AUTHORITARIAN NIGHTMARE

TRUMP AND HIS FOLLOWERS

JOHN W. DEAN
and BOB ALTEMEYER

APPENDICES IV–VII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"RIGHT" VERSUS "LEFT"

BOB ALTEMEYER

The original meaning of "right" and "left" in English probably referred to the hand with which one did most one-handed tasks. Since about 90 percent of humans are "right-handed," the word "right" naturally acquired second meanings of "preferred" and "trusted." It may not have taken long for the usage to create such expressions as "sitting at the right hand of God,' as in Psalm 110 and many other places in the Bible. As "right" gathered a broader meaning of "blessed," it easily came to mean "correct" and "good" as well. At the same time "left" was left (don't you know) with the dregs. It gathered a connotation of "un-preferred" that broadened to "unwanted" (as in "left-overs," "left out," and "left behind") to "wrong" and "evil." Similarly the Italian word "sinistra" which means "on the left" gave us "sinister" in English.

Ironically our right hands are controlled by the left hemisphere of our brains, and most people are right-handed because the left half of their cerebral cortex dominates the right half when it comes to using our hands. If people in ancient times could see what was going on in their brains, which as it happened they could not, the tribal chief's right-hand man would have been seated to his left. And The Powers That Be would have absconded with the word "left" to describe their exalted place in society. The best people would consider themselves "in the left," where "moral leftness" was. The first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution would be called the Bill of

Lefts. People would be self-leftious. British motorists would still drive on the left, and Americans would think there was something not left about that. Left? Left-on, bro.

Politically the phrase "being on the right" in English goes back to 1548 when Edward VI let the House of Commons meet in St. Steven's Chapel in Westminister Palace. The benches were set up in the choir stalls to the sides of the altar, facing each other rather than facing the altar. In the late 1600s when political parties were formed it became customary for the party with the largest number of seats to sit (naturally) on the right hand of the person running the meeting. You can see this on the BBC News tonight, and you will notice that Members bow slightly when entering and leaving the House. They're not kowtowing to the Speaker, they're genuflecting, sort of, before the altar (which was removed centuries ago).

But the terms "Right-wing" and "Left-wing" themselves arose in France in 1789 during the French Revolution, when delegates to the newly formed National Assembly sat to one side or the other of the President of the Parliament as they did in England. But where you sat depended on what you stood for. The nobility, called the Second Estate, sat to the right (of course) of the President, and the Liberal Deputies (the Third Estate) sat to the left. (They said they wanted to, thumbing their noses at the nobility's craving to have language as well as the angels on their side.) The phrases "right-wing" and "left-wing" did not enter British politics for a long time, until the late 1930s. They seemingly first appeared in the United States during McCarthyism when the Senator from Wisconsin, who knew a thing or three about casting malicious aspersions, termed Democrats "leftists."

MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY POLLING INSTITUTE SURVEY SPRING & AUTUMN 2019

BOB ALTEMEYER

Chapter Ten of this book, especially Endnote 2, explains how the highly reputable Monmouth University Polling Institute came to conduct the first nation-wide survey of responses to the full versions of our various authoritarianism scales, other personality tests, and sundry related measures. But I doubted the traditional person-to-person telephone poll would work all that well. The RWA Scale in particular, with its long and complicated items, would be plagued by error variance when people had to hear and remember multi-part statements. A brief test in January supported this apprehension and Patrick Murray obligingly set his staff to developing an on-line platform which came much closer to producing the traditional testing circumstances in personality research: a test whose items subjects read at their own pace, repeatedly if they wished, and then marked down their response on a "page" with the other items on that scale. I also thought that since no one was listening to the responses and writing them down, as in a telephone poll, an Internet survey would lessen impression management effects.

The Institute conducted a pilot study in May 2019 by sending our survey to about 13,000 New Jersey adults who had participated in an earlier

Monmouth poll. (We gave everyone contacted three chances to join in the fun.) Because of this earlier connection, about 7 percent of the people contacted by Internet—more than twice as high as usual—opened the email when it arrived. About a third of those 937 took a look and clicked our beautiful survey away into little bits of nothingness. (Patrick thought this was because the survey started off with questions about religion, at my insistence, against his advice.) (It took a lot of work on my part, but I finally convinced Murray that he, knew a helluva lot more about public opinion polling than I did.) Another sixth of those who opened the email started answering, but gave up after a while. This left us with 478 more or less complete sets of answers, representing 3.6 percent of the people contacted. This was a sharp decline from my Canadian studies where over 90 percent of the students and about 80 percent of their parent filled out surveys for the tiny incentive of 1-2 percent of the students' grade in a course. It took Murray's fine citizens of the Garden State a median 18 minutes to answer the 96 items on the questionnaire.

Emboldened by the Institute's skill at developing and implementing such a fine way of administering the personality tests, I began trying to insert all the scales I could into the "money" questionnaire being designed for the autumn. Meanwhile Monmouth University Polling Institute purchased email addresses of registered voters from Aristotle International, a Dallas-based firm that has assembled addresses and relevant information on about 30% of the registered voters in the USA. The poll was administered over the Internet in two waves on October 28 and November 17, 2019. The first wave deliberately oversampled Republicans because we were more interested in understanding them. The second wave was sent on its way after 569 sets of answers had come in and it tried to sculp the sample to fit national demographic values better. Altogether appeals were made

to 223,138 voters, but only 5,138 opened the email which asked them to answer a 25-35 minute survey for the Monmouth University Poll "about social attitudes, values, and issues facing the country today." Only 1,618 clicked through to see the survey, however, and of these, 990 completed all, or nearly all, of the 131 items involved, in a median time of 30.5 minutes. These 990[1] represented 0.44 percent of the 200,000+ who were invited to participate. There is no known "norm" for response rates for a long, out-of-the-blue online survey like this, The telephone polls you hear about today have a response rate of about 3 percent. (How often do you give up eating dinner to answer one?)

A guy who has been rejected by 97 percent of the women he asks out on a date (1) is asking a lot of women for a date, and (2) might find it small comfort, but he is still better off than a fellow shot down 99.56 percent of the time. However, we should not feel too downhearted. We are not trying to determine within a percentage point or two how much of the population likes Donald Trump—the regular polls do that—but rather what his fans are like compared to those who can't stand him. So, we did not need a close fit to the population. The sample we collected proved typical of cell-phone survey samples (more likely to be male, white, older, and college educated). Patrick Murray did not think there were any notable distortions beyond those four just mentioned.

THE SURVEY USED

The survey is given below as it would have appeared on the screens of our participants. Highlighted material has been inserted here to document what was going on as the poll progressed.

Survey Invitation

Subject: The Monmouth University Poll wants your opinion
Body: [MUPI logo]
Dear [FIRSTNAME],
Monmouth University is conducting a public opinion survey about social attitudes, values, and issues facing the country today.

Your participation is very important because only a few hundred people have been randomly selected for this survey and your views will represent many people throughout the country.

Please help with this important project by completing this online survey **before November XX**. It will take about **25 to 35 minutes** of your time and **your opinion will really count**.

We are not selling anything or asking for money. All your answers are completely confidential.

This project is conducted by the Monmouth University Polling Institute. For more information, visit: www.monmouth.edu/polling

SOCIAL ISSUES AND ATTITUDES SURVEY

This survey asks for your opinion on a variety of issues. This includes your views on current events as well as your reaction to a number of statements that some people might make about society in general. Some statements may be strongly worded and we ask that you gauge your response to them as they are presented, even though you may not hear such statements in your own daily life.

Note: The numbering of the items (e.g., "A0" below) did not appear on the survey itself.

A0.   **Would you say things in the country are going in the right direction, or have they gotten off on the wrong track**? (.664) [Numbers in parentheses after an item show correlation with Approval of Trump's performance, with Strong or Somewhat Disapproval coded as "0" and Somewhat or Strong Approval coded as "1."]
                    Definitely in the right direction
                    Probably in the right direction
                    Probably on the wrong track
                    Definitely on the wrong track
                    Not sure

A1.   **Thinking about your current financial situation, would you say you are struggling to remain where you are financially, basically stable in your current financial situation, or is your financial situation improving**? (.227) [Those for whom things have improved support Trump a bit more.]
                    Struggling
                    Stable
                    Improving
                    Not sure

A2.   **Recent indicators have shown that the U.S. economy has been growing, including lower unemployment and higher productivity. How much has your family benefitted from this economic upturn?** (.468) [Those who have benefitted more support Trump more than most]

Great deal

Some

Not much

Not at all

Not sure

A3.   **Thinking about today, how would you say that peop le like you are doing now in American society?** (.459) [People who think they are getting ahead support Trump more.]

People like me are getting left behind by a lot

People like me are getting left behind by a little

People like me are doing no better or worse than others

People like me are getting ahead by a little

People like me are getting ahead by a lot

Respondents were notified when they asked for the next page if they had left items on the present page unanswered. They could go back and answer, or continue, as they wished.

The following pages contain different statements. For each one, please indicate how much you <u>disagree</u> or <u>agree</u> with each using this scale:

Very strongly disagree (-4)

Strongly disagree (-3)

Moderately disagree (-2)

Slightly disagree (-1)

Neither disagree nor agree (0)

Slightly agree (+1)

Moderately agree (+2)

Strongly agree (+3)

Very strongly agree (+4)

It is important that you try to answer every question. If you have different reactions to different parts of a statement, select an average response that indicates how you feel on balance.

RWA Scale

RX1.   We need more marches and demonstrations to protest how badly minorities are treated in America. [This item is not part of the RWA Scale, but was put in to give participants a little practice with the nine-point response scale.]

RWA1.   Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us. [Beginning of the RWA Scale. A "-4" was scored as a 1, a "-3" was scored as a 2, etcetera, up to "+4" being scored a 9. "0" was scored as a 5.]

RWA2.   Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.* [Note: Statements marked with an asterisk are worded in the con-trait direction. That means the scoring key is reversed when the response is scored. The asterisk did not appear on the survey, of course.]

RWA3.   It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds

RWA4.   Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.*

RWA5.   The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.

RWA6.   There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.*

RWA7.   Our country <u>needs</u> free thinkers who have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.*

RWA8.   Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.

RWA9.   Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.*

RWA10.   The "old-fashioned ways" and the "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to live.

RWA11.   You have to admire those who challenged the law and the majority's view by protesting for women's abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer.*

RWA12.   What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.

RWA13.   Some of the best people in our country are those who
         are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and
         ignoring the "normal way things are supposed to be done." *

RWA14.   God's laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must
         be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break
         them must be strongly punished.

RWA15.   There are many radical, immoral people in our country today,
         who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes,
         whom the authorities should put out of action.

RWA16.   A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The
         days when women are submissive to their husbands and social
         conventions belong strictly in the past.*

RWA17.   Our country will be great if we honour the ways of our
         forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid
         of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything.

RWA18.   There is no "ONE right way" to live life; everybody has to
         create their own way.*

RWA19.   Homosexuals and feminists should be praised for being brave
         enough to defy "traditional family values."*

RWA20.   This country would work a lot better if certain groups of
         troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group's
         traditional place in society. [End of the RWA Scale]

RX2.   Once our government leaders and the authorities condemn
            the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty
            of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is
            poisoning our country from within. (.50)

RX3.   The U.S. Constitution gets in the way of things too much
            nowadays and should just be ignored when it interferes with
            taking action on some issue. (-.15)

RX4.   It is more important for a leader to be able to arouse the deep
            passions of the common man than to offer well-reasoned
            arguments for policies. (.31)

**For the next set of statements, please indicate how much you <u>oppose</u> or
<u>favor</u> each using this scale:**

> Very strongly oppose (-4)
> Strongly oppose (-3)
> Moderately oppose (-2)
> Slightly oppose (-1)
> Neither oppose nor favor (0)
> Slightly favor (+1)
> Moderately favor (+2)
> Strongly favor (+3)
> Very strongly favor (+4)

**You can work quickly. Your first reaction is generally best. Please try to
answer every question.**

Social Dominance Scale

SD1.   Some groups of people must be kept in their place.
            [Beginning of the 8-item Dominance SDO Scale]

SD2.   It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top
            and other groups are at the bottom.

SD3.   An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others
            to be on the bottom.

SD4.   Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

SD5.   Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.*

SD6.   No one group should dominate in society.*

SD7.   Groups at the bottom should not have to stay in their place.*

SD8.   Group dominance is a poor principle.*

SD9.   We should not push for group equality. [Beginning of the
            8-item Anti-Equality SDO Scale]

SD10.   We shouldn't try to guarantee that every group has the same
            quality of life.

SD11.   It is unjust to make groups equal.

SD12.   Group equality should not be our primary goal.

SD13.   We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.*

SD14.   We should do what we can to equalize conditions for
             different groups.*

SD15.   No matter how much effort it takes, we ought to strive to
             ensure that all groups have the same chance in life.*

SD16.   Group equality should be our ideal.*

"Child Rearing" Scale

Although there are a number of qualities that people feel children should
have, every person thinks that some are more important than others. For
each of the following pairs of desirable qualities, **please select the one you
think is** *more* **important for a child to have**.

CR1.   **It is more important for a child to have:**
                1. Independence   2. Respect for Elders (.413)
CR2.   **It is more important for a child to show:***
                1. Obedience   2. Self-reliance (.350)
CR3.   **It is more important for a child to have:**
                1. Curiosity   2. Good Manners (.349)
CR4.   **It is more important for a child to be:**
                1. Considerate   2. Well-behaved (.269)

**For the next set of statements, please indicate how much you disagree or
agree with each using this scale:**

Very strongly disagree (-4)

Strongly disagree (-3)

Moderately disagree (-2)

Slightly disagree (-1)

Neither disagree nor agree (0)

Slightly agree (+1)

Moderately agree (+2)

Strongly agree (+3)

Very strongly agree (+4)

It is important that you try to answer every question. If you have different reactions to different parts of a statement, select an average response that indicates how you feel on balance.

24 Prejudice items

PR1.   There are entirely too many people from the wrong places getting into the United States now.

PR2.   Muslims bring a valuable new element to American society and should be welcomed.*

PR3.   White people are the major victims of discrimination in the United States. The government is on everybody else's side but theirs.

PR4.   The more diverse America becomes, with different people with different religions and heritages from everywhere else in the world, the stronger it will be.*

PR5.   Black Americans continue to get less than their fair share of
            our country's wealth because of discrimination.*

R6.   Latin Americans are naturally lazy, promiscuous, and
            irresponsible.

PR7.   We should tear down the walls that keep people from
            different cultures away from us, rather than build new ones. *

PR8.   Two really bad things about the Jews is that they killed Jesus,
            and they secretly control the world's banks and economy.

PR9.   Racial minorities have had it good for years in the United
            States because of all the government programs that help them
            get ahead of white people.

PR10.   It will be great if someday America has become such a mixture
            of different people that white persons are in a minority like
            everybody else.*

PR11.   Instead of complaining and protesting all the time, African-
            Americans should be grateful for how good they have it here
            compared to where they came from.

PR12.   Religions like Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism are just as
            true as Christianity, and produce as much good behavior.*

PR13.   Every person we let into the country as a "refugee" means
            another American won't be able to find a job, or another
            foreigner will go on welfare here.

PR14.   Overall the white race has mainly brought exploitation and
              suffering to the other peoples of the world.*

PR15.   America should stop giving foreign aid to backward
              countries. They made their mess by themselves, so let them
              clean it up.

PR16.   Black people are just naturally more violent than white
              people.

PR17.   Christianity has very unjustly persecuted the Jews over the
              centuries.*

PR18.   Most minorities on welfare would rather work, but they can't
              get jobs that pay a living wage.*

PR19.   There's no way a religion like Islam that produces so many
              terrorists is as good a religion as Christianity is.

PR20.   Latin-Americans are as hard-working, law-abiding, and
              responsible as any other group of Americans.*

PR21.   Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural
              intelligence and "get up and go" of the white race.

PR22.   Americans are NOT exceptionally noble compared to the
              rest of the world. "American Exceptionalism" is just another
              ugly "master race" theory.*

PR23.   The immigrants from the Caribbean and Africa who have

come to America have mainly brought disease, ignorance, and
violence with them.

PR24.   It is good to live in a country where there are so many
          minority groups present, such as African-Americans,
          Hispanics, and Asians.*

Topical Questions

The next set of questions ask about some current events.

A4.   **How much interest do you have in the 2020 election for
          President?** (-.02)
                    A lot of interest
                    Some interest
                    Only a little interest
                    No interest

A5.   **How likely are you to vote in the November 2020 general
          election for President?** (-.02)
                    Definitely will vote
                    Probably will vote
                     Probably will not vote
                     Definitely will not vote
                    Not sure

A6.   **As of right now, how would you vote in the November 2020
          presidential election?** (.927)
                    Definitely vote to re-elect Donald Trump
                    Probably vote to re-elect Donald Trump

       Lean <u>toward</u> voting to re-elect Donald Trump

       Completely undecided, do not lean either way

       Lean <u>against</u> voting to re-elect Donald Trump

       Probably vote against re-electing Donald Trump

       Definitely vote against re-electing Donald Trump

       Will not vote in 2020

A7.   **What type of candidate would it be better for the Democrats to nominate?**

       Definitely prefer an experienced candidate who knows how to get things done

       Probably prefer an experienced candidate who knows how to get things done

       Probably prefer an outsider candidate who can shake up the system

       Definitely prefer an outsider candidate who can shake up the system

       Not sure

       Does not matter to me

A8.   **Which candidate would you prefer to see the Democrats to nominate?**[2] (See Endnote 2)

       Joe Biden

       Pete Buttigieg

       Kamala Harris

       Bernie Sanders

       Elizabeth Warren

       Someone else, specify: [Amy Klubuchar]

       Someone else, specify: [Andrew Yang]

       Someone else, specify: [Tulsi Gabbard]

Someone else, specify: [Mike Bloomberg]

Someone else, specify: [all others]

Not sure

No one, does not matter to me

A9.   **Who did you vote for in the 2016 election for president?**

Hillary Clinton

Donald Trump

Other candidate

Do not remember

Did not vote

A10.   **Do you approve or disapprove of the job Donald Trump is doing as president?**

Strongly approve

Somewhat approve

Somewhat disapprove

Strongly disapprove

Not sure

A11.   **Do you support or oppose impeaching and removing Donald Trump from office before the 2020 election?** (-.799)

Strongly support

Somewhat support

Somewhat oppose

Strongly oppose

Not sure

For the next set of statements, please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each using this scale:

> Very strongly disagree (-4)
> Strongly disagree (-3)
> Moderately disagree (-2)
> Slightly disagree (-1)
> Neither disagree nor agree (0)
> Slightly agree (+1)
> Moderately agree (+2)
> Strongly agree (+3)
> Very strongly agree (+4)

A12.   If Donald Trump is defeated in November 2020, he should continue to be president if he declares the election was fixed and crooked. (.466)

A13.   If the impeachment inquiry turns up information about potential criminal activity by Donald Trump, it would be fair to investigate him for possible prosecution of those activities once he is out of office. (-.638)

A14.   Donald Trump has the right to give himself a presidential pardon before he leaves office for any crimes he could be investigated for. (.628)

A15.   If Donald Trump is impeached and removed from office, he should be put on trial for any crimes he may have committed while in office. (-.711)

A16.   If Donald Trump resigns from office before his term is up, he
            should be put on trial for any crimes he may have committed
            while in office. (-.732)

A17.   If Donald Trump is defeated for re-election in 2020, he
            should be put on trial for any crimes he may have committed
            while in office. (-.741)

Demographics

These questions are for grouping purposes only.

D1.   **What is your gender?**
            Male (54%)
            Female (45%)
            Other

D2.   **What was your age in years on your last birthday?**
            _____   [ENTER NUMBER]
            (Mean = 60.7 years; r=.137)

D3.   **What was the last grade in school you completed?**
            8th grade or less   (00%)
            High school incomplete (Grades 9, 10 and 11)   (01%)
            High school complete (Grade 12)   (07%)
            Vocational/technical school   (06%)
            Some college, but no degree   (16%)
            Junior College graduate (2 year, Associate Degree) (08%)
            4-year college graduate (Bachelor's Degree)   (27%)
            Attended graduate school   (06%)
            Completed graduate school (Masters, Law, Medical
            degree, etc.) (29%)

D4.   **Do you have any children under the age of 18?**
                   No   Yes

D5.   **In politics today, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, independent, or something else?**
                   Republican   (N=301)
                   Democrat   (N=286)
                   Independent   (N=349)
                   Another party, please specify: _____

D5A.   **If you are an Independent, d**o you lean more toward the **Republican Party or more toward the Democratic Party?**
                   Lean more Republican   (N=146)
                   Lean more Democrat   (N=115)
                   Neither   (N=88)

D6.   **In general, would you describe your political views as liberal, moderate, or conservative?** (.661)
                   Very liberal   (N=098)
                   Somewhat liberal   (N=193)
                   Moderate   (N=288)
                   Somewhat conservative   (N=222)
                   Very conservative   (N=176)

D7.   **Are you of Latino or Hispanic origin?**
                   Yes (06%)
                   No

D8.   **Are you white, black or of Asian origin?**
                   White   (82%)
                   Black   (06%)

Asian   (02%)
Hispanic (white)   (06%)
Other, specify: [Mixed race]
 Other, specify: [other]

D9.   **How often do you attend religious or worship services, not**
         including weddings or funerals?
         More than once a week   (08%)
         Once a week   (21%)
         Once or twice a month   10%)
         A few times a year   (15%)
         Seldom   (22%)
         Never   (22%)

D10.   **What is your religious affiliation?**
         Protestant   (34%)
         Catholic   (21%)
         Other Christian   (18%)
         Jewish   (03%)
         Hindu
         Muslim
         Other, specify: [Buddhist]
         Other, specify: [other]
         None [D10A = Believe in God] (5%)
         None [D10A = Agnostic]   (7%)
         None [D10A = Atheist   (6%)

D10A.   **If your religious affiliation is "None," Which of the following best describes you:**

> Atheist. I believe there is no God.
>
> Agnostic. I do not believe, or disbelieve, in God. I do not know.
>
> I believe in God, but do not belong to or identify with any religion.
>
> Other, describe: ___

D11.   **If you belong to a specific religious denomination, please enter it here:**

> _____

D12.   **Would you describe yourself as a born-again or an evangelical Christian?**

> Yes, Born-again, but not evangelical
>
> Yes, Evangelical, but not born-again
>
> Yes, both born-again and evangelical
>
> No, neither of these

D13.   **So that we can group all answers, what is your total annual family income before taxes? Your answers are recorded confidentially.**

Under $25,000	(07%)
$25,000 to just under $50,000	(15%)
$50,000 to just under $75,000	(18%)
$75,000 to just under $100,000	(18%)
$100,000 to just under $150,000	(19%)
$150,000 to just under $200,000	(09%)
$200,000 or more	(13%)

N1.   **Which ONE of the following is the news source you use most often to find out what is going on in the country and the world?** *[Please choose only one]*

        ABC News

        Breitbart News

        CBS News

        CNN

        Drudge Report

        Facebook

        Fox News Channel

        Huffington Post

        Los Angeles Times

        MSNBC

        NBC News

        NPR/National Public Radio

        Newsmax

        New York Post

        New York Times

        One America News

        PBS News

        Politico

        Reddit

        Reuters

        RT

        Rush Limbaugh

        Twitter

        USA Today

        Wall Street Journal

        Washington Post

        Yahoo News

YouTube

Other, specify: [BBC]

Other, specify: [Google or Apple news feeds]

Other, specify: [Internet, non-specific]

Other, specify: [Talk radio, non-specific]

Other, specify: [other]

Other, specify: [Multiple sources, non-specific]

Other, specify: [None, no sources used]

We are nearly to the end of the survey. Your opinions are extremely valuable. There are a few more questions left that will really help with this research project.

U1.   **How much have you heard about recent reports involving Ukraine, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden?**

Have heard a lot   (-.081)

Have heard a little

Have not heard anything

U2.   **How much have you read or heard about the "rough transcript" issued by the White House of what was said in the call between Donald Trump and Ukrainian President Zelensky?)** (-.035)

I have read the transcript myself

I have not read the transcript myself, but I have read or seen extensive news coverage of what was in it

I have only heard a little about what the transcript actually says

I have not heard anything about the details in the transcript

For the next set of statements, please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each using this scale:

> Very strongly disagree (-4)
> Strongly disagree (-3)
> Moderately disagree (-2)
> Slightly disagree (-1)
> Neither disagree nor agree (0)
> Slightly agree (+1)
> Moderately agree (+2)
> Strongly agree (+3)
> Very strongly agree (+4)

U3.   The "rough transcript" of the Trump-Zelensky phone conversation that the White House released shows that the president did NOT specifically ask Zelensky to investigate Joe Biden or his son.(.720)

U4.   President Trump stopped the payment of funds for military aid to Ukraine, then called President Zelensky and asked for a favor in order to release those funds. (-.764)

U5.   White House officials put the transcript of the Ukraine phone conversation on a top-secret computer to hide it because they were afraid Trump could be damaged politically if it became public. (-.781)

U6.   If Barack Obama had made a phone call to the leader of a foreign nation in 2011, suggesting that his likely opponent

Mitt Romney should be investigated with the help of the president's personal attorney, Obama should have been impeached and removed from office. (-.628)

For the next set of statements, please indicate how much you <u>disagree</u> or <u>agree</u> with each using this scale:

Very strongly disagree (-4)
Strongly disagree (-3)
Moderately disagree (-2)
Slightly disagree (-1)
Neither disagree nor agree (0)
Slightly agree (+1)
Moderately agree (+2)
Strongly agree (+3)
Very strongly agree (+4)

Censorship Scale

CS1.   Should a university professor be allowed to teach an anthropology course in which he argues that men are naturally superior to women, so women should resign themselves to inferior roles in our society?

CS2.   Should a book be assigned in a Grade 12 English course that presents homosexual relationships in a positive light?

CS3.   Should books be allowed to be sold that attack "being patriotic" and "being religious"?

CS4.   Should a racist speaker be allowed to give a public talk preaching his views?

CS5.   Should someone be allowed to teach a Grade 10 sex education course who strongly believes that all premarital sex is a sin?

CS6.   Should commercials for "telephone sex" be allowed to be shown after 11 PM on television?

CS7.   Should a professor who has argued in the past that black people are less intelligent than white people be given a research grant to continue studies of this issue?

CS8.   Should a book be allowed to be published that argues the Holocaust never occurred, but was made up by Jews to create sympathy for their cause?

CS9.   Should sexually explicit material that describes intercourse through words and medical diagrams be used in sex education classes in Grade 10?

CS10.   Should a university professor be allowed to teach a philosophy course in which he tries to convince his students there is no God?

CS11.   Should an openly white supremacist movie such as "The Birth of a Nation" (which glorifies the Ku Klux Klan) be shown in a Grade 12 social studies class?

CS12.   Should "Pro-Choice" counselors and abortion clinics be allowed to advertise their services in public health clinics if "Pro-Life" counselors can?

For this final set of statements, please indicate how much you <u>disagree</u> or <u>agree</u> with each using this scale:

Very strongly disagree (-4)

Strongly disagree (-3)

Moderately disagree (-2)

Slightly disagree (-1)

Neither disagree nor agree (0)

Slightly agree (+1)

Moderately agree (+2)

Strongly agree (+3)

Very strongly agree (+4)

It is important that you try to answer every question. If you have different reactions to different parts of a statement, select an average response that indicates how you feel on balance.

Religious Fundamentalism scale

RF1.   God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed.

RF2.   No single book of religious teachings contains all the intrinsic, fundamental truths about life.*

RF3.   The basic cause of evil in this world is Satan, who is still constantly and ferociously fighting against God.

RF4.   It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion.*

RF5.   There is a particular set of religious teachings in this world that are so true, you can't go any "deeper" because they are the basic, bedrock message that God has given humanity.

RF6.   When you get right down to it, there are basically only two

kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God, and the rest, who will not.

RF7.   Scriptures may contain general truths, but they should NOT be considered completely, literally true from beginning to end.*

RF8.   To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion.

RF9.   "Satan" is just the name people give to their own bad impulses. There really is *no such thing* as a diabolical "Prince of Darkness" who tempts us.*

RF10.   Whenever science and sacred scripture conflict, *science* is probably right.*

RF11.   The fundamentals of God's religion should never be tampered with, or compromised with others' beliefs.

RF12.   *All* of the religions in the world have flaws and wrong teachings. There is *no* perfectly true, right religion.* [End of Religious Fundamentalism Scale]

RFX1.   If we have faith in Jesus, accepting him as our personal savior and asking forgiveness of our sins, *we will be saved*, no matter what kind of life we live afterwards. (.322)

Thank you very much for helping with this important research project!

EXPLANATIONS AND DETAILED ANALYSES OF THE AUTUMN 2019 NATIONAL AUTHORITARIANISM POLL UNDERTAKEN BY MONMOUTH UNIVERSITY POLLING INSTITUTE

BOB ALTEMEYER

Table 1 (below) shows how the national sample reacted to all six of our multi-item measures. Personality researchers will know that the most important information lay in the last two columns. The "Average Inter-Item Correlation" tells you how much a person's responses to a test all went together in the same direction, like cars on a one-way street. Low levels of interconnection mean the responses were going in many different directions, like cars in a mall parking lot on Black Friday, and you have a big mess. But the higher the number, the more the cars were lined up heading the same way. Almost all the scales in Monmouth's national survey look like they were fast one-way streets, as these things go. Some were like smooth-flowing superhighways, if not bullet-trains. For example, the 24 diverse prejudice items have 276 intercorrelations. These averaged .519 among our white

respondents, which is many times stronger than the bond as appeared in previous studies with similar scales. The wide-ranging sentiments tapped by these statements apparently go together in America now to unprecedented degrees. With relatively minor exceptions, people tend to either reject the whole package, or swallow most of it hook, line and sinker. So, people who complained about "too many people from the wrong sorts of places" were not just backing up the president, they also tended to think blacks are naturally violent and ungrateful for being brought to America, Jews killed Jesus and secretly control the banks, Latinos are lazy, promiscuous, and irresponsible, white people are superior to everyone else, Americans are exceptionally good people, etc. You can find people who are prejudiced against just one group, but they are rare. Where you find one prejudice, you usually find a dozen more tightly connected. It is a wide-ranging disease of the mind.

The last column in Table 1, "Alpha Reliability Coefficient," is determined by the average inter-item correlation and the number of items on the test. It indicates how stable, how trustworthy, the total score on a test is likely to be. A perfect test would have an alpha of 1.00, but nobody has ever gotten there. The best standardized IQ tests have alphas of about .90. Psychologists usually consider .80 "good enough." Nearly all of our tests met that minimum standard, and three of them had simply fantastic, very alpha, alphas. Again, to our knowledge, such numbers have never appeared before, certainly not as broadly, in a study of the general population.

Table 1 Statistical Properties of the Personality Tests Used in the Autumn 2019 National Survey (N=990)

Scale	Number of Items	Possible Range	Actual Range	Average (Mean)	Varience	Average Inter-Item Correlation	Alpha Realiability Coefficient
RWA	20	20-180	20-176	84.0	1577	.516	.955
SDO=DOM	8	8-72	8-71	23.4	136	.396	.840
SDO=ANTI	8	8-72	8-72	29.3	225	.502	.888
Child Rearing	4	0-4	0-4	1.50	1.84	.396	.725
Prejudice*	24	24-216	24-214	92.5	1987	.519	.963
Religious Fundamen.	12	12-108	12-108	50.4	833	.669	.960

*White respondents only (N=810)

(Continuing on with statistical doings) principal axes factor analyses of the instruments used in the survey produced strong evidence of unidimensionality in almost every case. All had one dominant factor in the unrotated solution with subsequent ones so small they were easily dismissed by a Scree test. For example, the first factor extracted from the 24 prejudice items had an eigenvalue of 12.94, while the second amounted to only 1.99. *Most* of the variance in each test, except SDO-Dominance and Child-rearing, was common variance, which is unheard of. It means the factor underlying all the items on the scale was more powerful than the effect of the specific issues raised by the different items plus the error variance. For a psychometrician, that is the thing dreams are made of.

What's an eigenvalue? It's how many eigens you got. Sheesh.

"FIGURE 1" VALUES FOR THE SOCIAL

Dominance Scales

Here are the means for the SDO-Dominance Scale, from the 466 "Strongly Disapprovers" to the 348 "Strongly Approvers:" 16.4, 25.2, 24.6, 27.9, and 31.0). The corresponding values for the "Anti-Equality" SDO scale are 19.3, 30.3, 27.8, 36.1, and 40.4

Correlations Between the Measures

The biggest reason we did the survey was to see what Trump's non-supporters were like, psychologically, compared to those who support him. The statistic that best shows this is called the correlation coefficient. It shows how much two things, like personal prejudice and support for Trump. Go along together in a whole sample. It does not show which causes the other one however (and both could be caused by something else). Correlations vary in strength from 0.00 (no connection whatsoever) to ±1.00 (a perfect connection).

Lots of things in life are correlated. For instance, if you measure the height and weight of all the adult human beings on the planet tomorrow, in your spare time, these two aspects of our physical being will correlate about .50. Generally, tall people tend to weigh more than short people, even though you run into definite exceptions. (I am 5'8" and weigh more than most of the players in the NFL If I were 3" taller, I'd look perfectly round from the front.) Similarly, you may have noticed that bright people do better in school than, uh, unbright people. The correlation between scores on a stellar IQ test and academic success also runs about .50. in studies

Because .50 is halfway between 0.00 and 1.00, you might conclude that height explains about 50 percent of the weight of the population (and potato chips explain the rest). But that would be wrong, it turns out. You *square* a correlation to see how important it is. So, height only explains (.50 x .50 =) .25, or 25 percent of the human tonnage being lugged around the planet. (And the rest is due to potato chips and chocolate.) So, for One Thing to be able to explain *most* of the differences (i.e., the variance) in Another Thing because it goes along with it, the two have to correlate about .71 or higher (because (.71) ^{2} gives you over 50 percent of the explanation). And you know what? A researcher in the social sciences may never discover a relationship that strong in her lifetime. Because nature and nurture affect us in so many different ways, almost nothing interesting about human behavior correlates that much with any one thing. All the big, powerful stuff that does, like who has babies (the females), was noticed a long time ago. There are virtually no simple answers to the remaining Mysteries of Life. Researchers plugging away at their little piece of the Humongous Unknown usually discover small bits of knowledge—which is to be expected because they are trying to find things nobody- but-nobody- has found before. Correlations between .30 and .40 are often considered important finds—even though you're only explaining 10-15 percent of what you're trying to figure out.

If you understand that, then sit down because Table 2 is going to blow your mind to smithereens. (Like Table 1, it still sends chills down my spine the way it did when the numbers first popped up on my monitor.) The table has some big Bad Boy Numbers in it representing some Big Very Bad Connections in America.

Table 2 Correlations Among the Scales, Political Party Preference,
and Approval of Trump's Performance
[Note: First correlation (xxx/) is for whole sample, N=990; Second
correlation (/yyy) is for white respondents only, N=810)]

	RWA Scale	Social Dominance: Orientation	Social Dominance: Anti-Equality	Child-Rearing	Predjudice	Religious Fundamentalism	Political Party Preference [a]	Approve of Trump [b]
RWA Scale	*	.613/ .634	.614/ .643	.645/ .666	.836/ .856	.829/ .841	.748/ .788	.737/ .764
Soc. Dom: Dominance		*	.640/ .642	.439/ .495	.712/ .720	.447/ .483	.568/ .571	.556/ .567
Soc. Dom: Anti-Equal.			*	.389/ .455	.729/ .734	.462/ .515	.627/ .628	.635/ .635
"Child Rearing"				*	.573/ .629	.569/ .593	.489/ .556	.471/ .528
Prejudice					*	.651/ .696	.775/ .787	.812/ .817
Religious Fundamen.						*	.627/ .700	.594/ .654
Party (Dem. Or GOP)							*	.859/ .868

a   Democrats versus Republicans.

b   Figure 1 in Chapter 10 shows that answers to the "Approve of Trump" question were enormously bi-modally distributed, Use of the Pearson product-moment correlation assumes a bi-variate normal distribution. Accordingly, we collapsed the "Approve Trump" data into two categories:, "Disapprove" (by merging "Strongly disapprove" and "Somewhat disapprove,") and "Approve" by following the same tack. Anybody who has ever speed-dated (we hear) knows that "Disapproval" versus "Approval" is at root a "natural," discrete, two-value variable (i.e. you hit or you miss) and therefore can be used to establish point-biserial correlations with continuous variables, which are product-moment values equal in size to Pearsons but which make no assumption, obviously, about normal distributions. The correlations shown in the column headed "Approve of Trump" are point-biserials.

c   There is not much to say about the four-item "Childrearing" Scale discussed in Appendix I.. It had better psychometric properties in this survey than usual

(or ever), but it still does not bring anything to the table that is not already there, and it misses a great deal as well. There is a statistical procedure called a multiple regression analysis that's a whiz at showing how important things are by themselves and in combination with other things. If you are trying to predict support for Trump, combining the RWA Scale and the "Four Simple Questions," gets you almost nothing more than what the RWA Scale gives by itself. True, it only takes four items to account by itself for $(.47)^2 = 22$ percent of the variance in people's support Trump and that might impress some. But that is less impressive than it seems. Most (13/20) of the items on the RWA scale accounted for more than that just by themselves as single items. We will accordingly not spend much "ink" on this measure.

Let us start with the final column, which reports correlations that the various measures had with approval of Trump's performance. There are two numbers in each cell, such as .737 and .764. The second numbers (which refers to only the 810-white folk in the sample) can be ignored unless we are discussing white prejudice. As you run your eye down the last column, you see that, most of all, Trump's supporters were Republicans not Democrats. The correlation (found in the bottom cell) was .859. But "Duh." "Duh Squared." Much more to the point (of this book, and other matters), *almost all our scales predicted support of Trump much, much better* than height predicts weight and much, much better than IQ predicts academic success—things we think of in everyday life as important predictors. But they are puny compared to what we've got here. Two of our measures, the degree to which the person is a right-wing authoritarian and the respondent's score on the prejudice items can each explain *most* of the difference we find in voters' reaction to Donald Trump. That is really saying something, given how complicated people's reasons can be for choosing a presidential candidate. But it's a fact, Jack.

You may be wondering how two different tests can each account for more than half of something. Is it like "Reaganomics"? ("Half of the economy is the federal government, and half is the state governments, and half is the private sector.") They cannot, if they are independent of each other. But RWA Scale scores and prejudice are themselves very, very highly correlated (.856 among the white respondents). Which means way more than most

(73.3 percent!) of the differences in prejudice among the white respondents in the study can be explained with just the RWA Scale, since .856 x .856 = 73.3 percent. Adding in the additional explanation that the two social dominance scales can contribute raises this to 81.1 percent. After which there's not much left to explain, even though (as we said in Chapter Six), many different kinds of people support Donald Trump. Economic factors for example are often cited. In our poll, as in other surveys, support for Trump had a low correlation with reports of annual family income before taxes (it was .00, DOA.). But a strong correlation (.660 over the whole sample) did appear between supporting the president and feeling that one had benefitted from the recent economic improvement. However, this feeling of moving ahead correlated .554 with prejudice (.539 for whites only). Thus, you could account for lots of the "Benefitted's" in Trump's corner with their prejudice scores. But economic improvement added little to our understanding of who supports Trump. A multiple regression analysis found that adding "Benefitted" to Prejudice raised the variance accounted for in Trump support from 65.9 percent to 71.4 percent for the whole sample, and from 66.5 percent to 71.7 percent for white respondents only. The biggest reason by far that people supported Trump was their level of prejudice, but some (not many) relatively unprejudiced subjects approved of him because they thought they were prospering thanks to him.

COMPARISON OF THE SCALE'S PERFORMANCE IN THE MAY AND OCTOBER POLLS.

The alphas for the RWA, Dominance, Anti-Equality, Child-Rearing, Prejudice, and Religious Fundamentalism measures in May were, respectively, .949, .833, .897, .658, .959, and .942. The values for the Autumn sample, as reported in Table 1 above were .955, .840, .888, .725, .963, and .960.

Table 3 gives the comparison of the inter-scale correlations obtained in the May and October polls (May correlation comes first; October correlation comes last)

Table 4. Correlations between the Scales and Trump Approval in May and in October 2019 Polls

	RWA Scale	Social Dominance: Orientation	Social Dominance: Anti-Equality	Child-Rearing	Predjudice	Religious Fundamentalism	Approve of Trump
RWA Scale	*	.630/ .613	.621/ .614	.527/ .645	.816/ .856	.780/ .829	.755/ .737
Soc. Dom: Dominance		*	.644/ .640	.439/ .405	.712/ .720	.490/ .447	.516/ .556
Soc. Dom: Anti-Equal.			*	.389/ .317	.729/ .734	.396/ .462	.659/ .635
"Child Rearing"				*	.516/ .629	.569/ .470	.406/ .471
Prejudice					*	.659/ .696	.812/ .817
Religious Fundamen.						*	.574/ .594

The October Poll Censorship Study

Another search for replication in the Monmouth autumn poll centered on the relationship between RWA and "political correctness." Various conservative politicians in Canada complained at one point about being pressured to be "politically correct," which usually meant not making comments that would offend disadvantaged groups. But conservatives seemed to want to control language and communications just as much, only on different topics. So, a dozen cases were assembled involving the spread of controversial ideas, half of which would anger High RWAs, and half of which would

tick off Lows. I thought the two groups would betray equal drives to censor. A large sample of parents of Canadian university students reacted to the twelve cases and their answers stunningly disconfirmed my hypothesis. Disbelieving, I ran the experiment again with a second parent sample and Mother Nature gave the same answer: "You're wrong, Dummy!!"

The "Censorship Scale" was accordingly squeezed onto the end of the Monmouth autumn poll because if any of my past studies would not replicate in the USA, it was probably this one because the previous outcomes seemed so wrong.

The Censorship Test is shown below as it appeared on our survey. Each item was answered on a +4 to -4 basis. The correlation between a desire to censor the material and RWA Scale scores is given in parentheses after each item.

ON RACE AND PREJUDICE

Nothing was more striking in our study, and it was confirmed by the Monmouth survey undertaken for us, than the widespread prejudice that has congregated in Donald Trump's base of supporters. It appears that some of the most racially prejudiced people in America show up at Trump rallies, and you will find among their many stereotypes a belief that the "white race" is intellectually and morally superior to African Americans, Asians, and Native Indians. These notions, however, were declared scientifically bankrupt a long time ago, and not just because research shows the stereotypes of various groups are misleading rather they are usually just plain false. So, we wish to close with a few comments about race and prejudice.

Prejudice, by definition, is based on feelings, not reliable information. Racism is just as baseless, for research shows the whole notion of "race" has no scientific validity.[1]

Some might say such research only shows how scientists are stupid because everybody can see there are white people, black people, yellow people, and so on. Well, these observers can also see the sun goes around the Earth every day, not to mention that the Earth is also flat. Perceptions can be wrong, and most perceptions about race are hardly obvious. Look at the so-called "white race," and you find they differ enormously in skin color from person to person. And no one in the so-called "white race" is even close to being white. In fact, a truly white person would be a bit freaky, and frightening. Human beings vary way too much in skin color, hair texture, facial

features, and so on to describe races of people. This becomes especially clear if you examine the genetic determinants of these visible features. Human DNA is literally all-over-the-map, a mishmash of different genes produced by eons of interbreeding from one part of our planet to another. You many have some Neanderthal DNA that slipped into your family tree one starry night thanks to nature's most outrageous Romeo and Juliet. (Author Altemeyer suspects Juliet was probably the Neanderthal; author Dean is not so sure.) Whatever, we all think we belong to a "race" because we have only the tiniest knowledge of our ancestors.

More specifically, you probably knew your four grandparents, or maybe more if there was a divorce in the family, but we are referring to consanguinity (blood), not affinity (marriage), to be technical. And you may also know the names of some of your eight great-grandparents. But unless someone in your family is into genealogy, you are likely completely ignorant of your sixteen great-great grandparents, even though they lived quite recently (maybe as recently as a 110 to 150 years ago) in the 300,000-year timespan of our species. Your DNA came from thousands of individuals you know nothing about. If you are English, do you think your ancestors always lived in England? Not a chance. Only the very recent ones did. This explains why people who send in a DNA sample to an ancestry analyzer get surprises like, "They say I'm 40 percent British, 30 percent Italian, 20 percent Finnish, and 10 percent Moroccan! What the heck?" And that may just describe your ancestors of 5000 years ago, not 50,000.

Where did you come from, really? If you are a so-called white, your immediate ancestors probably came from Europe. But *homo sapiens* only established permanent residence there about 40,000 years ago. Those people came from the Levant and settled along the Mediterranean coast, and a second group migrated from the steppes of Central Asia into central and northern Europe.[2] So if you are Italian you could just as easily say you are from the Near East. If you are British or German, like your authors, your

ancestors 45,000 years ago were likely Asians who combined the invention of the wheel and the domestication of horses and started the first wagon trains west. All these groups came out of Africa, where the evidence indicates *Homo Sapiens* originated, and only permanently moved to the Eurasian continent maybe 75,000 years ago. As a species, we were born in Africa and it is virtually certain that we were not very white.[3]

Accordingly, all Americans are African Americans. In the final analysis we all came from the same place, and your ancestors and those of NBA players, including Yao Ming, lived with one another there for almost all of our species' history. What's the difference between us? Not who our ultimate ancestors were, only when our ancestors left Africa. The forebearers of most so-called white Americans arrived in the New World in the last 400 years from Europe, most of them desperate immigrants seeking a better life. The ancestors of almost all so-called black Americans were kidnapped in West Africa and brought to the New World against their wills, where nearly all of them were enslaved for the rest of their lives. The Europeans who did this thought it perfectly moral, just as they thought it quite ethical to keep their descendants as human chattel, with many of them sired by white men who not only disowned their own sons and daughters but made them slaves.[4]

After the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation and the Fourteenth Amendment that Donald Trump swishes away with a wave of his hand, slaves' descendants continued to suffer disadvantages almost as severe as their slave ancestors did for generations. Their poor health and poverty explain why they have done so much of the dying from COVID-19. White African Americans did this to their brothers and sisters, and some are still doing it, believing they have the right to rule America because they desperately cling to a belief that they are superior. It is a baseless belief. It is all wrong, terribly wrong. It is long past time for white African Americans to appreciate their thin-skinned thinking. There is no superior race on this

planet. Prejudice only reveals ignorance, as it did on the street of Minneapolis when police officer Derek Chauvin murdered George Floyd. When disgust with American prejudice erupted on the streets of cities and towns everywhere, and throughout the world, the president of the United States, Donald Trump, and his supporters, did not understand it. Bring out the American armed forces and "dominate" the dissenters. Americans who do understanding prejudice and the fallacy of race must remove Trump from the White House this November, for it they do not, the prejudice will continue, and the American experiment will, as we noted earlier, have failed.

ENDNOTES

APPENDIX V

1   These 990 were all the respondents who reached the Demographic questions toward the end of the questionnaire. Whereas sometimes researchers drop participants from a study because they skipped a lot of questions or are judged to have given random or nonsensical answers, no one who got to the Demographics was excluded so that we might "take" as complete a picture of the sample involved as possible.

2   Our survey was conducted in late 2019 before the first Democratic caucus in Iowa and we listed the top five candidates in this question. Michael Bloomberg had not announced his candidacy yet. Persons who said they were Republicans were excluded from this analysis. The results have very little meaning because of sample limitations. Only persons who had voted in previous elections were likely to be contacted, so many Sanders supporters had no chance of being polled. Recall also that the sample was biased toward older white men. Also, the small differences and small sample sizes mean few of the differences below are statistically significant. So why did we include this breakdown? We thought people would ask for it if we did not.

Candidate	Number of Supporters	% Females	Mean AGE	Mean Pref-24	Mean RWA	Mean SDO-DOM	Mean SDO-Anti
Biden	129	48%	63.0	63.8	64.2	18.3	23.9
Buttigieg	106	49%	57.7	57.2	52.3	16.6	19.7
Sanders	54	41%	48.8	64.7	54.7	19.6	21.8
Warren	89	60%	55.3	51.9	49.4	16.4	16.9

EPILOGUE

1   Jennifer K. Wagner, Joon-Ho Yu, Jayne O. Ifekwunigwe, Tanya M. Harrell, Michael J. Bamshad, and Charmaine D. Roya. "Anthropologists' views on race, ancestry, and genetics**,**" *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* (Nov. 22, 2016).

2   David Reich, *Who We Are and How We Got Here* (New York, Pantheon Cooks, 2018).

3   Skin color in humans is determined by a number of different genes which mainly give us brown and yellowish casts. Mutations in some of these genes, most of them after *Homo sapiens* left Africa, led to a lightening of skin color. This proved adaptive in latitudes removed from the equator where dark skin inhibited the production of Vitamin D. Europeans and light-skinned Asians developed lighter skin according to how many of these mutations an individual inherited. The San people, most of whom live in Botswana, are light brown and they are usually considered the oldest existent group of *Homo sapiens*. However, the sapiens who left Africa about 75,000 years ago were not San, but another an early version of our species who had a different mitochondrial DNA. So what color were we when we were born? Definitely not white. You can forget the paintings of Adam and Eve produced by European masters.

4   Not to detract from his wonderful story, but DNA testing has confirmed that Alex Haley (1921-1992), the author of *Roots*, did not get his Y chromosome from Kunta Kinte, but rather from a Scottish overseer of slaves named William Harwell Baugh (b. 1827) who lived in northern Alabama. (Patrick Sawer, "DNA proves Alex Haley had Scottish roots," *Telegraph* (Feb. 28, 2009) https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/culturenews/4885075/DNA-proves-author-Alex-Haley-had-Scottish-roots.html .) Harwell sired Alec Haley (1845-1918), who sired Simon Haley (1892-1973), who sired Alex Haley. Alec Haley's wife, Queen (1857-1944), also had a white father who owned her mother, Easter.