

William McConochie, Ph.D.	Ph 541-686-9934
Political Psychology Research, Inc.	Fax 541-485-5702
71 E. 15th Ave.	E-mail:
Eugene, Or. 97401	Bill@Politicalpsychologyresearch.com

Getting Beyond In-fighting; Resolving Conflict between Conservative and Liberal  
Political Worldviews to Address Global Warming

Abstract: Correlation data is presented documenting trait differences between liberal and conservative worldviews across more than ten dimensions of political discourse and three dimensions of ethical beliefs. However, mean score data documents basic similarities between liberals and conservatives across these same dimensions. Several predictions are offered as to how the majority of liberals and conservatives will unite in the future in a new type of political party and governing.

Introduction.

In 1992 the Union of Concerned scientists, including 101 Nobel Prize winners, warned the world of imminent environment collapse, urging reduction in fossil fuel use, more efficient use of energy, water and other materials, reduction and elimination of poverty and stabilizing world population, as by empowering women to control their reproductive decisions (Peacemagazine).

In spite of these warnings and trends, there is little evidence of effective efforts to address these concerns. In the 1990s carbon dioxide in the world's atmosphere increased by less than one percent per year. Since 2000 it has increased dramatically to 3.5% per year. No part of the world has had a decline in emissions after 2000. The amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has reached what some experts consider to be a dangerous tipping point (Globalstewards). The world population has more than doubled during the past 50 years and is projected to double again during the next 50 years (Wikipedia/World\_Population).

It may seem reasonable to look to the United States for leadership on these issues, as the United States has led the world in scientific and technological innovations for decades. However, the United States leads in creating the very problems that need attention. United States is the world leader in per capita energy consumption, as it constitutes only 4.5% of world population but consumes 25% of world energy. And 86% of United States energy is produced via fossil fuels (coal, oil, and gas), all of which discharge carbon dioxide into the atmosphere (Wikipedia/Energy). Thus, on a per capita basis, the United States leads the world in emission of gases that contribute to global warming.

If other nations in the world emulate United States standard of living, which is dependent on high rates of energy consumption, then increase in burning fossil fuels world-wide seems inevitable.

If the United States as a nation cannot be depended upon to lead a constructive resolution of the energy production/fossil fuel use/atmospheric pollution problem, then

perhaps specific professions can offer solutions. One possible profession is the law profession. However, Gus Speth, currently professor of law at the University of Vermont and former United Nations staff member, has reviewed the efforts promoted by the legal profession to address environmental concerns over the past several decades, concluding that these efforts have been essentially ineffective (Speth, 2008).

He calls for dramatic new paradigms to address environmental concerns, including multidisciplinary approaches, grand social movements and help from religious leaders and behavioral scientists, such as psychologists. He also paraphrases economist Milton Friedman, who said that only a crisis promotes real change and that often such change capitalizes on "ideas that are lying around". These ideas, when realized, transform the impossible to the inevitable.

Review of research efforts by psychologists to help citizens address environmental problems shows that these efforts also have been minimally effective, suggesting that new approaches by psychologists will be needed (Swim et al, 2009). One approach psychologists might emphasize is their studies of human political behavior. Polls of as many as 33,000 citizens across all major regions of the world show that the majority of citizens are very concerned about environmental problems and are willing to endure costs to address them (Worldpublicopinion). On average, 65% of citizens believe that global warming is a very serious problem.

Thus, the problem may be conceptualized psychologically as a conflict between this majority citizen opinion and the minority financial interests of industries that profit directly from fossil fuel production and use, such as oil and gas companies, utility

companies and transportation industries. These industries, through financial contributions to the campaigns of elected political leaders, can directly influence government legislation to protect their production and use of fossil fuels to create energy and to power transportation.

Of course, virtually all citizens depend directly or indirectly upon the production of energy and transportation, as virtually all goods and services are transported, virtually all businesses and residents depend on electricity, and all local transportation, except walking and bicycles, depends on fossil fuels directly or indirectly. Even electric cars depend on electricity generated primarily by utility companies burning coal. Thus, in the long run, unless humanity can replace fossil fuels completely with other options, such as nuclear, wind, solar and hydrogen combustion, the only practical ways to significantly reduce global warming gases would seem to be by reduction in human population and reduction in standards of living, with all citizens living more simply, so that others may simply live, to paraphrase Mahatma Gandhi.

Assuming that citizens are willing to accept population control and more modest standards of living, then it would seem imperative that citizens who are concerned about the environment somehow become politically empowered, and in a manner that gives them a direct voice in shaping government policy, not just in electing representatives to public office.

A major challenge to uniting the majority of citizens politically will be resolving the apparent chronic conflict between the liberal and conservative worldviews that seem present in different forms throughout most, if not all, major national political affairs.

This conflict seems to cripple the United States effort to effectively address important national and world problems. For example, the United States has resisted full support of international treaties to address problems of global warming.

The dramatic efforts of citizen groups to replace dictatorships in the Middle East in recent years suggest that there is intense citizen interest in more advanced forms of government. Such interest has been evident in previous times historically, as during the French Revolution and during the formation of national government in the United States in the late 18th century.

There seems to be a gradual progression of human governments to forms that give increasingly direct voice to citizen desires, as reflected in transitions from monarchies and dictatorships to parliamentary and democratic forms of government, and from representative democracies to democracies that depend on direct citizen voting on policy issues, as through bond measures and referenda on taxes and other policies in state governments.

Presumably, progressive transitions of governments are more smoothly realized when the majority of citizens promoting them are united in political worldview. Differences between the conservative and liberal political worldviews thus pose an underlying challenge to citizen groups interested in transforming governments to forms more in line with majority citizen opinions and concerns.

To the extent that psychologists can help citizens understand the dynamics of human political behavior, and specifically those of the liberal and conservative worldviews, they may be able to facilitate new paradigms for more cooperative political

behavior. A new paradigm may be necessary to resolve the underlying, and perhaps innate, conflict between the conservative and liberal political worldviews.

Resolving the conflict between liberals and conservatives may at first appear to be a daunting task, in part because there is a growing body of research data supporting a genetic basis for these worldviews. If humans are hardwired politically, it may be impossible to change them.

Biologist Randy Thornhill and colleagues have found increasing frequency of religions, languages, war, conservative governments and disease pathogens closer to the equator (Thornhill, Fincher, & Aran, 2009). They postulate that the conservative worldview evolved in the human species because it protected local groups from neighboring disease pathogens to which the local group did not yet have immunity.

The present author has recently produced data consistent with this theory (McConochie, 2010a), including higher scores for conservatives on questionnaire measures of fear of diseased neighbors and endorsement of hypothetical attitudes of primitive tribal members, including endorsement of preserving local religion and language and engaging in warmongering. I hypothesize that the conservative worldview traits prepare persons with those traits to handle a variety of treats. For example, these traits include willingness to follow authoritarian leadership, engage in war and justify cruelty with fundamentalist religious beliefs of in-group superiority and supernatural backing.

In addition, I have hypothesized that the liberal worldview evolved because it served the local group by promoting peaceful trade with neighboring groups in times of

low threat. Liberals tend to get higher scores on a cluster of traits including human rights endorsement, a friendly foreign policy, kindly religious beliefs that eschew violence against humans, and endorsement of sharing economically. They also tend to endorse another measure of hypothetical attitudes of primitive tribal members, including encouraging teams of citizens to travel outside the home territory to interact peacefully with outside groups.

A physiological, genetic substrate for political orientation is suggested by recent studies. A twin study (Alford, Funk & Hibbing, 2005) shows that the correlations between conservative political orientation and questionnaire items that measure conservative attitudes are significantly higher for identical twins than for a matched sample of fraternal twins. An MRI study of the brain documents differences between conservatives and liberals (Ryota, Feilden, Firth & Rees, 2011). Conservatives have a larger right amygdala area, which is associated with greater sensitivity to fear. Liberals have a larger anterior cingulate cortex area, which is associated with constructively monitoring uncertainty and conflict.

I have asked students in classes and friends at club luncheons how many grew up in families of all conservatives, all liberals or some of each. In all groups the majority grew up in families of “some of each”. I then conducted an unpublished study of 199 persons in 25 families that showed that almost all of these families include both liberals and conservatives. And the 2010a study revealed that many people, even some strong conservatives and strong liberals, are a mixture of both liberal and conservative political

attitudes. In the 2010a study most traits were unrelated to years of education, as were liberal and political orientation themselves.

I interpret these findings as support for an evolutionary origin of liberal and political worldviews. Liberal and conservative worldviews present in families and clans gives even small social groups flexibility to take advantage of either high or low stress conditions. Primates that did not have this flexibility did not fare as well.

For decades psychologists have studied psychological traits related to politics. In 1950, social scientists created a psychological questionnaire measure of Fascism endorsement that was found to correlate with conservative political attitudes, to the embarrassment of political conservatives (Adorno, et al, 1950). The response was an effort to discredit the scale on the grounds that it did not have contrait items (items which if agreed with would lower one's score). Eventually a revised scale that *did* have contrait items, the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale of Bob Altemeyer, showed that adding contrait items made no difference; the measure still correlated with conservatism and with several unflattering traits, such as prejudice (Altemeyer, 2007).

Regarding research on this topic, recent comments of Stanford psychologist John Jost and colleagues are relevant. They opine in a 2003 review of psychological research on political attitudes: "The study of authoritarianism and other personality theories of political attitudes is often dismissed a priori as an illegitimate, value-laden attempt to correlate general psychological profiles with specific ideological beliefs. The psychological study of ideological conservatism is one that invites controversy, but this circumstance does not mean that researchers should avoid it." (Jost et al, 2003).



As reviewed in this article by Jost, a surge of renewed research has documented dozens of traits that differentiate liberals from conservatives. Many of the traits of conservatives are unflattering, though not all. Conservatives tend to be low on openness but high on conscientiousness, for example. My research on traits that differentiate liberal and conservative worldviews reveals several traits that are similarly unflattering to the conservative worldview (McConochie, 2010a, 2010b). For example, Warmongering Endorsement correlates  $.63^{**}$  with conservative political orientation and  $-.68^{**}$  with liberal political orientation.

When describing my findings to various audiences, including my own non-profit corporation board of directors, I have aroused concern over possible "bias" on my part. Concerns are raised when I label traits with terms such as "warmongering".

I have even been accused of bias by a conservative personal friend simply for including in a paper a review of relevant literature, research by dozens of other scientists that documents many unflattering traits associated with conservatism, such as prejudice, endorsement of aggression and war, intolerance of ambiguity and endorsement of social privilege or elitism.

In defense of these criticisms, I have offered several explanations. For example, I explain that I use the term "warmongering" because I am intending to measure something different from simple "militarism", as has been measured by other researchers. I define warmongering as invasive, as opposed to defensive, war, the sort of war promoted by Hitler...war initiated and waged to forcefully dominate and take from other nations without apology. I needed to measure this sort of war behavior to validate the Eidelson

worldviews, which I measured with an 80-item scale (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003, McConochie, 2005). The Eidelsons theorized that their five worldviews underlie international conflicts. In support of their theory, my studies showed a very strong, statistically significant correlation of .74 between my measure of warmongering endorsement and my measure of their worldviews: injustice, distrust, vulnerability, helplessness and superiority.

A few of the most encouraging results of my initial studies have been the finding that about 90 percent of citizens in many samples of students, churchgoers, etc. endorse government that serves them as members of the community overall, rather than as members of special interest groups, which is endorsed by only about 20 percent (persons endorse each government type separately).

My initial studies of about 20 psychological traits related to political attitudes revealed two clusters. One cluster clearly mapped on the conservative worldview as described by Thornhill, et al. The other seemed related to a liberal worldview. The percentage of persons who endorse the traits in the liberal cluster, such as kindly religious beliefs, human rights endorsement, concern for the environment, a kind and helpful foreign policy and improved government services, is between 75 and 95 percent in many of my studies. In contrast, only 6 percent or less typically endorse traits such as warmongering, religious fundamentalism, social disenfranchisement, Social Dominance Orientation and violence-proneness, which are associated with the conservative cluster.

Research by many scientists demonstrates how liberals can be temporarily induced to shift to the more conservative orientation, as when reminded of death

(mortality salience), disease, or the threat of military invasion from neighboring groups (Mortality Salience, Wikipedia). For the most part, however, we can expect conservatives to remain conservative and liberals to remain liberal.

Method.

To further test the theory of evolutionary origins of political worldviews, explore the possible relationship of my initial traits specifically to political orientation (liberal/conservative), and to clarify detailed political attitudes, I conducted two studies in 2010. The first measured more than 60 traits across 10 basic dimensions of political discourse, as mentioned above (McConochie, 2010a, & c). The trait items were presented in four questionnaires of over 800 items and were completed online by community college students for extra credit in classes taught by a friend of mine, Professor David Leung and by a smaller group of students from a university in New York. There were 151 to 189 persons total in the study (different totals for the 4 separate questionnaires), of which 35 were strong conservatives and 80 strong liberals. Virtually all of the traits correlated in the directions predicted with liberal and conservative political orientation. About 94 percent of the correlations were statistically significant.

The second study measured many of the traits in the first study and also several ethical dimensions presumed to underlie behavior of national political and corporate leaders (McConochie, 2010c). It included 43 strong conservatives and 49 strong liberals. Strong Conservatives are those who self-identify as 4 or 5 (Agree or Strongly agree) with the Conservative orientation item: "Politically, I consider myself a conservative." Strongly Liberals self-identify as 4 or 5 on the corresponding Liberal orientation item.

The correlations between the traits were similar to those found in the first study, described above, which included many of the same traits.

### Results.

Correlations between the traits of the second study are presented in Table 1.

(Insert Table 1 about here.)

Table 1. Correlations between psychological traits and political orientations for strong conservatives and strong liberals. N = 92, 47 strong conservatives plus 45 strong liberals, with a few who self-identified in both categories. Correlations are Pearson Product Moment, two tailed. Significance levels: .01\*\*, .05\*. The LibCon score is computed as the Liberalism score, plus the Conservatism score reverse-scored.

Trait	Conservatism	Liberalism	LibCon (Positive correlation = liberals higher. N = 87). Controlled for age, education and gender.
Conservatism	1.00	.00	
Liberalism	.00	1.00	
Age	-.06	-.01	
Gender	-.15	.08	
Years of education	-.08	-.01	
Warmongering	.49**	-.36**	-.43**
Violence-proneness	.00	.14	.16
Positive Foreign Policy	-.62**	.52**	.48**
Value Religion as personal guide	.53**	-.55**	.51**
Religious Fundamentalism	.63**	-.62**	.57**
Kindly Religious Beliefs	-.35**	.29**	.27**
Special Interest Group Elitism	.32**	-.28**	-.30**

Meta Religion Endorsement	-.31**	.29**	.24*
Public Democracy Endorsement	-.12	.02	.07
Authoritarianism	.48**	-.29**	-.38**
Human Rights Endorsement	-.46**	.44**	.42**
Environmentalism	-.51**	.45**	.44**
Big 5 Extroversion	.10	-.07	-.06
Agreeableness	-.22*	.16	.14
Conscientiousness	.12	-.09	-.11
Emotional stability	.07	-.15	-.12
Openness	-.51**	.48**	.50**
In-group Elitism (Ethical scale)	.18	-.05	-.16
Common Good Concern (Ethic)	-.75**	.70**	.67**
Messianic Nationalism (Ethic)	.48**	-.51**	-.45**
Guarded Self-Protection	.35**	-.33**	-.32**

Correlation coefficients have been the traditional way that prior researchers have measured the relationship between political orientation and psychological traits, such as in the studies summarized by Jost, et al in the articles cited above. And the correlations have rather consistently been unflattering for conservatives and flattering for liberals, e.g. in Table 1 conservatism correlating positively with warmongering and liberalism with human rights. In my studies, the fact that warmongering correlates positively and substantially with conservatism and negatively with liberalism implies to some persons that all conservatives are warmongers. This is the sort of interpretation of correlation data that has caused some observers bristle.

But in both of my studies, I found that the percentage of persons endorsing the liberal traits (those positively correlating with liberalism), such as kindly religious beliefs, positive foreign policy, public democracy, human rights and environmentalism) was much higher than for the traits correlating with the conservative orientation, such as warmongering, religious fundamentalism and authoritarianism. And this proportion was much higher even than the proportion of liberals in the samples, which implied that some conservatives were endorsing the liberal traits. I studied the data further and discovered that correlations alone do not tell the whole story.

To get a full understanding of the data, one must also examine the mean item scores on the traits. Significant correlations between group status and trait scores indicate that the mean item scores for the groups are significantly different. The mean item scores for my first study are presented in Table 2.

(Insert Table 2 about here.)

In Table 2, for item 5A, for example, we see that the score on warmongering endorsement for strong conservatives is 2.5, which is higher than it is for strong liberals, 1.6. Conservatism is more strongly related to endorsing warmongering than is liberalism.

However, because the mean scores for both groups are below the neutral range, which is 3, both liberals and conservatives, on average, agree that warmongering is not good policy. Similarly, for the Positive Foreign Policy scale, 5B, liberals as a group score higher than conservatives do, but both groups agree that a positive (peaceful and helpful) foreign policy is desirable.

This phenomenon is consistent across more than 10 dimensions of political discourse measured with over 60 scales in the first of my two studies. A sample of these scales is presented in the table. The Table 2 "Note" explains some of the details.

Table 2. Mean item scores of strong liberals -L- and strong conservatives -C- on 10 areas of political discourse, study 1. (Sample sizes range from 33 to 37 conservatives and from 66 to 84 liberals, depending on the trait.)

Note: Almost all of the "A" traits tend to correlate positively with Conservatism and Negatively with Liberalism. Almost all of the "B" traits tend to correlate positively with Liberalism and negatively with Conservatism. This relationship is reflected in the consistently higher scores for conservatives on the A traits and consistently higher scores for liberals on the B traits.

Political discourse area:	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
1. <u>Religion:</u>					
A. Fundamentalism	1.8 L	2.8 C			
B. Kindly Religious Beliefs			3.9 C	4.1 L	
2. <u>Social group belonging:</u>					
A. Social Disenfranchisement		2.2 L, 2.4 C			
B. Social enfranchisement			3.56 C, 3.58L		
3. <u>Government type pref.:</u>					

A. Spec. interest group govt.	1.7 L	2.0 C			
B. Common good govt.			3.9 C	4.5 L	
4. <u>Gender attitudes:</u>					
A. Male dominance		2.45 L	3.0 C		
B. Female respect				4.2C, 4.4L	
5. <u>Foreign Policy:</u>					
A. Warmongering	1.6 L	2.5 C			
B. Positive Foreign Policy			3.8 C	4.4 L	
6. Economics:					
A. Profit economics	1.7 L	2.4 C			
B. Balanced economics			3.8 C	4.3 L	
7. <u>Violence management:</u>					
A. Violence enabling		2.4 L, 2.9 C			
B. Citizen civility			3.7 C, 3.9 L		
8. <u>Social group relations:</u>					
A. Social dominance orientation	1.8 L	2.5 C			
B. Human Rights Endorse.				4.0 C, 4.6 L	
9. <u>Leadership type pref.</u>					
A. Authoritarianism		2.2 L, 2.9 C			
B. Citizen government			3.7 C	4.3 L.	



10. <u>Environment policy</u>	1.5 L	2.4 C			
A. Personal consumption					
B. Sustainable community endorsement			3.8 C	4.4 L	
11. <u>Miscellaneous traits:</u>					
A. Conservative traits		2.0 L	2.6 C		
B. Liberal traits			3.8 C	4.2 L	
12. Tribal beliefs:					
A. Conservative		2.6 L	3.1 C		
B. Liberal			3.6 C	4.2 L	
13. A. Lying and conniving		2.0 L, 2.4 C			
14. A. Disease phobia		2.0 L, 2.4 C			
15. A. Group-think	1.8 L	2.3 C			

Again, the content of the “A” traits in this table, those that conservatives tend to endorse more strongly than liberals do, will for some readers appear unflattering, especially ones such as 2A Social Disenfranchisement (the Eidelson worldviews), 5A Warmongering, 7A Violence enabling, 8A Social Dominance Orientation, 13A Lying and conniving, 14A Disease Phobia, and 15A Group-think.

Table 3 presents the corresponding mean scores for Strong Conservatives and Strong Liberals for the traits in the second study. The same phenomenon is present, with Strong Conservatives higher than Strong Liberals on the traits that correlate positively with conservatism and Strong Liberals higher on the traits that correlate positively with liberalism. And, the two groups, both Strong Conservatives and Strong Liberals, fall in the same general range, at or above the neutral point on the “Liberal” traits and at or below the neutral point on the “Conservative” traits.

Table 3. Mean item scores for 43 strong conservatives -C- and 49 strong liberals -L-, Study 2.

Trait	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
Warmongering	1.77 L	2.44 C			
Violence proneness	1.78 C, 1.90 L				
Pos. Foreign Policy			3.56 C,	4.18 L	
Value Religion		2.66 L	3.82 C		
Religious fundamentalism	1.95 L	2.80 C			
Kindly Religion			3.87 C	4.16 L	
Social & political elitism		2.64 L	3.01 C		
Meta religion			3.44 C, 3.81 L		

Public Democracy				4.30 C, 4.37 L	
Authoritarianism		2.47 L, 2.88 C			
Human rights				4.08 C, 4.55 L	
Environmentalism				4.09 C, 4.58 L	
Openness				4.70 C,	5.94 L*
In-group elitism		2.15 L, 2.33 C			
Common good concern		2.92 C	3.79 L		
Messianic nationalism		2.94 L	3.32 C		
Guarded self-protection		3.11 L, 3.39 C			

\* Big five traits are rated on a 7-point Likert scale.

#### Discussion.

This data appears to reflect tendencies for liberalism to be positively associated with one cluster of psychological traits and conservatism with another. Correlations reveal that the higher that a person self-identifies with either of these two political orientations, the more strongly he/she tends to endorse the traits in the cluster associated positively with that orientation. However, when mean trait scores are compared, strong liberals and strong conservatives fall rather closely together on the overall continuum of endorsement. And, both liberals and conservatives, as groups defined by their mean scores, tend to endorse the traits in the liberal cluster and eschew the traits in the conservative cluster; both endorse human rights and eschew warmongering, for example.

And, one of the most interesting findings is that both groups rather strongly endorse public democracy, defined as government that serves citizens as members of the community overall, rather than as members of special interest groups.

Because of their apparent genetic, biological underpinnings, and their low to non-existent correlations with years of education, the liberal and conservative worldviews and the traits that constitute them probably aren't likely to change much in individual persons. However, we may be able to capitalize on the fact that the majority of both liberals and conservatives appear to agree basically on political policy dimensions and appear to have relatively similar levels of traits related to political attitudes.

The present studies are on relatively small samples that certainly aren't random or necessarily representative of the population as a whole, so it might be premature to generalize too energetically from their data. However, the present correlation data is consistent with that of many other researchers from over 40 nations, as summarized by Jost and colleagues. And community college students, from my experience, tend to have scores on the Big Five, as measured by the BFI instrument (John & Benet-Martinez), very similar to norms based on tens of thousands of adults. The studies of this article are of personality traits, including the Big Five. The present study findings are also consistent with findings from many other studies by the present author of these and similar traits over the past seven years.

Therefore it does not seem unreasonable to speculate about the implications of the present findings. This could take the form of theoretical hunches, predictions about

future human political behavior or suggestions for activism. Consider the following predictions.

1. Theory-wise, it is the present author's prediction that human political systems will tend to evolve further from current forms of democracy to one's characterized by parties that promote candidates for office that will promote public democracy, rather than what appears at present to be special interest group democracy. This is based largely on the fact that only 20 to 25 percent of citizens endorse special interest group democracy, while 90 percent endorse public democracy and on the theory that reasoned public opinion drives social change. It is also based on the findings of human history, which seems to document a striving for greater say in government, as reflected in the French Revolution, the progression from monarchy to parliamentary government in England, the content of the U.S. Constitution and the uprisings currently in the Middle East in many countries trying to overthrow dictatorial governments. Human history tends to evolve to realize what the majority of citizens want.

2. As cultures mature, citizens will become less critical of political worldviews different from their own. This breeds ill will. Political activism will focus less on criticizing, condemning or converting citizens from one political worldview (liberal or conservative) to the other. Citizens of these two dispositions will be viewed more as representatives of inherited, species-important traits, than as self-declared political prophets.

3. Political activism will focus more on politically empowering the majority of citizens, as the majority of both strong liberals and strong conservatives appear to agree,

in general, on government agenda. And how they want things managed appears to be constructive (e.g. peaceful, sharing economically, protecting the environment, a common good ethic). "Public democracy", government serving citizens as members of the community overall, will be promoted by a new form of political party that unites the majority of strong liberals and strong conservatives (not extreme liberals and extreme conservatives). They will be more cooperative and effective in addressing important national and international problems than conservatives and liberals divided by conflicting parties. They will more effectively realize some of the lofty goals envisioned by Speth, above.

4. These more advanced political parties will depend heavily on sophisticated polls to measure in detail how the public wants government to run. It appears that the majority wants a constructive agenda. This measured majority opinion can be considered an empirical definition of the common good, and its pursuit in politics a manifestation of democracy. Polls measure what the people want, "of the people", a la Lincoln. They can provide a reliable measure of "what we want", as recommended by Speth.

5. Letting politics be controlled by a minority of citizens of either extreme conservative or extreme liberal political orientations will be avoided, as either extreme will be seen as vulnerable to disastrous policies. For example, Nazi Germany can be considered a manifestation of extreme conservative political orientation. An extreme manifestation of the liberal orientation might result in excessive expenditures for programs, all of which are desirable (education, welfare, medical care, foreign aid), but which in sum could bankrupt a nation. Uniting the majority of strong liberals and strong

conservatives in a new form of political party will create a political party that will consistently outnumber parties representing extreme liberal or conservative agendas.

6. Letting politics be characterized merely by oscillations between extreme conservative and extreme liberal administrations will be discouraged by strong liberals and strong conservatives, as neither extreme provides the reasonable, constructive agenda that the majority of citizens seems to want.

7. To protect governments against extreme conservative politics, members of the more advanced form of political party will tend to screen candidates for political office, as by rating them on scales designed to detect warmongering-proneness (McConochie, 2005). For example, several senior party members will rate candidates, take the mean of their (the raters') scores and use this as a reliable measure of a candidate's tendencies. This is another form of measuring what "we" (citizens) want, as recommended by Speth.

8. Similarly, to increase the likelihood of electing constructive leadership, the new form of party will measure the constructive leadership attitudes of political candidates. This can also be done with rating questionnaires. (See study # 7, McConochie Constructive Leadership Scale, Help Do Research, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com).

9. A new type of political party will evolve to empower the majority of citizens politically (McConochie, 2005). This party will be modeled in part after currently successful organizations, such as Rotary International and the League of Women Voters that have chapters and meetings regularly throughout a nation.

The party should depend heavily on sophisticated party questionnaires and polls to measure the policy desires of citizens on the full range of issues that must be effectively managed to run nations and the world...budgets, military, education, international relations, research, resource management, environmental protection, population and migration management, health care, jobs, trade, etc. The party platform would be defined by the results of such polls.

Such a party will promote government policy closely tied to the results of their polls, to help empower the majority of citizens, per item # 2, above. It could be assured of appealing to the majority of citizens, as their majority opinion on polls would define the platform. Thus, the party might be called the "Both" party, as it would appeal to the majority of both liberals and conservatives. The party will fund its candidates' election campaigns, grooming them to adhere to the party platform and to accept no special interest group money.

10. This new form of public democracy will promote government policies and programs that unite rather than alienate liberals and conservative orientations. Rather than pitting conservatives against liberals, or alternate control of government bodies by conservatives and liberals in one time cycle after another, government activities will be promoted that are a cooperative blend of talents and concerns reflected in both political orientations.

For example, forest management policies can be a blend of conservation concerns (liberal orientation) and lumber business/harvesting concerns (conservative), rather than



alternating between unchecked harvesting during a conservative administration and then total conservation by a liberal administration.

A classic example of such a cooperative program is the Polio Plus program of Rotary International, the goal of which is inoculating all the children of the world against polio and several other important contagious diseases. This program probably appeals to conservatives because it addresses disease prevention (conservatives tend to be phobic of diseases). The program probably appeals to liberals because it extends a helping hand to unfortunate people around the world (liberals tend to empathize strongly with unfortunate groups).

Conclusion.

The studies by the author cited herein are based on samples of limited size and diversity. While the findings are consistent with those of many similar studies on much larger and more diverse samples, replication is certainly called for. As most of the present study instruments are online at the author's web site, replication can be easily arranged for any English-speaking subjects anywhere in the world with Internet access. The author is open to collaborations to this end.

In conclusion, there is interesting data with political import from the fields of biology, neurology and psychology. This data is present in journal articles and books from many different disciplines. The data, in effect, is “lying around”, like pieces of a 1,000-piece puzzle. Disparately, the data may seem a bewildering jumble. But the pieces may just fit together in an interesting pattern to provide a vision of a more constructive way of managing human affairs on a large scale and with new paradigms.

## References:

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. & Sanford, N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, Harper Row.
- Alford, J., Funk, C., & Hibbing, J. (2005). Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?, *American Political Science Association* (a journal), May issue.
- Altemeyer, B. (2007). *The Authoritarians*, (<http://home.cc.umanitoba.ca/~altemey/>).
- Eidelson, R. & Eidelson, J. (2003). Dangerous Ideas: Five Beliefs That Propel Groups Toward Conflict, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 58, no. 3, March, 182-192.
- Globalstewards. [WWW.globalstewards.org/issues.htm](http://WWW.globalstewards.org/issues.htm).
- John, O., & Benet-Martinez, V. (1998). Los Cincos Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 75, No. 3, 729-750.
- Jost, J., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 129, No. 3, 339-375.
- Kanai, R., Feilden, T., Firth, C., & Rees, G. (2011). Political Orientations Are Correlated with Brain Structure in Young Adults, *Current Biology*, 21, April, 1-4.
- Mortality Salience, Wikipedia, ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortality\\_salience](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mortality_salience)).
- McConochie, W. (2005a). Political Psychology Research Instrument Manual, Publication #4, [Politicalpsychologyresearch.com](http://politicalpsychologyresearch.com) (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

McConochie, W. (2005b). Warmongering and Warmongering-Proneness as Psychological Traits, Publication #1, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

McConochie, W. (2006). Making Peace: Psychological Origins of Violence-Proneness, Warmongering and a New Democracy, Publication #3, Section III, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

McConochie, W. (2010a). Sixty-four Psychological Facets of Conservative and Liberal Worldviews, Publication # 30, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

McConochie, W. (2010b). Manual: Conservatism / Liberalism Study Questionnaire Scales, Publication #33, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

McConochie, W. (2010c). Exploring Executive Ethics to Understand Executive Choices Reflecting Disinterest in the Common Good, Publication #29, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (<http://www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com/Publications.htm>).

[Peacemagazine.org/.../v09n2p23.htm](http://Peacemagazine.org/.../v09n2p23.htm).

Speth, James Gus (2008). *Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Swim J., Clayton S., Doherty T., Gifford R., Howard G., Reser J., Stern P. & Weber E. (2009). Psychology and Global Climate Change: Addressing a Multi-faceted

Phenomenon and Set of Challenges; A Report by the American Psychological Association's Task Force on the Interface Between Psychology and Global Climate Change. <http://www.apa.org/science/climate-change>.

Thornhill, R., Fincher, C., & Aran, D. (2009). Parasites, democratization and the liberalization of values across contemporary countries. *Biological Reviews*, 84, 113-131.

Wikipedia. En.wikipedia.org/wiki/World\_population.

Wikipedia/Energy. ...wikipedia.org/.../Energy\_in\_the\_Unite...

Worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/.../187.php...