlm ZSBtZXJ2ZXkgd2FzIG1hZGUgYXZhaWxhYm1lIG9uIHRoZSBjbnR1cm5ldCB0byBlcmVyeSBtawxp dGFyeSBtZW1iZXIgw5kIGNpdm1saWfuIGVtcGxveWVlIGZvciB0aGUgZmlyc3QgdGltZSBpbiBP Y3RvYmVYIDE5OTkgdXNpbmcmgdG9wLWRvd24sIENoYWluLW9mLUNvbW1hbmQgYXBwcm9hY2ggdG8g ZW5jb3VyYWdlIHhcnRpy21wYXRpb24uICANSW4gYSBmb2xsb3ctdXAgUXVhbG10eSBvZiBmaWZl IFN1cnZleSBhY2NvbXBsaXNoZWQgaW4gSnVseSAyMDAwIHdpdGggYSByZXByZXN1bnRhdG12ZSwg cmFuZG9tIHNhbXBsZSBvZiBBaXIGRm9yY2UgcGVyc29ubmVsLCBwYXJ0aWNpcGFudHMgd2VyZSBu b3Rpbm1lZCB2aWEGZw1y3Ryb25pYyBtYW1sIChlLW1haWwpcIHRoYXQgY29udGFpbmVkiGEgaHlw ZXJsaW5rIHRvIHRoZSB3ZW1tYmFzZWQgc3VydmV5LiAgQmVjYXVzZSB0aGUgQWlyIEZvcmlIGRv ZXMGbm90IGhhdmUgYSBkYXRhYmFzZSBvZiBlLW1haWwgcYWRkcmVzc2VzLCB0aGUgk3N0YW5kYXJk LCBjb25maWdlcmF0aW9uIG9mIBMGsf1QRVJMSU5LICJtYW1lLmxhc3RuYW1lLmxhc3RuYW1lQGfpcmZvcmlYmFzZS5h Zi5taWwVIHdhcyB1c2VkiGFuZCBYzWfjaGVkiGFib3V0IDcwJSBvZiB0aGUgZ2FtcGx1LiAgDVRo ZXJlIGfyZSBkZWZpbml0ZSBhZHZhbRhz2VzIHRvIHVzaW5nIGUtbWfpbCBzdXJ2ZXkgYWRtaW5p c3RyYXRpb24gYmVjYXVzZSB0aGVyZSBhcmUgby2YgY29zdHMgZm9yIHhbcGVyLCBwcm1udGluZywg cGFja2FnaW5nLCBwb3N0YWdlLCBzY2FubmluZywgZXRjLiwgYW5kIHZhc3QgYw1vdW50cyBvZiBp bmZvcmlhdGlvbiBjYw4gYmUgY29sbGVjdGvkiGluIGEGcmVsYXRpdmlVseSBzaG9yZCB0aW1lZnJh bWUgdXNpbmcmgYSB3ZW1tYmFzZWQgYXBwcm9hY2guICBiB3dlcmVzLCB0aGVyZSBhcmUgYSB3aG9s ZSBob3N0IG9mIGNvbmlcm5zIGf1b3V0IHJlc3BvbnN1IGFuZCBub24tcmVzcG9uc2UgaXNzdWVz IHRoYXQgbXVzdCBiZSBhZGRyZXNzZWQ6ICBub24tZGVsaXZ1cnkgb2YgdGhlIHN1cnZleSBkdWUg dG8gYw4gaW5jb3JyZWN0IGUtbWfpbCBhZGRyZXNzIGFuZC9vciBubyBhY2N1c3MgdG8gdGhlIElu dGVybmV0LCBpbmRpdmlkdWf1sIGFuZCBiYXN1LWxldmVsIHR1Y2huaWNhbCBpc3N1ZXMgd210aCBz

AAAAIAQAA4ggAAOMIAADkCAAAGRAAABoQAAB+EQAAFBBoAAJEaAADeGgAA+SyAA
APQhAAD2IQAA9yEAAPohAAADAAQAawAEAAMABAADAAQAawAEAAMABAADAAQAawAEAAMABAADAAcA
BwAHAP//FAAAAA8ATQBvAHIAcGbpAHMAIABQAGUAdAb1AHIAcwbvAG4AQQBDADoAXABtAHkAIABk
AG8AYwB1AG0AZQBvAHQAacwBcAEEAdQB0AG8AUgB1AGMABwB2AGUAcgB5ACAAcwbhAHYAZQAgAG8A
ZgAgAEkAbgB0AGUAcgBuAGUAdAAgAFMAAdQByAHYAZQB5AHMAIABDAG8AbgBjAGUAcAB0AC4AYQBz
AGQADwBNAG8AcgByAGkAcwAgAFAAZQB0AGUAcgBzAG8AbgAlAEMAOGbCAEEARABNAEKATgBcAEkA
bgB0AGUAcgBuAGUAdAAgAFMAAdQByAHYAZQB5AHMAIABDAG8AbgBjAGUAcAB0AC4AZABvAGMADwBN
AG8AcgByAGkAcwAgAFAAZQB0AGUAcgBzAG8AbgAlAEMAOGbCAEEARABNAEKATgBcAEkAbgB0AGUA
cgBuAGUAdAAgAFMAAdQByAHYAZQB5AHMAIABDAG8AbgBjAGUAcAB0AC4AZABvAGMADwBNAG8AcgBy
AGkAcwAgAFAAZQB0AGUAcgBzAG8AbgAmAEMAOGbCAGkAbgB0AGUAcgBuAGUAdAAgAHMAAdQByAHYA
ZQB5AHMAXABBAEEAUABPAFIAIABBAGIACwB0AHIAYQBjAHQALgBkAG8AYwAPAE0AbwByAHIAaQBz
ACAAUAB1AHQAZQBjAHMAAbwBuADcAQwA6AFwAdwBpAG4AZABvAhcAcwBcAFQARQBNAFAAXABBAHUA
dABvAFIAZQBjAG8AdgB1AHIAeQAgAHMAYQB2AGUAIABvAGYAIABBAEEAUABPAFIAIABBAGIACwB0
AHIAYQBjAHQALgBhAHMAZAAPAE0AbwByAHIAaQBzACAAUAB1AHQAZQBjAHMAAbwBuACYAQwA6AFwA
aQBvAHQAZQBjAG4AZQB0ACAAcwb1AHIAAgB1AHkAcwBcAEEAQQBQAE8AUgAgAEEAYgBzAHQAcgBh
AGMAdAAuAGQAbwBjAA8ATQBvAHIAcGbpAHMAIABQAGUAdAb1AHIAcwbvAG4AJgBDADoAXABpAG4A
dAB1AHIAbgB1AHQAIABzAHUAcG2AGUAeQBzAFwAQQBBAFAATwBSACAAQQBiAHMAdABYAGEAYwB0
AC4AZABvAGMABgBFAGwAaQBnAHQAAdwBNafwAXABEAE0ARABDAEUAQQBTAfQAMQbCfMAUABFAEQ
XABTAFARQBEAFwAQwBvAG4AZgB1AHIAZQBvAGMAZQBzAFwAQQBBAFAATwBSACAAMgAwADAAMQbC
AFMAAdQByAHYAZQB5AHMAXABBAEEAUABPAFIAIABJAFMAUwBDAEMAIAABBAGIACwB0AHIAYQBjAHQA
LgBkAG8AYwAGAEUAbABpAGcAdAB3ADUAAA6AFwAVABFAE0AUABcAEEAdQB0AG8AUgB1AGMABwB2
AGUAcgB5ACAAcwbhAHYAZQAgAG8AZgAgAEEAQQBQAE8AUgAgAEkAUwBTAEMAQwAgAEEAYgBzAHQA
cgBhAGMAdAAuAGEAcwBkAA8ASgBhAG0AZQBzACAAUgAuACAAQwBhAHAAAbABhAG4ATABcAFwARABN
AEQAQwBFEEAUwBUADEAXABVAFMARQBSAFwASABPAE0ARQbCAEMAQQBQAEwAQQBOAEoAUgBcAHUA
cwB1AHIAZABhAHQAYQBcAEMAAbwBuAGYAZQBjAGUAbgBjAGUAcwBcAEEAQQBQAE8AUgAgAEkAUwBT
AEMAQwAgAEEAYgBzAHQAcgBhAGMAdAAuAGQAbwBjAAEAnX4xLPyYgGD/DwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAABAAMAAAMQAAAPhA0CEYTz/RXGBQABDQIGbygAAgAAAC4A
AQAAAJ1+MSwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD////////8BAAAAAAAAAD/QFxcRE1EQ0VBU1QxXE5PU1RIAE51
AQAAAJ1+MDI6
AHdpbnNwb29sAEhQIEExhc2VySmV0IDVtASBNWABcXERNRENfQVNUMVxOT1JUSAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAEQAocAHAAA3MBAAEAAQAAAAAAAAAABAA8AWAICAAEAWAICAAAATGV0dGVyAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAP///85AwAAAAAAP//////////BAATAAYAEQD//wEAAwAAAAEA//8B
AAEAAAD//wEAAwD//////////8AAAAAGAAAAAAEECcQJxAn
AAAQJwAAAAAAAAAXFxETURDRUFTVDFcTk9SVEgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABBAEDnABwAANzAQAB
AAEAAAAAAAAAAQAPAFgCAGABAFgCAGAAEx1dHRLcgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAIAD/
////OQMAAAAAAD//////////wQAEwAGABEA//8BAAMAAAABAP//AQABAAAA//8BAAMA/////////
//////////AAAAABgAAAAABAnECcQJwAAECcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQBB
AAAAeQAAAJgOpgYBAbSQRQAAAAAAAAABBAAAAAAAAAAIQAAAAAAAAAPkhAABgAAIAEAAAAQAAABH
FpABAAACAgYDBQQAfAgMEhwIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJ8AAAAAAAAAVABpAG0AZQBzACAATgB1AHcA
IABSAG8AbQBhAG4AAA1FpABAgAFBQEQACgCAGUHAAAAAAAAAABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAIAAAAAUwB5
AG0AYgBvAGwAAAAzJpABAAACCwYEAgICAgIEhwIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAJ8AAAAAAAAQQByAGkA
YQBsAAAAANSaQAQAAAgSGBAMFBAQCBI d6AAEAAACACAAAAAAAAAAD/AEEAAAAAFQAYQBoAG8AbQBh
AAAAIgAEAEETiBgAAPADAABoAQAAAACbK1xmK1NcJqdBTKYEAAkAAAAfBQAAqxsAAAEAGAAAAQA
gxBmAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAEAAAABAAAAAAAAACEDAAAhhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA
AA
AA
AA
AAAAAKUGwAE0ALQAgAASMAAAEAAZAGQAAAAZAAAA3SMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAD//xIAAAAAAA
EQBJAE4ARgBPFAFIATQBBAFQASQBPAE4AIABQAEUAUABFAFIAAAAAAAAADABLAGkAbQB5AGEAIABT
AC4AIABMAGUAZQAPAEoAYQBtAGUAcwAgAFIALgAgAEMAYQBwAGwAYQBvAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD+/wAABAACAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAA4Iwf8v1PaBCrkQgA

(PST)

Received: by firewall11.startribune.com; id JAA24025; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
09:44:05

-0600

(CST)

Received: from unknown(132.148.25.25) by firewall11.startribune.com via smap
(V5.5)

id xma024009; Tue, 11 Dec 01 09:43:38 -0600

Received: from stnavmail.startribune.com (stnavmail.startribune.com
[132.148.90.39])

by selma.startribune.com (8.11.3/8.11.3) with SMTP id fBBFhZ220102
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:43:35 -0600 (CST)

Received: from mail.startribune.com ([132.148.90.226])

by stnavmail.startribune.com (NAVGW 2.5.1.15) with SMTP id
M2001121109431225657 for

<aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:43:12 -0600

Received: from STAR-Message_Server by mail.startribune.com

with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:42:05 -0600

Message-Id: <sc15d4ed.038@mail.startribune.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2

Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 09:41:41 -0600

From: "Rob Daves" <daves@startribune.com>

To: aapornet@usc.edu

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

for by
others,

Mayo Clinic heart disease patients. Half of whom were prayed
although they didn't know it, and half of whom were not.

differences
between the two

hospitalizations or
strokes. The

After six months, researchers found no significant
groups in the number of deaths, heart attacks,
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 ESMTMP
id fBBHTMe12206 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 ESMTMP
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 ESMTTP
id fBBHhdel13851 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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112110909590.7892-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 news 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.

Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute

>From rusciano@rider.edu Tue Dec 11 10:58:14 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
id fBBIwEel9467 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
10:58:14
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA06963 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 10:58:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
id
<01KBQT1SD75S00115X@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
13:57:38 EDT
Received: from rider.edu ([10.59.1.53])
by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
with ESMTTP id <01KBQT1RY5LY00103R@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Tue, 11
Dec 2001 13:57:37 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 13:57:29 -0500
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C165719.B51AF337@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112110909590.7892-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

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 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.

>
> -----
> Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute
> -----
> -----
>
> *****

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 11 10:59:31 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
id fBBIxVe19915 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
10:59:31
-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 ESMTTP

id KAA08523 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 10:59:33 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FBIWjo14274 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 10:58:45 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 10:58:45 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Mayo clinic study on efficacy of prayer
In-Reply-To: <010701c18269\$b0e8ac60\$f178580c@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112110959230.19345-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

>From kagay@nytimes.com Tue Dec 11 11:24:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBBJO0e28847 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
11:24:00
-0800 (PST)
Received: from gatekeeper.nytimes.com (gatekeeper.nytimes.com
[199.181.175.201])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA04710 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 11:23:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mail2.nytimes.com (mail2.nytimes.com [170.149.207.84])
by gatekeeper.nytimes.com (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id OAA16053
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 14:14:16 -0500 (EST)
Received: from emailname.nytimes.com ([170.149.33.58])
by mail2.nytimes.com (8.8.8+Sun/8.8.8) with ESMTTP id OAA04985
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 14:28:00 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20011211141809.00caae70@mailgate.nytimes.com>
X-Sender: kagay@mailgate.nytimes.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 14:18:19 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Mike Kagay <kagay@nytimes.com>
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.

>From RFunk787@aol.com Tue Dec 11 13:22:06 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
id fBBLM6e18549 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
13:22:06
-0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-m07.mx.aol.com (imo-m07.mx.aol.com [64.12.136.162])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA22117 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 13:22:04 -0800
(PST)
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo-m07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.97.1fbfd9ec (2172)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:21:24 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <97.1fbfd9ec.2947d2d3@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:21:23 EST
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

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
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBBM88e24089 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
14:08:08
-0800 (PST)
Received: from ren-9.cais.net (ren-9.cais.net [205.252.14.84])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA14097 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 14:08:07 -0800
(PST)
Received: from WARREN.mindspring.com (63-216-231-13.sdsl.cais.net
[63.216.231.13])

by ren-9.cais.net (8.11.1/8.11.1) with ESMTTP id fBBM7iI98955
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:07:44 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011211170343.02728cb0@mail.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@mail.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:08:17 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
In-Reply-To: <97.1fbfd9ec.2947d2d3@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_11384283==_ .ALT"

====_11384283==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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>

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 fBBNKDe29200 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
15:20:13
-0800 (PST)
Received: from prserv.net (out2.prserv.net [32.97.166.32])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id PAA06232 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 15:20:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from attglobal.net (<unknown.domain>[32.103.122.70])
by prserv.net (out2) with SMTP
id <200112112319322020600mtoe>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 23:19:33 +0000
Message-ID: <3C16BF2A.B4FC88A4@attglobal.net>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 18:21:31 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011211170343.02728cb0@mail.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----
F8321774A0FC9091A3B8DBB6"

-----F8321774A0FC9091A3B8DBB6
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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:

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> 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 <p>At 04:21 PM 12/11/2001 -0500, Ray Funkhouser wrote:
<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite>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.
<p> Do we really need to hear this stuff? <p>Ray Funkhouser</blockquote>

<center>Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor

New York, NY 10022

<p>212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com

<a href="http://www.mitofskyinternational.com/"
eudora="autourl">http://www.MitofskyInternational<a
href="http://www.mitofskyinternational.com/"
eudora="autourl">.com</center>

 </blockquote>
</html>

-----F8321774A0FC9091A3B8DBB6--

>From jblair@srcmail.umd.edu Tue Dec 11 15:29:52 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 fBBNTqe00429 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
15:29:52
-0800 (PST)
Received: from srcmail.umd.edu (srcnotes2.umd.edu [128.8.179.41])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id PAA17683 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 15:29:51 -0800
(PST)
From: jblair@srcmail.umd.edu
Received: by srcmail.umd.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v1.2 (600.1 3-26-1998)) id
85256B1F.008119AD ; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 18:30:07 -0500
X-Lotus-FromDomain: SRC
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <85256B1F.00806C4C.00@srcmail.umd.edu>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 18:30:05 -0500
Subject: Re: AAPOR 2002 Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award

All submissions to the AAPOR Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award competition
received
through December 11 have been sent email confirmations of receipt. If you have
submitted a paper and not received an email confirmation, please contact me.

The deadline for submissions is extended to December 20.

Johnny Blair
jblair@srcmail.umd.edu

301 314 7831

fax 301 314 9070

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Dec 11 16:07:09 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 fBC078e03587 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
16:07:08
-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 ESMTMP
id QAA12149 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:07:09 -0800

(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
19:06:47
-0500

Message-ID: <3C169FB8.6BD56D52@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 19:07:20 -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
CC: ande271@attglobal.net
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011211170343.02728cb0@mail.mindspring.com>
<3C16BF2A.B4FC88A4@attglobal.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

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

Chairman, The Harris Poll
New York, Dec. 6, 2001

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

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 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>
> >
> >

>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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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
Received: from 63.149.125.129 by lw2fd.hotmail.msn.com with HTTP;
Wed, 12 Dec 2001 00:19:06 GMT
X-Originating-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>
<DIV></DIV>
<P>Hi,</P>
<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> <P>Thanks,<BR><BR>Wendy Landers </P> <DIV></DIV>
<DIV></DIV></div><br clear=all><hr>Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile
```

device: Click Here
</html>
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 11 16:54:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBC0sCe07194 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
16:54:12
-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 ESMTTP
id QAA02421 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:54:12 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBC0rOR27960 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:53:24 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 16:53:24 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: The War for Public Opinion (T Straus IMI)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112111647550.23985-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

>From vector@sympatico.ca Tue Dec 11 17:58:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBC1wle11159 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001
17:58:01
-0800 (PST)
Received: from tomts11-srv.bellnexxia.net (tomts11.bellnexxia.net
[209.226.175.55])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id RAA00819 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 17:57:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: from i7slu9 ([64.228.110.107]) by tomts11-srv.bellnexxia.net
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.16 201-229-121-116-20010115) with SMTP

id <20011212015706.HAVA24966.tomts11-srv.bellnexxia.net@i7slu9>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 11 Dec 2001 20:57:06 -0500
Message-ID: <002d01c182b0\$568200e0\$6b6ee440@i7slu9>
Reply-To: "Marc Zwelling" <marc@vectorresearch.com>
From: "Marc Zwelling" <vector@sympatico.ca>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <LAW2-F78atwD43oFLaq000003e8@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: survey research in the UK
Date: Tue, 11 Dec 2001 20:57:20 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002A_01C18286.6CD966A0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4522.1200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_002A_01C18286.6CD966A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<http://www.mori.com/i.shtml?ZCVT0123>

- Marc Zwelling --=20
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991
=20
See what's new at Vector:
<http://www.vectorresearch.com/>

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Wendy Landers=20
To: aapornet@usc.edu=20
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2001 7:19 PM
Subject: survey research in the UK

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=20

<DIV></DIV>

<DIV></DIV></DIV><BR clear=3Dall>

<HR>

Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile device: <A=20
href=3D"http://go.msn.com/bql/hmtag2_et1_EN.asp">Click=20
Here
</BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_002A_01C18286.6CD966A0--

>From skeeter@gmu.edu Wed Dec 12 05:48:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCDmve20243 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
05:48:57
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mserver2.gmu.edu (mail02.gmu.edu [129.174.0.10])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA14041 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 05:48:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from gmU.edu ([151.200.26.127]) by mserver2.gmu.edu
(Netscape Messaging Server 4.15) with ESMTTP id GO8H0Z00.542 for
<aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:48:35 -0500
Message-ID: <3C176053.1F88742@gmu.edu>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:49:07 -0500
From: "Scott Keeter" <skeeter@gmu.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RDD sample coverage of college students
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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>
>From S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com Wed Dec 12 06:37:59 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCEbwe22640 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
06:37:58
-0800 (PST)
Received: from srbi.com (srbi.com [12.14.34.4])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id GAA14169 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 06:37:58 -0800
(PST)
Received: from SRBI_NEW_YORK-Message_Server by srbi.com
with Novell_GroupWise; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:41:40 -0500
Message-Id: <sc172654.088@srbi.com>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:41:26 -0500
From: "Stephen Dienstfrey" <S.DIENSTFREY@srbi.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: RDD sample coverage of college students
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBCEbxe22641

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 Keeter" <skeeter@gmu.edu> 12/12/01 08:49AM >>>
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>

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Wed Dec 12 06:55:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCEt3e23772 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
06:55:03
-0800 (PST)
Received: from johnson.mail.mindspring.net (johnson.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.177])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA25306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 06:55:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from 1cust5.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.5]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by johnson.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16EA1P-0005S1-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:53:39 -0500
Message-ID: <3C17617C.92C9794D@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:54:12 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: RDD sample coverage of college students
References: <3C176053.1F88742@gmu.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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>

>From RFunk787@aol.com Wed Dec 12 07:52:09 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
id fBCFq9e26058 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
07:52:09
-0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-d06.mx.aol.com (imo-d06.mx.aol.com [205.188.157.38])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA05667 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 07:52:09 -0800
(PST)
From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo-d06.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.3f.34180f2 (2168)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:51:15 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3f.34180f2.2948d6f2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:51:14 EST
Subject: reply to Jim B.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

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 ESMTTP
id fBCGF8e27747 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP 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
> 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

-----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 <u>The Revolt of the Elites</u>, many of us have sold out. <p>Brian Vargus
 <p>RFunk787@aol.com wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>Jim -- <p>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. <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. 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. <p>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

University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

-----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 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 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

id fBCG0me29256 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:24:48
-0800 (PST)
Received: from tisch.mail.mindspring.net (tisch.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA02035 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:24:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from lcust5.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.5]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by tisch.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16ECBC-0006hm-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:24:22 -0500
Message-ID: <3C1776C0.383F7DD8@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:25:00 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
References: <3f.34180f2.2948d6f2@aol.com> <3C1782A2.CE9F4677@iupui.edu>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----
0124DC47ACC3302E0DE387F3"

-----0124DC47ACC3302E0DE387F3
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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."
<p>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
 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
<u>The
Revolt of the Elites</u>, many of us have sold out. <p>Brian Vargus

<p>RFunk787@aol.com wrote: <blockquote TYPE=CITE>Jim -- <p>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. <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. 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.
<p>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? <p>Ray Funkhouser</blockquote>
</blockquote> </html>

-----0124DC47ACC3302E0DE387F3--

>From Lydia_Saad@gallup.com Wed Dec 12 08:33:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCGXie01448 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:33:44
-0800 (PST)
Received: from exchn7.gallup.com (exchn7.gallup.com [198.175.140.71])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAB09921 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:33:45 -0800
(PST)
From: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com
Received: by Exchn7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <YKMXTH52>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:32:54 -0600
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE407E2B7D1@Exchn7.gallup.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:32:51 -0600
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCGhle02680 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:43:47
-0800 (PST)
Received: from kop1550145.db.smartrevenue.com (mail.smartrevenue.com
[164.109.30.90])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
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
kop1550145.db.smartrevenue.com (Rockliffe SMTPRA 3.4.5) with SMTP id
<B0000222981@kop1550145.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: <LPBBINMPOBMDDJCBNLJGEEBOENAA.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: <LPBBINMPOBMDDJCBNLJGAEKEKAA.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

>From KFeld@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/usc) with ESMTTP

id fBCGjSe03143 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:45:28
-0800 (PST)
Received: from nehor.office.humanvoice.net ([216.20.237.78])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA20502 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:45:29 -0800
(PST)
Received: by nehor.office.humanvoice.net with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
id <XT8AQAWP>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:45:07 -0700

Message-ID:
<C7D496BDFDBEE745BB21226605670F510B2EDF@nehor.office.humanvoice.net>
From: Karl Feld <KFeld@humanvoice.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: survey research in the UK
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:45:06 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C1832C.5ADFF170"

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_001_01C1832C.5ADFF170
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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>
<<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

<http://www.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm>

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

From: Wendy Landers [mailto:wendylanders@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2001 5:19 PM

To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: survey research in the UK

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
<http://go.msn.com/bql/hmtag2_etl_EN.asp> Here

----- _NextPart_001_01C1832C.5ADFF170

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">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 5.50.4522.1800" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY>
<DIV><SPAN
class=3D498023816-12122001><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff
size=3D2>Wendy,=20
</DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial
=
color=3D#0000ff=20 size=3D2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial = color=3D#0000ff
size=3D2>The=20 primary research organization in the UK is the Market
Research
=
Society. <nbsp;=20 You can obtain their contact info. at <A=20
href=3D"http://www.marketresearch.org.uk"><http://www.marketresearch.org.uk>.
uk. <nbsp;=20
Their magazine, Research, is the best way I've found to keep up on = trends
in
the=20

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.</DIV><DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Regards,</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Karl

G.=20 Feld
Vice President, Research=20 Development
<FONT face=3DArial color=3D#000000=20

size=3D2>humanvoice, inc. =

<FONT=20 face=3DArial size=3D2>2155 North Freedom Blvd.
<FONT =

face=3DArial=20 size=3D2>Provo, Utah 84601
p:

+1 = 801 344=20 5500
f: +1 801 370 1008

=
<FONT=20 face=3DArial size=3D2>e: kfeld@humanvoice.com </DIV>

<DIV>

<P>Karl's next speaking engagement is = ESOMAR Net

Effects=20 5 in Berlin, Germany on February 3-5. Learn more at <A = target=3D_blank=20

href=3D"http://www.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm">http://ww= w.esomar.nl/seminar_progs/NetEffects2002.htm</P></DIV>=

<BLOCKQUOTE>

<DIV class=3DOutlookMessageHeader dir=3Dltr align=3Dleft><FONT = face=3DTahoma=20

size=3D2>-----Original Message-----
From: Wendy Landers=20

[mailto:wendylanders@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December = 11, 2001=20

5:19 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: survey = research in=20

the UK

</DIV>

<DIV>

<DIV></DIV>

<DIV></DIV>

<P>Hi,</P>

<P>Where would I go, or who would I ask, to find out about what's = going on=20

currently in survey research in the UK? Anyone out there from = the UK=20

willing to answer some basic questions?</P>

<P>Thanks,

Wendy Landers </P>

<DIV></DIV>

<DIV></DIV></DIV><BR clear=3Dall>

<HR>

Send and receive Hotmail on your mobile device: <A=20

href=3D"http://go.msn.com/bql/hmtag2_etl_EN.asp">Click=20

Here
</BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_001_01C1832C.5ADFF170--
>From spelletti@hsph.harvard.edu Wed Dec 12 08:49:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fBCGnNe03726 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:49:23
-0800 (PST)
Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
id IAA24480 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:49:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ahab.hsph.harvard.edu (sph186-70.harvard.edu [134.174.186.70])
by hsph.harvard.edu (8.10.2+Sun/8.10.2) with ESMT id fBCGmi324730
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:48:44 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.3.2.7.2.20011212114640.00b48100@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Sender: spelletti@hsph.harvard.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:48:44 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Stephen Pelletier <spelletti@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
In-Reply-To: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE407E2B7D1@Exchn7.gallup.co
m>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Civil Liberties survey asks about military tribunals. The results can be found here:

http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/civilliberties_supplement.html

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
>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

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Wed Dec 12 08:51:30 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
id fBCGpTe04058 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
08:51:29
-0800 (PST)
Received: from tisch.mail.mindspring.net (tisch.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.157])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA26596 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:51:30 -0800
(PST)
Received: from 1cust5.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.5]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by tisch.mail.mindspring.net with esmtip (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16ECaz-0002Lj-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:51:02 -0500
Message-ID: <3C177CFE.CCCD1C92@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:51:41 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
References: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE407E2B7D1@Exchng7.gallup.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

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.

FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Nov. 28-29, 2001. N=900 registered voters nationwide. MoE is 3.

think . "Do you
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. 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
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227F9@AS_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)

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
FBCH30e06810

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.

>

> FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Nov. 28-29, 2001. N=900

> registered voters nationwide. MoE is 3.

>

> "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.

> 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 mail@marketsharescorp.com Wed Dec 12 09:13:32 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
id fBCHDVe07720 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
09:13:31
-0800 (PST)
Received: from tisch.mail.mindspring.net (tisch.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.157])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA20026 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:13:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: from 1cust5.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.5]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by tisch.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16ECwO-0002am-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 12:13:08 -0500
Message-ID: <3C17822D.B9152DC2@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 11:13:49 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227F9@AS_SERVER>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
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
>
> > -----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.
> >
> > FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Nov. 28-29, 2001. N=900
> > registered voters nationwide. MoE is 3.
> >
> > . "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.
> > > 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 beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 12 10:01:27 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
id fBCI1Qe19595 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
10:01:26
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA14839 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:01:27 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCI0aw11291 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:00:36 -0800
(PST)
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:00:36 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
In-Reply-To: <3f.34180f2.2948d6f2@aol.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112120822310.20211-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

To all AAPORNETters,

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 repond 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 "AAPORNET'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, 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 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)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
id
<01KBS5L6RRGW0014GS@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
13:07:39 EDT
Received: from rider.edu ([10.59.1.53])
by enigma.rider.edu (PMDF V5.2-31 #37528)
with ESMTMP id <01KBS5L6BS020017MP@enigma.rider.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Wed, 12
Dec 2001 13:07:39 -0400 (EDT)
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 13:07:30 -0500
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C179CE1.67896FE1@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <4.3.2.7.2.20011212114640.00b48100@hsph.harvard.edu>

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:
>
> [http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/civilliberties_sup
> plement.html](http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/civilliberties_supplement.html)
>
> 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
> >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
> SPelletti@hsph.harvard.edu
> www.hsph.harvard.edu/horp

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 12 10:13:59 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCIDwe21958 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
10:13:58
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA29038; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:13:58 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCID9A13089; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:13:09 -0800 (PST)
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 10:13:08 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F33227F9@AS_SERVER>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112121011020.20211-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 ESMTTP
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: (qmail 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/cshtml/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
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A28232-2001Dec11.html>

>From Claire.Durand@UMontreal.CA Wed Dec 12 13:09:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBCL9ae11204 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
13:09:36
-0800 (PST)
Received: from jason.MAGELLAN.UMontreal.CA (jason.MAGELLAN.UMontreal.CA
[132.204.2.30])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA22456 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 13:09:33 -0800
(PST)
Received: from I100868-SOCIO.umontreal.ca (ppp-29.dialup-168.worldonline.fr
[212.83.168.29])
by jason.MAGELLAN.UMontreal.CA (8.11.6/8.11.4) with ESMTTP id
fBCL92223736551
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 16:09:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011212160357.024bde90@poste.umontreal.ca>
X-Sender: durandc@poste.umontreal.ca
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 16:08:49 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMontreal.CA>
Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
In-Reply-To: <3C179CE1.67896FE1@rider.edu>
References: <4.3.2.7.2.20011212114640.00b48100@hsph.harvard.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBCL9ae11205

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:
>>
>>
> [http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/civilliberties_sup
> plement.html](http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/civilliberties_supplement.html)
>>
>> 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
> 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
> > SPelletti@hsph.harvard.edu
> > www.hsph.harvard.edu/horp

Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/>

Universit  de Montr al, dept. de sociologie,
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montr al, Qu bec, Canada, H3C 3J7
Actuellement   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: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322801@AS_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 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 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 ESMTMP

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)

Received: (cpmta 11369 invoked from network); 12 Dec 2001 15:26:10 -0800

Received: from 209.195.248.155 (HELO default)

by smtp.jpmurphy.com (209.228.32.122) with SMTP; 12 Dec 2001 15:26:10 -0800

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

X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

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 dittman@alaska.net Wed Dec 12 16:11:24 2001
>Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
> by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
> id fBD0BOe01524 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
>16:11:24
>-0800 (PST)
>Received: from hob.slb.nwc.acsalaska.net (hob.slb.nwc.acsalaska.net
>[209.112.155.42])
> by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
> id QAA18432 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 16:11:20 -0800
>(PST)
>Received: from alaska.net (82-pm14.nwc.alaska.net [209.112.141.82])
> by hob.slb.nwc.acsalaska.net (8.11.6/8.11.6) with ESMTTP id
>fBD0AlE90571;
> Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:10:48 -0900 (AKST)
> (envelope-from dittman@alaska.net)
>Message-ID: <3C17F168.9B3A7C43@alaska.net>
>Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:08:08 -0900
>From: Dittman Research Corporation <dittman@alaska.net>
>X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.06 [en] (Win98; U)
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>To: aapornet@usc.edu
>Subject: Re: reply to Jim B.
>References: <008c01c18364\$88a57e80\$9bf8c3d1@default>
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 ESMTTP
id fBD1NMe17233 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
17:23:22
-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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
id fBD1MV308721 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:22:31 -0800
(PST)

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 17:22:31 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: reply to David D.
In-Reply-To: <3C17F168.9B3A7C43@alaska.net>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112121641190.28466-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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.

> >
> > 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 ande271@attglobal.net Wed Dec 12 18:34:16 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 fBD2YFe12549 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001
18:34:15
-0800 (PST)
Received: from prserv.net (out4.prserv.net [32.97.166.34])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA14721 for <AAPORNET@usc.edu>; Wed, 12 Dec 2001 18:34:15 -0800
(PST)
Received: from attglobal.net (slip-32-103-123-
66.ny.us.prserv.net[32.103.123.66])
by prserv.net (out4) with SMTP
id <20011213023352204062ps6qe>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 02:33:52 +0000
Message-ID: <3C183E3A.EE6A8AAD@attglobal.net>
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 21:35:55 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Reply to Jim B.
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 ESMTMP
      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 ESMTMP
      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]
helo=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: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBKECEDMAA.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 /// More Arabs,

Muslims Allege Bias On the Job Complaints to EEOC More Than Double

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A28251-2001Dec11.html>

-----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?"
> >> >

> >> > This allows for a full us vs. them dichotomy.
> >> > --
> >> > Leo G. Simonetta
> >> > Art & Science Group, LLC
> >> > simonetta@artsci.com
> >>
> >

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Dec 13 06:34:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBDEYbel18784 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
06:34:37
-0800 (PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA04957 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 06:34:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <YZ880RB3>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:33:41 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322805@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:33:39 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 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 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 ESMTTP
id fBDG6Oe27126 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
08:06:24
-0800 (PST)
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 ESMTTP
id IAA11739 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 08:06:24 -0800
(PST)
From: elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov
Received: from dispatch.tco.census.gov (localhost.localdomain [127.0.0.1])
by dispatch.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.5) with ESMTTP id
fBDG5YE11881

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:05:34 -0500
Received: from deliver.tco.census.gov ([148.129.126.70])
by dispatch.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.6) with ESMTTP id
fBDG5Xw11872
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:05:33 -0500
Received: from it008nthqln.tco.census.gov (it008nthqln.tco.census.gov
[148.129.123.82])
by deliver.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.19) with ESMTTP id
fBDG5XJ02917
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:05:33 -0500
Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001
Message-ID: <OF0E1B8E87.2DE0A80B-ON85256B21.00584654@tco.census.gov>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:05:32 -0500
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18,
2001) at
12/13/2001 11:05:33 AM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

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> <simonetta@art sci.com> To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'"
cc:
Sent by: Subject: RE: reply to Jim B.
owner-aapornet
<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 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 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 ESMTTP
id fBDGUm00933 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
08:30:48
-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 ESMTTP
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

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>
> 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.

> Copyright (C) 2001 Independent Media Institute
>-----
>-----
>
>
>*****
>
>
>
>

>From simonetta@artsci.com Thu Dec 13 08:59:13 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 fBDGxCe08131 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
 08:59:12
 -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 IAA03044 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 08:59:09 -0800
 (PST)
 Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
 id <YZ880RF2>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:58:13 -0500
 Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322809@AS_SERVER>
 From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
 To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
 Subject: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.
 Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 11:58:13 -0500
 MIME-Version: 1.0
 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
 Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"

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

> -----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@artsci.com> 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 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 teresa.hottle@wright.edu Thu Dec 13 09:36:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBDHaZel13035 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
09:36:35
-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 ESMTTP
id JAA16250 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 09:36:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu
(PMDF
V6.1 #39146) id <OGOAO0L01M8EYA@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Thu, 13
Dec 2001 12:36:14 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (all131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37]) by
mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.1 #39146) with ESMTTP id
<OGOAO0L3XM8EAJ@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
12:36:14
-0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:35:42 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: finance survey
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C18E6EE.B5DD7A23@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en

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 ESMTMP
id fBDHgkel4269 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 ESMTMP
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 <OGOAO0N01MIL2C@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Thu, 13
Dec 2001 12:42:21 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (all131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37]) by
mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.1 #39146) with ESMTMP id
<OGOAO0LAKMILAJ@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
12:42:21
-0500 (EST)
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:41:48 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: finance survey
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C18E85C.77D890D0@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en

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 ESMTMP
id fBDHxHel6456 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

(PST)

Received: from HPDom-Message_Server by fuji.hp.ufl.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:57:15 -0500
Message-Id: <sc18a5ab.075@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:56:37 -0500
From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: "<"<aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Last-miute AAPOR submissions
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="=_4C1165EB.0B6A0C63"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--=_4C1165EB.0B6A0C63
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

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

--=_4C1165EB.0B6A0C63
Content-Type: text/html; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Description: HTML

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META
content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type> <META
content="MSHTML 5.00.3314.2100" name=GENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY style="FONT: 8pt
MS Sans
Serif; MARGIN-LEFT: 2px; MARGIN-TOP: 2px"> <DIV><FONT size=2>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.&nbsp; </FONT></DIV> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT
size=2>I
gotta confess, last year I wrote mine the evening of the
deadline, in between cooking dinner and waiting for the guests to
arrive.&nbsp;
But I'd been thinking about it beforehand, and I was serious about finishing
the
analysis before May, and I did.&nbsp; </FONT></DIV> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT
size=2>Mine was accepted as a poster presentation.&nbsp; If you
haven't done this lately, it is so much fun.&nbsp; Last year, the posters
were
conveniently located and well attended.&nbsp; I gave away 60 handouts, and
had
some interesting conversations with folks.&nbsp; 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.&nbsp; So having time to really talk was a
pleasure.&nbsp; And I learned who follows intercollegiate football:&nbsp; a
few
guys who saw the ugly colors I'd selected for my graphs (orange and blue) and
snickered, "Gator colors, huh?!"&nbsp; And people came close enough for me to
read their nametags, which seemed to be in notoriously small type last
year.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>So just do it!&nbsp; </FONT></DIV> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT
size=2>Colleen</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT size=2>P.S.&nbsp; Although I know
everyone
understands how these
```


(PST)

Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 10:36:07 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322809@AS_SERVER>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112130925400.16320-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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
> 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

>

> > -----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:
> > "'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 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 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 ESMTTP

id fBDLJIe07810 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001
13:19:18
-0800 (PST)
Received: from maynard.mail.mindspring.net (maynard.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.243])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id NAA06354 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:19:16 -0800
(PST)
Received: from lcust216.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.216]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by maynard.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16EdFj-0006gY-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 16:18:52 -0500
Message-ID: <3C190D45.77A2BA32@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 15:19:20 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112130925400.16320-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

> > 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
> >
> > > -----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@artsci.com> To:
> > > "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
> > > simonetta@artsci.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 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 i7slu9 ([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@i7slu9>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 13 Dec 2001 16:35:13 -0500
Message-ID: <001201c1841e\$1442ec20\$126ee440@i7slu9>
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-MSMail-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.

- Marc Zwelling -
Vector Research + Development Inc.
Phone: 416 - 733 - 2320
Fax: 416 - 733 - 4991

See what's new at Vector:
<http://www.vectorresearch.com/>

----- Original Message -----
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 <GOB00E6EAV3VJ@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-MIMEOLE: 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.74AD0A60"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0064_01C1841D.74AD0A60
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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 standarized 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
Mexico=20
525- 52113044

-----=_NextPart_000_0064_01C1841D.74AD0A60
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
content=3D"text/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1" = http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META
content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2919.6307" name=3DGENERATOR> <STYLE></STYLE> </HEAD>
<BODY
bgColor=3D#ffffff> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Hi,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>We were invited to
participate in
a = group to=20 develop a good index of parents satisfaction with the
education their
= children=20 receive in public schools in Mexico City.&nbsp;<div>The idea is to
combine =
this=20 information with actual estimates of school performance using =
standarized
tests=20 to reorient incentives. Any help or orientation?</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Ulises
Beltran</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>BGC, Beltran y Asocs., S. = C.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Saltillo 63</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT
face=3DArial
size=3D2>Col. Hipodromo-Condesa</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial
size=3D2>Mexico,
D. F., 06100</FONT></DIV> <DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>Mexico
</FONT></DIV>
```

<DIV>525- 52113044</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0064_01C1841D.74AD0A60--

>From mark@bisconti.com Fri Dec 14 06:31:14 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
id fBEEVEe22441 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
06:31:14
-0800 (PST)
Received: from albatross.prod.itd.earthlink.net
(albatross.mail.pas.earthlink.net
[207.217.120.120])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id GAA02878 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 06:31:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from dialup-209.244.214.186.dial1.washington2.level3.net
([209.244.214.186]
helo=mark)
by albatross.prod.itd.earthlink.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16EtMQ-00002n-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 06:30:50 -0800
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 09:24:59 -0500
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBAEEDMAA.mark@bisconti.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 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322809@AS_SERVER>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

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?

	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

> -----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@artsci.com> 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 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 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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP 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: <0532A6D56F30F24798DE4697CAFB347F024FEBA8@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

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

>From pjlavrakas@tvratings.com Fri Dec 14 07:53:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBEFr4e27097 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
07:53:04
-0800 (PST)
Received: from reliant.nielsenmedia.com (reliant.nielsenmedia.com
[63.114.249.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA11626 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 07:53:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from nmrusdunxg1.nielsenmedia.com (nmrusdunxg1.nielsenmedia.com
[10.9.11.119])
by reliant.nielsenmedia.com (8.11.5/8.11.5) with ESMTTP id fBEFqDe27945
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:52:13 -0500 (EST)
Received: from nmrusdunxg2.nielsenmedia.com (unverified) by
nmrusdunxg1.nielsenmedia.com (Content Technologies SMTPRS 4.2.5) with ESMTTP
id
<T57d163b7df0a090b77638@nmrusdunxg1.nielsenmedia.com> for
<aapornet@usc.edu>;
Fri,
14 Dec 2001 10:52:08 -0500
Received: by nmrusdunxg2.nielsenmedia.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)
id <Y4J0JPZN>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:52:12 -0500
Message-ID:
<F9BC190B7DE9D111965000805FA7C60B05BFA65C@nmrusnysx1.nielsenmedia.com>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A question...
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 10:52:04 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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
>From cporter@hp.ufl.edu Fri Dec 14 08:18:30 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
id fBEGITe28173 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
08:18:30
-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 IAA07345 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 08:18:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: from HPDom-Message_Server by fuji.hp.ufl.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:15:21 -0500
Message-Id: <sc19df49.097@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:14:37 -0500
From: "Colleen Porter" <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A question...
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="=_E2BFC989.C7A6C0BF"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--=_E2BFC989.C7A6C0BF
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

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

>>> pjlavrakas@tvratings.com 12/14/01 10:52AM >>>
>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

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

--=_E2BFC989.C7A6C0BF

Content-Type: text/html; charset=ISO-8859-1

Content-Description: HTML

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN"> <HTML><HEAD>
<META
content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type> <META
content="MSHTML 5.00.3314.2100" name=GENERATOR></HEAD> <BODY style="FONT: 8pt
MS Sans
Serif; MARGIN-LEFT: 2px; MARGIN-TOP: 2px"> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Colleen K. Porter<BR>Project Coordinator<BR><A
href="mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu">cporter@hp.ufl.edu</A><BR>phone: 352/392-
6919,
fax: 352/392-7109<BR>University of Florida,<BR>Department of Health Services
Administration<BR>Location:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-
015<BR>Mailing
Address:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;32610-
0195<BR>&gt;&gt;&gt;
pjlavrakas@tvratings.com 12/14/01 10:52AM &gt;&gt;&gt;<BR>&gt;There are no
legal
restrictions on research vis-a-vis time of day for<BR>&gt;placing calls, but
there certainly are prudent "rules" to follow and it<BR>&gt;seems that many
think 9pm is the last local time to dial RDD numbers.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;PJL<BR><BR><FONT
size=2>I think a lot of us try to follow that rule, but figuring out the
local
time is not always simple.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;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.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>Colleen</FONT></DIV> <DIV>&nbsp;</DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

--=_E2BFC989.C7A6C0BF--

>From teresa.hottle@wright.edu Fri Dec 14 08:27:56 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 fBEGRue29843 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001

08:27:56

-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 IAA16540 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 08:27:37 -0800

(PST)

Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON.mailserv.wright.edu by mailserv.wright.edu

(PMDF

V6.1 #39146) id <OGOC00B01DPA4G@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Fri, 14
Dec 2001 11:27:10 -0500 (EST)
Received: from wright.edu (all131037.wright.edu [130.108.131.37]) by
mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.1 #39146) with ESMTTP id
<OGOC00A6FDPACF@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
11:27:10
-0500 (EST)
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:26:37 -0500
From: Teresa Hottle <teresa.hottle@wright.edu>
Subject: Re: A question...
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3C1A283D.FC892970@wright.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.72 [en]C-CCK-MCD (Win95; I)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <sc19df49.097@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>

Colleen,
Do you use Wincati (I can't remember)? A nice function of Wincati is that it
does it
for you.

Terrie

>From JRachels@concentric.net Fri Dec 14 08:47:05 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBEG14e02183 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
08:47:04
-0800 (PST)
Received: from darius.concentric.net (darius.concentric.net [207.155.198.79])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA07460 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 08:47:04 -0800
(PST)
Received: from mcfeely.concentric.net (mcfeely.concentric.net
[207.155.198.83])
by darius.concentric.net [Concentric SMTP Routing 1.0] id fBEGkflL14320
for <aapornet@usc.edu.>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:46:41 -0500 (EST)
Received: from concentric.net (w230.z208036075.nyc-ny.dsl.cnc.net
[208.36.75.230])
by mcfeely.concentric.net (8.9.1a)
id LAA03287; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:46:38 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3C1A2CD9.8D3A77A6@concentric.net>
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 11:46:17 -0500
From: Joyce Rachelson <JRachels@concentric.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.78 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en,x-ns1QK9RBqgvNh5,x-ns2U150btwUq5f
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A question...
References: <sc19df49.097@fuji.hp.ufl.edu> <3C1A283D.FC892970@wright.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 Rachelson, 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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP

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 <Y606HZP1>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 13:22:02 -0500

Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F332281B@AS_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

>Report available at: <http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/>

>CONTACT: Ellen O'Brien or Sharon Flynn - CME
>(202) 331-7833

>>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
simonetta@artsci.com

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Dec 14 12:24:07 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBEKO6e15683 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
12:24:06
-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 ESMTTP
id MAA06063 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:24:00 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBEKN4P08954 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:23:04 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:23:04 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Position at American Cancer Society Behavioral Research Center in
Atlanta
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112141219110.2304-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 opportunity 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 ESMTTP
        id fBEKuAe22289 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001
12:56:11
-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 ESMTTP
        id MAA14816 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:56:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
        by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
        id fBEKtIK12306 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:55:18 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:55:18 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <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>
```

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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.

FREE Download Acrobat Reader

Cover & Table of Contents (99 KB)

Executive Summary (193 KB)

Introduction (161 KB)

- o Hazards and Hopes: Two Views of the Internet
- o The New Media's Role in Adolescent Development
- o Scope and Methods of This Study
- o Sidebars
 - o Adolescent Development: Growing Up Is Hard to Do
 - o Academic Research on Teens and the Media

Commercial Culture Online (5.4 MB)

(NOTE: Due to the size of this file, it may take awhile to open.
You might prefer to right-click on the link and then choose "Save Target As..." [PC]
or control-click on the link and choose "Download Link to Disk" [Mac]
to save the PDF directly to your computer. Then you can open it from your desktop.)

- o Defining Features of Teen Digital Culture
- o Themes and Content
- o Reach Out and Touch Someone
- o Teen Self-Expression Online
- o "Love my community, love my brand"
- o Getting to Know You
- o Data Collection Practices
- o E-Commerce
- o Sidebars
 - o Online Gaming
 - o MTV
 - o Online Music
 - o Marketing to Teens: New Trends and Strategies
 - o Studying the Teen Demographic: "Explorers," "Visibles," and "Isolators"

The Alternative Internet:

A Noncommercial and Civic Web Culture for Teens (2.7 MB)

(NOTE: Due to the size of this file, it may take awhile to open.

You might prefer to right-click on the link and then choose "Save Target As..." [PC]
or control-click on the link and choose "Download Link to Disk" [Mac]
to save the PDF directly to your computer. Then you can open it from your desktop.)

- o A Platform for Teen Expression
- o Linking Virtual and the Real Communities
- o Connecting Youth Globally
- o Blending Commercial and Nonprofit: New Business Models
- o The Corporate Civic Sector

New Trends and Future Directions (515 KB)

- o The Wireless Web
- o Marketing and Data Collection in the New Digital Environment
- o Sidebar
 - o When Worlds Collide: TV Meets the Internet

Conclusion & Recommendations (126 KB)

Endnotes & Back Cover (260 KB)

CENTER FOR MEDIA EDUCATION (CME)

Kathryn C. Montgomery, Ph.D., President

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 on 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 to ensure that the Internet serves young people as a bridge to community and civic engagement. CME's funders include the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Atlantic Philanthropies.

<http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/>

TEENSITES.COM <<http://www.cme.org/teenstudy/>>

>From eleahall@yahoo.com Sun Dec 16 19:27:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fBH3RAe00700 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Dec 2001
19:27:10
-0800 (PST)
Received: from web9205.mail.yahoo.com (web9205.mail.yahoo.com
[216.136.129.38])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id TAA21603 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 16 Dec 2001 19:27:12 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <20011217032649.18780.qmail@web9205.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [216.214.207.183] by web9205.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sun, 16
Dec 2001
19:26:49 PST
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2001 19:26:49 -0800 (PST)
From: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Spyware removal utility
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBCEKMDLAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

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>
>
>
>
>

> 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
>
>
I

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>

>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Mon Dec 17 08:15:29 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
id fBHGFTel2370 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001
08:15:29
-0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.246])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA08457 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 08:15:29 -0800
(PST)
Received: from lcust81.tnt87.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.69.81]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16G0Pw-0000qQ-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 11:15:05 -0500
Message-ID: <3C1E0C13.284E7BB@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 10:15:35 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Question wording was RE: reply to Jim B.
References: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322809@AS_SERVER>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Here is our latest poll for the Chicago Tribune conducted Dec 9-11 in
Illinois.

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0112160403dec16.story>

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%

Criminal court system 46%
Don't know 18%

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

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBHIWse22953 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001
10:32:55
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA14169 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 10:32:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBHIVwrl3290 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 10:31:58 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 10:31:58 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: National ID Card Gaining Support (WashPost)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112171024230.5006-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>

Monday, December 17, 2001; Page A01

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."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>

(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company

>From Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil Mon Dec 17 10:47:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBHilme25460 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001
10:47:48
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA00230 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 10:47:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: by ddsmttayz003 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <Y7Z6AKNW>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 13:46:55 -0500
Message-ID:
<F5D5DAE9D02BD511B23800805FBBC0245E92B4@ddsmttayz066.int.dmdc.osd.mil>
From: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: National ID Card Gaining Support (WashPost)
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 13:46:44 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id

fBHIlme25461

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.
* Jim

© 2001 The Washington Post Company

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>>
Monday, December 17, 2001; Page A01

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 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."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>
<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A52300-2001Dec16>>

© 2001 The Washington Post Company

>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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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

a frame as this?

-- Jim

Copyright (c) 2001 -- The Sydney Morning Herald

<http://www.smh.com.au/breaking/2001/12/14/FFX058CU6VC.html>

Published: Friday December 14, 7:18 AM

Refugees meeting proposal would register every person on Earth

By Maria Hawthorne

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
over-
stayers
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.

<http://www.smh.com.au/breaking/2001/12/14/FFX058CU6VC.html>

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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 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

--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.&nbsp; I'm looking for&nbsp; panels would of sufficient size to yield 800 completed interviews within a local market, when needed.&nbsp; 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.&nbsp; This is for use in an industry study of methodologies.&nbsp; As always in this business, sooner would be better for me than later.<BR> <BR> JAS<BR> <BR> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.<BR> Selzer & Company, Inc.<BR> Des Moines<BR> JAnnSelzer@aol.com, for purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com<BR> Visit our website at www.SelzerCo.com</FONT></HTML>
```

--part1_26.2035f815.294fa13d_boundary--
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 17 22:18:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FBI6I4e24756 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001
22:18:04
-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 ESMTTP
id WAA29097 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:18:03 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FBI6H5119384 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:17:05 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 22:17:05 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112172215300.10969-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

(C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People <www.jta.org>

http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?

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>

>From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Tue Dec 18 05:43:10 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBIDh9e17745 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
05:43:09
-0800 (PST)
Received: from imf16bis.bellsouth.net (mail116.mail.bellsouth.net
[205.152.58.56])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id FAA12366 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 05:43:10 -0800
(PST)

Received: from w5y0s9.bellsouth.net ([65.81.40.70])
by imf16bis.bellsouth.net
(InterMail vM.5.01.04.00 201-253-122-122-20010827) with ESMTTP
id

<20011218134312.DNKR10649.imf16bis.bellsouth.net@w5y0s9.bellsouth.net>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:43:12 -0500

Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011218083810.02deac70@pop3.norton.antivirus>

X-Sender: dhalpern@mail.atl.bellsouth.net@pop3.norton.antivirus

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1

Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:39:19 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>

Subject: Web Test Measures Prejudice Against Arab Muslims

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_634315==_ .ALT"

-----_634315==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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
<http://images.about.com/all/bullets/dot_clea.gif>

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

-----_634315==_.ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>
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
 <http://images.about.com/all/bullets/dot_clea.gif>

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

 </html>

-----_634315==_.ALT--

>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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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)

>
> -----
> ----
> -
> (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People <www.jta.org>
> -----
> ----
> -
> http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
>
>
> 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>
> -----
> ----
> -
>
>
> *****
>

>From mark@bisconti.com Tue Dec 18 08:32:46 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBIGWke01439 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
08:32:46

-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 IAA07220 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 08:32:44 -0800
(PST)

Received: (qmail 23802 invoked from network); 18 Dec 2001 16:32:23 -0000

Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)

by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 18 Dec 2001 16:32:23 -0000

Received: from mark ([138.88.86.160]) by bisconti.com ; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
10:32:18

-0600

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Bioterrorism Fears Lingering; Vaccine for Hill Staffers

Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:26:24 -0500

Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBGEHHDMAA.mark@bisconti.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002A_01C187B6.D381EEB0"

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

X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_002A_01C187B6.D381EEB0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Bioterrorism Fears Lingering

Survey Finds 20% of D.C. Area Residents Directly Affected

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57432-2001Dec17.html>

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. i;½
2001 The Washington Post Company

RELATED:

Anthrax Vaccine Urged for Hill Staff
Health Officials Want Inoculations To Start This Week
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57229-2001Dec17.html>

State Dept. Hit by New Anthrax Scare
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57221-2001Dec17.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

-----=_NextPart_000_002A_01C187B6.D381EEB0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">

<head>

```

<meta http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; = charset=3Diso-8859-
1">
<meta
name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document> <meta name=3DGenerator
content=3D"Microsoft
Word 9"> <meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9"> <link
rel=3DFile-List
href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C187B6.D0071FD0">
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
    <o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
  </o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
  <w:WordDocument>
    <w:View>Normal</w:View>
    <w:Zoom>0</w:Zoom>
    <w:DocumentKind>DocumentEmail</w:DocumentKind>
    <w:EnvelopeVis/>
  </w:WordDocument>
</xml><![endif]-->
<style>
<!--
  /* Font Definitions */
@font-face
    {font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    panose-1:2 4 6 2 5 3 5 3 3 4;
    mso-font-charset:0;
    mso-generic-font-family:roman;
    mso-font-pitch:variable;
    mso-font-signature:647 0 0 0 159 0;}
@font-face
    {font-family:"Arial Unicode MS";
    panose-1:2 11 6 4 2 2 2 2 2 4;
    mso-font-charset:128;
    mso-generic-font-family:swiss;
    mso-font-pitch:variable;
    mso-font-signature:-1 -369098753 63 0 4129023 0;}
@font-face
    {font-family:"\@Arial Unicode MS";
    mso-font-charset:0;
    mso-generic-font-family:auto;
    mso-font-pitch:auto;
    mso-font-signature:0 0 0 0 0 0;}
  /* Style Definitions */
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
    {mso-style-parent:"";
    margin:0in;
    margin-bottom:.0001pt;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
    {color:blue;
    text-decoration:underline;

```

```

        text-decoration:underline;
        text-decoration:underline;
        text-decoration:underline;
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
    {color:purple;
    text-decoration:underline;
    text-decoration:underline;
p.MsoAutoSig, li.MsoAutoSig, div.MsoAutoSig
    {margin:0in;
    margin-bottom:.0001pt;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Book Antiqua";
    mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}

p
    {margin-right:0in;
    mso-margin-top-alt:auto;
    mso-margin-bottom-alt:auto;
    margin-left:0in;
    mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
    font-size:12.0pt;
    font-family:"Arial Unicode MS";}
span.EmailStyle15
    {mso-style-type:personal-compose;
    mso-ansi-font-size:10.0pt;
    mso-ascii-font-family:Arial;
    mso-hansi-font-family:Arial;
    mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
    color:black;}

@page Section1
    {size:8.5in 11.0in;
    margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;
    mso-header-margin:.5in;
    mso-footer-margin:.5in;
    mso-paper-source:0;}

div.Section1
    {page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dpurple = style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p><b><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span = style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:18.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;font-weight:bold'=>
>Bioterrorism
Fears Lingering</span></font></b><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack =
face=3DArial><span
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;col=
or:black'>
<br>
Survey Finds 20% of D.C. Area Residents Directly Affected =
</span></font><font
size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span =

```

style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p>=></p>

<p>http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57432-2001Dec17.html<o:p></o:p>=></p>

<p><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p>By Richard Morin
 Washington Post Staff Writer
 Tuesday, December 18, 2001; Page A11 <o:p></o:p></p>=>

<p>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.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p>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.<font
size=3D2 color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p=
></p>

<p><span = style=3D'font-
size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>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.<font size=3D2
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p=
></p>

<p><span = style=3D'font-
size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>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.<font = size=3D2 color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span = style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></span=
></p>

<p><span = style=3D'font-
size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>Nationally, =
Harvard
researchers said, 4 percent of those interviewed said they or someone = they
knew had
been affected directly by anthrax.<font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>=

<p><span = style=3D'font-
size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>"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.

<o:p></o: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.<o:p></o:p></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.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p>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.<o:p></o:p>=

</p>

<p>The impact of anthrax is lingering, particularly among residents most directly touched by the recent emergency.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p>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.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p>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. <o:p></o:p></p>=</p>

<p>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. <o:p></o:p></p>

<p><span = style=3D'font-

size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>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.<span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:
12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p=
></p>

<p><span = style=3D'font-
size:10.0pt;
mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;color:black'>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.<span
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial;col=
or:black; mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal align=3Dcenter style=3D'text-align:center'><font =
size=3D2
color=3Dblack face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;
font-family:Arial'>=A9 2001 The Washington Post Company =
<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial;font-weight:bold'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p><=
</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:
Arial;font-weight:bold'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p><=
</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span =
style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:

Arial;font-weight:bold'>RELATED:<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>Anthrax = Vaccine Urged for Hill Staff<!--plsfield:stop-->
Health Officials = Want Inoculations To Start This Week<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57229-2001Dec17.html</= a><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>State = Dept. Hit by New Anthrax Scare<!--plsfield:stop--><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57221-2001Dec17.html</= a><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>>-----<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><!--[if supportFields]><span=20 style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial'><span=20 style=3D'mso-element:field-begin'> AUTOTEXTLIST \s "E-mail Signature" <span=20 style=3D'mso-element:field-separator'><![endif]--><f= ont

size=3D2 face=3DArial>Mark David RICHARDS, Ph.D., = Sociologist</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>Senior Associate, = Bisconti Research, Inc.</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>2610 Woodley Place = NW</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>Washington, District = of Columbia 20008</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>202/ = 347-8822</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>202/ 347-8825 = FAX</p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>mark@bisconti.com</p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><!--[if supportFields]><span=20 style=3D'font-size:10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-size:12.0pt;font-family:Arial'><span=20 style=3D'mso-element:field-end'><![endif]--><![if = !supportEmptyParas]> <![endif]></p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----_NextPart_000_002A_01C187B6.D381EEB0--

>From HFienberg@stats.org Tue Dec 18 09:33:33 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBIHXWe08357 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001

09:33:32
-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 ESMTTP
id JAA27169 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 09:33:31 -0800
(PST)
Received: by CMPA01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Z1RD9ZRP>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 12:43:12 -0500
Message-ID: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E5B138A@CMPA01>
From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 12:43:11 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBIHXXe08358

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)

>
> -----
> ----
> -
> (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People <www.jta.org>
> -----
> ----
> -
> [http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?](http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp)
>
>
> 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>
> -----
> ----
> -
>

>
> *****
>
>From eleahall@yahoo.com Tue Dec 18 09:51:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FBIHpwe09558 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
09:51:58
-0800 (PST)
Received: from web9204.mail.yahoo.com (web9204.mail.yahoo.com
[216.136.129.27])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id JAA13554 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 09:51:57 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <20011218175136.41562.qmail@web9204.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [205.158.211.210] by web9204.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18
Dec 2001
09:51:36 PST
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 09:51:36 -0800 (PST)
From: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@yahoo.com>
Subject: Possible survey questions re anthrax-- Feedback requested
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBGEHHDMAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

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

RCF Economic and Financial Consulting
(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>

>From WestoverT@ci.boulder.co.us Tue Dec 18 10:07:58 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 fBII7ve11691 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
10:07:58
-0800 (PST)
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
id KAA29185 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 10:07:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from CobTest-Message_Server by NwTest0.ci.boulder.co.us
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
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:06:13 -0700
From: "Terry Westover" <WestoverT@ci.boulder.co.us>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Panels
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBII7we11692

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

>From eleahall@yahoo.com Tue Dec 18 11:10:03 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id FBIJA3e20725 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
11:10:03
-0800 (PST)
Received: from web9207.mail.yahoo.com (web9207.mail.yahoo.com
[216.136.129.40])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id LAA02847 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:09:55 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <20011218190915.9184.qmail@web9207.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [205.158.211.210] by web9207.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18
Dec 2001
11:09:15 PST
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:09:15 -0800 (PST)
From: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@yahoo.com>
Subject: Feedback requested on hypothetical anthrax questions
To: aapornet@usc.edu
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>

>From simonetta@artsci.com Tue Dec 18 11:28:37 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
id FBIJSZe23073 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001

11:28:35
-0800 (PST)

Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA22818 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:28:30 -0800
(PST)

Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Z1HQYBAK>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:27:42 -0500

Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322840@AS_SERVER>

From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>

To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)

Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:27:41 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id
fBIJSae23074

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)
>
>
> >
> >
> -----
> -----
> -
> > (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People
> <www.jta.org>
> >
> -----
> -----
> -
> > http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
> >
> >
> > 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>

> -----
> ----

-
>
>
>
> *****
>

>From mcohen@fabmac.com Tue Dec 18 11:41:46 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id FBIJfje25717 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
11:41:45
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mail1.radix.net (mail1.radix.net [207.192.128.31])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
id LAA07692 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:41:42 -0800
(PST)
Received: from b2n2e7 (chris.fabmac.com [207.192.151.80])
by mail1.radix.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA11959
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:41:19 -0500 (EST)
From: "Michael Cohen" <mcohen@fabmac.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Study of minority recruitment for public safety institutions
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:43:09 -0500
Message-ID: <001c01c187fc\$3927c2e0\$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)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

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 JAnnSelzer@aol.com Tue Dec 18 11:43:51 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id FBIJhoe26266 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
11:43:50
-0800 (PST)
Received: from imo-r02.mx.aol.com (imo-r02.mx.aol.com [152.163.225.98])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA10145 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 11:43:48 -0800
(PST)
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
by imo-r02.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.15f.5d5651e (3313)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:43:17 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <15f.5d5651e.2950f654@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:43:16 EST
Subject: Re: Panels
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_15f.5d5651e.2950f654_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

--part1_15f.5d5651e.2950f654_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

--part1_15f.5d5651e.2950f654_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>Thank you for your response.&nbsp;
Can you
give me more contact information on this?&nbsp;
When I search the web, I get
a
lot of
hits, but mostly not what I'm looking for.&nbsp;
JAS<BR> <BR> J. Ann Selzer,
Ph.D.<BR> Selzer & Company, Inc.<BR> Des Moines<BR> JAnnSelzer@aol.com,
for
purposes of this list; otherwise, JASelzer@SelzerCo.com<BR> Visit our website
at
www.SelzerCo.com</FONT></HTML>
```

--part1_15f.5d5651e.2950f654_boundary--
>From HFienberg@stats.org Tue Dec 18 13:14:02 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
id fBILE2e06050 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
13:14:02
-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 ESMTTP
id NAA11983 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 13:14:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: by CMPA01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <Z1RD9ZS1>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 16:23:44 -0500
Message-ID: <F58FF1B42337D311813400C0F0304A1E5B1398@CMPA01>
From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 16:23:43 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Just found the guts of the RJC poll on their website:

The Luntz analysis: http://www.rjchq.org/RJCAAnalysis_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)
>
>
> >
>
> -----
> ----
> -
> > (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People
> > <www.jta.org>
>
> -----
> ----
> -
> > http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
> >
> >
> > 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>

> -----
> ----
> -
> >
> > *****
> >
>

>From jparsons@srl.uic.edu Tue Dec 18 13:46:34 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBILkYe11825 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
13:46:34
-0800 (PST)
Received: from larch.cc.uic.edu (larch.cc.uic.edu [128.248.155.164])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id NAA14545 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 13:46:34 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 24203 invoked from network); 18 Dec 2001 21:31:28 -0000
Received: from srl2.srl.uic.edu (HELO srl.uic.edu) (131.193.93.91)
by larch.cc.uic.edu with SMTP; 18 Dec 2001 21:31:28 -0000
Received: from SRL#u#MAIL#u#DOMAIN-Message_Server by srl.uic.edu
with Novell_GroupWise; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 15:47:49 -0600
Message-Id: <sc1f6525.006@srl.uic.edu>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.2
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 15:47:12 -0600
From: "Jennifer Parsons" <jparsons@srl.uic.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: measuring respondent debt
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Disposition: inline
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id

fBILkYe11826

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

>From allenbarton@mindspring.com Tue Dec 18 14:30:01 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 fBIMU0e18022 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
14:30:00
-0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.246])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id OAA29419 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:30:01 -0800
(PST)
Received: from user-2ivf0kv.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.130.159]
helo=default)
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16GSju-0001Fb-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:29:34 -0500
Message-ID: <000001c18812\$ade8f980\$9f82f7a5@default>
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush: How about equal time for Muslims?
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:22:30 -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

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 jim.schwartz@ujc.org Tue Dec 18 14:47:14 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
id fBIMlDe20272 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
14:47:13
-0800 (PST)
Received: from ashd1-1.relay.mail.uu.net (ashd1-1.relay.mail.uu.net
[199.171.54.245])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id OAA18037 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 14:47:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: from ny-exch01.ujc.org by mr0.ash.ops.us.uu.net with ESMTTP
(peer crosschecked as: host10.ujc.org [208.253.177.10] (may be forged))
id QQltzn14724
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 22:47:07 GMT
Received: by ny-exch01 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <Y5XMFJTL>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:41:21 -0500
Message-ID: <FE08E7146ED0D411938900105AA88A3131371E@ny-exch01>
From: "Schwartz, Jim" <jim.schwartz@ujc.org>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:41:17 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----=_NextPart_001_01C18815.1AF35550"

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_001_01C18815.1AF35550
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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.

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com=20

> -----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
>=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.
>=20
> 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 can argue that that definition is too
> broad... =20
> But perhaps the poll is not as skewed as Sid suggests.
>=20
> As I said, perhaps.
>=20
> Cheers,
> Howard Fienberg

> STATS
>=20
> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu=20
> [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)
>=20
>=20
> I'm sorry to be a picky methodologist, but I wonder how Frank Luntz
> developed his national sample of Jews. I've wrestled with=20
> this problem for
> years - and am convinced that there is no way to do this -=20
> short of spending
> very large sums on painstaking, needle-in-a-haystack RDD=20
> screening - that
> yields reliably projectible results.* And even then, there are major
> problems to be worked out. I'm guessing that Luntz used some=20
> form of listed
> sample. Most lists tend to over-represent those with=20
> relatively strong
> religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). This might help to=20
> explain the
> surprising Republican tilt in the results. Perhaps I'm=20
> expecting too much,
> but it's curious that no one quoted in the story questioned=20
> the sampling.
>=20
> Sid Groeneman
> Groeneman Research & Consulting
> Bethesda, Maryland
> sid.grc@verizon.net (NEW!)
> www.groeneman.com
>=20
> * One exception might be using phone numbers from previous=20
> RDD surveys where
> the respondent had been identified as Jewish. But these are=20
> also expensive
> and hard to come by, and it's doubtful that Luntz used that method.
>=20
> ----- 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)
>=20
>=20
> >
> >=20
> -----
> -----
> -
> > (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People=20
> <www.jta.org>
> >=20

> -----
> -----
> -
> > http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?
> >
> >
> > 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=20
> Jews would vote
> > for Bush -- 42 percent -- than for former presidential=20
> candidate Al Gore,
> > who received 39 percent.
> >
> > In the 2000 election, Gore got 79 percent of the Jewish=20
> vote to Bush=B4s 19
> > percent.
> >
> > Republican activists were quick to hail the results as a=20
> shift of Jewish
> > political sentiment, but Democrats cast doubt on the survey=B4s
> > significance.
> >
> > Republican pollster Frank Luntz, who conducted the poll=20
> for the RJC, said
> > the survey suggests a possible political realignment=20
> within the Jewish
> > community.
> >
> > "Despite conventional wisdom, Jewish voters are no longer=20
> a lock in the
> > Democratic column," Luntz said, speaking on behalf of the RJC.
> >
> > Observers across the political spectrum did not find=20
> Bush=B4s approval
> > ratings surprising, since every president is buoyed in=20
> times of national
> > crisis.
> >
> > Bush also has gained favor recently in the eyes of many=20
> American Jews
> > with his war against terrorism, his support for Israel and=20
> his pressure
> > on the Palestinians to crack down on terror.
> >

> > But some say that makes the survey an unfair snapshot of a=20
> president at
> > his peak, rather than a clear indication of major=20
> 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=20
> statistically
> > insignificant samples.
> >
> > The survey of 400 Jewish voters was conducted Nov. 28-29.=20
> 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=B4s policy toward Yasser =
> Arafat;
> >
> > * Some 27 percent said Bush=B4s performance makes them more=20
> likely to
> > vote for other Republicans, 28 percent said less likely,=20
> and 35 percent
> > said no difference.
> >
> > Luntz said the results show that Republicans need an=20
> active and sustained
> > outreach in the Jewish community, and noted that young=20
> Jewish voters are
> > "up for grabs."
> >
> > It was not clear what impact Bush=B4s present support might=20
> mean for the
> > future of his presidency or the Republican Party.
> >
> > Democrats should be warned but not alarmed by the survey,=20
> said Hyman
> > Bookbinder, the former longtime American Jewish Committee=20
> representative
> > in Washington.
> >
> > Bush deserves to gain politically in the Jewish community=20
> because he has
> > done the right thing regarding Israel and the war on terrorism,

> > Bookbinder said, but it=B4s too soon to count votes for the=20
> next elections.
> >
> > Bookbinder questioned results showing more favorable=20
> ratings for Bush=B4s
> > domestic agenda, saying people were not really focused on=20
> domestic issues
> > now. Republican positions on domestic issues such as=20
> abortion and school
> > prayer have alienated Jewish voters in the past.
> >
> > In the survey, 42 percent approve of Bush=B4s handling of=20
> domestic issues
> > such as education and social security, but 47 percent disapprove.
> >
> > In the past, only 20 to 25 percent of Jewish voters have=20
> supported a
> > Republican domestic agenda, according to the pollsters.
> >
> > The Jewish community has been moving in a conservative=20
> direction for some
> > time, according to Murray Friedman, director of the=20
> 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=B4s important about the approval ratings in this=20
> week=B4s survey is
> > that Bush is seen as a leader, according to Marshall=20
> 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=B4s still a leader and=20
> president in his
> > own right," Breger said.
> >
> >

> > http://www.jta.org/page_view_story.asp?

> >=20

> -----
> -----

> -
> > (C) JTA - Global News Service of the Jewish People=20

<www.jta.org>

> =

--

-

>

>

> *****

>

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C18815.1AF35550

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 = 5.5.2653.12">

<TITLE>RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S Samber, JTA.org)</TITLE> </HEAD>

<BODY>

<P>Let's discuss a quick short reply saying more to = come. thanks </P>

<P>-----Original Message-----

From: Leo Simonetta [[A = HREF=3D"mailto:simonetta@artsci.com">mailto:simonetta@artsci.com\]</F=ONT>](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) </P>

<P>My personal favorite finding is:
</P>

<P>> & * & 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. </P>

<P>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. </P>

<P>This does not look like a political realignment to = me. </P>

<P>--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC
simonetta@artsci.com </P>

<P>> -----Original Message-----
>

From: Howard Fienberg [[A =](#)

href="mailto:HFienberg@stats.org">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
> [[\]On Behalf Of

> Sid Groeneman

> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 11:18 = AM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject:
Re:
Poll
shows Jews support Bush \(S = Samber, JTA.org\)
>](mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu)

>
> I'm sorry to be a
picky
methodologist, but I = wonder how Frank Luntz
>
developed his national sample of Jews. = I've wrestled with

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> 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
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>>
religious identities (and Orthodox Jews). = This might help to

> explain the
> surprising
Republican tilt in the = results. = Perhaps I'm
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>>
expecting too much,
> but it's curious that no
one
quoted in the = story questioned
> the
sampling.

>
> Sid Groeneman

> Groeneman Research & Consulting
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> Bethesda, Maryland
>
sid.grc@verizon.net
(NEW!)
> www.groeneman.com
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>>
> * One exception might be using
phone
numbers = from previous
> RDD surveys
where

> the respondent had been identified as = Jewish. =;
But
these are
> also expensive
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> 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

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> Subject: Poll shows Jews support Bush (S = Samber,
JTA.org)

>
>
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
> >
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >

SIZE=3D2>>
> 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

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> > insignificant samples.
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
>
> > The survey of 400 Jewish
voters
was =
conducted Nov. 28-29.
> The margin of

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> > error was 4.9 percent.
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
>
> > Among the key findings:

> >
> >

Two-thirds approve of the = way Bush has handled U.S.-Israeli

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> > relations;
> >
>

> > * Nearly 80 percent approve of =
Bush=B4s
policy toward Yasser Arafat;
> >

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> > * Some 27 percent said = Bush=B4s performance
makes
them more
> likely to
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
> vote for other Republicans, 28 = percent said less likely,

> and 35 percent
> >
> said
no difference.
> >
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
> Luntz said the results show that = Republicans need an

<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> > active and sustained
> >
> outreach
in the Jewish community, = and noted that young
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
Jewish voters are
> > "up for
grabs."
> >
<FONT
SIZE=3D2>> >
> It was not clear what impact = Bush=B4s 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=B4s too soon = to count votes for the
> next elections.

> >
> > Bookbinder questioned results = showing more favorable
> ratings for Bush=B4s
> > 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=B4s 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.
> >
<FONT

From: rasinski@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 RAA20042
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:09:02 -0600
Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)
id A1008716700; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:05:03 -0600
Message-Id: <0112181008.AA1008716700@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 17:04:57 -0600
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: <rasinski@norcmail.uchicago.edu>
Subject: Job Opportunities at NORC
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

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.

>From eleahall@yahoo.com Tue Dec 18 20:16:36 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBJ4GZe21916 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001
20:16:35
-0800 (PST)
Received: from web9204.mail.yahoo.com (web9204.mail.yahoo.com
[216.136.129.27])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id UAA19027 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 20:16:36 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <20011219041613.28014.qmail@web9204.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [216.214.204.213] by web9204.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18
Dec 2001
20:16:13 PST
Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 20:16:13 -0800 (PST)
From: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@yahoo.com>
Subject: My apologies! Sent the same message twice by accident.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <20011218190915.9184.qmail@web9207.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Somehow I thought it got lost the first time. Yahoo performed better than I thought it did.

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>

>From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Tue Dec 18 20:25:02 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
id fBJ4P2e22803 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001

20:25:02
-0800 (PST)

Received: from imf04bis.bellsouth.net (mail104.mail.bellsouth.net [205.152.58.44])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id UAA24410 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 20:25:03 -0800 (PST)

Received: from w5y0s9.bellsouth.net ([65.81.41.69])
by imf04bis.bellsouth.net
(InterMail vM.5.01.04.00 201-253-122-122-20010827) with ESMTTP
id

<20011219042410.HNMA3777.imf04bis.bellsouth.net@w5y0s9.bellsouth.net>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 18 Dec 2001 23:24:10 -0500

Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011218231732.029b4ec0@pop3.norton.antivirus>

X-Sender: dhalpern@mail.atl.bellsouth.net@pop3.norton.antivirus

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1

Date: Tue, 18 Dec 2001 23:20:25 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>

Subject: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the New Yorker

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="====_41416358==_ .ALT"

-----_41416358==_ .ALT

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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/?ta_lk/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.

-----_41416358==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/html; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
Interesting editorial comment about the presidential vote
recount in
this week's <u>New Yorker</u> magazine.

 Dick Halpern

December
18, 2001

 <a href=3D"http://www.newyorker.com/PRINTABLE/?ta
lk/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.

-----_41416358==_.ALT--

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Dec 19 04:02:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBJC2Pe24355 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001
04:02:25
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mta5.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (mta5.srv.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.5.31])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id EAA07282 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 04:02:26 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Sydney2002 (ool-18bd8131.dyn.optonline.net [24.189.129.49])
by
mta2.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.0 Patch 2 (built Dec 14
2000))
with SMTP id <OGOL00D0IARBR0@mta2.srv.hcvlny.cv.net> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Wed, 19
Dec 2001 07:02:00 -0500 (EST)

Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:01:45 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Poll shows Jews support Bush: How about equal time for Muslims?
In-reply-to: <000001c18812\$ade8f980\$9f82f7a5@default>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHOEFCCJAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

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 multiplies 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 countries. 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.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf
> Of Allen Barton

> Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2001 5:23 PM

> To: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Poll shows Jews support Bush: How about equal time for
> Muslims?

>

>

> 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 ESMTMP

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 ESMTMP

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 <OGOL00I01HYLJ3@mailserv.wright.edu> for aapornet@usc.edu;

Wed, 19

Dec 2001 09:37:33 -0500 (EST)

Received: from wright.edu (all131039.wright.edu [130.108.131.39]) by

mailserv.wright.edu (PMDF V6.1 #39146) with ESMTMP id

<OGOL00H4FHYLXS@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)

Content-type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="Boundary_(ID_L6Lq1v/bMnBRI6K4Kt2Y0A)"
X-Accept-Language: en

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary_(ID_L6Lq1v/bMnBRI6K4Kt2Y0A)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

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

--Boundary_(ID_L6Lq1v/bMnBRI6K4Kt2Y0A)
Content-type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="teresa.hottle.vcf"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: attachment; filename="teresa.hottle.vcf"
Content-description: Card for Teresa Hottle

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
email;internet:Teresa.Hottle@wright.edu
title:Research Associate
fn:Teresa Hottle
end:vcard

--Boundary_(ID_L6Lq1v/bMnBRI6K4Kt2Y0A)--
>From mail@marketsharescorp.com Wed Dec 19 07:17:35 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fBJFHYe02633 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001
07:17:34
-0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp10.atl.mindspring.net (smtp10.atl.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.246])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMT
id HAA22158 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 07:17:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: from 1cust55.tnt30.chi5.da.uu.net ([67.195.146.55]
helo=marketsharescorp.com)
by smtp10.atl.mindspring.net with esmt (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16GiT0-00053N-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 10:17:11 -0500
Message-ID: <3C20A183.C5E87C3@marketsharescorp.com>
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 09:17:39 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Feedback requested on hypothetical anthrax questions
References: <20011218190915.9184.qmail@web9207.mail.yahoo.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854";
x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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!
>

> 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>

>From simonetta@artsci.com Wed Dec 19 08:03:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBJG3we06298 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001
08:03:58
-0800 (PST)
Received: from as_server.artsci.com ([209.218.147.47])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id IAA23439 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 08:03:59 -0800
(PST)
Received: by AS_SERVER with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
id <ZGJ3DATV>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 11:02:32 -0500
Message-ID: <91E2D5E92CF5D311A81900A0248FC2F3322846@AS_SERVER>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Zogby Poll
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 11:02:31 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

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 ESMTTP
id fBJHPue10200 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001
09:25:56
-0800 (PST)
Received: from maill1.radix.net (maill1.radix.net [207.192.128.31])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
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 maill1.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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
id fBJIR5e15649 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001

10:27:05
-0800 (PST)

Received: from atl_intmail.grizzard.com ([208.178.112.229])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id KAA13703 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 19 Dec 2001 10:27:05 -0800
(PST)

Received: by atl_intmail.grizzard.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2653.19)

id <ZGXCGWMK>; 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
Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 13:24:22 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

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 tmglp@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 ESMTTP
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: tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu
Received: from tetra.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa11655;
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 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: 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., 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

> 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: 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.,
> 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

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBLJ1Ae11822 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
11:01:10
-0800 (PST)
Received: from notes.marist.edu (notes.marist.edu [148.100.1.15])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA20273 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 11:01:07 -0800
(PST)

Subject: Interest in a Low Incidence National Omnibus
To: aapornet@usc.edu
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.2a November 23, 1999
Message-ID: <OF4CCCF6F2.79269065-ON85256B29.005CCC77@marist.edu>
From: "Kathleen Tobin-Flusser" <Kathleen.Tobin-Flusser@marist.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:00:44 -0500
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on Shakespeare/Marist(Release 5.0.8 |June
18,
2001)
at 12/21/2001 02:00:45 PM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

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 ESMTTP
id fBLJ2be11835 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
11:02:37
-0800 (PST)

Received: from hsph.harvard.edu (hsph.harvard.edu [128.103.75.21])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id LAA21574 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 11:02:37 -0800
(PST)
Received: from PROUST (sph186-161.harvard.edu [134.174.186.161])
by hsph.harvard.edu (8.10.2+Sun/8.10.2) with SMTP id fBLJ1t008571
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:01:55 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <4.1.20011221140524.00alf650@hsph.harvard.edu>
X-Sender: jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:06:44 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "John T. Young" <jtyoung@hsph.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: Opinion leaders and the mass media <fwd>
In-Reply-To: <3C237C69.65524DEE@rider.edu>
References: <SIMEON.10112211029.B@gj9k20b.config.mail.virginia.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

it is from "he 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,

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.,
>> 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 jwerner@jwdp.com Fri Dec 21 11:35:00 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBLJYvel5808 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
11:34:57

-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 LAA18385 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 11:34:51 -0800
(PST)

Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
14:34:23

-0500

Message-ID: <3C238EEE.1E53EFD9@jwdp.com>

Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:35:10 -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: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker

References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011218231732.029b4ec0@pop3.norton.antivirus>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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
> 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. From pmeyer@email.unc.edu Fri Dec 21 11:50:58 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fBLJove23576 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001

11:50:57

-0800 (PST)

Received: from smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.139])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id LAA03303 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 11:50:57 -0800
(PST)
Received: from login7.isis.unc.edu (pmeyer@login7.isis.unc.edu [152.2.1.104])
by smtpsrv0.isis.unc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id OAA07400;
Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:50:33 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from pmeyer@localhost)
by login7.isis.unc.edu (AIX4.3/8.9.3/8.9.3) id OAA36150;
Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:50:34 -0500
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:50:34 -0500 (EST)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login7.isis.unc.edu
To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <3C238EEE.1E53EFD9@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0112211446050.26344-100000@login7.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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.

=====
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
=====

>From lmcgill@Princeton.EDU Fri Dec 21 11:56:28 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
id fBLJuRe26057 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
11:56:27
-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 ESMTTP
id LAA08873 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 11:56:27 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (wm1.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.57])
by Princeton.EDU (8.12.1/8.12.1) with ESMTTP id fBLJu33q010346
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:56:03 -0500 (EST)
Received: from princeton.edu (wvs-56x6t01.Princeton.EDU [128.112.45.88])
by smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id OAA19701

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:56:03 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3C2393D3.32B7731A@princeton.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:56:03 -0500
From: Lawrence T McGill <lmcgill@Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.77 [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

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&page=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,

> 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 lmcgill@Princeton.EDU Fri Dec 21 13:40:50 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBLLen11760 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
13:40:50
-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 ESMTTP
id NAA03821 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 13:40:49 -0800
(PST)
Received: from smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.65])
by Princeton.EDU (8.12.1/8.12.1) with ESMTTP id fBLLeK3q000493;
Fri, 21 Dec 2001 16:40:20 -0500 (EST)
Received: from princeton.edu (wvs-56x6t01.Princeton.EDU [128.112.45.88])
by smtpserver1.Princeton.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id QAA02292;
Fri, 21 Dec 2001 16:40:19 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <3C23AC43.2987ED7B@princeton.edu>
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 16:40:19 -0500
From: Lawrence T McGill <lmcgill@Princeton.EDU>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.77 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: jwerner@jwdp.com
CC: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011218231732.029b4ec0@pop3.norton.antivirus>
<3C238EEE.1E53EFD9@jwdp.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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 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.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Dec 21 14:09:57 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBLM9uel13907 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001
14:09:57
-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 ESMTTP
id OAA25759 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:09:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBLM9qR02283 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:09:52 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2001 14:09:52 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Washington Post-ABC News Poll: America at War
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112211344110.23842-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Friday, December 21, 2001

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?

	-----Approve-----			-----Disapprove-----			No opin.
	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	
12/19/01	86	64	22	12	6	6	2
11/27/01	89	69	21	9	5	4	1
11/6/01	89	65	24	9	4	5	2
10/9/01	92	76	16	6	3	3	1
9/27/01	90	70	20	6	3	3	4
9/13/01	86	63	23	12	6	5	2
9/9/01	55	26	29	41	22	20	3
8/12/01	61	28	33	31	17	14	8
7/30/01	59	28	30	38	22	17	3
6/3/01	55	27	28	40	22	18	6
4/22/01	63	33	30	32	16	16	5
3/25/01	58	NA	NA	33	NA	NA	8
2/25/01	55	NA	NA	23	NA	NA	22

2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bush is handling the nation's economy?

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
12/19/01	67	27	6
11/6/01	72	23	5
9/9/01	48	48	4
7/30/01	52	45	3
6/3/01	53	41	6
4/22/01	55	38	7
3/25/01	50	42	8

3. Do you approve or disapprove of the way the U.S. Congress is doing its job?

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
12/19/01	59	34	7
9/9/01	45	48	7
7/30/01	48	48	4
4/22/01	58	33	8
10/31/99	42	53	6
9/2/99	46	47	7
6/6/99	48	46	6
3/14/99	44	49	7
2/14/99	46	50	4
12/20/98	44	51	5
12/19/98	45	50	5
12/13/98	49	46	5
11/7/98	41	55	4
11/1/98	49	47	5
11/1/98 LV	47	51	2
10/25/98	45	44	11
10/25/98 LV	45	48	7
10/18/98	46	45	8
10/18/98 LV	45	49	5
9/28/98	52	44	4
9/28/98 LV	52	46	2
8/21/98	55	39	6
7/12/98	46	44	11
5/12/98	45	45	9
4/4/98	47	45	8
1/31/98	55	35	10
1/30/98	55	35	10
1/25/98	56	37	8
1/24/98	55	38	7
1/19/98	47	49	5
10/13/97	36	57	7
8/27/97	39	54	7
7/8/97	40	53	6
4/24/97	40	53	7
3/9/97	35	60	5
8/5/96	42	52	7
6/30/96	35	58	7
5/22/96	35	60	5
3/10/96	30	64	6
1/7/96	31	65	5
11/19/95	27	68	5
10/1/95	32	65	3
7/17/95	34	63	3
3/19/95	39	56	5
1/29/95	42	52	6
10/31/94	21	72	8
10/23/94	18	78	4
9/11/94	24	70	5
6/26/94	34	61	5
3/27/94	35	62	3
2/27/94	32	64	4

1/23/94	29	60	11
11/14/93	28	66	6
8/8/93	33	64	3
4/26/93	30	69	2
1/17/93	29	66	6
4/9/92	17	78	5
3/18/92	19	76	5
3/8/92	22	73	6
2/2/92	32	64	4
12/15/91	35	59	6
10/21/91	45	50	5
6/2/91	49	46	5
10/14/90	34	63	3
2/4/90	41	55	4
1/16/90	39	55	6
8/21/89	42	53	5
5/23/89	54	44	2
2/14/89	53	44	3
1/23/88*	43	53	4
6/1/87*	56	40	4
6/22/85*	54	37	9
5/83*	33	43	24
6/81*	38	40	22
6/79*	19	61	20
9/78*	29	49	22
6/77*	34	42	24
6/75*	29	54	17
8/74*	48	35	17

*Gallup

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?

Other	Neither Bush	No dif. Democrats	No (vol.)	(vol.)	(vol.)	opin.
12/19/01	54	28	4	9	6	0
9/9/01	41	42	4	6	1	5
7/30/01	42	43	4	6	3	3
6/3/01	40	42	5	7	3	3
4/22/01	46	36	4	6	3	4

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

Environmental issues	2
Morality/Family decline	2
Foreign policy/Immigration reform	2
Government/military spending/national debt	1
War on drugs	1
Other	6
No opinion	9

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

	Too much	Too little	About the right amount	No opin.
a. Terrorist threats in this country	9	39	51	1
b. The war in Afghanistan	10	12	74	3
c. The economy	4	58	36	2
d. Education	5	62	31	3
e. Health care	5	73	20	2

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?

	-----Approve-----		-----Disapprove-----		No		opin.
	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	NET	Strongly	Somewhat	
12/19/01	89	67	22	9	5	4	2
10/15/01	92	75	17	5	3	3	3

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)?

	Over	Yet to come	No opin.
12/19/01	17	80	2

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)?

Over	Yet to come	No opin.
------	-------------	----------

12/19/01 10 88 2

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?

	-----Confident-----		-----Not confident-----		No		opin.
	NET	Very	Somewhat	NET	Not too	At all	
12/19/01	70	32	39	29	18	11	1
11/6/01	73	28	45	26	17	9	1
9/27/01	81	37	44	18	14	4	1

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)?

	US must capture/ kill bin Laden	War can succeed without bin Laden	No opin.
12/19/01	64	34	2
11/6/01	64	30	6

12. Which would you personally prefer - having bin Laden (killed), or (captured)?

	Killed	Captured	Neither (vol)	No opin.
12/19/01	44	49	6	1

13. Would you favor or oppose:

a. having U.S. forces take military action against Iraq to force Saddam Hussein from power?

	Favor	Oppose	No opin.
12/19/01	72	24	5
11/27/01	78	17	6
10/11/94*	72	23	5
1/15/93**	82	15	3
8/21/92 RV	65	30	5
2/9/92	62	35	3
4/22/91	51	43	6
4/5/91	54	37	9
3/15/91	57	38	5

*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?

	Favor	Oppose	No opin.
12/19/01	75	22	3

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)?

	Must remove Hussein	Can succeed w/o removing	No opin.
12/19/01	61	33	6

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?

	-----Threat-----			No	No opin.
	NET	Serious	Not serious		
12/19/01	39	21	18	59	2
10/30/95*	55	NA	NA	42	3

*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?

	-----Concerned-----			-----Not concerned-----			No op.
	NET	Grt.deal	Somewhat	NET	Not much	None	
12/19/01	70	27	43	29	22	8	1
10/15/01	77	35	43	23	14	9	0
10/9/01	82	36	46	18	12	6	*

10/7/01	81	41	40	18	13	4	1
9/27/01*	83	43	39	17	12	5	*
9/11/01	87	49	38	12	7	4	1
6/13/97	62	21	41	38	24	14	*
6/2/97	63	22	41	37	28	9	*
8/5/96	74	31	43	26	18	8	*
4/20/95	78	38	40	21	16	5	1

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?

	US doing all it can	US should do more	No opin.
12/19/01	59	40	1
11/27/01	62	36	1
11/6/01	56	43	2
10/15/01	68	29	3
10/9/01	71	27	2

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	Yes	No	No opin.
a. Average Americans	74	24	2
b. Arab-Americans and American Muslims	65	29	6

Trend:

a. Average Americans	Yes	No	No opin.
12/19/01	74	24	2
11/27/01	81	16	2

b. Arab-Americans and American Muslims	Yes	No	No opin.
12/19/01	65	29	6
11/27/01	73	19	8

19. Have September's terrorist attacks made you personally more suspicious of people who you think are of Arab descent, or not?

	Yes	No	No opin.
12/19/01	31	67	2
10/9/01**	38	60	1
9/13/01*	43	56	1

**"last month's terrorist attacks"

*"Do you think the attacks this week will make you personally more suspicious . . ."

www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/vault/stories/data122101.htm

(C) 2001 The Washington Post Company

>From sid.grc@verizon.net Sat Dec 22 07:42:24 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBMFgOe25894 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 22 Dec 2001
07:42:24
-0800 (PST)
Received: from smtp002pub.verizon.net (smtp002pub.verizon.net
[206.46.170.181])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id HAA25844 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 Dec 2001 07:42:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Dell4300 (pool-151-200-44-232.res.east.verizon.net
[151.200.44.232])
by smtp002pub.verizon.net with SMTP
; id fBMFfOP20629
Sat, 22 Dec 2001 09:41:24 -0600 (CST)
Message-ID: <001801c18aff\$1e5eafe0\$6601a8c0@Dell4300>
From: "Sid Groeneman" <sid.grc@verizon.net>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: National Weighting Targets for an English-Speaking Sample
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2001 10:41:26 -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 6.00.2600.0000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

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

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Sat Dec 22 09:39:04 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBMHd4e29508 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 22 Dec 2001
09:39:04
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.5.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA01610 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 22 Dec 2001 09:39:05 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Sydney2002 (ool-18bd8131.dyn.optonline.net [24.189.129.49])
by
mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.0 Patch 2 (built Dec 14
2000))
with SMTP id <0GOR00QPABBGW@mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Sat, 22
Dec 2001 12:37:59 -0500 (EST)
Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2001 12:38:13 -0500
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>,
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHCEHJCJAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

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

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Dec 23 20:16:09 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
id fB04G8e04904 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Dec 2001
20:16:08
-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 ESMTTP
id UAA05041 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Dec 2001 20:16:08 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fB04G1317989 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 23 Dec 2001 20:16:01 -0800
(PST)
Date: Sun, 23 Dec 2001 20:16:01 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: World's most respected companies 2001 (FT.com)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112232004540.16974-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

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

Rank 1998	Rank 1999	Rank 2000	Rank 2001	Name	Country	Sector
1	1	1	1	General Electric	US	Electric
2	2	2	2	Microsoft	US	IT
4	4	5	3	IBM	US	IT
t24	6	3	4	Sony	Japan	Consumer Goods
3	3	4	5	Coca-Cola	US	Food/Beverages
5	10	6	6	Toyota	Japan	Engineering
t35	t13	11	7	Nokia	Finland	Electrical/Electronics
t17	9	20	8	Wal-Mart	US	Retail
9	12	8	9	Intel	US	IT
--	24	22	10	Citigroup	US	Financial
11	17	10	11	General Motors	US	Engineering
--	t38	34	12	AIG	US	Financial
t9	t29	43	13	Ford	US	Engineering
t24	15	9	14	3M	US	Consumer Goods
t14	11	35	15	Hewlett-Packard	US	IT
6	5	12	16	DaimlerChrysler	Germany	Engineering
t7	8	16	17	Nestlé	Switz	Food/Beverages
--	--	--	18	Southwest Airlines	US	Transport
t17	t29	--	19	Johnson & Johnson	US	Healthcare
--	t21	14	20	Berkshire Hathaway	US	Financial

--	28	t23	21	BP	UK	Energy/Chemicals
--	--	--	22	Federal Express	US	Transport
--	25	33	23	Disney	US	Media/Leisure
13	t36	--	24	BMW	Germany	Engineering
t27	7	19	25	Dell	US	IT
--	t38	42	26	Exxon Mobil	US	Energy/Chemicals
--	--	7	t27	Cisco Systems	US	IT
t14	t36	13	t27	Procter & Gamble	US	Food/Beverages
t7	18	t31	29	ABB	Switz/Swed	Engineering
12	t21	t23	30	Royal Dutch/Shell	Netherl/UK	Energy/Chemicals
--	t41	t28	31	L'Oreal	France	Consumer Goods
t17	19	15	32	McDonald's	US	Media/Leisure
--	t49	--	33	Vivendi Universal	France	Utils & Media/Leisure
--	--	t28	34	Virgin	UK	Transport
--	16	46	35	Merck	US	Healthcare
--	--	40	36	Airbus Industrie	Fr/Ger/UK/Sp	Engineering
--	t41	27	37	Siemens	Germany	Electrical/Electronics
--	--	--	38	Allianz	Germany	Financial
--	26	--	39	Volkswagen	Germany	Engineering
--	--	50	40	AOL Time Warner	US	Media/Leisure
--	--	--	41	HSBC	UK/Hong Kong	Financial
--	--	--	42	Bombardier	Canada	Engineering
16	--	t47	43	Philip Morris	US	Food/Beverages
--	--	--	44	Porsche	Germany	Engineering
--	t32	30	45	SAP	Germany	IT
--	46	t47	46	Axa	France	Financial
t35	20	37	47	Unilever	Netherl/UK	Food/Beverages
--	--	18	t48	Nike	US	Consumer Goods
--	--	--	t48	NTT DoCoMo	Japan	Telecoms
--	--	--	50	Singapore Airlines	Singapore	Transport

<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 ESMTTP
 id fB06LCe10021 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

Message-ID: <OFE3EF7AAE.28BD855E-ON85256B2C.0021AA53@uwindsor.ca>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 01:07:42 -0500
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on ZEUS/University of Windsor(Release 5.0.8
|June
18, 2001) at 12/24/2001 01:07:46 AM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I will be out of the office starting 2001-12-22 and will not return until
2002-01-02.

K.H.

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Mon Dec 24 04:31:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBOCVve24401 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
04:31:57
-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 ESMTTP
id EAA23323 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 04:31:58 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
07:31:30
-0500

Message-ID: <3C272048.FEC35FDE@jwdp.com>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 07:32:08 -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: World's most respected companies 2001 (FT.com)
References: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112232004540.16974-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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/FT30LNBQ6VC.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
>From bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com Mon Dec 24 09:58:13 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBOHwCe00840 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
09:58:12
-0800 (PST)
Received: from nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com (nt-
exchange.knowledgenetworks.com
[64.75.23.141])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA15035 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 09:58:14 -0800
(PST)
Received: by nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2650.21)
id <ZJVLYPQN>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 09:58:15 -0800
Message-ID: <9CD3E27284EBD511BBE30008C733A7EE085C39@nt-
exchange.knowledgenetworks.com>
From: Bill McCready <bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Panels
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 09:58:14 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_000_01C18CA4.8F1B9800"

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>Terry,
</P>

<P>Thanks for the mention. Let me know if I can ever provide you with additional information. </P>

<P>all the best,
</P>

<P>Bill McCready
</P>

<P>Knowledge

 N E T W O R
K
S </P>

<P> William C. McCready, Ph.D.
<FONT
SIZE=2> Director, Client Development
Government,
Academic & Non-Profit Research
<<A
HREF="http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp"
TARGET="_blank">http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp>

10 South Riverside Plaza, 18th Floor, Chicago, IL
60606

 Phone 312.474.6464 Fax

In-Reply-To: <3C272048.FEC35FDE@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112240945280.18014-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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!

> >

-- Jim

> >-----
> >-----

>

> Here is the FT methodology description, available from:

> <http://specials.ft.com/wmr2001/FT30LNBQ6VC.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
>

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 24 10:42:25 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBOIgOe02706 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
10:42:24
-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 ESMTTP
id KAA00764 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:42:26 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBOIgHY21741 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:42:17 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 10:42:17 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Herriot Award Nominations Sought
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112241037530.20224-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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.4.33.0112241215410.26950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(C) 2001 Newsweek, Inc

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/677089.asp#BODY>

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

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/677089.asp#BODY>

(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 ESMTTP
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 ESMTTP
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
NewYorker
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
In-Reply-To: <3C23AC43.2987ED7B@princeton.edu>
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011218231732.029b4ec0@pop3.norton.antivirus>
<3C238EEE.1E53EFD9@jwdp.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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 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

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 24 13:48:42 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
id fBOLmgell1603 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
13:48:42
-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 ESMTTP
id NAA28509; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 13:48:41 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBOLmW108205; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 13:48:32 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 13:48:31 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>, <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the
NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224151235.03d6d670@pop.mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112241242330.26950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 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
>
>

>From bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com Mon Dec 24 18:33:38 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fBP2Xce22573 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
18:33:38
-0800 (PST)
Received: from nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com (nt-
exchange.knowledgenetworks.com
[64.75.23.141])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA02417 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:33:38 -0800
(PST)
Received: by nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2650.21)
id <ZJVLYQ13>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:33:39 -0800
Message-ID: <9CD3E27284EBD511BBE30008C733A7EE085C40@nt-
exchange.knowledgenetworks.com>
From: Bill McCready <bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Recall: Panels
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:33:30 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.8AACDE80"

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_001_01C18CEC.8AACDE80
Content-Type: text/plain

Bill McCready would like to recall the message, "Panels".

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.8AACDE80
Content-Type: text/html

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>  
<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=us-ascii"> <META  
NAME="Generator" CONTENT="MS Exchange Server version 5.5.2653.12">  
<TITLE>Recall: Panels</TITLE>  
</HEAD>  
<BODY>
```

```
<P><FONT SIZE=2>Bill McCready would like to recall the message,  
&quot;Panels&quot;.</FONT> </P>
```

```
</BODY>
```

```
</HTML>
```

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.8AACDE80--

```
>From bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com Mon Dec 24 18:34:48 2001  
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])  
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP  
id fBP2Yme22917 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001  
18:34:48  
-0800 (PST)  
Received: from nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com (nt-
```

exchange.knowledgenetworks.com
[64.75.23.141])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id SAA02742 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:34:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: by nt-exchange.knowledgenetworks.com with Internet Mail Service
(5.5.2650.21)
id <ZJVLYQ1Q>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:34:49 -0800
Message-ID: <9CD3E27284EBD511BBE30008C733A7EE085C41@nt-
exchange.knowledgenetworks.com>
From: Bill McCready <bmcCready@knowledgenetworks.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Panels
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:34:40 -0800
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.B3D6E4E0"

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_001_01C18CEC.B3D6E4E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

MESSAGE SENT IN ERROR TO LIST

Bill McCready

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.B3D6E4E0
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>MESSAGE SENT IN ERROR TO LIST</FONT>
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Bill McCready</FONT>
</P>

</BODY>
</HTML>
```

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C18CEC.B3D6E4E0--
>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Mon Dec 24 18:38:25 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 fBP2cPe23576 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
18:38:25
-0800 (PST)
Received: from johnson.mail.mindspring.net (johnson.mail.mindspring.net
[207.69.200.177])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id SAA03810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 18:38:24 -0800
(PST)
Received: from pool0183.cvx32-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net ([209.179.157.183]
helo=x.mindspring.com)
by johnson.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16IhTX-0001is-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 21:37:56 -0500
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224212752.03235350@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 21:37:18 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the
NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112241242330.26950-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224151235.03d6d670@pop.mindspring.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset="us-ascii"

<html>

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:

<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%.

</dl>How is that, Jim? Are you persuaded.

warren

At 01:48 PM 12/24/01 -0800, you wrote:

<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite> Warren,

 Your
statistical
reasoning here is--no surprise--unassailable. I think
 the
major

hurdle to what you propose is that America's public school
teach
our students about democracy long before our colleges (and
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

> >
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
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
 >
 ></blockquote> <x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep> Warren
Mitofsky

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

 212 980-3031
 212 980-3107
FAX</html>

>From RSimm32573@aol.com Mon Dec 24 19:16:32 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
id fBP3GVe25759 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
19:16:32
-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 ESMTTP
id TAA12651 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 19:16:31 -0800
(PST)
From: RSimm32573@aol.com
Received: from RSimm32573@aol.com
by imo-r04.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.e4.200cc153 (4155)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 22:15:23 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <e4.200cc153.2959494a@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 22:15:22 EST
Subject: Re: World's most respected companies 2001 (FT.com)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_e4.200cc153.2959494a_boundary"
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

--part1_e4.200cc153.2959494a_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

--part1_e4.200cc153.2959494a_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<HTML>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

 </HTML>

--part1_e4.200cc153.2959494a_boundary--
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 24 20:44:06 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
id fBP4i5e28088 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
20:44:05
-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 ESMTTP
id UAA02450 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 20:42:50 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBP4gft05027 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 20:42:41 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 24 Dec 2001 20:42:40 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224212752.03235350@pop.mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112241908270.26733-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 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:
>
>
>
> 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
> > > > 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
> >
> >

> Warren Mitofsky
> *****
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
> >
> 212 980-3031
> 212 980-3107 FAX
>

>From emilda.rivers@census.gov Mon Dec 24 22:02:11 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBP62Be00552 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001
22:02:11
-0800 (PST)
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 ESMTTP
id WAA19793 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 24 Dec 2001 22:02:10 -0800
(PST)
From: emilda.rivers@census.gov
Received: from dispatch.tco.census.gov (localhost.localdomain [127.0.0.1])
by dispatch.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.5) with ESMTTP id
fBP619E15951
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 01:01:09 -0500
Received: from deliver.tco.census.gov ([148.129.126.70])
by dispatch.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.6) with ESMTTP id
fBP614w15844
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 01:01:04 -0500
Received: from it008nthqln.tco.census.gov (it008nthqln.tco.census.gov
[148.129.123.82])
by deliver.tco.census.gov (8.11.6/8.11.6/v3.19) with ESMTTP id
fBP614o17763
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 01:01:04 -0500
Subject: Emilda Rivers/PRED/HQ/BOC is out of the office.
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <OF72E0DF97.E51F57F6-ON85256B2D.00210E7E@tco.census.gov>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 01:01:04 -0500

X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18, 2001) at
12/25/2001 01:01:04 AM
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I will be out of the office starting 12/24/2001 and will not return until 12/31/2001.

I will respond to your message when I return.

Thank you, have a good day, and safe and happy holidays!

>From jwerner@jwdp.com Tue Dec 25 04:10:58 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBPCAwe10392 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
04:10:58
-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 ESMTTP
id EAA23210 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 04:10:56 -0800
(PST)
Received: from jwdp.com ([151.203.180.152]) by jwdp.com ; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
07:10:30
-0500
Message-ID: <3C286CDF.5C33B1E3@jwdp.com>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 07:11:11 -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
CC: "Warren J. Mitofsky" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the New Yorker
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224151235.03d6d670@pop.mindspring.com>
<5.1.0.14.2.20011224212752.03235350@pop.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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
> 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
>

>From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Tue Dec 25 05:18:40 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 fBPDlIee11876 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
05:18:40
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mta3.srv.hcvtlvy.cv.net (mta3.srv.hcvtlvy.cv.net [167.206.5.9])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTP
id FAA04810 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 05:18:39 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Sydney2002 (ool-18bd8131.dyn.optonline.net [24.189.129.49])
by
mta3.srv.hcvtlvy.cv.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.0 Patch 2 (built Dec 14
2000))
with SMTP id <OGOW00G82IAC5H@mta3.srv.hcvtlvy.cv.net> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Tue, 25
Dec 2001 08:18:12 -0500 (EST)
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 08:17:46 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: Dirty Politics and Close Elections
In-reply-to: <5.1.0.14.2.20011224212752.03235350@pop.mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHKEJICJAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
Content-type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="Boundary_(ID_6a4FebjBTMUhCnQTttLT5w)"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary_(ID_6a4FebjBTMUhCnQTttLT5w)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

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 exactcly 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 wwner.

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!

class=775535312-25122001><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV>
<DIV> <FONT face=Arial
color=#0000ff size=2>3) </DIV> Taking into account the overvotes (some
of
these also were the result of Ballot design) including
those</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> in Palm Beach,
but
also Jacksonville (a two card punch card ballot) thousands intended to vote
for</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> Gore rather
than
Bush, but had their ballots spoiled.</DIV> <DIV><SPAN
class=775535312-25122001><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> <FONT
face=Arial color=#0000ff size=2>4) Though the average error rate was
higher on the punch card ballot, than on optical scan it was
exactcly</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> somewhat higher on
another system that made marks mechanically. </DIV> But the error rate went to
as
high</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> as 30% in some
precincts. </DIV> Though there was strong association with race in the
precinct,
first time voter,</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> older, low education, etc.
with spoiled ballots, there was a large unexplained variation that could have
something</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV> to do with how the election
was administered.</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2>Putting it another way, what happened in Florida was that a flawed
system
controlled by the GOP (largely) </DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2>denied
many voters the chance to have their preference registered. </DIV> <DIV><SPAN
class=775535312-25122001><FONT face=Arial color=#0000ff
size=2> </DIV>
<DIV>But
it
seems to me that if statistics has a use it is in attempting to figure out
voter
intent "post-hoc," as in</DIV>

<DIV>Palm Beach, or in having the whole election voided.</DIV> <DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>I think what should have happened in Fla is that Florida's electors should have been thrown out because</DIV>
<DIV>either: 1) that there were enough spoiled ballots to make the result hard to assess and their was not</DIV>
<DIV>time to re-run it; 2) the counting mechanism in FLA were not adequate to declare a wwner.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>We wouldn't need a coin toss, what we needed was a "fair election." I truly believe that the</DIV>
<DIV>discussion of this has been undercut by the "War Against Terrorism." No one is willing to say</DIV> <DIV>out loud any more, the Bush's election was illegitimate, but it was. </DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Banning everything but Optical Scan ballot systems (or other systems with audit trails) that have</DIV>
<DIV>a method to "check the vote" before the voter leaves would be a start. (By the way some precincts</DIV>
<DIV>had turned off the checking system because of turn out.)</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>The counting of absentees is another issue!</DIV> <DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Andy</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>

--Boundary_(ID_6a4FebjBTMUhCnQTttLT5w)--

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 25 10:09:55 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fBPI9tel5963 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001

10:09:55

-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 ESMTTP
id KAA22606 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 10:09:55 -0800
(PST)

Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBPI9jQ20548 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 10:09:45 -0800
(PST)

Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 10:09:45 -0800 (PST)

From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Blacks Who Voted Against Bush Offer Support to Him in Wartime
(NYTimes)

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112250919380.17393-100000@almaak.usc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/25/national/25BLAC.html>

December 25, 2001

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."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/25/national/25BLAC.html>

Copyright 2001 The New York Times Company

>From rbrapo@wm.edu Tue Dec 25 14:49:20 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])

by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

id fBPMnJe24448 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001

14:49:19

-0800 (PST)

Received: from email.wm.edu (mars.wm.edu [128.239.10.11])

by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP

id OAA14683 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 14:49:19 -0800

(PST)

From: rbrapo@wm.edu

Received: from webmail1.wm.edu (webmail1.wm.edu [128.239.10.25])

by email.wm.edu (2.1.2/8.9.1/Execmail 2.1) with ESMTTP id RAA07199

for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:41:34 -0500 (EST)

Received: (from webmail@localhost)
by webmail1.wm.edu (8.10.2+Sun/8.10.2) id fBPmij212212
for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:44:45 -0500 (EST)
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Kai Hildebrandt/University of Windsor is out of the office.
Message-ID: <1009320285.3c29015d8da8c@webmail1.wm.edu>
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:44:45 -0500 (EST)
References: <OFE3EF7AAE.28BD855E-ON85256B2C.0021AA53@uwindsor.ca>
In-Reply-To: <OFE3EF7AAE.28BD855E-ON85256B2C.0021AA53@uwindsor.ca>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-Originating-IP: 64.123.133.63

Kai,

Usually 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 year.

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.
>
>

Ronald B. Rapoport
Professor of Government
College of William & Mary
rbrapo@wm.edu
>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 25 15:25:46 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBPNPke25249 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
15:25:46
-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 ESMTTP
id PAA21537 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 15:25:47 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBPNPbs12449 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 15:25:37 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 15:25:36 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the New Yorker
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112251421140.6998-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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 legitimization 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

> > > > 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

than

> > > > ever.

>

> Warren Mitofsky

> *****
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
>
> 212 980-3031
> 212 980-3107 FAX
>
>

Warren Mitofsky

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Tue Dec 25 17:52:26 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQ1qPe29421 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
17:52:25
-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 ESMTTP
id RAA16121 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:52:25 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQ1qFD20344 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:52:15 -0800
(PST)
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 17:52:15 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: National Lampoon takes on BLS, government surveys
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112251744560.19759-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

(c) 2000 National Lampoon

http://www.nationallampoon.com/news/12_19b.asp

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."

http://www.nationallampoon.com/news/12_19b.asp

(c) 2000 National Lampoon

>From mitofsky@mindspring.com Tue Dec 25 20:37:22 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQ4bMe02409 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001
20:37:22
-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 ESMTTP
id UAA13023 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 20:37:23 -0800
(PST)
Received: from pool0112.cvx32-bradley.dialup.earthlink.net ([209.179.157.112]
helo=x.mindspring.com)
by barry.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 16J5o9-0000Pv-00
for aapornet@usc.edu; Tue, 25 Dec 2001 23:36:49 -0500
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011225232953.032bac70@pop.mindspring.com>
X-Sender: mitofsky@pop.mindspring.com
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Tue, 25 Dec 2001 23:36:10 -0500

To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the
NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112251421140.6998-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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

> 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
> > > > 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
> >
> >
>

>Warren Mitofsky
>*****
>Mitofsky International
>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
>New York, NY 10022
>
>212 980-3031
>212 980-3107 FAX

Warren Mitofsky

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Wed Dec 26 09:09:01 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQH91e24080 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Dec 2001
09:09:01
-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 ESMTTP
id JAA08726; Wed, 26 Dec 2001 09:07:35 -0800 (PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQH7Ng29512; Wed, 26 Dec 2001 09:07:23 -0800 (PST)
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2001 09:07:23 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>

To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the NewYorker
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20011225232953.032bac70@pop.mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112260834240.26823-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

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
> > *****
> >
> >----- 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
> > > > 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
> > >
> > >

> > Warren Mitofsky
> > *****
> > Mitofsky International
> > 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> > New York, NY 10022
> >
> > 212 980-3031
> > 212 980-3107 FAX
> >
> > Warren Mitofsky
> > *****
> > Mitofsky International
> > 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> > New York, NY 10022
> >
> > 212 980-3031
> > 212 980-3107 FAX
> >
> >

> From andy@troll.soc.qc.edu Wed Dec 26 09:40:08 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBQHe7e25643 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Dec 2001
09:40:08
-0800 (PST)
Received: from mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net [167.206.5.22])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id JAA24909 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Dec 2001 09:40:09 -0800
(PST)
Received: from Sydney2002 (ool-18bd8131.dyn.optonline.net [24.189.129.49])
by
mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net (iPlanet Messaging Server 5.0 Patch 2 (built Dec 14
2000))

with SMTP id <0GOY009M40XVZX@mta7.srv.hcvlny.cv.net> for aapornet@usc.edu;
Wed, 26
Dec 2001 12:37:09 -0500 (EST)
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2001 12:36:37 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: 2000 Presidential Election -- editorial comment in the
NewYorker
In-reply-to: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112260834240.26823-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu, Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHGEKCCJAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

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
> > > *****
> > >
> > >----- 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
> > > > > > 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

by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMT
id fBR4PI523562 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Wed, 26 Dec 2001 20:25:18 -0800
(PST)
Date: Wed, 26 Dec 2001 20:25:17 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Poll: 71% of Palestinians support return to talks (JerusalemPost)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112262022510.20164-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 1995-2001 The Jerusalem Post - <http://www.jpost.com>

[http://cgis.jpost.com/cgi-bin/General/printarticle.cgi?
article=/Editions/2001/12/27/News/News.40675.html](http://cgis.jpost.com/cgi-bin/General/printarticle.cgi?article=/Editions/2001/12/27/News/News.40675.html)

December, 27 2001

The Jerusalem Post

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 Bank 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>

>From RFunk787@aol.com Thu Dec 27 05:53:23 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBRDrNel13140 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001
05:53:23
-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 ESMTTP
id FAA19272 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001 05:53:23 -0800
(PST)

From: RFunk787@aol.com
Received: from RFunk787@aol.com
by imo-r07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v31_r1.9.) id 5.155.66164fe (4196)
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001 08:52:51 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <155.66164fe.295c81b3@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2001 08:52:51 EST
Subject: Recent USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll -- most admired man
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

(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.

>From smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu Thu Dec 27 07:01:22 2001

Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTMP
id fBRF1Le15186 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001

07:01:21

-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 ESMTMP
id HAA09693 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001 07:01:19 -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 JAA15818
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 27 Dec 2001 09:05:26 -0600

Received: from ccMail by norcmail.uchicago.edu (ccMail Link to SMTP
R8.30.00.7)

id A1009465260; Thu, 27 Dec 2001 09:01:02 -0600

Message-Id: <0112271009.AA1009465260@norcmail.uchicago.edu>

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.30.00.7

Date: Thu, 27 Dec 2001 09:00:56 -0600

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Subject: Re: Recent USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll -- most admired man

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

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%).

Reply Separator

Subject: Recent USA Today/CNN/Gallup poll -- most admired man

Author: <aapornet@usc.edu> at INTERNET

Date: 12/27/01 8:52 AM

(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.

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Fri Dec 28 15:20:48 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBSNKme24471 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001
15:20:48
-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 ESMTTP

id PAA21886 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001 15:20:48 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBSNKXP24058 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001 15:20:33 -0800
(PST)
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2001 15:20:33 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CONFERENCE BOARD: US Consumer Confidence Jumps 8-Plus Points
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112281514450.23060-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 2001 - The Conference Board Inc

<http://www.conference-board.org/search/dpress.cfm>

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

>From dhalpern@bellsouth.net Fri Dec 28 15:50:29 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
id fBSNoSe25919 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001
15:50:28
-0800 (PST)
Received: from imf20bis.bellsouth.net (mail020.mail.bellsouth.net
[205.152.58.60])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with ESMTTP
id PAA04696 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001 15:50:28 -0800
(PST)
Received: from w5y0s9.bellsouth.net ([65.81.42.96])
by imf20bis.bellsouth.net
(InterMail vM.5.01.04.00 201-253-122-122-20010827) with ESMTTP
id
<20011228235436.CXOL1592.imf20bis.bellsouth.net@w5y0s9.bellsouth.net>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Fri, 28 Dec 2001 18:54:36 -0500
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20011228184432.0236ce00@pop3.norton.antivirus>
X-Sender: dhalpern@mail.atl.bellsouth.net@pop3.norton.antivirus
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Fri, 28 Dec 2001 18:46:32 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>
Subject: WHY NO ONE REALLY KNOWS HOW CONSUMERS FEEL.
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="====_974524==_ .ALT"

====_974524==_ .ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

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 post-September 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 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.

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

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 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.

 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 <i>predict
</i>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.

 </html>

-----_974524==_.ALT--

>From mark@bisconti.com Sat Dec 29 09:28:21 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
id fBTHSLe03987 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Dec 2001
09:28:21
-0800 (PST)
Received: from relay.clickability.com (relay.clickability.com
[208.184.224.73])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id JAA10580 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sat, 29 Dec 2001 09:28:19 -0800
(PST)
From: mark@bisconti.com
Received: (qmail 20284 invoked from network); 29 Dec 2001 17:27:25 -0000
Received: from localhost (HELO relay.clickability.com) (127.0.0.1)
by localhost with SMTP; 29 Dec 2001 17:27:25 -0000
Message-ID: <923611972.1009646845097.JavaMail.root@localhost>
Date: Sat, 29 Dec 2001 09:27:25 -0800 (PST)
To: mark@bisconti.com, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: CNN.com - Islamic states lag on freedom, global survey finds -
December 18,
2001
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_Part_13513_923616611.1009646845066"
X-Mailer: sendhtml

-----_Part_13513_923616611.1009646845066
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: INLINE

This might be of interest. Mark Richards

If you are having trouble with any of the links in this message, or if the URL's are not appearing as links, please follow the instructions at the bottom of this email.

Title: CNN.com - Islamic states lag on freedom, global survey finds -
December
18,

2001 CNN.com will expire this article on 01/01/2002.

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to access the sent link:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=viewThis&etMailToID=1001553800&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to SAVE THIS link:
<http://www.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThisPopupApp?clickMap=saveFromET&partnerID=2006&etMailToID=1001553800&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to forward this link:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=forward&etMailToID=1001553800&partnerID=2006&pt=Y>

*Please note, the sender's email address has not been verified.

Email pages from any Web site you visit - add the EMAIL THIS button to your browser,
copy and paste the following into your Web browser:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=browserButtons&pt=Y>

Instructions:

-
- If your e-mail program doesn't recognize Web addresses:
1. With your mouse, highlight the Web Address above. Be sure to highlight the entire Web address, even if it spans more than one line in your email.
 2. Select Copy from the Edit menu at the top of your screen.
 3. Launch your Web browser.
 4. Paste the address into your Web browser by selecting Paste from the Edit menu.
 5. Click Go or press Enter or Return on your keyboard.

-----=_Part_13513_923616611.1009646845066

Content-Type: text/html

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: INLINE

<!--file:/etHTMLEmail.html template:HTMLEmail1-->

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>EMAIL THIS Email</TITLE>

<STYLE TYPE="TEXT/CSS">

```
body { background-color: #FFFFFF}
.font-cn { font-family: Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif; font-size: 11px;
color:
#000000} .fontbold { font-weight: bold; font-family: Verdana, Arial,
Helvetica,
sans-serif; font-size:11px;color: #000000} .fontsponsor { color: #333399;
font-weight: bold ; font-family: Verdana, Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif;font-
size:
11px;} .fontlargebold {font-size:12px; font-weight: bold; font-family:
Verdana,
Arial, Helvetica, sans-serif;} .fontspacer { font-size: 5px } </STYLE>
```

</HEAD>

<BODY bgcolor="#FFFFFF" link="#000099 vlink="#000099" alink="#000099"> <IMG
SRC="http://ste.clickability.com/ste.gif?151|5010|4010|3000|2006|2006|9574629

|
N|2|"

WIDTH="0" HEIGHT="0"> <TABLE width="487" border="0" cellspacing="0"
cellpadding="2"

bgcolor="#000000">

<TR>

<TD>

<TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="0"

bgcolor="#FFFFFF">

<TR>

<TD width="1%"><IMG

src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/spacer.gif"

width="13" height="5"></TD>

<TD width="99%"><IMG

src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/spacer.gif"

width="1" height="5"></TD>

</TR>

<TR>

<TD> </TD>

<TD>

<TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="0">

<TR>

<TD><IMG

SRC="http://images.clickability.com/partners/2006/mainLogo.gif" alt="CNN.com"

border="0"></TD>

```

                <TD align="RIGHT" class="font-cn"><IMG
src="http://images.clickability.com/logos/cc0000/emailthis-
logo.gif">&nbsp;<br><!--fil
e:/sponsorship.html template:SponsorshipBlock2--> <table cellspacing="0"
cellpadding="0" border="0"> <tr> <td align="right" class="font-cn">Powered
by</td>
<td>&nbsp;<a href="http://www.clickability.com" target="_blank"><IMG border=0
src="http://images.clickability.com/partners/1/smallclicklogo.gif"></a></td>
</tr>
</table>
</TD>
                </TR>
        </TABLE>
</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD bgcolor="#000000" colspan="2"><IMG
src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/spacer.gif" width="1"
height="1"></TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">&nbsp;</TD>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">&nbsp;</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">&nbsp;</TD>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">
<TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="0">
        <TR>
                <TD class="fontbold">
                        This might be of interest.  Mark Richards
                </TD>
                <TD width="13">&nbsp;</TD>
        </TR>
</TABLE>
</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">&nbsp;</TD>
<TD bgcolor="#CCCCCC">&nbsp;</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD bgcolor="#000000" colspan="2"><IMG
src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/spacer.gif" width="2"
height="1"></TD>
</TR>

```

```
<TR>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
<TD class="fontbold">Click the following to access the sent
link:</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD class="fontspacer">&nbsp;</TD>
<TD class="fontspacer">&nbsp;</TD>
</TR>

<TR>
<TD>&nbsp;</TD>
<TD>
<TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="2">
  <TR>
    <TD colspan="3" valign="top" class="fontlargebold">

      <IMG
SRC="http://images.clickability.com/partners/2006/etIcon.gif"
ALIGN="ABSBOTTOM">

      <A
  HREF="http://cnn.worldnews.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=v
  i
  ewThis&e
  tMailToID=1001553800" style="color:#000099" target=_blank>CNN.com - Islamic
  states
  lag on freedom, global survey finds - December 18, 2001</a> <span
  class="fontbold"><nobr><IMG src="http://images.clickability.com/sti/icon-
  clock.gif"
  alt="CNN.com will expire this article on 01/01/2002.">CNN.com will</nobr>
  expire this
  article on 01/01/2002.</FONT>
    </TD>
  </TR>

  <TR>
    <TD width="6%">&nbsp;</TD>
    <TD width="39%">&nbsp;</TD>
    <TD width="55%">&nbsp;</TD>
  </TR>

  <TR>
    <TD width="6%" align="center" valign="top">&nbsp;</TD>
    <TD width="39%"><A
  HREF="http://cnn.worldnews.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThisPopupApp?cl
  ic
  Map=save
  FromET&partnerID=2006&etMailToID=1001553800"><IMG
```

```
src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/btn-save-link.gif" width="115"
height="20"
BORDER="0" ALT="SAVE THIS link"></A></TD>
      <TD width="55%"><A
href="http://cnn.worldnews.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=f
o
rward&et
MailToID=1001553800&partnerID=2006" target=_blank><IMG
src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/btn-fwd-link.gif" width="131"
height="20"
BORDER="0" ALT="FORWARD THIS link"></A></TD>
    </TR>
  </TABLE>

  <TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="2">
    <TR>
      <TD>&nbsp;</TD>
    </TR>

    <TR>
      <TD class="font-cn">Please note, the sender's email address
has not
been verified.</TD>
    </TR>
  </TABLE>

  <TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="2">
    <TR>
      <TD width="72%">&nbsp;</TD>
      <TD width="28%">&nbsp;</TD>
    </TR>
    <TR>
      <TD width="72%" class="fontbold" valign="top"> Get your
EMAIL THIS
Browser Button and use it to email information from any Web site.</TD>
      <TD width="28%" class="fontbold"><A
href="http://cnn.worldnews.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=b
r
owserBut
tons"><IMG src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/email-this-promo.gif"
width="98"
height="40" border="0"></a></TD>
    </TR>
  </TABLE>

  <TABLE width="100%" border="0" cellspacing="0" cellpadding="2">
    <TR>
      <TD width="99%" valign="top" align="right">&nbsp;</TD>
      <TD width="1%" valign="top" align="right">&nbsp;</TD>
    </TR>

    <TR>
```

```

                <TD width="99%" valign="top"><!-- Banner Start --><script
language="JavaScript1.1"
src="http://ads.web.aol.com/file/adsWrapper.js"></script>
<style type="text/css">
<!--
span.aoltextad { text-align: justify; font-size: 10pt; color: black; font-
family:
sans-serif }
-->
</style>
<!-- world_email_this_page -->
<script language="JavaScript1.1">
<!--
htmlAdWH(93103231, 468, 60);
//-->
</script>
<noscript><a href="http://ads.web.aol.com/link/93103231/aol"></a></noscript><!-- Banner End --></TD>
                <TD width="1%" valign="top" align="right"><IMG
src="http://images.clickability.com/eti/spacer.gif" width="7" height="2"
border="0"></TD>
                </TR>

                <TR>
                <TD width="99%" class="fontspacer">&nbsp;</TD>
                <TD width="1%" class="fontspacer">&nbsp;</TD>
                </TR>
        </TABLE>
</TD>
</TR>
</TABLE>
</TD>
</TR>
</TABLE>
</HTML>

<script language="JavaScript1.1"
src="http://ads.web.aol.com/file/adsEnd.js"></script>

</BODY>
</HTML>

```

-----=_Part_13513_923616611.1009646845066--

```

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Sun Dec 30 13:38:44 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
        by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
        id fBULche07272 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001
13:38:43
-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 ESMTTP
        id NAA21873 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001 13:38:44 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
        by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP

```

id fBULcPI28398 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001 13:38:25 -0800 (PST)
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2001 13:38:25 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Mathematical evidence for Congress' growing polarization (J Ellenberg, Slate)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112301336270.22041-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

© 2001 Microsoft Corporation

<http://slate.msn.com/?id=2060047>

Posted Wednesday, December 26, 2001, at 7:57 AM PT

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.

<http://slate.msn.com/?id=2060047>

>From mark@bisconti.com Sun Dec 30 15:17:10 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 fBUNH9e14436 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001
15:17:09
-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 PAA15369 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001 15:17:06 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 2766 invoked from network); 30 Dec 2001 23:16:42 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 30 Dec 2001 23:16:42 -0000
Received: from accountant ([138.88.86.99]) by bisconti.com ; Sun, 30 Dec 2001
17:16:36 -0600
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: 1) Islamic states lag on freedom, global survey finds; 2) How Islam
Lost Its
Way
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2001 18:17:08 -0500
Message-ID: <NEBBJFMEALLAJDBKDMILCELMCCAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_001E_01C1915E.3236F3A0"
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 V5.50.4522.1200
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <NEBBJFMEALLAJDBKDMILCELMCCAA.mark@bisconti.com>
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_001E_01C1915E.3236F3A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

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

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A37263-2001Dec28.html>

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-

al

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. i;½ 2001 The Washington Post Company

-----_NextPart_000_001E_01C1915E.3236F3A0
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef;
name="winmail.dat"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="winmail.dat"

eJ8+IgkXAQaQCAAEAAAAAAAAABAAEAAQeQBgAIAAAA5AQAAAAAADoAAEIgAcAGAAAAElQTS5N
eJ8+aWNY
b3NvZnQgTWFPbC50b3RlADEIAQ2ABAACAAAAAgACAAEGgAMADgAAANEHDAAEABIADwAAAAAIWEB
A5AGADgjAAA1AAAAACwACAAEAAAAALACMAAAAAAMAjgAAAAACwApAAAAAADADYAAAAAAB4AcAAB
AAAAUQAAADEpIElzbGfTaWMgc3RhdGVzIGxhZyBvbiBmcmVlZG9tLCBnbG9iYWwg3VydMv5IGZp
bmRzOyAyKSBib3cgSXNsYW0gTG9zdCBjdHMGV2F5AAAAAIBcQABAAAFgAAAAHBkYfUEse5I3v9
RxHVlcUABFpLLdYAAAIBHQwBAAAFwAAAFNNVFA6TUFSS0BCSVNDT05USS5DT00AAAsAAQ4AAAA
QAAGDgByp82HkcEBAGeKDGAAAAAYAAAAAAAAASwugm5zNQRlcQAgCkThUfCgAAACwAfDgEAAAAC
AQkQAQAAAKweAACoHgAANzQAAEExaRnUkykpXAwAKAHJjcGcxMjUWMgD4C2BuDhAwMzNPAfcCpAPj
AgBjaArAc7BldDagBxMCGH0KgzJ2CJB3awuAZDQMYH5jAFALAwu2CrEKHAswa2UJ4HALkHNI0AB
QHMeYRUCFIAEoAuAZz2M2UQogIElzc2BtDeAgmnMBkHQHkQtgZyACIBYgA1AJ4GQDcCwgZx0JAGIH
QBbQCHB2ZXn/F7AScRCwE9kU7w8gChERUBpEBZB1BtAEkCAxOIMYMAHQMDegUG8W4IEJgDogOToy
ORFgAE0gRVNUICGxQjQdguDnVcKtXELdGRBDC2EJCAYAbwrAB5EDE8UWQFdBu0hJTtoBHVE90IC0t
G4IvAzAWTxdSHBBoEnEgde5oH6Af8QVab2Yjo3e1BbBsI5B3I8ADoGkFQHMFOeAcCdG8XuAPwI7Ag
aGEgBgIgLsiWbaB1/QIwchkQI7AJ0SogB3MEYOkfkWxpFIBsKEEmABwQ/iABAARgBQAXAA3gGDAn
AH0JcHAJEReCJLMD8AEAIIXodQOCBRBnaHQEILBzaG93CYAXglQKUGBzZGF5LiGUE9NG+RfU
AH0JcHAJEReCJLMD8AEAIIXodQOCBRBnaHQEILBzaG93CYAXglQKUGBzZGF5LiGUE9NG+IEgI
YBEgGDALgCVR8wQgAHBudRiRkyQYMAIQwygAI5A3NSBwBJab4PcCMCQyJypuKqECIAQgLWB/H5Ep
oAWQJfAqkAMgKkVjQIqcxgwJZEKsS1xJrMyLjMx2iIcLiAlIlQjwP8fkQQAjVeJwC1QFeElgBDw
9nMvYBwQdC1gJTEjsido/GltKAAlYBkQAHajnySk+CwiIC8LHNAf8SwhMjFsQWQHIOgSwrAFwBu
+HljaxkQFUAsIC/iJwA/FuMHgAIwODcbwCpmIHbebw3gB5Ef4ReAcCtAESCvPFAnICTyKbFi
+KEF5
KpCXMHAN4DCjZwdzYnUFQD0HQHmp8RkQK0Az0WZ1/wMgIhYrQC1wKrEYkQIQMGH/NWFGgAeAJDUv
YBjAQ8EAID8tcUTCPIFG4yQ2BGBzcacKUD3BP+lhZAEAZDg2+k0HQGkkoDoQPGNEcyfm7ya0
YBjAQ8EAID8tcUTCPIFG4yQ2BGBzcacKUD3BP+lhZAEAZDg2+A6Ai
FgDAagWwO/Iqkf0tcSIXwj3QRMEvCzg2OMH3ILA6ECNhZyXwJ0AYgEP0/G5wA2AZMDEhJyIKsSjA
/xVAA6A5cUnwJpEjYBDgORG/GMAHkTAiLGspcCQRZRjw+SgxeWUKwCartjExU0QCu1kxKbE2EVBZ
IjBBZ0aTx0iRB4AFwFuUzgwGTDXERAFQatgZBkQRTQwAHDvBbEIAEPhGPBsMSEWkAIGbxdxPHER
EDgwsQVAC4Bj/wpAAQBGAgCQWkAEETwyC2D/BuAFwF0xBIFI4hDgBvARAX8mkVCxXuE8I1wjW1BY
0W7/QYIkMRkwNTBGVLYOSFZJO88clYjPGAXYGctcRxQOwl/KAI1QVFQVZlpsVF0PDIy7WbwIkQy

F8IuPdBTUgtgXwJAHCfMFF91PFBJKpBx6RgwTGlEwGEYMAYQX6CftTgAHEAGgBzA8I0FmLODvAHBY
gQBwahEubqATyBQF/z3gBbE8ckcxGKE0YUBxCeAfHUAJhn+LFACQHA6L+Qvd3NwLmMwchOgA3AC
LxySLldPUkxEzi8HgDoQdC8OIHUWOKovLMQuF8UuGMQuCXBFJRjAvEnFleC4s8G33CVAT03NQLyA3
L4AH4CITX2wwHPFFIQQgU5B5G4FccylwWkAgWSQBBJAUESf9BCBBEOAIkBJwQYJ6ITPi9kcG8D8h
Oy3ABHAuIBgwVlJ08ReRSE4xQjqSRb9fgAUgQ/ITxU4AHyFQBjDDGPB6EWAwoAXAQU3xL4CtBHBi
LUB6YGL6lVMxcbN9khvHMzAcDH1AUBdg8R+gQjA0Uu9T8hzTGDDmT0YwCQBva3ERNFAzgx8T
LUB6YGL6lVMxcbN9khvHMzAcDH1AUBdg8R+xHMJ
TiFTxUPRQBz8nfkcC1c8G4vVaJfgAeQiC9BMwHANjMtHJHJG8FpUHepSVNMHbBB+EJBRBgwg+AS
YG4yIWHvIgAkWjkhKeRzNcUQ8Gmx/0YwCHAsQViBUKEGIgDATtH3B0ADIDxyIjISCHAZECRC/wSQ
A2BZUD3QLWAmoXCREPD/GPAL4hDiRkEx0gMQL5En0uMRETPLU2N5cJAnACRB/4CQBnFFYCVBNbAG
cRiRCsBdA2BnAHAb4DwnQxDxef5ibOAEIDcpCXApceXAlKL+ZgBwKqIEAHZwajFWMSzg/zxi
cRiRCsBdA2BnAHAb4DwnQxDxef5ibOAEIDcpCXApceXAlKL+PqFO
IGKCJpFLoS+gBud/HQEcIUTBJwCZUW5BnWIKwf8l8E4gb8EnAEVgCXBHMRgw/wlwfFIJgBgw
IGKCJpFLoS+Kkos
Y1iBFRg/PDKGoUdACsGPLDgwt17C9wPxL8FTsXBiUAWQhoA5If8b4AAgC3FuxW/yWkUxUQXA715h
PHAEICcgdxgWYSukNn5NL6ApcC9gO5gv8TxyVfs74S1xUxbzKuE8QVjBhaH1PudCL6BooWGTy1Yx
KMD/WkApsToQESBKMzxwj2F5VP85I5pFA6AkQTHgANAooY9S+04iI2BqANAUgEpjmuWZcc8DoAZg
BTA4MDExbsU4wf8+oTpwJgCtdDODQ3IAkDww/yMxKAIKUKVmXIiYMH1UjUF/KXKY4QUQoeFu
BTA4MDExbsU4wf8+ATwA
GDBKrl+gC3A6IBgwSBjxdZtR/xeABcAAcJHxXsKu+I1BOSHFRDjg0UYxr8M4ME4FsTkh7yVh
GDBKrl+u0Sf
ITgwRVjTrwc5Iv+7UwGgRoAKQBcQIzEpcAEQ/y/mLVADoEnhBnFQpDw2bOD/EiB60SzDJeKX
ITgwRVjTrwc5Iv+QUPh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n7KzUiYAW1FhTiD7LjET01c40xgAqHUtEW5B+zxRfXI/vAG/Qa4E9VK7A/5zzUNGMSITfUCu
n7KzUiYAW1FhTiD7LjET01c40xgAqHUtEW5B+WEDx
vvD/3jGGwzgwTdcioTnQEWcZQM+UsQYQzQEFwEvkI2CMmP97kVTQCeAWoFpAnoIqcJeS7ySxFaGq
1DxyVE3hGID80vXnbxDw07BNaiYQ5pFDY//Gkw+gcJBG8pl42nLCgXBC/1vEmWJY0bjgAuMm8bwQ
v3HngBGv4j7QaXokkSNGNDD/PGNqhfmeWlBdYZ5xGDB/EP9AQc1AQsIZMANwTUHceWJF//vxnyP7
kCwgXjysYs5SDD/HQEPwCmxK0BrUEpCu2KuCF/WwsNjWpBs4PCj4UJdQTmyvWQiDsgx4EOwNDA4
MFcmwf0v8W2R8eKhmuAWoCmwoWL/ZqApsQ7IjNAZUTCXQ2NU0P/6MhvgydI8g73pV4HosBsQ/5gA
fSAQ0JSxTjPDAsyv3P/k3E8MQFEJVEVczj0JyBRUP+1QiIEahCEDX109ZYwgILzrjEjMNAR+mNP
JFQ0ZvD/Z5gmtXBzpeWodlB2VTPYsv91UliiYeB2wPDzrZRDJkCoq/0fpB8B7IZtxxWGa4DRQKuH/
cJGoh2e2Q3J2UwTQURNEwfHV4GxmLa2Rwfe50V1w/7VQslA0EWJxzJSWIEVDrUL+ZMXgmDLS5Ddh
fgHF8QzC/zyyYGR7ITCjRoDi8e9hdhD/L1ErJhDkBiB60T0EPqFnmN8LovsQwfAi88WgdUHQ3L/
JGe5M7UR2wHDocEhloEsE/+bAjHkqoGjIkHkfdRlscmwvWuE6eP0YZZQPxC1hVmU8P+S9CgBUkJx
IQRrqIwBAohx+yHCN+FmfVhSUpvTYbDhIv/nQELRUJDaoUZhqtTnQToi/3ZQZbST0d3yQ2Ou
IQRrqIwBAohx+yHCN+AxFh
/PH/K5NYXbAzld8kiJhGcVDcvcfYdWAKUB4gtCyULQicVD/jLzS8ftFAjPz8GagucMfE/+Wtvtx
v0CrQnyQa1CDAQsA3fYyU+PQOIH5wEeWUFOWP6dSjeCVtASFVMEilBowzJazjUxOTc5XxH0
v0CrQnyQa1CDAQsA3fYyU+Ef3C
g2unQUNkoBUi8U9R7gH/+QCS0aszY1D28vsQYOCgcd/9ESVbK4JEBFLQsJxirsT/5pIi86Gh6rGS
UWxQtPG/4f+UkJNxxHxNlMmeUwTRlMroW/WSgQfZBIFLbowzxI0CyQPO085PgcHb9oWgWXXCgcX8n
woy2oKKKAI7z+xAhYS3/qIwD4vnB0HCobKJ4b6GosJvYB0nhNMnljZNBaAAh/2zwhqI18vMV
woy2oKKKAI7z+SyQE
oQrhoIL/UgML8afBDPEZ4iQ0UrNiAT5oDHLdkaKBDofkoChN81ZgphB4dIlwybCl8sJR/81xqtJc
BujgSVKM4UerF6H/R1HYQ42iphDNmLLCpiGUEf/b41SSEYSfkRaC94GScJNxx34VALiHvstix4YBw
GZDpQ/+rQiHw0/TtUbiwseKmUvrB/7BU8/GTU+njzXG/8e8QaGTnTREooYaiLimEdpvtFyH/uPB6
0Ts51MF79q6iorAaAv+vtOQHJMHC8HDxVmCohY3j/weSdxB2UCHA4RKYQdmEFyL/rNH18cCg

OTs51MF79q6ioRAaAv+tOFT
sQL2k9G2AP+hoS9iEbEjQI7hi3AQggui/+kxopKtXI6ynaANAdlgZdH/q0FCUE8BIMAMwdRS
sQL2k9G2AP+vHJT
A/cVQQ+jLgJfK/Hg0evh2KH/7vLGMQZy12Hj9ooRF7L5sf9465phh3BqRIVRdACak+ih/9bA9lC6
Eu9hxJMw4WDCAL/49GZxtbBVmBNkKeR8zPHUP8yQLAV0JGkMbHyZQPCU74h//MjjaJNk+2y7IA/
oNyBjiP/jeEfMxfRx0H2QYZjMxMEMP/W8XJChXVO4zSy72E+eArB/yZxj10JMcYxYfDQEDGzJTPj
BDGWgTEsMI9QhFbj0X5wu3BJko1jAwKioZaBRf/UYkXh/OftAQQwM4N5If3j/7oRoSHB8MEgtYV1
wOCAFLJ+dcmQCCFBsBIwEPFCUE//L0WzkUJ4HLDN8CASdAC6UP+mEAGie2IMUwCALFIM8sBy
wOCAFLJ+/2jh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y
TDC1kX8xkLFhZKAHURRRQgMvYkf/21GHsbjxeBLMZQ0xJ9HVUu8s1AsjJdgmgmINMEIS89H/DT0/
Mbtja5HckQZyJBGyOP8REfYgLaDAUiMRq2FpAlaw9xSB4EJg8GghYFFQxCeTIf+dofDhwfFn
Mbtja5HckQZyJBGyOP8REfYgLaDAUiMRq2FpAlaw9xSB4EJg8GghYFFQxCeTIf+tEBS
NAEeabUx/1EhNvGFBrtykWatAGxBGrD/aRkmo0qBfVHo0XQAI3A3QN8tIbUya6DLUGjwzEwBJ1D/
XfFIsu8+e+QlEEbhrGAXEP1rgk0yoCNwJ1Drs6iWzML/yOE5wZdTJYG+U8qhnjM5wX9ZJSX1
XfFIsu8+e+KVQ9
Uj6TA9ZamHn/3aN5o70yX6BI1LzCqtEv0Peg+MBQ15B5X5Q2EachduL/pQAJInPWBtN48g0hX8Uj
+PkqwGx1rGEaWHhhq5O1Nf9LgTIRLYOaM6GmKyQOdjNA/TU1RKxgaPFRgtOx2gGc8f8tUVaz
+xkiu
BdK3PVQHcxpI3zNideDzSLQhs8Et0cUUlu9jUF9SjSfHUFMT8i/QLSH/oycd5V7hORBZJTQkc8CL
4v8Ro15yC8CTE2uRvME+VbzC/8mBuDG34Tk3yjiXYV7xWRbsMjDRmE8lZibRWoPKc/01JUih
4v8Ro15yC8CTE2uRvME+odsB
0jfpYtVTLzj/Q7F3Ys1EV1H18sBSJ1AOg/9pIS86eGCY8bixTiBNiH6T/5xBhbCyoEXAcwRvEFda
c5D/eLXaMahhgyOwIu0ABsPJEv8vNvcCH6On4bqhRuAMsV+R/6QhfOBvweCEXpLGcf+gazH/UbII
5vDh2FGH0m8Rk8FP8n/4tH1QYLHAhASxmRGKM0K/SKB6oqaEeILpQG0CVSzh7dhrU4vj7YBmacFm
k3dB7+yBuKI06VOyeXzS25KhE/87skxQT/ByISKcW1NOAFCh/14yTMNtAmsRrQFesb2Rk5L/
k3dB7+o5jb
UFNwFARdcHOQWhDVUqccIBGhWvI1M9Ixb9fh17rRESGJkGTHwHHIM+0xf0FT2TKJAPngzwFm
UFNwFARdcHOQWhDVUqccIBGhWvI1M9Ixb9fh17rRESGJkGTHwHHIM+wZDQ
Q/ZJdcDrUXDtgNtQqaUA4f5Td/BdUE90nPH5ENbAVnF/YHB50NbxRAV+sDzieKJF95+wq4CfQUfc
MGkh8kGi4D/lgJqBdOBOWhCFn0FTdd5roLfc8YfjUx11oKGNyV8LYelBpCC6IKUAD1LNCyxD/7fg
C2CgkCbRXxHCBY10CGH71IHFhVAIMuEiFAIAoZqg/8fAzCGvIYIQZhQ6YSQwkvD/C3Gk0HvzsTJE
Un4BkTEB9/tqINsBbneiw2U8cfkwQhH/a4LHwEZgibI85km5PiGi4fvbAhv1aoEAGZFCNIPxTXD/
fuJroHvwaDFJ88fAlJCLMP+pwNtX5aC9Vq1FqtHC44oz/6GUHGPjKOLwt+C2IPizgrE/4VED
fuJroHvwaDFJ88fAlJCLMP+YAgx
XISCYanAdXX/8ZLxEUzof+GA5PhBY/Tw4f53aVPboQn1UMLtgJaWBsP/WQDcINnRLSIScPDR6ADF
hf3wVGO5EPsjYIG34Rt2kDB/mCD8MN+ToZTU5UV7sAft/06Q4RQL4bEiwnIiwe7/9/LzuTEneDc5
j4KzVSkA4vA/6iBFYoIxuyDBANSiQWbvqVCW8ZbS1wBXsUKeyU93xloQ0ZEwLUhhUHAXsf5BjdAX
gVjCkPFqQcqvH/JSRSUsUwuZCxAZhRC8BFk/+jtuiBMYLMYYshEARWg+2A704KiDF0YjREbDaB
TqLysP+68R9hyHShsLixkIPZMgiA/0yiQXKwgmCQSSbsXry6WL/MLK6oTIBlfc3405hYJAc
TqLysP+oHc1
0Zv1/fBq8sBWULrwbv2okFI9ElRy3eG10VYz3LL9ozZXOaAigTNQYRK2oM8A/3WZ9xMscQDhzuFu
YaPwFNC914A6f8FE9n6LSYNwXzH3JSR5TNOQbOVBMdAKYRAEv+eBf9m5I9fhQhHBZVTXkd5i+lKD

I fRBqJBPXEdWIHukILkxTL/B55TCYh9hUf5hVlAx4L+zmqogxJywPKD/xYWS4PER6DDmQ12i4kEy
AP8H0be0uyBKsSQGLHH2YO0B13ThrzBMgz/FlEbEdwNB/3gRe6MSgROyBFBCiJlhuIBPsTC4Qbky
cMBmLQZBed+WALxGRoG8s0uQbMVCrHD/4vCtILyC/zFMEgZAaoG08v/ggQcwlLTngkmgqQA
cMBmLQZBed+QqLh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2Ny8by3U91uR6dI1NGnx8GxzneeQwP938P4RoyVv8AixWVEfQ/6B/2zmybL/MKOy6jZr9IxShND/
t/JMkvixBGAugBfg+7B44/9rwQsX+eDkIRBantKesZ5A/3ETI5Lx8JYA+NLzsIPRBQFfqFKK8foC
MDRTsGkVNEPfUaAjkrwg/wGjk2hUUSxx//yEa8JTImxz/8GbkNdQUfL/c4ZEdP8xAbSGcBgQRBGs
Qv+okQG9CYWmoWQzXXMTIcLC3+77LfnJ0AoeI1F2HLA14/868yOQGFVWUHWZRX0Z8a4hv7mS
Qv+okQG9CYWmoWQzXXMTIcLC3+2nad
0QSjadADgGicBe8mSv3gtCBsc0fpgDZxCND/VVfXIEBgBtLt4EhwVWDcYf+j0cLCP9AK0jmg13NQ
ELDz/53nfdP5A+ezZ3Bm5PoJpWL/LzEpMbohLnGtETj4D0pVUf+d91bRcLjB4GnQ8WHvYSeR32xj
HcG0wCfgrjFi/NQmkf9G0Z6zHKgC5RUAE3Bqs3Cx/dJDb/DUEuy5g6ejqnKoUv+K4FDQV5Gokf4o
GMZU4Kqx/9rh87JigaeyZFGPUKhsXBH/Yfoi0uSgTTe/YTj4fQRoIo/YQbZDD8RrNFUuU0hA/0M3
dZWDFWxhSNKEMWew6dR/WtLNEEcAsDK+V/oBb7Bw/2/wNVLrJPOAiVCokT4Ct8X/PPWtoanjanCx
4ahSPuGGcPt58TOCeX3xQRDkdBvTixD/syKpdbhKD905hXohk4GyIv+HEb3AtMGN5LOS5+L45aMk
711VpGILtHWkTzhwSXO6df/J9CQC+IW91tVU0qNw038x//xEwmNjKAJAN9GQWGeige0H/+SH8Mkeq
QIDp1A+SSJLeAf/h8ZYAd4N14EBgdpJitdTD/+9RD3GhEWSHj2DWrWxzqCD/TYCxoNs0EeCX
QIDp1A+YNml
nIBIkV/roxsUxBc6YGYDZGF74CUD/yXSSdBbwZJz1eHuEbnRezX/zKfW4PJAdLJjUEZgppCckf9R
cY3UD41v8BhiXxF1lc3R21BrQnqTmd0gYl2wt6G/76JkUUZgGwCmAVCRbukw73cQ0QWewPIwLSVB
wCBtkDUh0HlsEGO/YXAQUXXlboBkReAtQVSwmlD/kf/A8tVlcVKK8vygXmLokS01wXwiZfXzYjHF
gEpgAmFKknFjXCdhOdQgMsWAMZwjVxHgYlHuZ3TA9oGEakNhQQ7BSb9XSsVNuXWzfXXgAFBgCwAB
gAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYAAAAAA4UAAAAAADAAOACCAGAAAAAADAAAAAAARgAAAAAQhQAA
AAAAAMAB4AI IAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAAFKFAAAnagEAHgAJgAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYA
AAAAVIUAAAEAAAAEAAAAOS4wAB4ACoAI IAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAADaFAAABAAAAQAAAAA
AAAEAAuACCAGAAAAAADAAAAAAARgAAAAA3hQAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAHgAMgAggBgAAAAAAwAAA
AAAAAEYAAAAAOIUAAAEAAAAABAAAAAAAsADYAI IAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAAIKFAAABAAAA
CwA6gAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAAAEYAAAAADoUAAAAAADADyACCAGAAAAAADAAAAAAARgAAAAAR
hQAAAAAAAMAPYAI IAYAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAABiFAAAAAAAAwBfgAggBgAAAAAAwAAAAAA
AEYAAAAAYUAAAAAALAHGACCAGAAAAAADAAAAAAARgAAAAAGhQAAAAAAAI B+A8BAAA
AEYAAAAAYUAAAAAALAHGACCAGAAAAAADAAAAAAARgAAAAAGhQAAAAAAAI B+EAAA
AAswugm5zNQRlCQAgCkThUcCafOPAQAAABAAAAALMLoJucZUEZXEAI ApE4VHAgH7DwEAAACAAAA
AAAAADihuxAF5RAaobsIACsqVsIAAFBTVFBSWC5ETEwAAAAAAAE5JVEH5v7gBAKoAN9luAAAA
QzpcV0lORE9XU1xMb2NhbCBTZXR0aW5nc1xBChBsawNhdGlvbiBEYXRhXElpY3Jvc29mdFxpDxRs
b29rXG91dGxvb2sucHN0AAAAAwD+DwUAAAADAA00/TcAAAI BfwABAAAAMQAAADxORUJCSkZN
b29rXG91dGxvb2sucHN0AAAAAwD+RUFM
TEFKREJLRE1JTENFTE1DQ0FBLm1hcmtAYmlzY29udGkuY29tPgAAAAADAAyQDdRULwMABxB9KQAA
AwAQEAAAAAADABEQAAAAAB4ACBABAAAAAZQAAAE1TTEFNsUNTVEFURVNMQUdPTkZSRUVET00sR0xP
QkFMU1VSVkvZXRklORFNERUNFTUJFUjE4LDIwMDFQT1NURUQ6OToyOUFNrVNUKDE0Mj1HTVQpQ11D
TEFJUkVTT0FSRVNXQVMAAAAAoN4=

-----= _NextPart_000_001E_01C1915E.3236F3A0--

>From mark@bisconti.com Sun Dec 30 16:03:38 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 fBV03ce18306 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001

16:03:38
-0800 (PST)
Received: from epimetheus.hosting4u.net (epimetheus.hosting4u.net
[209.15.2.70])
by usc.edu (8.9.3.1/8.9.3/usc) with SMTP
id QAA27877 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Sun, 30 Dec 2001 16:03:35 -0800
(PST)
Received: (qmail 17012 invoked from network); 31 Dec 2001 00:03:09 -0000
Received: from libra.hosting4u.net (HELO bisconti.com) (209.15.2.27)
by mail-gate.hosting4u.net with SMTP; 31 Dec 2001 00:03:09 -0000
Received: from accountant ([138.88.86.99]) by bisconti.com ; Sun, 30 Dec 2001
18:03:03 -0600
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Mathematical evidence for Congress' growing polarization (J
Ellenberg,
Slate)
Date: Sun, 30 Dec 2001 19:04:01 -0500
Message-ID: <NEBBJFMEALLAJDBKDMILOELMCCAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
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 V5.50.4522.1200
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112301336270.22041-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

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

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of
James
Beniger
Sent: Sunday, December 30, 2001 4:38 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: Mathematical evidence for Congress' growing polarization (J
Ellenberg, Slate)

© 2001 Microsoft Corporation

<http://slate.msn.com/?id=2060047>

Posted Wednesday, December 26, 2001, at 7:57 AM PT

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.

<http://slate.msn.com/?id=2060047>

© 2001 Microsoft Corporation

>From beniger@rcf.usc.edu Mon Dec 31 14:58:08 2001
Received: from usc.edu (root@usc.edu [128.125.253.136])
by listproc.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBVMw8e19851 for <aapornet@listproc.usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Dec 2001
14:58:08
-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 ESMTTP
id OAA00052 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:58:10 -0800
(PST)
Received: from localhost (beniger@localhost)
by almaak.usc.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/usc) with ESMTTP
id fBVMvnQ16077 for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:57:49 -0800
(PST)
Date: Mon, 31 Dec 2001 14:57:49 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: ACLU Dismayed by Polls Taken Since Sept. 11 (B Polen, Wired News)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0112311452090.6792-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Copyright (C) 1994-2001 Wired Digital Inc

<http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,49317,00.html>

2:00 a.m. Dec. 31, 2001 PST

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

interception of specific individuals to mass interception and filtering by law enforcement. Except by a general report to a court, we're simply not going to know.

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.

<http://www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,49317,00.html>

Copyright (C) 1994-2001 Wired Digital Inc
