

Concerns about the Violence of the Iraq War⁺

Roy Carr-Hill

Background

What's it all about?

This war has the potential for generating more complex and multiple divisions than perhaps any other: obviously between Muslims and non-Muslims, between West and East, between poor and rich countries, between Europe and America, and between the countries of Europe; but also because between those who believe that violence and war are acceptable means of resolving international divisions and those who do not. Many commentators have remarked that Blair has managed to reverse the trend towards political apathy, although this itself may have unpredictable consequences. One particular issue of concern is the likely damage to our intercultural relations that, at least relatively to the rest of Europe, have been relatively calm over the last decade.

To understand the likely shifts and divisions of the British population over the (violence) of this war, we have carried out a targeted survey. Before we describe the findings of this survey, we set the scene by documenting where we are moving from the previous situation. Twelve years ago, we carried out a detailed local public opinion survey in Hull on attitudes to the violence of the (first) Gulf War.

Of course, then as now, there had been several national opinion polls asking about approval or otherwise of the involvement of Britain and British troops in the Iraq War, or their attitude to various political aims. However, it was and is now not possible to understand from the responses to such a survey issues that are at the forefront of the debate such as:

- a) how people perceive the morality of going to war and the violence of war when it happens and how they responded to this; or

⁺ Roy Carr-Hill is Professor in Health & Social Statistics at University of York and University of London Institute of Education. This study was funded by *Radical Statistics* and *Science in Society Trust* and was conducted with the support of John Bibby of *Mathemagic* York, Martin Shaw of University of Sussex (School of Social Sciences) and Ludi Simpson of University of Manchester (Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research).

- b) how people are influenced by the assumptions, assertions and images of the war conveyed to them by the media and how they were responding to them; or
- c) their view of the likely consequences of the war in terms of security from terrorism and from further wars. Nor is it possible to understand, apart from age, sex and voting intentions, how far people in different groups of the population respond differently, either to the basic issue of 'approval' of the war, or to these issues of violence, media coverage or the risks of war. We showed, in the previous project that we were able to answer many of those kinds of questions with an achieved random sample of about 500 in Hull (see Shaw and Carr-Hill, 1991).

Findings of the previous survey

The results of that survey generated several significant findings. First this was the only survey at the time to distinguish between those who had at least an indirect personal involvement through the presence of family and friends on the Gulf and those who did not. Indeed, whilst rather obvious, differentiation according to what we might call 'warrior status' (people who have had personal connections to the armed forces) has been surprisingly neglected in defence or war studies. Perhaps, not unsurprisingly, this group had quite distinctive responses. For the vast majority of respondents, however, the Gulf War was a distant event personally as well as geographically, to which they responded on the whole with support, but also in many cases with anxiety.

That study also showed that some of the traditional focuses of identification and authority failed to produce differential responses. For example, Catholics were, at least in our survey, if anything the most pro-war of all religious groups, in striking contrast to the Pope's strong moral stance against that war. There was a better 'fit' twelve years ago between the views of political leaders and followers with, consequently quite strong differentiation between respondents according to political party affiliation. Differences between men and women were also significant. There was strong evidence of the relatively pacifistic tendencies of women's responses when compared to men. Age differences were also significant.

The situation was, of course, different just prior to this war in several respects. First, in terms of approval of a possible (at the time of the survey) war in Iraq. Unlike prior to the Gulf War when Iraq was clearly seen as the aggressor because they had invaded Kuwait, national public opinion polls showed that the probable forthcoming war with Iraq was unpopular and that a large majority of the population were against

pursuing it without the backing of the United Nations - although public opinion changed once fighting started. Second, the international and political context is substantially different. Not only was there much less international consensus providing a backing for the War – and there are still international tensions - we are now much further from the end of the Cold War, the military hegemony of the United States is now even more firmly established, the Israel-Palestine conflict is even sharper, and of course there have been the terrorist attacks of the last few years against Western countries or groups. Third, this is all happening in the context of increasing globalisation, a so-called ‘war’ between Islam and Western civilisations and, at least in England, an increase in political apathy.

Nevertheless, the fact that we carried out that study 12 years ago means that we shall be able to assess how attitudes to violence and war have changed; and we see this as an important component of the project. It is for this reason that we used, to a large extent, similar questions (see Annex I).

Aims, objectives and methods

Purpose

The *overall* purpose of the project was:

to gain a detailed understanding of attitudes towards (the violence of) war, the prosecution of war and the political risks of this war during the current climate of insecurity by carrying out local public opinion surveys before the start of the war, and after it has finished, among both the general population and ethnic sub-groups.

Apart from the clear political aims of the survey to document what has been ignored, it is hoped that this will contribute to the ‘evidence basis’ for designing any intervention aiming at changing attitudes towards war and peace. The design of the sample includes substantial groups who might be most affected by the war (see below).

Target Samples and Approach

Whilst, in the previous project, the study was limited to Hull, the issues involved here mean that it is important to be able to compare the attitudes and views of different ethnic and religious groups and especially those of Muslims. We realise that the division is not as simple as this in that many Iraqis are Christians; indeed some query whether Iraq is really an Arab country. However, this was the only feasible division for a postal survey. To do this, we have carried out the survey in Bradford (to capture the views of Pakistani Muslims and white poor), in Ealing (Indian Hindu and Muslim, both middle and working class) as well as in York (predominantly white middle and working class).

Reported public opinion is these days based principally on telephone surveys. Although national telephone coverage is now c.95%, coverage is much lower among poorer populations including many from ethnic minorities and of course respondents are those more likely to be at home. Ideally we would have carried out an interview survey, but that would have been expensive and time-consuming. We have therefore used the postal survey method based on random samples. In the previous project, we successfully used the electoral register and have repeated this method in the new surveys. Despite some recognised problems with using the register, there were particular advantages for us, both in Bradford and Ealing, in using the electoral register in order to be able to carry out name-based stratification. Whilst this is by no means perfect at differentiating between Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs, it is a reasonably good approximation; and, for simplicity, we have used Muslim/non-Muslim throughout whilst recognising that these are not precise descriptions of the sub-groups. In Bradford and Ealing, the sample was stratified by name 50:50 from the electoral register of 2001. For consistency, we have therefore also used the electoral register in York. A reminder was sent out after three weeks.

Coverage and bias

Every method of social research has its biases. Mail surveys are no exception. One advantage of mail surveys however is that we have a lot of experience in using them, and their biases are fairly well documented. (For example, they typically under-represent disadvantaged groups.)

In addition, mail surveys allow us to estimate the extent of under-representation and bias if we use reminders as, typically, those who respond only after a reminder are more similar to non-respondents than are those who responded to the initial mail-out.

In addition to age and sex, a variety of questions were asked in order to be able to differentiate sub-groups in the population: employment and tenure status; newspaper readership (both national and local); cultural and religious community (essentially Muslim/non-Muslim); and Warrior Status (none/ever served in armed forces/any family member currently involved as military or civilian or respondent employed in defence industry).

Mail-out and returns

We mailed out 1,200 in each of the three locations based on a systematic sample of the electoral register in York and systematic samples of each stratum of Asian/non-Asian names of 600 in Bradford and Ealing. From the total mail out of 3,600, we received 957 replies – a crude response

rate of 27%. Response was much lower from Ealing than from either York or Bradford: another North-South divide?

Given the use of the electoral register, there were bound to be some addressees who had moved. Indeed, we received a large number of returns saying Not Known at this Address but obviously many others addressed to previous occupants will have just been binned. However, a crude estimate based on the fact that the electoral register of 2001 was at least eighteen months out of date and one expects between 10% and 20% mobility per year (nearer the bottom end in cities like Bradford and York; nearer the top end in areas like Ealing), would be that one could reasonably inflate this figure by a quarter to give 34%. For postal surveys with just one reminder that is reasonable.

Analysis

The stratification of the sample meant that, out of the 957, there were 243 with Muslim names and 94 with South Asian names. Because of the stratification, the sample has been reweighted to be roughly representative of the English population. Based on Census counts of 1,009,553 with Muslim names and 679,390n with Hindu or Sikh names out of a total population of 39,237,250, the following weights have been used:

- for Muslims $(1009553/39237250)/(122/478)$.
- for Hindus and Sikhs $(679390/39237250)/(47/478)$
- for everyone else $(37548307/39237250)/(309/478)$.

Overall Results

The politics of war

Similar questions to those in the national opinion polls were asked, in order to confirm that we were dealing with a similar population. Asking the standard question used by several of the pollsters, 39% approved (15% strongly) of British involvement in the war with 48% disapproving (30% strongly). Men were nearly twice as likely to approve as women (51% vs 27%), older people were more likely to approve (45%) compared to younger (32%) and men were three times as likely to *strongly* approve as women in both age categories. Conversely, younger were much more likely to strongly disapprove (51% vs 44%) and women were more likely to disapprove (56% vs 40%) 'Warriors' were twice as likely to strongly approve (21% vs 12%) and much less likely to strongly disapprove (20% vs 34%). Unsurprisingly, Muslims were less enthusiastic with 83% showing strong disapproval.

A very large majority (67%) felt that the 'inspection teams should be given longer to work before military force is used'; with women more likely to agree and older less likely, although the differences were much smaller than for the simpler question on approval or disapproval. Fewer (61%) of 'warriors' agreed; in contrast, the percentage was much higher among Muslims (92%). A similarly very large majority (70%) thought that Britain should not go to war without the UN and there was a clear difference between 78% of the younger age group compared to 53% of older men with older women in between. Nearly all (92%) of the Muslims responded NO to war without a new UN resolution.

Among the 277 (adjusted number) who replied to the question about why they thought we should go to war without a new resolution (even though only 237 gave an affirmative answer to Question 3), 64% gave as the reason 'to prevent Iraq developing WMDs', 48% the simple 'because we have to stand up to dictators', and 44% the rather more parochial response that we have 'to protect ourselves from terrorism'. Sub-groups followed roughly the same pattern.

Unlike many of the national opinion polls, which asked for agreement or disagreement with specified political aims, we asked our respondents to prioritise the war aims if there were to be a war. Asked to choose the two they most agreed with out of eight possible, most chose 'manifest reasons': 43% gave 'to prevent Iraq developing WMDs', 5% 'to destroy Iraq's military machine', 49% 'to overthrow Saddam Hussein', 1% to occupy Iraq. Significant minorities, however, gave 'latent' explanations: 23% 'to uphold international law', 30% 'to achieve a Middle East peace settlement, including the Palestinian question', 23% 'to make the world safe from terrorism', although only 2% 'to secure oil supplies'. Twelve per cent said 'shouldn't be fighting'. The largest difference between men and women was for preventing Iraq developing weapons of mass destruction (48% men, 38% women). Warriors were hardly different from the rest, whilst 32% of Muslim respondents were also keen to overthrow Saddam Hussein, but were more concerned (56% compared to 30% of the remainder) about an overall solution to the Middle East crisis.

At the time of the survey, it still appeared just possible that there might not be a war and we asked what the respondent thought should happen if there were to be no war: 25% opted for 'continue UN inspections', 5% for sanctions, but 44% for a UN tribunal to try Saddam Hussein for crimes against humanity' and 21% for a Conference with the Arab States. Men were split almost equally between the first and the third (31% and 38% respectively), whilst women strongly preferred the tribunal option (49% to 19%); there was no clear pattern by age, nor by 'warrior' status. Although about 20% of Muslim respondents endorsed both the

U.N inspections and tribunal route, 32% opted for the Conference with Arab States.

Two more questions were asked that were designed to fill out the picture of people's attitudes to the politics of this war. Quite large numbers were 'most concerned' that WMDs would be used by terrorists in an attack in Britain either on their own initiative (24%) or in retaliation for an attack on Iraq (39%) and of course this fits with the large proportion of those who agreed with going to war without a new UN resolution who gave this as a justification, and who gave this as one of their two main war aims. The only differences between men and women were that men were more likely to think that Saddam Hussein would use WMDs on his own initiative; and the older thought it more likely that terrorists would use WMDs to attack in Britain in retaliation for an attack on Iraq. Warriors were more likely than non-warriors to believe that terrorists would use WMDs to attack in Britain on their own initiative (30% vs 21%); and Muslim respondents were nearly as much concerned about this with, perhaps surprisingly, little or no additional concern about Saddam Hussein using WMDs to attack neighbouring countries whether on his own initiative or in retaliation to an attack on Iraq.

Although not quite as large as the proportion who thought that the inspection teams should have been given longer to work, considerably more (50%) felt that UN inspections were the 'most effective in containing Iraq's development of WMDs' compared to 32% who opted for a military attack led by USA. Twice as many men opted for the US-led attack (43% compared to 21%) whilst a small minority of women saw sanctions as a possible alternative; and many more (38% vs 24%) of the older age group opted for the 'US-led attack'. The strongest contrast this time was between young women with 61% in favour of continuing UN inspections and 20% for a military attack and older men with far fewer (38%) opting for continuing inspections and far more (53%) for a military attack. There was a similar contrast between non-warriors and warriors (53% vs 41% for continuing UN inspections compared to 28% vs 42% for a US-led attack). Unsurprisingly, there was little enthusiasm amongst Muslims for a US-led attack but 76% opted for continuing inspections and 9% (only just below the rest of the sample) for continuing sanctions.

Table 1: Reasons for going to war and views on Saddam Hussein

	Why Go To War?			Views on Saddam Hussein		
	Prevent WMDs	Overthrow Saddam Hussein	Make world safe from terrorism	A dangerous man	Like Hitler or mad	An oppressive dictator
Women	38	47	26	57	25	70
Men	48	51	20	58	15	74
45 and older	45	51	22	62	21	71
Under 45	41	46	25	53	18	72
Tenants	42	50	28	59	26	62
Owner-occupiers	43	48	23	57	18	75
Military involvers	44	48	33	65	20	74
Non-involvers	42	49	20	55	20	70
<i>Voted Last time:</i>						
Conservative	44	56	21	62	20	69
Labour	42	47	28	53	20	72
Liberal	40	45	18	60	7	85
Others	50	46	20	60	22	65
<i>Vote if tomorrow:</i>						
Conservative	46	47	27	70	26	64
Labour	56	61	22	56	26	72
Liberal	30	42	12	55	5	78
Others	38	45	29	54	15	73
C of E	53	59	25	63	23	74
Other Christian	47	44	28	61	22	67
Muslim	9	33	17	17	25	42
Hindu-Sikh	43	57	42	44	33	33
Other	26	39	18	52	11	76

The personalities

The high degree of personalisation of the conflict is shown by the proportion who gave ‘to overthrow Saddam Hussein’ as one of their priority war aims. Asked the specific question about what they thought of Saddam Hussein over half (58%) thought that he was dangerous, whilst 71% thought that he was a dictator and 14% thought he was like Hitler. In the previous survey, this latter option had been endorsed by 36%.

Personalisation was a highly differentiated option - as in the previous survey. Whilst similar proportions of men and women saw Saddam Hussein as dangerous, or as an oppressive dictator; 62% of older age groups compared to 53% of younger thought he was dangerous. A much

smaller proportion (17%) of Muslims thought Saddam Hussein was dangerous and 42% also thought he was an oppressive dictator.

Table 2: Views on George Bush and Tony Blair

	Making world a safer place		Warmonger		Defending business interests		Blair to Bush	
	Bush	Blair	Bush	Blair	Bush	Blair	Poodle	Restraint
Women	21	44	27	10	22	18	52	29
Men	29	47	15	9	25	15	47	43
Over 45	33	51	17	9	19	11	43	37
Under 45	17	40	26	10	28	22	56	33
Tenants	21	46	27	9	23	20	56	30
Owner-occupiers	27	46	19	10	24	15	46	38
Military involvers	39	58	17	9	20	14	37	47
Non-involvers	21	41	22	9	25	18	53	32
<i>Voted Last Time:</i>								
Conservative	29	38	11	9	22	10	57	31
Labour	24	45	23	9	23	18	48	33
Liberal	17	49	30	10	23	22	35	55
Others	30	54	21	13	24	21	58	32
<i>Intended Vote:</i>								
Conservative	31	38	16	7	14	10	63	26
Labour	42	70	16	0	13	8	27	60
Liberal	12	37	31	15	35	25	49	43
Others	17	34	24	15	28	21	42	25
C of E	31	50	23	6	16	7	43	39
Other Christian	31	51	14	13	24	14	48	36
Muslim	0	0	31	25	39	50	91	9
Hindu-Sikh	25	38	25	13	25	25	50	33
Other	11	37	22	10	36	31	53	34

Bush doesn't have a good press either - with only 25% and 15% saying he was 'trying to make the world a safer place' (Bush, Thursday 27th March, Camp David) and 'defending western values', respectively'. More (21% and 23%) saw him as a warmonger and defending business interests, respectively, and 10% saw him as a megalomaniac. Men were slightly more favourable (51% negative against 45% positive) than women (58% negative compared to 34% positive). Older age groups were nearly twice as likely as the younger to give the favourable view (48% compared to 27%), whilst the younger were much more likely to give a negative view (66% vs 45%). Over half (54%) of warriors gave favourable views compared to 34% of non-warriors and non-warriors were more likely than warriors (11% vs 6%) to see Bush as a megalomaniac. Only 8% of Muslims gave Bush positive ratings.

Blair apparently fares much better, with 46% and 21% saying that he was trying to make the world a safer place and defending Western values. Even so, 10% and 16% saw him as a warmonger and defending business interests, respectively. There were no obvious differences between men and women. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the older age group, compared to 58% of the younger, thought he was trying to make the world a safer place or defending Western values. By contrast, more than twice as many of the younger age group than the older thought he was defending business interests. Nearly three-fifths of the warriors saw Blair as trying to make the world a safer place compared to just over two-fifths of non-warriors; 30% of Muslims saw him as a warmonger (compared to 9% of the remainder) and 51% as defending business interests.

The YouGov poll at a similar time asked voters to rate Bush and Blair on a scale from 1 to 10. There was little difference by age but sharp divisions by voting intention. However, these are not as large as we have shown between, for example, the 40% of Labour and the 6% of Liberals who think Bush is making the world a safer place.

Table 3: YouGov Poll - Ratings of Bush and Blair by voting intention

	Bush	Blair
<i>Average</i>	2.9	4.4
Conservative	3.8	3.6
Labour	2.7	5.2
Liberal Democrat	1.9	3.9

In terms of Blair's relationship to Bush, 50% saw him as Bush's poodle compared to 36% who saw him acting as a restraint on Bush. Men and women had similar views although women were more reluctant to express an opinion; older age groups were kinder than younger ('only' 43% of older age group seeing him as a poodle and 38% as a restraint compared to 56% and 33% among the younger. Sub-groups – especially Muslims – were even more critical (see below).

The YouGov poll asked a similar question. The breakdown by age showed a similar but much less sharp gradient between old and young; the breakdown between political parties is shown in the following table; whilst the pattern is similar, their divisions are less sharp.

Table 4: YouGov Poll - Views on relationship between Bush and Blair by voting intention

	Poodle		Restraint	
	This survey	YouGov	This survey	YouGov
<i>Average</i>		46		38
Conservative	71	57	22	27
Labour	33	37	56	49
Liberal Democrat	71	31	23	36

Asked what should happen to Saddam Hussein, 19% gave what one might call the democratic option that he ‘should be left to Iraqi people to deal with’, whilst 61% said he ‘should be brought to trial for war crimes’. Men were slightly more likely than women to think that he should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with (23% vs 16%) whilst women were slightly more likely than men to think that he should be brought to trial for war crimes (63% vs 59%); older age groups were slightly more likely to think that he should be brought to trial for war crimes (64% to 58%). Warriors were more likely than non-warriors to want him brought to trial for his war crimes (70% vs 58%) but the same proportion (19%) thought that he should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with. Whilst 27% of Muslims agreed that he should be brought to trial for his war crimes (lower than the rest of the sample but still a substantial proportion), 58% thought that he should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with (the ‘democratic option?’).

Role of violence

“ ... we cannot avoid responsibilities for the casualties that would result from the war we chose to fight. Any actions that show less respect for the lives of Iraqi civilians than the US military would show for the lives of Americans would not be ethically defensible.” Peter Singer, Los Angeles Times, 27 March

Despite the best efforts of many campaigning groups, and the evidence of several bloody conflicts over the last decade, there was, as in the previous Gulf War, very little direct intimation of violence in the coverage of the build-up to war. Nevertheless, although over half the respondents said that the minimum violence necessary to win should be used against Iraq (58%), over one third said that the violence of the war against Iraq could not be justified (34%). It is worth remarking that the proportion opting for the nuclear option had dropped from the already quite low figure of 6% twelve years ago to only 3%. Although the differences were not large, older age groups favoured the minimum violence option (59% vs 31%) whilst younger age groups were more likely to say that the violence could not be justified (35% vs 57%); but the group nearest to giving equal proportions was older women (49% for minimum violence, 40% for war cannot be justified). Warriors more likely (71%) to say

minimum violence, less likely (23%) no violence; Muslims were less likely (10%) to say minimum violence, more likely (85%) no violence.

Asked about their recall of the allied air strikes on Iraq during the Gulf War twelve years ago, 40% remembered them as ‘precise air strikes against strategic targets with minimum civilian casualties’, but 35% remembered them as ‘intensive bombing with unacceptable civilian casualties; whilst only 18% recalled ‘sorties by brave allied airmen’. Men were more likely than women to remember them as ‘precise air strikes’ (49% vs 32%) and ‘sorties by brave allied airmen’ (24% vs 11%) *but* only slightly less likely to remember ‘intensive bombing’. The older age group were nearly twice as likely (52% vs 27%) to likely to remember them as ‘precise air strikes’; in particular older men stood out from the rest with 64% remembering them as precise air strikes and only 32% as intensive bombing’. Sixty per cent of warriors remembered them as ‘precise air strikes’ compared to 34% of non-warriors. Over two thirds of Muslims remembered them as ‘intensive bombing’.

Concern for casualties

Twelve years ago there was a marked difference between the high levels of concern for British and US service personnel (82% and 56% respectively) compared to very low levels of concern for Iraqi civilians, let alone for Iraqi soldiers (34% and 22%, respectively). The results are very different in this survey.

Table 5: Level of concern for casualties

	British Service personnel		American Service personnel		Iraqi Service personnel		Iraqi civilians	
	Very	Not	Very	Not	Very	Not	Very	Not
Women	72	3	51	5	33	19	69	2
Men	69	5	50	14	31	39	62	8
Over 45	75	3	53	8	30	30	70	7
Under 45	67	5	51	11	34	28	62	3
Tenants	76	3	50	16	28	35	66	4
Owner-occupiers	70	4	52	7	34	27	67	5
Military involvers	71	2	46	10	30	39	64	8
Non-involvers	71	4	54	10	33	25	67	4
<i>Voted Last Time:</i>								
Conservative	78	3	52	2	22	46	54	10
Labour	76	3	56	12	40	24	69	5
Liberal	59	0	43	6	32	16	84	2
Others	67	7	53	11	32	25	68	0
<i>Intended Vote:</i>								
Conservative	76	4	49	8	21	44	56	9

Labour	74	1	62	8	38	26	61	4
Liberal	65	4	44	11	32	19	76	4
Others	69	6	50	10	35	25	72	4
C of E	79	3	56	7	30	35	69	5
Other Christian	72	1	52	9	32	27	58	3
Muslim	46	18	20	40	50	10	92	0
Hindu-Sikh	63	13	43	14	33	17	63	13
Other	59	6	47	12	37	22	68	7

Whilst the proportions very concerned about loss of life among British and American service personnel have dropped to 71% and 50% respectively, the proportion who are very concerned about loss of life among Iraqi soldiers has risen by nearly half to 32%; similarly, whilst 29% reported being *not* concerned about loss of life among Iraqi soldiers in this survey, this is a substantial drop from the 42% recorded last time and it is noticeable that 10% were also *not* concerned about loss of life among American service personnel (compared to only 4% for British service personnel). In fact, the second highest reported level of being ‘very concerned’ was for Iraqi civilians (66%), whilst only 49% were very concerned with loss of life among Israeli civilians.

The increased level of concern appears to be almost universal. Whilst women always reported higher levels of being very concerned than men, the largest gap of 7% (for Iraqi civilians) was the average gap in the previous survey. Similarly, even where older age groups did report higher levels of being very concerned than younger (in four of the seven comparisons), the largest gap of 8% (again for Iraqi civilians) was only just larger than the average gap in the previous survey (where older age groups always reported higher levels of being very concerned). Even the division between warriors and non-warriors, with the former generally less concerned than the latter, shows only small differences with the largest gap being for the relative lack of concern for American service personnel (45% very concerned compared to 54% of non-warriors). There has therefore been a marked shift against ‘our’ service personnel and towards equal levels of concern for all nationalities across all strata of society.

The views of Muslims contrast interestingly with those of non-Muslims. The reductions to 46% and 17% of being very concerned for loss of life amongst British and American service personnel - and the sharper contrast between the 92% who are very concerned with loss of life among Iraqi civilians and the 27% for loss of life among Israeli civilians - are perhaps to be expected. But the extent to which Muslims are *more* concerned about loss of life amongst Iraqi service personnel than non-Muslims (46% very concerned compared to 32%) is perhaps not as much

as one might have expected. Indeed, Muslims are *equally* concerned about loss of life amongst British and Iraqi service personnel.

Media representations

“It’s all a propaganda show ... As was the case with the first Gulf War, we’ll only learn the truth much later” Friedrich Nowotny, German Journalist.

Nearly all (86%) watched TV news regularly; men a little more than women (90% vs 82%). Most (71%) watched because they wanted to be informed about the prospect of war; but nearly a half (46%) watched because they ‘feel worried by the prospect of war’ and a substantial minority (18%) said they were ‘frightened by the prospect of war’. The main difference between men and women was that women were much more likely to be worried or frightened (82% vs 48%). Older age groups were a little more likely to seek information (72% vs 69%) but there was no difference by age in feeling worried by the prospect of war; however, older women more than twice as likely to be worried or frightened about the prospect of war than older men (94% vs 44%). Warriors were slightly more likely to want to be informed (74%) and slightly less likely either to ‘feel worried by the prospect of war’ (42%) or ‘frightened by the prospect of war’ (12%). Muslims were less concerned about being informed (46%) and more likely to feel worried about the war (64%).

On the whole, the majority thought that the TV news was balanced: 69% saying it was informative, with a fifth (20%) saying that it was not informative enough and only a small proportion saying it was too informative; and 61% saying it was patriotic with the remainder dividing more or less equally between those who thought it was too patriotic and those who thought it was not patriotic enough (18% and 22% respectively). However, although over half (62%) said the TV’s coverage presented a ‘sensible attitude towards war’, nearly a third (30%) said that TV ‘glorifies war too much’. There were few differences between men and women, although men were more likely to think it was not patriotic enough (26% vs 17%); younger age groups were more likely to think it was not informative enough (28% vs 13%) and were more likely to think that TV glorified war (35% vs 26%).. Warriors were more likely to find TV not informative enough (24%), not patriotic enough (29%) and fewer (24%) thought it glorified war but more (14%) thought it was too critical. Muslims were more likely to think that TVs were not informative enough (34%), 42% saying it was too patriotic and 53% saying that it glorified war too much.

Over two thirds (72%) read a national newspaper daily dividing almost equally between tabloids (36%) and broadsheets (29%). Over half (61%)

were satisfied or very satisfied with their newspaper's coverage of the war; most (83%) found them informative, patriotic (73%) and sensible (77%). Note that these were larger approval ratings than with the TV coverage. Men were more likely to read any newspaper (74% vs 70%) and both were equally more likely to read tabloids (men:(38% vs 30%; women 33% vs 26%). Men and women did not differ in their views of whether or not their newspaper was informative, but men thought that it was not patriotic enough (19% vs 8%) and that it was too critical (12% vs 5%) whilst women thought it glorified war too much (16% vs 13%). Warriors were twice as likely (19% vs 10%) to be very satisfied with their newspaper and less likely to think that it glorifies war too much (6% vs 18%). Muslims were less likely to read tabloids (26%), less likely to be satisfied or very satisfied with their newspaper (43%), and thought it not informative enough (32%), too patriotic (37%) and that it glorifies war too much (29%).

Three-fifths (60%) read a local paper regularly: nearly half (45%) thought that their local paper was not informative enough about the war, and the respondents tended to complain (28%) that their local paper was not patriotic enough (whilst the reverse was true for the nationals). Most (73%) thought their paper had a sensible attitude towards war. As with the nationals, men and women did not differ in their views of whether or not their newspaper was informative, but men were twice as likely to think it was too patriotic (15% vs 8%) and women were more likely to think that it glorified war too much (12% vs 9%). The major difference according to age was that younger age groups were much more likely to think that their paper was not informative enough (57% vs 36%). There were only small differences between warriors and non-warriors in their views of their paper, although 14% of warriors compared to 9% of non-warriors thought it glorified war too much. Although there were the same divisions of views about their local paper according to religion as with the nationals the differences were not as large: thus Muslims were only a little more likely to think that their paper was not informative enough (51% vs 45% of non-Muslims), too patriotic (21% vs 11%) and that it glorifies war too much (22% vs 10%).

Impact of war

When asked if they had been affected personally, 51% said that they were 'worried by the violence of the war in general', with only 158 people (9%) saying they felt worried about 'family members or friends who are in the Region' and 38% saying that they hadn't been affected personally by the war. Women were more likely than men to be worried about the violence of war (62% vs 40%), as were the younger compared to the older (52% compared to 49%).

About 26% said that they thought another family member had been adversely affected by the violence of the war. Of those, whilst 50% were adults, 22% were children, teenagers or young people. Typical comments are included in the Annex II: whilst some were current situational concerns, the majority could be grouped into the following categories:

War is wrong

- In general
- This particular war

Concerned about Other People

- Family working in target area
- Soldiers
- Iraq and Muslims in other countries

Political Consequences

- Living in 'dangerous' area
- Possibility of Britain being bombed

Variations between Sub-Group's Attitudes to Violence and War

We noted 12 years ago that this had been one of the first comprehensive surveys in Britain on war and war-related issues, and that it advanced knowledge especially in the way in which we have attempted to discover, portray and explain variations between sub-groups in the population. Despite the elapse of time, we believe that the same holds true today in showing how views have shifted over the intervening 12 years for different sub-groups. Specifically, we shall look at sub-groups differentiated by age and gender, by social status, by 'warrior' status and by religion. There are many other possible axes of differentiation; these will be considered in later publications.

Age and gender

In the reporting of the overall results, we have compared responses by men and women and by younger and older age groups. In this section, as well as summarizing those results, we also look at the breakdown between younger men, younger women, older men and older women to see whether there is any interaction between age and gender and these are reported where appropriate.

Age, gender and other characteristics

First of all, it should be noted that, in contrast to the previous survey, there are some substantial divisions between men and women and between older and younger. By contrast with the survey in Hull 12 years ago, there are now clear differences in levels of owner occupation between younger and older people, reflecting both the different areas sampled and the national changes in the housing market. It is also noticeable that the gap between older men and women is twice the size of the gap between younger men and women. The difference between groups in terms of employment status is also predictable and the gap between the sexes is the same in both age groups. It is perhaps the difference in voting intentions that is the most striking with younger women more likely than younger men intending to vote Labour whilst the reverse is true for older age group.

Table 6: Age, gender, and other characteristics

	Owner occupier	Employed	Voting Intention		
			Conservative	Labour	Liberal Democrat
Men under 45	68	70	21	23	17
Women under 45	65	71	12	32	19
Men 45 and older	82	44	25	32	18
Women 45 and older	75	43	23	19	16
Total	73	56	20	27	17

In terms of religion, there are also substantial differences. Women and older people are more likely to profess Church of England. The four way breakdown shows that older women are twice as likely to Church of England as younger men. Whilst nearly 40% of younger men in our sample are Muslim, when adjusted to the British population, this represents only 3%.

Table 7: Age, gender and religion

	Church of England	Other Christian	Muslim	Hindu-Sikh	Other
Younger men	31	29	5	2	33
Younger women	46	21	4	2	27
Older men	51	24	1	1	23
Older women	59	22	1	2	17
Total	47	24	3	2	25

Age, gender and violence about war

Overall, as in the previous survey, men were more ‘gung-ho’ about the prospect of war (51% compared to 27% approving or strongly approving), as were older people (45% compared to 32%). But, whilst there is very

little difference between young and old women, there is a difference between young and old men that was not apparent before with only 38% of younger men approving or strongly approving of the prospect of war compared to 60% of older men. Correspondingly, the proportions that disapproved or strongly disapproved were 49% of younger men and 34% of older men. There was also a contrast between the 38% of women (with little difference between younger and older) and 34% of younger men compared to 25% of older men who did not believe the violence of the war against Iraq could be justified.

Men were more likely than women to think that Saddam Hussein should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with (23% vs 16%) whilst women were slightly more likely than men to think that he should be brought to trial for war crimes (63% vs 59%); and both these differences were statistically significant. There was not much difference by age although older age groups tended to think that he should be brought to trial for war crimes (64% to 58%). The four-way breakdown identifies older women as having the most distinctive views with 69% saying he should be brought to trial for war crimes and only 15% that he should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with.

Whilst there are some differences by gender in terms of the answers to the question about what they think of Blair and Bush, it is the generation gap that is more pronounced. The largest difference between men and women was that 27% of women thought Bush was a warmonger compared to 15% of men, and men and women were never more than 3% apart in respect of Blair. In contrast, whilst only 17% of the younger age group thought Bush was making the world a safer place compared to 33% of the older group, the proportions were almost reversed (28% and 19%) for the proportions that thought that he was defending business interests. Blair fared no better with 51% of over 45s thinking that Blair was making the world a safer place compared to 41% of under 45s; and twice as many of young as old thinking he was defending business interests. In addition 56% of under 45s thought Blair was Bush's poodle compared to 43% of the over 45s.

Table 8: Concern for side of casualties by age and gender

	Proportion Very Concerned				Total
	Young Men	Young Women	Older Men	Older Women	
British Service Personnel	69	68	71	77	71
Israeli Civilians	44	54	50	48	49
American service personnel	45	51	50	51	52
Iraqi civilians	62	65	66	73	66
Iraqi service personnel	34	35	30	30	32
Civilians of any other nationality	58	61	52	62	58
Service personnel of other nationality	48	51	50	44	48

Women were only slightly more concerned about possible casualties to servicemen of different nationalities, with a maximum gap of 4 percentage points (compared to men) for British servicemen compared to an average gap of 7 percentage points in the previous survey. Older people shared women's extra concern for casualties, for British and American service personnel but not for Iraqi servicemen.

There were not so many differences between men and women in their reaction to TV or their own national newspaper as in the previous survey, although 26% of men compared to 17% of women thought TV was not patriotic enough, and when asked about their own national newspaper 20% of men compared to 8% of women thought it was not patriotic enough. Whilst the only major difference between younger and older in respect of TV was that 28% of the younger age group thought that it was not informative enough compared to 13% of the older age group, the contrasts between generations were sharper with their own national newspaper: thus 18% of younger compared to 9% of older thought that it was not informative enough, 21% vs 6% thought that it was too patriotic and 23% vs 7% thought that it glorified war too much. In some cases the two dimensions reinforced each other: so that 32% of younger men compared to 12% of older men thought that TV was not informative enough, 30% of younger men compared to 15% of younger women thought it was not patriotic enough (and 24% vs 7% for their own newspaper), and younger men were more likely than older men to think that TV and their own national newspaper glorified war (36% vs 23% and 19% vs 9%), with an even stronger contrast between younger and older women in respect of their own national newspaper (27% vs 4%).

Women were more likely to report being worried about the violence of the war in general (62% vs 40%), and, although there was no difference between young and old, the contrast between older women and older men was even sharper (69% vs 33%). Women were more likely (33% vs 21%) and younger respondents more likely (32% vs 22%) to report that someone in their family had been affected by the war, and there was a striking difference between the responses of older women and older men (31% vs 14%), given that the same population of families are the object of the question.

Discussion

The breakdowns by both age and gender show large differences for different sets of questions. The age differences can, in part, be explained by the relative experience of war of the younger and older cohorts, which we have taken to underpin many of the variations in attitudes between subgroups (see below). Thus older men and older women have both

experienced Second World War at least vicariously through their parents tales who are more likely to be concerned about casualties to ‘our boys’ and take a ‘realpolitik’ view that Bush and Blair are trying to make the world a safer place rather than be concerned about more abstract questions such as whether or not TV glorifies war. Younger men and women are less swayed by the last world war and have more diverse cultural perspectives. The breakdown by gender was, relatively, far more significant in the previous survey. There still are sustained differences, which are greater when we move beyond questions of the politics of war to those of responses to violence, but these latter are sometimes eclipsed by the ‘generation gap’: younger generations increasingly skeptical about the intentions of political leaders and the media.

Social status and voting intention

Because of the difficulty in categorising social status, the proxy indicators used here are employment and tenure status. In fact, breakdowns by employment status showed very few differences, so the focus has been on differentiation by tenure status. In this sample, 73% reported owner occupancy, 19% renting (all types) and 19% other; whilst it was sensible to distinguish renting from the council as a separate category 12 years ago in Hull, here we only distinguish between owner-occupiers and everyone else.

Respondents were asked both how they voted last time and how you would vote if there was a General Election tomorrow. The former breakdown shows little of interest, so the focus is on voting intentions and the responses divided as follows: Conservative (20%), Labour (26%), Liberal (18%) Green and Others (6%), Wouldn’t Vote (8%) and don’t know (23%). The strong Liberal showing – even after weighting to recover a representative sample¹ – was stronger than in the national polls at the time and probably reflects the character of the constituencies on which our survey was based, but is mainly due to the prior stratification of our sample. In view of the similarity in the overall level of approval and disapproval of the war that we found to that in the national polls at the time, we have not adjusted our figures to take account of the difference between the parties.

Don’t knows and No responses were excluded from these tables which are therefore based on a breakdown between Conservatives, Labour, Liberal and others.

¹ Indeed, among the Muslims in the sample, the proportions were 14%, 7%, 47% and 3%.

Tenure status and attitudes to violence of the war

On the whole owner-occupiers were more 'considered' than non-owner occupiers: for example, more likely to say that inspections should be given longer to work (69% vs 61%) and answers to questions 2, 3, 5 and 7 were in the same direction although the differences were small. They were also more likely to say that Saddam Hussein should be left to the Iraqi people to deal with (21% vs 15%) and less likely to say that he should be killed (8% vs 13%). But they are also less cynical – or realistic – in being less likely to think that Bush is a warmonger (19% vs 27%) and Blair is defending business interests (15% vs 20%), more likely to think that Bush is trying to make the world a safer place (27% vs 21%), and less likely to think that Blair is Bush's poodle (46% vs 56%).

Although 36% of owner occupiers did not believe that the violence of the war against Iraq could be justified compared to 28% of non-owner occupiers, and the reverse was true for the option that minimum violence necessary should be used, there was no difference between the groups in their recall of the allied air attacks in the Gulf War nor in their concern about casualties.

In contrast with the previous survey, the tenure status variable discriminates this more 'conservative' attitude when asked about the national and local newspapers they read although not to TV. Owner-occupiers were more likely to think that their own national newspaper was not informative enough (15% vs 9%), that both were not patriotic enough (13% vs 19% and 27% vs 33%) and that both had a 'sensible' attitude towards war (83% vs 63% and 76% vs 65%).

Voting intention

The results here were rather surprising. Those intending to vote Labour were most likely to approve or strongly approve of the war (58% compared to 56% of those intending to vote Conservative and 23% of those intending to vote Liberal), reinforced by the sharp contrast between the 88% of intending Liberal voters who think inspection should be given longer to work against 6% thinking that Britain should go to war without a new UN resolution compared to the 51% and 45% of intending Labour voters with intending Conservative voters similar to Labour.. Again, the contrast between the 50% of intending liberal voters who think that achieving a Middle East peace settlement, including the Palestinian question should be a war aim and the 28% of Labour voters is striking.

In terms of views about the leaders, once again the main contrast is between those intending to vote Labour or Liberal: whilst 42% of Labour voters compared to 12% of Liberal voters thought that Bush was trying to make the world a safer place (the figures for Blair were 70% and 37%),

only 13% of Labour voters thought Bush was defending business interests compared to 36% of Liberal voters (the figures for Blair were 8% and 25%). Conservatives were closer to Labour voters in their view as to whether Bush was trying to make the world a safer place (31%), but closer to Liberal voters in their view of Blair (38%); however they were more likely than other groups to think that Bush (21% vs 13%) and Blair (33% vs 19%) were trying to defend Western values. Unsurprisingly, whilst 50% of Liberal and 63% of Conservative voters thought that Blair was Bush's poodle, this was true of 'only' 26% of Labour voters (inverted commas because it is still quite a large fraction of his own party supporters!).

There was the same contrast over their views of the violence of war; whilst 73% of Labour voters thought that minimum violence necessary should be used to win the war, only 16% were categorically opposed to the use of violence, compared to 48% and 50% of Liberal voters respectively. Similarly whilst 51% of Labour but only 25% of Liberal voters remembered the allied air attacks on Iraq during the Gulf War as precise strikes with minimum civilian casualties, only 25% of Labour voters remembered them as intensive bombing with unacceptable casualties compared to 55% of Liberal voters. Again Conservatives were much closer to Labour voters. Curiously enough, Liberal voters did NOT register higher levels of concern for casualties except for Iraqi civilians (see Table above); indeed they recorded lower levels of concern than respondents from the other two parties except for Iraqi service personnel.

Discussion

There were very few differences in terms of tenure status; and those that were observed reflected the relative youth of non-owner-occupiers. The lack of relevance of tenure status in respect of attitudes to war is an illustration of the difficulty of ascribing variations in this area (of defence or military studies) to the usual categories of social differentiation.

The extent to which those intending to vote Labour support the Government line at the time is of course unsurprising in terms of what we know about how people shape their attitudes to fit dominant and strong positions they hold, but their benign memory of the nature of the allied air attacks during the first Gulf War is striking.

The similarity in the views of Conservatives and Labour supporters – except in their views about the leaders - is also striking. About the only distinctively 'conservative' attitude was that they were more likely than everyone else to thin that both Bush and Blair were defending Western values.

There was a strong anti-war sentiment among Liberals that distinguished their responses from everyone else's; and, at least relatively, this includes a lower level of concern for service personnel.

Warrior status and attitudes to war

The rationale for including a breakdown according to the respondent's level of involvement with military issues is simply that we assume people's attitudes are formed by their experience, and that some individuals will have been involved more than others. We have asked respondents a variety of questions designed to elucidate the various ways in which individuals might be involved with military issues. These were 'Have you served in the Armed Forces' (yes = 160 or 17% including reserves and territorials), 'At the present time are you or any member of your immediate family serving in the armed forces or 'employed by a firm that makes defence equipment (yes to either = 97 or 10%), and finally whether any member of their immediate family was serving or a civilian (yes to either = 119 or 12%) in the Middle East. Altogether 255 (or 27%) answered yes to one or more of these questions.

When we carried out a similar survey during the Gulf War about 39% answered yes to one or more of these questions and so we were able to distinguish between those we called historical warriors (17% of the sample) including those who had served during the Second World War or National Service subsequently; those who were current warriors (15% with current family involvement with the armed forces or the defence industry); and those we called 'Gulf Involved' (15%) which included all those with any family involvement with the Gulf at the time and those who claimed to be 'worried about family members or friends in the Gulf. In this survey, we have constructed similar categories with 'Gulf' being replaced by war region; however, the proportion answering yes to one or more of these questions was a third lower at 27% (and the 'current warrior' category only included 10%), whilst the other two categories were 17% and 12% respectively. In general, we have judged this too small to draw conclusions from, so in our main analysis we have collapsed all the categories, although there are occasional commentaries where there are striking differences between historical warriors and current Iraq involved.

Nevertheless, the definitions produced some immediate differences in the composition of the categories: unsurprisingly over 84% of historical warriors were men (and most of those were over 45) but the distribution was more even among the other sub-categories.

Warriors as a whole were more likely to approve or strongly approve of the war than non-warriors (50% vs 35%) - although the contrast was less

clear for current Iraq involvers (42% vs 38%) - and to think that Britain should go to war without a new UN resolution (34% vs 23% with little difference between the sub-categories). Warriors as a whole were also much more positive about Bush and Blair with 39% (58%) thinking that Bush was helping to make the world a safer place compared to 21% (41%) of non-warriors; and this time it is historical warriors who are the least different from the others with the corresponding figures for Bush and Blair being 35% (54%) and 24% (44%). This suggests that serving in a war in the distant past has a very different effect on attitudes compared to being involved with someone serving or working in the war region.

This pattern is confirmed in their attitude to the violence of war. Under a quarter of warriors (23%) thought that the violence of the war could not be justified compared to 37% of the remainder, with little differentiation between the sub-categories; and 60% vs 34% remembered the Gulf War as 'precise strikes against strategic targets' but only 31% vs 37% as 'intensive bombing', with historical warriors the more 'gung-ho' and current Iraq involvers quite close to the remainder. Finally, whilst warriors as a whole were not that different in terms of their concern for casualties among British and American service personnel - although they were less concerned about Iraqi service personnel - historical warriors were much less concerned about casualties to American service personnel (36% compared to 55% of the remainder) and not concerned about casualties to Iraqi service personnel (44% compared to 26%).

Overall, warriors have a pretty uniform attitude towards the tele-media - more likely to say that it is not informative enough, not patriotic enough and too critical of war with a 6 to 10 point percentage distance from non-warriors in each case - but historical warriors are particularly concerned about it not being patriotic enough and being too critical of war with a 18 and 15 point percentage gap respectively, and 33% of Iraq involvers thought that it was not informative enough compared to 19% of everyone else..

Our findings therefore reinforce the observation in the previous study that relationships to war and the military are important to people's attitudes but that these relationships are complex being structured both by actual experience and or closeness to war and also by the way in which these are encapsulated in time.

Religion

In the previous survey, we had asked about religion and did note some differences between those professing Catholicism as compared to those affiliated to Church of England (see Shaw and Carr-Hill, 1991). Specifically, the proportion of Catholics strongly approving of the war was higher than any other group despite the Papal declarations against the war, and they were the least concerned about casualties. In this survey, however, the comparisons were much more important, because of the potential differences between Muslims and non-Muslims and so a specific section is included.

Attitudes to war and to the personalities

The breakdown by religion, besides showing that very few (only 4%) of Muslims approved or strongly approved of the war, also showed how half of Church of England believers did (50%) compared to only 39% overall. Unsurprisingly, 92% of Muslims therefore thought that inspections should have been given longer to work (and again Church of England respondents were at the opposite end of the spectrum with only 58% saying this compared to 66% overall); and whilst the 30% of Muslim respondents that agreed that one of the war aims should include overthrowing Saddam Hussein was lower than the 49% overall (and 58% of C of E), 56% thought that the war aim should include achieving a Middle East settlement compared to 30% of non-Muslims.

In terms of the personalities, only 20% thought Saddam Hussein was a dangerous man compared to 59% of non-Muslims, and although 42% thought that Saddam Hussein was an oppressive dictator, this was still substantially less than the 70% of non-Muslims, 21% thought he was standing up for Arabs compared to 2% of non-Muslims. Whilst less than 1% of Muslims thought Bush was trying to make the world a safer place compared to 26% of non-Muslims (and 31% of Christians), and 29% thought he was a warmonger compared to 21% of non-Muslims, their preferred view (42%) was that he was defending business interests compared to 23% of non-Muslims. There were similar patterns in their views of Blair and 91% of Muslims thought that Blair was Bush's poodle (compared to 48% of non-Muslims and only 43% of C of E).

What should Muslims be concerned about?

Asked about Muslims concerns, Muslim respondents were more concerned about 'attacks by the USA on Iraq because it's a Muslim country' (33% compared to 8% of non-Muslim respondents who answered the question), than 'attacks by the Saddam Hussein regime on ordinary Muslims inside Iraq' (13% compared to 38%), although 43% (19%) said both.

Asked who they thought Muslims should support in the event of Britain participating in a war against Iraq, 4% of Muslims said they thought they should support Britain and the USA compared to 37% of non-Muslim respondents who answered the question, whilst 19% (30%) thought that they should support the Iraqi opposition (trying to overthrow Saddam Hussein); and even though only forty-three (19%) of the Muslim respondents suggested that they should support Islamic militants fighting the West, this was over twice as many as those who said they should support Iraq (Saddam Hussein's government). On the other hand, 44% of Muslim respondents didn't like any of the proffered alternatives.

Muslim concern for casualties

Muslim men and women were less concerned about casualties to British service personnel and a lot less concerned about American service personnel although, in both cases, the gap was narrower with men than with women. Both had a very high (above 90%) level of concern about Iraqi civilians but lower about Israelis.

Table 9: Concern for casualties by religion and gender

	Men			Women		
	All	Muslim	CofE	All	Muslim	CofE
British Service personnel	69	48	75	72	44	80
Israeli civilians	46	21	46	51	35	54
American service personnel	50	16	52	51	23	57
Iraqi civilians	62	91	60	69	92	74
Iraqi service personnel	31	37	26	33	60	32
Civilians of other nationality	54	77	46	62	81	69
Service personnel of other nationality	48	44	47	48	51	56

However, perhaps the most interesting point was that Muslim men had nearly the same low level of concern about casualties among Iraqi service personnel as the remainder of the sample, whilst Muslim women were much more concerned. C of E women are more concerned about casualties than other women except for casualties to Iraqi service personnel.

Discussion

Main findings

There are several important findings:

- Violence is Wrong and this is more marked than 12 years ago
- Labour voters are more pro-war than the 'others';

- Whilst, as before, women are more non-violent than men, that difference is eclipsed by the generation gap (between under and over 45s),
- Involvement with the Military still matters
- There is a Muslim position and, to a much lesser extent, there is also a Church of England position

Violence is Wrong

There has been a marked shift against 'our' service personnel and towards equal levels of concern for all nationalities across all strata of society. When asked similar questions during the Gulf War, more than 70% overall were concerned about loss of life among British service personnel, between 40% and 60% concerned about loss of life amongst US or Saudi service personnel and Israeli or Saudi civilians, only just over 30% concerned about loss of life amongst Iraqi civilians and only just over 20% about loss of life amongst Iraqi service personnel. The figures have changed substantially.

The differences probably reflect the shift in the politics of making war during the 1990s with an increasing revulsion of the use of 'spin' terms such as 'collateral' damage, the mediated horror of civilian massacres in Kosovo and Rwanda, and the institution of the International Criminal Court whose major focus has been on indicting leaders seen to be responsible for those (and other) massacres. Perhaps there is a growing criminalisation of war.

Shifting ideological allegiances of party political groupings

Given that the survey was carried out at the height of the ferment over whether or not to go to war – although, in retrospect, that had clearly been decided several months earlier – it is perhaps not surprising that those who still claim that their intention was to vote Labour also gave allegiance to the official lies. The contrast between those saying that they intended to vote Labour and those that intended to vote Liberal is striking. Although Charles Kennedy did not take advantage of this, it looks as if there would have been an opening for him; or perhaps he was simply waiting for Blair to dig his own grave?

Gender, violence and generation gap

Whilst the main findings of the last survey were the importance of 'warrior status' and the revulsion women had towards violence relative to men, the surprise here was that the difference between men and women had declined because everyone now thought casualties should be avoided; and that sometimes the division in opinions between men and women is overshadowed by the division between older and younger age groups.

Involvement with military

Our findings reinforce the observation in the previous study that relationships to war and the military – including simply working for a firm that makes defence equipment - are important to people’s attitudes. But the strength of attitudes varies according to the salience of the actual questions asked to the specific experiences of each sub-group and/or closeness to a war situation. There were understandable differences between those who have historically been involved in military service, those who are currently involved, and those who have any involvement with the situation in the Region at the time.

Religion

The perception of England as a progressively secular society was challenged by this war against a predominantly Muslim country, linked in government propaganda to fundamentalist religious groups. When it comes to violence, professed religion matters. Although this is most clearly seen in the contrast of Muslims, where their views about the war are very different from ‘mainstream’ and especially from those with any involvement in the War, to a much lesser extent but still systematically, it is also the case that Church of England believers are different from the ‘mainstream’.

Wider implications: the potential for inter-group tensions

“Terrorism is the war of the poor and War is the terrorism of the rich” Sir Peter Ustinov, German TV, Thursday 20 March 2003

In many of the comparisons – and especially those related specifically to the impact of the war on Iraq and Iraqis - there are substantial differences between Muslims and non-Muslims. To explore any divergence was, of course, one of the main objectives of this survey *prior* to the prosecution of war. But there is also an important convergence in terms of being concerned about casualties of all nationalities and in views about media representation of the potential conflict. It should be possible to build upon such a common humanity but the continuing carnage in Iraq (see Gordon, this issue) is likely to exacerbate the inter-cultural tensions within England.

ANNEX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

**The Cathie Marsh Centre for
Census and Survey Research
University of Manchester**

**MatheMagic
York
www.mathemagic.org**

13th February 2003

Dear

Attitudes to War on Iraq

We are sending you this questionnaire as part of a survey to understand attitudes towards (the violence of) the war in Iraq. We would like to know what you think of the prosecution of war and the political risks of this war during the current climate of insecurity.

There have been and there will be several national opinion surveys polls asking about approval or otherwise of the involvement of Britain and British troops in the Iraq War, or the attitude to various political aims. But these polls only ask a small number of questions so that people are not allowed to have their say about many of the important issues such as (a) how people perceive the morality of going to war and the violence of war when it happens and how they respond to this; or (b) how people are influenced by the assumptions, assertions and images of the war they get through the media and how they were responding to them; or (c) their view of the likely consequences of the war in terms of security from terrorism and from further wars. We also feel that it is very important to find out how different communities are reacting to this situation,

Your name has been chosen at random from the electoral register. Your replies will remain confidential. We intend to publicise the results through local and national papers as soon as possible – and hopefully before the war starts. Any results will only be reported in aggregate and there will be no possibility of an individual's responses being identified.

We hope you are interested in the survey and can spare the time to complete the questionnaire. If you have any questions about the survey please ring Roy Carr-Hill on 01904 432 306. In particular, if you have difficulties in replying to the questionnaire in English but would like to make your views known, please ask a friend to help you or – as a last resort - ring up Naseer Baig on 01274 726541.

Roy Carr-Hill and John Bibby and Ludi Simpson
MatheMagic Centre for Census and Survey Research
<http://www.mathemagic.org>
University of Manchester
<http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/staff/ss.htm>

YOUR ATTITUDES TO WAR IN IRAQ

For some of the following questions you should tick one box; for others, when you might agree, at least in part, with several of the proffered alternatives, we are asking you to tick no more than two. Note that the box to tick is always on the right hand side of the statement.

1. What is your attitude to the involvement of British forces in the event that there is a war on Iraq?

Strongly approve ¹ approve ² Neither approve nor disapprove ³ disapprove ⁴ strongly disapprove ⁵ No opinion ⁶

2. Do you think that the inspection teams should be given longer to work, before military force is used?

Yes ¹ no ² don't know ³

3. Do you think Britain should go to war without a new UN resolution?

Yes ¹ no ² don't know ³

If yes, why do you say that? (tick the one or two you most agree with)

- to prevent Iraq developing weapons of mass destruction..... ¹
- to secure oil supplies..... ²
- because we have to stand up to dictators..... ³
- because we support America..... ⁴
- to protect ourselves from terrorism ⁵
- none of these..... ⁶
- don't know..... ⁷

4. If there is a war, what should the war aims be? (tick the two you most agree with)

- to prevent Iraq developing weapons of mass destruction..... ¹
- to destroy Iraq's military machine..... ²
- to overthrow Saddam Hussein..... ³
- to occupy Iraq..... ⁴
- to uphold international law..... ⁵
- to achieve a Middle East peace settlement, including the Palestine question.. ⁶
- to make the world safe from terrorism..... ⁷
- to secure oil supplies..... ⁸
- shouldn't be fighting..... ⁹
- don't know..... ¹⁰

5. What do you think should happen if there is no war?

Continue UN inspections..... ¹ remove all sanctions and inspections of Iraq ²
UN tribunal to try Saddam Hussein for crimes against humanity..... ³
More sanctions... ⁴ Conference with Arab States ⁵ don't know..... ⁶

6. Which of these risks of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) are you most concerned about?

- Saddam Hussein using WMDs against neighbouring countries on his own initiative ¹
- terrorists using WMDs to attack in Britain on their own initiative ²
- Saddam Hussein using WMDs against neighbouring countries in retaliation for a US attack..... ³
- Saddam Hussein using WMDs or other violence against opponents inside Iraq... ⁴
- terrorists using WMDs to attack in Britain in retaliation for an attack on Iraq... ⁵
- No opinion..... ⁶

7. Which of the following do you think will be most effective in containing Iraq's development of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs)?

- continuing UN inspections..... ¹
- continuing UN sanctions..... ²
- a military attack led by the USA..... ³
- No opinion..... ⁴

8. Which of the following do you think Muslims should be most concerned about?

- NOT RELEVANT FOR ME..... ¹
 attacks by the USA on Iraq, because it is a Muslim country..... ²
 attacks by the Saddam Hussein regime on ordinary Muslims inside Iraq ... ³
 both ⁴ neither ⁵

9. Who do you think Muslims in Britain should mainly support in the event of Britain participating a war against Iraq?

- NOT RELEVANT FOR ME..... ¹
 Britain and the USA..... ²
 Iraq (Saddam Hussein's government) ³
 Iraqi opposition (trying to overthrow Saddam Hussein) ⁴
 Islamist militants fighting the West..... ⁵
 None of the above ⁶

10. What do you think of Saddam Hussein? (tick the one or two you most agree with)

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| he is a dangerous man..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ¹ | he is like Hitler..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ² |
| he is standing up for the Arabs..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ³ | he is mad..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ⁴ |
| he is an oppressive dictator..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ⁵ | none of these..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ⁶ |
| don't know..... | <input type="checkbox"/> ⁷ | | |

11. What do you think of the way Bush is behaving in this context?

- He is trying to make the world a safer place... ¹
 He is a Warmonger..... ²
 He is defending Western values..... ³
 He is defending business interests..... ⁴
 He is a Megalomaniac..... ⁵
 No opinion..... ⁶

12. What do you think of the way Blair is behaving in this context? (tick one in each of (a) and (b))

- (a) He is trying to make the world a safer place ¹ He is a Warmonger ²
 He is defending Western values ³ He is defending business interests.. ⁴ No opinion ⁵
- (b) he is Bush's poodle ¹ he is a restraint on Bush ² No opinion ²

13. What should happen to Saddam Hussein? (tick one only)

- should be left in power if Iraq disarms..... ¹
 should be left to Iraqi people to deal with..... ²
 should be allowed to go into exile..... ³
 should be killed..... ⁴
 should be brought to trial for war crimes..... ⁵
 none of these..... ⁶
 don't know..... ⁷

14. Which of these statements comes closest to expressing your view of the role of violence in this war? (tick one only)

- I believe that nuclear weapons should be used against Iraq to win the war..... ¹
 I believe that the minimum violence necessary to win should be used against Iraq ²
 I do not believe that the violence of the war against Iraq can be justified..... ³
 none of these..... ⁴
 don't know..... ⁵

15. Which of these statements best describes how you remember the allied air attacks on Iraq during the Gulf War twelve years ago? (tick the one or two you most agree with)

- sorties by brave allied airman..... ¹
 precise strikes against strategic targets, with minimum civilian casualties ²
 like video or computer games..... ³
 intensive bombing with unacceptable civilian casualties..... ⁴
 none of these..... ⁵

can't remember/too young to remember..... ⁶
 don't know..... ⁷

16. How concerned are you about the possible loss of life among the following groups of people? (tick one box in each row)

	very concerned	concerned	not concerned
British service personnel.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
Israeli civilians.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
American service personnel.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
Iraqi civilians.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
Iraqi service personnel.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
Civilians of any other nationality.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
Service personnel of any other nationality	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹	<input type="checkbox"/> ²	<input type="checkbox"/> ³
No opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/> ¹		

17. Do you watch television news about the prospect of war regularly? Yes ¹ No ²

18. If you watch TV news about the war regularly (at least once most days), which of these reasons would you give for doing so? (tick one or two which most apply to you)

- I want to be informed about the prospect of war..... ¹
- I feel worried by the prospect of war..... ²
- I feel frightened by the prospect of war..... ³
- I find the prospect of war fascinating..... ⁴
- I find the prospect of war exciting..... ⁵
- none of these..... ⁶
- don't know..... ⁷

19. If you don't watch TV news of the war regularly, which of these reasons would you give for not doing so? (tick one or two which most apply to you)

- I haven't got access to a TV..... ¹
- I'm not interested or too busy to watch TV news about the war..... ²
- I find TV coverage about the war boring and repetitive..... ³
- I find better coverage about the war in the press or radio..... ⁴
- I find TV coverage about the war worrying..... ⁵
- I find TV coverage about the war frightening..... ⁶
- none of these..... ⁷
- don't know..... ⁸

20. Which of these statements would you say applies generally to TV's coverage about the prospects for war on Iraq? (tick *only one* in each (a), (b) and (c))

- a) informative ¹ too informative ² not informative enough ³
- b) patriotic ¹ too patriotic ² not patriotic enough ³
- c) glorifies war too much ¹ sensible attitude towards war ² too critical of war ³

21. Do you read one of the following national daily newspapers regularly? Please tick the one you read most often.

- Sun ¹ Star ² Mirror ³ Mail ⁴ Express ⁵
- Telegraph ⁶ Independent ⁷ Times ⁸ Guardian ⁹ Other ¹⁰
- None ¹¹

22. How satisfied are you with its coverage of the build-up to war?

- very satisfied satisfied dissatisfied very dissatisfied don't know

23. Which of these statements would you say applies to your paper's coverage of the build up to War in Iraq? (tick *only one* in each (a), (b) and (c))

- a) informative ¹ too informative ² not informative enough ³
- b) patriotic ¹ too patriotic ² not patriotic enough ³
- c) glorifies war too much ¹ sensible attitude towards war ² too critical of war ³

24. Do you read either of the following local papers regularly. Answer either (a) or (b)

- (a) For those in York Yorkshire Evening Press ¹ Yorkshire Post ² None ³
- (b) For those in Bradford Telegraph and Argus ¹ Yorkshire Post ² None ³
- (c) For those in Ealing Ealing Gazette ¹ Ealing Times ² None ³

25. Which of these statements would you say applies to your local paper's coverage of the build-up to the War in Iraq? (tick only one in each of 9a), (b) and (c))

- a) informative ¹ too informative ² not informative enough ³
- b) patriotic ¹ too patriotic ² not patriotic enough ³
- c) glorifies war too much ¹ sensible attitude towards war ² too critical of war ³

26. Have you been affected personally by the build-up to war in any of the following ways (tick one)

- I feel worried about family members or friends who are in the Region... ¹
- I feel worried by the violence of the war in general..... ²
- I haven't been affected personally by the war..... ³
- don't know..... ⁴

27. Would you say that any other member of your family has been adversely affected by the prospect of violence of the war?

- Yes ¹ No ² don't know ³

(a) *If yes, tick any of the following whom you would say have been affected:*

- Child (14 and under) ¹ Teenagers and young people (15-24) ²
- Adult (25-64).... ³ Older person (65+) ⁴

(b) *If you have ticked any of these, are the people in question:*

- Male ¹ female ² both ³

If yes, could you describe how they have been affected? _____

28. Would you give us the following details of yourself and your family? (This is to enable us to compare the views of men/women, different age groups, supporters of various parties, etc.) Please tick the descriptions, which apply to you.

- (a) Sex: male ¹ female ²
- (b) Age: 15-24 ¹ 25-34...² 35-44 ³ 45-54...⁴ 55-64...⁵ over 65.⁶
- (c) Religion: Church of England ¹ Roman Catholic ² other Christian ³
- Muslim..... ⁴ Jewish..... ⁵ Hindu..... ⁶
- Sikh..... ⁷ other..... ⁸ None..... ⁹

29. Is where you live:

- owned by you..... ¹ rented from the council..... ²
- rented from a housing association..... ³ rented privately..... ⁴
- other..... ⁵

30. Are you currently employed?

- yes ¹ no..... ¹

If yes, please state job title: _____

If no, are you:

- registered unemployed.... ¹ houseperson ¹ student.... ¹ retired..... ¹

31. (a) How did you vote in the last General Election (2001)

- Conservative... ¹ Labour... ² Liberal Democrat... ³ Green ⁴
- other (please specify)..... ⁵ wouldn't vote.....⁶ don't know... ⁷

(b) How would you vote if there was a General Election tomorrow?

Conservative... ¹ Labour... ² Liberal Democrat... ³ Green ⁴
other (please specify)..... ⁵ wouldn't vote.....⁶ don't know... ⁷

32. Have you served in the armed forces?

Second World War... ¹ National Service..... ² Falklands war ³
Gulf War.....⁴ Regular forces in peacetime ⁵ Reserves ⁶
Territorials..... ⁷

33. At the present time, are you, or any other member of your immediate family:

(a) serving in the armed forces..... yes ¹ no ²
(b) employed by a firm which makes any defence equipment..... ¹ ²

34. Has any member of your immediate family gone as part of their military service to the potential war region?

Yes..... ¹ no..... ²

35. Is any member of your immediate family a civilian in the Gulf?

Yes..... ¹ no..... ²

36. Is there any other comment you would like to make about the prospect of war against Iraq?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

We are also interested in finding out whether people's views change if the war starts and as it continues through different stages. If you have no objection to answering a second questionnaire of this kind, please tick.

We shall be publicising the results through the local paper; but if you would like a copy of the full report, please tick here.

Optional Questions

Finally, there are two other questions that we think some people may find difficult or repugnant to answer so we have put them at the end as optional questions. But we would be very interested in your responses to the following questions:

Q37 (a) We know that, in the Gulf War, thousands of Iraqi civilians were killed but only a much smaller number of British and American personnel. Given that there have to be some deaths in any war, how far do you think the American and British forces should be prepared to accept an increase in risk to their own service personnel to save Iraqi civilian lives

Keeping our soldiers safe should always be the first priority, even using methods that mean more civilians die

Since soldiers volunteer to take risks, the protection of innocent civilians should always be the first priority.....

We should try to balance protecting soldiers' lives and the lives of innocent civilians.....

None of the above.....

(b) How many deaths of Iraqi civilians would you be prepared to accept in order to avoid one death of a British or American soldier,

Radical Statistics Issue 84

None One Ten ... One Hundred ...
One Thousand As many as necessary

ONCE AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ANSWER COMPLETION, PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

IN THE FREEPOST ENVELOPE PROVIDED TO

FREEPOST MATHEMAGIC
1 STRAYLANDS GROVE
YORK,
YO31 1EB

Costs of Survey under consideration for funding by the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust

ANNEX II: WORRIES ABOUT BUILD-UP TO WAR

- worried about children, grandchildren and great grandchildren
- members of my family work in London use target area airports etc. not panic just concern.
- like myself they think a war is wrong - people will have to discuss this round a table eventually even if there is a war so why have a war!
- served during previous conflict with the gulf
- worried about British people going to fight and about possibility of Britain being bombed
- worried memories from last world war
- sad, worried as could lose son and/or son-in-law
- concerned about families in Iraq
- attending meetings and demonstrations
- both are worried about the potential of war and are concerned about Bush's motives for war.
- made anxious and blood pressure raised
- holding the same opinions they are as dismayed as I am .
- violence of any kind disturbs my wife so the prospect of civilians hurt, here or in Iraq, upsets her
- they feel let down by Blair and have lost trust in politicians to represent the people.
- concerned about the moral legality of such a conflict, the aftermath.
- concern as to why our supposed democracy is ignoring the manifest concerns and wishes of those it 'represents'
- as a serving member of the armed forces.
- feels they have seen and endured too much war really worried about rest of family
- thought of loss of life generally, petrol price rises, inflation to rise, public cost attacks in Britain by Muslims resident in UK
- very suspicious
- my son may be recalled into armed forces, also other male family members.
- completely opposed and upset
- 2/3 of husband colleges called up for active duty as had previously been in services.
- placed in danger
- they are worried about me as I will inevitably have to fight for the country during the war
- it frightens them and they don't fully understand the reasons
- 16 year old son worries he may have to go to war if it goes on for a lot of years
- by having to go to Iraq
- lower tourism in my country therefore reduced income for my family
- family member (granddaughter) in armed forces - very worrying time
- sent to fight American battle
- cant go on holiday
- daughter and son-in-law very concerned his relatives in the gulf
- nephew in the marines, on the ark royal will be involved
- very upset and worried for other people who are fighting in the war.
- my son is in the British army and been sent over to fight. He's 19.
- worried about our men and civilians being killed
- worried
- my 7 year old son is frightened.
- youngest doesn't understand and pensioners remember 2nd WW and feel its happening again
- depressed, anxious about attacks in the UK, sad for the service families
- they do not want a war and feel sad and concerned.
- worried and scared
- personal experience in 2nd WW has an effect on his views
- feeling frightened/powerless
- really worried, campaigning to stop it, feeling frustrated
- live in Muslim community, if war starts will be murder living here!
- grandson is in the army
- because we will be dealing with fanatics. God help everybody.
- he is a serving soldier currently in Iraq
- my 13 year old son is very worried and doesn't understand.

- causing distress
- stunned into daily prayers to stop the war
- stressed
- fellow Muslim brothers and sisters to die for in a war.
- frightened
- always watching news and talking about the war and how they are both against Bush and Blair.
- worried about the war
- very frightened especially my 70 year old mother
- no matter what the Iraqis do to try and avoid war, the US will attack. The US is after something i.e. oil
- worried and opposed to any war against Iraq
- worried about the prospect of war, concerned about the innocent Iraqi will be killed as a result of this unjust war against Iraq.
- confused and worried, about why. Scared it'll be like WW1 and WW2
- frightened
- violence is not the answer to anything! And questions have been raised whether war is against terrorism or Muslims
- Increase in Islamophobia. Muslims could be attacked, Muslims will be considered terrorist.
- members of armed forces.
- these are our Muslim brothers and sisters who will die unjustifiably for greeders.
- worried by the violence of war
- too hard to describe
- they don't believe the violence of war against Iraq is justified.
- they feels what's happened after the war . What's happened to the Muslims who lived in western countries.
- fear of war and consequences thereafter for both, Muslims and westerners
- less trust in politicians, worries about people dying unnecessarily
- thinks America and Britain are going to turn to other countries once they've washed their hands with Iraq like they did with Afganistan
- scared, angry at their own British government, feel as though our voice does not count
- effected due to the fact innocent Muslims are going to be killed
- they now watch the news everyday and read the daily paper to see what is going to happen.
- traumatised / loss of sleep
- worried
- frightened and worried about terrorist attacks on Britain.
- anything can happen anywhere, there is no security of both of them
- financial instability; travel restrictions; tense inter communal relations etc
- worried about what it will do for the future
- they think thousand of thousand child like them will kill for nothing
- concerned about the violence of the war
- watching the killing and bloodshed on TV is a nightmare for them
- all my family and extended family live in Baghdad and fear Saddams attack and use of chemical weapons on them.
- they live in the region of Baghdad and are living in constant fear and terror from every direction (own government and the US/UK)
- it scares my son and makes him feel hatred for Bush and Blair
- killed by the regime in Baghdad after 91 War
- feel worried about the violence of the war in general and the knock on effects on the rest of the world
- by the murdering and killing of the innocents by Hitec cluster and carpet bombing
- that thousands of innocent civilians may get killed for no fault of theirs
- fear of women, children, civilian will be killed, lot of dislocation, after war affects is greater
- brother lives in Jordan. May have to leave if situation becomes extreme
- generally worried, and angry against the Bush and Blair governments
- daughter with young children to worry about
- my parents are very concerned about the violence of the war and the repercussions