

Why did so many Americans believe Saddam Hussein was behind the 9/11 attacks?

By Global Research

Global Research, March 05, 2010

<u>Department of Sociology, University at</u> Buffalo 5 March 2010

Althaus and Largio argue that the resilience of this belief was in fact an artifact of pollsters' switch to forced-choice questions: although open-ended survey questions find very small percentages blaming Saddam for 9/11, forced choice questions reveal a high proportion of the public willing to believe in Saddam Hussein's culpability even before the administration shifted its focus from Afghanistan to Iraq, and that this means that "The American public's apparently widespread belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9/11 terror attacks was no feat of misdirection by the Bush administration. Instead, the Bush administration inherited and played into a favorable climate of public opinion" (Althaus and Largio, 2004). But where did this favorable climate of public opinion come from?

We suggest that answers on forced-choice questions and support for politicians' actions are both examples of inferred justification: when responding to forced-choice questions, respondents assume that there is a good reason why a name is present among a list of choices (even if there is not); similarly, in judging politicians' actions, voters assume that there is a good reason why a politician supports a policy measure, particularly one as consequential as the decision to go to war. We test this theory on a sample of respondents in Illinois, and show that 20% of respondents give an inferred justification response. In essence, in invading Iraq the administration presented the public with the equivalent of a forced choice survey question of whether or not Saddam was responsible for 9/11; some respondents concluded that, if we invaded Iraq, there must have been a good reason for doing so, and 9/11 seemed to them the most obvious justification.

Click here for study in PDF

The original source of this article is <u>Department of Sociology</u>, <u>University at Buffalo</u> Copyright © <u>Global Research</u>, <u>Department of Sociology</u>, <u>University at Buffalo</u>, 2010

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Global Research

Theme: History

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca