Personal Security vs. Civil Liberties after 9/11: Some Sobering Evidence from Sober Second Thoughts

Darren W. Davis
davisda@msu.edu

and

Brian D. Silver
bsilver@msu.edu

Department of Political Science
Michigan State University
303 South Kedzie Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1032

June 30, 2003

Acknowledgments: A previous version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association in April 2003. The research on which this study is based was supported by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Russell Sage Foundation, as well as by funds from the College of Social Science at Michigan State University. The Civil Liberties Survey was conducted by the Office for Survey Research of the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at MSU. We appreciate the expert work of Karen Clark, Larry Hembroff, and Katherine Cusick on the survey. None of these organizations or individuals is responsible for our analyses or interpretations.
Public opinion surveys following the terrorist attacks on America revealed that the citizens’ perceptions of democratic norms and civil liberties were affected in important ways. Exposed to a high level of threat and vulnerability to future terrorist attacks as well as to governmental efforts to provide safety and security, citizens became more willing to accept restrictions on civil liberties for greater personal security. Relying on a series of survey experiments embedded in a national survey, this paper explores the extent to which greater deliberation over rights leads to greater support for democratic norms. We argue that under high levels of threat, such as that experienced in the context of 9/11, citizens may find it particularly difficult to shut off their sense of threat and anxiety. Deliberating on their sense of threat and anxiety leads to greater willingness to restrict civil liberties, even in the face of attempts to moderate them. Our results show that people find it easier to accept restrictions on civil liberties than to support civil liberties. Equally important, among whites and Hispanics, when their initial willingness to concede civil liberties is challenged by counter-arguments, people accept more extreme concessions of civil liberties for security. Among African Americans, however, threat and greater deliberation lead to greater support for civil liberties.
Personal Security vs. Civil Liberties After 9/11:
Some Sobering Evidence from Sober Second Thoughts

The American way of life has been said to be changed fundamentally by the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Previously enjoyed freedoms, security, and isolation from international events and enemies, usually taken for granted, were challenged by a heightened sense of threat and vulnerability from the terrorist attacks and from the government’s efforts to provide greater safety and security to its citizens. American citizens were observed to have a change of heart and a renewed faith in religion, government, and each other, at least in the short run.¹

Research based on national surveys conducted shortly after the 9/11 attacks suggests that citizens’ commitment to civil liberties and democratic values was affected in important ways by the terrorist attacks. Citizens were not willing to make a wholesale concession of rights to the government but instead supported the preservation of civil liberties on balance. But many of those who felt threatened by the vulnerability of the country as a whole, even if they were previously inclined to be protective of civil liberties because they held liberal political beliefs or did not trust the government, would trade off some civil liberties for the sake of greater personal security.

While understanding individual reactions to the terrorist attacks and what the context reveals about the conditional support for civil liberties are important, it is equally important to consider the extent to which a reasoned and deliberative thought process underlies the choice between civil liberties and personal security. Civil liberties decisions normally reflect an affective and emotional reaction to a threatening situation (Gibson 1998; Kuklinski et al. 1991; Marcus et al. 1995). But the context of the threat of terrorism, and the framing of the issues by the government and the mass media, raise

¹ The Boston Globe (November 18, 2000) reported that in the three-week period following the terrorist attacks Americans contributed more than $757 million to charitable organizations. Also see Putnam (2002).
important questions about the validity of survey responses. The context of the terrorist attacks produced pressures that could invite citizens to endorse positions they might not support if they thought through the consequences of their positions.

For instance, a surge in patriotism may pressure people to accept authoritarian solutions and to restrict civil liberties (Adorno et al. 1950, Gomberg 2002). Because of a spike in trust in government, as part of a rally effect for the president (Hetherington and Nelson 2003), people may grant the government license to implement policies to combat terrorism that conflict with civil liberties (Hetherington 1998). Threat and a sense of vulnerability may also sharpen attention to new information and release people from ideological predispositions (Marcus and MacKuen 1993, 2001; Marcus et al. 2000). This could lead to more transitory and persuasible opinions.

This paper examines whether greater deliberation or a cognitive assessment of the trade-offs between civil liberties and personal security leads to different responses, by examining the results of experiments in question wording included in a national survey conducted shortly after 9/11. Specifically, the interviewers challenge the initial answers through counter-arguments and invite respondents to change their opinion. We explore several important civil liberties issues: the indefinite detention of non-citizens, making it a crime to belong to terrorist organizations, and racial profiling.

It is understandable that a heightened sense of threat, patriotism, trust in government, rallying around the president, and individual political predispositions should influence people’s willingness to trade off civil liberties for greater personal security. But the extent to which a “sober second thought” compels citizens to reconsider their initial opinions has tremendous implications for the enduring effects of the terrorist attacks on America. For instance, if the trade-offs between civil liberties and personal security are based on emotion, then civil liberties choices may only be temporary and reflect a momentary emotional reaction that can be expected to subside with a diminishing threat. If civil
liberties responses are deliberative and defended, however, then the newly formed attitudes may reflect a real change in attitudes and have more profound implications for democracy.

It turns out that a majority of respondents do, in fact, alter their civil liberties decisions after greater deliberation. In response to counter-arguments highlighting the implications of their beliefs, citizens find it easier to abandon pro-civil liberties attitudes than pro-security attitudes. Though expected to moderate initial attitudes in the face of counter-arguments, most respondents become more willing to concede their rights for greater security. This suggests that the terrorist attacks may have induced a new way of thinking among American citizens.

**The Basis of Civil Liberties Attitudes**

Understanding the malleability of civil liberties decisions begins with a realization that restrictions on civil liberties attitudes may be an affective response to a threatening situation. According to Gibson (1998) and Kuklinski *et al.* (1991), civil liberties responses reflect the most readily accessible and affective dimension of people’s attitudes, which may reflect an incomplete processing of information. Citizens aroused by a sense of threat may not fully process all information and by relying on their most accessible and affective attitudes they may stop short of considering the full implications of their beliefs. While people fixate on their immediate concerns and on relieving their anxiety, other evaluative dimensions, such as beliefs about democratic norms, remain dormant unless activated through further deliberation over rights. As a result, in their immediate responses people may endorse restrictions on civil liberties because of the greater accessibility of affective information than cognitive and because people tend to weigh the potential negative consequences more heavily than the positive.²

---

² It is possible that even after a consideration of the implications and consequences, people may not find them particularly objectionable or worse than the alternative. Citizens who are initially supportive of civil liberties may have already fully processed the relevant information and considered the ramifications of governmental efforts to protect citizens from the threat of terrorism.
However, according to this logic, a different civil liberties decision, usually more supportive of civil liberties and tolerance, is likely to result if people make a more deliberative assessment of their civil liberties and personal security concerns. Peffley, Knigge, and Hurwitz (2001) support the contention that greater deliberation, through a consideration of competing values, leads to a greater acceptance and extension of civil liberties.

This framework is consistent with the work of Marcus et al. (1995), which shows that people who are told to pay attention to their feelings are significantly less tolerant than those who are told to pay attention to their thoughts. According to Marcus et al. (1995), greater reasoning about the implications of civil liberties attitudes leads people to reconsider their automatic response, which is natural intolerance towards ideas they find objectionable. When asked to attend to their feelings, people may focus on their immediate needs for security against threat and therefore react with intolerance. When asked to attend to their thoughts, they may focus on the benefits of tolerance, thereby superseding their natural instinct to be intolerant (p. 82). Marcus et al. (1995) also show that individuals who are less committed to democratic principles are more open to persuasive messages than those who are more committed.

Presumably, when asked through counter-arguments to initial survey responses to deliberate further on the implications of their initial responses, people’s thoughts are more likely to come into play than their feelings. However, whether such further deliberation will lead to more reflection upon the implications of the initial positions, or instead to a reinforcement of a more emotion-based position, is an open question, and so, too, is the expectation that further deliberation will tend to induce people toward greater support for civil liberties. While greater deliberation may be expected to translate into support for civil liberties in low-threat situations, this may not be a realistic expectation in high-threat situations such as the situation in America after 9/11. That is, given the intense and emotional reactions to the threat of terrorism, and that initial civil liberties attitudes are driven by affective considerations,
receiving citizens to deactivate their sense of threat and fear may be an insurmountable task (LeDoux 1996). Because it is difficult to shut down a sense of threat, counter-arguments may lead respondents to dwell more on their insecurity.

If attempts at deliberation invite citizens to focus further on their sense of threat and fear, concerns for personal security can be expected to outweigh support for civil liberties. Kuklinski et al. (1991, 22) assert that “reason need not always yield a more tolerant, just, or fair society.” When asked to concentrate on the consequences of their civil liberties decisions, respondents consistently express less support for civil liberties. Exploring the qualitative statements of their survey respondents, Kuklinski et al. attribute the results to the notion that when people think about the consequences, even with respect to general principles, they typically dwell on the negative consequences, which reduces their enthusiasm for the expansion of civil liberties. Gibson (1998) also shows greater success in creating intolerance among those who initially support civil liberties than in creating tolerance among those who are initially intolerant. Because of a negativity bias and an incomplete processing of information, it is easier to convert tolerance to intolerance than it is to convert intolerance to tolerance.

Thus, the previous literature would seem to support contradictory outcomes of further deliberation. We argue that especially in the context of 9/11, greater deliberation is likely to lead to greater intolerance, and less support for civil liberties. In contrast to previous experimental research in which threat perceptions are generally low or are only hypothetical, the 9/11 attacks were real and caused widespread fear and concern among Americans. For this reason, in the aftermath of 9/11 we do not expect greater deliberation over whether to support civil liberties or greater security to lead automatically to greater support for civil liberties. Rather, the graphic images of airplanes crashing into buildings left an indelible imprint on peoples’ minds that, at least during the time of our survey two months later, was difficult to forget. Threat and fear among American citizens were not experienced only vicariously or at a great distance; rather the attacks occurred on American soil and thousands of
innocent citizens were killed. Subsequent anthrax deaths in Fall 2001 created widespread concern about bioterrorism and risks associated with such normally mundane activities as opening the daily mail. Hence, unlike most other war-type situations Americans have faced, the context created a greater opportunity for threat to be personalized.

**The Meaning of Response Inconsistencies in Survey Experiments**

Our primary interest is in the direction of change in responses to civil liberties questions in survey experiments when respondents are presented with information challenging their stated beliefs. We do not measure the underlying emotional or cognitive processes, but rather the outcome of further deliberation: whether further deliberation leads people toward greater or lesser support for civil liberties.

Measuring change in survey responses is neither straightforward nor simple. Converse (1970) proposed that respondents who change their position over time hold no true convictions, but instead express random responses or non-attitudes. Based on the assumption that the length of time between surveys is irrelevant for assessing the extent of consistency, respondents are charged with having no real preferences if they offer different opinions on an issue in successive surveys.

Similarly, Zaller (1992) suggests that inconsistencies result from differences in the accessibility and saliency of information at the moment of the survey, which may be influenced by the survey itself. According to Zaller and Feldman (1992: 610), “individuals typically do not develop ‘true attitudes’ of the type that opinion analysts routinely assume, but possess a series of autonomous and often inconsistent reactions to the questions asked by pollsters.” People possess multiple and often conflicting opinions, and any change may be a function of a combination of chance and the accessibility of beliefs at the moment of the survey. Achen’s (1975) and Erikson’s (1979) measurement error interpretation shifts the blame for response instability from respondents to the survey questions. Simple
survey questions may not sufficiently capture complex attitudes. Alvarez and Brehm (2002) suggest that the “nonattitudes” and “sampling” perspectives may be somewhat overstated as individuals are capable of rendering reliable opinions based on predispositions.

Although extant explanations for discrepancies in responses remain important, inconsistencies in survey responses in which attitude change occurs over a matter seconds (as opposed to months in the early response effects literature, or years in Converse’s analyses) may be more meaningful. We base this on the idea that people strive for consistency in the context of a single conversation or interview, and hence to the extent there is a bias in asking people the same or similar questions in the same interview, the direction of the bias is likely to be against change. Because respondents are likely to be aware of potential discrepancies in their responses when they occur over a matter of seconds, they are likely to understand when their responses conflict. Even if respondents’ opinions are uninformed or their answers come off the top of their heads without much thought, there would also be a strain toward consistency.

However, the argument that all “change” in survey experiments is meaningful can only be taken so far. Because the normal approach in experimental designs in surveys involves a presentation of new information to respondents, there is usually no way of knowing how respondents would have answered if they had been asked the same question with full information initially. In this situation, response change in reaction to new information or a counter-argument may not deserve to be treated as persuasion. In our approach, we do not claim that the respondents are being persuaded by new information, as this would entail a more sophisticated measurement strategy; rather we use the approach of presenting additional information and counter-arguments in order to examine the extent to which individuals defend their initial positions. That is, we ask how stable responses to civil liberties vs. personal security choices are when respondents are presented with information that challenges their initially stated beliefs.
Data and Research Design

The “Civil Liberties Survey” data come from a national random digit-dialing telephone survey of persons 18 years of age and older. The average interview lasted 26 minutes. The survey was conducted between November 14, 2001 and January 15, 2002. With an over-sample of African Americans and Hispanics, the survey interviewed 1,448 respondents. The completion rate (RR4) was 52.3 percent; the refusal rate (REF3), 19.0 percent. The survey data are weighted to be representative of the adult population of the United States.

Many of the survey questions reflect the salient issues in the government’s efforts against terrorism during the first two months after the September 11 attack. Because of the timing of the survey and to capitalize on the recency of the attacks and fear, the survey could not ask questions about other civil liberties issues that would later become important, such as military tribunals, the rights of foreign prisoners (e.g., under the Geneva Convention), and the rights of American citizens accused of fighting for the enemy.

Our approach to measuring response instability involves the use of counter-arguments to assess the extent to which respondents modify their initial civil liberties responses. A potential weakness to counter-argument experiments is the difficulty in determining whether people on one side of the issues changed because their positions are more pliable or because they were confronted with stronger counter-arguments. It is partly for this reason that this analysis relies on several experiments rather than just one.

---

3 The survey was conducted by the Office for Survey Research of the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at Michigan State University. Technical details are described in Hembroff (2002).

All survey respondents were asked initially whether they support certain aspects of civil liberties over personal security. Respondents were asked in separate questions (1) whether it should be a crime to belong to or contribute money to any organization that supports terrorism, (2) should the government be able to arrest and detain a non-citizen indefinitely if suspected of belonging to a terrorist organization, and (3) should law enforcement be able to detain people of certain racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Although understanding whether or not respondents changed their answers is interesting, we are mainly concerned here with the direction of change after counter-arguments. A challenge to responses in the form of counter-arguments can either make people defensive and push them further to the extreme, lead them to a more moderate position, or result in no change at all. The counter-arguments were framed to show respondents the implications of their beliefs about the trade-off between civil liberties and personal security.

If respondents initially selected personal security over supporting civil liberties on detaining non-citizens, they were presented with the justification: “Suppose, in doing this, people would be judged guilty by association rather than by a crime they may have personally committed.” Those who accepted civil liberties over personal security were presented with a counter-argument: “Suppose people who contribute to these organizations actually are supporting the activities and goals of terrorist organizations.”

Respondents who initially supported personal security over civil liberties by agreeing that the government should be able to arrest and detain non-citizens indefinitely were presented with a counter-argument reminding them of the civil liberties position: “Suppose this means that many innocent people could be locked up for a long time without ever being charged with a crime.” A response initially supportive of civil liberties was challenged by the justification: “Suppose there were strong suspicions that these people are terrorists and detaining them would prevent them from committing other crimes.”

Respondents initially supporting personal security over civil liberties by accepting racial profiling were presented with the question: “Suppose this means racial profiling leads to unequal treatment of
We used an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) model to investigate the initial structure and loadings of the eight value trade-off questions. Based on these results, the value trade-off approach appears to do quite well in producing a one dimensional structure of support for civil liberties. With an eigenvalue of 1.97 and 33 percent explained variance, all of the items load higher than .46 on the first factor and there is no distinguishable pattern in the loadings on the other factors. The three civil liberties questions that our experiments are attached to loaded relatively high on the first factor; crime to belong to terrorist organization (.49), detain non-citizens (.56), and racial profiling (.43).

Respondents who were initially undecided were randomly assigned to a counter-argument for or against the civil liberties position. Respondents who were coded as “Don’t Know” in response to a counter-argument were counted as saying “it makes no difference.”

Figure 1 shows the distribution of responses to a battery of civil liberties questions in which our survey experiments were embedded. Each question captures a different aspect of the conflict between civil liberties and personal security, though all of the questions seem to tap a common underlying dimension. The distributions of answers to all of the questions about specific civil-liberties trade-offs depart from the answers to the general question concerning the willingness to give up some civil liberties, in which a slight majority (54.6 percent) favors protecting civil liberties. Here we are concerned mostly with the variability in the willingness to trade-off civil liberties for personal security on the three questions used in the experiments analyzed in our present study.

Our three embedded experiments span the spectrum of pro-security/pro-civil liberties support found in the answers to this series of questions. When asked about the racial profiling of people based on their race and ethnicity, 82.0 percent prefer the protection of civil liberties. However, only 53.3 percent prefer protecting civil liberties to supporting indefinite detentions of non-citizens for greater personal security, and only 28.8 percent prefer protecting civil liberties to considering it a crime to

---

We used an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) model to investigate the initial structure and loadings of the eight value trade-off questions. Based on these results, the value trade-off approach appears to do quite well in producing a one dimensional structure of support for civil liberties. With an eigenvalue of 1.97 and 33 percent explained variance, all of the items load higher than .46 on the first factor and there is no distinguishable pattern in the loadings on the other factors. The three civil liberties questions that our experiments are attached to loaded relatively high on the first factor; crime to belong to terrorist organization (.49), detain non-citizens (.56), and racial profiling (.43).
belong to a terrorist organization. Because a different process seems to underlie the initial attitudes in our experiments, we expect their attached experiments to be driven by different processes and explanations. However, the extent to which effects are consistent across the experiments will reveal an important influence of the context of the terrorist attack.

**The Un-Doing of Civil Liberties and Personal Security**

In addition to a sense of vulnerability that citizens felt after the terrorist 9/11 attacks, there is reason to expect the possible undoing of initial after counter-arguments to be related to respondent characteristics, including psychological, attitudinal, and sociodemographic characteristics. We develop a model to assess the willingness to alter their civil liberties responses.

**Threat.** To reflect how fear is manifested in the context of the terrorist attacks, we rely on two classes of measures: sociotropic fear and personal fear. Whereas *sociotropic fear* is a generalized anxiety and sense of threat to society, the country as a whole, or the region where one lives, *personal fear* is a sense of threat to oneself or one’s family.

After the terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center, more terrorist threats against the country were expected and the country was on continuous alert. The Civil Liberties Survey asked about concern that the country might experience another terrorist attack, that the area in which people lived might suffer from a terrorist attack, and that someone in their family might become a victim of a bioterrorist attack. To capture the internalized sense of fear, the survey asked about people’s own concern about flying in an airplane, opening the mail, the safety of food and drinking water, going into tall buildings, and being in large crowds or stadiums.

An exploratory factor analysis revealed that the personal fear questions represented a coherent dimension as the first factor. Though distinct from the personal fear dimension, the sociotropic fear

---

8 We deliberately chose the word “concern” because of our own concern that some respondents, especially males, might be reluctant to admit to “fear” or “anxiety.”
items did not form a coherent second dimension. “Concern about the country experiencing another attack” (SEC4) loaded highly on the second factor, with the remaining two items loading lower (but still captured by the second dimension). As a result, we decided to use the single item that loaded most highly on this second dimension—“concern that the country will experience another attack” (SEC4)—as our indicator of sociotropic threat. To indicate personal threat, at first we calculated the mean of the responses to the five personal fear items (F1, F2, F3, F4, and F6). This mean score correlates .99 with a factor score based on the same items. However, upon reflection, because the different types of personal fear were likely to affect people differentially in part because of where they lived in the country, and because the “mean” score tends to dampen the measured effects of personal fear by averaging across all items, we chose to use an indicator of “highest fear.” That is, respondents who stated that they were “very concerned” about any of the five personal threats were coded 4; those whose most intense expression of fear was that they were “somewhat concerned,” were coded 3; those whose most intense expression was that they were “not very concerned” were coded 2; and the remaining respondents were coded 1.

Scores on both the sociotropic fear and personal fear indicators range from 1 (lowest fear) to 4 (highest fear). The sociotropic and personal fear scales are correlated with one another (at r=.44), but are expected to capture the effects of distinct aspects of the fear of terrorism on support for civil liberties.

In the Civil Liberties Survey, 33.3 percent of the respondents indicated that they were “very concerned” that another terrorist attack might occur in the next few months, and 50.6 percent were “somewhat concerned.” This is consistent with evidence from other national surveys of sustained concern by Americans that another terrorist attack might occur during Fall 2001 and Winter 2002. The mean of 3.1 (s.d. .77) on a 4-point scale reflects widespread sociotropic fear.
In addition to its breadth, sociotropic fear is notable for its lack of relationship to broad demographic differences in the population. Race and gender differences are negligible, and differences by levels of education show no clear pattern. Only the young – those age 18-24 – stand out. Although a majority (70 percent) of this cohort has “some concern” or is “very concerned” about another terrorist attack, the percentage “very concerned” (16 percent) is substantially less than that reported by any other cohort and less than half the percentage for the respondents as a whole (32 percent).

We find lower overall levels of personal fear than sociotropic fear. We also find more individual variation in the levels of personal fear than of sociotropic fear. The coefficient of variation at the individual level is .25 for sociotropic fear and .35 for personal fear. In addition, in our initial review we find clear differences in levels of personal fear by race and ethnicity, as well as by gender. African Americans, Latinos, and women express greater personal fear than whites and men. Persons with the lowest levels of education express greater personal fear than persons with the highest levels.

**Trust in Government.** Support for civil liberties is connected to a larger set of beliefs about democratic institutions and processes. If the willingness to exchange civil liberties for security translates into a concession of power to government, then trust and confidence in government should take on great importance. Trust in government may be thought of as a resource upon which government can draw when it needs latitude from its citizens in tolerating restrictions on their civil liberties (Hetherington 1998, Weatherford 1987). Hetherington (1998) shows that rather than just revealing dissatisfaction, low levels of trust make it more difficult for the government to succeed.

With respect to the relationship between trust and the willingness to alter civil liberties responses as a result of counter-arguments, people more trustful of government can be expected to alter their responses in the direction of greater concessions to civil liberties. People who are less trustful of government have greater concern about empowering government in the fight against terrorism because presumably government has the potential to abuse its power.
A single indicator is used to measure trust in government. This measure has been widely used in the research literature: “How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right? Would you say just about always, most of the time, only some of the time, or none of the time?” Using a four-point scale, in which “always” is scored as 4 and “none of the time” is scored as a 1, we find an overall mean of 2.5 (s.d. .71).

**Interpersonal Trust.** High levels of interpersonal trust (sometimes referred to as “social trust”) are seen as important indicators of social capital and mark the ability of citizens to work in concert to influence what the government does. Furthermore, if people trust other people, they may feel that it is less necessary to grant the government additional powers to control misbehavior. If they trust their neighbors or other members of their communities, they may also have a stronger sense of personal security and be less fearful of terrorists in their midst.

Thus, we expect to find people who have higher levels of interpersonal trust to be less willing to concede civil liberties to the government to counter the terrorist threat. In this sense, higher interpersonal trust might partly compensate for the effect of higher trust in government. As a counter-hypothesis, however, we might expect the level of interpersonal trust to be positively correlated with a willingness to concede civil liberties to the government, because more trusting individuals may tend to grant greater trust to the authorities as well, and to be less concerned that intrusive government surveillance will be misused against them. To measure interpersonal trust, we use two of the original items from Rosenberg’s (1956) faith-in-people scale (see Appendix). Respondents who volunteer that “neither” position is close to their own are coded in a middle position. We use the mean score of the responses to the two items. Scores range from 3 (highest) to 1 (lowest).

**Liberalism-Conservatism.** Political ideology seems capable of playing a critical role in the undoing of initial civil liberties responses. Previous research shows strong ideological differences in the support for civil liberties and reactions to threat (McClosky 1964, McClosky and Brill 1983,
We rely on a 7-point scale ranging from Strong Conservative to Strong Liberal (see the Appendix). Far more than liberals, conservatives have been associated with beliefs about duty, respect for authority, and the primacy of law and order over the exercise of individual rights. Liberals, on the other hand, are often seen as willing to risk a measure of social instability for the sake of promoting certain changes (McClosky and Brill 1983). According to McClosky and Brill (1983), liberals tend to think of rights as natural and inalienable that government cannot take away, while conservatives tend to view rights as more situational and contingent. Once citizens consider the implications of their initial responses the change may represent a move toward their ideological position. If change occurs in the consideration of initial civil liberties, we expect change to move in a more ideologically distinct way.7

**Dogmatism.** Dogmatic individuals are usually more accepting of governmental authority than less dogmatic individuals. If asked to stop and think about their initial responses, which typically reflect weak attachment to civil liberties, dogmatists are likely to support greater governmental authority to combat terrorism. Because a closed and cognitively inflexible belief system is associated with a sense of pessimism, fearfulness, trust in authority, and intolerance, which became intensified in the context of the terrorist attacks, we expect more dogmatic people to support personal security over the protection of civil liberties. A closed and inflexible belief system is associated with denial of rights to others and restrictions on civil liberties (Gibson 1998; Gibson and Gouws 2000; Sullivan et al. 1982). To capture this psychological predisposition, the survey incorporated six items adapted from Rokeach’s dogmatism scale. To each question, respondents were offered four response categories, from strongly agree to strongly disagree (see the Appendix).8

**National Pride.** National pride may be thought of as an attachment to the nation and political community. Because the terrorist attacks on innocent citizens were so heinous and dramatic,
and the perpetrators were foreigners, American citizens were forced to reflect on their feelings about the country and its values. Intense feelings of national pride, loyalty and love of the country were seen as positive by-products of the terrorist attacks. Outward expressions of pride and patriotism – the American flag plastered on buildings, homes, cars, and clothing – revealed an underlying sense of unity and togetherness.

Taken to the extreme, however, patriotism may undermine democratic values and processes. Patriotism can take on chauvinistic tones and lead to a narrow definition of who and what may be considered “American” and the rejection of out-groups who may not fit traditional American characteristics. Echoing language from the 1950s, in the post-9/11 era people who voiced questions about government policies or practices were sometimes branded as “anti-American.” In such instances, a strong sense of patriotism and rallying people to support the common cause is associated with intolerance (Adorno et al. 1950, Gomberg 2002) and social dominance (Sidanius et al. 1997). Research by Schatz and Staub (1996) shows that blind patriotism is strongly associated with political conservatism and the belief that the U.S. national security is vulnerable to foreign threat. This result informs Hurwitz and Peffley’s (1987) and Sullivan et al.’s (1992) findings that patriotism is associated with aggressive views on national defense and security.

**Political Interest.** Political interest may work against the alteration of initial civil liberties responses. Knowledge of and interest in the events relating to the terrorist attacks and governmental efforts to combat terrorism may help affirm civil liberties attitudes because of their anchoring to current information. However, it is also possible that political interest and exposure to more information may lead to response change as increased interest may lead to a greater understanding of the threat of terrorism or the consequences of governmental efforts. A single item indicator is used to measure political interest, “How interested are you in politics?” This item ranges from 1 (Not Interested at All) to 4 (Very Interested).
Race and Ethnicity. Race and ethnicity are expected to influence the pliability of civil liberties responses. African Americans tend to be strongly supportive of civil liberties (Davis 1995), due in part to their struggle for civil rights and a distrust of government. As a result, African Americans may be reluctant to concede rights that they have worked hard to achieve or to empower a government in which they have little confidence, even for the sake of personal security. If given the opportunity, African Americans might be willing to adopt more extreme pro-civil liberties positions. Hispanics may not have as profound a history of struggle for civil liberties and civil rights as African Americans, but they have also not been fully integrated into American society and show little faith in government (Howell and Fagan 1988). While we expect Hispanics to show greater support for civil liberties than whites, they are expected to be sensitive to policies related to the rights of immigrants and non-citizens.

Demographic Items. We include demographic measures to tap aspects of culture and experience with government, civil liberties, and the vulnerability to terrorism. For instance, education is included because it exposes people to the requirements of democracy. Individuals with higher levels of education should be less willing to accept restrictions on civil liberties than individuals with lower levels of education. In the context of the terrorist attacks, the willingness to trade civil liberties for personal security is expected to increase with age. The conservative nature of aging, and the emotional reactions among older people, are due largely to a general sense of vulnerability to threatening events.9

Analysis

Our main interest in this analysis is to assess whether, if people alter their initial civil liberties responses, they adopt a pro-civil liberties or a pro-security position and how perceptions of threat influence such a decision. The dependent variable has three categories: 1 – Became less democratic,

9 Education, the number of years of education completed, ranges from 0 to 20. Age ranges from 18 to 93. Male is a dichotomous variable coded as 1 for male and 0 for female.
It is critical to rule out the possibility that the initial responses are random as a rival hypothesis to the idea that substantive changes in response to counter-arguments are meaningful. Although we shall not discuss the results in detail, we accomplished this by examining the predictability of initial civil liberties responses. Initial civil liberties responses are not random. Although a different process underlies the reactions to the different initial questions, detaining non-citizens and making it a crime to belong to a terrorist organization appear to have something in common. An increase in sociotropic threat leads to a greater probability of supporting pro-security positions in detaining non-citizens and belonging to a terrorist organization. A heightened sense of trust in the federal government is related to a greater probability of supporting the pro-security position in response to the detaining non-citizens and racial profiling questions. Among the attitudinal items, dogmatism translates into greater support for personal security only on the detaining non-citizens issue. Greater national pride is associated with greater support for personal security on the detaining citizens and terrorist organization questions, but on the racial profiling question, greater pride leads to the support of civil liberties. Self-identified political liberals are more supportive of civil liberties than conservatives or moderates on detaining non-citizens and racial profiling. Race is an important determinant of the support for civil liberties in which African Americans give consistently more pro-civil liberties responses than whites across all of the civil liberties items. Hispanics are different from whites on only the detaining non-citizens question, which may resonate among.

There is reason to suspect that the inclusion of African Americans into equations with whites and Hispanics confounds the results of the counter-arguments. First, despite perceiving a greater sense of personal threat and vulnerability from the terrorist attacks than whites and Hispanics, African Americans are also more supportive of civil liberties. Such a strong positive relationship between personal threat and fear among African Americans may diminish the overall effects of an expected negative relationship among the respondents as a whole. Second, there is a greater tendency for African Americans to be located on the pro-civil liberties side of the counter-arguments. To address these concerns, we analyze the responses by African Americans separately.

Experiment 1: Guilt by Association

Shortly after the September 11 terrorist attacks citizens and non-citizens with ties to Arab, Muslim, and Middle Eastern countries and organizations came under a cloud of suspicion. Many citizens were detained and arrested for suspected ties to organizations said to be supportive of terrorism, and with the casting of this broad net, several credible links in the U.S. and abroad to terrorist
organizations were publicly identified. Arrests and detentions were made and the government was able to interrupt the funding of some suspected terrorists organization.

The USA Patriot Act made it a crime for people to belong to or contribute to any organization that was deemed by the U.S. Attorney General to be a terrorist organization or have links to an international terrorist organization. With echoes of the “Attorney General’s List” from the McCarran Act of 1950, this component of the USA Patriot Act raised the risk that many innocent persons would be judged guilty by association. Under the law, detention of citizens and deportation of non-citizens who provide assistance for lawful activities of a group the government claims is a terrorist organization was permitted. It effectively removed the presumption of innocence for those under investigation, making it easier for the government to conduct surveillance against persons suspected of violating conspiracy laws.

There is overwhelming support for policies making it a crime for people to belong to or contribute money to terrorist organizations (Figure 1). However, a large proportion of the respondents alter their initial responses after hearing the counter-arguments (Table 1). For example, 51.6 percent of those who initially favored unlimited detention altered their position after the counter-argument, while 68.6 percent of those who initially favored presuming such individuals to be innocent altered their position after the counter-argument.

There is a definite “bias” to the changers. While some respondents move in a pro-civil liberties direction after the counter-arguments, changers are far more likely to move in a pro-security direction. When we challenge those who initially express pro-security attitudes on whether it is a crime to belong to a terrorist organization, 48.4 percent do not alter their beliefs, while 14.9 percent accede to the counter-argument by moving in a pro-civil liberties direction (see line 1a in Table 1). However, a remarkable 36.7 percent of those who already favored a pro-security position say they would be even
more likely to support detaining non-citizens indefinitely after the counter-argument. On the other side of the issue (line 1b in Table 1), of those people who were initially supportive of civil liberties, while 13.7 percent become more supportive of the civil liberties position after the counter-argument, and 31.4 percent do not change their position, 54.9 move in a pro-security direction. Such an asymmetry in attitude shifting in which it is easier to talk people into pro-security positions is consistent with the previous literature (Gibson 1998).

**Effects of Threat.** According to the ordered probit results in Table 2, after deliberation on the consequences of their initially pro-security attitudes, citizens with a heightened sense of sociotropic threat become more supportive of restrictions on civil liberties after the counter-arguments.\(^\text{11}\) This finding supports Kuklinski et al.’s (1991) research on the differences between the affective and cognitive bases of threat and fear. While the initial response may have been driven more by affect than reflective thought; when challenged to reflect on their initial answers the respondents, continuing to focus on the source of anxiety, move even further in an anti-civil libertarian direction.

**Effects of Other Factors.** Trust in government also matters. Among people who start off supporting a pro-security position, higher levels of trust lead to providing the government with greater flexibility in combating terrorism and greater restrictions on civil liberties. Challenging this result is the finding that faith or trust in people leads to greater support for civil liberties. Among those who start off from an pro-security position, dogmatism increases the likelihood of adopting a pro-security position after the counter-argument. However, among those who start from an initially pro-civil liberties position, higher levels of dogmatism leads to greater support for civil liberties. Hence, dogmatism appears to push people to extreme positions on both sides of the issue.

\(^\text{11}\) We tested the same model with whether or not people changed their responses at all due to the counter-arguments as the dependent variable. Because none of the predictor variables consistently explained absolute change in responses, we are confident that our focus on the direction of change captures the most important aspect of the response to the counter-arguments.
Higher levels of national pride are associated with preferring greater restrictions on civil liberties, even among individuals who were initially in favor of protecting civil liberties. Hispanics who started off supporting civil liberties are even more likely than whites to take support civil liberties after the counter-arguments. Counter-intuitively, higher levels of education are consistently related to greater support for personal security after the counter-arguments. We suspect that this finding captures a subtle response effect in which people with higher levels of education are more sensitive to their answers being challenged than people with lower levels of education.

Although there are no gender distinctions in the initial responses, men are more likely than women to move in a pro-security direction (and to reject a pro-civil liberties position) when given a counter-argument. We speculate that males are more aggressive in their reactions to the terrorist events, and as a result, the effect of the counter-arguments and exposure to information may be more relevant to them. It could also be that males are less receptive to the idea of having their initial opinions challenged by a stranger over the telephone. The effects of age are consistent with our expectations. Higher age levels are related to greater support for democratic norms.

African Americans’ response to counter-arguments challenging their initial beliefs reveal an entirely different process from that of whites and Hispanics (Table 3). After more deliberation, greater trust in people and higher levels of education among African Americans leads to their supporting greater restrictions on civil liberties. Furthermore, after more deliberation, African Americans who perceive high sociotropic threat are likely to voice greater support for civil liberties. We comment on this finding in more detail later.

[Table 3 about here]

Experiment 2: Indefinite Detentions

Indefinite detentions without a writ of habeas corpus were not approved as part of the USA Patriot Act, although they had been included in the initial proposal. However, arrests and detentions
of citizens and non-citizens were a crucial component of the government’s efforts to prevent future terrorist attacks. Using material witness statutes, or charges related to visa or immigration status, detentions initially involved the arrests of people within the United States on immigration violations, the denial of legal representation, and the withholding of the names of detainees from the public. After the invasion of Afghanistan, many individuals captured on the battlefield were detained and later transferred to Guantanamo Bay.

Challenging initial beliefs about the indefinite detention and arrest of non-citizens shows a similar pattern to the first experiment (question 2 in Table 1). Among those who initially chose a pro-security position (line 2a), in response to the counter-argument 40.8 percent do not change, while 42.0 percent become more supportive of civil liberties and 17.2 percent become more supportive of their initial pro-security position. Greater deliberation among this group of respondents generates support for civil liberties. In contrast, citizens who start from a pro-civil liberties position (line 2b) are more likely to alter their positions than those who first choose security: only 33.8 percent maintain their initial positions), but 43.1 percent become less committed to civil liberties after the counter-argument.

On the whole, the explanatory variables do not matter much on responses to the pro-security counter-arguments, as the overall equation is not statistically significant. It is possible that on this issue greater deliberation leads individuals to respond randomly from a pro-security position, initial pro-civil liberties beliefs regarding detaining non-citizens are not pliable in a systematic way, or our counter-argument was not persuasive enough to move people.

Effects of Threat. Among citizens who chose an initial pro-civil liberties position (i.e., opposed the indefinite detention of non-citizens), threat remains a critical determinant of adopting a pro-security position (Table 2). While the effect of sociotropic threat is no longer statistically significant, the effect of personal threat is now negative and significant. Hence, after some deliberation, people who perceive greater personal threat may come to dwell more on their sense of vulnerability and support
The effects of education on support for civil liberties appear to be consistent with the previous counter-arguments. Because the more educated tend to understand better the principles behind democracy (Prothro and Grigg 1960, McClosky 1964, McClosky and Brill 1983), those who are more educated should, upon greater deliberation, move in a more pro-civil liberties direction. Here, however, education does not operate as expected.

The counter-arguments to “detaining non-citizens” also lead to a several contradictions to the first experiment. In the previous experiment, greater age is related to increased support for democratic norms among initial pro-civil liberties supporters. But in the “detaining non-citizens” experiment, among people who were initial pro-civil liberties supporters, older people are more likely to abandon civil liberties after a counter-argument. There may be a sense of intolerance, or perhaps an underlying sense of fear, among older individuals that is picked up by relating the question to “non-citizens.”

Following a different pattern but consistent with the previous experiment, greater personal threat among African Americans leads to greater support for civil liberties (Table 3): after being challenged through counter-arguments, African Americans become more supportive of civil liberties. Again this suggests a very different mentality among African Americans than among whites and Hispanics.

**Experiment 3: Racial Profiling**

Before the 9/11 terrorist attacks, racial profiling, directed largely at African Americans, was seen as racist, and after an extended campaign by civil rights and civil liberties organizations, racial profiling had fallen out of favor and law enforcement officials around the country were trained to avoid it. However, in response to the terrorist attacks the federal government seemed to recast racial profiling as part of a general profiling of prospective terrorists. Because the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist
attacks were all of Middle Eastern decent, citizens perceived to be of Middle Eastern background, suspected of having ties to terrorist activities, came under great scrutiny. Though intended to single out individuals suspected of having terrorist ties, many innocent citizens were subjected to questioning or harassment.

Our question on racial profiling elicited an overwhelmingly pro-civil liberties response (Figure 1). The resistance to change and the direction of change in response to counter-arguments reflect a consistent pro-civil liberties concern. Racial profiling is an easier policy option for civil libertarians to uphold when challenged than the arguments about belonging to a terrorist organization and indefinite detention of those suspected of terrorism. Among the few who initially supported racial profiling (line 3a of Table 1), 49.1 percent remain at their initial position, but only 12.2 percent are less likely to support racial profiling in response to our counter-argument. Citizens who started off being supportive of civil liberties (line 3b) are more likely to maintain this attitude in the face of counter-arguments against it.

Although most people (82 percent) do not initially support racial profiling, some differences in support for racial profiling become distinguishable when people are asked to think about the implications of their initial answers (Table 2).

**Effects of Threat.** Personal threat continues to compel people to back off from their initial pro-civil liberties position after some deliberation. Despite being supportive of civil liberties initially, people who continue to dwell on their sense of threat become more supportive of racial profiling. This is true in the previous two experiments as well.

As revealed in the first two experiments, a heightened sense of threat among African Americans lead to greater support for civil liberties after more deliberation.

**Effects of Other Factors.** After greater deliberation and exposure to counter-arguments, faith in people leads to support for pro-democratic positions among persons who initially rejected the
pro-civil liberties position. This is true on the first experiments as well, though the effects were smaller. Political interest is now significant and positive which suggests that greater political interest leads to the backing-away from an initially intolerant position after the counter-argument.

Dogmatism, which significantly affected the adoption of a counter-argument in Table 2, exerts a similar anti-democratic influence. Dogmatic individuals do not back away from their initially intolerant position, but instead become even more supportive of racial profiling.

Liberalism is now an important explanation for support for civil liberties. As in the first experiment, higher age levels are associated with greater protection of civil liberties after some deliberation. Unexpectedly, higher levels of trust in the federal government leads to a further support for civil liberties.

Consistency of Findings Across the Experiments

While each civil liberties/security trade-off has some idiosyncratic aspects, and we have only included three experiments, if our findings are to be generalizable then we should find some consistency in the effects of the independent variables across the experiments. The number of factors that appear to work in a consistent way is very limited.

The Effects of Perceived Threat. The effect of threat (personal threat and to a lesser extent sociotropic threat) stands out as a consistent and generalizable result across the three experiments for both whites/Hispanics and African Americans.

Our interpretation of this effect is that deliberation, after exposure to counter-arguments challenging their initial beliefs, does not automatically lead people to make a cognitive assessment of civil liberties. Instead, threat may compel initial civil-libertarians to dwell further on their sense of vulnerability: many people switch from being pro-civil libertarian to pro-security after the counter-arguments. We would speculate that in the context of the terrorist threat in America, when respondents
are asked to reflect further on their opinions on the fundamental issue of trading off security for civil liberties, further deliberation evokes images of the tragedy of 9/11.

Threat does not operate this way for people who start off with pro-security positions. For them, although counter-arguments in general may have an effect (see Table 1), perceived threat does not account for variance in the response after the counter-arguments. The effect of threat was already captured to a significant degree, however, in their initial adoption of a pro-security position.

Threat is perceived very differently among African Americans. Whereas whites and Hispanics may have the luxury of thinking mainly about the source of threat from the terrorist attacks, Africans Americans may have more reason to perceive multiple threats in a national crises: the threat from terrorism and the threat from the government itself. African Americans perceiving greater threat become even more supportive of civil liberties. This issue deserves greater attention that we can give it here. We suspect that because African Americans possess a skeptical and distrustful view of government generally, awareness of the danger of terrorism may also spark greater concern that a government that they do not trust will gain additional powers when it combats terrorism.

A related factor may be African Americans’ perceptions of whites. In further analysis (not shown in a table), we find that African Americans who feel less warm toward whites are less willing to give up civil liberties for greater security in the face of a perceived threat of terrorism. Under greater deliberation about civil liberties attitudes, African Americans appear to respond to perceived threat in a way that reflects their status as a racial minority, at risk and to some degree antipathetic to the government and to whites and concerned about giving up hard-fought civil rights victories during the crisis.

**The Effects of Other Factors.** Most other independent variables do not operate consistently across the three experiments. However, when challenged, dogmatists who initially adopt pro-security positions express their dogmatism further by endorsing security even more strongly. Those who have
greater national pride become more pro-security after counter-arguments, whether they at first endorsed the civil liberties or the security option. It could well be that for dogmatists and strong patriots, being questioned about and asked to reflect more on their beliefs evokes not so much reasoned reflection but an emotional response.

**Conclusion**

Understanding the trade-offs between civil liberties and personal security in the context of the terrorist attacks is complex. Because of a variety of pressures and predispositions, citizens’ initial reactions to the trade-off between civil liberties and personal security are not always what they maintain after a second thought. While decisions based on affective considerations may lead to the desire to satisfy immediate needs and the restriction of civil liberties, the expectation that greater deliberation translates into greater support for democracy and civil liberties needs revision. Second thoughts may not be “sober” second thoughts but instead in many cases may evoke emotion-laden memories of the horrific events that happened on 9/11.

By relying only on the initial choices that people make between civil liberties and personal security, one would conclude that the terrorist attack and governmental efforts to combat terrorism have only a modest effect on transforming American society. If initial reactions were driven mostly by affective considerations, such as a sense of threat and vulnerability, trust in government, and patriotism, the preference for personal security over civil liberties might be only temporary. As the threat of terrorism subsides so will the rally effects on trust in government and patriotism, and so too, perhaps, the willingness to cede rights to the government for the sake of greater security against terrorism.

That after further consideration and a direct challenge to their anti-democratic beliefs, people become even more willing to concede civil liberties, however, suggests a more serious threat to support for civil liberties. It is easier to talk people into abandoning pro-civil liberties attitudes than pro-security
attitudes. Personal security concerns are probably anchored to more accessible and affective reactions to threat and a sense of vulnerability. Also, those who are already committed to a pro-security position become even more extreme in their personal security concerns after deliberation, despite efforts to dissuade them from this position. Just how enduring these responses are requires considerably more attention. But the idea that discussion and deliberation will lead people toward more moderate positions finds little support.

Although the initial positions of African Americans on the civil liberties questions are also affected by their sense of threat – with higher threat associated with greater willingness to concede civil liberties for security – after further deliberation African Americans with a greater sense of threat of terrorism are less likely to concede civil liberties for security. This effect runs opposite that which we find for whites and Latinos. Because in times of national crises such as the terrorist attacks African Americans have concern about both the threat from terrorism and the threat from government itself, African Americans’ perception of threat, during a “second thought” in which their first response was challenged by the interviewer, translates into greater support for civil liberties, and opposition to increasing the power of the government.
Appendix A: Main Batteries of Questions Used

Civil Liberties

CL4. Some people say it should be a crime for anyone to belong to or contribute money to any organization that supports international terrorism. Others say that a person’s guilt or innocence should not be determined only by who they associate with or the organizations to which they belong.

CL5. Some people say the government should be able to arrest and detain a non-citizen indefinitely if that person is suspected of belonging to a terrorist organization. Others say nobody should be held for a long period of time without being formally charged with a crime.

CL6. Some people say that law enforcement should be able to stop or detain people of certain racial or ethnic backgrounds if these groups are thought to be more likely to commit crimes. This is called racial profiling. Others think racial profiling should not be done because it harasses many innocent people just because of their race or ethnicity.

Dogmatism

DG1. Next, I would like to read you a series of statements and have you tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with each. The first is, there are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against it.

DG2. A group that tolerates too many differences of opinion among its members cannot exist for long.

DG3. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

DG4. Of all the different philosophies that exist in the world there is probably only one that is correct.

DG5. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one’s own.

DG6. Most of the ideas that get printed nowadays aren’t worth the paper they are printed on.
Fear

SEC4. I’d like to start by asking you some questions about your feelings since the terrorist attacks on September 11th. All in all, how concerned are you that the United States might suffer another terrorist attack in the next 3 months?

SEC5. How concerned are you that the area in which you live might suffer a terrorist attack in the next 3 months?

SEC8. How concerned are you that you or someone in your family might become a victim of a bio-terrorist attack, (such as anthrax or smallpox)?

F1. How concerned are you about flying on an airplane?

F2. How concerned are you about opening your mail?

F3. How concerned are you about the safety of food and drinking water

F5. How concerned are you about going into tall buildings?

F6. How concerned are you about being in large crowds or stadiums?

Liberalism-Conservatism

P17a. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a conservative, a moderate, or a liberal? Would you consider yourself very conservative (very liberal) or somewhat conservative (somewhat liberal)? If moderate, do you generally think of yourself as closer to the conservative side or the liberal side?

Trust in Authorities

T1. The next set of questions are about trust. How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?

GT2. Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, or that it is run for the benefit of all people?
GT3. How much of the time do you think you can trust law enforcement to do what is right?

GT4. Since the terrorist attacks, has your confidence in law enforcement increased, decreased, or has stayed about the same?

Political Interest

Interest. How interested are you in politics? Would you say you are very interested, somewhat interested, not very interested, or not interested at all?

Interpersonal Trust

FIP1. Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can’t be too careful in your dealings with people. Which of these opinions comes closest to your own?

FIP2. Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?
References


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Position</th>
<th>Counter-arguments</th>
<th>Less Democratic</th>
<th>No Difference</th>
<th>More Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crime to belong to terrorist organization/Guilt should not be determined by association</td>
<td>Suppose people were judged guilty by association rather than by a crime they committed</td>
<td>36.7% (349)</td>
<td>48.4% (460)</td>
<td>14.9% (142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Crime to belong to terror org. (Pro-Security)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Innocent (Pro-Civil Liberties)</td>
<td>Suppose people are actually supporting terrorists activities</td>
<td>54.9% (217)</td>
<td>31.4% (124)</td>
<td>13.7% (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-citizens suspected of belonging to terrorist organization should be detain indefinitely/No one should be held for long without being formally charged with a crime</td>
<td>Suppose innocent people could be locked up for a very long time without being charged with a crime</td>
<td>17.2% (111)</td>
<td>40.8% (271)</td>
<td>42.0% (263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Detained as long as it takes (Pro-Security)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Oppose detaining non-citizens (Pro-Civil Liberties)</td>
<td>Suppose detaining them would prevent them from committing other crimes</td>
<td>43.1% (313)</td>
<td>33.8% (245)</td>
<td>23.1% (168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Law enforcement should be to stop or detain people of certain racial or ethnic backgrounds/Racial profiling harasses innocent people just because of their race or ethnicity</td>
<td>Suppose this leads to unequal treatment of people just because of their race or national origin</td>
<td>38.8% (83)</td>
<td>49.1% (105)</td>
<td>12.2% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Allow racial profiling (Pro-Security)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Oppose racial profiling (Pro-Civil Liberties)</td>
<td>Suppose people from certain racial or ethnic backgrounds were actually more likely to commit crimes</td>
<td>14.4% (163)</td>
<td>70.3% (798)</td>
<td>15.3% (174)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Ordered Probit Analysis of Counter-Arguments On Survey Experiments
(African Americans Excluded)
Dependent Variable: Change in Pro-Civil Liberties Direction
1=Pro Civil Liberties Response, 0=No Change, -1=Pro-Security Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Terrorist Organization</th>
<th>Detaining Citizens</th>
<th>Racial Profiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initially Pro Security</td>
<td>Initially Pro Civil Liberties</td>
<td>Initially Pro Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropic Threat</td>
<td>.07 (.07)</td>
<td>-.34* (.13)</td>
<td>-.22 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Threat</td>
<td>.04 (.05)</td>
<td>.19* (.09)</td>
<td>.04 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Federal Govt.</td>
<td>-.22* (.07)</td>
<td>.19 (.14)</td>
<td>.15 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>-.10* (.05)</td>
<td>.23* (.10)</td>
<td>-.24* (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>-.08 (.06)</td>
<td>-.20 (.12)</td>
<td>.38* (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td>.22* (.07)</td>
<td>.05 (.14)</td>
<td>.65* (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>.08 (.07)</td>
<td>-.00 (.14)</td>
<td>.24 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>-.07 (.08)</td>
<td>-.29* (.13)</td>
<td>-.15 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>.17 (.14)</td>
<td>.57* (.29)</td>
<td>.36 (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.05* (.02)</td>
<td>-.06 (.04)</td>
<td>-.05 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.02* (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.21* (.09)</td>
<td>-.83* (.20)</td>
<td>-.38 (.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P                     | 51.49 71.77           | 11.76 62.62        | 62.34 35.51      |
| Pseudo R²              | .04 .16               | .01 .06            | .20 .03          |
| N                     | 678 238               | 471 467            | 175 742          |

*Note: Standard errors in parentheses. *Significant at p=0.05.*
Table 3. Ordered Probit Analysis of Counter-Arguments On Survey Experiments
(African Americans Only)
Dependent Variable: Change in Pro-Civil Liberties Direction
1=Pro Civil Liberties Response, 0=No Change, -1=Pro-Security Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Terrorist Organization</th>
<th>Detaining Citizens</th>
<th>Racial Profiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initially Pro Security</td>
<td>Initially Pro Civil Liberties</td>
<td>Initially Pro Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropic Threat</td>
<td>.01 (.18)</td>
<td>.73* (.20)</td>
<td>-36 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Threat</td>
<td>.11 (.17)</td>
<td>-.22 (.18)</td>
<td>-.46 (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Federal Gov.</td>
<td>-.02 (.19)</td>
<td>-.07 (.23)</td>
<td>-.09 (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>-.13 (.14)</td>
<td>-.11 (.15)</td>
<td>-.12 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td>-.30 (.18)</td>
<td>-.36 (.23)</td>
<td>-.22 (.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td>-.07 (.18)</td>
<td>-.70* (.27)</td>
<td>.04 (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>.06 (.17)</td>
<td>-.07 (.21)</td>
<td>.52* (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>-.26 (.21)</td>
<td>-.02 (.23)</td>
<td>-.14 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>-.22* (.07)</td>
<td>-.13 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>-.05* (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.41 (.25)</td>
<td>.27 (.37)</td>
<td>.56 (.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P^2 )</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>42.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.02 .26</td>
<td>.27 .14</td>
<td>.02 .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>123 94</td>
<td>74 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard errors in parentheses. *Significant at \( p < .05 \).
Figure 1. Civil Liberties vs. Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Liberties vs. Security</th>
<th>Prefer Security</th>
<th>Protect Civil Liberties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give up some civil liberties (CL1)</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate protesters (CL10)</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial profiling (CL6)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrantless searches on suspicion (CL8)</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor telephone and e-mail (CL9)</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detain non-citizens indefinitely (CL5)</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require national ID cards (CL2)</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers criticize terrorist policies (CL7)</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime to belong to terrorist org. (CL4)</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>