



Badger Poll™ #11, Release #4
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
University of Wisconsin Madison
November 7, 2003

NOTE: When using material from this release please cite the Badger Poll™ conducted by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center, paid for by private funds at the University. The Capital Times (Madison) and the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel are the poll's media sponsors.

Iraq and the Bush Administration: Views in Fall 2003

Views of the US-led war in Iraq and its aftermath continue to be a matter of controversy in Wisconsin. Public attitudes in general had moved in a more pro-Bush direction as the overt war ("major combat operations") met with quick success, but there has been some increased questioning since. At present, views are again mixed, but the public continues to endorse the rationale for the war, believes that weapons of mass destruction did exist, but likely either remain hidden or were secretly destroyed. Moreover, while such weapons figure prominently in the public mindset about the war, the public seems torn by whether their existence or even an administration belief that they HAD existed is a sine qua non for justifying the war. These conclusions are based on the most recent Badger Poll™ which interviewed some 511 randomly chosen adult state residents between October 21 and 28, inclusive. Questions are discussed in the order they were asked on the actual instrument so it is easier to see the context in which items were answered.

Views of specific policy areas can both affect and be affected by, overall perceptions. In the fall of 2003, George W. Bush's job ratings are best characterized as moderate. Residents split almost evenly between those who characterize the job he is doing as President as either excellent (15%) or good (35%) on the one hand and those who call his performance either fair (27%) or poor (21%).

Approbation of Bush is very slightly more common among men as a group than women, and tends to decline (also rather modestly) with age. But it is self-described partisanship where clear distinctions are evident. Fewer than one in five Democrats place Bush at "good" or higher. This contrasts with half of all Independents, and roughly seven Republicans in eight.

These ratings are a bit lower than we found at the last Badger Poll™ in August, although the difference is small enough that one cannot have great confidence that the measured difference is due to a real shift in the population as opposed to the "luck of the draw" of which residents were chosen for the survey. But, as the accompanying table shows, Bush's ratings have so far never been lower than they are now, and in particular, they have declined since last April when nearly seven in ten called Bush's performance "good" or "excellent".

Residents were also asked about a number of more specific areas to see whether each was seen as an area of relative strength or weakness for the President. Among the sample as a whole, he is seen as not doing quite so good a job on foreign policy as he is overall as Chief Executive. Specifically, about four in ten call his "handling foreign policy" either excellent (12%) or good

Overall Presidential Rating
Polls from Spring 2002 to Fall 2003

	OCT03	AUG03	MAY03	APR03	MAR03	FEB03	JAN03	SPT02	JUN02	MAR02
Overall rating										
Excellent	15%	14%	27%	31%	18%	19%	16%	19%	25%	28%
Good	35	38	35	38	35	39	38	45	44	40
Fair	27	28	24	21	30	25	29	23	22	22
Poor	21	19	13	10	16	16	14	12	8	7

Answers such as don't know, or refused, omitted for space

(29%). This contrasts with the almost six in ten who rate it either fair (28%) or poor (30%). The same general patterns noted earlier for gender and age are again present (albeit not much clearer than was the case for overall perceptions). If "partisanship stops at the water's edge" in the old phrase, this is not evident for ratings of Bush's foreign policy performance. Fewer than one Democrat in six, but three Republicans in four give Bush a grade of at least "good".

These more specific ratings are not measured on every Badger Poll™, but they have occurred a number of times. The current levels are numerically as low or lower than previous readings, but (on the surveys on which this question has been asked) it has tended to move about less than has the general job performance ratings.

If the focus is "dealing with problems here at home", the Wisconsin public's views are more critical. Overall, three in ten fall at excellent (5%) or good (24%), while two thirds think either fair (33%) or poor (36%) is more like it. Men and women are quite similar as groups. Ratings (modestly) trail off with age until one reaches the oldest group, which rebounds a bit. But as before it is partisanship where one sees the clearest distinctions. Fewer than one in ten Democrats feel Bush is doing a "good" job or better, this figure rises to one in four Independents, and jumps to three in four Republicans, echoing the clear differences earlier noted.

Across time, Bush's domestic ratings have tended to be lower than his foreign policy "grades", which continues to be the case. In absolute terms this area is now lower than on any of the previous soundings.

Clearly, an important component of domestic performance, as is nearly always the case, is the yet more specific area of "handling the economy" -- although it should be noted that this survey was completed before the recent reports of (at least short term) growth. Indeed, Bush's overall ratings on the economy specifically were almost identical with those on "problems here at home". Again fewer than three in ten called his performance excellent (5%) or good (23%) contrasted with more than seven in ten who found it fair (34%) or poor (38%).

Groups tend to fall in the same relative positions, but it is worth noting that distinctions among them are a little less evident. For instance, while few Democrats rate Bush "good" or better on the economy (8% good and no excellent), among Republicans just over half fall in this group (11% excellent, 43% good). This is a clear partisan pattern, but not quite so clearly focused as is the overall domestic performance rating.

If one looks at how this question has worked over time, two patterns (at least) are evident. First, this has always been a comparatively weak area for Bush. Second, one would be hard pressed to argue that Bush's current ratings were worse than observed back in August, or indeed in several earlier soundings.

Looking back overseas, Bush's performance on "dealing with terrorism" is seen comparatively positively by Wisconsin residents. Overall, somewhat over half chose excellent (19%) or good (36%) to characterize their impressions. Just over four in ten felt it deserved a grade of fair (25%) or poor (18%).

Men are somewhat more upbeat than women. Age finds views improving some as one moves from the youngest group (under thirty) to the next older (thirty to forty-four), but then it declines as one continues up the age ladder. Partisanship may be seen, with all groups seeing this area as better than most, but the proportion calling Bush at least good in the war on terrorism starts off at just under three in ten among Democrats, rises to just over half among Republicans, and almost hits three in four among GOP adherents.

Terrorism has tended to be an area of relative strength for Bush and this poll is no exception. But while his ratings now are arguable roughly the same as they were in August, perceptions of how he is doing in this area are at or close to the weakest he has received. Most recently, in April of this past year, almost eight in ten called Bush's performance in this area either "good" or "excellent".

And then there is Iraq specifically. Overall, the balance between excellent (14%) and good (31%) on the one hand and fair (24%) or poor (30%) on the other is reversed from what was found on terrorism. Group patterns tend to be similar, with partisanship once again the clearest grouping -- one in five Democrats, but three in four Republicans for instance rating Bush as "good" or higher.

Bush's October ratings in this area are quite similar to those he received in August, with the differences small enough that one would be hard put to label the numerical difference as more than might be expected from random poll to poll fluctuation. They are clearly lower than in the heady aftermath of the war (up to the proclaimed end of major combat operations), but on a rough par with the period before the outbreak of hostilities. It should be noted that except in April (essentially at the fall of Baghdad to American forces) ratings of Iraq have tended to be less positive than views of how well Bush is dealing with terrorism.

Attitudes to Iraq are complex. To begin with, two thirds of the Wisconsin public believes that the "United States ORIGINALLY (emphasis added) did the right thing in threatening war if Saddam Hussein refused to give up any weapons of mass destruction he might have." Three in ten (30%) demurred. Men and women as groups take similar stances, Belief that the original choice to threaten war was appropriate has an "inverted vee" pattern by age, first rising as one moves from the youngest to next older, then falling for the two older age groups, with the clearest cutpoint at 45. Self-described Democrats split right down the middle, Independents tend to endorse this notion by about three to two. Over nine in ten Republicans do.

As the accompanying chart shows, this sentiment now is roughly where it was BEFORE the war. Once hostilities broke out, belief that the original threat was justified jumped to around eight in ten on both the April and May polls. It has declined some in the two most recent surveys, but still -- retrospectively the overall aim still finds support.

Job ratings on Specific Areas

	10/03	9/03	5/03	4/03	3/03	2/03	1/03	9/02
Foreign policy								
EXCELLENT	12%	12%			13%		12%	20%
GOOD	29	29			33		32	41
FAIR	28	34			30		34	23
POOR	30	24			23		20	15
Problems here at home								
EXCELLENT	5%	4%			6%		6%	12%
GOOD	24	31			33		30	40
FAIR	33	36			35		39	29
POOR	36	28			25		24	18
Dealing with the economy								
EXCELLENT	5%	3%	4%	7%	5%	4%	4%	6%
GOOD	23	23	34	32	22	26	23	30
FAIR	34	38	30	32	39	38	38	36
POOR	38	35	30	28	32	31	31	25
Dealing with terrorism								
EXCELLENT	19%	17%	29%	34%	20%	20%	18%	32%
GOOD	36	42	41	44	46	43	42	40
FAIR	25	23	23	14	25	23	26	17
POOR	18	16	8	7	9	13	12	11
Dealing with Iraq								
EXCELLENT	14%	15%	30%	40%	18%	19%	11%	22%
GOOD	31	32	32	35	31	30	31	30
FAIR	24	24	22	13	26	25	28	23
POOR	30	27	13	10	23	24	26	20

Note: Don't Know and Refused omitted for space

When people were asked if "the United States had to choose between letting Iraq have weapons of mass destruction or going to war with Iraq", the answer by almost five to three (54%-35%) is "yes". Gender patterns are similar. Again the thirty to forty-four group is most backing, but now the youngest is on a rough par with the oldest. Democrats modestly feel the choice was not necessary, but Independents and especially Republicans come down on the other side, the latter most onesidedly.

Looked at across time, the October results are not all that different from August, registering at most a small decrease. But there has been more change since earlier. In February, before shooting had started, seven in ten thought the US was faced with this choice, which figure rose as war approached, dropped a bit once fighting started, and after holding into May, has fallen off since.

At present, the public seems torn over whether or not the Administration went to more more quickly than it had to. Half (51%) thought it had done "everything it could to avoid war with Iraq", but almost as many (46%) felt there was "something else it should have done". This sentiment falls off some with age (majorities of both under-45 groups) think enough was done. Majorities (somewhat narrower) of those above that age think more should have been tried.

Across the partisan spectrum one moves from almost three to one sentiment among Democrats that more should have been done to almost five to one among Republicans who think everything reasonable was done, with Independents split in the middle.

The present split is the narrowest margin since this particular question was first put back in February and a five to four majority felt enough had been done to avoid war. This feeling increased, reaching its high point during the actual fighting and has since trailed off.

After respondents were reminded that "the UN had passed many resolutions demanding that Iraq disarm", but that "the US was not able to get a final resolution explicitly calling for war", they were asked "do you support or oppose the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway". By about a two to one margin (62%-32%), the Wisconsin public is in support.

Both men and women come down on the same side, but men by a stronger margin. The oldest respondents split, among the other groups, support rises and then falls off as one moves up the ladder. Democrats come close to splitting evenly on the original decision to use force (with a very narrow plurality against it), but support rises to three to two among Independents and almost eight to one among Republicans.

Sentiment about the decision to go to war now is quite similar to what it was in August (numerically support is very slightly higher now, but the difference is too small for any real confidence that more than poll to poll fluctuation underlies the "trend"). The level of support now is about what it was in March (having risen from February) although below the high point in April.

Turning to the consequences of the war, it would appear to be the case that the Wisconsin public still considers the problem of Iraqi "weapons of mass destruction" to be important. Two thirds say it is very likely (32%) or somewhat likely (33%) that, "if the US had decided NOT to go to war" "we would eventually have been attacked by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction". Another one in three felt it either "not very likely" (22%) or "not likely at all" (13%).

In an unusual pattern, women were at least as concerned as men with this possibility. Those thirty to forty-four were most worried, with the youngest group less so, followed by those forty-five to fifty-nine. Half of Democrats thought this possibility at least somewhat likely, as did six in ten Independents and seven in eight Republicans. It is noteworthy that among all groups the proportion thinking this threat at least somewhat likely never falls much below half, as was the case when it came to endorsing the original decision to go to war.

This question was asked since March, and the present results are quite close to August figures, and MAY reflect a slight increase in the level of perceived threat if the US had not gone to war. At the same time, the recently perceived level of threat is somewhat lower than during the fighting, and (though less clearly) than just before the outbreak of hostilities. In any event, it seems clear that the public at large does not (yet) reject the notion that Iraqi WMD threat potentially existed (or "eventually" would).

Another dimension of the war's impact is on the risk of terrorism. Overall, the public is quite divided on this. To be sure, the largest single group (some 39%) believe that the US decision to attack Iraq will "in the long run" decrease the risk of terrorism in the world. But one in four (25%) think it will

Iraq Questions from Six Surveys

	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR	FEB
Bush's Dealing with Iraq						
EXCELLENT	14%	15%	30%	40%	18%	19%
GOOD	31	32	32	35	31	30
FAIR	24	24	22	13	26	25
POOR	30	27	13	10	23	24
Original threat of war						
YES, DID RIGHT THING	65%	70%	78%	80%	65%	65%
NO, HAS NOT	30	26	18	16	26	26
ONLY WITH OTHERS (VOL)	1	*	1	*	1	1
Necessary choice war/permit WMD						
YES, HAVE TO CHOOSE	54%	57%	66%	66%	77%	71%
NO, NOT NECESSARY	35	32	28	25	16	20
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (V.)	2	2	1	1	*	1
Steps to avoid war						
DONE ALL REASONABLE	51%	55%	65%	66%	56%	51%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	46	41	32	31	36	41
Support US action alone w/o UN						
YES	62%	61%	71%	75%	61%	58%
NO	32	34	25	19	31	32

Note: wording changes, primarily tense, to deal with outbreak of war between March and April surveys. Don't know and Refused omitted.

increase, and one in three (32%) think it will not make much difference. Except for Democrats and those sixty and older, in every group more people think the terrorism risk will go down in the long run because of the war on Iraq than think it will go up, but the balance differs. A majority of Republicans think the risk will decrease. Men are more optimistic (less pessimistic?) than women.

This question has shown a fair amount of change poll to poll since it was first asked last March. There have always been a substantial group taking each position, but the balance in the direction of an INCREASE in terrorism risk in March. By April that had moved to a somewhat stronger balance that the risk would decrease, which held in May. August found an almost even split, so the present result is an increase in optimism.

Looking back on the "US led war", respondents were asked to characterize it on a five point scale from complete success to complete failure. By far the most common opinion was that it was "only partly a success", felt by almost half (45%). Those who called it either a complete (4%) or mostly (32%) a success did outnumber those who called it mostly (14%) or a complete (4%) failure. But the balance is scarcely overwhelming, and it is noteworthy that fewer than one in ten are at the "extremes" (either a complete success or a complete failure).

In only one group (Republicans) was most the common view other than "only partly a success" (and even there, one third took this position). But the balance between those considering the war a success (mostly or completely) or a failure (mostly or completely) differed a fair amount. Men were not much more

Trend from March

	OCT	AUG	MAY	APR	MAR
Use of WMD against US w/o war					
VERY LIKELY	32%	31%	40%	42%	34%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	33	31	32	32	33
NOT VERY LIKELY	22	24	19	17	23
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	13	12	8	8	8
Long-term impact of war					
INCREASED TERROR RISK	25%	33%	24%	25%	42%
DECREASED TERROR RISK	39	35	44	46	27
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	32	29	31	27	28

Note: wording changes, primarily tense, to deal with outbreak of war between March and April surveys. Don't know and Refused omitted.

upbeat than women as a group. Sanguine assessments were relatively more common among those forty-five or younger. Among the two older groups, the balance was very slightly either positive or negative, but in both cases, quite even. When it came to party, Republicans were most likely to declare success (six in ten did, compared to one in twenty who thought it a failure). Independents came down on balance modestly on the side of finding the war a success.

This question was also asked in May and August, and has shown movement. In May, six in ten found the war to be at least mostly a success, and fewer than one in ten to be even mostly a failure. In August, this had turned to just under four in ten calling it mostly a success, compared to one in six who called it at least mostly a failure, and the single most common answer had become "only partly a success". That pattern continued in October, with changes too small to produce a clear conviction that anything other than poll to poll fluctuation lies behind the (very small) movement.

Earlier, it was noted that there still seems to be sentiment that Iraqi WMD did or would constitute a threat to the US. Respondents were reminded that no clear evidence of WMD had been found and asked what they thought the explanation would be if none are found. Only one in six (17%) think that would mean "the US was wrong about Iraq having such weapons". A similar sized group (16%) thinks the "Iraqis destroyed them secretly". But by far the largest group (60%) thinks "they remain hidden somewhere".

Among all groups examined, the largest group thinks the weapons are still hidden. This opinion however is less common among older respondents than young, and the (always minority) view that the US was wrong is also more common in this group. Democrats are most skeptical (least trusting?), but while one third of them think the US was wrong about WMD, just under half thought the weapons were still hidden and one in six felt they HAD existed (emphasis added) but had been secretly destroyed. In any event, the lack of evidence has not convinced the Wisconsin public that the Hussein regime was innocent of WMD programs.

Each time this question has been put since May, by far the largest group believes the Iraqis hid weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, this figure was only marginally higher then, right after large scale fighting ended, than it was either in August or now. And the difference between August and now is so small as to miss "significance" in either the "statistical" (being confident it

Looking Back at War

	OCT	AUG	MAY
Assessment of war			
COMPLETE SUCCESS	4%	3%	9%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	32	35	52
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	45	43	29
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	13	6
A COMPLETE FAILURE	1	3	1
Why no WMD found			
US WAS WRONG	17%	17%	10%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	16	14	14
IRAQIS HID THEM	60	61	66
If US thought no WMD			
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	38%	35%	47%
BAD IDEA	33	37	26
DON'T HAVE OPINION	27	28	25

Note: Answers such as Don't know and Refused omitted

reflects real differences in the population, as opposed to sampling) or "substantive" (important by virtue of the size of the difference) sense.

The final question in this series asked whether "if the US government thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore, do you think it was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons, a bad idea, or don't you have an opinion". Opinion is split among respondents overall. Just under four in ten (38%) say it would have been a good idea, but one third (33%) label it a bad idea. Tellingly, a large number (27%) availed themselves of the proffered category that they did not have an opinion. This suggests not only that opinion on this matter -- ruling WMD out of the picture (and assuming that the government believed they no longer existed) -- is divided, but that it is fluid, and subsequent discoveries in terms of what the Iraqis had as well as what the US government thought at the time, could well shift opinion.

The overall split find a mixed echo in the groups examined. On balance, men narrowly say going to war for other reasons would have been a good idea, while women were split (a slight plurality for it being a bad idea). The age pattern we have noted for other questions obtains (broadest "pro-administration view" among those between thirty and forty-four, with the youngest next and support declining after one reaches forty-five), with the additional note that the youngest group were especially likely to say they had no opinion.

When it comes to party, those Democrats with an opinion label knowingly going to war for other reasons a "bad" idea by rather more than two to one, while Independents split virtually evenly, and Republicans endorse it by somewhat more than four to one. Thus this question is one which is especially likely to break in a partisan direction.

In May (when explicit search for WMD had really only begun and before there was widespread questioning of whether or not the administration had indeed believed there were existing weapons posing a current threat) the public thought that going to war for other reasons was a good idea by a margin of 47%-26%. By

August, that had declined to essentially an even (35% good, 37% bad) split. Thus the current reading, is slightly less evenly balanced than was the case in August, but clearly more evenly split than in May.

It should be noted that we did NOT explicitly ask whether people believed that the administration thought there were extant WMDs nor whether they overstated the case that they posed an "imminent threat" (though the fact that so many believe either that the weapons remain hidden or that they had existed but had been secretly destroyed, suggests that sentiment that the administration did not think the weapons existed remains quite limited). The key is that IF weapons existed they strengthen the case for war in the mind of the public, many of whom thing the war was a good idea even if the administration thought that the WMD were not a real and imminent threat. If people become convinced that they did not exist, and especially if they come to believe that the administration knowingly misled the public, things could change.

Statewide Marginals and Percentages for Key Groups

What follows is the exact question wording for each of the items referred to in the release. All results shown are for the basic sample of state residents. The first column is the percentage of the entire sample giving each response. The second and third reports the percentages for men and women separately. The fourth, fifth, and sixth columns show self-described Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. Columns seven through ten group respondents by age.

Q01. INTERVIEWER: (DO NOT ASK) Enter respondent's gender

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
MALE	49%	100%	--%	43%	48%	58%	53%	54%	46%	43%
FEMALE	51	--	100	57	52	42	47	46	54	57

Q02. How would you rate the job George W. Bush is doing as President?
Excellent, good, fair or poor?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
EXCELLENT	15%	18%	13%	1%	15%	37%	20%	16%	13%	14%
GOOD	35	35	35	18	36	48	36	40	33	31
FAIR	27	27	28	37	30	14	26	28	29	23
POOR	21	19	24	43	19	1	15	15	25	31
TOO SOON TO TELL (VOL)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	1	1	--	3	--	1	1
REFUSED	*	*	*	--	--	--	--	*	--	*

IRAQ01. Do you think the United States originally did the right thing in threatening war if Saddam Hussein refused to give up any weapons of mass destruction he might have?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, DID RIGHT THING	65%	68%	62%	48%	59%	91%	67%	78%	59%	51%
NO, HAS NOT	30	28	32	48	37	7	26	19	36	43
ONLY W/OTHERS (VOL.)	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
DON'T KNOW	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	4
REFUSED	2	1	2	--	--	1	3	1	2	*

IRAQ02X. Do you think the United States had to choose between letting Iraq have weapons of mass destruction or going to war with Iraq?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
YES, HAD TO CHOOSE	54%	56%	53%	38%	60%	72%	47%	62%	57%	42%
NO, DID NOT HAVE TO	35	37	34	51	34	17	46	32	33	39
IRAQ HAS NO WMD (VOL.)	2	2	2	4	2	1	--	1	2	7
DON'T KNOW	6	5	7	7	3	7	6	3	6	10
REFUSED	2	1	4	1	3	3	1	2	3	3

IRAQ03X. Do you think the Bush administration did everything it reasonably could to avoid war with Iraq, or is there something else it should have tried?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
DONE ALL REASONABLE	51%	53%	48%	26%	47%	82%	61%	59%	44%	41%
SHOULD HAVE TRIED	46	45	46	71	50	17	34	36	54	55
DON'T KNOW	3	2	5	3	3	1	3	4	2	4
REFUSED	1	--	1	--	--	--	2	1	--	*

IRAQ09Z. Although the UN had passed many resolutions demanding that Iraq disarm, the US was not able to get a final resolution explicitly calling for war. Do you support or oppose the decision of the US and other countries to use force anyway?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
SUPPORT	62%	69%	55%	45%	58%	87%	63%	73%	59%	48%
OPPOSE	32	27	37	49	37	11	27	25	33	47
DON'T KNOW	4	2	6	5	5	1	7	2	4	5
REFUSED	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	1	5	*

IRAQ10X. If the US had decided NOT to go to war, how likely do you think it is that we would eventually have been attacked with Iraqi weapons of mass destruction? Very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not likely at all?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
VERY LIKELY	32%	27%	36%	21%	30%	42%	35%	41%	27%	22%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY	33	31	35	27	29	43	29	30	37	31
NOT VERY LIKELY	22	22	21	31	28	10	22	20	23	23
NOT LIKELY AT ALL	13	19	7	21	11	3	15	8	13	21
DON'T KNOW	1	1	1	--	2	1	--	1	--	4
REFUSED	*	--	*	--	--	--	--	--	--	*

IRAQ10Y. In the long run, will the US decision to attack Iraq increase the risk of terrorism in the world, reduce it, or not make that much difference one way or the other?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
INCREASE	25%	23%	27%	36%	26%	10%	17%	21%	26%	33%
DECREASE	39	47	32	26	41	56	44	46	39	28
NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE	32	28	36	35	32	29	32	29	32	36
DON'T KNOW	4	3	5	3	2	3	7	3	4	3
REFUSED	*	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--

IRAQ10Z. Would you call the US led war in Iraq a complete success, mostly a success, only partly a success, mostly a failure, or a complete failure?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
COMPLETE SUCCESS	4%	5%	2%	1%	3%	9%	10%	3%	2%	2%
MOSTLY A SUCCESS	32	31	32	15	30	51	36	41	27	23
ONLY PARTLY A SUCCESS	45	46	44	52	49	32	41	46	44	44
MOSTLY A FAILURE	14	14	15	26	13	5	9	7	20	21
A COMPLETE FAILURE	4	3	5	6	5	--	5	2	5	6
DON'T KNOW	1	1	2	--	1	3	--	--	1	3
REFUSED	*	1	*	1	--	--	--	1	1	--

IRAQ12A. So far, the United States has not found clear evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. If it turns out that none are found, do you think this means the US was wrong about Iraq having such weapons, that the Iraqis destroyed them secretly, or that they remain hidden somewhere?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
US WAS WRONG	17%	21%	13%	32%	20%	2%	13%	11%	19%	27%
IRAQIS DESTROYED	16	15	16	17	10	18	13	19	16	14
IRAQIS HID THEM	60	58	62	46	60	72	68	65	57	48
DON'T KNOW	7	6	8	3	9	7	6	5	7	10
REFUSED	1	*	1	1	1	--	--	--	1	*

IRAQ12B. If the US government thought the Iraqis didn't actually have weapons of mass destruction anymore, do you think it was a good idea to go to war with Iraq for other reasons, a bad idea, or don't you have an opinion?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
GOOD IDEA ANYWAY	38%	44%	33%	23%	41%	56%	37%	49%	35%	30%
BAD IDEA	33	31	36	52	38	13	22	28	41	40
DON'T HAVE OPINION	27	25	30	25	18	30	40	22	23	29
DON'T KNOW	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
REFUSED	1	1	1	*	3	1	1	2	1	1

QD05. Generally speaking, do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent, or something else?

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
DEMOCRAT	30%	27%	33%	100%	--%	--%	28%	28%	32%	33%
REPUBLICAN	30	36	25	--	--	100	41	30	25	28
INDEPENDENT	21	21	21	--	100	--	8	21	25	26
OTHER	11	10	12	--	--	--	13	10	14	6
NONE	6	6	5	--	--	--	6	9	2	4
DON'T KNOW	1	--	1	--	--	--	1	1	1	--
REFUSED	2	1	3	--	--	--	2	1	1	3

QD11. In what year were you born? (ENTER FOUR-DIGIT YEAR) (Calculated and grouped as below)

	TOT	GENDER		PARTISANSHIP			AGE IN YEARS			
		M	F	DEM	IND	REP	<30	<45	<60	60+
18-29	15%	17%	14%	14%	6%	21%	100%	--%	--%	--%
30-44	31	34	28	29	31	31	--	100	--	--
45-59	30	29	32	32	37	25	--	--	100	--
60 and over	21	18	23	23	26	20	--	--	--	100
DK/REFUSED	3	2	3	2	1	3	--	--	--	--

* denotes less than .5%

-- denotes 0%

HOW THE POLL WAS DONE

This BADGER POLL™ was conducted by the University of Wisconsin Survey Center as part of its ongoing program of research designed to benefit the research community and the people of Wisconsin, under the direction of G. Donald Ferree, Jr., Associate Director for Public Opinion Research of the Center. The media sponsors of the survey are the (Madison) Capital Times, and the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. The BADGER POLL™ is intended to be a "poll of record" for the state, investigating matters of concern to Wisconsinites including politics, culture, and their daily lives, adhering to the highest standards of polling methodology and rigorous independence.

A total of 511 randomly chosen state residents were interviewed for this survey by telephone between October 21 and 28, inclusive. Telephone numbers were generated by computer in proportion to the number of adults living in each area of the state. Theoretically, results from this survey have a "margin of error" of a little over +/- 4%. This means that, had we asked every eligible resident in Wisconsin, exactly these questions at the time the survey was conducted, there is only a one in twenty chance that the answers would differ by more than that in either direction from what we report here. There could be differences because of changes in question wording, events occurring in the meantime, or any of the practical difficulties involved in taking a scientific survey. Results based on subgroups are subject to a larger "margin of error".