

Draft

**Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset:
Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity**

**A National Post/COMPAS Poll
with Supplemental Questions for Global Television**



**COMPAS Inc.
Public Opinion and Customer Research
Toronto / Ottawa
September, 2001**

Overview

In the wake of the attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, Canadians foresee more terrorist bombings as well as the possibility of terrorist-inspired chemical, biological, or nuclear attacks, according to a nation-wide National Post/COMPAS poll fielded September 17-18 (two questions were added for Global TV). Canadians want assertive and even aggressive action. In particular, sizeable majorities want Canada to

- speak up more vigorously against terrorism,
- to take stronger action against terrorists' use of Canada as a base,
- to join an alliance to impose economic and diplomatic sanctions on countries supporting terrorism,
- to join a military alliance prepared to attack the armies of countries supporting terrorism,
- to increase military spending,
- support pre-emptive assassination of terrorists,
- invoke capital punishment as a punishment option,
- align more closely with the United States in world affairs, and
- require Arab and Muslim countries to choose sides on the matter of international terrorism.

Powerful Consensus Foresees Trouble Ahead

Almost without exception, Canadians anticipate more terrorist bombings akin to the one against the World Trade Center. Only 9% have any doubts of a recurrence. Among Canadians with an opinion on the matter, 30% say that a recurrence will definitely take place, 42% that it will very probably take place, and 20% that it "perhaps" may take place, as shown in the second column of numbers of table 1. Canadians are slightly less pessimistic about the prospect of so-called ABC attacks—atomic, biological, and chemical. As shown in table 2, of those with an opinion, 12% say that such attacks will definitely take place, 35% very probably, and 34% "perhaps" while 14% say very probably not and 5% definitely not.



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

Table 1: "At this point, I'd like to ask some questions relating to the terrorist airplane attack on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon. Will there be more terrorist bombings like these in the future, do you think? Definitely, very probably, perhaps, very probably not, definitely not". DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD DNK

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Definitely	28	30
Very probably	40	42
Perhaps	20	20
Very probably not	7	7
Definitely not	2	2
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	4	-

Table 2: "How about terrorist biological or chemical attacks or attacks with small nuclear weapons? Will there be attacks like this in the future... definitely, very probably, perhaps, very probably not, definitely not." DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD DNK

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Definitely	12	12
Very probably	33	35
Perhaps	33	34
Very probably not	13	14
Definitely not	4	5
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	5	-

Canadians are agreed in their forecasts of trouble irrespective of their party preferences, age, gender, language, education, or place of birth.



Too Little Canadian Action—A Near Consensus

Canada Speaks Up Too Little, Does Too Little to Keep Canada Free of Terrorism, and Invests Too Little in Defence

The World Trade Center calamity appears to have stimulated a public appetite for an assertive position in world affairs. Clear majorities want Canada to speak up more vigorously against terrorism (64% of those with an opinion, table 3), do more to prevent terrorists from operating on Canadian soil (82% of those with an opinion, table 4), and spend more on defence (76% of those with an opinion, table 5). Opinion in favour of assertive action is passionate, as evidenced by the fact that those who say that Canada speaks up too little outnumber almost 6:1 those who say that we speak up too much. Those who say that Canada does too little to thwart terrorists on Canadian soil outnumber 10:1 those who say that we do too much. Those who favour more military spending outnumber almost 8:1 those who favour less. Among those with strong opinions on military spending, i.e. those who say that we spend far too little or far too much, advocates of more spending outnumber 12:1 advocates of less.

Table 3: “Does Canada do far too much, too much, too little, or far too little in speaking up vigorously against world terrorism?” DONT PROMPT BUT RECORD just right/okay as it is vs. dnk

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Far too much	2	3
Too much	8	8
UNPROMPTED: Just right/Okay as it is	24	26
Too little	47	50
Far too little	13	14
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	6	-



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

Table 4: "Does Canada do far too much, too much, too little, or far too little to make sure that terrorists do not use Canada as a base of operations?" DONT PROMPT BUT RECORD okay as it is vs. dnk

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Far too much	2	2
Too much	6	6
UNPROMPTED: Okay as it is	9	10
Too little	50	53
Far too little	27	29
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	6	-

Table 5: "Do you think Canada invests far too much, too much, too little, or far too little in military preparedness?" DONT PROMPT BUT RECORD okay as it is vs. no military action under any circumstances vs. dnk

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Far too much	2	2
Too much	6	6
UNPROMPTED: Okay as it is	14	15
Too little	48	52
Far too little	22	24
UNPROMPTED: No military action under any circumstances	1	1
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	8	-



Alliance Partisans More Activist—Quebecers, Francophones, and New Democrats Less Activist—and the Special Case of the Foreign-Born

Canadians are largely consensual in their thirst for action but Alliance voters are slightly more activist while Quebecers, Francophones, Bloc Voters, and New Democrats tend to be somewhat less activist or even pacifist in varying degrees.

Alliance voters are more inclined to say that Canada

- speaks up far too little—36% vs. 16% NDP, 15% PC, 11% Liberal, and 4% Bloc
- does far too little against terrorists on Canadian soil—55% vs. 34% PC, 29% Liberal, 25% NDP, and 24% Bloc, and
- spends far too little in defence—60% vs. 37% PC, 18% Liberal, 17% NDP, and 5% Bloc.

For their part, Bloc voters and the broader francophone and Quebec community from which they are drawn tend to less activist positions, reflecting the pacifist intellectual roots of Quebec. For example, francophones are a little less likely to anticipate more terrorist bombings (63% very probably or definitely vs. 73% among Anglophones), to feel that Canada speaks up too little (56% vs. 66%), or to feel that Canada does too little to prevent terrorists from using Canadian soil (35% vs. 43%). A bigger difference separates Anglophones from francophones over defence spending. Thus, 57% of francophones feel that Canada should be spending more on defence compared to 81% among Anglophones. By historical standards, francophone-Anglophone differences are nonetheless not especially great.

New Democrats tend to be consistently opposed to stronger military action but the proportion of Canadians intending to vote NDP has fallen to all-time low of 4% of decided voters. The NDP sub-sample is thus too small to be very certain where New Democrats truly stand on these war and peace issues.

Respondents who report being born abroad tend to share the Canada-wide consensus favouring action with minor hints of difference. The foreign-born tend to be as desirous of Canada's speaking up against terrorism while being a little less fulsome in their commitment to military action. Among the small sub-sample of the foreign-born, those from the continent of Africa, which includes part of the Middle East, tend to be the most reticent. In practice, 84% of the native born feel that Canada does too little to protect Canadian soil from terrorists compared to 7% feeling that we do too much. By



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

comparison, 75% of the foreign-born feel that Canada does too little to protect Canadian soil from terrorists compared to 12% feeling that we do too much.

Staunch Support for Economic, Diplomatic, and Potential Military Action and for Requiring Arab and Muslim Countries to Choose Sides...and Personal Willingness to Serve

Near Consensus on Economic and Military Action in General

Canadians are resolutely in favour of action to combat terrorism. Four-fifths favour an international alliance to apply diplomatic and economic sanctions on countries providing aid to terrorism, as shown in tables 6a and 6b. An even higher percentage favour Canada's joining such an alliance if it is formed (89% in table 6b). Were such sanctions to fail and/or military action deemed necessary, four-fifths (81%) support the idea of an alliance building up the military capability to destroy the military wherewithal of any country found to harbour or support terrorism. Eighty-two percent favour Canada's participation in such a military alliance. Among the 21% opposed to a military alliance, 39% would favour such a military alliance in the event of a recurrence of terrorism. Among those who oppose a military alliance today, 39% (i.e. 8% of all Canadians) are opposed to military action under any circumstances. Thus, over 90% of Canadians are willing to back military action under one or other scenario.

Table 6a: "Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following opinions about actions against terrorism" [NO ROTATION][DNKs included]

	Agree or	Disagree or No	In be- tween	DNK
--	-------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----



*Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center
Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll,
September 19, 2001*

	Yes			
The international alliance of countries against terrorism should use diplomacy and economic sanctions against any country that harbours or supports international terrorism. Do you agree or disagree? DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	80	15	3	2
Should Canada participate in such an alliance? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	87	8	3	2
Suppose diplomatic and economic efforts fail and military action is necessary. Should the international alliance against terrorism then build up the means to destroy the military capability of any country that harbours or supports international terrorism? DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	79	14	5	2
Should Canada participate in such military preparation? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. DNK	81	14	4	1
IF OTHER THAN AGREE TO CANADA'S PARTICIPATING IN MILITARY ALLIANCE IN SECOND TO LAST QUESTION: Suppose terrorists bring about a second or third catastrophe like the World Trade Center bombing. Would you then agree or disagree that the international alliance against terrorism should build up the means to destroy the military capability of any country that harbours or supports international terrorism? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	36	44	12	8
IF OTHER THAN AGREE IN Q11A: Should	34	44	12	10



*Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center
Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll,
September 19, 2001*

Canada oppose any use of military means to combat terrorism under any circumstance? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk				
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Table 6b: Same as Preceding Table Albeit with DNKs excluded

	Agree or Yes	Disagree or No	In be- tween	DNK
The international alliance of countries against terrorism should use diplomacy and economic sanctions against any country that harbours or supports international terrorism. Do you agree or disagree? DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	82	15	3	-
Should Canada participate in such an alliance? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	89	8	3	-
Suppose diplomatic and economic efforts fail and military action is necessary. Should the international alliance against terrorism then build up the means to destroy the military capability of any country that harbours or supports international terrorism? DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	81	15	5	-
Should Canada participate in such military preparation? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. DNK	82	14	4	-
IF OTHER THAN AGREE TO CANADA'S PARTICIPATING IN MILITARY ALLIANCE IN SECOND TO LAST QUESTION: Suppose	39	48	13	-



*Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center
Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll,
September 19, 2001*

terrorists bring about a second or third catastrophe like the World Trade Center bombing. Would you then agree or disagree that the international alliance against terrorism should build up the means to destroy the military capability of any country that harbours or supports international terrorism? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk				
IF OTHER THAN AGREE: Should Canada oppose any use of military means to combat terrorism under any circumstance? PROMPT IF NECESSARY yes or no and DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD in between/it depends vs. dnk	38	49	13	-

Strong Support for Requiring Arab and Muslim Countries to Choose Sides

By a margin of about 2:1, the public wants the international coalition to require Arab and Muslim countries to choose sides on the matter of terrorism, as shown in table 7. Among those with an opinion, 62% want the countries in question to choose sides while 31% would prefer a more temperate strategy involving compromise.

Intriguingly, those Canadians who tend to be less militarily activist or more pacifist are no less likely to embrace a strategy of requiring Arab and Muslim countries to choose sides. For example, francophones tend to be a little less supportive of military spending and military action but are no less supportive of a strategy of demanding that certain countries choose sides. Thus, 63% of francophones with an opinion support this policy compared to 62% of Anglophones. For their part, women are at least as supportive of a tough talk strategy as men. Thus, 65% of females want to require Arab and Muslim countries to choose sides compared to 60% of men.

Table 7: "Which of the following opinions about foreign policy is closer to your own?" [rotate]

	DNKs	DNKs
--	------	------



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

	included	excluded
The international coalition against terrorism should require every Arab and Muslim country to decide which side it's on while there is still time to defeat terrorism...OR	55	62
The international coalition should seek a compromise on terrorism because Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan and some other Muslim or Arab countries are frequent supporters of terrorism	28	31
UNPROMPTED: In between	6	6
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	12	-

Women and Francophones Are a Little Less Likely to Willingly Serve in the Armed Forces

Canadians seem not only resolute in their support of necessary action but also prepared to serve in the Armed Forces. About three-fifths of Canadians say that they would serve if their skills were needed, as shown in table 8. As might be expected, males and Anglophones expressed greater interest in serving than females and francophones. Thus, 68% of Anglophones said that they would probably or definitely serve compared to 41% of francophones. Meanwhile, 71% of males said that they would probably or definitely serve compared to 52% of females.

Table 8: [Global TV] Suppose the military needed people like you and you were in the right age bracket. Would you be willing to serve—definitely, probably, probably not, definitely not. DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD perhaps/it depends vs. DNK. IF RESPONDENTS SAYS HE/SHE IS IN THE RIGHT AGE BRACKET, THEN REPEAT "Would you be willing to serve—definitely, probably, probably not, definitely not."

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

Definitely	28	29
Probably	32	33
UNPROMPTED: Perhaps/It depends	3	3
Probably not	14	14
Definitely not	21	22
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	3	-

Strong Support for Closer Alignment with the United States—More Temperate Support among Francophones and Bloc Voters

By a margin of almost 3:1, Canadians favour closer alignment with the United States in world affairs, as shown in table 9, below. The very small group of NDP voters is divided on the issue but majorities of every other partisan grouping favour closer alignment by a sizeable margin. Alliance voters favour closer U.S. alignment more strongly than others but the margin of difference is not immense. Among Alliance voters, 73% favour closer alignment compared to 69% among PC voters, 62% among Liberals, and 56% among Bloc voters.

Bloc voters, like francophones and Quebecers more generally, are less supportive of a pro-U.S. alignment than other Canadians but the reasons are not entirely clear. Historically, francophones and Quebecers have been positively disposed towards American society and culture as a counterpoint to Great Britain. Their reticence about international alignment with the U.S. may have its roots in a historical pacifism or partly even in a certain empathy with anti-American radicalism. Without further questions, it's not possible to properly account for the greater reservations of Quebecers, francophones, and Bloc voters about alignment with the U.S. In practice, 66% of Anglophones favour closer alignment while 20% favour less alignment. The corresponding figures among francophones are 45% and 31%, respectively.

Table 9: "Generally speaking, do you think that Canada should become a lot less aligned with the United States in world affairs, less aligned, more aligned with the United States, or a lot more aligned?" DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD no change vs. dnk vs. it depends.

	DNKs	DNKs
--	------	------



*Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center
Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll,
September 19, 2001*

	included	excluded
A lot more aligned	16	17
More aligned	44	45
UNPROMPTED: No change	13	13
Less aligned	19	19
A lot less aligned	3	3
UNRPOMPTED: It depends	3	3
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	2	-

Terrorism and the Law—Strong Support for Pre-Emptive Assassination and Capital Punishment for Terrorists

Long imbued with a strong civil liberties tradition and a powerful discomfort with capital punishment, Canadians now embrace by large margins the notion of treating terrorists like enemies and allowing pre-emptive assassination, as shown in table 10. In a similar spirit, four-fifths of Canadians believe that capital punishment should probably or definitely (60%) be treated as an option by courts in terrorist cases, as shown in table 11.

Canadians' attitudes towards these life-and-death matters are not entirely predictable. On the predictable side, francophone tendencies to pacifism are reflected in attitudes towards pre-emptive assassination and capital punishment. Anglophones favour pre-emptive assassination by an overwhelming margin (73% vs. 21% in table 10) while francophones are divided (50% vs. 46%). Anglophones are also more supportive of capital punishment—82% definitely or probably favour it vs. 65% among francophones.

Like francophones, women tend to be less military-oriented or military-minded in their attitudes about actions against terrorism. But, in the legal realm women emerge as just as hawkish as men. Thus, 79% of men believe that capital punishment should definitely or probably be an option compared to 78% of women. Pre-emptive assassination elicits 67% support among men and 70% among women.



Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll, September 19, 2001

Table 10: "Which of the following opinions about terrorists is closer to your own [rotate]"

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Known terrorists should be treated like enemies in war and eliminated whenever there is an opportunity to do so without harming innocent people	66	69
Terrorists should have the same rights to a trial as a normal criminal and should never be assassinated even if this appeared to be the only way to prevent a major tragedy in a particular situation.	25	26
UNPROMPTED: Sometimes/In between/It depends	6	6
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	3	-

Table 11: [Global] "Should capital punishment be considered an option for individuals brought to trial and convicted of terrorism...it should definitely be considered an option, probably, probably not, definitely not?" DON'T PROMPT BUT RECORD it depends/maybe vs. dnk

	DNKs included	DNKs excluded
Definitely	58	60
Probably	18	19
UNPROMPTED: It depends/maybe	2	2
Probably not	6	6



*Canadians' Anti-Terrorist Mindset--Foreign Policy after the World Trade Center
Calamity: A National Post/Global Television/COMPAS Poll,
September 19, 2001*

Definitely not	13	13
UNPROMPTED: DNK/REF	2	-

Methodology

The National Post/COMPAS nation-wide survey of n=500 was fielded September 17-18, 2001. Surveys of this size are deemed accurate to within 4.5 percentage points 19 times out of 20. The principal investigator is COMPAS President Dr. Conrad Winn.

