McConochie Warmongering-Proneness Scale
William A. McConochie, Ph.D.
File: WarmongeringPronenessManual_102413

Abstract: A 50-item scale for rating leaders on traits that correlate with warmongering endorsement is described, including the scale itself and reliability and validity data. The instrument is very reliable (.98) and valid (.90) and is offered as a tool for research and informing citizens of leader dispositions.

The McConochie Warmongering-Proneness Scale (McWap) was an outgrowth of several studies by the author of the trait of warmongering *endorsement*. The trait of warmongering-endorsement has been measured by the author with scales of 10, 20, 32 and 44 items with high reliability (McConochie, 2006). Warmongering as a psychological trait is defined by the author as harboring thoughts, attitudes and intentions for engineering invasive, aggressive war, as promoted by Hitler, for example. It is thus more focused than prior measures of militarism by other researchers, which implicitly include endorsement of war in general, including defensive war.

In the warmongering-endorsement scales, items are presented in 5-option Likert scale format, from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. All of the items used in these scales correlate significantly and substantially with the total score for their respective scale. Factor analysis of items in the 44-item version of the warmongering-endorsement scale yields the content as presented in Table 1 (McConochie, 2007).

(Insert Table 1 about here.)

Table 1. Content of warmongering –endorsement.

Factor table	Sample questionnaire item content.
General warmongering endorsement	Bush was justified in invading Iraq, Preemptive war to prevent weapons buildups is okay, military is the most important aspect of government
Nationalistic warmongering	The Roman Empire was justified in warmongering, my nation should do whatever it wants at the expense of other nations, Nazi Germany was justified in invading Russia
Selfish cruelty	Admiration of Hitler, killing of civilians in war to lower morale is okay, war to reduce enemy populations for own gain is okay
Vicarious warmongering pleasure	Enjoy reading war stories, watching war movies and playing war video games
Killing helpless and weak	Spanish warmongering for gold okay, political assassination okay, military killing of prisoners okay
Weapons love	Civilian gun access endorsed, interest in bombs and weapons
Vengeance motive	Imprison and execute traitors, U.S. should have stuck it out

	in Vietnam
Battle planning	Would like to design battle plans
Nationalism	Would like to be a powerful national leader, my nation should prosper at expense of other nations

Warmongering endorsement thus measured has been found to correlate significantly with many other traits, as presented in Table 2.

 (Insert Table 2 about here.)

Table 2. Traits correlating significantly with warmongering endorsement.

Traits correlating positively with warmongering endorsement:	Pearson product moment correlation (Sample sizes range from 31 to 376 across many studies) (* = .05, ** = .01):
Violence-proneness	.67**
Terrorism endorsement	.54**
Social disenfranchisment	.74**
Anarchy endorsement	.46**
Military Dictatorship endorsement	.57**
Tribal (special interest group) democracy endorsement	.37**
Authoritarianism endorsement (McConochie scale)	.56**
Religious fundamentalism (McConochie scale)	.60**
Claustrophobia	.40*
Fear of Heights	.60**
Anxious unless busy	.39*
Unspecified anxiety	.41*
Overall clinical anxiety	.54**
Xenophobia	.39*
Religiousness	.53**
Anti-Muslim	.80**
Fear of terrorism	.54**
Fear of small creatures	.37*
Fear of evil spirits	.40*
Endorsement of political lying and conniving	.53**
Messianic self-image	.18**
Propaganda endorsement	.45**
Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer scale)	.59**
Social Dominance Orientation	.46**
Voted for G.W. Bush in 2004	.34*
Traits correlating negatively with warmongering	

endorsement:	
Public democracy endorsement (government serving the best interests of the community overall).	-.36**
Big Five Agreeableness	-.34**
Big Five Emotional stability	-.26**
Sustainability endorsement	-.69**
Positive foreign policy endorsement	-.74**
Ecology concerns endorsement	-.60**
Human Rights Endorsement	-.51**
Kindly Religious Beliefs endorsement	-.51**
U.S. should get out of Iraq (in 2006)	-.42**
Citizens should participate more directly in government decisions	-.27*
The U.S. should have a positive, helpful foreign policy	-.56**
Democratic forms of government are better than authoritarian ones	-.38*
Natural resources should be conserved and recycled	-.61**
People should cooperate more than compete with each other	-.67**
Interest in a new type of political party promoting the community overall	-.31*
Desire for improved government services	-.45**
Voted for Kerry in 2004	-.38*

The warmongering-*proneness* scale was created to provide an instrument for measuring from afar the warmongering disposition of political and military leaders, past and present. It would be impractical to get leaders to complete a questionnaire of warmongering-endorsement, but rating from a distance was considered a viable approach for assessing a leader's warmongering –proneness. If he had traits correlating with warmongering-endorsement, he might also have a history of warmongering *behavior*.

A 50-item rating scale was created. A research version is provided in Addendum 1. The questionnaire items were written to permit rating of either current leaders, such a candidates for political office or current office holders, or of historical figures whose cultures, weaponry and related issues might differ from current ones. For example: "Does the person advocate access to and use of nuclear weapons or other very destructive weapons, if needed to achieve military ends?", and "Does the person lack a college education? (Or other advanced education typical of his/her time and culture.)"

The initial use of the instrument was by 20 well-educated church members who rated G. W. Bush and John Kerry after the election of 2004 (in January of 2005). The scores for Bush

were tightly clustered together and all higher than the scores for Kerry, which were also tightly clustered. Additional data were obtained from a variety of adults who had read biographies and other information on various prominent historical figures, some of warmongering reputation (e.g. Hitler, Bonaparte and Attila the Hun) and some of peaceful disposition (e.g. Jimmy Carter, Mahatma Gandhi and Nelson Mandela). A total of 112 ratings were completed across 25 leaders, resulting in the data provided in Table 3.

(Insert Table 3 about here.)

Table 3. Warmongering-proneness scores for leaders.

Leader	Mean item score	Standard deviation	Number of raters
Nelson Mandela	1.61	.16	2
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

Item analysis revealed that all of the 50 items correlated significantly and substantially with the total score, suggesting that the instrument would have high reliability. Indeed, the reliability of the scale based on this data, computed as the Cronbach alpha, is .98. While this may seem improbably high, similar very high reliability (e.g. .99) has been found for similar rating scales of political leaders in which the mean item score for a given leader is computed across several raters (Simonton, 2006).

Validity was computed by having 20 other persons rate 20 of the above leaders (those on whom data was available at the time of the study) on a simple one-item measure of warmongering *behavior*, in 5-point Likert format, defined as:

" Promoting the development and use, for aggressive purposes, of military weapons and forces (armies, navies, etc.)".

The raters were again a group of well-educated adult members of a local church. The Pearson product moment correlation between these scores and the mean item scores on warmongering-proneness scale was .90.

Discussion

Critiques and defenses.

An article of the above findings was submitted to a professional journal for publication but rejected in part because the reviewers wanted the ratings done by "experts", following the examples of similar studies of U.S. presidents. The present researcher is seeking university professors to do ratings. One history professor rated Napoleon Bonaparte and obtained a score of 3.46. This compares to the mean item score of 3.64 generated by the 4 prior "lay" raters (standard deviation .37). The professor complained that 8 of the 50 items in the scale didn't seem relevant for Bonaparte due to cultural and historical differences. The score was recomputed using only the 42 items that he *did* consider relevant. This score was 3.52, closer to the lay mean of 3.46. It seems reasonable to let objecting raters use only those items they think relevant in such cases, as a scale of 40 items is likely to be virtually as reliable as one of 50. None of the other prior raters had balked at using the scale because items seemed irrelevant.

Studies by Simonton have compared the ratings of U.S. president traits done by "experts" and separately by university students (Simonton, 2007). The student scores were virtually the same as those of prior "experts", correlating .84 with expert scores. This demonstrates that highly reliable instruments used properly by non-experts can yield accurate scores. Perhaps this is not surprising, considering that a steel tape measure, used properly, can be expected to yield the same square footage measure of a house, whether done by a careful home owner ("lay" person) or by a realtor ("expert") or by a physicist who designed the tape measure ("super-expert"). It is expected that the McWap instrument, being highly reliable, will yield similar scores for leaders whether done by careful, well-informed lay raters or more highly informed "experts" (e.g. journalists, political scientists and history professors).

A similar comparison of lay versus expert raters was made by Goldberg on the Bender Visual Motor Gestalt test. Secretaries, using clearly stated diagnostic instructions, were able to make diagnostic decisions as accurately as psychology students in training and experienced psychologists (Goldberg, 1959). In a similar study, Goldberg found that psychologist trainees could make diagnostic decisions as accurately as experienced clinicians based on MMPI test scores (Goldberg , 1965).

Thus, if an instrument is reliable, does not require exotic expertise to make decisions, if information necessary to make decisions is available to raters and instructions for making decisions are clear, then reasonably well-informed and intelligent persons can use it to produce scores as reliable and as valid as experts might produce. It is expected that this will hold true for the McWap scale.

The McWap is designed for use by reasonably well-informed and intelligent lay persons, not just highly educated expert historians, journalists and political scientists. It has seemed to function as designed; lay persons can use it successfully to produce reliable scores (alpha of .98), especially when averaged across several raters. And their scores are valid, inasmuch as they correlate highly with what lay persons judge to be warmongering behavior per se, based on the above validity coefficient of .90 between test scores and independent ratings of this trait. Indeed,

it is hard to imagine more reliable and valid scores could be produced by other raters, no matter how "expert".

Intended Use.

The McWap rating scale is intended for use eventually by researchers, journalists and by the general public to assess historical figures for educational purposes and current politicians and candidates for political office to help inform voters prior to elections. For example, if Germans had been able to rate Hitler on such an instrument, his Nazi political party might not have won so many votes and he might not have risen to control of the national government. About 94 percent of general citizens studied by the author are not of a warmongering disposition. And over 90 percent endorse human rights. 89 percent hold kindly religious beliefs. Over 70 percent endorse a positive, helpful foreign policy. Under normal circumstances, the majority of the general public would not seem likely to want warmongering political leaders.

Summary.

The McConochie Warmongering-Proneness scale is well-grounded in extensive studies of the relationship between the trait of warmongering and other traits. The McWap instrument appears to yield highly reliable scores and scores that appear to provide a valid measure of warmongering-proneness defined as having traits that predispose one to warmongering attitudes and behavior given opportunity and circumstances to do so. The instrument would seem to have value as a preventative tool to help protect nations from empowering leaders who are likely to promote aggressive, invasive war.

References:

Goldberg, Lewis R. (1959), The Effectiveness of clinicians' judgments: The diagnosis of organic brain damage from the Bender-Gestalt, Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 23, 25-33.

Goldberg, Lewis R. (1965), Diagnosticians vs. Diagnostic Signs: The diagnosis of psychosis vs. neurosis from the MMPI, Vol. 79, No. 9, 1965, 1-28.

McConochie, William, A., A Comprehensive Measure of Warmongering as a multifaceted but primarily unitary trait; Response sets as a concern in questionnaire construction, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publication # 15. 2006.

McConochie, William A., Manual, Political Psychology Scales, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publication # 4. 2007.

Simonton, Dean K, Presidential I.Q., Openness, Intellectual Brilliance , and Leadership: Estimates and Correlations for 42 U.S. Chief Executives, Political Psychology, Vol 27. No. 4, 2006.

Simonton, Dean K, <u>Presidential Greatness and Its Socio-Psychological Significance: Individual or Situation? Performance or Attribution?</u>, unpublished manuscript, dksimonton@ucdavid.edu.

Addendum 1.

<u>Political Leader Rating Form</u>**:** (11/1/07).

(Note: This version of the scale is used for research purposes. Scoring instructions: Add scores for all completed items and divide by the number of items scored. Usually, all 50 items are scored. If a rater has found some item totally irrelevant to the person being rated, subtract the number of omitted items from 50 before you divide the total score to get the mean item score. E.g., if you score 45 items with all 3's, your total score would be 3 x 45 = 135. Divided by 45 = 3. If you score 40 items, 10 1's, 10 2's, 10 3's and 10 4's, your total score will be 10 x 1 (10) plus 10 x 2 (20) plus 10 x 3 (30) plus 10 x 4 (40), or 100. Divided by 40, your mean item score will be 2.5.)

Rating instructions: Please only rate leaders with whom you are intimately familiar by extensive reading about them. Detailed biographies of historical leaders are one source of information. Publications by reputable authorities and journalists are a good source of information on current political figures.

Be careful in making your judgments. Rate the leader on each trait specifically. Rate each item carefully, thinking of the specific information that supports your decision.

If you think a particular item is irrelevant for your leader, you can omit it.

Thank you for your help.

Please complete the following information. Asterisked items are required for research purposes. Other items are optional. If you are doing this rating for a school project, be sure to include your name, or a code name for yourself, so you can provide a copy of your report to your teacher for school credit:

Your name: _____

Your institution, if any: _____

*Your educational level (years of education): _____

*Your present Aoccupation@ (enter a number from list below: _____

1 high school student.

2 community college student.

3. College or university student, undergraduate.

4. Graduate student.

5. Employed adult

    A. Public school teacher (K-12)

    B. Community college professor.

    C. 4-year college or university professor.
    D. Other employment.
6. Unemployed or retired adult.
      A. Trained as a teacher or professor.
      B. Unemployed journalist.
      C. Unemployed, other career area.

*Indicate your knowledge level in the three areas below: (1 = little or none, 2 = some, 3 = much
4 = very much, 5 = teacher, professor or otherwise an expert):
_____History.
_____Political science.
_____Journalism.

_____ Enter the identification number of the leader you are rating:

1. Alexander the Great
2. Edi Amin
3. Attila the Hun
4. Osama Bin Laden
5. Napoleon Bonaparte
6. George H. Bush (Bush, Senior)
7. George W. Bush
8. Jimmy Carter
9. Winston Churchill
10. Bill Clinton
11. Dwight Eisenhower
12. Mahatma Gandhi
13. Adolph Hitler
14. Saddam Hussein
15. Lyndon Johnson
16. John F. Kennedy
17. John Kerry
18. Genghis Khan

19. Abraham Lincoln
20. Nelson Mandela
21. Slobodan Milosovic
22. George Patton
23. Pol Pot
24. Franklin D. Roosevelt
25. Teddy Roosevelt
26. Joseph Stalin
27. Harry Truman
28. George Washington
29. Woodrow Wilson
30. Omar Al-Bashir, leader of Sudan, Africa
31. Kim Jong-Il, leader of North Korea
32. Sayyid Ali Khamenei, leader in Iran
33. Hu Jintao, leader of China
34. King Abdullah, Saudi Arabia
35. General Than Shwe, Burma (Myanmar) leader
36. Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe, Africa leader
37. Islam Karimov, Uzbekistan leader
38. Muammar Al-Qaddafi, Libya, Africa leader
39. Bashar Al-Assad, Syria leader, Middle East
40. Other leader: Print first and last name: _____.

Instructions:
You will be rating this leader on up to 50 personality traits. Try to think only of this trait
as you rate the leader, not his or her overall character. Be as objective and accurate as
you can. Select one number for each of the items below to rate the person, thinking
carefully of the specific objective evidence that supports your rating. Consider statements
made by the person or behaviors while seeking leadership or acting as a leader. Consider
friendships, favors accepted or given and overt affiliations or group memberships. For
historical figures, mentally translate each item into the past tense. For example, read item
1 as "Did the person belong to a group....etc." Again, if you think a given item is simple
irrelevant for the leader, you can omit it.

Circle one number for each item, using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strong evidence against the trait.	Some evidence against the trait.	Neutral. A position between 2&4, or not sure.	Some evidence for the trait.	Strong evidence for the trait.

1 2 3 4 5   1. Does the person belong to a group, organization or social class that feels
                helpless?
1 2 3 4 5   2. Does the person belong to a group that feels a sense of injustice?

1 2 3 4 5   3. Does the person belong to a group that feels distrust in other groups?

1 2 3 4 5   4. Does the person belong to a group that feels vulnerable?

1 2 3 4 5   5. Does the person belong to a group that feels superior to other groups?

1 2 3 4 5   6. Is it likely that the person feels like a failure in careers longed for or engaged in?

1 2 3 4 5   7. Does the person tend to think rigidly, inflexibly, unable to consider alternative points of view, alternative courses of action?

1 2 3 4 5   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?

1 2 3 4 5   9. Does the person seem preoccupied with or frequently concerned about being rejected by others?

1 2 3 4 5   10. Does the person engage in activities that suggest pleasure from hostile acts, such as participating in or watching violent sports, or recreational activities?

1 2 3 4 5   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?

1 2 3 4 5   12. Does the person have gun skill and access to guns? (Or to other common combat weapons.)

1 2 3 4 5   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?

1 2 3 4 5   14. Does the person show an unwillingness to help reduce violence in the community?

1 2 3 4 5   15. Does the person seem comfortable lying and/or using propaganda?

1 2 3 4 5   16. Does the person seem interested in dominating other individuals or groups?

1 2 3 4 5   17. Does the person seem to think it is his/her position, right or duty to dominate others?

1 2 3 4 5   18. Does the person hold membership in groups or organizations who advocate dominating other groups?

1 2 3 4 5   19. Does the person maintain an authoritarian stance vis a vis other persons or groups?

1 2 3 4 5   20. Does the person associate with or endorse groups that advocate authoritarian views, opinions or actions?

1 2 3 4 5   21. Does the person hold fundamentalist religious beliefs, e.g. that there is only one true God and that anyone that disagrees with this belief is wrong?

1 2 3 4 5   22. Does the person disavow (reject) kindly religious beliefs, e.g. that all peoples should strive to cooperate and compromise to get along together?

1 2 3 4 5   23. Does the person advocate or condone anarchy forms of government?

1 2 3 4 5   24. Does the person advocate or support military dictatorship forms of government?

1 2 3 4 5   25. Does the person advocate government serving special interest groups rather than citizens in general?

1 2 3 4 5   26. Does the person have a messianic self-image, a sense of personal destiny or duty to achieve great things?

1 2 3 4 5   27. Does the person lack a college education? (Or other advanced education typical of his/her time and culture.)

1 2 3 4 5   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 Astupid@ 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.

1 2 3 4 5   29. Does the person disavow (reject) endorsement of human rights, e.g. prisoner of war rights and equal status for women?

1 2 3 4 5   30. Does the person disavow international global warming treaties? (Or similar international accords.)

1 2 3 4 5   31. Does the person disavow international arms control treaties? (Or similar international accords.)

1 2 3 4 5   32. Does the person disavow endorsement of fossil fuel conservation and eventual replacement with renewable, non-polluting fuels? (Or similar conservation and sharing internationally of fuel resources of his/her time and culture.)

1 2 3 4 5   33. Does the person disavow conservation of forests and fresh water fisheries?

1 2 3 4 5   34. Does the person disavow public democracy, direct participation by the public in government policy decision-making?

1 2 3 4 5   35. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy, e.g. fighting terrorism with non-military means more than military ones?

1 2 3 4 5   36. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy helping other nations achieve their goals?

1 2 3 4 5   37. Does the person disavow support of the United Nations organization? (Or for other similar efforts to promote international cooperation and peace.)

1 2 3 4 5   38. Does the person have a disagreeable personality, being oppositional, irritable, contrary, argumentative or unsupportive of others?

1 2 3 4 5   39. Does the person have tendencies toward anxiety, depression or other signs of emotional instability?

1 2 3 4 5   40. Does the person have strong trust in top government leaders, such as Presidents, Kings, cabinet members?

1 2 3 4 5   41. Does the person advocate unquestioning loyalty to such leaders?

1 2 3 4 5   42. Does the person think spending for military activities should be increased?

1 2 3 4 5   43. Does the person disavow the idea of his/her national budget being determined by direct vote of the citizens?

1 2 3 4 5   44. Does the person think his/her nation should try to control the world with military power?

1 2 3 4 5   45. Does the person advocate retaliation against wrongdoers?

1 2 3 4 5   46. Does the person advocate access to and use of nuclear weapons or other very destructive weapons, if needed to achieve military ends?
1 2 3 4 5   47. Does the person have interest in military activities, manufacturers, armed forces, weapons?
1 2 3 4 5   48. Does the person enjoy war movies, war stories, hostile video games? (Or other such theatrical entertainment of a bellicose theme.)
1 2 3 4 5   49. Does the person think war is a noble and glorious activity?
1 2 3 4 5   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?

Report to be immediately available to the rater:

<u>Leader Rating Report on McConochie Warmongering-Proneness Scale</u>

Thank you very much for helping with this research project.
Your score will be added to those of other raters and help build the database for leaders.

Current rater's name, if given: _____
Institution, if given: _____
Date of rating: _____
Leader rated: _____
Leader score as rated by current rater: _____
Note: This score is the mean item score across all 50 items rated.

<u>Scores of leaders as rated by other raters</u>.
Note: These scores are updated about once per month. Date of last update: _____

Note: The standard deviation is the range above and below the mean item score within which 66% of the ratings fall.

I.D. number	Name	Country	Mean item score	Number of ratings to date	Standard deviation of ratings
1	Alexander the Great	Middle East	3.73	2	.02
2	Edi Amin	Uganda, Africa			
3	Attila the Hun	Asia	4.04	1	-
4	Osama Bin Laden	Middle East			
5	Napoleon Bonaparte	France	3.64	4	.37
6	George H. Bush (Senior)	U.S.A.	2.6	2	.00
7	George W. Bush	U.S.A.	4.00	21	.40
8	Jimmy Carter	U.S.A.	1.73	3	.34

9	Winston Churchill	Great Britain	2.20	8	.58
10	Bill Clinton	U.S.A.	2.09	2	.13
11	Dwight Eisenhower	U.S.A.	2.29	2	.21
12	Mahatma Gandhi	India	1.71	5	.23
13	Adolph Hitler	Germany	4.50	7	.29
14	Saddam Hussein	Iraq	4.68	2	.11
15	Lyndon Johnson	U.S.A.	2.56	1	-
16	John F. Kennedy	U.S.A.	2.10	1	-
17	John Kerry	U.S.A.	2.14	20	.30
18	Genghis Khan	Asia	3.98	1	-
19	Abraham Lincoln	U.S.A.	1.92	6	.47
20	Nelson Mandela	South Africa	1.61	2	.16
21	Slobodan Milosovic	Yugoslavia/Serbia			
22	George Patton	U.S.A.	3.11	2	.24
23	Pol Pot	Cambodia			
24	F. D. Roosevelt	U.S.A.	1.98	8	.37
25	Teddy Roosevelt	U.S.A.	2.12	2	.42
26	Joseph Stalin	U.S.S.R.	4.21	6	.26
27	Harry Truman	U.S.A.	1.84	1	-
28	George Washington	U.S.A.	1.82	1	-
29	Woodrow Wilson	U.S.A.	2.47	2	.24
30	Omar Al-Bashir	Sudan, Africa			
31	Kim Jong Il	North Korea			
32	Sayyid Ali Khamenei	Iran			
33	Hu Jintao	China			
34	Kin Abdullah	Saudi Arabia			
35	General Than Shwe	Burma (Myanmar)			
36	Robert Mugabe	Zimbabwe, Africa			
37	Islam Karimov	Uzbekistan			
38	Muammar Al-Qaddafi	Libya, Africa			
39	Bashar Al-Assad	Syria, Middle East			
40 and up.	Other leaders.				