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• Third, authoritarians’ sense of order is not necessarily or solely defined by worldly powers. To authoritarians, there are higher powers that delineate right from wrong and good from evil. There are transcendent ways of behaving and being that are enduring, everlasting, and the root of balance and order. These authorities are “morally and ontologically superior” to state or institutional authority and must be obeyed. The higher authority may be otherworldly, or a text (for example, the Constitution) imbued with enlightened, transcendent power when its meaning is interpreted originally.

• Finally, I stipulate—as other students of authoritarianism have—that authoritarianism is universal and transcends society, culture, politics, and race. Authoritarianism is not limited to Europeans or whites. It does not discriminate. It is found in every culture and among members of every race.

Authoritarianism and Threat

In all of its different manifestations and guises, threat is at the root of authoritarianism. It determines where an individual is likely to be located “on the continuum between authoritarian (closed) and democrat-


ic (open) beliefs”, as James Gibson has written, “threat perceptions are one of the strongest predictors of intolerance.”

Erich Fromm attributed Fascism’s rise to threat. Isolated, powerless, and insecure people “escaped from freedom” by submitting to Nazi authoritarianism. Adorno et al.’s Freudian explanation of authoritarianism proposed that a threatening childhood environment created authoritarian adults. Rokeach argued that “adverse experiences, temporary or enduring,” threaten individuals, create anxiety, and cause dogmatism and intolerance. As such, over time, threat, uncertainty, and fear breed authoritarianism.

A variety of threats have been theoretically implicated in authoritarianism and “point to threat as a primary, or perhaps as the primary, determinant of heightened authoritarianism.” Among them are personal threats; the threat of personal failure; threat aggregated and estimated across society; socially learned and experienced threats; external and internal fear and anxiety; intensely identified and conforming in-groups threatened by unconventional out-groups; individual and collective threats; personal insecurity caused by the threat of terrorism; and differentially perceived economic threats.


53. Erich Fromm, Escape from Freedom (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1941); Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality; Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, 69.


56. For the impact of personal threat on shaping authoritarian propensity, see Samuel Fillenbaum and Arnold Jackman, “Dogmatism and Anxiety in Relation to Problem Solving: An Extension of Rokeach’s Results”; Lipset, Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics; and Sanford, Self and Society: Social Change and Individual Development. For the threat of
Nearly a half century after the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality*, however, the statistical evidence linking threat to authoritarianism remained sparse. Feldman and Stenner’s work bridged this empirical gap.\textsuperscript{57} Using childrearing questions included on the 1992 American National Election Studies (ANES) survey for the first time to estimate authoritarianism, they found, as one observer of the field has written, that “authoritarianism and perceptions of environmental stress [i.e., threat] interact in creating intolerance.”\textsuperscript{58} Threat did not make individuals more authoritarian. Instead, according to Feldman and Stenner’s hypothesis, it activated intolerant authoritarian behaviors in individuals already predisposed to authoritarianism.


Data sources:\textsuperscript{57} Feldman and Stenner, “Perceived Threat and Authoritarianism.”
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candidates, or a deteriorating national economy catalyze authoritari-
anism, while personal threats to individuals (for example, unemploy-
ment) do not.60

The lack of a connection observed by Feldman and Stenner
"[1]n the absence of threat...between authoritarian predispositions
and the dependent variables"61 also raised serious questions about the
theoretical accounts forwarded both by Adorno and his co-authors
and by Altemeyer of the origins of authoritarianism. To answer these
questions, Feldman proposed, in a later article, a new explanation for
authoritarianism that allows for the observed interactive effects of
threat and authoritarianism. He posited that “authoritarian predispo-
sitions originate in the conflict between the values of social confor-
mity and personal autonomy.” When social conformity is threatened,
authoritarian predispositions are activated and intolerant behavior is
produced.62

Building on this work, Stenner proposed the “Authoritarian Dynam-
ic,” a “process in which an enduring individual predisposition interacts
with changing environmental conditions—specifically, conditions of
‘normative threat’—to produce manifest expressions of intolerance.”
There are three vitally important components of Stenner’s theory.
First, authoritarianism is conceptualized as an enduring predisposi-
tion that is partially inherited. Second, authoritarianism is not always
evident; authoritarian behavior is activated “when needed.” As such,
“authoritarianism does not consistently predict behavior across differ-
et situations.” Finally, not all threats are created equal. Only threats
to norms and order, when they are perceived by an individual with an
authoritarian predisposition, have the capacity to elicit an intolerant
reaction.63

While Feldman and Stenner’s account of the interaction between
threats to moral order and authoritarianism is compelling and well
documented, it is certainly not the last word. Other scholars found
that threats to morality and mortality can activate authoritarian be-
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behavior in individuals with a predisposition to authoritarianism. Using the Balanced F-scale to measure authoritarianism, Rickert found that authoritarians who were economically threatened were six times more likely “to favor restricting benefits to powerless groups” than authoritarians and nonauthoritarians who were not threatened. Experimenting with situationally induced threats, Lavine et al. concluded that threats to cultural values as well as personal threats activate authoritarian behaviors in those predisposed to authoritarianism. Moreover, the experimental results implied “that authoritarians think and act as they do in order to reduce an apparently acute sensitivity to threat,” an observation that is a half-step away from conceptualizing authoritarianism as a shield from threat.

“Threats to social order and cohesion, social identity, economic security, and mortality” have all been associated with authoritarian activation. Some scholars have argued that sociotropic threat (that is, a perceived threat to society) is a more important trigger of intolerant, antidemocratic behavior than personal threat. By contrast, Darren Davis has contended that “when threat is personalized the response may become overwhelmingly intolerant toward perceived outgroups or threatening groups.” Thus, the list of scholars who find threats,
beyond threats to norms, are important triggers of authoritarianism is lengthy and distinguished: it includes Adorno, Altemeyer, Davis, Duckitt, Hetherington, Lavine, Lodge, Merolla, Oesterrich, Rickert, and Zechmeister.

Who is activated by threat is as contested a question as what type of threat activates them. Many scholars take exception to Stenner's concept of an authoritarian dynamic and argue that authoritarian behavior is not turned on and off by the presence or absence of threat. To them the aggression that forms the bedrock of authoritarian behavior is chronically salient and not only influences how authoritarians act, but also persistently alters their perception of the world. For example, Hetherington argues that authoritarians, perpetually in a state of hypervigilance, are always threatened and activated. Normative and physical threats do not further agitate their authoritarian predisposition; they are already acting or prepared to act. Instead, according to Hetherington and his coauthors, it is nonauthoritarians who, when confronting physical threats, act more like authoritarians.

My own perspective on authoritarian activation is a hybrid of Stenner's authoritarian dynamic and Hetherington, Weiler, and Suhay's equally compelling observations. On the one hand, I hold that those Americans who are predisposed to authoritarianism are also more likely to feel threatened. When they perceive a mortal, physical threat or a moral, normative danger—which is, on balance, more often than the “average” American—their authoritarianism is activated. On the other hand, I contend that nonauthoritarians who perceive a mortal or moral threat will also become more aggressive and behave more like

---
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authoritarians. Thus, applying the cartoon character Pogo’s well-known aphorism to nonauthoritarian Americans, “we have met the enemy, and he is us.”

Measuring Authoritarianism

Measurement problems have plagued the study of authoritarianism since research on the question began. As noted above, the design and statistical validity of the first attempt to estimate individuals’ innate predisposition to authoritarianism, the F-scale, was challenged just four years after its introduction. By the 1960s, many scholars considered the F-scale an “Edsel, a case study in how to do everything wrong.”

New measurement schemes also fell short of the measurement mark for a variety of reasons. For example, the Conservatism scale conflated authoritarianism with conservatism; the foundation of the Balanced F-scale remained the scientifically unfalsifiable Freudian psychodynamic theory; and while the Dogmatism scale avoided the conservative bias of both the Conservatism and F-scales, the questions comprising it were worded (like the F-Scale) in one direction and subject to acquiescent response bias.

In an effort to resolve the ongoing authoritarian measurement problem, Altemeyer introduced the Right-Wing Authoritarian (RWA) scale in 1981 and has regularly updated it to reflect societal changes. A number of scholars of the subject have recognized the RWA.

---
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