

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106



8212211

Presley, Sharon Lee

VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF POLITICAL RESISTERS TO AUTHORITY

*City University of New York*

Ph.D. 1982

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106



VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF POLITICAL

RESISTERS TO AUTHORITY

by

SHARON PRESLEY

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
The City University of New York.

1982

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jan. 28, 1982  
date

Stanley Milgram  
Chairman of Examining Committee

January 31, 1982  
date

Herbert D. Saltzman  
Executive Officer

Stanley Milgram

Edgar Borgatta

Irwin Katz  
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF POLITICAL  
RESISTERS TO AUTHORITY

by

Sharon Presley

Adviser: Professor Stanley Milgram

In an attempt to explore the personal basis of resistance to authority, a study of 183 men and women political resisters who have engaged in civil disobedience or otherwise put themselves under threat of government sanctions was undertaken. Thirty-six anti-nuclear, 12 draft registration, 36 left tax and 21 libertarian tax resisters, as well as 29 communist anarchists and 50 individualist anarchists composed the resister sample. The nonresister comparison groups consisted of 34 liberal and 29 conservative political activists. The measures used were the Defining Issues Test (a test of level of moral judgment) and the Survey of Political Attitudes, a specially designed questionnaire.

As previous literature has suggested, the differences between resisters and nonresisters were found to be in the realm of cognitive beliefs rather than temperament traits. Strong rejection of political and social authority, a belief that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than

what the law says, a professed unwillingness to be in positions of authority over others, a lack of conventional religious affiliations, and a feeling of being different as a child or adolescent are the attitudes and values that differentiate the resister groups from both nonresister groups.

Contrary to the hypotheses, measures of ascription of responsibility and independence/autonomy did not distinguish resisters from nonresisters. However, as expected, personality measures of sociability, need for social support, and gregariousness did not differentiate resisters as a whole from the nonresisters.

The resisters were also found to have levels of moral judgment considerably higher than the average for a general adult population. The differences between the resister groups and the conservatives were significant but the differences from the liberals were on the whole not. An argument contending that a bias in the interpretation of the scoring of the Defining Issues Test adversely affected the scores of the libertarians and anarchists was presented.

Consistent with this high level of moral reasoning, the motivations for political involvement expressed by the resisters included concern with moral principles and social injustice, as well as anger with the political system. However, unlike many of the nonresisters, none of the resisters expressed conventional political motivations.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The major source of inspiration for this study was the classic Obedience To Authority by Stanley Milgram. It was my privilege to have Professor Milgram serve as my dissertation chairman, and my special thanks to him for his advice and encouragement. To my committee, gratitude also: Edgar Borgatta, whose advice in the statistical analysis was invaluable; Irwin Katz for his suggestions for revision; Robert Buckhout and Stanley Renshon for their special interest in this project. James Rest's willingness to discuss my criticism of his Defining Issues Text is also appreciated.

Because of the unusual nature of the subjects in this study, I am especially grateful to the organizations and people who cooperated with me in obtaining willing volunteers: Grace and Ed Hedemann and the War Resisters League, Bob Berkel and the National Resistance Committee, Jim Tobin and the Taxpayers Union of Illinois, Ralph Fucetola and Kathy Greene of the United Taxpayers of New Jersey, Robert Clarkson of the Patriot Cannon, the Libertarian Book Club, Association of Libertarian Feminists, SHAD Alliance, Mobilization for Survival, Coalition for Direct Action at Seabrook, Peacemaker, WIN, Lexington Democratic Club, Young Republicans, Young Democrats, Conservative Party, and Liberal Party.

Not only my gratitude but my praise goes to Cindy Cisler who designed the layout and typeset the Survey of Political Attitude, the professional-looking questionnaire I used. I am also enormously indebted to my typist, Shoshana Edwards, for her heroic efforts and to Robbie for the crucial task of proofreading.

Last but hardly least, I express my thanks and respect to all the resisters who participated in the study, not only for answering two time-consuming questionnaires, but for being what they are: individuals committed enough to a better society to put their beliefs into action.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II	METHOD.....	22
	Measures	
	Procedures	
	Subjects	
III	RESULTS.....	32
	Survey of Political Attitudes	
	Defining Issues Test	
IV	DISCUSSION.....	87
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	116
	APPENDIX I.....	121
	The Survey of Political Attitudes	
	APPENDIX II.....	126
	Conservative Tax Resisters	
	APPENDIX III.....	131
	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	
	APPENDIX IV.....	159
	Results of the D score of the Defining Issues Test	
	APPENDIX V.....	161
	Analysis of the Discrepancy between the Scores of the Libertarians and Anarchists and the Other Resisters on the Defining Issues Test	

APPENDIX VI.....	186
Sex Differences on the Defining Issues Test	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	189

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number of Respondents to the Survey of Political Attitudes in Each Political Group.....	24
2	Number of Respondents to the Defining Issues Test in Each Political Group.....	25
3	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Attitude Toward Authority Scale.....	39
4	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on "Conscience" Item of Attitude Toward Authority Scale.....	42
5	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Directiveness Scale.....	45
6	Religious Preferences.....	48
7	Percentage Feeling Different as a Child or Adolescent.....	55
8	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Personal Responsibility Scale.....	57

List of Tables, cont.

Table		Page
9	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Independence/Autonomy Scale.....	60
10	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Need for Social Support Scale.....	62
11	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Sociability Scale.....	64
12	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations on Gregariousness Scale.....	66
13	Motivations for Political Involvement Expressed by Resisters.....	69
14	Motivations for Political Involvement Expressed by Nonresisters.....	72
15	Type of Motivation for Political Involvement.....	74
16	Means and Standard Deviations of P-Percent Score on Defining Issues Test.....	78

List of Tables, cont.

Table	Page
17 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for the Conservative Tax Resisters on Selected Measures from the Survey of Political Attitudes and the Defining Issues Test.....	128
18 Religious Preferences of Conservative Tax Resisters.....	129
19 Motivations for Political Involvement for Conservative Tax Resisters.....	130
20 Mean Age and Standard Deviations.....	132
21 Level of Education.....	133
22 Majors of Those Who Attended College.....	134
23 Occupations.....	136
24 Political Views.....	137
25 Length of Time Involved in Present Political Activities.....	139

List of Tables, cont.

Table		Page
26	Multiple Regression for Communist Anarchists Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Attitude Toward Authority as the Dependent Variable.....	141
27	Multiple Regression for Resister Groups Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Attitude toward Authority as the Dependent Variable.....	142
28	Multiple Regression for Resister Groups Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Attitude toward Authority as the Dependent Variable.....	144
29	Multiple Regression for Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Directiveness as the Dependent Variable.....	145

List of Tables, cont.

Table		Page
30	Multiple Regression for Communist Anarchists Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Directiveness as the Dependent Variable.....	146
31	Multiple Regression for Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Directiveness as the Dependent Variable.....	147
32	Multiple Regression of Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Feeling Different as a Child as the Dependent Variable.....	148
33	Multiple Regression of Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Feeling Different as a Child as the Dependent Variable.....	149

List of Tables, cont.

Table	Page
34 Multiple Regression for Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Personal Responsibility as the Dependent Variable.....	150
35 Multiple Regression for Individualist Anarchists Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Personal Responsibility as the Dependent Variable.....	151
36 Multiple Regression for Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Liberals with Selected Independent Variables and Independence/Autonomy as the Dependent Variable.....	152
37 Multiple Regression for Significantly Different Resister Groups Compared to Conservatives with Selected Independent Variables and Independence/Autonomy as the Dependent Variable.....	153

List of Tables, cont.

Table	Page
38 Multiple Regression of All Groups with Selected Independent Variables and Need for Social Support as the Dependent Variable.....	154
39 Multiple Regression of All Groups with Selected Independent Variables and Sociability as the Dependent Variable.....	155
40 Multiple Regression of All Groups with Selected Independent Variables and Gregariousness as the Dependent Variable.....	155
41 Means and Standard Deviations of D-Score on Defining Issues Test.....	160
42 Stage Profiles: Mean Raw Scores at Each Stage of the Defining Issues Test.....	165

List of Tables, cont.

Table	Page
43 Mean Rankings of Importance of Property Rights Items.....	173
44 Mean Ratings of Importance of Property Rights Items.....	174
45 Mean Rankings of Importance of Law and Order Items.....	177
46 Mean Ratings of Importance of Law and Order Items.....	178
47 Factor Analysis of Items on the Defining Issues Test.....	179
48 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on the D-Score of the Defining Issues Test.....	187
49 Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Males and Females on P% Score of the Defining Issues Test.....	188

" [The tyrant has] nothing more than the power you confer upon him to destroy you...How can he have so many arms to beat you with, if he does not borrow them from you?...How would he dare assail you if he had not cooperation from you?

Resolve to serve no more, and you are at once freed. I do not ask that you place hands upon the tyrant to topple him over, but simply that you support him no longer; then you will behold him, like a great Colossus whose pedestal has been pulled away, fall of his own weight and break in pieces."

--Etienne de la Boetie

The Discourse on  
Voluntary Servitude

"Human history begins with man's act of disobedience which is at the same time the beginning of his freedom and development of his reason."

--Erich Fromm

"Disobedience in the eyes of anyone who has read history, is man's original virtue. It is through disobedience that progress has been made, through disobedience and rebellion."

--Oscar Wilde

In spite of the erosion of the sanctity of political authority in modern society, points out Flacks (1973), there exists at the same time a large degree of mass obedience and acquiescence. Experiments by Milgram (1963, 1974) have shown how easily ordinary people will obey authority, even when doing so goes against their own inclinations and consciences while phenomena like Nazi Germany and My Lai have shown what awesomely destructive proportions such mass obedience can take on. Surveying this "spectre of the cheerful robot," Flacks concludes that "the core problem of contemporary psychology is to clarify the conditions of individual self-determination." (Flacks, 1973, p.15)

As exemplars of serious efforts to explore the social psychology of freedom, Flacks cites the experiments of Milgram (1963, 1974) and Asch (1952). One of the most significant conclusions to come out of their studies is that whether people obey or disobey, conform or resist, is largely contingent on the situation. "it is not so much the kind of a person a man is," says Milgram, in speaking of his obedience experiments, "as the kind of situation in which he finds himself that determines how he will act." (Milgram, 1974, p. 205) Milgram found, for example, that con-

ditions such as proximity of the victim, behavior of peers in the experiment, and absence of the experimenter all had significant effects on the rate of obedience and resistance.

But an intriguing question remains, one as important to the social psychology of freedom as the question of why people obey. How do we explain those who resisted in the Milgram experiments? The situational conditions were exactly the same for them as for those who obeyed. If situational factors are not the determinants, then there must be something peculiar to the individual resisters that makes them different from those who obey, personal characteristics which make them more resistant to pressure from authority.

Only a handful of studies have examined the personal characteristics of those who obey or resist authority, with little in the way of answers. A questionnaire given to Milgram's subjects immediately after the experiment yielded only very general information. No significant differences were found between Republicans and Democrats but Catholics were more obedient than Protestants or Jews, the better-educated more defiant than the less educated, and those in the professions of law, medicine and teaching more defiant than those in the more technical and scientific professions. Length of military service, with the exception of former officers, was also correlated with higher levels of obedience. But even some of these findings washed

out in subsequent experimental conditions. "My overall reaction," concluded Milgram, "was to wonder at how few correlates there were of obedience and disobedience and how weakly they are related to observed behavior. I am certain that there is a complex personality basis to obedience and disobedience. But I know we have not found it." (Milgram, 1974, p. 205)

In an attempt to investigate possible personality variables, Elms (Elms and Milgram, 1966) administered several questionnaires to subjects who had undergone the Milgram experiment. No significant differences were found between obedient and defiant subjects on any of the MMPI scales. The major finding of significance was a relationship between obedience and a high score on the California F scale. This remained true even when the level of education was held constant. Other attitudinal differences, with some exceptions, formed patterns compatible with the major "authoritarian personality" finding. Elms also constructed a questionnaire consisting of 10 situations in which a person was faced with a choice between obedient and defiant behavior, but it was not a good predictor of performance in the experiment. Echoing Milgram's frustration, Elms concluded, "However I analyzed the answers to this questionnaire, forward, backward, upside down and sideways, the obedients and the defiants just weren't much different. That wouldn't have bothered me much except

that I knew they really were different, dammit!." (Elms, 1972, p. 135)

An investigation of willingness to obey as a function of both personality and situational variables was conducted by Larsen, et al (1972) in a partial replication of the Milgram paradigm. The predictor variables were a set of personality scales (measuring aggression, hostility, parental aggression training and attributed power) and three experimental conditions (conformity, female learner, high model). The experimenter gave no direct command to the subjects, as in the Milgram experiment, so the essential variable was situational conformity. No relationship was found between the personality variables and behavior. There was, however, a significant effect for the experimental conditions, lending further support to the idea of situational pressures as the major factor in inducing obedience.

Though the evidence is very weak, there are a few positive personality clues besides the F-scale findings. One such clue comes from a study by Kohlberg (1969). He administered his Moral Judgment Scale to 34 Yale undergraduate students who had served in Milgram's pilot studies. Kohlberg found that 75% of the subjects who scored at the stage of personal principle (the highest stage of moral development according to Kohlberg's theory) refused to obey the experimenter as compared to only 13% of the

subjects at all earlier stages.

Because of the small number of subjects in the Kohlberg study, the results are somewhat tentative but other research evidence also suggests a link between high level of moral judgment and willingness to resist authority. In their study of student activists at the University of California, Berkeley, Haan, Smith and Block (1968) found that 80% of those who scored at the stage of personal principle on the Kohlberg scale had participated in the Free Speech Movement sit-in (an act of civil disobedience, not just protest) as opposed to only 10% participation by those who scored at the conventional level.

Two other studies of real-life resistance to authority also suggest a link between moral values and resistance. In a study of Europeans who clandestinely helped rescue Jews from the Nazis in World War II, London (1970) found that "some kind of active moralism seemed characteristic of all the rescuers and usually was related to parental morality rather than a specific ideology." In a study by Gaylin (1970) of war resisters -- young men who went to prison rather than allow themselves to be drafted for the Viet Nam War -- most of the men were not only opposed to conscription as a matter of principle but many had been involved in principled protest activities as well.

Another clue to individual differences between obedient

and defiant subjects found in the original Milgram experiment was in attribution of responsibility. Subjects in four of the experimental conditions were asked to what degree they thought each participant in the experiment (experimenter, subject, and learner, i.e., victim) was responsible for the fact that the learner was given electric shock against his will. The defiant subjects, more often than the obedient subjects, attributed primary responsibility to themselves and less responsibility to the learner.

Although Milgram points out that we do not know whether this finding represents enduring predispositions or post facto adjustments of thought, several studies do suggest a link between attribution of responsibility and attitude toward obedience to authority. In a study of public reaction to the trial of Lt. William Calley for the massacre of unarmed Vietnamese civilians at My Lai, Kelman and Lawrence (1972) found that among the respondents who approved of the trial, the most frequently chosen reasons for approval were ones that affirmed the responsibility of the individual soldier. Among respondents disapproving of the trial, the majority felt that Calley should not be held personally responsible. In a similar study, Suedfeld and Epstein (1973) also found that those who ascribed high responsibility to Calley personally, as compared with those who felt he should not be held accountable, were more likely to feel the guilty verdict was just.

Evidence that ascription of responsibility also has an effect on behavior comes from several experimental studies which show that people who see themselves as personally responsible in a threatening situation are more likely to act in a socially responsible manner. (Lerner & Matthews, 1967; Tilker, 1970 Schwartz, 1970; Kilham & Mann, 1974) Though ascription of responsibility in these studies was a product of experimental manipulation rather than individual disposition, the findings still suggest an important relationship.

A link between moral norms, ascription of responsibility and prosocial behavior has been suggested by Schwartz (1970). He proposes that the relation of moral norms to behavior depends on how a person defines his moral choice situation. A moral norm, first of all, must be activated before it is likely to have a significant effect on behavior. There are, he suggests, two necessary conditions for activation of a person's moral norms when he faces a decision: 1) awareness that his potential acts may have consequences for the welfare of others, and 2) ascription of responsibility for those acts and their consequences to himself.

The individual characteristics which so far seem to have a possible relation to willingness to resist authority - level of moral judgment, ascription of responsibility

to self, authoritarianism - all have something in common which distinguishes them from the other personality variables tested. Unlike the MMPI scales and the tests used by Larsen et al, which are traditional temperament traits, these variables are intellectual or cognitive. They reflect evaluative and prescriptive beliefs rather than affective tendencies or personality styles. In a similar vein, Burley and McGuinness (1977) have proposed that the difference between those who obey and disobey is in the realm of cognitive abilities rather than temperament traits. But their suggestion that high level of social intelligence (ability to understand others and act in an appropriate manner) is an important mediating factor is less than totally convincing on both theoretical and empirical grounds.

Concepts such as moral judgment, personal responsibility and authoritarianism are not only cognitive, they all have value components as well. That is, they entail "beliefs concerning desirable modes of conduct." (Rokeach, 1973) Moral judgment is based on personal moral values while personal responsibility includes the notion of moral accountability. Authoritarianism involves beliefs concerning the value of authority and proscriptions dealing with how to act toward authority.

The connection between individual values and behavior has been discussed extensively by Rokeach (1973). Values,

in his view, are the basis for individual actions and attitudes: "Values are guides and determinants of social attitudes and ideologies on the one hand and of social behavior on the other." (Rokeach, 1973, p.24) If Rokeach's theory is valid, we would expect differences in values between obedient and defiant that could account for the differences in their actions.

In an attempt to further explore the individual basis of obedience and resistance to authority, this study investigates the relation between certain personal values and attitudes and willingness to resist authority. Since the prior research which suggests a relationship between resistance and level of moral judgment and personal responsibility has been scanty, measurements of these variables were included along with measurements of prescriptive and evaluative beliefs about authority.

Rather than setting up an artificial situation in the lab, the study examines real-life resisters. The failure of many psychologists to study actual settings with ordinary people (i.e., non-college students) has been the subject of criticism by other psychologists (Asch, 1952; Ring, 1967; Harré & Secord, 1973; Braginsky & Braginsky, 1974). Although Milgram's experiment is a notable exception, many lab experiments, even in social psychology, set up situations that are so trivial and artificial, so

removed from a real-life context, that the behavior elicited has no clear relation to normal behavior. By using known resisters, we can study individuals whose resistance represents a genuine and meaningful real-life commitment.

However, in spite of the importance of studying real-life phenomena, only a few studies have actually examined known resisters. Although these studies, such as the previously cited ones by Gaylin (1970), London (1970), and Haan, Smith and Block (1968) have given us useful information, the subjects were limited in number and range. Gaylin's psychoanalytic study of war resisters, while rich in detail and color, only reported interviews with six men. London's analysis of Christians who rescued Jews from the Nazis was based on only 27 men and women, all Europeans. The Haan, Smith and Block study of FSM participants has a much larger sample pool (957) but all the subjects were college students or Peace Corps volunteers. A study of war resisters and Green Berets by Mantell (1974) provided a great deal of information about the socialization of resisters but only included 25 men. An exploration of real-life resisters using a larger number of subjects with a broad range of backgrounds seemed called for.

There is another reason for studying real-life resistance. Just as obedience is a more powerful phenomenon in the face of authority with no power to apply sanctions,

so resistance is more powerful under threat of coercive sanctions. In the Milgram experiment, the authority had no power to compel obedience, It is precisely because the subjects could have walked out at any time with no consequences that their willingness to obey takes on great psychological significance. By maximizing the issue of sanctions, we can maximize the psychological significance of the resistance. But since it would be unethical to have the threat of coercion in the lab, we have to make use of an already existing situation in the field. Therefore, since the most obvious and accessible example of authority with the power to apply coercive sanctions is the government, this study examines political resisters.

Resistance to government, as opposed to merely breaking the law or defiance of the law for the sake of defiance, involves disapproval of unjust authority. Resisters hold "the view that the unimpeded operation of an authority system would result in an injustice, that is, a violation of some principle about what is fair or right." (Fireman et al, 1978, p.9) Therefore, the subjects of this study are individuals who believe that the government is engaged in some action that they consider unfair, unjust or wrong.

By this definition, resistance to authority does not necessarily involve rejection of authority as such, but only disapproval of particular actions of the authority.

Thus, resisters could approve of other kinds of authority without destroying the validity of their particular resistance. If other acts of authority do not seem unjust to them, they will have no motivation to resist. Yet, as Milgram's study shows, many people perceive injustice without being willing to resist it. It is necessary, therefore, to clarify the difference between protest and resistance. Fireman et al (1978) distinguish two categories of actions that go beyond protest: resistance, which involves open refusal to do what the authority requires; and struggle, which goes beyond noncompliance and involves attempts to actively seek change in the authority system.

For the purposes of this study, therefore, a resister is defined as a person actively refusing (or refusing within the last year) to obey what he or she perceives to be unjust or unfair government demands and/or is engaged in active struggle against government action in a situation where there is a threat of coercive sanctions (for example, getting arrested, fined or harassed by government, property confiscation, etc.).

#### Sources of resisters

The most practical way to find such resisters is to seek them from groups organized for the purpose of resisting government action. Using groups is also practical because it enables us to maximize comparability of subjects

in regard to the form of their resistance.

Resistance to authority may be structured in several different ways. Fireman et al (1978), for example, make four distinctions in regard to encounters with authority. Resistance may be individual or collective, that is, people with a similar relation to authority may group together. Resistance may be discrete (one-time) or continuing, that is, the resisters may have established some pattern in relation to this particular authority system and have the expectation of future contact with each other. The resisters may also be organized or unorganized. Finally, there is the distinction between clear or questionable availability of sanctions. So, in terms of these distinctions, the study solicited subjects through groups that are organized, collective and under clear threat of sanctions.

In recent times, there have been three major issues around which overt resistance to government actions or laws has focused: draft registration, taxes, and nuclear power.

Former President Carter's reinstatement of draft registration for 19 and 20 year old men brought immediate avowals of resistance not only from longtime anti-conscription groups like the War Resisters League, but also from ones newly formed for this purpose such as the Coalition Against Registration and the Draft (CARD) and the

National Resistance Committee. Though Selective Service officials claimed over a 90% compliance rate in the July 1980 registration period, various newspapers as well as CARD and the National Resistance Committee estimate the overall rate of noncompliance to be about 25%, that is, one million men who did not register. Since the potential maximum legal penalty for failure to register is five years in jail and/or a \$10,000 fine, draft registration resisters can certainly consider themselves under threat of government sanctions.

Tax protest has been prominent in the news since the passage of Proposition 13 in California, but organized, overt tax resistance ranging from simple protest to openly refusing to file forms or pay taxes has been around for a long time. The consequences of this resistance can and has included IRS harassment, levys on bank accounts and salaries, seizing property, and even in some cases, going to jail. The groups involved range from tax resistance and property tax protest groups which are predominantly conservative and libertarian to income and phone tax resistance groups which are predominantly left-wing politically.

War Tax Resistance, the major left tax resistance group, is an offshoot of one of the oldest political resistance groups in the U.S., the War Resisters League. The War Resisters League has long advocated nonviolent

civil disobedience to disrupt conscription. War Tax Resistance believes that tax money goes to pay for a war budget it considers immoral. Methods of income tax resistance suggested by WTR literature include refusing to pay a token amount, returning blank 1040 forms and not filing at all. Also suggested is phone tax resistance (which involves subtraction of federal tax from one's phone bill) and various forms of withholding tax resistance.

The rhetoric of the right-wing income and property tax resistance groups stresses the unfairly high tax burdens imposed by capricious government and the unconstitutionality of IRS procedures. Pointing out that America was founded as a tax revolt, they assert that tax resistance is in the American tradition. People associated with such groups may be involved in several different forms of protest. A few overtly refuse to file completed IRS forms or pay income taxes (or pay property taxes, in the case of property tax strike groups). Others do not openly refuse to file forms but may evade or underreport their incomes. However, the distinction between protestor and resister in these groups is becoming increasingly blurred. The IRS makes no distinctions between protestor and resister and avoids the term "resistance" at all. In its January 1979 Manual Supplement, the IRS sets forth procedures for "tax protest coordinators" - people to monitor and deal

with "illegal tax protestors" - and discusses possible criminal sanctions against promoters of tax protest. This supplement has been duly noted in the tax revolt periodicals. So even the tax protestors who do not openly refuse to file IRS forms increasingly perceive themselves as subject not only to IRS harassment (tax audits, IRS files, etc.) but possible legal sanctions as well just for being overt in their protest.

The third major current focus of resistance is nuclear power. With the spectre of Three Mile Island hanging over our heads, many different kinds of people, including many heretofore non-political, have become involved in anti-nuclear activities. Since the protests of the anti-nuclear groups have increasingly included civil disobedience, these groups provided a good source of resisters who meet the criteria of this study.

In addition to groups organized to resist government on a particular issue, there is a category of people engaged in active struggle against all government on principle: the anarchists. Believing that all associations should be voluntary, the anarchists are opposed to government because it is, in their view, inherently coercive (Bookchin, 1971; Rothbard, 1974; Walter, 1969). Though not all anarchists are involved in overt civil disobedience, many are or have been public resisters (including draft

and tax resistance) while others resist in a myriad of private ways. Since the word "anarchist" still conjures up visions of furtive bomb-throwers in the minds of most people, let alone paranoid government agencies, overt anarchist activities and groups are subject to close scrutiny from the FBI, the "Red Squad" and other spy agencies. Anarchist activists can fully expect to have FBI files. Therefore, on all these grounds, the anarchists warrant inclusion as resisters in this study.

#### Measurements

Two major scales for measuring level of moral judgment are currently available - the Moral Judgment Scale (Kohlberg, 1969, 1976) and the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1976; Rest et al., 1977). The Moral Judgment Scale, based on Kohlberg's six-stage theory of moral development, is the older and better known test. The Defining Issues Test (DIT) was chosen, however, because it has several advantages over the Kohlberg scale. Unlike the Moral Judgment Scale, the DIT has completely standardized stimuli and test conditions as well as objective scoring, thus making it far easier to use and score. The DIT has been shown to have high reliability and validity, having been used in over 100 studies with many different investigators and conditions (Rest et al., 1977). The DIT presents subjects

with a set of stories, each containing a moral dilemma and a list of statements of possible considerations for deciding how to solve the dilemma. It then asks the subjects to first rate and then rank what they see as the most important considerations. The statements are written to represent five of six stages of moral judgment which are similar but not identical to Kohlberg's stages. Rest's stage six, for example, is defined as "the morality of non-arbitrary social cooperation" while Kohlberg's stage six emphasizes the morality of personal conscience, "the DIT is supposed to work," says Rest, "as a developmental measure of moral judgment by a dual process of comprehension and preference: less developed subjects don't pick the high stage items because they don't comprehend them; more developed subjects don't pick the lower stages because they are viewed as too simplistic." (Rest et al, 1977, p.5)

Because the DIT is fairly time-consuming and the subjects were not members of a captive audience, it was deemed impractical to make the rest of the questionnaire too long. To keep the length within reasonable bounds, the items measuring the other variables were combined into one set of questions. Several existing measures were culled for appropriate questions and then adapted to a uniform format.

Schwartz (1970) has developed an Ascription of Responsibility Scale to measure personal acceptance of responsibility. It includes 28 statements which are opinions or self-descriptive statements referring to actions with interpersonal consequences. Each statement has a rationale for ascribing responsibility either to or away from the actor. Unfortunately, upon close inspection, some of the items go beyond measuring personal responsibility in a strictly ethical sense; they seem to relate more to vaguely altruistic feelings and preachy moralism that are irrelevant to the purposes of this study. For example, the item, "Gossiping is so common in our society that a person who gossips once in a while can't be blamed so much," is far less directly related to the concern of personal responsibility than "No matter how much a person is provoked, he is always responsible for whatever he does." So the statements which seemed most to the point, along with several other analogous statements, were used to measure ascription of responsibility.

We would, in theory, expect resisters to have an attitude which reflects, if not skepticism of authority, at least a wariness that would cause them to question the idea of unconditional acceptance of political or social authority. Items dealing with attitudes toward both political and general authority were culled from the Autonomy

scale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist et al, 1959, 1968). Minor changes were made in the wording in order to balance out the positive and negative statements.<sup>1</sup>

Although no correlation was found between subjects' temperament traits and their willingness to obey or disobey in the lab, real-life resisters may or may not be different. A test of personality was therefore included to test the hypothesis that there are no significant differences in temperament traits between resisters and non-resisters. The usual personality inventories are prohibitively long but several short tests of personality are available. One that seemed appropriate for this study is the Interpersonal Orientation Scale (Borgatta & Bohrnstedt, 1968). The four subscales measure independence/autonomy, sociability, need for social support, and directiveness. The last three did not seem to bear any obvious relationship to resistance and were therefore expected to yield no differences. However, autonomy is not just a temperament trait, it is a way of relating to authority. High autonomy scores have been found to be correlated with protest against authority (Haan, Smith & Block, 1968;

---

<sup>1</sup> Items from Cochran's (1975) Hierarchical Control Scale were also incorporated into the questionnaire, but they did not emerge as a separate and distinct factor in the factor analysis and were dropped from the final results.

Presley, 1971; Kerpelman, 1973). Therefore, we would expect resisters to have high autonomy scores on this measure.

In addition, a set of questions soliciting the standard demographic information, as well as potentially relevant information about family background, personal motivation, and political background were included. No hypotheses were made about these variables; it was left to an a posteriori analysis to see what differences emerged.

#### Hypotheses

Based on the considerations discussed above, the following hypotheses were formulated:

- A. Resisters will have a higher measured level than the non-resister comparison groups on the following variables:
  - 1. Level of moral reasoning.
  - 2. Ascription of personal responsibility.
  - 3. Rejection of authority.
  - 4. Independence/autonomy.
- B. No differences between the resister groups and the non-resister groups will be found on the following personality variables:
  - 1. Sociability
  - 2. Need for social support
  - 3. Directiveness

## METHOD

### A. Measures

Level of moral reasoning was measured by the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1979).

The other variables were measured through the Survey of Political Attitudes, a questionnaire specially designed for this study. It is composed of the following sections:

1. Personal Background (Section A)
2. Family Background (Section B)
3. Personality Inventory (Section C) consisting of the Interpersonal Orientation Scale (Borgatta & Bohrnstedt, 1968).
4. Political and Social Attitudes (Section D)

The items in this section were compiled from the Ascription of Responsibility Scale (Schwartz, 1970), Preference for Hierarchical Control (Cochran, 1975), Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist & Yonge, 1968), the Survey of Ethical Attitudes (Hogan, 1970), and several of my own design. All questions were adapted to a uniform format with possible responses on a scale from "strongly agree" to strongly disagree."

A copy of the Survey of Political Attitudes  
can be found in Appendix I.

B. Procedure

Subjects were contacted at meetings of appropriate groups or through the mailing lists of such groups. Those who volunteered were asked to return the two questionnaires anonymously. The questionnaire set was designed as a self-mailer with postage and a return address. All questionnaires given out were coded according to the type of group approached.

Table 1            NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS TO THE  
 SURVEY OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES  
 IN EACH POLITICAL GROUP

Group	Total Number	Male	Female
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Individualist Anarchists	50	30	20
Communist Anarchists	29	19	10
Anti-Nuclear	36	25	11
Draft	12	12	
Left Tax	36	20	16
Libertarian Tax	21	19	2
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	18	16
Conservatives	29	16	13

Table 2            NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS TO THE  
                       DEFINING ISSUES TEST IN EACH  
                                  POLITICAL GROUP

---

Group	Total Number	Male	Female
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Individualist Anarchists	41	23	18
Communist Anarchists	25	16	9
Anti-Nuclear	24	18	6
Draft	10	10	
Left Tax	26	14	12
Libertarian Tax	13	12	1
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	17	9	8
Conservatives	17	11	6

---

C. Subjects

Table 1 shows the number of respondents to the Survey of Political Attitudes for each group. Table 2 shows the number of respondents for the Defining Issues Test.

1. Anarchists

A distinction between types of anarchists is important. Though all anarchists would agree on the basic essence of anarchism succinctly stated by 19th century American anarchist, Benjamin Tucker as "...the doctrine that all affairs of men should be managed by individuals or voluntary associations and that the State should be abolished" (Tucker, 1897), two major camps with significant philosophical differences have emerged: communist anarchism and individualist anarchism.<sup>2</sup> The most obvious difference is that communist anarchists do not believe in private property in the means of production while individualist anarchists believe in private property, private exchange of goods and services, and the free market. Communist anarchists and individualist

---

<sup>2</sup> These labels are self-designated, i.e., how advocates of these points of view describe themselves,

anarchists, as these labels imply, also have a different emphasis on the role of the individual in society, which leads to important differences in values and personal styles. Though all anarchists are individualists in some sense, the communist anarchists place more emphasis on the communal, cooperative aspect while the individualist anarchists concentrate on the "sovereignty of the individual" (Krimerman & Perry, 1966).

Communist anarchists were recruited from meetings of the Libertarian Book Club and from a mailing done to names published in the Social Revolutionary Anarchist Federation Bulletin.<sup>3</sup> Those who labeled themselves "communist anarchist" on Question A13 of the Survey of Political Attitudes were designated as communist anarchists. Nineteen men and 10 women responded to the Survey of Political Attitudes; with 16 male and nine female usable Defining Issues Test responses.

Since the modern day libertarian movement is so intertwined with the individualist anarchist movement, the distinction is not always explicitly

---

<sup>3</sup> "Libertarian" was originally a euphemism for "anarchist" in times when "anarchist" was a dangerous word to use. The Libertarian Book Club, founded by communist anarchists active in the 1920's, follows this older usage of the term "libertarian."

made in libertarian groups and periodicals, and therefore the two cannot easily be separated. Not all libertarians are anarchists, but most individualist anarchists would also call themselves libertarians. Therefore, individualist anarchists were recruited through libertarian sources, including Laissez Faire Book and Teaching Society (a libertarian-anarchist bookstore and teaching society in New York City), the New York Libertarian Party, the national mailing list of the Association of Libertarian Feminists, and several other libertarian groups. Thirty men and 20 women who labeled themselves "individualist anarchist" on Question A13 responded to the Survey of Political Attitudes; there were 23 male and 18 female respondents to the Defining Issues Test.

## 2. Anti-Nuclear Resisters

Individuals who had participated in civil disobedience and/or been arrested in anti-nuclear demonstrations were recruited from meetings of the SHAD Alliance, the Coalition for Direct Action at Seabrook, Mobilization for Survival, and through an ad in WIN (a non-Marxist left magazine with an anti-nuclear stand). Twenty-five men and

11 women completed the Survey of Political Attitudes. There were 18 usable male and six female Defining Issues Test responses.

### 3. Left Tax Resisters

Participants in the tax resistance program of War Tax Resistance and the War Resisters League were obtained through a national mailing list of WTR counselors provided by the national office of the War Resisters League. Additional volunteers were recruited from the New York City chapter of WRL and through notices in WIN and Peacemaker (both peace-oriented, non-Marxist left magazines). Twenty men and 16 women responded to the Survey of Political Attitudes; with 14 male and 12 female Defining Issues Test respondents.

### 4. Right Tax Resisters

Though both libertarian and conservative tax resisters were part of the original sample of responses collected, only the libertarian tax resisters have been retained in the main body of the study. The conservative tax resisters, though differing significantly from the nonresisters in several important respects, turned out to be more like the nonresisters than the other resisters. Because these results would

make the main discussion prohibitively complex, the conservative tax resisters are treated separately in Appendix II. Whatever the personal basis for conservative tax resistance, it is not being adequately tapped by the measures in this study.

The libertarian tax resisters were obtained through a list of names of tax protest activists provided by the Coordinator of the United Taxpayers of New Jersey, and through a list of people who withheld property taxes in the Illinois Tax Strike of 1977-78 or withheld Federal income tax, supplied by the President of the National Taxpayers Union of Illinois. Subjects were classified as libertarian if they labeled themselves as either "libertarian" or "individualist anarchist" on Question A13. Nineteen male and two female libertarians answered the Survey of Political Attitudes, while 12 men and one woman completed the Defining Issues Test.

#### 5. Draft Resisters

Men who were legally obligated to register for the July 1980 draft registration but who refused to do so were recruited through meetings or mailings to names provided by the National Resistance Committee, the War Resisters League and New York

City CARD. Twelve men completed the Survey of Political Attitudes; 10 of them filled out the Defining Issues Test.

6. Nonresister Comparison Groups

To assure that resistance and not merely political activity was the crucial difference between the comparison and resister groups, nonresisters were sought from political groups, but ones not associated with resistance to authority. Volunteers were recruited from New York City meetings of the Young Democrats, Young Republicans, Liberal Party, Conservative Party, and the Lexington Democratic Club. If respondents labeled themselves as "conservative" or "conservative-libertarian," they were categorized as conservatives.<sup>4</sup> If they labeled themselves as "liberals" or "democratic socialists," they were categorized as liberals. There were 18 male and 16 female liberal respondents to the Survey of Political Attitudes; nine men and eight women completed the Defining Issues Test. Sixteen men and 13 women conservatives completed the Survey of Political Attitudes, with 11 male and six female responses to the Defining Issues Test.

---

<sup>4</sup> There is general consensus among both conservatives and libertarians that a "conservative-libertarian is still a conservative.

## RESULTS

### I. SURVEY OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES

#### A. Statistics

A factor analysis was performed on the items in the Personality Inventory (Section C) and the Political and Social Attitudes (Section D) as a basis for the scales used for the comparison of the resister and nonresister groups. The scales which emerged from the Political and Social Attitudes section are the Attitude toward Authority Scale (all items with loadings of .60 or more) and Personal Responsibility Scale (all items with loadings of .40 or more). The scales which emerged from the Personal Inventory included three that were the same as or similar to the original scales: directiveness, need for social support, and independence/autonomy. However, the original sociability scale broke down into two factors: sociability and what was labeled "gregariousness." All items used had loadings of .40 or more.

Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients, computed for these derived scales, ranged from .52 for the Sociability Scale to .79 for the Attitude toward Authority Scale.

A factor analysis of the groups indicated that each resister group formed a separate and distinct factor so none of the groups could be combined. The conservative and liberal nonresisters were negatively correlated to each other in one factor.

The mean scores on each scale for each resister group were compared with each nonresister group using a t-test with a two-tailed distribution and two levels of probability (.05 and .01).

A series of multiple regression analyses were used to examine the relation between the scales and the independent variables from Section A and B of the Survey of Political Attitudes.

B. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Since the multiple regression analyses indicate that the role of demographic characteristics in accounting for the differences in this study are small, only a summary of the characteristics is presented here. A more detailed description, with tables, can be found in Appendix III.

In certain respects, the sample is a relatively homogenous one. All the groups, both resister and nonresister, are highly educated. Over 80% in every group have had some college; in all groups except the two youngest (draft and anti-nuclear),

over 50% are college graduates. Like the student activists examined in the 1960's (Block, Haan & Smith, 1969; Mankoff & Flacks, 1971), most of these activists majored in the social sciences or humanities. As could be expected from their high level of education, those who are no longer students are mostly engaged in professional or business occupations.

The mean age does, however, vary from group to group. The youngest are the draft resisters, averaging 19 years, and the anti-nuclear resisters who average in their mid-twenties. The two anarchist groups have a mean age in their early thirties while the left tax resisters, conservatives, and liberals average in their late thirties. The libertarian resisters are the oldest, with a mean in their mid-forties.

Since the political views of the resisters will be relevant in the discussion section, a brief description is included here. The communist anarchists and individualist anarchists are, of course, already defined by their political views. The libertarian tax resisters are composed of eight individualist anarchist and 13 non-anarchist libertarians. Three communist anarchists, three libertarians, three democratic socialists, and a liberal,

a Marxist, and an individualist anarchist make up the draft resisters. The anti-nuclear resisters are mostly democratic socialists (12) and communist anarchists (11) with two liberals, six other leftists, and three individualist anarchists who did not label themselves libertarian and one who did. The composition of the left tax resisters is mostly communist anarchist (10) and liberal (11) with seven other assorted leftists and pacifists. Three left tax resisters labeled themselves individualist anarchists without identifying themselves as libertarians.

The length of time the activists have been involved in their present activities tends to be either more than five years or less than one. As we could expect from the timely nature of the activity, most of the draft and nuclear resisters have been involved for less than a year. Most of the other resisters, however, have been active for more than five years, as have the liberals. A large minority of the conservatives have also been involved that long, but an almost equal percentage have been active for less than a year.

However, in spite of some lack of homogeneity in the sample, the demographic characteristics

seem to be exerting little influence on the results. The regression analyses show that, whatever the differences among the groups, these factors contribute much less, on the whole, to the prediction of scores on the dependent variables than does the factor of membership in a resister or nonresister group. On the Attitude toward Authority, Directiveness, Personal Responsibility, and Independence/Autonomy Scales, political group membership is the most important and sometimes the only significant contributor to prediction of scores.

Only on the personality scales measuring need for social support, sociability and gregariousness is political group membership not a significant factor.

#### C. Results of the Scales and Other Items

When all the results from the Survey of Political Attitudes were examined, they led to a slightly different story than I originally set out to tell. The Hierarchical Control Scale, for example, did not emerge as a factor separate from attitude toward authority, so it was dropped from the final analysis. At the same time, information gleaned from other items not included in the scales did yield important differences between the resisters and the nonresisters. These data, taken together, form meaningful patterns which reflect a range of

attitudes that are not only consistent with each other but also with the political behavior of these activists.

There are good theoretical reasons to expect such consistency. According to Milton Rokeach (1973), a crucial link between attitude and behavior is the importance of the attitude for the individual's underlying belief or value system. If the attitudes being tapped reflect important personal values, then high consistency among related attitudes and between related attitudes and behavior could reasonably be expected. The attitudes expressed by the resisters, as will be argued in detail in the discussion section, are firmly grounded in more basic value systems that influence them over a wide range of behaviors and beliefs.

1. Attitudes toward Political, Social and Religious Authority

Attitude toward authority is the most clearcut pattern to emerge from the data. Across measures of attitudes toward political, social, religious and even interpersonal authority, the resisters show a consistently high level of rejection of authority which distinguishes them sharply from the nonresisters.

a) Attitude toward Authority Scale

The Attitude toward Authority Scale  
is composed of the following items:

- 1) There should be more respect for law and order. (PSA #2)
- 2) Society does not put enough restraint on the individual. (PSA #3)
- 3) I am in favor of strict enforcement of all laws no matter what the consequences. (PSA #11)
- 4) One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authority. (PSA #17)
- 5) There are times when it is right for a person to break the rules. (PSA #20)
- 6) Resistance to authority may be a sign of maturity. (PSA #21)
- 7) A person's conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say. (PSA #36)

The higher the score, out of a possible 35,  
the more rejecting of authority.

Table 3 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON  
ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY SCALE

Group	N	(35 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Communist Anarchists	29	32.72 *	2.36
Individualist Anarchists	50	32.64 *	2.275
Draft	12	31.75 *	1.765
Left Tax	36	30.25 *	3.35
Anti-Nuclear	36	30.25 *	3.94
Libertarian Tax	21	28.29 *	2.795
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	23.97	3.605
Conservatives	29	20.17	4.84

\* different from liberals and conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

As Table 3 shows, the hypothesis that the resister groups would have a higher measured level of rejection of authority than the nonresisters was upheld perfectly. All the resister groups have significantly higher mean scores than the nonresisters. The high scores of the resisters, ranging from 28.29 for the libertarian tax resisters to 32.72 for the communist anarchists, indicate a strong rejection of political and social authority. The conservative nonresisters, with a mean score of 20.11, and the liberal nonresisters, with 23.97, are in a middle range - neither extremely rejecting or accepting - and thus, are more similar to each other than to the resisters. The standard deviations, as Table 3 also shows, indicate that there is almost no overlap between the scores of the resisters and the nonresisters, making the differences even more striking.

Given the fact that resistance to authority is the raison d'etre of the resister groups, these results are, in some sense, not surprising. Yet psychologists

are far from convinced that attitudes are consistent with behavior. Often cited in evidence of inconsistency, for example, are the field studies of restaurant owners by LaPiere (1934) and Kutner et al (1952), which found discrepancies between verbal expressions of discrimination and non-discriminatory face-to-face behavior. Consistency between attitudes and behavior has occasionally been demonstrated, as for example, a study by Byrne (1969) which found that the subject's vote was a function of the number of views he had in common with the candidate, but, on the whole, psychologists have had great difficulty in showing such relationships. Psychologists have also argued that "attitude test scores alone are not enough to predict behavior" (Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962, p. 163) and that "people may act contrary to their attitudes (Chein, 1948, p. 148)."

Table 4 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON  
 "CONSCIENCE" ITEM OF ATTITUDE  
 TOWARD AUTHORITY SCALE

Group	(5 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>		
Communist Anarchists	4.41	.63
Individualist Anarchists	4.40	.65
Draft	4.10	1.04
Anti-Nuclear	3.97	1.11
Left Tax	3.97	.845
Libertarian Tax	3.60	.995
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>		
Liberals	2.84	1.19
Conservatives	3.00	1.29

We could not assume beforehand, therefore, that the resisters would be so adamant in their rejection of authority as their high scores on this scale seem to indicate. Nor could we assume that the liberals and conservatives would be so similar to each other and so different from the resisters.

Of particular note, for reasons to be detailed in the discussion section, are the means on Item #7 of the Attitude toward Authority Scale: "A person's conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say." In Table 4, the higher the score, out of a possible 5, the more agreement with the statement.

The principle of individual conscience seems to be an important one for the resisters. The two anarchist groups express the strongest agreement with this statement, as their high mean scores of 4.41 and 4.40 and small standard deviations of .63 and .65 show. The draft, anti-nuclear and left tax resisters, all with means near 4 (4.1, 3.97 and 3.97, respectively), also express agreement with the statement, though

not as adamantly as the anarchists. The libertarian tax resisters, with a mean of 3.6, agree, but not quite as strongly as the other resisters.

The nonresisters, both liberal and conservative, are again much more like each other than the resisters, with means of 2.84 and 3.00, respectively. Both non-resister groups express mixed feelings about this item but, on the whole, are much less accepting of the idea that conscience is superior to the law as a guiding agent.

Table 5 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON DIRECTIVENESS SCALE

Group	N	(16 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Communist Anarchists	29	7.45 ****	2.73
Anti-Nuclear	36	8.44 ****	3.34
Left Tax	36	8.56 ****	3.56
Individualist Anarchists	50	9.30 ***	3.16
Draft	12	9.58 **	3.29
Libertarian Tax	21	10.38 *	3.44
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Conservatives	29	11.00	3.45
Liberals	34	12.235	3.00

\*\*\*\*Different from liberals and conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*Different from liberals at  $p < .05$ , and conservatives at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*Different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

\*Different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

b) Directiveness Scale

The Directiveness Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) I like being in positions of authority. (PI #3)
- 2) I enjoy directing the activities of others. (PI #11)
- 3) I like to take charge of things in almost any kind of situation. (PI #19)
- 4) I like to supervise others. (PI #23)

The higher the score, out of a possible 16, the more directive. See Table 5.

The Directiveness Scale has an important but unpredicted relation to resistance. Contrary to the hypothesis that there would be no difference between resisters and nonresisters on this personality scale, all the resister groups have significantly lower mean scores than the liberal nonresisters while every resister group except the libertarian tax resisters and the draft resisters has a significantly lower score than the conservative nonresisters. The moderately high scores of

the conservatives and liberals are once again closer to each other than to most of the resisters.

As will be argued in the discussion section, the professed reluctance of the resisters to direct the behavior of others is yet another indication of their rejection of authority, an unwillingness to have control over others. Whether their professed attitudes are consistent with their actual behavior in everyday life is a question that this study cannot answer so I will only note that the resisters' expressed attitudes on the Directiveness Scale are consistent with their other attitudes toward authority.

Table 6

## RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES

Group	N	No Religion	Unconventional	Conventional
		% (n)	Religion % (n)	Religion % (n)
<u>RESISTERS</u>				
Draft	12	83.33 (10)	16.67 (2)	
Individualist Anarchists	49	77.50 (38)	14.30 (7)	8.2 (4)
Communist Anarchists	29	75.86 (22)	24.14 (7)	
Anti-Nuclear	36	55.55 (20)	38.90 (14)	5.55 (2)
Libertarian Tax	21	42.86 (9)	47.62 (10)**	9.50 (2)
Left Tax	35	25.70 (9)	48.60 (17)*	25.70 (9)
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>				
Liberals	34	14.71 (5)	8.82 (3)	76.47 (26)
Conservatives	27	14.82 (4)	3.70 (1)	81.48 (22)

\* includes 13 Quakers.

\*\* includes 5 members of Libertarian churches.

All differences between resister groups and nonresisters are significant at  $p < .01$ .

c) Religious Preference

The responses to Item #10 in Section A of the Survey of Political Attitudes ("Your religious preference") can be interpreted as a general indication of attitude toward the authority of religion. To express no religion or to prefer a religion which does not have a conventional authority structure is, in some sense, a rejection of religious authority.

If the respondents checked "atheist," "agnostic" or "indifferent," they were categorized as having no religion. Respondents who checked one of the major established religions ("Protestant," "Catholic" or "Jewish") were categorized as having a conventional religious preference.

Choices designated as unconventional religious preferences were those with forms of religious expression which differ widely from the prevailing norms of the major religions.

This included choices such as "Unitarian," "Quaker," "deist," "vedantist," and "Mystic." Quakers and deists have no liturgy, priesthood, or outward sacrament, while Unitarians do not believe in the Trinity, a doctrine accepted by all the major Christian churches. Vedantist and mystic are choices even further outside the norms of western religion.

What almost all the unconventional preferences have in common is a less strongly developed structure of religious authority than is true of most conventional religions. The Quakers, for example, do not believe in any religious authority other than individual conscience, while Unitarians have long been noted for their liberal attitudes toward religious beliefs and religious authority. The choices of deist and mystic do not even imply the acceptance of religious structure, let alone religious authority.

Table 6 shows that most resisters claim no religious affiliation, but when they do, their preference is usually unconventional. The differences between the resisters and the nonresisters are all significant. Over 75% of the anarchists and draft resisters have no religion; only in the individualist anarchist group are there any conventional preferences (8.4%). The majority of the anti-nuclear resisters report no religion (55.5%), while most of the rest of them (38.9%) express an unconventional choice such as Quaker, mystic or pantheist, none of which imply any obvious religious authority figure.

Very few libertarian tax resisters report conventional religious preferences, but nearly half (47.62%) have unconventional preferences, while nearly as many (42.86%) have no religion. Of these unconventional choices, however, half are Libertarian churches, which have no religious hierarchy and are oriented toward rational humanism rather than a belief in a supreme being.

these churches are also ways of legally keeping money out of the hands of the IRS (what the IRS would call a "tax dodge"). So the libertarian tax resisters are even less oriented toward religion than they seem at first glance.

Fewer left tax resisters claim no religious affiliation (25.7%) and more have conventional preferences (25.7%) than the other resisters. Instead, almost half (48.6%) have unconventional affiliations, most of which are Quaker. The Quakers, as noted before, have a strong tradition of believing in individual conscience rather than religious authority as the guide to personal morality.

In contrast, 76.47% of the liberals and 81.48% of the conservatives express conventional religious preferences while only 14.7% and 14.8%, respectively, have no religion. Once again, the two nonresister groups are similar to each other but very different from the resisters.

### Summary

Consistent with their political behavior, the resisters show, across measures of political, social and religious attitudes, a degree of rejection of authority which is significantly greater than the nonresisters. On all these measures, the liberal and conservative nonresisters are much more like each other than the resister groups. On the Attitude toward Authority Scale, the resisters express less acceptance of political and social authority and more belief in the idea that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than what the law might say. On the Directiveness Scale, the resisters express less willingness to be in positions of authority over others. When asked their religious preferences, most resisters claim no religion; the majority are agnostics and atheists. When the resisters do report a religious preference, most indicate an unconventional choice that is not oriented toward belief in traditional religious authority. In contrast, most nonresisters express conventional religious preferences and only a few have no religion.

## 2. . Personal Responsibility and Personality Measures

The findings for the other scales are less clearcut than for the ones measuring attitudes toward authority. The greatest differences between resisters and nonresisters were expected to be on the scales measuring ascription of personal responsibility and independence/autonomy. But the hypothesis that the resisters would measure higher on these scales than the nonresisters was, as we shall see, only partially upheld. As it turns out, the item in this section which most distinguishes resisters from nonresisters is the question asking whether the respondent felt different as a child or adolescent. Though no differences were hypothesized on the personality scales measuring sociability, need for social support, and gregariousness, a few weak ones were found. But, as will be discussed in detail later, these findings seem more related to differences in ideological values among the resisters rather than differences between resisters and nonresisters.

Table 7 PERCENTAGE FEELING DIFFERENT AS A  
CHILD OR ADOLESCENT

Group	N	%	(n)
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Draft	11	100 *	11
Individualist Anarchists	49	97.6 *	48
Communist Anarchists	28	96.4 *	27
Anti-Nuclear	36	94.4 *	34
Libertarian Tax	21	81.0 **	17
Left Tax	35	77.1	27
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Conservatives	29	58.6	17
Liberals	34	55.9	19

\* different from liberals and conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\* different from liberals and conservatives at  $p < .05$ .

a) Perception of Feeling Different as a Child  
or Adolescent

Item B12 reads as follows:

When you were a child or adolescent,  
did you feel

- (a) very much like other youngsters
- (b) somewhat like other youngsters
- (c) no opinion, not sure
- (d) somewhat different from others
- (e) very different from others

Table 7 shows the percentage of respondents in each group choosing either "d" or "e" (being different) as their answer.

The resisters are much more likely to say that they felt different as a child or adolescent than the nonresisters. Over 90% of the anarchists, draft and anti-nuclear resisters claim they felt different as compared with 58.6% of the conservatives and 55.9% of the liberals. These differences are all significant. The percentage of tax resisters who say they felt different is also greater than the nonresisters - 81% of the libertarians and 77% of the left tax resisters - but only the libertarians are significantly different.

Table 8 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY SCALE

Group	N	(20 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Individualist Anarchists	50	16.08 **	2.81
Libertarian Tax	21	15.85 *	1.96
Anti-Nuclear	36	15.06 *	2.67
Draft	12	14.67 ns	3.50
Left Tax	36	13.89 ns	3.09
Communist Anarchists	29	13.03 ns	2.71
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Conservatives	29	14.38	3.16
Liberals	34	13.15	2.91

\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$  and conservatives  
at  $p < .05$ .

\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

b) Personal Responsibility Scale

The Personal Responsibility Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) No matter how much a person is provoked, they are always responsible for what they do. (PSA #4)
- 2) Being upset or preoccupied does not excuse a person's doing things that she would not ordinarily do. (PSA #16)
- 3) Occasionally in life a person finds herself in a situation in which she has absolutely no control over what she does to others. (PSA #26)
- 4) Extenuating circumstances never completely remove a person's responsibility for his or her actions. (PSA #32)

The higher the score, out of a possible 20, the more accepting of personal responsibility.

As Table 8 shows, the hypothesis that the resisters would be higher in measured level of personal responsibility than the nonresisters was upheld for only a few of the groups. The individualist anarchists, liber-

tarian tax resisters, and anti-nuclear resisters have significantly higher mean scores than the liberals, but only the individualist anarchists have a significantly higher score than the conservatives.

c) Independence/Autonomy Scale

The Independence/Autonomy Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) I like to plan things by myself.  
(PI #1)
- 2) When I have a problem, I like to work it out by myself. (PI #5)
- 3) People often think I am independent in my ways. (PI #9)
- 4) I like the idea of getting out on my own. (PI #21)

The higher the score, out of a possible 20, the more independent.

As Table 9 shows, the hypothesis that the resister groups would be higher in measured level of independence/autonomy than the nonresisters did not fare well either. The individualist anarchists and the libertarian tax resisters have significantly higher scores than the conservatives, but

Table 9 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON INDEPENDENCE/AUTONOMY SCALE

Group	N	(20 Possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Libertarian Tax	21	17.67 ***	2.80
Individualist Anarchists	50	17.50 ***	2.17
Draft	12	17.08 ns	2.68
Anti-Nuclear	36	15.92 ns	3.79
Communist Anarchists	29	15.59 **	2.47
Left Tax	36	14.56 *	4.47
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	16.82	1.77
Conservatives	29	15.48	2.71

\*\*\* different from conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

\* different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

the trend to be different from the liberals is not significant. However, in direct opposition to the hypothesis, the communist anarchists and left tax resisters have significantly lower scores than the liberals. The import of this reversal will be dealt with in the discussion section.

d) Need for Social Support Scale

The Need for Social Support Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) I like it when people go out of their way to include me in.  
(PI #2)
- 2) I like it when my friends worry about me. (PI #6)
- 3) I like people to do thoughtful little things for me. (PI #10)
- 4) I want my friends to be loyal to me. (PI #14)
- 5) I like to have the feeling that people really care about me.  
(PI #18)
- 6) I like to be remembered by my friends. (PI #22)

Table 10 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON NEED FOR SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALE

Group	N	(24 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Communist Anarchists	29	19.41 ns	3.39
Anti-Nuclear	36	19.25 ns	4.59
Left Tax	36	18.42 ns	5.24
Libertarian Tax	21	16.00 ***	4.23
Draft	12	17.75 ns	6.05
Individualist Anarchists	50	17.50 **	3.27
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	19.59	3.105
Conservatives	29	18.38	3.61

\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$  and conservatives  
at  $p < .05$ .

The higher the score, out of a possible 24, the more need for social support.

Though no differences were predicted on this scale, a few were found, as Table 10 shows. The individualist anarchists and libertarian tax resisters have significantly lower mean scores than the liberals but only the libertarian tax resisters have a significantly lower score than the conservatives. However, in the regression analysis (see Appendix III), political group membership is not a significant factor in predicting scores on this scale so the differences found are somewhat tentative.

e) Sociability Scale

The Sociability Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) I would rather be in a group that is friendly than one that is cool and efficient. (PI #8)
- 2) I think that being kind and gentle with friends is more important than asserting yourself, even when you're right. (PI #12)

Table 11 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON SOCIABILITY SCALE

Group	N	(12 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Communist Anarchists	29	9.03 ns	1.84
Left Tax	36	8.88 ns	2.62
Draft	12	8.67 ns	3.42
Anti-Nuclear	36	8.53 ns	2.95
Individualist Anarchists	50	7.66 **	2.10
Libertarian Tax	21	7.38 *	2.655
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	8.92	1.90
Conservatives	29	8.10	1.84

\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

\* different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

- 3) I feel a warm, friendly atmosphere in a group is probably the only way to get efficiency in the long run. (PI #16)

The higher the score, out of a possible 12, the more sociable.

No differences were hypothesized on this scale and almost none were found (see Table 11). The individualist anarchists and the libertarian tax resisters measure significantly less sociable than the liberals, but in the regression analysis, political group membership is again not a significant factor in predicting scores on this scale. Thus the trend is a weak one.

f) Gregariousness Scale

The Gregariousness Scale is composed of the following items:

- 1) I like to be with people a great deal. (PI #4)
- 2) I enjoy taking the initiative in meeting people. (PI #24)

The higher the score, out of a possible 8, the more gregarious.

Table 12 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
ON GREGARIOUSNESS SCALE

Group	N	(8 possible) mean score	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Communist Anarchists	29	5.83 ns	1.63
Anti-Nuclear	36	5.72 ns	1.99
Libertarian Tax	21	5.67 ns	1.74
Draft	12	5.00 ns	2.49
Left Tax	36	4.89 **	1.94
Individualist Anarchists	50	4.86 *	1.69
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	34	5.85	1.50
Conservatives	29	5.17	1.51

\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

Two weak differences were found on this scale (see Table 12). The individualist anarchists and left tax resisters have significantly lower mean scores than the liberals, but as is the case with the other personality traits, the regression analysis indicates that group membership is not a significant predictor of scores on this scale.

#### Summary

Only one measure in this section differentiates resisters from nonresisters. Almost all of the resisters say they felt different as a child or adolescent, as compared to only slightly over half of the nonresisters. On the Personal Responsibility Scale, on which differences between resisters and nonresisters had been hypothesized, only the individualist anarchists, libertarian tax resisters, and anti-nuclear resisters are significantly more accepting of personal responsibility and that, only from the liberals. The only difference on the Independence/Autonomy Scale consistent with the hypothesis that the resisters would measure higher is between the two libertarian groups on the one hand and the conservatives on the other. In direct opposition to the hypothesis, the communist anarchists and left tax resisters measure significantly lower than the liberals.

No differences were predicted on the rest of the interpersonal orientation scales but a few tentative ones were found. The two libertarian groups have significantly lower scores on both the Sociability and Need for Social Support Scales than the liberals. On the Gregariousness Scale, the individualist anarchists and the left tax resisters have lower scores than the liberals. However, since political group membership is not a significant factor in predicting scores on these scales in the regression analysis, other factors such as age may be accounting for the differences.

With the exception of perception of feeling different, the differences found, including the tentative ones, can be explained in terms of differences in ideological values among the resister groups. This argument will be detailed in the discussion section.

### 3. Motivations for Political Involvement

Though not included in the original hypotheses, a factor which turned out to differentiate resisters from nonresisters is motivation for political involvement. Question 16a of Section A of the Survey of Political Attitudes asks: What motivated you to become involved in your present political activities?

Table 13

MOTIVATIONS FOR POLITICAL  
INVOLVEMENT EXPRESSED BY RESISTERS

Group	Type	Motivation	n
Communist Anarchists	D	Dissatisfaction with political situation	8
	P	Desire for free society	3
	P	Concern for others	3
	D	Militarism, draft	3
	D	Anti-nuclear sentiments	3
	D	Personal exploitation	2
	P	Change society, justice	2
	O	Family background	2
	O	Reading	2
	P	Conscience	1
Anti- Nuclear	D	Fear of nuclear power and/ or Three Mile Island	10
	P	Social change mentioning justice or suffering	10
	P	General social change	6
	D	Survival	6
	D	War, military	2
	D	Personal self-interest	2

Table 13 (cont.)

Group	Type	Motivation	n
Left Tax	D	War, militarism Vietnam	10
	P	Social change, better world	8
	P	Religious beliefs	7
	P	Personal ethics or conscience	3
	D	Survival	2
Draft	D	Dissatisfaction with political situation	5
	P	Moral beliefs, personal principles	4
	P	Loss of freedom	1
	D	Personal experience	1
	P	Religious beliefs	1
	P	Concern for people	1
Individualist Anarchists	P	Desire for freedom, free society, liberty	11
	P	Philosophical or political principle	9

Table 13 (cont.)

Group	Type	Motivation	n
Individualist Anarchists (cont.)	D	Personal oppression or self-interest	9
	D	Dissatisfaction, anger with political situation	8
	D	Assorted disgruntlement	5
	P	Social change, injustice	4
	O	Reading	4
	D	Anti-war beliefs	1
Libertarian Tax	D	Dissatisfaction with government	5
	P	Loss of freedom	7
	D	Taxes	3
	P	Moral principles	2
	D	Concern for future	2
	D	War in Vietnam	1
	O	Reading	1

D= Dissatisfaction

P= Principle or idealism

C= Conventional

O= Other, unclassifiable

Table 14

MOTIVATIONS FOR POLITICAL  
INVOLVEMENT EXPRESSED BY NONRESISTERS

Group	Type	Motivation	n
Liberals	P	Social justice, improve society	8
	C	Candidate	3
	C	Social reasons, friends	3
	C	Civic duty	2
	C	Career	2
	P	Conscience, moral obligation	2
	C	Preserve status quo	2
	P	Civil liberties	1
	P	Women's rights	1
	P	Concern for people	1
Conservatives	D	Dissatisfaction with government policies	4
	C	Candidates	4
	C	Interest in politics	3
	C	Concern for country	3
	C	Civic duty	2
	D	Economic concerns	2
	D	Military, defense	1
	P	Freedom	1
P	Lack of morality	1	

The range of answers, as we might expect from an open-ended question, is hard to classify. Some respondents did not answer at all while others gave several answers. Some gave a specific influence (e.g., a particular book) while others gave an underlying psychological motivation (e.g., concern for a better world). Thus the results are suggestive rather than systematic. Yet a pattern emerges from these data too, one that is consistent with the other findings in the study as well as with the value systems of the resisters. These motivations, as will be argued later, are an important and necessary part of the process which leads to willingness to resist authority.

The answers fall into three broad categories, as shown in Tables 13 and 14. Those answers which express moral or philosophical principles, desire for freedom, concern with social injustice, concern for others, or religious beliefs were classified as "idealistic" or "principled" responses ("P" in the tables). Responses that reflect dissatisfaction or anger with government policies or the political situation were classified as "dissatisfaction" answers ("D" in the tables). Those answers which express a concern for civic duty,

Table 15 TYPE OF MOTIVATION FOR POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

Group	TYPE OF MOTIVATION			
	Dissatisfaction with political situation	Principles or idealism	Conventional political reasons	Other (unclassifiable)
<u>RESISTERS</u>				
Communist Anarchists	55.2% (16)	31.0% (9)		13.8% (4)
Anti-Nuclear	55.6% (20)	44.4% (16)		
Left Tax	40.0% (12)	60.0% (22)		
Draft	46.2% (6)	53.8% (7)		
Individualist Anarchist	45.1% (23)	47.1% (23)		7.8% (4)
Libertarian Tax	52.4% (11)	42.9% (9)		4.8% (1)
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>				
Liberals		52.0% (13)	48.0% (12)	
Conservatives	33.4% (7)	9.5% (2)	57.1% (12)	

love of country, helping a candidate, preserving the status quo, or social reasons were classified as "conventional" reasons ("C" in the tables). Anything that did not obviously fit into these three categories was classified as "other" ("O" in the tables).

Given this taxonomy, Table 15 shows that almost all of the responses given by the resister groups fall into either the idealistic or dissatisfaction categories. As we might expect, nearly half of the responses of the resister groups express dissatisfaction. An almost equal percentage of responses fall into the principled or idealistic category, along with a small percentage classified as other. None of the resisters give conventional responses.

In contrast, the two nonresister groups give many conventional answers - 48% for the liberals and 60.9% for the conservatives. The liberals give about the same percentage of principled responses as the resisters but express no dissatisfaction motivations (not so surprising in pre-Reagan, liberal New York City). The conservatives, with a third of their responses expressing dissatisfaction, are more unhappy with government than the liberals but not as unhappy as the resisters. Few of the conservatives voiced principled moti-

variations.

Interpretation of these results must, of course, be tempered with the recognition that the sample is neither large nor necessarily representative. Clearly, for example, some conservatives are motivated by principle and some liberals by dissatisfaction. Yet the trend found in these results is consonant with the other findings in the study. Principles coupled with anger seem to provide the primary motivation for the resisters while more conventional political reasons heavily flavor the motivations of the nonresisters.

#### B. DEFINING ISSUES TEST

##### P-percent Score

The P% score is the index that has been most used for Defining Issues Test (DIT) responses. The sum of weighted ranks given to Stage 5 and Stage 6 items is computed and then calculated as a percentage of the total response. The score reflects "the relative importance a subject gives to principled moral considerations in making a decision about moral dilemmas" (Rest, 1979, p.5.2).

Rest divides the post-conventional level into three stages: 5A, "the morality of social contract;" 5B,

"the morality of intuitive humaneness;" and 6, "the morality of principles of ideal social cooperation."

The hypothesis that the resisters would have higher levels of moral reasoning than the nonresisters was confirmed only with regard to the conservatives, as Table 16 shows. All the resister groups have P% scores that are significantly higher than the conservative nonresisters. Not so with the liberals. Even though the mean scores of the anti-nuclear, left tax and draft resisters (60.175, 59.75, 57.93, respectively) are higher than the liberals (54.03), the difference is not significantly different from the liberals. The individualist anarchists, however, do have a significantly lower score (47.35) than the liberals. The score of the conservatives (36.96) is also significantly lower than the liberals. The DIT does not categorize subjects at particular stages, but anything above 50 is considered high.<sup>5</sup>

---

5

Another, newer DIT index, the D score, was also computed. The results are similar to those found with the P% score. The means for the D score can be found in Appendix IV.

Table 16 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
OF P-PERCENT SCORE ON DEFINING  
ISSUES TEST

Group	N	Mean	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Anti-Nuclear	24	60.175 *	10.84
Left Tax	26	59.75 *	9.13
Draft	10	57.93 *	9.11
Communist Anarchists	25	51.56 *	9.27
Libertarian Tax	12	50.09 *	9.77
Individualist Anarchists	41	47.25 **	8.72
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Liberals	17	54.03	13.66
Conservatives	17	36.96 ***	13.67

\* different from conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\* different from conservatives at  $p < .01$  and liberals  
at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

### Bias in the DIT

Because the discrepancy between the scores of the libertarian tax resisters, communist anarchists and individualist anarchists and the other resisters seems at odds with what several of the previous findings in the study as well as the professed values of these groups would lead us to expect, I decided to investigate the possibility that something about the DIT itself affected the libertarians and anarchists differently than the other resisters. A more detailed account of the analysis, with tables, which led me to conclude that a content bias in the interpretation of DIT items accounts for this discrepancy in scores can be found in Appendix V. A summary is presented below.

On several counts, it could reasonably be expected that the libertarians and anarchists would score as high on a test of moral judgment as the other resisters. On other measures in the study that seem linked to moral judgment, for example, there are no differences between the libertarians and anarchists and the other resisters. On the Attitude toward Authority Scale, two important value orientations that are elements in Kohlberg's model of moral development are tapped: attitude toward authority and individual conscience. The highest stage of moral development (Stage 6), according to Kohlberg (1969), is characterized by judgment based on universal principles of justice and

orientation to conscience as a guiding agent. In contrast, the conventional level of moral development is characterized by orientation to authority and judgments based on the expectancies of others. Not only do all resisters, including the libertarians and anarchists, adamantly reject authority on the Attitude toward Authority Scale, they assert strongly that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say. Furthermore, many of the motivations for political involvement given by the libertarians and anarchists, as well as the other resisters, show evidence of ethical considerations. Frequently cited, for example, are reasons which explicitly mention personal principle or concern for social injustice.

Yet another reason to expect libertarians and anarchists to show high levels of moral reasoning is their professed belief in ethical principles which transcend the laws of any government. Universal individual rights and concern with moral principles are explicit and frequent themes in libertarian and anarchist writings, as is discussed in greater detail in Appendix V.

For all the reasons listed above, it seems inconsistent for the libertarians and anarchists to have scores on the DIT that are so much lower than the other resisters. So I turned to the DIT. When I closely examined the way the

DIT items are interpreted, I found what I contend is a bias that adversely affects the scores of the libertarians and anarchists to a far greater extent than the other resisters. Analysis of the findings for the stage profiles and certain test items provide concrete evidence to support this contention.

Recall that the postconventional level of the DIT has three stages: 5A (social contract), 5B (intuitive humanness), and 6 (ideals of social cooperation). Though the libertarians and anarchists have overall mean P% scores that are lower than the liberals, examination of the stage profiles shows that these resister groups have higher scores on two of the three postconventional stages. On Stage 6, both the libertarian tax resisters and the individualist anarchists have mean raw scores similar to the other resisters and several points higher than the liberals. The score of the communist anarchists is similar to the liberals. On Stage 5B, the libertarian tax resisters, individualist anarchists and communists anarchists are as high or higher in their mean raw scores as the other resisters and two or more points higher than the liberals.

Only on Stage 5A are the mean raw scores of the libertarians and anarchists lower than the liberals. (Since Stage 5A has 12 items and Stage 6 only 5 and Stage 5B only 4, the responses to Stage 5A weigh heavily.) But, as

argued in greater detail in Appendix V, many of the Stage 5A items reflect a majoritarian or collectivist approach to social ethics that is in direct opposition to the philosophical values of libertarians. They would not rank such items as important moral considerations, thereby losing points on the P% score. Liberals, as well as most of the other resisters, whose political views are leftist, would not find these items in conflict with their political values.

On Stage 4 (the stage of law and order, authority orientation), however, the libertarian tax resisters and individualist anarchists have higher mean raw scores than the other resisters. Yet the scores of these two groups on the Attitude toward Authority Scale, as well as their political beliefs clearly demonstrate a strong rejection of authority. Anarchists upholding law and order thinking is a peculiar image indeed.

So what then accounts for these puzzling scores on Stage 4? When I examined the interpretations of the Stage 4 items, I found what I contend is yet another content bias that works against libertarians. Three of the items scored at Stage 4 deal with issues of property rights. Because these items are placed at the law and order stage, they are apparently intended to be interpreted as "legal" rights. But libertarians view property rights as moral rights no different than other moral rights. This point of view has

nothing to do with the legal status of property. That is, I argue, libertarians use a post-conventional or principled conceptual process to arrive at this judgment. Because the importance of property rights is an integral part of the libertarian philosophy, it seems likely that the libertarians are not only ranking the property rights items high but choosing them instead of the Stage 5A items that conflict with the libertarian philosophy.

Empirical evidence for this argument can be found by examining the differences in rankings of the property rights items and the law and order items on Stage 4. If the above analysis is correct, then libertarians should rank the property rights items high and the law and order items low. This turns out to be precisely the case. On the mean rankings of the importance of the property rights items, the libertarian tax resisters and individualist anarchists have much higher scores than either the liberals or the other resisters. But on the mean rankings of the importance of the law and order items, the libertarian groups have scores that are lower than either the conservatives or the liberals and similar to the other resisters. I concluded, therefore, that the scores of the libertarian tax resisters and individualist anarchists are not indicative of a greater law and order orientation than the other resisters.

But what accounts for the lower P% scores of the communist anarchists relative to the other resisters? Certainly not their responses to the property rights items. As we see from the stage profiles, they do have, however, a much higher score on the A-scale than any other group. The A-scale, according to Rest, reflects an "anti-establishment orientation, a point of view which condemns tradition and the existing social order for its arbitrariness or its corruption by the rich for the exploitation of the poor" (Rest, 1979, p.5.2). Since it is an experimental scale which apparently, in Rest's view, does not reflect principled reasoning, high valuation of the items on this scale is not worth points on the P% score.

But, as is argued in Appendix V, the items on the A-scale read like a primer of communist anarchism. Opposition to the establishment and to the exploitation of the poor are integral parts of the communist anarchist philosophy of mutual aid. Therefore, I contend, the communist anarchists use principled reasoning to arrive at these responses, even though the answers are not scored as principled on the DIT.

Proponents of the stage theory of moral development have argued that it is the kind of standard or conceptual framework rather than the specific content that determines

level of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969; Rest, 1976).<sup>6</sup> Or, as Rokeach (1960) might put it, it is not what you believe but why you believe it that is psychologically important about a belief system. If so, then the libertarians and anarchists should be judged by the conceptual framework they actually use. The evidence, both empirical and theoretical, suggests that these groups use principled moral reasoning to rank as important, items on the DIT that are not scored as principled. Therefore, I contend, their scores on the DIT are artifactually low. If this is the case, the lower scores of the libertarians and anarchists cannot be interpreted to mean that their level of moral reasoning is less highly developed than the liberals or the other resisters.

#### Regression Analysis of the DIT

Given both the content bias which I argue affects the results so strongly and the small number of responses to the DIT, a regression analysis of the demographic characteristics of the sample seemed inappropriate. A preliminary regression analysis was done, but the results were uninterpretable. However, Rest (1977) reports that age,

---

<sup>6</sup> Kohlberg has been accused of letting content triumph over form (for example, Gilligan, 1977). The DIT seems subject to the same problem.

socioeconomic status, sex, college major, and profession do not have a clear and consistent relationship to DIT scores. Therefore, as is the case with the Survey of Political Attitudes, these factors may not play important roles in influencing the DIT scores of the present sample. The role of level of education, the only factor besides IQ which Rest found to be consistently correlated with DIT scores, will be discussed later.

## DISCUSSION

The picture that emerges from the study of political resisters to authority is complex. Not all the major hypotheses were crisply confirmed, nor were the resisters always sharply differentiated from the nonresisters. But political resistance is complex. The kinds of resistance and reasons for involvement differ widely. We cannot expect a simple answer to the question of who disobeys.

So complex are the data in this study that no one overall "resister profile" emerges. Though in their attitude toward authority, the resisters are much more like each other than the nonresisters, when personality traits are included, each group's overall pattern is distinct and different.<sup>7</sup> The differences among the resister groups are not central to the main question of this study, i.e., what characteristics differentiate resisters from nonresisters, but they do tell us something important not only about the resister groups but, ultimately, about the

---

<sup>7</sup> Many psychologists who have studied political activists have failed to appreciate the variety and complexity of political ideologies. Most studies of student activists, for example, have not defined categories any more finely than "radical" or "conservative." Yet, without even considering the plethora of Marxist and socialist groups that exist, there are, in the present study, three distinct left radical and two distinct libertarian groups.

basis for their resistance.. Because the pattern of each resister group can be directly tied to the ideology of the group in a way predictable and consistent with its rhetoric, a good case can be made for the contention that resisters have coherent value systems that serve as guides and determinants for their political attitudes and behavior.

Left unanswered by this study, but an important question for future research is the role of individual values vs. group values. That is, do individuals with certain personal values join groups with compatible values or do they become members of a group and then are influenced by group values? The answer is probably somewhere in between and no doubt varies from individual to individual. It is possible at the very least that group values and the organization itself provide what Milgram (1974) has called "binding factors," mechanisms that "cement the structure." In this case, the group may provide the cement in the form of social support and encouragement for resistance rather than obedience.

Yet, in spite of the complexity of the results, a pattern emerges which does characterize the resisters and distinguishes them from the nonresisters. The most clear-cut part of the pattern is attitude toward authority. Across measures of attitudes toward political, social, religious, and interpersonal authority, the resisters consistently express significantly more rejection of authority than the nonresisters, both liberal and conservative. The attitudes

of these resisters are not only consonant with their political behavior but also with the philosophical values expressed in the literature of the resister groups.

#### ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY

Must the citizen, even for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience then?... It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think is right

--Henry David Thoreau

"Civil Disobedience"

#### Political and Social Authority

Attitude toward authority is, according to Milgram (1974), a crucial element of the psychological dynamic which leads to obedience or resistance. In discussing the immediate antecedent conditions for obedience, Milgram defines three conditions necessary for shifting into the "agentic state" - "the condition in which a person sees himself as an agent for carrying out another person's wishes: 1) perception of a legitimate authority, 2) defining oneself as part of the relevant authority system, and 3) perceiving the entry into the system as voluntary (Milgram, 1974, p.133).

These antecedent conditions are not present for the resisters. In their attitudes as measured in this study, as well as their political values as demonstrated in their literature, the resisters assert that there are situations in which they do not perceive political authority as legitimate or voluntarily accepted. If, as Milgram (1974) declares, the "ideological abrogation to authority...constitutes the principal cognitive basis of obedience," then the resisters' refusal to accept the legitimacy of political authority is the cognitive basis for their resistance.

For the anarchists, no authority is perceived as legitimate or even relevant. "In a word," declares Bakunin (1972), "we reject all legislation, all authority." Anarchists do not even consider themselves morally part of the political authority system, even if they are physically part of the system. Nor do they view their entry into the system as voluntary. "If then, the State is not 'us'," writes anarchist theoretician Murray Rothbard, "if it is not the 'human family' getting together to decide mutual problems...what is it?...it is the only organization in society that obtains its revenue not by voluntary contribution or payment for services rendered..." (Rothbard, 1974b, p.70). "The normal and continuing condition of the State is oligarchic rule: rule by a coercive elite." (Rothbard, 1974a, p.53) The strong rejection of authority shown by the anarchists in

this study is thus entirely in keeping with their professed beliefs.

The libertarian tax resisters, whether anarchist or not, share with other libertarians the view that "taxation is theft" (a popular libertarian button slogan). Libertarian tax resisters see taxation as a violation of individual rights (Bray, 1972) as well as unconstitutional (Chodorov, 1954). Some, like the property tax strikers, may also emphasize that sky-rocketing taxes are a violation of the social contract (Tobin, 1980). All would agree that government taxation is coercive and illegitimate.

The left tax resisters do not necessarily reject all government authority (except for the many anarchists among them) but, believing that "war is a crime against humanity" (War Resisters League, 1980) which the State may not legitimately perform, they "say no to war" by withholding taxes they see as going to aid immoral militarist government activities (War Resisters League, 1977; Durland, 1979).

The draft resisters certainly do not view their entry into the draft registration as voluntary. The majority (58%) of them are anarchists or libertarians, and therefore perceive the draft as an exercise of illegitimate authority on principle. Many are members of the National Resistance Committee, which believes its opposition "is in the best tradition of American ethics and values," and considers

draft registration as a violation of individual rights (Moore et al, 1980). Others are members of the War Resisters League, a long-time opponent of conscription which, like the National Resistance Committee, sees draft registration not only as a step toward losing freedom but also as a first step toward war and thus illegitimate (WRL, 1980.; Moore et al, 1980).

A sizable number (44.5%) of the anti-nuclear resisters are also anarchists while the rest at least "question authority" (a popular button and T-shirt slogan in anti-nuclear circles). Because they consider nuclear power as a threat to all life, the anti-nuclear resisters see political protection of it as illegitimate. Because they have no choice about the building or maintaining of what they see as life-threatening nuclear plants, they perceive that political protections are coercive. Since "conventional legal ways of shutting down plants don't work," the anti-nuclear resisters feel that "[t]he potential victims of nuclear power have every right and obligation to step outside the laws which protect corporations and utilities that use technologies endangering the environment and human life" (SHAD, 1980a).

In contrast, the philosophy expressed in the writings of most liberals and conservatives indicate a more conventional attitude toward authority. In spite of the many particular ideological differences between liberalism and

conservatism, both generally accept the legitimacy of political authority. Though both conservatives and liberals have disapproved of many specific acts of authority, few have condoned civil disobedience as a way to deal with the problem, preferring instead to work through the standard political process. Though some conservatives (for example, those who join anti-draft or anti-nuclear groups) do break the law for political reasons, their resistance is an individual act not stemming from the mainstream of either conservative or liberal thought.<sup>8</sup>

The scores of the liberals and conservatives on the Attitude toward Authority Scale are in keeping with this more moderate view of political authority - not too accepting, not too rejecting. Though conservatives are often seen as more authority-oriented than liberals (Adorno et al, 1950; McClosky, 1958), the differences on this scale, while statistically significant, are relatively small. The two non-resister groups are, in their attitude toward authority, much more like each other than the resisters.

---

<sup>8</sup> The conservative tax resisters do have a relatively coherent ideology which encourages resistance to authority at least in regard to taxes, but they are not viewed as part of the conservative mainstream either by themselves or other conservatives. In the present sample, there are only 9 self-professed liberals: 2 anti-nuclear, 6 left tax, 1 draft resister.

Illustrative of the similarity in attitude about the legitimacy of authority between the liberals and conservatives, as well as the differences from the resisters, are the attitudes expressed toward the idea that a person's conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say. The resisters are very much in agreement with this statement, while both the liberals and conservatives have much more mixed feelings and reservations. To the resisters, conscience is more legitimate than the law.

#### Interpersonal Authority

The resisters' rejection of authority is not just confined to the political realm, but extends to their attitudes about interpersonal behavior as well. They not only reject the legitimacy of political authority to govern their behavior, they claim significantly less willingness to direct or exercise nonpolitical authority over others than the nonresisters.

Because the implied definition of authority on the Directiveness Scale is vague, two interpretations are possible: authority as assertion of leadership or authority as power over others. Given the general attitude toward authority of these resisters and their highly political point of view, it seems likely that many of them interpret the items on this scale in the second sense. The liberals and conservatives, for whom the issue of authority is less salient and less

sensitive, are thus presumably less likely to make the distinction between the two meanings.

The Directiveness Scale is, therefore in some sense, a more subtle measure of attitude toward authority. Since this scale is not overtly political, one's interpretation of the items may depend partly on one's sensitivity to the issue of authority. On the other hand, the salience of the definition of authority as power over others may be especially high to the resisters because they were picked on the basis of their resister group membership. They may simply be fulfilling group expectations by claiming to reject authority in any guise. We do not know whether their expressed attitudes on the Directiveness Scale are actually reflective of their everyday behavior. However, since the issues of hierarchy and anti-authoritarianism are explicit and repeated themes in the literature of most of the resister groups, there is good reason to think that authority in interpersonal relations is a genuine concern for many of the resisters. Whatever their actual behavior may be, the resisters are at least sufficiently sensitive to the problem of interpersonal authority that they express attitudes consistent with their other attitudes and their group values.

The direction of the mean scores on the Directiveness Scale gives evidence of just how consistent these resisters are. If one were to arrange the groups on a continuum on

the basis of ideological sensitivity to the problem of authority in interpersonal relations, it would be precisely the order found in the results. For example, the resisters whose rhetoric espouses the most concern with hierarchy are the communist anarchists, followed closely by the anti-nuclear and left tax resisters. The communist anarchists do, in fact, have the lowest scores on this scale, with the anti-nuclear and left tax resisters next lowest.

An issue which has been the subject of considerable discussion on the non-Marxist left is non-hierarchical decisionmaking. Murray Bookchin, the most influential contemporary communist anarchist theoretician, has discussed hierarchy and organization extensively in his speeches and writings (Bookchin, 1971, 1974). Anti-nuclear associations are intentionally organized around affinity groups that operate on the basis of "the consensus process...that allows every member's views to have equal standing" rather than majority rule (SHAD, 1980b). Those who conduct anti-nuclear meetings are carefully called "facilitators" rather than "leaders." The left tax resisters, many of whom are communist anarchists and/or anti-nuclear protestors, share this intellectual milieu.

Although some libertarian writers have addressed the question of application of libertarian principles to inter-

personal behavior (for example, Breggin, 1980), the issues of hierarchy and interpersonal authoritarianism are not as explicit or frequent as themes. Thus, presumably being, as a group, less sensitive to the issues of interpersonal power, libertarians may interpret the items on the Directiveness Scale as reflecting "leadership" rather than "power over others" more often than the leftists. But since the negative connotations of authority are more salient to the libertarians than to the liberals and conservatives, the scores of the two libertarian groups, which are between the left-oriented groups and the nonresisters, make theoretical sense. The scores of the two libertarian groups, relative to each other, are also consistent with this analysis. The individualist anarchists, who are more rejecting of authority than the libertarian tax resisters, also have lower directiveness scores.

Even the score of the draft resisters, which is higher than all the other resister groups except for the libertarian tax resisters, is compatible with the foregoing analysis. Since the draft resisters are an ideologically mixed group, composed of communist anarchists, libertarians, democratic socialists, and liberals, we could expect a score reflecting an average somewhere in between the two extremes. Furthermore, the issue of hierarchy is not a central or even salient one for draft resisters, as it is for communist

anarchists or anti-nuclear resisters. The factor of age may be playing a role, however, since age rather than group membership is the significant predictor of scores for the draft resisters in the regression analysis of this scale. Though the findings for the draft resisters are thus somewhat ambiguous, the trend remains consistent with the analysis offered.

The conservatives and liberals are once again more similar to each other than to most of the resisters, showing a moderately high willingness to be in positions of authority. For conservatives and liberals, who have a more conventional perspective on authority than the resisters, the idea of authority as power over others is likely to be a less salient interpretation than it is to the resisters. Nor do the nonresisters have any specific ideological reason to see directing others as undesirable.

#### Religious Authority

Rejection of religious authority is yet another part of the pattern that separates the resisters from the non-resisters. Most resisters are not religious, but when they are, they prefer religions that are unconventional and lacking in strong authority structure. Only a few resisters have conventional religious preferences, in contrast to the

nonresisters, the majority of whom express conventional religious choices. Unlike the resisters, the percentages of nonresisters who say they have no religious affiliations is very small.

As with the other attitudes toward authority discussed above, rejection of conventional religious authority is consistent with the ideological values reflected in the literature of these resister groups. The findings are also consistent with earlier studies which found a lack of religiosity among libertarians (Presley, 1971; Schweitzer & Elden, 1971) New Left activists (Haan, Smith & Block, 1968) and draft resisters (Useem, 1970).

The strong rejection of religion found for the anarchists is consonant with their professed ideological stance. "Anarchists," writes Nicolas Walter, "have traditionally been anticlerical and also atheist" (Walter, 1969, p.13). Anarchist and libertarian literature is replete with attacks on religion and religious institutions (Bakunin, 1970; Rand, 1961; Smith, 1979). "Neither God nor master" is a popular communist anarchist slogan while libertarians, heavily influenced by the philosophical writings of Ayn Rand, are staunch advocates of reason over faith.

Since 44.5% of the anti-nuclear resisters and 58.3% of the draft resisters are anarchists, their lack of religiosity is not surprising. But even beyond the anarchist

influence, the left political milieu is one that questions many traditional values, including religious ones. "Spirituality" may be encouraged, but not conventional religions.

The left tax resisters also include a sizable number of anarchists (33.4%), though some of them may be Christian anarchists. Many of the others are Quakers (36%) and/or members of peace groups like the Fellowship of Reconciliation, American Friends Service Committee, and the Catholic Peace Fellowship. These organizations are part of a long tradition of Christian resistance to political authority - taxes, conscription, anti-militarism, and conscientious objection (Schissel, 1968; Muste, 1968; Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1979). Christian tax resistance based on pacifism, credal or biblical writings or individual conscience is an explicitly articulated position in these circles (Kaufman, 1975; Durland, 1979).

#### MEASURES OF PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PERSONALITY

Unlike the results discussed above, the scales measuring personal responsibility and personality do not yield a pattern that distinguishes resisters from nonresisters. What the findings for these scales suggest instead is a split between the libertarian and the left resisters that is related to ideology rather than resistance. But if these findings do not tell us about the difference between

resisters and nonresisters, they do illustrate once again how consistent the expressed attitudes of these resisters are with their professed political beliefs.

#### Feeling of Being Different

However, a test response which does prove to be characteristic of most resisters and which tends to distinguish them from nonresisters is a feeling of being different as a child or adolescent. Over 90% of the draft resisters, anarchists and anti-nuclear resisters say they felt different, as compared with only slightly over half of the two nonresister groups. The trend for the left and libertarian tax resisters is similar to the other resisters, though only the libertarians are significantly different from the nonresisters. However, since the factor of group membership is not significant in the regression analysis for the anti-nuclear and draft resisters, some caution should be exercised in interpreting these results. Other factors such as age could be accounting for the differences. Perhaps, younger people, whether resisters or not, raised in more recent and changing times are more likely to feel different than those raised in earlier generations. Since the resisters who are somewhat less likely to have felt different are the older ones - the libertarian and left tax resisters - the difference in generations may be a real factor.

Previous studies of "young radicals," however, have also found an "early sense of specialness." "What distinguished virtually all of [the young radicals]," writes Kenneth Keniston, "was a feeling, from an early age of being somehow different, separate, apart and exceptional..." (Keniston, 1971, p.221). So, even though the results for some of the resister groups are ambiguous, there are grounds for suspecting that the difference is a real one.

The resisters' sense of being different as a child or adolescent suggests that the process which brought them to the political stance which sets them apart, began operating when they were very young. Future research on the political socialization of resisters would do well to examine the unique personal and family experiences that could have influenced such feelings. The role that feeling different as an adult may play is another potential area to explore. If one feels "out of step" already, then it may be relatively easy to move even further from the political mainstream. The resisters' feeling of being different does not, however, seem to have resulted in nihilistic alienation. Like Raskolnikov, these resisters feel above the system, but unlike him, they have constructive alternatives to offer.

#### Personal Responsibility

Ascription of personal responsibility, as measured in this study, does not turn out to differentiate resisters

from nonresisters. Only a few differences were found. The two libertarian groups and the anti-nuclear resisters are more accepting of personal responsibility than the liberals, but only the individualist anarchists are more so than the conservatives.

These results may in some part be due to the inadequacy of the scale. Only four items were used in the final scale, and these items measure only one aspect of the concept of personal responsibility - accountability for one's actions, no matter what the circumstances. Hedging on these items does not preclude the possibility of feeling moral accountability in particular situations. Schwartz (1970) contends that moral norms are activated when two conditions prevail: awareness that the action has consequences for the welfare of others, and ascription of responsibility to oneself for the action. The wording of the items on this scale does not explicitly draw attention to the possibility that the actions in question have consequences for others. Nor do the items tap another important dimension of the concept of personal responsibility - moral obligation to help others.

Because of the way that this scale defines personal responsibility, it may be measuring ideological differences that have little to do with resistance per se but a great deal to do with differences in values between libertarian and left philosophies.

The libertarian philosophy explicitly and repeatedly emphasizes the idea that the individual is responsible for his or her actions (Rand, 1961; Branden, 1974; Rothbard, 1974a; Breggin, 1980). The idea that "society" or social forces determine one's actions is rejected. "A man's social environment," writes libertarian psychologist Nathaniel Branden, "can provide incentives to think or it can make the task harder...but the social environment cannot determine a man's thinking or nonthinking" (Branden, 1974, p. 430).

In contrast, liberal and left ideologies give more credence to the idea that society or the social environment determine the actions of individuals to a greater or lesser extent, as with the cliché that "poverty creates crime." The rejection of the idea that an individual is always responsible for his or her actions is also compatible with the group-oriented outlook of the communist anarchists, and to a large extent, the rest of the radical left.

The direction of the scores on the Personal Responsibility Scale are generally consistent with the argument that the results reflect ideological differences between the libertarian and left groups. The two libertarian groups have the highest scores while the liberals, communist anarchists and left tax resisters have the lowest. The draft resisters, composed of both libertarians and leftists, have a mean score in between the two extremes while the conservatives, who

also extoll the virtues of personal responsibility in their literature but not so adamantly as libertarians, also have a mean score in between.

The only group score that cannot be explained in terms of a left/libertarian split is the anti-nuclear resisters. This may be a genuine case where ascription of personal responsibility and resistance are linked. "In the wake of the long chain of nuclear accidents," reads a SHAD leaflet, "we felt we had to take decisive and dramatic action" (SHAD, 1980a). The perceived threat of nuclear power plus a feeling of obligation to do something about it may be primary motivations for these activists. To be willing to be arrested and carted off to jail may require a strong sense of personal moral responsibility.

However, while the other left groups may feel that individuals are not always responsible for their actions, these groups do seem to have a strong sense of moral obligation to help others, as will be discussed in the section on moral judgment.

#### Independence/Autonomy

The results on the Independence/Autonomy Scale, where resisters were expected to have higher scores than the non-resisters, may also reflect a split along ideological lines.

As is the case on the Personal Responsibility Scale, the two libertarian groups have higher scores than the left groups. This time, however, their scores are significantly higher than the conservatives rather than the liberals. And in direct opposition to the hypothesis, the communist anarchists and left tax resisters measure less autonomous than the liberals.

The high scores of the libertarians are consistent with their philosophy as expressed in their literature. From the "sovereignty of the individual" proclaimed by the 19th century individualist anarchists to the "virtue of selfishness" asserted by Ayn Rand, libertarianism is more than anything else a philosophy of individualism (Andrews, 1966; Rand, 1961; Rothbard, 1974a; Chodorov, 1980). Consonant with these professed values as well as the results, earlier research has also found libertarians to be high in measured level of autonomy (Presley, 1971).

But previous studies have also found radical activists to be high in autonomy (Haan, Smith & Block, 1968; Kerpelman, 1972). A closer examination of the scale gives a clue as to why the communist anarchists and left tax resisters have lower scores relative to the others. The autonomy scale used in the Haan, Smith and Block study is from the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist & Yonge, 1968). It includes

items measuring political and social autonomy as well as personal independence. Some of the items in the Attitude toward Authority Scale (on which the communist anarchists and left tax resisters did so well) are from the OPI Autonomy Scale. But the definition of independence/autonomy on the Interpersonal Orientation Scale is much narrower. Items like "I like to plan things by myself" are measuring personal independence, not political autonomy. The communist anarchists and left tax resisters are neither political nor social conformists but they do believe more strongly in group efforts and mutual aid than most people. Though "[t]he Self must always be identifiable in the revolution, not overwhelmed by it..." writes Bookchin, the "liberation of the Self involves, above all, a social process" (Bookchin, 1970, p. 330-331).

#### Other Personality Traits

No differences were predicted on the personality variables of sociability and need for social support. Although a few significant differences were found using the t-tests, the regression analyses do not show group membership to be a significant factor in predicting scores on these scales. Any differences, therefore, are suggestive rather than conclusive.

However, the few differences that were found are not inconsistent with the previously discussed differences in personal values among the resisters. Those with the highest independence/autonomy scores - the two libertarian groups - are also the ones with low scores on the Need for Social Support Scale. The two libertarian groups are also the lowest on the Sociability Scale while the individualist anarchists are lowest on the Gregariousness Scale. These results are compatible with their professed individualism. Consistent with their group-oriented philosophy, the communist anarchists have high scores on both sociability and need for social support while the trend for the left tax resisters is similar.

We can therefore conclude that there may be personality differences between libertarians and leftists, and even, sometimes, the nonresisters, but these differences have little to do with willingness to resist. Personality, as hypothesized, is not related to resistance in this study.

## MORAL REASONING AND MOTIVATION

To accept passively an unjust system is to cooperate with that system; thereby the oppressed become as evil as the oppressor. Noncooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good.

--Martin Luther King, Jr.

The resisters in this study are characterized by high or principled levels of moral reasoning. Though the DIT scores on the libertarians and anarchists present special problems because of what I have argued is a content bias in the scoring of the Defining Issues Test, the overall level of moral reasoning reflected by the scores of the resisters is high by any comparison. The P% scores of all the resister groups, as well as the liberals, are well above the mean of 35 for a general adult population. Since most studies find few subjects with scores above 50, any score over 50 is considered high (Rest, 1979).

When level of education, the only variable besides IQ which is consistently correlated with DIT scores, is taken into account, the results for the resisters look even more impressive. Rest (1979) reports mean P% scores of 42.3 for a general college-educated population and 53.2 for a population with graduate level education. Other studies have found average P% scores of 47.3 for graduates and 50.1 for current graduate students (reported in Rest,

1979). Since only a minority of the anti-nuclear and none of the draft resisters have even finished college, their high scores of 60.2 and 57.9 are considerably above the average for their level of education. Though more of the left tax resisters have finished college (36%), and many have a graduate level education (39%), their score of 59.75 is still well above average. In spite of the problematic scores of the libertarians and anarchists, even they are slightly above average for their mean level of education since only a minority in these groups have a graduate level education.

Virtually the only samples with mean P% scores as high as most of the resisters are groups composed primarily of graduate students in courses related to moral philosophy. Rest (1979) reports, for example, that a sample of Ph.D. students in moral philosophy and political science averaged 65.2, seminarians in a liberal protestant seminary, 59.8, and experienced teachers enrolled in a special workshop on moral and cognitive development, 56.8.

The liberals, who have the highest level of education in this study (56% have a graduate level education), are, with a mean P% score of 54.03, slightly above the average.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> There is a nonsignificant trend for the female liberals to have higher P% scores than male liberals. The difference between liberal men and women is significant on the D score. The possible implications of these findings are discussed in Appendix VI.

However, the conservatives, with a mean score of 36.96, are below average for their level of education since 28% have finished college and 41.4% have a graduate level education.

Though no studies of political activists are included in Rest's summary of DIT research (Rest, 1979), he reports, in an earlier work, some findings that are associated with conservative and liberal political attitudes. A "Law and Order" test is negatively correlated with DIT scores. "The higher the DIT scores," writes Rest, "the less tendency for a subject to endorse value positions that attribute almost limitless power to authorities or that value maintenance of social institutions at high costs to individual welfare and freedom" (Rest, 1977, p.23). Conversely, DIT scores are positively correlated with a test of "libertarian, democratic attitudes" and belief in civil liberties. The resisters' rejection of authority and their high DIT scores are thus in keeping with Rest's findings, as are the scores of the conservatives and liberals. The only discrepancies from this pattern are the libertarians and anarchists, who cannot be accused of not being strong advocates of civil liberties, yet have lower DIT scores than the other resisters. (This is yet another reason to question their DIT scores.)

"Moral judgment scores," declares Rest, "attempt to tap the basic conceptual framework by which a subject

analyzes a social-moral problem and judges the proper course of action" (Rest, 1979, p.5.1). The conceptual framework of these resisters, as evidenced by their high DIT scores, is a highly developed one that places great importance on principled moral reasoning. Other results in the present study are consistent with the idea that the resisters' thinking is characterized by a concern with moral principles. Their strong agreement with the statement that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say, for example, reflects an attitude compatible with Kohlberg's Stage 6, the stage of orientation toward "conscience as a guiding agent" (Kohlberg, 1969). Moreover, moral principles and concern for social injustice are spontaneously given as motivations for political involvement by many of the resisters.

Their conceptual framework for moral decision-making distinguishes the resisters sharply from the conservative nonresisters as well as the general population. The conservatives have significantly lower DIT scores, do not express strong agreement with the idea of the supremacy of individual conscience, nor do the motivations for political involvement they express convey a concern with moral principles or social injustice.

The liberals' framework for moral reasoning is, however, in some respects similar to the resisters. The

DIT scores of the liberals are not significantly different; though when level of education is taken into account, there may be a trend for the resisters to have mean scores that are more above the average than the liberals. Many of the liberals also share a concern with social injustice. At the same time, however, many of the liberals give conventional political motivations, which none of the resisters do. What the liberals do not share with the resisters is a strong belief in the supremacy of individual conscience over the law. The liberals' high mean scores on Stage 5A and relatively lower scores on Stages 5B and 6 suggest that their moral reasoning is more oriented toward the morality of social contract than the morality of conscience or more abstract non-legalistic principles.

Lockwood (1976), in discussing the extent to which an individual's ethical philosophy provides guidance in determining his or her views on matters of public policy, concludes that "there is...a relation between a person's reasoning about public policy and his moral reasoning as defined by the Kohlberg scale (Lockwood, 1976, p. 323). The findings in this study that rejection of authority and willingness to disobey authority are correlated with high level of moral reasoning, as defined by a test based on Kohlberg's theory, lends support to Lockwood's conclusion. Lockwood notes, however, that the link between moral reasoning and actual behavior in regard to public policy has been inade-

quately researched.

The previous research dealing with the link between principled reasoning and resistance behavior which does exist is strongly supported by the new evidence of the present study. As we recall from the introduction, Kohlberg (1970) reports that 75% of the Stage 6 principled reasoning subjects disobeyed in the Milgram experiment on obedience to authority while only 13% of lower stage subjects disobeyed. In the Haan, Smith and Block (1968) study, 50% of the Kohlberg Stage 5 and 80% of the Stage 6 students sat in during the Free Speech Movement protests while only 10% of those at conventional stages did. "Active moralism" was also found to be a distinguishing characteristic of those who rescued Jews from the Nazis in World War II (London, 1970). Thus both previous research and the present study suggest that moral principles play an important role in influencing willingness to disobey authority.

"In the case of voluntary obedience to a legitimate authority," writes Milgram, "the principal sanctions for disobedience come from within the person. They are not dependent on coercion, but stem from the individual's sense of commitment to his role" (Milgram, 1974, p. 141). In contrast to the willing obedient, the resisters in this study have an internalized basis for disobedience, in spite of the threat of government coercion. Rather than

being committed to a role that entails a sense of obligation to obey authority, these resisters are committed to moral principles strong enough to overcome the fear of government sanctions.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The dissenter is every human being at those moments in his life when he resigns momentarily from the herd and thinks for himself.

--Archibald MacLeish

What kind of people resist authority? What characteristics distinguish resisters from nonresisters? As suggested in the introduction, the differences for these political resisters lie in the realm of cognitive beliefs and values rather than temperament traits. Rejection of political and social authority, a belief that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than the law, professed unwillingness to exercise authority over others, lack of religious affiliation, and a feeling of being different as a child or adolescent are the characteristics which significantly distinguish the resisters from the nonresisters. Also important in describing the resisters is their high level of moral reasoning, as defined by the Defining Issues Test, as well as motivations for political involvement that include anger with the political system and concern with moral principles and social injustice.

Measurements of ascription of personal responsibility, independence/autonomy, sociability, need for social support, and gregariousness do not differentiate resisters, as a

whole, from nonresisters. These results reflect instead an ideological split along left/libertarian lines, a finding that is consistent with the argument that the resisters have deeply-held value systems which guide and determine their political behavior.

Rokeach has argued persuasively for the importance of viewing a person's character as a system of values:

A person's character, which is seen from a personality psychologist's standpoint as a cluster of fixed traits, can be reformulated from an internal, phenomenological standpoint as a system of values....A major advantage gained in thinking about a person as a system of values rather than a cluster of traits is that it becomes possible to conceive of his undergoing change as a result of changes in social conditions. In contrast, the trait concept has built into it a characterological bias that forecloses such possibilities for change in advance. (Rokeach, 1973, p. 21).

Seeing the attitudes of the resisters as a system of values not only ties these attitudes into a coherent, inter-related, and logical whole, it enables us to see resistance as a process rather than merely a response determined by an isolated trait. It is not just principled moral reasoning alone, for example, that makes the resisters willing to disobey authority. For these resisters, the process of resistance has three major elements. All three must be present for resistance to occur.

The first element is the value system itself - the dynamic basis for guiding the behavior and attitudes of these resisters. Evidence that the attitudes characteristic of

the resisters are part of an important value system comes from both the consistency of the attitudes across different measures and their consistency with the resisters' professed ideological beliefs. "The more a given belief is functionally connected or in communication with other beliefs, the more implications and consequences it has for other beliefs," declares Rokeach, "the more central the belief" (Rokeach, 1968, p. 5).

An important component of the value systems of the resisters is their conceptual framework for moral reasoning. A level of moral reasoning that is considerably above the average for the general population distinguishes the resisters from the conservatives but not the liberals. In keeping with their principled moral reasoning, many of the resisters say they were motivated to become politically active because of moral principle or concern with social injustice. However, unlike many of both the liberals and conservatives, none of the resisters express conventional political reasons for becoming politically active.

The second element in the process of resistance is the activation of these value systems through perception of political injustice. All the resister groups not only imply their dissatisfaction and anger with governmental actions through the very fact of their resistance, they explicitly claim dissatisfaction and anger as motivating

factors for their political involvement. The liberals, in contrast, do not say they were motivated by anger or dissatisfaction. Some of the conservatives also express dissatisfaction or anger but almost none mention a concern for social injustice.

It is the third element in the process of resistance that differentiates the resisters clearly from the liberals. The resisters' rejection of the legitimacy of authority, coupled with their belief that individual conscience is a better guide to conduct than the law, distinguishes them from the liberals as well as the conservatives. In these respects, the liberals and conservatives are far more like each other than the resisters. "Ideological justification," writes Milgram, "is vital in obtaining willing obedience, for it permits the person to see his behavior as serving a desirable end" (Milgram, 1974, P. 142). These activists have instead an ideological justification for resisting.

"It is compliance," declares Milgram, "that carries the passive voice. The act of disobedience requires the mobilization of inner resources and their transformation beyond inner preoccupation, beyond merely polite verbal exchange into a domain of action" (Milgram, 1974, p. 163). The inner resources of these political resisters to authority are well-articulated and deeply-held value systems that

place great importance on principles of social justice and individual conscience. Their moral principles, coupled with a rejection of the legitimacy of political authority are the wellspring of their resistance to authority.

APPENDIX I

SURVEY OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES

**About These Questionnaires** The two sets of questionnaires you are receiving—*Survey of Political Attitudes and Opinions About Social Problems*—are being used for a comparative study of the social and political attitudes of people with different political orientations. The data from this study, which will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous, are being collected for my doctoral dissertation research in the Social Psychology program at the City University of New York. Your cooperation in filling out both questionnaires as completely as possible will be greatly appreciated. Please return them to me at the address below, by *May 31, 1980*. Thank you.  
Sharon Presley, 24-42 24th Street, Astoria, New York 11102

# Survey of Political Attitudes

## A. Personal Background

- 1 Age \_\_\_\_\_ 2 Sex  Female  Male
- 3 Level of education attained:  
 a. did not finish high school  
 b. high-school graduate  
 c. some college  
 d. completed college  
 e. some graduate or professional school  
 f. graduate or professional degree  
 g. vocational or trade school
- 4 Major in college (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5 Degrees, if any (specify field) \_\_\_\_\_
- 6 Your occupation \_\_\_\_\_
- 7 Are you (check one)  single  single, living together  
 married  separated  divorced  widowed
- 8 Your mate's occupation (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_
- 9 a. Your own 1979 income:  up to \$5,000  
 over \$5,000 to \$12,000  
 over \$12,000 to \$18,000  
 over \$18,000 to \$30,000  
 over \$30,000 to \$60,000  
 over \$60,000  
 b. 1979 household income:  up to \$5,000  
 over \$5,000 to \$12,000  
 over \$12,000 to \$18,000  
 over \$18,000 to \$30,000  
 over \$30,000 to \$60,000  
 over \$60,000
- 10 Your religious preference:  
 a. Protestant (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Roman Catholic  
 c. Jewish (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. agnostic  
 e. atheist  
 f. other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 g. indifferent
- 11 Do you attend religious services  
 weekly  occasionally  
 fairly regularly  never
- 12 Your political-party affiliation:  
 a. Conservative  f. other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Democratic  
 c. Liberal  
 d. Libertarian  
 e. Republican  
 g. Independent/non-partisan  
 h. not a registered voter
- 13 Which of the following best describes your political views? If more than one is appropriate, mark a "1" by your first choice and a "2" by your second choice.  
 a. anarchist-communist  g. libertarian  
 b. anarchist-individualist  h. Marxist  
 c. conservative  i. middle-of-the road  
 d. conservative-libertarian  j. other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. democratic socialist  
 f. liberal
- 14 What political or issue-oriented groups do you belong to or work with? For example: National Organization for Women, Save the Whales, Young Republicans, War Resisters League. (Use full names, not initials.) \_\_\_\_\_
- 15 Which of the following activities have you participated in during the last two years? Check all that apply.  
 a. signed petitions for a cause  
 b. contributed money to a political candidate  
 c. contributed money to a political issue  
 d. worked for a political party and/or candidate  
 e. worked for a political issue  
 f. voter registration  
 g. attended meetings regularly  
 h. attempted to influence lawmakers (lobbying, letters, etc.)  
 i. distributed literature  
 j. volunteer work in political group  
 k. officer (or other post) or paid staff of political group  
 l. gave speeches, participated in panels, etc.  
 m. attended demonstration or rally  
 n. broke a law to show opposition to a law or policy  
 o. other \_\_\_\_\_
- 16 a. What motivated you to become involved in your present political activities? \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. How long have you been involved in these activities?  
 one year or less  5 to 10 years  
 one to 5 years  more than 10 years
- 17 Were you involved in other political activities before the present one?  Yes.  No. If so, for how long?  
 one year or less  5 to 10 years  
 one to 5 years  more than 10 years
- 18 What degree of influence have others who share your political attitudes had on your willingness to engage in your present political activities?  
 a. none  e. a great deal  
 b. very little  f. not sure  
 c. moderate amount
- 19 What do you see as the possible consequences of your political involvement? What have been the actual consequences in the past and present? Check all that apply.
- |   | possible                 | actual                   |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. positive social reinforcement from the community                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. social disapproval from the community                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. advancement in job or political career                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. government harassment (FBI file, tax audit, etc.)                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. government sanctions (arrest, seizure of property or salary, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. personal satisfaction  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. other (specify) _____  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. very few consequences at all                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. not sure, no opinion   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please go on to the next page

## B. Family Background

The following questions deal with your family background. Please respond with the answers that were true during your childhood (up to age 18).

- 1 a. How many brothers? \_\_\_\_\_ b. How many sisters? \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. Your birth order \_\_\_\_\_
- 2 Parents' (or guardians') level of education:
- |   |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | mother                   | father                   |
| a. did not finish high school           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. high-school graduate                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. some college                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. completed college                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. some graduate or professional school | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. graduate or professional degree      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. vocational or business school        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. don't know; not applicable           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 3 Parents' (or guardians') occupation:  
 mother \_\_\_\_\_ father \_\_\_\_\_
- 4 Parents' (or guardians') religious preference:
- |   |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|   | mother                   | father                   |
| a. Protestant (specify) m _____ f _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Roman Catholic                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Jewish (specify) m _____ f _____     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. agnostic                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. atheist                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. other (specify) m _____ f _____      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. indifferent                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 5 Parents' (or guardians') political-party affiliation
- |                                    |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                    | mother                   | father                   |
| a. Conservative                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Democratic                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Liberal                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Republican                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Socialist                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Communist Party USA             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. other (specify) m _____ f _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 6 Which of the following best describes your parents' (guardians') political views?
- |                                    |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                                    | mother                   | father                   |
| a. apolitical, none                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. conservative                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. democratic socialist            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. liberal                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Marxist                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. middle-of-the-road              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. uncertain, unknown              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. other (specify) m _____ f _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 7 How often did your parents engage in political activities such as those listed in question A.15 (excluding voting)?
- |                 |                          |                          |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                 | mother                   | father                   |
| a. never        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. rarely       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. occasionally | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. frequently   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 8 What political groups, if any, did your parents belong to or work with (full name, not initials)?  
 Mother \_\_\_\_\_  
 Father \_\_\_\_\_
- 9 Did your parents think it was important to be aware of injustice in society and concerned with mitigating it?
- |                       |                          |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                       | mother                   | father                   |
| a. not important      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. somewhat important | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- |                   |                          |                          |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                   | mother                   | father                   |
| c. very important | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. not sure       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
- 10 Did you engage in political activities (student government, social issue groups, protest groups, etc.) as a child or adolescent (through age 18)?  
 a. not at all  b. occasionally  c. frequently
- 11 If so, specify what groups \_\_\_\_\_
- 12 When you were a child and adolescent, did you feel  
 a. very much like other youngsters  
 b. somewhat like others  
 c. no opinion, not sure  
 d. somewhat different from others  
 e. very different from others

## C. Personality Inventory

How well does each statement describe you?

- |  |                          |                            |                                     |                                     |                            |                          |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
|  | Always<br>describe<br>me | Probably<br>describe<br>me | Probably<br>don't<br>describe<br>me | Probably<br>don't<br>describe<br>me | Probably<br>describe<br>me | Always<br>describe<br>me |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
- 1 I like to plan things by myself
- 2 I like it when people go out of their way to include me in
- 3 I like being in positions of authority
- 4 I like to be with people a great deal
- 5 When I have a problem I like to work it out by myself
- 6 I like it when my friends worry about me
- 7 In any group, I like to have a permanent position
- 8 I would rather be in a group that is friendly than one that is cool and efficient
- 9 People often think I am independent in my ways
- 10 I like to have people do thoughtful little things for me
- 11 I enjoy directing the activities of others
- 12 I think being kind and gentle with friends is more important than asserting yourself, even when you are right
- 13 I like to be challenged by new situations and new things
- 14 I want my friends to be loyal to me
- 15 I do not like to take a subordinate position
- 16 I feel a warm, friendly atmosphere in a group is probably the only way to get efficiency in the long run
- 17 I try to be independent in my actions
- 18 I like to have the feeling that people really care about me
- 19 I like to take charge of things in almost any kind of situation
- 20 I become concerned with the problems of my friends very easily
- 21 I like the idea of getting out on my own
- 22 I like to be remembered by my friends
- 23 I like to supervise others
- 24 I enjoy taking the initiative in meeting people

## D. Political and Social Attitudes

Each of the items below is a statement of an attitude or opinion that some people hold. For each item, check the box that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure or opinionless	Disagree	Strongly disagree		Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure or opinionless	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1 In the final analysis, parents generally turn out to be right about things.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	19 Scientists and teachers should never do work that is not true to their personal beliefs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 There should be more respect for law and order.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	20 There are times when it is right for a person to break the rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Society does not put enough restraint on the individual.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	21 Resistance to authority may be a sign of maturity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 No matter how much a person is provoked, they are always responsible for whatever they do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	22 Parents should make certain that they know as much as possible about what their teenagers are doing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 In a business organization a good vice-president's job is to be a supporter of existing policies, not a critic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	23 It is unfair to condemn a soldier for obeying commanding officers even if the orders are immoral.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Communities would be better off if they established their own organizations as an alternative to federally administered services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	24 With the pressure for grades and widespread cheating in schools nowadays, the person who cheats occasionally is not really much at fault.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 In college classes, the amount of useful material presented would be likely to increase if students worked with the instructors to determine course content.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	25 It is not the duty of a citizen to support his country when it is wrong.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8 When a 12-year-old child has a bedroom of his own, he should be permitted to clean it or not as he chooses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	26 Occasionally in life a person finds herself in a situation in which she has absolutely no control over what she does to others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Unquestioning obedience is not a virtue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	27 You can't blame a person these days for not wanting to get involved when they see someone in trouble on the streets or in the subways or buses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 You can't blame basically good people who are forced by their environment to be inconsiderate of others.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	28 Disobedience to the government is never justified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 I am in favor of strict enforcement of all laws no matter what the consequences.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	29 If a public high-school student does not conform to the dress code, he or she should be sent home from school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 Every person should interpret the Bible or other religious texts for him- or herself.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	30 Children should be taught that the religious tradition of their family is only one of a number of beliefs that they might find satisfying.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 We should respect the beliefs of our forefathers and not think that we know better than they did.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	31 In an elementary school, a good teacher should schedule blocks of free time so that students may choose some of their own activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14 Most of the time, college students should study a curriculum that has been planned by an experienced instructor rather than choose their own study topics.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	32 Extenuating circumstances never completely remove a person's responsibility for his or her actions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 A person's conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	33 In college classes, class attendance should be required by the instructor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16 Being upset or preoccupied does not excuse a person's doing things she would ordinarily not do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	34 A guaranteed annual wage would provide security, which would promote self-reliance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17 One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	35 Jury members should be chosen from adults who volunteer for jury duty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 What happens to me is largely my own doing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	36 A person's conscience is a better guide to conduct than whatever the law might say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**How to return your completed questionnaires:**

When you have filled out both the Survey of Political Attitudes and the Opinions About Social Problems questionnaires, please put the four Opinions pages inside this Survey folder, fold the six-sheet packet in half so this page faces out, staple the packet together at the bottom, and mail it. Please be sure to mail it by May 31, 1980.

to mail, staple here  
after folding in half

fold here to mail

**FIRST CLASS MAIL**

To: Sharon Presley  
24-42 24th Street  
Astoria, New York 11102

to mail, staple here  
after folding in half

## APPENDIX II

### Conservative Tax Resisters

Resistance to authority is not just confined to people with left-wing or libertarian political beliefs, as issues like tax resistance, school bussing, and laetrile smuggling have shown. However, judging from the results of this study, the personal basis for conservative resistance to authority is not the same as for leftists and libertarians.

On the measures used in this study, the conservative tax resisters are for the most part similar to the conservative nonresisters (Tables 17 & 18). But the conservative tax resisters do differ in several important respects from the other conservatives. The conservative tax resisters are significantly more rejecting of authority and measure significantly higher in degree of independence/autonomy. The conservative tax resisters are also more likely to give anger, dissatisfaction, and principled motives and fewer conventional reasons for their political involvement than the conservative nonresisters (see Table 19).

There is no significant difference between the conservative tax resisters and the liberals in degree of rejection of authority. The conservative tax resisters express fewer principled motives for political involvement but more anger and dissatisfaction reasons and fewer conventional motives than the liberals.

There is no significant difference between the conservative tax resisters and the nonresister groups in directiveness or in percentage expressing conventional religious affiliations. (Table 18)

On the scales measuring personal responsibility and personality traits, there are only two significant differences. As noted above, the conservative tax resisters have a significantly higher level of independence/autonomy than the conservative nonresisters, as well as a significantly lower need for social support than the liberals. There are no significant differences between the conservative tax resisters and the two nonresister groups in personal responsibility, sociability and gregariousness.

The conservative tax resisters have a significantly lower score on the P% and D scores of the Defining Issues Test than the liberals (Tables 17 & 41). The differences between the conservative tax resisters and the conservative nonresisters on the two scores are not significant.

The demographic characteristics of the conservative tax resisters are included in Appendix III.

The conservative tax resisters were obtained from the United Taxpayers of New Jersey, a seminar on tax resistance conducted by prominent tax resistance advocate Marvin Cooley, and via a request sent out by the editor of the Patriot Cannon (a tax revolt newsletter) to people on his national mailing list.

Table 17 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR THE CONSERVATIVE TAX RESISTERS ON  
SELECTED MEASURES FROM THE SURVEY OF  
POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND THE DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Scale	N	Mean	SD
Attitude toward Authority	22	23.95 *	3.63
Directiveness	22	11.86 ns	1.75
Personal Responsibility	22	14.45 ns	2.56
Independence/ Autonomy	22	17.81 **	2.42
Need for Social Support	22	17.86 ***	2.71
Sociability	22	8.45 ns	1.62
Gregariousness	22	5.32 ns	1.52
DIT P%	14	36.94 ****	11.18

\* different from conservatives at  $p < .05$ .

\*\* different from conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

Table 18

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF  
CONSERVATIVE TAX RESISTERS

---

N	No Religion % n	Unconventional % n	Conventional % n
21	28.6 (6)	5.00 (1)	71.4 (15)

---

Differences from nonresister groups are not significant

Table 19            MOTIVATIONS FOR POLITICAL  
 INVOLVEMENT FOR CONSERVATIVE  
 TAX RESISTERS

Type of Motivation	Motivation	n
Dissatisfaction	Dissatisfaction, anger with government policies	11
Dissatisfaction	Fear of socialism or communism	3
Principled	Religious beliefs	3
Dissatisfaction	Taxes	2
Principled	Freedom	2
Dissatisfaction	Concern for future	1
Conventional	Love of country	1
Total dissatisfaction motives =		73.9%
Total principled motives =		21.7%
Total conventional motives =		4.3%

## APPENDIX III

### Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

#### Age

The mean age of the groups, as Table 20 shows, varies considerably. The draft resisters are understandably the youngest (19.2 years). The anti-nuclear resisters tend to be in their middle twenties, while the two anarchist groups average in their early thirties. The left tax resisters, liberals and conservatives have a mean age in the late thirties. The conservative and libertarian tax resisters are the oldest, with a mean age in the middle forties.

#### Level of education

The entire sample, both resisters and nonresisters, is a highly educated one. (Table 21) In each of the groups, at least 80% have had some college. Over 50% in each group, except the two youngest (draft and anti-nuclear resisters) are college graduates or beyond. The liberals have the highest level (79.4% with a B.A. or more, 55% at a graduate level). With the exception of the liberals, the differences in education seem more related to age than group.

#### Major in College

Consistent with previous studies of radical political activists (Haan, Smith & Block, 1968; Mankoff & Flacks, 1971), the majority in almost every group, both resister

Table 20 MEAN AGE AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

Group	N	Mean Age	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Draft	11	19.2	.405
Anti-Nuclear	35	26.2	9.7
Communist Anarchists	29	31.7	11.6
Individualist Anarchists	50	32.7	6.3
Left Tax	35	37.4	15.9
Libertarian Tax	21	43.7	11.4
Conservative Tax	22	44.2	10.1
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Conservatives	29	37.1	17.5
Liberals	34	38.4	15.5

Table 21

## LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Group	N	High School	Some	College	Grad
		or less	College	Grad	School
		% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<u>RESISTERS</u>					
Communist Anarchists	29	16.3 (3)	31.0 (9)	37.9 (11)	20.7 (6)
Individualist Anarchists	50	2.0 (1)	26.0 (13)	46.0 (23)	26.0 (13)
Anti-Nuclear	36	11.1 (4)	52.8 (19)	27.8 (10)	8.3 (3)
Left Tax	36	5.6 (2)	19.4 (7)	36.1 (13)	38.9 (14)
Draft	12		100.0 (12)		
Libertarian Tax	21	4.8 (1)	38.1 (8)	19.0 (4)	38.1 (8)
Conservative Tax	22	18.2 (4)	18.2 (4)	31.8 (7)	31.8 (7)
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>					
Conservatives	29	6.9 (2)	24.1 (7)	27.6 (8)	41.4 (12)
Liberals	34	5.9 (2)	14.7 (5)	23.5 (8)	55.9 (19)

Table 22 MAJORS OF THOSE WHO ATTENDED COLLEGE

Group	N	Social Sciences/ Humanities		Physical Science/Math		Business		Other	
		% (n)		% (n)		% (n)		% (n)	
<u>RESISTERS</u>									
Left Tax	30	73.3 (22)		13.3 (4)		3.3 (1)	10.0 (3)		
Individualist Anarchists	44	68.2 (30)		22.7 (10)		4.5 (2)	4.5 (2)		
Communist Anarchists	21	66.7 (14)		19.0 (4)		4.8 (1)	9.5 (2)		
Anti-Nuclear	24	66.7 (16)		16.7 (4)			16.7 (4)		
Draft	9	66.7 (6)		11.1 (1)		11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)		
Libertarian Tax	16	31.125 (5)		43.75 (7)		18.75 (3)	6.25 (1)		
Conservative	15	46.7 (7)		26.7 (4)		26.7 (4)			
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>									
Conservatives	20	55.0 (11)		5.0 (1)		40.0 (8)			
Liberals	31	90.3 (28)		3.2 (1)		6.5 (2)			

Percentages are rounded off

and nonresister, majored in the social sciences or humanities (Table 22). The exceptions are the conservative and libertarian tax resisters, who were more likely to have majored in the physical sciences than the other groups. The majors of the liberals are overwhelmingly social sciences or humanities (90.3%) while the conservatives are the ones most likely to have some business-related major.

#### Occupation

The occupations of the sample are consonant with their high level of education (Table 23). A majority in every group except the communist anarchists, anti-nuclear and draft resisters (many of whom are still young and/or still in college) are in either business or professional occupations.

#### Political Views

Table 24 shows the distribution of political views in the sample. The communist anarchists and individualist anarchists are, of course, defined in terms of their political views. Many of the anti-nuclear resisters are also anarchists - 30.6% (11) are communist anarchists and 13.9% (5) label themselves individualist anarchists (but their use of the term may not be the same as defined in this study since only one also labeled himself a "libertarian"). Democratic socialists comprised 33.3% (12) of the anti-

Table 23

## OCCUPATIONS

Group	N	Professional	Business	Non-profes- sional	Student	Other
		% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<u>RESISTERS</u>						
Individualist Anarchists	50	64.0 (32)	12.0 (6)	14.0 (7)	10.0 (5)	
Conservative Tax	22	54.5 (12)	18.2 (4)	22.7 (5)		4.5 (1)
Libertarian Tax	19	52.6 (10)	21.05 (4)	21.05 (4)		5.3 (1)
Left Tax	34	61.8 (21)	2.9 (1)	29.4 (10)		5.9 (2)
Communist Anarchists	28	42.9 (12)		25.0 (7)	14.3 (4)	17.9 (5)
Anti-Nuclear	32	37.5 (12)		37.5 (12)	21.9 (7)	3.1 (1)
Draft	11	18.2 (2)		18.2 (2)	63.6 (7)	
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>						
Liberals	34	67.6 (23)	5.9 (2)	5.9 (2)	14.7 (5)	
Conservatives	28	53.6 (15)	17.9 (5)	17.9 (5)	3.6 (1)	7.1 (2)

Percentages are rounded off.

Table 24 POLITICAL VIEWS

Group	N	Communist Anarchist % (n)	Individual-Anarchist % (n)	Libertarian % (n)	Democratic Socialist % (n)	Liberal % (n)	Other Left % (n)
<u>RESISTERS</u>							
Communist Anarchists	29	100.0 (29)					
Individualist Anarchists	50		100.0 (50)				
Anti-Nuclear	36	30.6 (11)	13.9 (5)***		33.3 (12)	5.6 (2)	16.7 (6)**
Left Tax	36	27.8 (10)	5.6 (2)		30.6 (11)	16.7 (6)	19.4 (7)
Draft	12	25.0 (3)	8.3 (1)	25.0 (3)	25.0 (3)	8.3 (1)	8.3 (1)*
Libertarian Tax	21		38.1 (8)	61.9 (13)			

\* includes one Marxist.

\*\* includes two Marxists.

\*\*\* only one also labeled himself "libertarian."

Percentages are rounded off.

Table 24 cont.

Group	N	Democratic Socialist % (n)	Liberal % (n)	Conservative % (n)	Conservative Libertarian % (n)
Conservative Tax	22			36.4 (8)	63.6 (14)
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>					
Conservatives	29			62.1 (18)	37.9 (11)
Liberals	34	14.7 (5)	85.3 (29)		

Percentages are rounded off.

Table 25 LENGTH OF TIME INVOLVED IN PRESENT POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Group	N	Less than		1-5		5-10		10 or more		Total %
		1 year % (n)	years % (n)	years % (n)	years % (n)	years % (n)	years % (n)	5 years or more		
<u>RESISTERS</u>										
Libertarian Tax	20	5.0 (1)	10.0 (2)	40.0 (8)	45.0 (9)	85.0				
Left Tax	34	2.9 (1)	17.65 (6)	14.3 (4)	42.86 (12)	57.2				
Individualist Anarchists	47	4.2 (2)	21.3 (10)	29.8 (14)	44.7 (21)	74.5				
Conservative Tax	22	13.64 (3)	22.72 (5)	13.64 (3)	50.0 (11)	63.6				
Communist Anarchists	28	7.14 (2)	35.7 (10)	14.3 (4)	42.86 (12)	57.2				
Anti-Nuclear	35	22.9 (8)	48.6 (17)	11.4 (4)	17.1 (6)	28.5				
Draft	12	66.7 (8)	33.4 (4)			0.0				
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>										
Liberals	34	17.6 (6)	20.6 (7)	20.6 (7)	41.2 (14)	61.8				
Conservatives	29	34.5 (10)	24.1 (7)	13.8 (4)	27.6 (8)	41.4				

nuclear resisters while 5.6% (2) are liberals, and 16.7% (6) are assorted other leftists, including two Marxists. The left tax resisters are similar to the anti-nuclear resisters with 27.8% (10) communist anarchists, 5.6% (2) individualist anarchists (neither labeled themselves libertarian), 16.7% (11) liberal, and 19.4% (7) leftist or pacifist. The draft resisters are composed of 25% (3) communist anarchist, 8.3% (1) individualist anarchist (also a libertarian), 25% (3) libertarian, 25% (3) democratic socialist, 8.3% (1) liberal and 8.3% Marxist (a man who gave his second choice as "communist anarchist"). Among the libertarian tax resisters, 38.1% (8) are individualist anarchists and 61.9% (13) are non-anarchist libertarians. Of the conservative tax resisters, 63.6% (14) are conservative-libertarian and 36.4% (8) are conservative. The conservative nonresister group is 62.1% (18) conservative and 37.9% (11) conservative-libertarian. The liberal nonresister group is composed 85.3% (29) liberals and 14.7% (5) democratic socialists (of whom four are women).

#### Length of time involved in present political activities

As Table 25 shows, the majority of the two anarchist groups and all three tax resister groups have been involved in their present political activities for five years or more. Because anti-nuclear demonstrations are recent phe-

Table 26 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR COMMUNIST ANARCHISTS  
 COMPARED TO LIBERALS WITH SELECTED INDEPENDENT  
 VARIABLES AND ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY AS  
 THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p < .01)
Age	.17	.03	-.50D-01	2.4 ns
Level of education	.25	.06	.31	0.5 ns
Mother's level of education	.44	.195	-1.51	18.4
Mother's sense of injustice	.45	.20	.20	0.3 ns
Mother's religion	.50	.25	.91	2.8 ns
Mother's occupation	.55	.31	.88	5.3
Communist Anarchist	.87	.76	7.94	105.9

The independent variables found to be statistically significant in the general regression but not in the regression of individual groups are presented with the first group in each regression table to show which variables were part of the regression analysis.

Table 27 . MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED  
 TO LIBERALS WITH SÉLECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES  
 AND ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY AS THE DEPENDENT  
 VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Individualist Anarchists	Age	.24	.055	-.58D-01	3.0
	Mother's level of education	.35	.13	-.92	9.8
	Individualist Anarchist	.86	.74	8.42	146.6
Draft Resisters	Mother's level of education	.55	.30	-1.69	13.0
	Mother's concern with injustice	.60	.32	.96	4.0
	Draft	.83	.69	7.40	31.3
Left Tax	Age	.193	.037	-.96D-01	11.3
	Level of education	.196	.038	.94	4.5
	Mother's level of education	.28	.08	-1.68	18.9
	Mother's concern with injustice	.31	.09	.70	3.7
	Mother's occupation	.56	.32	1.34	11.6
	Left Tax	.80	.64	5.71	57.4

Table 27 cont.

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Anti-Nuclear Resisters	Age	.33	.11	-.10	6.2
	Level of education	.34	.12	1.70	8.6
	Mother's level of education	.41	.167	-1.37	9.2
	Mother's concern with injustice	.42	.172	.78	4.6
	Mother's occupation	.49	.24	.98	4.1
	Anti-Nuclear	.76	.57	6.76	47.5
Libertarian Tax	Age	.05	.002	-.85D-01	5.9
	Level of education	.08	.006	1.07	5.8
	Mother's level of education	.43	.18	-1.58	13.2
	Mother's occupation	.54	.30	1.33	8.4
	Libertarian tax	.72	.52	4.26	22.4
Conservative	Mother's level of education	.29	.08	-1.22	5.5
	Mother's occupation	.47	.23	1.40	6.71

Table 28 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED  
 TO CONSERVATIVES WITH SELECTED INDEPENDENT VAR-  
 IABLES AND ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHORITY AS THE  
 DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Groups	Variables	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Communist Anarchists	Communist Anarchists	.87	.76	12.54	132.2
Individualist Anarchists	Age	.24	.06	-.59D-01	2.91
	Individualist Anarchists	.88	.78	12.16	199.8
Draft Resisters	Draft	.82	.67	11.28	26.01
Left Tax	Age	.18	.03	-.77	5.9
	Left Tax	.81	.666	9.79	89.6
Anti-Nuclear Resisters	Level of Education	.39	.16	1.37	4.6
	Anti-nuclear	.80	.64	10.60	70.9
Libertarian Tax	Age	.05	.002	-.75D-01	3.3
	Libertarian Tax	.75	.56	8.78	47.8
Conservative Tax	Conservative Tax	.52	.27	4.71	13.0

Table 29 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO LIBERALS WITH SELEC-  
TED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND DIRECTIVENESS AS  
THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Communist Anarchists	Age	.04	.001	-.72D-01	4.1
	Communist Anarchist	.69	.48	-4.99	36.0
Anti-Nuclear	Anti-Nuclear	.55	.31	-3.67	13.8
Left Tax	Age	.36	.13	-.12	17.4
	Left Tax	.65	.42	-4.07	24.4
Individualist Anarchist	Age	.07	.005	-.86D-01	4.5
	Individualist Anarchist	.51	.26	-3.38	19.0
Draft	Age	.08	.007	-.12	3.38
Libertarian Tax	Age	.37	.14	-.80D-01	4.07

Table 30 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR COMMUNIST ANARCHISTS  
 COMPARED TO CONSERVATIVES WITH SELECTED  
 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND DIRECTIVENESS AS  
 THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Age	.17	.03	-.80D-01	8.1
Level of education	.38	.147	1.06	6.5
Sex	.39	.154	.61	0.6 ns
How long involved in present activities	.40	.16	.71	3.7
Birth order	.42	.17	-.47	1.5 ns
Father's concern with injustice	.47	.22	.62	3.2
Communist Anarchist	.70	.49	-4.01	23.8

Table 31 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO CONSERVATIVES WITH  
SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND DIRECTIVENESS  
AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variables	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Anti-Nuclear Resisters	Age	.02	.0003	-.74D-01	5.0
	Level of education	.34	.12	1.20	6.0
	Birth order	.47	.22	-.69	3.7
	Anti-Nuclear	.56	.32	-2.20	5.4
Left Tax	Age	.44	.19	-.11	18.7
	Level of education	.49	.24	.96	5.1
	Left Tax	.64	.41	-3.23	12.7
Individualist Anarchists	Age	.20	.04	-.96D-01	8.5
	Length of political activities	.32	.10	.75	4.1
	Individualist Anarchist	.50	.25	-2.44	8.9

Table 32 MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO LIBERALS WITH  
SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND FEELING  
DIFFERENT AS A CHILD AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Communist Anarchists	Father's occupation	.40	.16	.36	7.1
	Communist Anarchist	.67	.45	1.46	23.9
Individualist Anarchists	Father's occupation	.43	.18	.30	8.4
	Individualist Anarchist	.64	.41	1.19	25.8
Libertarian Tax	Major	.23	.05	-.10	3.9
	Libertarian Tax	.49	.24	1.16	7.4

Table 33 MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO CONSERVATIVES WITH  
SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND FEELING  
DIFFERENT AS A CHILD AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p <.01)
Communist Anarchists	Age	.292	.085	-.13D-01	.9 ns
	Sex	.294	.086	.13	.1 ns
	Major	.35	.12	-.21	.3 ns
	Father's occupation	.41	.17	.27	2.5 ns
	Teen political activities	.42	.18	-.24	.009 ns
	Communist Anarchist	.60	.36	1.24	9.8
Individual- ist  Anarchists	Individualist Anarchist	.62	.38	.99	13.00
Libertar- ian  Tax	Major	.40	.14	-.96	4.1

Table 34 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
 REGISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO LIBERALS WITH  
 SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND PERSONAL  
 RESPONSIBILITY AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variables	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Individual- ist	Level of education	.02	.0003	1.55	6.0
Anarchists	Mother's occupation	.45	.21	1.01	6.0
	Individualist Anarchist	.57	.32	2.42	9.0
Libertarian Tax	Libertarian Tax	.57	.32	2.59	6.8
Anti-Nuclear	Anti-Nuclear	.39	.15	2.20	3.9

Table 35 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR INDIVIDUALIST ANARCHISTS  
 COMPARED TO CONSERVATIVES WITH SELECTED  
 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY  
 AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variables	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Level of education	.03	.001	.77	1.3 ns
Level of college degree	.22	.048	-.61	2.4 ns
Major	.23	.052	.14	1.6 ns
Father's occupation	.25	.06	-.64	2.5 ns
Mother's occupation	.33	.11	.57	1.8 ns
Individualist Anarchist	.44	.19	2.02	4.8

Table 36 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
 RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO LIBERALS WITH  
 SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND INDEPENDENCE/  
 AUTONOMY AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Communist	Level of education	.06	.004	-.72	2.4 ns
Anarchist	Level of college degree	.33	.11	.58	4.5
	Political activities as teen	.41	.17	-.57	2.0 ns
	Communist anarchist	.44	.20	-.82	1.31ns
Left Tax	Left tax	.38	.14	-2.18	4.9

Table 37 MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT  
RESISTER GROUPS COMPARED TO CONSERVATIVES WITH  
SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND INDEPENDENCE/  
AUTONOMY AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Group	Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Conservative Tax	Conservative Tax	.42	.18	2.17	3.9
Libertarian Tax	Libertarian Tax	.38	.14	2.23	3.9
Individualist Anarchist	Individualist Anarchist	.46	.21	2.18	10.2

Table 38 MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF ALL GROUPS WITH SELECTED  
 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND NEED FOR SOCIAL  
 SUPPORT AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Influence of friends	.41	.17	.53	5.1
Father's occupation	.48	.23	.71	4.2

Table 39      MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF ALL GROUPS WITH SELECTED  
    INDEPENDENT VARIABLES    AND SOCIABILITY AS  
    THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Feeling different as a child	.36	.13	-.55	8.8

Table 40      MULTIPLE REGRESSION OF ALL GROUPS WITH SELECTED  
    INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AND GREGARIOUSNESS AS  
    THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Variable	Multiple R	R Sq	B	F(p<.01)
Age	.11	.01	-.35D-01	5.1
Feeling different as a child	.34	.11	.28	4.0

nomena, most anti-nuclear resisters have not had the opportunity to be involved for long, though most (77.1%) have been active for more than a year. The issue's very recent salience accounts for the short duration of the draft resisters' involvement (66.7% less than one year). Like most of the resisters, a majority of the liberals have also been involved for more than five years (61.8%) but only a minority of the conservatives (41.4%) have. The conservatives also have a relatively high percentage (34.5%) of people who have been active a year or less.

#### Results of Multiple Regression Analyses

The lack of homogeneity among the groups in some of the demographic characteristics raises the question of how much influence these differences exert on the results. The multiple regression, while rich and suggestive, requires elaboration in further studies and need not be dealt with in detail in this study. However, as Tables 26 - 41 show, whatever the differences among the groups in terms of demographic variables, these factors contribute much less, on the whole, to prediction of scores on the dependent variables than does the factor of membership in a resister or nonresister group.

This is especially true on the Attitude toward Authority Scale where in every case, the factor of group member-

ship is by far the most important predictor of scores (Tables 26-28). Only in the case of the conservative tax resisters as compared to liberals does another factor (mother's occupation) contribute more.

For the resisters whose scores on the Directiveness Scale are significantly different from the liberals, the only significant contributor to prediction of scores besides group membership is age (Table 29). However, in all cases except the draft and libertarian tax resisters, group membership is more important. Age is the only significant factor for these latter two groups.

For the resisters, as compared to the conservatives, on the Directiveness Scale, level of education and age are the only other consistently found factors besides group membership (Tables 30-31). However, only in the case of the left tax resisters does age contribute more than group membership.

On the Personal Responsibility and Independence/Autonomy Scales and the "felt different as a child" item, in almost every case where significant differences between resisters and nonresisters were found, the most important contributor to prediction of scores is the factor of group membership (Tables 32-37). The only exception is for communist anarchists on the Independence/Autonomy Scale, where level

of college degree is the only significant contributor. But as is argued in the discussion section, the scores of the communist anarchists are explainable in terms of their ideology, so this finding in the regression analysis seems artifactual.

Only on the personality scales of sociability, need for social support and gregariousness was group membership not found to be a significant predictor of scores (Tables 38 - 40). But since no differences between resisters and nonresisters were hypothesized and very few found on the t-tests, this finding in the regression analysis is what we would expect.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that, although the background characteristics of the sample are not always comparable for the different groups, the role of these variables is small compared to the importance of group membership in accounting for the differences found in this study between the resisters and the nonresisters.

#### APPENDIX IV

##### Results of the D Score on the Defining Issues Test

The D score of the Defining Issues Test, a more recent index than the P% score, was developed as a way to take into account the subject's response to lower stage (i.e., conventional or pre-conventional level) items, which the P% score does not. The D score is based entirely on the ratings of the items, rather than the rankings as the P% score is. Thus, the D score reflects a person's relative preference for principled reasoning over conventional and pre-conventional reasoning, in contrast to the P% score, which reflects just the level of principled reasoning (Table 41).

Though the pattern for the D scores is similar to that of the P% scores, there are some statistical differences. Now, though their mean scores (26.46 and 24.175) are higher, the two anarchist groups are no longer significantly different from the conservatives (23.02). Since the mean score of the liberals (30.19) is the third highest, none of the differences from the resister groups are significant except for the two anarchist groups. The lack of significant difference between the anarchists and the conservatives can be explained by the content bias which I contend affects the scoring of the DIT items (see Appendix V).

Table 41 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF D-SCORE  
ON DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Group	N	Mean	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>			
Left Tax	26	31.29*	4.89
Draft	10	30.78*	7.11
Libertarian Tax	12	28.93**	5.82
Anti-Nuclear	24	28.19**	3.97
Individualist Anarchists	41	26.46***	6.12
Communist Anarchists	25	24.175****	4.07
Conservative Tax	14	24.13***	6.63
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>			
Conservatives	17	23.02	6.44
Liberals	17	30.19	6.54

\* different from conservatives at  $p < .01$ .

\*\* different from conservatives at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .05$ .

\*\*\*\* different from liberals at  $p < .01$ .

## APPENDIX V

### Analysis of the Discrepancy Between the Scores of the Libertarians and Anarchists and the Other Re- sisters on the Defining Issues Test

The unexpected discrepancy between the P% and D scores of the libertarian tax resisters, individualist anarchists, and communist anarchists and the other resisters on the Defining Issues Test raises questions about the validity of these scores. While the scores of these groups are not low compared to a general population, they are lower than we might expect, on several counts.

First, the low scores of the libertarians and anarchists relative to the other resisters are at odds with other results in the study which show all the resisters to have attitudes directly linked to high levels of moral reasoning - rejection of authority and belief in individual conscience as a guide to moral judgment.

A second compelling reason to question these discrepant scores is evidence from the writings of libertarians and anarchists which indicate that their professed beliefs include an explicit and strong concern with universal principles of ethics. While it is certainly true that people do not always embody the principles they profess to believe, neither can such beliefs be dismissed as irrelevant. In

the case of libertarians, other findings in the present study, as well as previous studies (Presley, 1971, 1977; Schweitzer & Elden, 1971; Donovan & Shaevitz, 1973) have shown their attitudes to be consistent with their ideological rhetoric. Further, the frequency and vigor with which the theme of universal moral principles is articulated in libertarian literature makes it seem not unreasonable to assume that many libertarians would incorporate such principles in their own thinking.

Individualist anarchists and libertarians have a systematic, well-articulated philosophy explicitly based on moral concepts and individual rights. "Ethics," writes Ayn Rand, "is an objective, metaphysical necessity of man's survival." (Rand, 1961, p. 23) According to Murray Rothbard, the other most influential libertarian thinker, "natural rights as the basis for the libertarian creed has been adopted by most libertarians, past and present." (Rothbard, 1974b, p. 25) The view of individual rights succinctly stated by libertarian philosopher Robert Nozick is axiomatic for libertarians: "Individuals have rights and there are things no person or group may do to them (without violating these rights)." (Nozick, 1974, p. ix)

This view of rights leads to a stance toward political authority which is explicitly based on ethical principles.

"The libertarian," writes Rothbard, "refuses to give the State the moral sanction to commit actions that almost everyone agrees would be immoral, illegal and criminal if committed by a person or group in society. The libertarian, in short, insists on applying the general moral law to everyone, and makes no special exemptions for any person or group." (Rothbard, 1974b, p. 10)

These samples of the writings of influential libertarians clearly reflect moral reasoning at Kohlberg's Stage 6. Stage 6, in his view, is the stage of a highly abstract, universal code of ethics and personal principle. (Kohlberg, 1976) Philosopher Richard Burke's clarification of the difference between Stage 5 and Stage 6 further illustrates why the examples above reflect Stage 6 thinking: "If you believe that persons have 'rights' only because a given society has become persuaded that they do, you're stage five. If you understand that persons have rights because of their nature -- including their characteristic relation to each other and their world -- you're stage six." (Burke, 1981, p. 10). A society in which every person has the same rights is also consonant with the DIT Stage 6 ("ideal social cooperation"), which includes items like "what values are going to be the basis for governing how people act toward each other."

The literature of communist anarchism also expresses a concern for individual rights and moral principles that transcend a particular society's laws. "The liberty of man," writes Bakunin, "consists solely in this: that he obey natural law because he has himself recognized them as such, and not because they have been externally imposed upon him by any extrinsic will, whether divine or human, collective or individual." (Bakunin, 1972, p. 161) According to Malatesta, "anarchism was born of a moral revolt against social injustice." (Malatesta, 1972, p. 28) Like the individualist anarchists, communist anarchists put individual rights at the heart of their morality. "Anarchists," says communist anarchist Nicolas Walter, "believe that the best way to guarantee [the full life of the individual] is to secure equal freedom for every member of society." (Walter, 1969, p. 15)

If the actual level of moral reasoning of libertarians and anarchists were consistent with their philosophy as expounded by their influential writers, we would expect these groups to exhibit scores that place them at the highest ranges of a test of moral judgment. That is, unless there is something in the test itself which adversely affects the libertarians and anarchists to a greater extent than the other resisters. Examples from libertarian and anarchist literature may not constitute proof that they

Table 42 STAGE PROFILES: MEAN RAW SCORES AT EACH STAGE OF  
THE DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Group	STAGE						
	2	3	4	5A	5B	6 A	
<u>RESISTERS</u>							
Anti-Nuclear	1.55	6.60	6.31	21.12	7.02	7.02	7.49
Left Tax	2.00	6.05	9.08	20.335	7.78	7.34	5.74
Draft	2.00	7.66	8.56	17.92	9.23	7.62	4.42
Communist Anarchists	3.33	8.31	5.58	17.43	8.05	5.46	10.40
Libertarian Tax	3.18	4.60	14.06	14.35	7.97	7.73	5.48
Individualist Anarchists	4.64	6.96	13.64	12.94	8.92	6.48	4.85
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>							
Liberals	3.24	6.15	14.33	20.87	6.29	5.25	2.12
Conservatives	4.57	8.53	21.52	13.29	4.68	4.21	1.49

have high levels of moral reasoning, but if we can find a bias in the DIT which works against these groups in spite of or because of their professed beliefs, then their DIT scores can legitimately be called into question. Fortunately, we need not settle for a merely theoretical content analysis of the items in the DIT because there is concrete evidence in the results. There are two lines of evidence: examination of the stage profiles and analysis of certain items that work against libertarians and anarchists.

If libertarians and anarchists are, as I contend, using postconventional moral reasoning, we would expect evidence of this to be reflected somewhere in the mean raw scores on the stage profiles (Table 42).

It should be recalled that the postconventional level of the DIT consists of three stages: Stage 5A (the morality of social contract), Stage 5B (the morality of intuitive humaneness) and Stage 6 (the morality of ideal social cooperation). Let us examine the findings for each stage profile in turn.

#### Stage 6 Profile

The Stage 6 items are:

1. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act toward each other. (Heinz #8)
2. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice? (Student Takeover #7)

3. Would society be failing what Mr. Thompson would fairly expect? (Escaped Prisoner #5)
4. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation? (Doctor's Dilemma #8)
5. What individual differences ought to be relevant in deciding how society's roles are fulfilled? (Webster #5)

The libertarian tax resisters have the highest Stage 6 mean raw score of all the groups (7.74). The individualist anarchists have a mean score slightly lower than the other resisters (6.48), but closer to them than to the liberals (5.25). Only the score of the communist anarchists (5.46) does not fit in with the rest of the resisters, though it is slightly higher than the liberals.

#### Stage 5B Profile

The Stage 5B items are:

1. Are the students following principles which they believe are above the law? (Student Takeover #11)
2. What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior. (Doctor's Dilemma #10)
3. Would refusing the job to Mr. Lee be consistent with Mr. Webster's own moral beliefs? (Webster #9)

4. What effect would stopping the paper have on the student's education in critical thinking and judgments? (Newspaper #9)

On Stage 5B, there is a clear difference between the resisters and the nonresisters. This time, both anarchist groups and the libertarian tax resisters have high scores, as we might expect with items reflecting a belief in personal principles that transcend the law. The scores (8.05 for the communists, 8.92 for the individualists, and 7.97 for the libertarians) are in fact several points higher than the liberals' score of 6.29.

#### Stage 5A Profile

So far, the stage profiles for the libertarians and anarchists have reflected the high level of moral reasoning we would in theory expect. But on Stage 5A, we find the first discrepancy between the anarchists and libertarians and the other resisters. The anti-nuclear and left tax resisters and the liberals have the highest scores (21.12, 20.335, 20.87, respectively), while the communist anarchists (17.43) and draft resisters (17.92) are several points lower and the two libertarian groups (14.35 for the anarchists and 12.94 for the tax resisters) are about as low as the conservative nonresisters (13.29).

If we examine the content of the Stage 5A statements, we begin to see why the libertarians score so much lower than the left-oriented resisters. At least four of the 12 items are ones that libertarians, but not leftists, would disavow as legitimate moral considerations because of their philosophical beliefs. These items:

1. Do a majority of people in Mr. Webster's society feel like his customers or are a majority against prejudice? (Webster #7)
2. Would stealing in such a case bring about a total good for the whole of society or not? (Heinz #12)
3. Would taking over the buildings in the long run benefit more people to a greater extent? (Student Takeover #4)
4. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served? (Escaped Prisoner #11)

These items imply either a majoritarian or collectivist view of social morality, i.e., that there is a public good higher than individual good, that society is something above and beyond individuals. Libertarians would vehemently reject such a view. "The libertarian," writes Rothbard, "believes that one of the prime errors in social theory is to treat 'society' as if it were an actually existing entity." (Rothbard, 1974b, p. 38) In the libertarian view, society

has no rights of its own, nor is there such a thing as the public good, only the good of individuals (Rothbard, 1974b; Nozick, 1974). But the left resisters, who have a more communalist orientation, and the liberals, who are more oriented toward social contract and majoritarian politics, would be able to agree with these items.

Because libertarians would not see these items as legitimate moral considerations, they would not rate them as important, thus detracting from their P% score. Even though the test requires four rankings per story, libertarians have only one or two postconventional answers to choose from per story while leftists have three or four. For example, the Heinz story has the following postconventional items:

Heinz #8: What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act toward each other (Stage 6)

Heinz #10: Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society. (Stage 5A)

Heinz #12: Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole of society or not. (Stage 5A)

Libertarians would agree with #8, reject #12, and probably not embrace #10 either (see the discussion of the factor

analysis of the DIT on p. 149 of this appendix). Because there is only one postconventional item in this story libertarians can agree with and are likely to think is important, they are forced to either choose conventional level items for the rest of the required three ranks or leave the spaces blank, whereas leftists have all three postconventional items to choose from.

To reiterate the argument: the reason libertarians reject the Stage 5A items that reflect a majoritarian philosophy is not because they use conventional moral reasoning but because these items are in direct opposition to their particular moral principles.

#### Stage 4 Profile

Stage 5A is not the only source of what I contend is a content bias in the DIT that works against libertarians. Stage 4 also present unique problems for them.

Since the individualist anarchists and libertarian tax resisters have higher Stage 4 scores than the other resisters, they seem to be choosing these items in preference to the Stage 5A items which run counter to their specific beliefs. Yet it seems peculiar that a group of people with scores so high on rejection of authority and whose literature so explicitly rejects the validity of government should be using a law-and-order, authority-oriented level of moral reasoning.

This puzzling finding can be explained by examining certain evidence in the data. There are three items scored at Stage 4 which libertarians would see as important for principled reasons, that is, they are using postconventional thinking to respond to items which are scored as reflecting conventional reasoning.

The following items, which are concerned with the issue of property rights, are scored at Stage 4:

1. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected. (Heinz #6)
2. Do the students have any right to take over property that does not belong to them. (Student Takeover #2)
3. Does the owner of the business have the right to make his own business decisions or not. (Webster #1)

Rest, the designer of the Defining Issues Test, apparently sees property rights as legal rights, but libertarians see property rights as moral rights, no different from other rights. Rejecting the "typical liberal dichotomy between 'human rights'... and 'property rights'," libertarians believe the two "are inextricably intertwined; they stand or fall together...Property rights are human rights, and are essential to the human rights which liberals attempt to maintain." (Rothbard, 1974b, p. 44-45) Regardless of one's

Table 43

MEAN RANKINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
OF PROPERTY RIGHTS ITEMS

---

Group	(12 possible) mean	SD
Libertarian Tax	9.42	2.02
Conservatives	7.29	3.18
Individualist Anarchists	7.27	2.77
Draft	3.00	2.40
Liberals	2.47	2.74
Anti-Nuclear	1.58	2.60
Communist Anarchists	1.44	1.44
Left Tax	1.31	1.76

---

Table 44

MEAN RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
OF PROPERTY RIGHTS ITEMS

Group	(15 possible) mean	SD
Individualist Anarchists	6.80	2.29
Libertarian Tax	6.60	1.99
Conservatives	6.53	2.32
Liberals	4.65	2.47
Draft	3.80	3.04
Left Tax	3.58	3.05
Anti-Nuclear	2.58	2.51
Communist Anarchists	1.20	2.18

opinion of the libertarian argument, the important point for the purposes of this analysis is that libertarians believe property rights are important moral considerations as a matter of principle rather than because the law says these rights should be protected.

There is an empirical way to demonstrate that the responses of the libertarians in this study do not reflect law-and-order thinking: by showing that libertarians rank the property rights items high but rank the law-and-order items on Stage 4 low. The mean rankings of the property rights items are shown in Table 43 and the mean ratings in Table 44. Exactly as we would expect, the two libertarian groups (and the conservatives) have the highest scores, that is, they rank the property rights items as more important than do the other groups. The three left-oriented resister groups - communist anarchists, anti-nuclear and left tax resisters - have the lowest scores. The pattern is the same for the ratings, thus the problem seems to be affecting both the P% score and the D score.

The following items from Stage 4 reflect a law and order orientation:

1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.  
(Heinz #1)
2. Wouldn't it be a citizen's duty to report an escaped criminal regardless of the circumstances.

(Escaped Prisoner #10)

3. Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving her an overdose would be the same as killing her? (Doctor's Dilemma #2)
4. Whether there is a law that forbids racial discrimination in hiring for jobs. (Webster #2)

Table 45 shows the mean rankings for the law and order items. The cores of the libertarian groups are, as predicted, lower than the liberals and conservatives, that is, the libertarians consider these items as less important than the two nonresister groups. The pattern is even stronger for the mean ratings (Table 46). The two libertarian groups, along with the communist anarchists, have the lowest cores, while the liberals and conservatives have the highest.

A factor analysis of the individual items of the DIT also provides evidence for the contention that libertarians respond differently to the property rights and the law-and-order items (Table 47). Only two strong factors emerge: one that includes the property rights items, and one that is composed of law-and-order, authority-oriented items.

Factor 1 reflects attitudes toward property rights and capitalism (items Heinz 6, Heinz 9, Student 2, Webster 1 and Webster 6), social and collective rights (items Heinz 10, Student 4, Student 10), and helping people in need (items

Table 45

MEAN RANKINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
OF LAW AND ORDER ITEMS

---

Group	(16 possible) mean	SD
<hr/>		
<u>RESISTERS</u>		
Draft	1.40	1.84
Left Tax	2.00	1.72
Communist Anarchists	2.64	1.55
Individualist Anarchists	2.90	1.91
Libertarian Tax	2.92	2.11
Anti-Nuclear	3.375	1.97
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>		
Liberals	4.12	2.69
Conservatives	4.35	3.18

---

Table 46

MEAN RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
OF LAW AND ORDER ITEMS

---

Group	(20 possible) mean	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>		
Individualist Anarchists	6.88	2.44
Communist Anarchists	6.88	2.54
Libertarian Tax	7.00	2.66
Anti-nuclear	7.04	2.42
Left Tax	8.04	2.34
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>		
Conservatives	9.00	4.23
Liberals	9.41	2.85

---

Table 47

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF ITEMS ON  
THE DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Item #	Item	FACTOR LOADINGS	
		Factor 1	Factor 2
H1	Community laws upheld	-.03	.62
H6	Druggist's rights to his invention	-.67	.22
H9	Worthless law protects rich	.78	.02
H10	Law in way of most basic claim of society	.63	.15
H12	Stealing brings about more total good	.50	.10
S2	Any right to take over property	-.48	.36
S4	Taking over building benefits more people	.62	.03
S10	Running university in hands of a few administrators or all the people	.59	.006
P2	Every time someone escapes punishment, it encourages more crime	-.26	.51
P3	Better off without prisons and oppression of legal system	.53	-.28
P7	Heartless and cruel to send Mr. Thompson to prison	.51	-.17
P8	Would it be fair to all prisoners if Mr. Thompson let off	.07	.62
P10	Citizen's duty to report escaped criminal	-.11	.75

Table 47 cont.

Item #	Item	FACTOR LOADINGS	
		Factor 1	Factor 2
D2	Doctor obligated by same laws as everyone else	.06	.63
W1	Owner's right to own business decisions	-.40	.32
W2	Law that forbids racial discrimination	.34	.47
W6	Abandon greedy and competitive capitalist system	.67	-.07
W10	Hard-hearted to refuse the job	.64	.10
W12	If someone in need, helped regardless of what you get back	.65	.18
N4	When welfare of school threatened, principal has right to give orders to students	-.17	.46
N11	Should principal be influenced by angry parents when he knows best	.07	.61
Communist Anarchists		-.44	.33
Anti-Nuclear		-.31	.06
Draft		-.05	.06
Liberals		-.05	-.18
Conservatives		.17	-.25
Libertarian Tax		.12	.03
Individualist Anarchists		.39	.21

Prisoner 7, Webster 10 and Webster 12). Factor 1 is, in fact, defining the items which most ideologically differentiate communist anarchists from individualist anarchists. The two groups act just as we would expect; the communists have the lowest loading (-.44), and the individualists the highest (.39). Because of the way the items are weighted, a high positive loading for the groups is associated with the negative loadings for the items in the factor. That is, individualist anarchists are positively correlated with the three property rights items (loadings of -.67 for Heinz 6, -.48 for Student 2, and -.40 for Webster 1). There is, however, a surprisingly weak trend for the libertarian tax resisters.

All the items with high loadings on Factor 2 reflect a law-and-order (items Heinz 1; Prisoner 2, 8, 10; Doctor 2; Webster 2) or authority orientation (items Webster 4 and 11). A negative loading is associated with rating these items as important. The liberals and conservatives have the highest loadings (-.18 and -.25) while the two anarchist groups have the highest positive loadings (.33 for the communists and .21 for the individualists). The libertarian tax resisters, again inexplicably, do not show a similarly strong trend.

However, the results of the factor analysis do show the individualist anarchists to be positively associated

with high valuation of the property rights items and rejection of the law-and-order items.

#### The Scores of the Communist Anarchists

But what about the communist anarchists? They do not fare well relative to the other resisters on Stage 5A or 6. What answers are they giving instead? Clearly not the property rights items. As the Stage Profiles show, it is the A-scale that is affecting their scores. The communist anarchists have a much higher score than any other group. They are apparently choosing these items instead of postconventional items that would give them points on both the P% and D scores.

The A-scale consists of items "intended to typify an 'anti-establishment' orientation, a point of view which condemns tradition and the existing social order for its corruption by the rich and for its exploitation of the poor" (Rest, 1979, p.5.2). It is composed of the following items:

- 1 Whether the druggeest is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow. (Heinz 3)
2. Whether running the university ought to be in the hands of a few administrators or in the hands of the people. (Student Takeover #10)

3. Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal system. (Escaped Prisoner #3)
4. Whether people would be much better without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths. (Doctor #3)
5. Whether the greedy and capitalistic system ought to be completely abandoned. (Webster #6)

Reporting that "there has been interest in the anti-establishment orientation as possibly a transition phase between conventional morality and principled morality -- in effect, a stage 4 1/2," Rest says that the A-scale items "were included in the DIT to enable some preliminary study of 'regressed' Stage 2 subjects [later seen as 'Stage 4 1/2']" (Rest, 1979, p. 5.2). Rest may not see these items as reflecting principled morality, but the communist anarchists do. Opposition to capitalism (H9, W6), for example, is a basic tenet of their philosophy. "Capitalism is the greatest crime of all," proclaims Alexander Berkman, "...it devours more lives in a single day than all the murderers put together." (Berkman, 1972, p. 78) The rest of the A-scale items read like a primer of communist anarchism: opposition to the legal system (P3), opposition to regimentation by society (D3), and a belief in the decentralization of

power (S10). (Walter, 1969; Bookchin, 1971; Berkman, 1971)

In assuming that the A-scale does not represent principled morality, Rest apparently sees these items as merely reflecting nihilistic rebellion. But the communist anarchists are neither sullen nihilists nor "rebels without a cause." Their opposition to the establishment is only part of a philosophy which espouses constructive social alternatives based on principles of mutual aid, social cooperation and nonhierarchical organization. (Kropotkin, 1972; Bookchin, 1971; Ward, 1973)

#### Conclusions About the Scores of the Libertarians and Anarchists

To reiterate the conclusion drawn in the Results section: proponents of the stage theory of moral development have argued that it is the kind of standard or conceptual framework rather than the specific content that determines level of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969; Rest, 1976). Or, as Rokeach (1960) might put it, it is not what you believe but why you believe it that is psychologically important about a belief system. If so, then the libertarians and anarchists should be judged by the conceptual framework they actually use. The evidence, both empirical and theoretical, suggests that these groups use principled moral reasoning to rank as important, items on the DIT that are

not scored as principled. Therefore, I contend, their scores on the DIT are artifactually low. If this is the case, the lower scores of the libertarians and anarchists cannot be interpreted to mean that their level of moral reasoning is less highly developed than the liberals or the other resisters.

## APPENDIX VI

### Sex Differences on the Defining Issues Test

The only significant sex difference on any variable in the study appears on the DIT (see Table 48). The difference between liberal males (27.01) and liberal females (33.76) on the D score is significant. There is a similar but non-significant trend on the P% scores; the liberal males have a mean score of 50.39 and the females, 58.125 (Table 49).

Sex differences are rarely found on the DIT (Rest, 1979), so this finding is especially interesting. Because women are less likely to become political activists than men (Kelly & Boutilier, 1978), they may need an extra push to motivate themselves. It might be the case that the impelling reason for liberal women is a strong concern for social justice. Conventional reasons may not be enough for them, though it may be for men.

Because of these sex differences, it should be kept in mind in considering the scores of the liberals on the DIT that the sample of liberals is composed of almost equal numbers of men and women. If men only had been used, the differences between the resisters and the liberals might very well have been significant. Pursuing possible differences between liberal men and women would be an interesting line of further research.

Table 48 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR  
 MALES AND FEMALES ON THE D SCORE OF  
 THE DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Group	Female			Male		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>						
Left Tax	12	31.22	5.90	14	31.35	4.07
Anti-Nuclear	6	29.12	4.71	18	27.88	3.79
Individualist Anarchists	18	27.12	6.37	23	25.77	5.96
Communist Anarchists	9	25.43	4.60	16	23.47	3.71
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>						
Liberals	8	33.76*	4.09	19	27.01	6.84
Conservatives	6	25.28	7.17	11	21.77	5.99

\* different from liberal males at  $p < .05$ .

Table 49 MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR  
 MALES AND FEMALES ON P% SCORE OF  
 THE DEFINING ISSUES TEST

Group	n	Female		n	Male	
		Mean	SD		Mean	SD
<u>RESISTERS</u>						
Anti-Nuclear	6	65.20	8.89	18	58.50	8.82
Left Tax	12	61.79	8.53	14	58.01	9.57
Communist Anarchists	9	50.34	10.57	16	52.24	8.75
Individualist Anarchists	18	46.20	8.96	23	48.07	8.63
<u>NONRESISTERS</u>						
Liberals	8	58.12	9.50	9	50.39	16.20
Conservatives	6	38.27	19.28	11	36.25	10.56

None of the differences are statistically significant.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1950.
- Andrews, S.P. The sovereign individual and the science of society. In L.I. Krimerman & L. Perry (Eds.), Patterns of anarchy. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Asch, S.E. Social psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1952.
- Bakunin, M. God and state. New York: Dover, 1970.
- Bakunin, M. In P. Berman (Ed.), Quotations from the anarchists. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Berkman, A. ABC of anarchism. London: Freedom Press, 1971.
- Berkman, A. In P. Berman (Ed.), Quotations from the anarchists. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Block, J.H., Haan, N. & Smith, M.B. Socialization correlates of student activism. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25 (4), 143-177.
- Bookchin, M. Post-scarcity anarchism. In H. Silverman (Ed.), The American Radical Tradition. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1970.
- Bookchin, M. Post-scarcity anarchism. New York: Ramparts Press, 1971.
- Bookchin, M. On hierarchy and domination. Black Rose, 1974, #1.
- Borgatta, E. & Bohrnstedt, G.W. A short-form personality inventory: the Interpersonal Orientation (IO) Form. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 38, (4), 1-6.
- Braginsky, B.M. & Braginsky, D. Mainstream psychology: a critique. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.
- Branden, N. Free will, moral responsibility, and the law. In T. Machan (Ed.), The libertarian alternative. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1974.

- Bray, K. Taxation and tyranny. Provo, Utah: Tax Rebels of America, 1972.
- Breggin, P. The psychology of freedom. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1980.
- Burke, R. Letter to the editor. Psychology Today, 1981, 15, (4), 10.
- Burley, P.M. & McGuinness, J. Effects of social intelligence on the Milgram paradigm. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 767-770.
- Byrne, D., Bond, M.H., & Diamond, M.J. Response to political candidates as a function of attitude similarity-dissimilarity. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 251-261.
- Chein, I. Behavior theory and the behavior of attitudes: some critical comments. Psychological Reports, 1948, 55, 175-188.
- Chodorov, F. The income tax: root of all evil. New York: Devin-Adair, 1954.
- Chodorov, F. Fugitive essays. Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1980.
- Cochran, N. Measuring preferences for hierarchical control: an attitude scale for contemporary times. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 695-705.
- Donovan, J.M. & Shaevitz, M.H. Student political activists: a typology. Youth and Society, 1973, 4, 379-408.
- Durland, W. People pay for peace: a military tax refusal guide for the radical religious pacifist. Philadelphia: The Center on Law and Pacifism, 1979.
- Elms, A.C. Social psychology and social relevance. Boston: Little, Brown, 1972.
- Elms, A.C. & Milgram, S. Personality characteristics associated with obedience and defiance toward authoritative command. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1965, 2, 282-289.
- Fellowship of Reconciliation. War Tax Packet distributed by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Nyack, New York, 1979.

- Fireman, B., Gamson, W.A., Rytina, S., & Taylor, B. Encounters with unjust authority. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan, 1978.
- Flacks, R. Introduction to section one: the specter of the cheerful robot: the problem of authority in modern life. In R. Flacks (Ed.), Conformity, resistance and self-determination. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.
- Gaylin, W. In the service of their country. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1970.
- Gilligan, C. In a different voice: women's conceptions of self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, (4)
- Haan, N., Smith, M.B. & Block, J.H. Moral reasoning of young adults: political-social behavior, family backgrounds, and personality correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 183-201.
- Harré, E. & Secord, P.F. The explanation of social behavior. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, 1973.
- Heist, P. & Yonge, G. Omnibus personality inventory - form F manual. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1968.
- Hogan, R. A dimension of moral judgment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 205-212.
- Kaufman, D. What belongs to Caesar? Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1975.
- Kelly, R.M. & Boutilier, M. The making of political women. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978.
- Kelman, H.C. & Lawrence, L.H. Assignment of responsibility in the case of Lt. Calley. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 172-212.
- Keniston, K. Youth and dissent. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1971.
- Kerpelman, L. Activists and non-activists: a psychological study of American college students. New York: Behavioral Publications, 1972.

- Kilham, W. & Mann, L. Level of destructive obedience as a function of transmitter and executant roles in the Milgram obedience paradigm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 696-702.
- Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: the cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1969.
- Kohlberg, L. Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. & Ballachey, E.L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Krimerman, L.I. & Perry, L. (Eds.) Patterns of anarchy. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Kropotkin, P. In P. Berman (Ed.), Quotations from the anarchists. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Kutner, B., Wilkins, C. & Yarrow, P. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior involving racial prejudice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 649-652.
- Larsen, K.S. Coleman, D., Forbes, J. & Johnson, R. Is the subject's personality or the experimental situation a better predictor of a subject's willingness to administer shock to a victim? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 287-295.
- LaPiere, R.T. Attitudes vs. actions. Social Forces, 1934, 13, 230-237.
- Lerner, M.J. & Mathews, G.W. Reactions to suffering of others under conditions of indirect responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 319-325.
- Lockwood, A.L. Moral reasoning and public policy debate. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- London, P. The rescuers: motivational hypotheses about Christians who saved Jews from the Nazis. In J. Macauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.) Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

- Malatesta, E. In P. Berman (Ed.), Quotations from the anarchists. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Mankoff, M. & Flacks, R. The changing social base of the American student movement. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1971, 395, 54-67.
- Mantell, D.M. True Americanism: Green Berets and war resisters. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.
- McClosky, H. Conservatism and personality. American Political Science Review, 1958, 42, 27-45.
- Milgram, S. Behavioral study of obedience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 371-378.
- Milgram, S. Obedience to authority. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Moore, F., Berkel, B. & Mueller, M. Resistance manual. San Francisco: National Resistance Committee, 1980.
- Muste, A.J. Of holy disobedience. Wallingford, PA.: Pendle Hill, 1968.
- Nozick, R. Anarchy, state and utopia. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Presley, S. Individualist libertarians: a study of non-conservative right-wing youth. Unpublished M.A. thesis, San Francisco State College, 1971.
- Presley, S. Value differences among six political activist groups. Unpublished paper, City University of New York Graduate Center, 1977.
- Rand, A. For the new intellectual. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Rest, J.R. New approaches in the assessment of moral development. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Rest, J.R. Revised manual for the Defining Issues Test. Minneapolis: Minnesota Moral Research Projects, 1979.
- Rest, J.R., Carroll, J., Lawrence, J., Jacobs, K., McColgan, E., Davison, M. & Robbins, S. Development in judging moral issues - a summary of research using the Defining Issues Test. Minneapolis: Minnesota Moral Research Projects, 1977.

- Ring, K. Experimental social psychology: some sober questions about some frivolous values. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1967, 3, 113-123.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Rokeach, M. The nature of human values. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Rothbard, M. For a new liberty. New York: Macmillan, 1974a.
- Rothbard, M. The anatomy of the state. In T. Machan (Ed.), The libertarian alternative. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1974b.
- Schlissel, L. (Ed.) Conscience in America. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1968.
- Schwartz, S.H. Moral decision making and behavior. In J. Macauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Schweitzer, D.R. & Elden, J.M. New Left as right: convergent themes of political discontent. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27 (1), 141-166.
- SHAD. Civil disobedience: an act of conscience. Leaflet distributed by the SHAD Alliance, New York City, 1980a.
- SHAD. Untitled leaflet distributed by the SHAD Alliance, New York, 1980b.
- Smith, G. Atheism: the case against God. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Press, 1979.
- Suedfeld, P. & Epstein, Y.M. Attitudes, values and ascriptions of responsibility: the Calley case. Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 63-77.
- Tilker, H. Socially responsible behavior as a function of observer responsibility and victim feedback. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 95-100.

- Tobin, J. Editorial reply on Chicago's Channel 5. National Taxpayers United of Illinois Taxnews, February/March, 1980.
- Tucker, B. State socialism and anarchism: how far they agree and wherein they differ. In Instead of a book. New York: B.J. Tucker, 1897.
- Useem, M. Involvement in a radical political movement and patterns of friendship: the draft resistance community. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1970. Cited in K. Keniston (Ed.), Radicals and militants. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1973.
- Walter, N. About anarchism. London: Freedom Press, 1969.
- War Resisters League. A call to war tax resistance. Leaflet distributed by the War Resisters League, New York, 1977.
- War Resisters League. What is the War Resisters League. Leaflet distributed by the War Resisters League, New York, 1980.
- Ward, C. Anarchy in action. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.