Measuring Warmongering and Warmongering-Proneness

as Psychological Traits

William A. McConochie, Ph.D.
Political Psychology Research, Inc.
71 E. 15th Ave.
Eugene, Or. 97401
Bill@Politicalpsychologyresearch.com
9/17/07

Note: This paper is a rewrite of a paper submitted for journal publication but rejected

because the reviewers wanted two primary improvements: 1. More review of related prior

studies, and 2. Ratings of political leaders on warmongering-proneness done by more

"professional", "expert" raters. The present paper version includes an extended background

review but not yet ratings by professional raters. Such ratings will be sought in future

studies. However, the expectation is that no difference will be found between lay and

"expert" raters. A steel tape measure is a highly reliable measuring instrument that will yield

accurate measures of the square footage of a house, even when measured by a careful "lay"

person rather than a building contractor or realtor. The warmongering-proneness rating

scale has extremely high reliability (alpha .98) when used by intelligent, well-educated lay

raters. Therefore, their ratings of political and historical figures are expected to be as

accurate as those that could be done by "experts".

Key words: Warmongering, antisocial traits, leadership, war, participatory democracy, religious fundamentalism

Abstract

Warmongering as a psychological trait is measured reliably (.95) and found to correlate significantly as expected with antisocial tendencies, including social disenfranchisement (the Eidelson worldviews) (.74), violence-proneness (.67), religious fundamentalism (.60), Right Wing Authoritarianism (.59), endorsement of military dictatorship (.57), Social Dominance Orientation (.46), and endorsement of special interest group democracy (.37). It correlates negatively with several pro-social traits, including endorsement of a positive foreign policy (-.74), human rights endorsement (-.51), kindly religious beliefs (-.51), and endorsement of public democracy serving the best interests of the community overall (-.36). Warmongering-proneness is measured in two current political leaders and 23 historical figures with a 50-item rating scale that is reliable (.98) and is validated against independent ratings of the warmongering disposition of twenty of these leaders (.90). Implications for protecting nations from dangerous leadership are discussed.

<u>Measuring Warmongering and Warmongering-Proneness as Psychological Traits</u>

During the past century, vigorous warring of nations has escalated in destructiveness as world population has doubled and redoubled and technology has advanced dramatically. Society attempts to explain and deal with this destructiveness from many different perspectives. Comics make fun of politicians, journalists probe for selfish and evil motives among government officials. Politicians themselves sometimes disclose the unseemly inner workings of government. Political scientists theorize about a myriad of forces that impinge upon and shape political decisions and leader behavior. Psychiatrists analyze. Psychologists measure traits and correlate them with political behaviors.

Will Rogers: "You can't say civilization don't advance, however, for in every war they kill you in a new way." (Rogers, 1920)

"Our country is guilty of torture...what are you going to do about this? It's your country. They [political leaders] are doing this in your name. Perhaps you should get in touch with them." Molly Ivins (2005).

Oregon politicians Philip Barnhart (State Representative) and Peter Sorenson (County Commissioner), who between them have many years of experience in local, state and federal

government, have explained to the author that to be a successful politician in the United States one must align one's legislative votes primarily with the wishes of one's most generous campaign contributors. Thus, from this perspective, special interest money from the few buys political decisions that affect the many. At the national level, money from the defense and oil industries could combine to engineer a militarily aggressive foreign policy to assure continuous access to foreign oil reserves and continuous business for arms manufacturers, the "military-industrial complex" of which President Eisenhower warned the nation in his farewell address.

Psychiatrist, Jerrold M. Post has been employed by the U.S. Government to develop psychological profiles of foreign leaders to inform our leaders (Post, 2004). For example, he has noted Bin Laden's view of himself as an agent of God who has ordered religious Muslims to kill Americans. He describes Bin Laden as on a messianic mission framing, conflict as a religious war with President Bush as commander-in-chief of the corrupt, secular Western world. He cites a tradition of psychoanalytic interpretations of leader behavior and offers opinions specifically of the motives of Uganda leader Idi Amin. He opines that U.S. senators Wayne Morse and Key Pittman "both clearly had significant narcissistic elements in their personalities" and that alcoholism is frequently found in such narcissistic politicians (Op cit p. 34).

In general, Post presents his ideas as theories or hypotheses but does state that these need be referred to traditional scientific investigation for verification. He posits a great variety of psychological traits that bear on the behaviors and decisions of political leaders.

He uses traits of paranoia and narcissism to explain the behavior of evil political leaders such as Saddam Hussein and Jim Jong Il of North Korea. His analysis is complicated by the fact that he sees advantages to paranoia in a leader who can thus protect himself from being displaced by competitors, as in the cases of Stalin and Hitler.

Post offers no suggestions about how nations can protect themselves from such dangerous leaders other than establishing some criteria when selecting military officers to assure good decision-making in times of stress (p. 122). However, it is difficult to see how such criteria would be exercised in a practical manner that could prevent a military dictator from taking over a democratic nation.

Post offers an opinion that is unsubstantiated with data and, if taken at face value, is quite anti-social in import and seems based on what some behavioral scientists consider outmoded need theory: "thus enemies are necessary for self-definition, which makes it necessary to have enemies in our midst."   In this, his theory is reminiscent of that of George Hegel and Friedrich Nietzsche, whose philosophies of war may have inspired warmongering German leaders in both World Wars.

In summary, the psychiatric paradigm as modeled by Post leaves much to be desired. While it can generate hypotheses, until these are tested by scientific investigation they must be viewed with caution. His omission of discussion of any American Presidents suggests a nationalistic bias that limits his perspective. He fails to consider what accounts for the several U.S. Presidents who have declared wars, increasingly ignoring or overriding the Constitutional responsibility of Congress. Post publishes in 2004, well after President G. W.

Bush was repeatedly criticized by the media for his questionable invasive warring behavior but fails to discuss what personality traits or other psychological processes might explain Bush's behavior.

Political scientists have offered a wide variety of theories to explain political leadership, variously emphasizing either the traits of leaders ("agency") or the social and other environmental forces impinging on them, such as political pressures exerted by politicians and voters ("structure"). A review of this academic specialty by Bryan Jones (1989) reveals many conflicting theories but little scientific research data, perhaps because of the complexity of the issues as perceived by these academicians. Jones concludes his book by acknowledging great diversity among political science theories and calls for a unity between them. However, he hints at pessimism, saying that this potential unity is hindered by preoccupation within "subdisciplinary areas" that generate the many independent theories.

In contrast, political psychologists have tended to narrow their focus to topics that lend themselves to testable psychological hypotheses about political behavior in general and Presidential leadership in particular. Perhaps no challenge to the profession of political psychology is more relevant to world peace than understanding the behavior of national leaders in terms of their proclivities for peace or war. For example, the textbook of key readings, *Political Psychology* (Jost & Sidanius, 2004), opens with Hitler's bombing of Guernicia in Spain in 1937 at the request of General Franco. The text editors dramatize the importance of stopping war, stating, "Guernica captures ancient human themes that are among the core topics addressed by the science of political psychology".   Understanding top

leadership is increasingly important as U.S. Presidents repeatedly declare wars independent of Congress, exerting potentially very destructive international power. (Schlesinger, 2004)

As pointed out by Jost: "There is no single way to do political psychology." (Op. cit., p. 2). Some researchers have measured specific traits and attitudes and their relationships to the political behavior of government leaders. For example, Lloyd Etheredge has studied the traits of extroversion and social dominance (Etheredge, 1978a). He interprets his findings to support his hypothesis that personality traits are directly related to political decisions by American leaders, including Presidents, secretaries of state and selected government advisors between 1889 and 1968. Specifically, persons with higher social dominance are more likely to advocate use of military force. Those higher on extraversion are more likely to advocate cooperation, trade and summit conferences to resolve international tensions.

Etheredge cites a variety of further studies that document the relationships between personality traits and decisions related to military action by high level government personnel, including foreign service officers in the State Department and mid-career military officers. He reviews a study in Norway that demonstrated correlations between how military and navy cadets handle personal and professional problems in a manner consistent with their personality traits (Etheredge, 1978b). He cites studies of military officers characterized by high dogmatism and endorsement of aggressive military policies, versus State Department foreign service workers, who were low on dogmatism and high on flexibility. The military officers favored maintaining order in underdeveloped countries while the foreign service workers favored protecting civil liberties for citizens in those

countries.   High self-esteem diplomats and members of the Office of Management and Budget tend to oppose the use of military force, but high self-esteem military officers advocate military force.

Etheredge concludes that the greater one's desire to feel active and powerful personally, the higher his tendency to advocate the use of military force in foreign policy. Etheredge concludes more generally that personality strongly colors a government employee's job-related views, and offers several poignant opinions in summary of his research findings:

"A man experiences other nations internally, in his own mind; they are creations which partly embody his own emotions."

"The use of these processes tends to trap a man by his own character structure and emotional dynamics."

"Internally consistent and plausible decisions do not necessarily have a rational base, and journalists and scholars will mislead people if they mistake rationalizations for true explanations."

Etheredge admits without hesitation that his research is motivated by a concern for promoting international peace, comfortable with the role of professional advocate, much as man hundreds of scientists advocate for addressing the dangers posed by global warming. He presents his work and theory as groundbreaking in pointing to the personality underpinnings of a national leader's penchant for war, saying:

"Some scholars have maintained personality influences to be trivial (except in cases of marked pathology, for example Hitler); other writers have contended that they might be significant for virtually every decision maker. But no one has previously explicitly proposed that features of American elite modal personality increase the predisposition to war."

There is a long tradition of efforts to understand antisocial traits in the general population, such as the authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001), and Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). These traits tend to correlate positively with each other and with other traits, such as religious fundamentalism.

Studies by Milgram and Zimbardo, have demonstrated the ease with which persons in positions of even temporary authority can persuade normal adults to engage in atrociously hostile behavior toward fellow human beings (http://irregulartimes.com).

While ethical principles governing mental health professionals place strictures of confidentiality on them when performing and releasing results of diagnostic assessments, these ethics apparently do not apply when assessing political leaders psychologically from a distance.

For example, political psychologists for years have conducted assessments of U.S. Presidents and reported their findings in journal articles accessible by the public. Repeated efforts have been made to understand pro-social traits of U. S. presidents. Recently Simonton (2006) has summarized efforts to assess Presidents in terms of their intelligence,

"intellectual brilliance," and Big Five personality traits, pointing out that such traits have been shown to correlate positively with leader performance.

Simonton assesses President G. W. Bush specifically in terms of intelligence and the Big Five personality traits of "Intellectual Brilliance" (a version of Openness) and Openness itself. He estimates this president's I.Q to range between 111 and 139 by various estimates. However, he estimates his Intellectual Brilliance and Openness to be very low compared to other U.S. presidents. Based on these estimates he predicts below average performance by Bush compared to other Presidents.

Studies dating back to 1926 of the relationship between personality traits and attitudes related to war are summarized by Newcomb and Newcomb (Newcomb & Newcomb). For example, Eckman found that belligerent California political leaders were less in favor of the "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency", more in favor of increasing the defense budget and more likely to see Soviet leaders (decades ago) as 'evil and dangerous'. A militarism scale developed by Porter differentiated reserve military officers and ROTC students from conscientious objectors and pacifists. Higher scores on a measure of war endorsement are associated with masculinity, living in the United States Midwest, authoritarianism, power-seeking, approval of capital punishment and belief in God and an afterlife. Eckhardt developed a militarism scale measuring endorsement of a strong military force. Higher scores were associated with masculinity, lower education, military experience, social conformity, religious orthodoxy, anti-democracy, anti-intellectualism and aggressive nationalism.

Fascism has been studied by Stagner and Katzoff, and by Adorno, et al (1950). Their measures of fascism (F) have been found to correlate positively with aggressive nationalism, anti-welfare, anti-labor, militarism, national isolationism, aggressive foreign policy, authoritarian religious ideology, a suspicious and superstitious worldview, submission to authority and endorsement of Fascism itself.

Eckhart developed his measure of militarism by factor analyzing 470 items from 71 scales found in social science literature. The items specific to war related to endorsement of military deterrence, military security and war propaganda. Factor analysis yielded 18 primary ideological factors, given labels such militarism and religiosity, each of which accounted for 11 percent of the variance, conservatism (5%), internationalism (3%), political cynicism (3%) and nationalism (2%).

Eckhart's military force items included ones such as "The West should increase its military strength, even if this could lead to an arms race and war, " and "I want my country to have power and influence in the world". Propaganda items included "Our strategy against Communism must be primarily offensive in nature." A xenophobic element was reflected in items such as "We are encircled by the enemy and must be ready to deal a crushing blow to any attempts by aggressors." As scored, this was a pro-peace measure, the above items reverse-scored. The scale appears to measure general public attitudes about militarism.

Bob Altemeyer developed a revised F–scale with a version containing half con-trait items. Previously some researchers had doubted that the original scale measured more than response bias. Altemeyer found that the all pro-trait item scale and the half con-trait item

scale had virtually the same validity. He has developed a measure of Right Wing

Authoritarianism, which correlates positively with many other anti-social traits, as well as

with Religious Fundamentalism. (Altemeyer, 1981, 1992)

These studies document that there are a number of personality traits of an antisocial

nature that are associated with endorsement of a militaristic foreign policy. The

authoritarian personality trait is among them. Intelligence and openness or "intellectual

brilliance" help explain impressions of the success or lack thereof of United States Presidents.

While the trait of militarism has been measured as a loosely defined concept and

found typical of military personnel and militaristic foreign policy attitudes in both the

general public and in government workers, the trait specifically of warmongering per se has

not been conceptualized or operationally defined. David Campbell (1995) in his study of U.

S. military generals alluded to the warmongering trait but made no effort to operationally

define it as such.

Especially in light of the continual occurrence of increasingly destructive wars, it is

important to develop a measure specifically of the psychological trait of warmongering, if

possible, to help understand the warring behavior of humans. While there are many non-

psychological factors that bear on the behavior of leaders, there seems ample evidence that

measurable psychological traits underlie important decisions of political leaders. To the

extent that a leader can successfully isolate himself from the public, his own cabinet, or other

close political advisors and his broader government, then presumably his personal traits

assume greater importance in governing his behavior. If one of these traits is a personal penchant for warmongering, the welfare of millions of persons may be in jeopardy.

To begin the study of warmongering as a psychological trait it is important to understand four concepts that are related but different in important ways: warmongering as defined in a dictionary, warmongering behavior, warmongering as a psychological concept and trait, and warmongering-proneness as a psychological concept and trait.

Dictionary definitions of warmongering typically include "a person who advocates war" and sometimes also "a person that stirs up war".   It seems reasonable to assume that these definitions refer more to invasive than to defensive war.

Warmongering behavior is the actual overt behavioral manifestation of warmongering as defined in the dictionary. A person can be said to "advocate war" via statements in informal conversations, and in writings and public speeches.

Stirring up war behavior may be defined as assertive public advocacy of war, such as vigorous public efforts promoting   propaganda to identify enemies, encouraging an increase in military spending and arms development, and promoting the buildup of combat personnel. Presumably a person who has a degree of social or political power, such as a journalist or politician, can most easily accomplish this.

The epitome of overt warmongering behavior would seem to be successful efforts to gain total personal political and military power over a nation, enabling the warmongering individual to engineer invasive wars against other nations. Hitler is the classic example.

Warmongering as a psychological concept or trait is defined for the purposes of this paper as the psychological processes reflecting desires to promote invasive, self-serving or nation-serving war. As a science, psychology requires that such concepts be operationally defined, that is, defined by a reliable and valid measuring instrument, such as a questionnaire made up of statements about advocating invasive war. Such a questionnaire can consist of statements reflecting feelings, beliefs and attitudes that reflect desires to promote war. The challenge is to imagine the sorts of beliefs, thoughts and attitudes that go on in the mind of a warmonger such as Hitler. These are then written as statements with which a person can agree or disagree. The goal of initial data gathering is to determine whether a batch of such traits form a reliable measure. If so, then subsequent research can explore correlations with other traitsas expected from prior research, which has shown positive correlations between measures of the more general concept of militarism endorsement and Right Wing Authoritarianism and Religious Fundamentalism. One would similarly expect negative correlations with measures of pro-social traits, such as endorsement of human rights and a peaceful and helpful foreign policy.

Warmongering-proneness may be defined as a psychological trait consisting of attitudes, beliefs, etc. that are directly related to warmongering as a psychological concept or trait. For example, if research shows that Right Wing Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, human rights endorsement and positive foreign policy endorsement correlate significantly with the trait of warmongering, then one could build a rating scale to assess the presence of these four traits in a political or military leader. If a reliable and valid

scale was built, persons high on the scale could then be considered "warmongering-prone" in the same sense that persons who have many traits associated with heart disease (obesity, smoking, low exercise) are more prone to heart attack.

Warmongering-proneness embodies the assumption that persons high on this trait are more likely to endorse warmongering itself and are more likely to promote warmongering if and when they gain political or military power.

Thus, these four concepts, the dictionary definition of warmongering, actual warmongering behavior, warmongering as a psychological trait and warmongering-proneness as a psychological trait, while related to each other are unique in their meanings.

Consider an example. U.S. President George W. Bush could defend himself as not fitting a dictionary definition of warmonger, denying that he advocates invasive war. He could argue that he is merely reflecting his nation's concerns for self-preservation when he orders war that he defines as defensive. He could refuse to complete a psychological questionnaire measuring the psychological trait of warmongering and thus evade assessment on this specific concept, even though he might score highly on it if he did take it. His overt behavior, requesting money from Congress to wage war and ordering military forces to do so, he could defend also as simply defensive in essence and thus not reflecting warmongering behavior as a invasive, aggressive trait. However, journalists could rate him carefully on a reliable and valid measure of warmongering-proneness consisting of overtly observable behaviors shown by research to be related to the psychological concept of warmongering. If these journalists consistently rate him as very high on the trait of warmongering-proneness,

he would warrant the label of "warmongering-prone". He would be expected in the future to behave in a manner consistent with this definition, promoting the development and use of military power to wage aggressive, invasive war. Whether he actually was successful in this would be a function of many things in addition to his own warmongering-proneness, including support or opposition to his efforts by other elements of political power, such as the U.S. Congress' influence on their President. Even if he were not successful, he could still be very high on the trait of warmongering-proneness.

Warmongering

Method

Because the subject of the studies reported herein are so politically relevant, objectivity is essential as far as possible. As pointed out by Jost and Sidanius, "when moral and political values are at stake, perfect neutrality is elusive." (Jost and Sidanius, 2004) It is important that the reader understand that the authors' motives, while born of applied psychology, are other than partisan politics.

I am an applied psychologist by training and practice. I have practiced in school, clinical and industrial/organizational arenas. As such, I have a penchant for seeking practical applications of psychological science to addressing present community problems. I have built tests for measuring clinical conditions such as depression, anxiety and violence-proneness and batteries of tests for screening job applicants. I market these over the Internet and have among my customers a Fortune 100 company that uses my battery of tests for the

job of heavy truck driver. My At Risk for Violence test has been validated in numerous

studies, for example differentiating incarcerated from non-incarcerated teenagers and adults.

I have worked as a therapist and for many years under contract with the Social Security

Administration as a diagnostician. As an applied psychologist I am an advocate for good

services to and helpful solutions for my clients, whether school children, teachers, adults,

married couples, companies or government agencies. One reviewer, known only to the book

publisher, of the table of contents of my book manuscript (McConochie, 2006a) opined that

"Either McConochie is an unrecognized genius whose work will transform politics

everywhere, and I mean that literally, or he is an advocate masquerading as a scientist". As

an applied psychologist I am an advocate for good, scientifically supported solutions for my

client's problems. I see no shame in that. Perhaps my reviewer was an academician who

does not serve clients in the same sense that applied psychologists do. A successful applied

psychologist must implicitly endorse and understand his clients' problems as legitimate and

solvable by the application of the science and practice of psychology. An applied political

psychologist can view electing public officials as, in a sense, a personnel selection issue. In

this paradigm, using valid and reliable measures of the psychological traits of candidates for

office to inform voters of their probable behavior in the political arena is appropriate.

I am a member of Rotary International and have a life-long concern for improved

government and for government services reflecting public desires ("public democracy")

versus special interest groups, in particular ones whose interests conflict with peace. I am

not a "political" animal, having always registered as an independent and having voted more

out of a vague sense of civic duty than out of confidence in political candidates, who, in spite of their campaign rhetoric, seem to represent the special interests of their major campaign contributors. I had yearned for decades to make some sort of important contribution as a scientist to addressing issues of good government and peace.

My entry into the field of political psychology was inspired by an article in the American Psychologist in the spring of 2003. Roy and Judy Eidelson proposed five worldviews that may underlie international conflict. These had not been operationally defined or measured but were described in sufficient detail that I thought I could develop a Likert-scale questionnaire that would measure them. The worldviews were injustice, helplessness, vulnerability, distrust and superiority. They were theorized by the Eidelsons to exist within individuals and groups.

To measure the Eidelson worldviews, I wrote an 80-item scale containing 8 items each for the individual and group levels of each of the five worldviews. This instrument was used in several studies of community college and university students, Nigerian criminals, Quakers, business executives and others.

To validate this instrument, I developed measures of several other traits, including warmongering, positive foreign policy endorsement, sustainability endorsement, religious fundamentalism, kindly religious beliefs and endorsement of five types of government (Table I). These and related measures were included in many validation studies (McConochie, 2006a). The subjects of these studies were adults ranging in age from 13 to 86, mean 30, standard deviation 15. Approximately 45% were males. Education ranged from 3 to 25 years,

mean 14, standard deviation 3. Subjects included church members (Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Quakers, Lutherans and Unitarians), community college and university students, business managers, Slavic Americans, Nigerian criminals, and Americans from Oregon, Wisconsin, Kansas and Illinois. Sample sizes per study ranged from 24 to over 250. Combined statistics include sample sizes over 380, as reflected in Table II.

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

The more than 20 scales developed by the author to date are presented in their entirety in a manual available at the author's Web site (McConochie, 2006b). This manual includes basic statistical properties of each scale, including reliability and validity data. In the interest of space, only the warmongering scale will be presented in detail below. As a preface to this presentation, in Appendix A the reader is referred to sample items from the various scales included in the present studies.

Table I presents the basic statistical characteristics of these scales. With a few exceptions, all are presented in Likert scale format, usually 5 levels.

Validity Data

Validity data for the several measures of warmongering has been of several sorts: face, content, construct, concurrent and known groups.

Face validity. Face validity was sought by writing questionnaire items to span the full range of thinking expected to characterize the mind of a national leader or other person who wants to amass and use military weaponry and power to wage invasive war. Specifically,

simply by visual examination, the item content reflects the following seven topics related to war: interest in military weaponry, a mean and aggressive attitude toward other nations, a self-centered attitude about indulging one's own needs at the expense of others, a cruel attitude toward prisoners and persons resisting war activities, endorsement of past military warmongers, endorsement melding military and political leadership, and endorsement of war itself as a good activity (see Appendices B and C).

Content validity. Content validity was assured by running correlations between items and the total score made up of the items and then including in the final version of a scale for a particular study only items which correlated significantly and substantially in the expected direction. For convenience in studies involving many traits and items, shorter versions of the scale were created by selecting items with the highest correlations with the total score. In various studies as few as 10 and as many as 36 items were used to measure warmongering.

Warmongers tend to agree with each of the statements in Appendix B unless the statement is reverse scored (as indicated by R). Warmongers disagree with reverse-scored items. This 32-item scale is highly reliable (alpha of .95). Items 7 and 10 were omitted because they did not correlate substantially with the total score in the study for which this particular scale was used. The items are presented in 5-option Likert scale format, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

Construct validity. The content of the items included in 23- and 34-item versions of the warmongering scale was further explored via factor analysis, using Varimax rotation. Two separate analyses were conducted, the first on 380 persons combined across 10 studies

(23-item scale), the second on 41 persons in one group (34-item version). In both cases, eight

factors with Eigen values greater than one emerged, revealing that the warmongering trait as

measured is indeed multifaceted, as suggested by the seven content clusters previously

mentioned in "face validity."

Concurrent validity. Concurrent validity was established via correlations between

warmongering and other traits, and with other questionnaire items of age, gender,

intelligence and education.

Correlations with Other Traits

Table II presents correlations between warmongering and the other traits, which will

be discussed in order. The scale used to measure warmongering in these various studies

ranged from a 10-item scale (asterisked items, Appendix B) to a 32-item scale (Appendix B).

The large sample statistics are based on the 20-item scale.

The correlations in Table II provide a rich profile of the psychological nature of

"warmongers," defined as persons with higher warmongering scores.

General "demographics." Warmongers tend to be younger, less intelligent (Table IV,

item 29) and less well educated males. Thus, warmongering leaders are likely to find more

willing followers among persons with these characteristics. The correlations are modest

enough that warmongering leaders can be older, intelligent, well-educated persons, and

female, though perhaps being intelligent is the most important of these for effective

leadership.

Fearfulness. Warmongers tend to be low on emotional stability (item 27). Specifically, they tend to be overly fearful (item 25), xenophobic (11), fearful of terrorism (28) and may hold prejudice against specific religious groups of foreigners (26).

Unhappy, insecure worldview. Warmongers tend to be higher on Social Disenfranchisement (item 1), having a worldview characterized by feelings of injustice, distrust, helplessness and vulnerability, complemented with feelings of superiority, perhaps as a compensation for the first four. This element of superiority is also reflected in a tendency toward a messianic self-image (item 14). Perhaps, feeling at odds with a world they fear, warmongers take it upon themselves to eliminate what they see as undesirable, recruiting others to help in improving the world by eliminating evil. Social, religious or cultural organizations that promote the idea that their members are somehow superior to other groups, as Nazis promoted Aryans as superior, may be reflecting this world view and inadvertently setting their members up for conflict with other groups.

Antisocial religious and human rights attitudes. Warmongers tend to see themselves as highly religious (item 17) and hold fundamentalist religious beliefs rather than kindly religious beliefs (15, 22 and 16). They believe in competition against rather than cooperation with other persons and groups different from themselves. They think their God/god is the only one and view those who disagree as wrong. They tend not to endorse human rights (18).

Hostile social attitudes. Warmongers tend to be low on the basic personality trait of agreeableness (item 27), tending to conflict and argue with others. They are violence-prone (item 19). They see it as their right and duty to dominate others (24). They see themselves as

having the "right" or "correct" views of social and political issues and justified to impose

them on others (23).

Militaristic political orientation. Warmongers tend to prefer forms of government

that minority powers, such as wealthy special interest groups, can control. They prefer forms

of government characterized by authoritarian rule, especially military dictatorship. While

endorsing special interest group democracy, they do not endorse public democracy, defined

as government serving the best interests of the community overall as opposed to special

interest groups. They do not endorse a positive foreign policy, preferring one characterized

by competition with and domination of other nations.

Selfish, short-term policies. Warmongers do not endorse sustainable policies and

programs or respect for the environment. They do not endorse a public school budgeting

process that assures that all necessary aspects of the school program are always

proportionally and fairly funded. These attitudes may reflect a selfish, short-term attitude or

insensitivity to other species or to good, healthy living conditions for humans in the present

and future.

Dishonesty. Finally, warmongers endorse dishonesty as a fundamental policy, both to

gain political power through lying and conniving and to promote war through propaganda.

Correlations with Specific Attitudes and Beliefs

Correlations between warmongering and specific questionnaire items provide further

insights into the mind of the warmonger. Consider, for example, items from the 80-item

Social Disenfranchisement questionnaire, presented in Appendix C. Notice in particular the

themes of fear, almost paranoia, regarding foreigners (e.g., items 49–51, 57–64),

aggressiveness and domination (e.g., items 42, 48, 78–80).

Warmongers' attitudes toward leadership and national budgets are also informative.

Higher warmongering scores correlate with these questionnaire items:

Unquestioning loyalty to superiors, including political leaders, is appropriate. (.50**)

One should submit to the will of religious or political leaders who say they know what god

(or God wants). (.43**)

Current military spending should be increased. (.75**)

Human services spending should be reduced. (.51**)

Physical resources spending should be reduced (.53**)

These attitudes are in contrast to the majority of adults completing these

questionnaires. For example, 75% of citizens want military spending decreased 5 to 10%.

Persons with higher scores on religious fundamentalism and warmongering tend to trust

national political leaders, while those higher on kindly religious beliefs, human rights

endorsement and endorsement of a positive foreign policy do not necessarily (Table III).

Known groups studies

Quakers are known for their endorsement and promotion of peace. They have won a

Nobel peace prize. As expected, they have lower warmongering scores than the general

public, as represented by community college students presented in Table IV. The difference

between the scores for 35 Quakers and 61 college students was tested by running a partial

correlation coefficient between a group identifier (1 for college students, 0 for Quakers) and

warmongering, controlling for age, gender and education. The correlation was .34, significant at the .001 level. In a similar study, 169 Nigerian criminals were compared to the 61 college students. The criminal group was higher on warmongering than the college students, as expected, with a partial correlation of .72, significant at the .000 level. The Nigerian sample was tested by a professor in that country, who had contacted the author via the Internet to inquire about his violence-proneness scale.

Warmongering-Proneness

Method

Warmongering is an extremely dangerous and costly trait, continuing to threaten groups within nations, between nations and civilization as a whole. It is the responsibility of behavioral scientists with knowledge of this trait to carry their findings to practical application for the benefit of humankind. Further validity for measures of the trait of warmongering could be gained by knowing the scores of political and military leaders. Of particular interest would be scores for leaders with known histories of warmongering such as Hitler, Attila the Hun and Genghis Khan, compared to peace-loving leaders such as Gandhi, Nelson Mandela and Jimmy Carter. However, deceased leaders cannot take a questionnaire and it would not be practical to expect politicians running for public office or military leaders to complete a questionnaire measuring the trait of warmongering. Nonetheless, because of the severe danger warmongering leaders pose to nations, it behooves the citizens of a nation to know the level of this trait in political leaders, especially those campaigning for top leadership positions.

The author has worked for several decades as an applied psychologist in the clinical and industrial/organizational fields. His violence-proneness test was developed to help public schools and communities protect themselves from dangerous individuals.

Because of the very robust relationship between the warmongering trait and many publically observable traits, it seemed possible to devise a rating scale that journalists could use to rate the warmongering-proneness of political figures, to enable them to inform the public of the presence or absence of this trait in candidates for office. Such a scale might also be valuable to the military in evaluating candidates for military service, especially high-ranking officers who could attempt coups. The scale might also be of value to historians for studying historical leaders.

The author wrote a 50-item rating scale (the McConochie Warmongering-Proneness scale, McWaP), basing the content of items directly on the traits found to correlate significantly with warmongering, as discussed above. Sample items are presented in Appendix D. The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for "Strong evidence against the trait" to 5 for "strong evidence for the trait."

This rating form was initially tested by having 19 adults complete it on President George W. Bush and his 2004 Presidential opponent John Kerry. The raters were middle-aged adults, 12 of whom were from a mainstream Christian church that includes both Democrats and Republicans. Raters were not asked to indicate either their own names or political affiliations. They ranged in age from 29 to 80, mean age of 62, standard deviation

11.4. Eight were men. They ranged in education from 12 to 22 years, mean 16.7 years (college degree, plus). The data were collected in January–March, 2005.

Results

All of the 19 scores for Bush were higher than Kerry's highest score. The mean item score for Bush was 3.99—for Kerry it was 2.13. The scores clustered tightly around the means (standard deviation .42 for Bush, .31 for Kerry). The difference between these mean scores was significant at the .000 level.

To get an estimate of the absolute degree of warmongering-proneness reflected in scores of 3.99 and 2.13, a mean item score above the midpoint of the scale, 3.5, would indicate a positive score, "has the trait". A mean item score below 3.5 would indicate "does not have the trait."

One can also examine the percentile equivalents of mean item scores of 2.13 (Kerry) and 3.99 (Bush) on the presumably related measure of warmongering itself as normed on the adults in prior studies reported above. For example, using the 214 American adult sample, a mean item score of 2.20 on warmongering corresponds to the 67th percentile. The highest score for these normal adults is 3.6, the 100th percentile. Bush's score of 3.99 is above the 100th percentile for these normal Americans.

Scores between the 25th and 75th percentiles are considered to be "average" on widely accepted measures of other major psychological traits, such as intelligence. By this framework, Kerry's score somewhat below the 67th percentile would fall in the average range

on warmongering-proneness, while Bush's score at the 100th percentile would fall in the very high range.

As mentioned above, this instrument measures traits related to warmongering, not warmongering itself. We can expect that scores on this instrument would correlate very highly with scores on the warmongering scale. For example, the multiple correlation between several of the traits included in the McWaP and warmongering was .80. The traits included in this statistic were the Big Five personality traits, the social disenfranchisement total scores for the five individual and five group measures, the sustainability endorsement scale, age and education.

To further check this expectation of a high correlation between the McWaP scale and warmongering, I ran a multiple correlation between nine of the many dimensions in the McWaP on the one hand and warmongering on the other for the samples of 35 and 33 churchgoers. The dimensions were age, education, Big Five personality traits, intelligence (measured by my 12-item scale), religious fundamentalism and kindly religious beliefs measured by my scales, human rights endorsement (44-item scale), a measure of ecology or sustainability endorsement and my 12-item lie/conniving scale. The multiple correlations were .85 and .82 respectively.

These correlations, ranging from .80 to .85, were expected to be an underestimate of the relationship between warmongering and the McWaP scale itself, as the McWaP is based on more than the dimensions included in any of these three studies. These rather high

multiple correlations supported the expectation that the McWaP, if reliable, would provide a very accurate estimate of the warmongering disposition itself.

To establish markers for politicians' scores on warmongering-proneness, one could obtain scores on the McWaP for well-known political leaders, some considered to be warmongers, some not. For example, it would be interesting to have scores on Napoleon Bonaparte, Hitler and Stalin, compared to Lincoln, Roosevelt and Churchill. If the first three leaders have scores higher than the latter three, this would add support to the validity of the instrument and provide objective anchor points on the scale. We can rate leaders long dead, as long as sufficient historical data about their lives is available.

A slightly modified version of the McWaP was created for rating historical leaders. Rating form items were phrased in the past tense and some items were adjusted for historical realities (e.g., no nuclear weapons in Bonaparte's time). In addition to the 19 church members who rated Bush and Kerry, several other adults rated political leaders on the McWap. They rated leaders with whom they felt familiar from reading history, biographies, etc. These raters ranged in age from 29 to 80. Most were between age 47 and 72. They were well-educated college graduates, many with advanced degrees, either retired history teachers or history buffs who read biographies on historical leaders. One hundred twelve ratings were obtained on 25 current and past leaders (Table V).

Alpha reliability for the 50 items in the scale for this data was .98. While this may seem almost too high to be real, such very high reliabilities have been obtained by others using averaged scores by expert raters (cf. Simonton, 2006, p. 517). Regarding internal

consistency, 49 of the 50 items in the scale correlated significantly with the total score.

Thirty-eight of the 50 items correlated .60 or higher with the total score while 18 correlated

above .80. The only item that didn't correlate was an item that asked if the person rated was

of the male gender. Because all of the persons rated were males, this item didn't add anything

to differentiating persons on this scale. Based on subsequent research, this item has been

replaced with "Does the person have a messianic self-image, a sense of personal destiny or

duty to achieve great things?"

The fact that the 49 items all correlate significantly with the total score is another

indication that all of these dimensions are parts of a single trait, in this case

"warmongering-proneness". In a sense, this seems an indirect further confirmation of the

validity of prior studies documenting the relationships between the warmongering trait and

all of the other psychological traits included in the McWap scale.

To check the validity of the scores, the author created a rating form asking persons to

rate 20 of these leaders (before McWap data for the other 5 were obtained) on a scale from 1

to 5 on warmongering defined not as warmongering per se but simply as "promoting the

development and use, for aggressive purposes, of military weapons and forces (armies, navies,

etc.)."

Twenty-two adults did these ratings. They were well-educated and were middle-aged

for the most part (mean age of 60, standard deviation 11.2 years). Twenty-seven percent

were men. They all had a college education, many with advanced degrees (mean 17.9 years,

standard deviation 1.7 years). Gender did not correlate strongly with other variables; these

results are not gender-biased. Sixteen of these raters were members of mainstream Christian

churches. None of these adults had done the McWaP ratings. The reliability of these ratings

was .99, computed by transposing the file and computing the alpha for the 22 raters' scores.

Computations were made to find the average (mean) ratings for the 20 leaders (22

ratings for each one). These scores provide perspective on the range of the warmongering

disposition as viewed by educated American adults (Table VI). The correlation between these

scores and the McWaP rating form scores for the 20 leaders included in both groups was

.90**.

Discussion

Several interesting implications flowing from the present studies have inspired the

present author to conduct additional studies. The relationship between religious

fundamentalism as defined by the author via factor analysis of sample beliefs from the major

world religions has been compared to Altemeyer's Religious Fundamentalism scale,

developed from brainstorming initially, and to Gerard Saucier's Alpha belief factor, which he

developed from a lexical approach (McConochie, 2006c). The meaning of religion for

fundamentalists compared to those of the kindly disposition has been explored, with

unexpected and interesting findings: The proportions of persons with fundamentalist (6%)

and kindly religious beliefs (89%), and the proportions of those who endorse warmongering

(6%) and human rights (90%) has been explored and discussed in the context of implications

for a species survival function.

Motives for participating in war other than as a warmonger, as in defensive warrior and pacifist behavior, have been studied with Dr. Holly Arrow (McConochie, 2006c) of the University of Oregon. Seventy percent of 238 students described themselves as defensive warriors, 25% as pacifists and 5% as invasive warriors, the same percentage of "warmongers" found in other studies. The trait of warmongering has been explored and found to be as present among persons of other nations and continents and with the same political implications as for Americans. The positive relationship between the trait of warmongering and special interest group democracy but negative relationship with public democracy, and the very strong public preference for public democracy (90%) over special interest group democracy (18%) has been followed with a design for a political party that would promote this new form of government. Studies by the author (McConochie, 2006a, p. 213 ff.) have explored public endorsement levels for various features of this new hypothetical party, including processes for funding and platform issue definition.

The trait of warmongering, reliably measured via self-report questionnaires, is related to many other psychological traits and is manifested variously in groups, as expected, that vary in their peace-promoting and antisocial tendencies. Such questionnaire measures permit detailed exploration of the mind of the warmonger in regard to attitudes and beliefs about religion, politics and foreign policy. This can empower researchers to reveal the links between these attitudes and potentially dangerous proclivities toward selfishness, such as special interest group favoritism and destructive conflict with other political parties. At the

extreme, understanding warmongering helps unravel attitudes and beliefs that can underlie and lead to civil and international war.

The corresponding trait of warmongering-proneness can be reliably measured by a rating scale of items with content based on the relationships between warmongering and other traits. Such rating scales can be used by historians to study past military and political figures with greater quantitative precision. These scales can also be used by journalists to inform voters in the present on the potentially dangerous tendencies of candidates for political office.

Other traits, such as leadership, genius and perhaps even saintliness could similarly be measured and studied, further expanding the scientific exploration of these historically and socially important human characteristics. Such studies can also help to bridge distances between the fields of psychology, history, political science, religion and other fields, promoting interdisciplinary studies.

The present journal article presents studies which are limited in various ways but in ways that can be easily overcome by further research. The items used to measure warmongering and warmongering-proneness all were written by the author. Other authors or groups of researchers might conceive of items with different content and thus different import from the present findings. The groups studied and reported in this article are of limited variety. Further studies of other groups known to vary in their proclivities for peace or war can help clarify the validity of the trait of warmongering as measured. Additional current political figures, military leaders and historical figures can be added to the list of

those already rated with the warmongering-proneness scale. Additional studies can explore

the validity of such expanded lists with independent ratings of the trait of warmongering.

These ratings can be done by journalists, historians others, to explore the possible rater-bias

influence on such data. For example, ratings of current political figures by persons of

opposing political orientations, e.g., Republicans versus Democrats versus Independents,

could reveal biases.

Warmongering-proneness and warmongering are perhaps the most dangerous and

destructive human traits, considering the millions of people that have been killed directly

under the influence of warmongers such as Hitler and Stalin. Of perhaps equal importance

might be pro-social, political traits such as humanitarianism, peace-promotion, saintliness

and pro-social political leadership. These can be conceptualized and studied with future

scales.

All of the present studies were conducted with questionnaires in English. Studies

using translated versions can be conducted to explore the implicitly universal implications of

the present findings. To facilitate this, the author has had four of his primary scales

translated into French, German and Spanish to facilitate such studies (McConochie, 2006b).

Discussion points:

Do President G. W. Bush's efforts to reduce the threat of North Korea as a warmongering

nation prove that Bush himself is not a warmonger?

No, for if he is high on warmongering-proneness, this trait does not change just because of

one or another political behavior. This trait is considered to be rather deep-seated, as are

many other psychological traits, such as intelligence and the Big Five personality traits,

which are rather stable, especially in adulthood. Historical examples include Napoleon

Bonaparte, who after many years as an aggressive military leader of France was imprisoned.

He escaped and resumed his warmongering, ending in defeat at Waterloo and imprisonment

until his death. Hitler negotiated a peace treaty with Stalin in August of 1939 but then

invaded Russia less than 24 months later in June of 1941.

If a modern-day rating scale of warmongering-proneness does not include items reflecting

possible peace-promoting behaviors by a leader, is the rating scale defective or otherwise

inadequate?

No. Political lying and conniving are consistent with warmongering, as noted in Hitler's

behavior, above. A warmonger can appear to promote peace in some activities but still be a

warmonger at heart. If a rating scale of warmongering-proneness consists of enough good

items to render it technically reliable, and if studies confirm that it is valid (correlating as

expected with other evidence of warmongering), then it is a dependable and viable scientific

instrument.

If a rating scale of warmongering-proneness does not include items about content that some

experts think should be a part of the concept, is the scale inadequate? No. No scale measure

of a trait will include all possible items that could be reliable and valid contributors to the

scale. No intelligence test includes all possible items that measure intelligence. Two

different intelligence tests can include no items in common but both be reliable and valid

measures of intelligence, just as distance can be measured in terms of meters or yards with

equal accuracy.

Are raters' judgments of warmongering-proneness hopelessly biased by media coverage,

historical information or other biased information, rendering any attempts to rate a trait such

as warmongering-proneness inaccurate and thus useless?

No. Indeed, the more information available to raters the better, and the longer the rating

scale, the better. A reliable and valid scale of warmongering-proneness will consist of many

valid items, each consisting of an observable characteristic, such as religious beliefs, foreign

policy attitudes, human rights policies, and policy statements about military armaments. The

more information journalists or other raters have about these behaviors, the more accurately

they can rate them on a given leader. Taking the mean score across several careful raters

yields scores that very reliably differentiate leaders with different amounts of this trait. For

example, many different political and military leaders active in World War II are reliably

differentiated with the author's warmongering-proneness scale. Roosevelt, Churchill and

Eisenhower have scores much lower than those of Patton, Stalin and Hitler.

But if these ratings all were done by Americans, might not their leanings favor Americans over German and Russian leaders?

Perhaps. But this would not explain how they would reliably rate Patton higher than Eisenhower, both American Generals, or Stalin, over Churchill, both foreign allies. More comparative studies are certainly appropriate to see if leader scores hold up when done by careful raters from different nations. But the possibility of contrary results in future studies does not negate the value of results from initial studies. The fact that the Wright brothers' Dayton Flyer airplane was flimsy and could only carry a light load over a limited distance did not render it an invalid contribution to the studying of aerodynamics. Indeed, we could argue that putting an end to war is as worthwhile a goal as enabling humans to fly and that identifying potential warmongers and keeping them out of political power is a practical approach to this end.

Summary

Warmongering and warmongering-proneness are found to be reliably measurable psychological traits that permit studies of the behavior of both current political leaders and past historical figures. Warmongering is robustly related to many other traits, including religious fundamentalism, kindly religious beliefs and endorsement of human rights, sustainable policies and programs, and a positive foreign policy. Warmongers endorse military dictatorship and special interest group democracy, whereas the majority of citizens (90%) strongly prefer a new form of democracy serving the best interest of the community

overall. Scientists can follow these research leads to explore the many implications in a diverse array of related topics, including religion, history, political science and evolution. Applied psychologists can explore mechanisms by which a new form of democracy can be defined and realized to protect nations from war and to promote government serving the best interests of communities overall, as opposed to special interest groups.

References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality.* New York: Harper.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2,* 113–133.

Campbell, D. P. (1995). The psychological test profiles of brigadier generals: Warmongers or decisive warriors? In D. Lubinski & R. V. Dawis (Eds.), *Assessing individual*

differences in human behavior: New concepts, methods, and findings. P. 145 ff., Palo

Alto, CA: Davies–Black.

Eidelson, R. J., & Eidelson, J. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward

conflict. *American Psychologist, 58,* 182–192.

Etheredge, Lloyd S. (1978a). Personality Effects on American Foreign Policy. *The*

American Political Science Review, Vol. 72, No. 2., June, pp 434-451.

Etheredge, Lloyd S. (1978b). *A World of Men: The Private Sources of American Foreign*

Policy, The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. and London.

HTTP://irregulartimes.com/conformitiy.html. (Brief overview of Asch, Milgram and

Zimbardo studies with references).

Hunsberger, B. (1996). Religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and hostility

toward homosexuals in non-Christian religious groups. *The International Journal for*

the Psychology of Religion, *6*(1), 39–49.

Ivins, Molly. (2005). *Don't Blame Newsweek*. Alternet. May, 17.

Jost, J. T., and Sidanius, J. (2004). *Political psychology.* New York: Psychology Press

McConochie, W. (2006a). *Making peace: Psychological origins of violence-proneness,*

warmongering and a new democracy. Author.

McConochie, W. (2006b). *Manual for political psychology scales.* Author. Available at

www.Testmasterinc.com

McConochie, W. (2006c). Religious beliefs for war, peace and species survival. In

submission to *Political Psychology*.

Post, Jerrold M. (2004). *Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World, The Psychology of Political Behavior*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., and London.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 741–763.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. (2004). *War and the American Presidency*, W.W. Norton & Co., New York.

Rogers, Will, *New York Times*, Dec. 23, 1929.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Simonton, D. K. (2006). Presidential I.Q., openness, intellectual brilliance, and leadership: Estimates and correlations for 42 U. S. chief executives. *Political Psychology, 27,* 511–526.

www.apa.org/publicinfo/prisonerabuse.html (2006).

Appendix A

Sample Items for Scales Studied

All are by the author except scales 22–24. Except for the Violence-proneness scale and the

Big Five items, all scale items are presented in 5-option Likert format, from Strongly Disagree

(1) to Strongly Agree (5). Some items are reverse scored.

Scale	Sample items
1.Social Disenfranchisement (Eidelson worldviews), Individual level.	"I am more special and important than other people are."
Social Disenfranchisement, Group level	"A group I'm in has a long history of persecution by other groups."
2. Sustainability	"My national government should support international

Endorsement Scale	treaties and efforts to reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming."
3. Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement	"My national government should… … help other countries with peaceful means rather than military ones. …support the United Nations."
4. Proportional Public School Budgeting Endorsement	This scale measures endorsement for a budgeting system for public schools based on a proportion of each dollar going for designated essential services, regardless of total budget amounts, with teacher salaries and benefits determined by mathematics rather than union contracts.
5. Pro-Public democracy Endorsement Scale	This scale is based on endorsement levels independently for each of five types of government: anarchy, military dictatorship, monarchy, special interest group funded democracy ("tribal democracy"), and a hypothetical democracy serving the interests of the community overall vs. special interest groups. The first four are reverse-scored.
6-9. Warmongering scales	"Our nation should be guided by the principle 'Might

	makes right; survival of the fittest."
	"Nazi Germany was justified in invading other countries in World War II."
	"In war, it is reasonable to kill many enemy civilians by bombing cities to lower morale."
10. Warmongering-proneness	This scale measures the warmongering-proneness of a political or historical leader, via ratings, usually done by experts familiar with the leaders. Sample items: "Does the person belong to a group that feels superior to other groups?" "Does the person think spending for military activities should be increased?"
11. Xenophobia	"I would rather live in Kansas, the geographical center of the United States, than in California."
12. Political Lying and Conniving Endorsement	"Political leaders should be willing and able to skillfully lie to the public if necessary to promote and defend their actions"
13. Propaganda endorsement	"If you're not for me, you're against me."
14. Messianic Self-image	"I have felt that I may have a special destiny in life."

Scale	
15. Religious Fundamentalism. (McConochie)	"There is only one true god (or God) which all people of the world should worship." "Unquestioning loyalty to superiors, including political leaders, is appropriate."
16. Kindly Religious Beliefs Scale	"The peoples of all nations should learn to live peacefully together, resolving differences not by economic or military might but by discussion, working together, increasing understanding of one another and compromising." "Violence toward one's fellow humans is not appropriate." "One should love his neighbor as himself and treat others as he would like to be treated."
17. Religiousness Scale	"I am a very religious person", "I try to say prayers daily."
18. Human Rights Endorsement	"Everyone has the right to food, clothing and shelter." "We should promote local, regional and global civil society, and promote the meaningful participation of all interested individuals and organizations in decision

	making at the local, regional and global level."
19. At Risk for Violence Test	This 58-item questionnaire measures about a dozen traits that correlate with incarceration in teens and adults and with other measures of criminal intent and actions. Traits measured include feelings of social rejection, unresolved anger, endorsement of homicide as a way to solve personal problems, e.g. "I can think of at least one person I know that I would like to kill if I was sure I would get away with it", and gun skill and access. 4-item Likert format.
20. Terrorism endorsement scale	"I have the courage to die in committing an act of terrorism." "I want to learn more about how to become a terrorist."
21. Government Type Preferences Scales	These five items simply ask how strongly a person endorses each of the five types of government included in scale #5, above. The items are presented in 5-option Likert format.
22. Religious Fundamentalism (Altemeyer, 20 items)	This scale includes items such as "When you get right down to it, there are only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God;

	and the rest, who will not."
23. Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer)	This scale includes items such as "The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated trouble makers and got us back on our true path." For this study, the items were presented in 7-option Likert format.
24. Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto and Sidanius)	This scale includes items such as "In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups." Presented in 7-option Likert format.
25. Clinical anxiety	This 99-item scale measures several aspects of clinical anxiety and also clinical worry. Sample items: "I am afraid of dying before my time", "Other people say I am overly anxious or scared", "Anxiety interferes with my sleep many nights".
26. Muslim prejudice	Five items, e.g. "Islamic countries are violent, fanatical and dangerous."
27. Big Five Personality traits	Five items independently measure the Big Five traits: Extroversion, Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability. The items are in 7-option Likert format with each end of each

	item anchored with words descriptive of that end of the trait.
28. Fear of Muslim Terrorism	Measured by five items, such as "My country is threatened by terrorists one way or another almost every day."
29. Verbal intelligence	Measured by either 1 or 5 sections of the author's True/False Quick Verbal Quotient test, modeled after the Wechsler Adult Intelligence scale: Information, Similarities, Arithmetic, Vocabulary, and Judgment.

Appendix B

A 32-item Warmongering Scale (34 items less items 7 and 10)

Asterisked items constitute a 10 item scale.

1. I feel like getting even with or retaliating against people who have mistreated me.

*2. My national government should do whatever best serves the interests of our nation's

interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary.

3. Our nation should be guided by the principle: "Might makes right; survival of the fittest."

4. Our nation should be guided by the principle: "Cooperate, compromise and help others;

survival of the kindest." R

5. If my government asked me to, I would be willing to reduce my consumption of gasoline or other transportation budget by 10 percent to help reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming. R

7. I would like to fly a military jet fighter plane and shoot its cannons.

*8. President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein.

9. I admire Adolf Hitler, Chancellor of Germany during World War II.

11. If I were President, I would want to have a good supply of nuclear weapons and powerful military forces that could deliver them at my command.

12. If I were the leader of a nation, I would be willing to take strong measures to repress persons in my country who opposed my leadership.

13. Nazi Germany was justified in invading other countries in World War II.

14. Our country should avoid going to war at all costs. R.

15. Our country should go to war whenever we think our access to resources in other countries is threatened.

16. I like to watch war movies.

17. I would resent being drafted to fight in almost any kind of war for my nation. R.

18. Military leaders who start wars that kill many civilians indiscriminately should be tried as war criminals. R

19. Ethnic cleansing, to rid the world of undesirable types of people, is a justified aspect of wars.

20. If questionnaires like the on I have just taken could reliably identify persons who are interested in starting wars, then candidates for national political office in my country should have to pass them to make sure they do not get elected. R

21. Military battles are a noble and glorious activity.

22. I would rather have an ex-military general for President of our nation than a non-military person.

23. In war, it is reasonable to kill many enemy civilians by bombing cities to lower morale.

24. It is reasonable to let prisoners of war starve if food is scarce.

* 25. It is more reasonable to spend money for a stronger military force than for a national health care program.

* 26. It is wiser to spend more money for a strong military than for non-military peace-promoting foreign aid, trade, student exchanges and tourism.

27. It is reasonable to use prisoners of war as slave laborers during time of war.

28. If a nation has problems due to a growing population it is more reasonable for them to conquer other nations by war for more space and resources than to control the size of their population.

29. If a citizen refuses to fight in his nation's war because he is a pacifist, he should be considered a traitor.

* 30. It is more honorable to serve one's nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.

* 31. The United States should have stuck it out in South Viet Nam until it won the war.

* 32. The United States was justified in killing off Native American Indians and taking control of their land.

* 33. Centuries ago, the Spaniards were justified in killing natives in Central and South America to get their silver and gold.

 34. Centuries ago, the Romans were justified in invading and conquering Europe and Great Britain to expand the Roman Empire.

9th item of 10 item scale: A good reason for our nation going to war is to kill enemy soldiers and civilians in order to reduce population numbers so there are more resources for the people of our nation.

10th item of 10 item scale: A good reason for our nation going to war is to assure access to whatever raw materials, such as oil, we need from other nations.

Appendix C

Social Disenfranchisement Items which Correlate with Warmongering

Warmongers agree with all statements except those followed by "R", with which they disagree.

29. It is better to combat terrorism with foreign aid and student exchanges than with military action. R.

31. Patience and peaceful efforts are better than military action to stop strong countries from victimizing weak ones. R.

42. A group I'm in must be prepared to fight other groups before they fight us.

46. I belong to a group or organization that actively works to promote world peace between nations. R.

47. I think powerful nations should each adopt a weak nation to befriend and help. R.

48. I think that weak and unusual peoples, ethnic groups and languages should be protected and cherished. R.

49. It is wise to assume that strangers are more dangerous than safe.

50. I trust hardly anyone.

51. Most people will take unfair advantage of you if they can.

52. Very few persons are capable of truly cooperating with others.

53. We should teach children to be kind and helpful to all people and animals. R.

54. Almost everyone is good and kind inside. R.

55. People turn out badly only if they are mistreated. R.

57. Many people of other nations are deliberately trying to harm our nation.

58. Many leaders of foreign countries cannot be trusted to keep their promises.

59. Several other nations are making trouble for us around the world.

60. There are nations that are evil to the core and dangerous to our welfare.

61. Almost all common people in all nations are friendly and kind to foreigners. R.

63. Our nation is wise not to trust most of the nations in the United Nations.

64. I am a member of a group that has good reason to distrust other groups.

77. I prefer to be in groups that help weaker groups to succeed. R.

78. I believe all nations should be helped to have power and respect. R.

79. Powerful nations should not boast and dominate weaker nations. R.

80. Powerful countries should be willing to give up some of their power so weaker nations

can survive. R.

Appendix D

The McConochie Warmongering-Proneness Scale (McWaP)

1. Does the person belong to a group, organization or social class that feels helpless?

2. Does the person belong to a group that feels a sense of injustice?

3. Does the person belong to a group that feels distrust in other groups?

4. Does the person belong to a group that feels vulnerable?

5. Does the person belong to a group that feels superior to other groups?

6. Is it likely that the person feels like a failure in careers longed for or engaged in?

7. Does the person tend to think rigidly, inflexibly, unable to consider alternative

points of view, alternative courses of action?

8. Does the person seem to have a lack of guilt for wrongdoing either by him/herself

or by persons with whom he/she closely identifies?

9. Does the person seem preoccupied with or frequently concerned about being

rejected by others?

10. Does the person engage in activities that suggest pleasure from hostile acts, such

as participating in or watching violent sports, or recreational activities?

11. Does the person seem to have a reservoir of unresolved anger. For example,

does he/she bear grudges? Are there persons or groups with which he/she

seems constantly at odds?

12. Does the person have gun skill and access to guns?

13. Does the person seem unwilling to ask for help with personal or business problems,

to carefully consider helpful suggestions or other offers of assistance?

14. Does the person show an unwillingness to help reduce violence in the community?

15. Does the person seem comfortable lying and/or using propaganda?

16. Does the person seem interested in dominating other individuals or groups?

17. Does the person seem to think it is his/her position, right or duty to dominate others?

18. Does the person hold membership in groups or organizations who

advocate dominating other groups?

19. Does the person maintain an authoritarian stance vis a vis other persons or groups?

20. Does the person associate with or endorse groups that advocate authoritarian

views, opinions or actions?

21. Does the person hold fundamental religious beliefs, e.g. that there is only one

true God and that anyone that disagrees with this belief is wrong?

22. Does the person disavow kindly religious beliefs, e.g. that all peoples should strive

to cooperate and compromise to get along together?

23. Does the person advocate or condone anarchy forms of government?

24. Does the person advocate or support military dictatorship forms of government?

25. Does the person advocate government serving special interest groups rather

than citizens in general?

26. Does the person have a messianic self-image, a sense of personal destiny or duty

to achieve great things?

27. Does the person lack a college education?

28. Does the person lack verbal intelligence? Be careful in rating this one. Don't

assume that a person is not intelligent just because they have done a few "stupid"

things. High verbal intelligence is often reflected in traits and activities such

as sophisticated conversation, good memory, comprehensive awareness of

relevant information, high grades in school, high levels of formal education,

significant achievement in career activities, etc. Don't assume the person has high

verbal intelligence just because they have a college degree.

29. Does the person disavow endorsement of human rights, e.g. prisoner of war rights

and equal status for women?

30. Does the person disavow international global warming treaties?

31. Does the person disavow international arms control treaties?

32. Does the person disavow endorsement of fossil fuel conservation and

eventual replacement with renewable, non-polluting fuels?

33. Does the person disavow conservation of forests and fresh water fisheries?

34. Does the person disavow public democracy, direct participation by the public

 in government policy decision-making?

35. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy, e.g. fighting terrorism

with non-military means more than military ones?

36. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy helping other nations achieve

their goals?

37. Does the person disavow support of the United Nations organization?

38. Does the person have a disagreeable personality, being oppositional,

irritable, contrary, argumentative or unsupportive of others?

39. Does the person have tendencies toward anxiety, depression or other signs

of emotional instability?

40. Does the person have strong trust in top government leaders and cabinet members?

41. Does the person advocate unquestioning loyalty to such leaders?

42. Does the person think spending for military activities should be increased?

43. Does the person disavow the idea of his/her national budget being determined by direct

vote of the citizens?

44. Does the person think his/her nation should try to control the world with military

power?

45. Does the person advocate retaliation against wrongdoers?

46. Does the person advocate access to and use of nuclear weapons or other very destructive

weapons, if needed to achieve military ends?

47. Does the person have interest in military activities, manufacturers, armed forces,

weapons?

48. Does the person enjoy war movies, war stories, hostile video games?

49. Does the person think war is a noble and glorious activity?

50. Does the person think that powerful nations in the past have been justified in killing peoples in underdeveloped countries to get control of their gold, silver, land or other resources?"

Table I

Statistical Properties of Study Scales

Scale	Range	Mean	Standard deviation	Alpha reliability .	Sample size (combined over several	Numbe r of Items

				Or KR-21 reliab.*	studies)	
1. Social disenfranchisement (Eidelson traits), Individual level	49-142	98.8	19.0	.96	381	40
Social Disenfranchisemnt, group level	45-142	101.5	17.0	.94	380	40
Social Disenfranchisement, Total Score	97-262	200.0	33.2	.97	378	80
2. Sustainability endorsement	29-60	45.0	7.5	.76	383	12
3. Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement	30-60	50.5	7.0	.87	112	12
4. Proportional Public School Budgeting	3-15	10.7	2.45	.63	383	3

Endorsement						
5. Public Democracy End	9-25	19.45	4.19	.56	383	5
6. – 9. Warmongering scales of 10,12, 20 and 32 items. For the 20-item scale:	20-79	49.4	14.72	.88	376	20
10. Warmongering-proneness	56-248	144.0	53.5	.98	25	50
11. Xenophobia	8-27	15.81	4.83	.73	31	6
12. Lying and Conniving	12-34	16.55	4.98	.89	58	12
13. Propaganda Endorsement	4-20	11.16	3.22	.89	273	4
14. Messianic Self-Image	4-20	11.16	3.22	.81	273	4
15. Religious Fundamentalism	14-73	41.65	12.7	.83	246	17

16. Kindly Religious Beliefs	33-65	53.19	5.80	.81	246	13
17. Religiousness	4-20	9.20	4.80	.89	46	4
18. Human Rights Endorsement	85-220	189	22.5	.95	247	44
19. Violence-Proneness	Details in separat e manual .			.90		58
20. Terrorism endorsement scale.	"			.90		12
21. Government Type Preferences	A 1-5	1.79	1.284	*.75	383	1
	MD 1-5	1.85	1.250	*.69	383	1
Scale items:	Mo 1-5	2.32	1.221	*.44	383	1
Anarchy, Military	TD 1-5	2.59	1.354	*.51	383	1
Dictatorship,	PD 1-5	4.01	1.236	*.27	383	1
Monarchy, Tribal						
Democracy, Public						

Democracy.

22. Religious fundamentalism (Altemeyer)	14-45	31.7	6.2	*.82	115	20
23. Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer)	35-150	89.6	29.0	*.97	47	34
24. Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius and Prato)	23-62	41.5	11.6	*.95	47	16
25. Clinical anxiety (with many sub-scales). Total score:	71-240	153.9	46.5	*.96	27	64
26. Muslim prejudice	5-20	10.96	5.0	.89	27	5
27. Big Five- Extroversion	1-7	3.74	1.76	*.54	383	1

Agreeableness	1-7	5.02	1.59	*.38	383	1
Openness	1-7	3.99	1.98	*.66	383	1
Conscientiousness	1-7	3.78	1.68	*.47	383	1
Emotional Stability	1-7	4.39	1.69	*.45	383	1
28. Fear of Muslim Terrorism	4-18	11.7	3.3	.70	31	
29. Verbal I.Q.						
12 item Info. test:	1-12	7.39	2.45	.61	88	12
Full 60-item test:	86-125	104.0	10.35	*.93	30	60

Table II

Pearson Product Moment Correlations between Warmongering and other

Traits

Trait	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Warmongering	Large sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15. 45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Age	-.50**	375
Gender (Male)	.32**	376
Education	-.27**	367
29. Verbal intelligence	-.33*, -.48**, -.20 (-.27[a])	41, 30, 88
1. Social disenfranchisement, individual	.66**	376
Social disenfranchisement, group	.70**	373
Social disenfranchisement, total	.74**	373
2a. Sustainability endorse.	-.69**	376

2b. Ecology concerns endorsement	-.60**	112
3. Positive foreign policy endorsement	-.74**	111
4. Proportional Public School Budgeting Endorsement	-.43**	376
5. Public democracy endorsement	-.36**	376
10. Warmongering-proneness	N/A. See discussion below.	
11. Xenophobia	.39*	31
12. Political lying & conniving	.53**	255
13. Propaganda endorsement	.45**	255
14. Messianic self-image	.18**	255
15. Religious Fundamentalism (McC)	.53**, .60**	110, 31
16. Kindly Religious Beliefs	-.51**	109
17. Religiousness	.44*, .53**	31, 27
18. Human Rights endorsement	-.51**	111
19. Violence-proneness	.67**	48

20. Terrorism Endorsement	.24	33
21. Government type preferences:		
21a. Anarchy endorsement	.46**	376
	.54[a]	
21b. Military dictatorship endorsement.	.57**	376
	.70[a]	
21c. Monarchy endorsement	.33**	376
	.51[a]	
21d. Tribal democracy endorsement.	.37**	376
	.53[a]	
21e. Public Democracy Endorsement (Best Interests of Community Overall)	-.36**	376
	-.71[a]	
22. Religious Fundamentalism (Altemeyer)	.63**	35
23. Right Wing Authoritarianism	.59**	40

24. Social Dominance Orientation	.46**	40
25a. Claustrophobia	.40*	27
25b. Fear of Heights	.60**	27
25c. Anxious unless busy	.39*	27
25d. Unspecified anxiety	.41*	27
25e. Fear of small creatures	.37*	31
25f. Fear of evil spirits	.40*	31
25g. Overall Clinical Anxiety	.54**	27
26. Anti-Muslim prejudice.	.80**	31
27. Big Five Agreeableness	-.34**	376
	-.57[a]	
Big Five Emotional Stability	-.26**	376
	-.40[a]	
28. Fear of Terrorism	.50**	31
29. Verbal intelligence (listed above as fourth item).		

[a]Corrected for attenuation.

*p = .05. **$p \leq$ .01.

Table III

Correlations between Religious Fundamentalism and Warmongering versus Trust in Political

Leaders, Contrasted to Those for Persons who Endorse Kindly Religious Beliefs, Human

Rights and a Positive Foreign

Policy

Item	Fund Rel	Kindly Rel	Human Rts	Foreign Policy	Warmong.
President	.47**	-	-	-	.56**
Representatives in Congress	.34**	-	-	-	.39**

Senators	.31*	-	-	-	.34*
Lobbyists	.38**	-	-	-	.51**
Cabinet	.52**	-	-	-	.55**
Special interest groups	.28	-	-	-	.44**

Table IV

Warmongering Scores Documenting Differences between Quakers, Criminals and the General Public

Group	Warmongering Mean item score	Standard deviation
35 Quakers	1.48	.32
61 community college students.	2.08	.55

| 169 Nigerian criminals | 3.07 | .31 | |

Table V

Scores for 25 Leaders on the McWaP Scale

Leader	Score	Standard deviation	Number of raters
Nelson Mandela	1.61	.16	2

Leader	Score	Standard deviation	Number of raters
Mahatma Gandhi	1.71	.23	5
Jimmy Carter	1.73	.34	3
George Washington	1.82	-	1
Harry Truman	1.84	-	1
Lincoln	1.92	.47	6
F.D. Roosevelt	1.98	.37	8
Bill Clinton	2.09	.13	2
J.F. Kennedy	2.10	-	1
Teddy Roosevelt	2.12	.42	2
John Kerry	2.14	.30	20
D. Eisenhower	2.29	.21	2
Winston Churchill	2.20	.58	8
Woodrow Wilson	2.47	.24	2
Lyndon Johnson	2.56	-	1

G. H. Bush	2.6	.00	2
George Patton	3.11	.24	2
N. Bonaparte	3.64	.37	4
Alexander the Great	3.73	.02	2
Genghis Khan	3.98	-	1
G. W. Bush	4.00	.40	21
Attila the Hun	4.04	-	1
Stalin	4.21	.26	6
Hitler	4.50	.29	7
Saddam Hussein	4.68	.11	2

Table VI

Mean Scores for Past and Current Political Leaders on a 1-item Rating of "Promoting

Military

Aggression"

1.1	Mahatma Gandhi
1.3	Nelson Mandela
1.8	Jimmy Carter (Nobel Prize winner.)
2.6	Bill Clinton
2.6	Lincoln
2.8	John Kerry
2.8	Woodrow Wilson (Founder of League of Nations.)
3.1	F.D. Roosevelt
3.5	Eisenhower
3.6	Churchill
3.7	Teddy Roosevelt
4.2	George H. Bush

4.3　　　George Patton

4.5　　　Alexander the Great

4.6　　　Stalin

4.7　　　Napoleon Bonaparte

4.8　　　Attila the Hun

4.8　　　Genghis Khan

4.9　　　G. W. Bush

5.0　　　Hitler