of his observations to determine how animals behavior, mode of life, habitat, and physical forms are interrelated.

Notes

The author thanks Peter Gautrey for his assistance with the Darwin Archive at the Cambridge University Library, and Bob Keegan for commenting on an early draft of this paper. Some of this work was done while on study-leave from the University of Western Australia.

1. Janet Browne, "Darwin and the Expression of Emotions," in David Kohn, Ed., *The Darwinian Heritage* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), pp. 307–326.
2. Robert T. Keegan and Howard E. Gruber, "Love, death and continuity in Darwin's thinking," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 19 (1983):15–30. Robert T. Keegan and Howard E. Gruber, "Charles Darwin's 'Diary of an Infant' an early phase in his Psychological Work," in Georg Eckardt, Wolfgang G. Bringmann, and Lothar Sprung, Eds., *Contributions to a History of Developmental Psychology* (Mouton, 1983), pp. 127–145. Fernando Vidal, Marino Buscaglia, and J. Jacques Vonéche, "Darwinism and Developmental Psychology, *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 19 (1983):81–94.
3. Colin G. Beer, "Darwin, Instinct and Psychology," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 19 (1983):68–80.
4. Richard F. Burkhardt, "Darwin on Animal Behaviour and Evolution," in Kohn, *The Darwinian Heritage*, pp. 327–365.
5. William H. Thorpe, *The Origins and Rise of Ethology* (London: Heinenann Educational, 1979).
6. At DAR 30–31.
7. Nora Barlow, Ed., *Charles Darwin's Diary of the Voyage of HMS Beagle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933).
8. Nora Barlow, Ed., "Darwin's Ornithological Notes," *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History) Historical Series* 2 (1963):203–278.
9. Kenneth G. V. Smith, Ed., "Darwin's Insects," *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History) Historical Series* 14 (1987):1–143.
10. Barlow, *Charles Darwin's Diary*, p. 430.
11. Patrick Armstrong, *Under the Blue Vault of Heaven: a Study of Charles Darwin's Sojourn in the Cocos (Keeling) Islands* (Nedlands: Centre for Indian Ocean Research and University of Western Australia, 1991). Patrick Armstrong, *Darwin's Desolate Isles: a Naturalist in the Falklands, 1833 and 1834* (Chippenham: Picton Publishing, 1992).
12. Richard F. Burkhardt and Sydney Smith, Eds., *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), Appendix 4, Books on board the *Beagle*, pp. 553–566.
13. 21 March 1833. Notebook 1.14, Down House.
14. Barlow, *Charles Darwin's Diary*, p. 397.
15. March 1834; *Zoological Diary*, DAR 31.1/238.
16. Burkhardt, "Darwin on Animal Behavior and Evolution," p. 334.
17. Charles Darwin and John Gould, *The Zoology of the Voyage of the Beagle:* Part 3, *Birds.* (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1841), p. 61.
18. Charles Darwin, *Journal of Researches into the Geology and Natural History of the Countries Visited during the Voyage of the Beagle*, 2nd ed. (London: John Murray, 1845), p. 96.
19. See, for example, Browne, "Darwin and the Expression of Emotions"; Burkhardt, "Darwin on Behaviour and Evolution," Thorpe, *The Origins and Rise of Ethology.*
20. March 1834, *Zoological Diary*, DAR 31.1/240.
21. April 1836, *Zoological Diary*, DAR 31.2/326.
22. DAR 31.1/241–242.
23. Barlow, *Charles Darwin's Diary*, p. 397.
24. R. C. Stauffer, Ed., *Charles Darwin's Natural Selection* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
25. DAR 31.1/239.
26. Ibid.
27. Smith, *Darwin's Insects.*
28. Ibid., p. 73.
29. Ibid., pp. 53, 60, 65, 78.
30. April 1836, DAR 31.2/361.
31. February 1836, DAR 31.2/363–366.

Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences
Volume 29, October 1993

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

JAN BAARS AND PEER SCHEEPERS

This article provides a history of the theoretical and methodological contributions, particularly Erich Fromm's, of the sub-syndromes of the concept of authoritarianism and the relationship of his work to the classical study by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford.

In 1950, the classic study "The Authoritarian Personality" by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford was published. The crucial concept of this study, termed "authoritarianism," was meant to ". . . measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group."[1] The authors introduced it as a "syndrome, a . . . structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic propaganda." They stated that it consisted of nine sub-syndromes: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, anti-intraception, superstition and stereotypy, power and toughness, destructiveness and cynicism, projectivity and concern with sex.[2] They mentioned that its development was based on different sources: from quantitative and qualitative analyses of material previously gathered, from psycho-analytical interpretations of projective questions, from studies some of the authors had previously participated in, and from ". . . the general literature on anti-Semitism and fascism . . . ."[3] These theoretical bases were not discussed systematically. Although the authors said that, "The theories that have guided the present research will be presented in suitable contexts later,"[4] this was never done. Nevertheless, from 1952 to 1987 more than 1200 studies were published on this subject.[5] Among these, there are critical contributions,[6] endeavours to clarify psychodynamic mechanisms among concepts,[7] extensive reviews of research and theory,[8] re-interpretations,[9] and elaborations of the measurements proposed in the original study.[10] None of the studies however, focused explicitly on the theoretical ideas that had guided the research. More specifically, no research was conducted to determine the theoretical and empirical foundations of the sub-syndromes introduced in the original study and listed above. These foundations were laid in the 1930s and 1940s within the context of a world in the midst of economic and political crises. Some of the relevant history has been clarified by Jay,[11] and has been updated in recent years by Wiggershaus[12] and Baars.[13] We will refer to these sources, but base our conclusions on the relevant original texts.

Pauperization Without Revolt

In the late 1920s, a major crisis had hit the world economy. The consequences were severe for most social classes but especially for the lower classes whose unemployment

Jan Baars *teaches sociological theory and social philosophy at the Free University in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. He researches the history of social theory, especially Critical Theory and theories concerning biography and the life course.*

Peer Scheepers *is associate professor of sociology at the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands. He is responsible for the execution of large-scale longitudinal survey research on social and cultural developments in the Netherlands. Within this framework, he is especially interested in the development and explanation of authoritarianism and ethnocentrism.*

led to poverty. This crisis in the capitalist system followed by circumstances of "pauperization" had been predicted by Marx.[14] As Marxian theorists, members of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) in Frankfurt, Germany, expected the proletariat to revolt under such circumstances. Instead, ISR members were confronted with empirical studies that indicated widespread submission to and identification with strong anti-communist leaders[15] as well as resignation and political apathy among severely impoverished people.[16]

Particularly important was a study by Erich Fromm. He developed a questionnaire to be completed by industrial workers and civil servants. This questionnaire was inspired by a study by Siegfried Kracauer.[17] Kracauer had observed that civil servants, increasing in numbers in those days, tried to appear superior when with the working class whereas the latter class, when employed, often received better payment than civil servants. Kracauer characterized this would-be middle class of civil servants as "bicyclist characters": they tried to adapt to middle class standards, catering to those above them and behaving aggressively toward those below them.

Fromm analyzed his data from a specific methodological position.[18] He tried to find consistencies among the answers of respondents to various themes in the questionnaire in order to construct types, referred to as "ideal types" or "syndrome-types."[19] Eventually, he constructed three main categories—a radical type, a compromising type, and an authoritarian type—and a number of ambivalent types. In general, he was concerned about the widespread presence of authoritarian types, which he found in disproportionate numbers among voters for the National Socialist Party and parties he labelled "bourgeois." Among voters for the social-democratic parties, socialists and communists, there were few authoritarian types but more than he had expected.[20]

Based on these findings, Fromm described "people with conservative-authoritarian character."[21] They had a strong emotional drive to submit to strong leaders whom they admired as symbols of power and toughness and had a strong urge to identify with these authorities in order to derive personal security and strength.

Fromm's methodological approach and his data analyses contained elements characteristic of the concept of authoritarianism, such as authoritarian submission and identification with power and toughness. But none of these were credited to Fromm in the classical study by Theodor Adorno et al. done almost two decades later. In fact, many of the members of the ISR objected to the publication of Fromm's findings altogether. Their objections were ideological in nature, but they were stated in methodological terms, questioning the validity and reliability of Fromm's questionnaire. Fromm tried unsuccessfully to refute the criticism of his colleagues,[22] and did not publish his book until many years later in 1980.

Fromm was probably in the midst of his statistical analyses when his findings on the widespread presence of authoritarian people submitting to a strong leader by voting for the National Socialist Party, were corroborated by the historical events of the time. In January of 1933, when Hitler rose to power, the members of the ISR took refuge in Switzerland. Although they had no explanations as to why the proletariat had not revolted but had instead submitted to an authoritarian leader, they hesitated to revise Marxist theory. They regarded the calamities in Germany as temporary events. The non-revolution of the proletariat was considered to be due to the relics of a traditional authoritarian paternal family[23] which had obstructed an uprising. It was proposed that this type of family might be replaced by new types of solidarity,[24] but the members of the ISR were not optimistic as to when this new type of solidarity would be achieved.

Therefore, they considered it wise to transfer their activities from Europe to the United States where the Institute of Social Research was established in 1934.

Revolutionary Disillusions

Prior to 1933 the principal question of the ISR was: Why does the exploited social class not rise up against its economic and political exploiters? The same scientists from 1934 on asked: Why has the exploited class submitted itself to its exploiters? This theme was central in the "Studien über Autorität and Familie" ("Studies on Authority and the Family") that were published in 1936.

Again, Fromm's contribution was crucial. He elaborated on his previously developed[25] synthesis of Marxian and Freudian perspectives. He had stated that the classic Marxian theory on the relationship between "being" and "consciousness" had to be complemented with psychoanalytical insights and brought to fruition in empirical research.[26] His crucial axiom was that one's ideological choices were rationalizations of unconscious drives and wishes that in turn were catalyzed by one's economic situation, i.e., one's social class.[27] He added that one's personality was also affected by one's family background, which in turn was also supposed to be equally affected by the position of the family in the class structure.[28] But in his 1936 contribution, he, as other contributors, regarded social class as a determining force of minor importance.[29] Hence, he concentrated on the analysis of parental influences on the formation of personality structures.

Fromm's basic axiom was that submission to authorities was a normal phenomenon in bourgeois societies. At first, one submits to the father as the authority; and later, to teachers and eventually, to the state. He interpreted this submissive attitude as an indication of a weak "Ego" that needed to be compensated by a strong "Super-ego" to repress unconscious "Id" drives. This type of personality was reproduced repeatedly because of a dialectical relationship between the Super-ego and authorities in general. Weak personalities would be inclined to project previously internalized norms on authorities which in turn would demand submission to norms which would be added to the Super-ego. As a consequence of this process, one's tendency to submit would eventually increase so that the individual's personal conscience located in the Super-ego was replaced by the normative force of external authorities.[30]

Fromm labelled this type of personality as "authoritarian-masochist." In this elaboration he was inspired by Wilhelm Reich, and by Nietzsche, who had written about the tendency to exert cruelty against "the alien world". . . . There they enjoy freedom from any social constraint, and dally in the wilderness to compensate themselves for the tension brought about by long enclosure in the peaceful atmosphere of their society; they return to the guiltlessness of a predatory conscience. . . . "[31] Fromm characterized this type with certain dispositions: submission to authorities; aggression toward those primarily deviant or weaker groups, who were not inclined to submit to authorities; and, belief that one's fate is determined by supernatural powers.

In a study published by Fromm in 1941,[32] he described authoritarianism as merely one of the possibilities to "escape from freedom" in search of safety. There was also the possibility of a pretence of safety in destructiveness: a disposition to destroy the other under the pretext of love, duty, or patriotism. And as a third possibility for safety, he mentioned automatic conformism: to conform rigidly to conventional norms and mores.

Both Fromm and Max Horkheimer considered the social situation of those days, so full of social antagonisms and disastrous developments, to be the main source of

Scheepers, P. and Baars, J., 1993: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of the Authoritarian Personality,, In: Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 29 (No. 4, Oct. 1993), pp. 345-353.

this personality type. But, more generally, they suspected that an industrial society would time and again reproduce weak personalities within authoritarian families. Consequentially, developments toward a new society were obstructed by persistent family structures that reproduced personalities more than willing to submit to authorities. Fromm and Horkheimer had every reason to be disillusioned.

Further Historical Disillusionments

This disillusionment increased with Horkheimer's fear that an "authoritarian world period" was about to start. At the beginning of the 1930s he had hoped that technological progress which he considered a precondition for a new society would in time make it possible to fully control nature.[33] Later he decided that technological means were used for repression and destruction, by both capitalist and communist governments.

By the end of the 1930s, Adorno joined Horkheimer in the United States. Together they worked on a new philosophy of history that would reflect their disillusions. The result was published in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*,[34] in which they focused on the traditional way societal progress was based on technological means to control nature. This persistent historical tradition had clearly surfaced in the Enlightenment, but could be found much earlier in history. Even important critical thinkers such as Marx and Freud had believed in these means which would turn out to be fatal. The instrumentalization of scientific knowledge that emerged at the end of this process would lead—according to Adorno and Horkheimer—to a loss of critical rationality. Societal powers which used the advanced technological tools for their destructive purposes would no longer be criticized or unmasked. What was even worse in their view, articulated for instance in their reflection on "The Importance of the Body,"[35] was that the societal attempt to control nature was accompanied by control over and repression of human drives. Repression of emotional drives in favour of ardent, obedient labour produced a fundamental problem, in their view, because people would somehow realize that they did not get what they really wanted and that they were exploited by captains of industries and other leaders with whom they had identified. During this process, individuals would develop strong rancorous feelings, but would feel inhibited in directing these feelings toward their exploiters. The reason was that the repression of emotional drives resulted in a process of a weakening Ego and an externalization of Super-ego. An individual would lose his personal autonomous conscience which would be replaced by external authorities. They would direct their negative feelings toward the weak and the deviant, especially toward those who criticized authorities. The dialectics of internalized control over nature would result in a dynamic process in which Western societies might eventually be destroyed. Adorno and Horkheimer regarded the disastrous events directed by the leaders of the National Socialist Party in Germany, as actual examples of the destructive dynamics that played a fundamental role in the Western tradition.[36]

Destructive Dynamics and Empirical Research

This theoretical analysis by Adorno and Horkheimer was very similar to Fromm's analysis regarding authoritarian personalities. What Adorno and Horkheimer added was a more general analysis of the historical patterns and the social situation considered to be the context within which this type of personality would develop. The previous decade had shown that authoritarian personalities were susceptible to the ideology of Nazism in which anti-Semitism and general ethnocentrism were crucial elements.

Adorno and Horkheimer wanted to gain more insight into the susceptibility of personalities to these ideological elements. In 1939 they developed a research design which was published in 1941. Three years later they secured significant funds from the American Jewish Committee and from the Jewish Labor Committee, both interested in the analysis and deterrence of anti-Semitism. With these funds they started a project, entitled "Studies in Prejudice" which would eventually result in a series of five books, one of which was *The Authoritarian Personality*.

An important part of this study was devoted to anti-Semitism as an ideology: a consistent and stable system of opinions, values, and attitudes toward Jews. Adorno et al. developed a large pool of items to measure the extent to which respondents agreed with anti-Semitism. These items were submitted to statistical tests, until Adorno et al. had a set with which "stereotyped negative opinions describing the Jews as threatening, immoral and categorically different from non-Jews, and hostile attitudes urging various forms of restriction, exclusion, and suppression as a means of solving the Jewish problem" were measured.[37]

Yet, they suspected that anti-Semitism was related to a more generally unfavorable attitude toward all kinds of minorities accompanied by a favorable attitude towards one's own social group. This phenomenon was labelled "ethnocentrism," a concept coined by W. G. Sumner.[38] They developed measurements for these attitudes and tested their scales which showed internal consistencies and appeared to be strongly related to each other. Hence, they concluded that "Ethnocentrism is based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves stereotyped negative imagery and hostile attitudes regarding outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate."[39]

After the development of these measurements, the idea of measuring prejudice without mention of any outgroup arose. The actual purpose was to detect the personality structure which was susceptible to the ethnocentric ideology. This was in agreement with the central assumption of the research that "the political, economic, and social convictions of an individual often form a broad and coherent pattern, as if bound together by a 'mentality' or 'spirit,' and that this pattern is an expression of deep-lying trends in his personality."[40] Moreover, it was the final step in a tradition of research that had started nearly two decades earlier with Fromm's empirical studies.

Authoritarianism as a Product of Two Traditions

The social science community soon realized that Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford had succeeded in developing a measurement of authoritarianism with the nine sub-syndromes listed above. The principal reason for their quick success may have been that they were able to use methodological as well as substantial knowledge on authoritarianism developed previously but merely mentioned in passing.

First, there was a psychoanalytical tradition to which Fromm had substantially contributed. We have seen that, inspired by Kracauer and drawing on Nietzsche and Freud, Fromm had already, in the early 1930s, arrived at sub-syndromes of conventionalism, authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression, as well as identification with symbols of power and toughness. In his 1936 contribution he added the sub-syndrome of superstitiousness; in 1941, he described destructiveness and rigid conformism. In general, he had pictured the personality structure of authoritarians as being characterized

Scheepers, P. and Baars, J., 1993: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of the Authoritarian Personality,, In: Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 29 (No. 4, Oct. 1993), pp. 345-353.

by a weak Ego, compensated by a strong Super-ego, dominated by external authorities to repress unconscious Id drives.

Adorno et al. also referred to a study by Erikson[41] who had tried to analyze the psychopathological characteristics responsible for Germans supporting Hitler's slogans, Erikson proposed that, because of their cultural and historical background, Germans lacked a strong internal authority for which they compensated by being harsh on their children whom they expected to obey them absolutely. He also stated that Germans were passionately cruel to themselves, were inclined to sadism, and had obsessional concerns about sex.

From a study by Maslow,[42] Adorno et al. derived a description of an authoritarian personality who had a malicious, sceptical, and cynical portrayal of mankind. Maslow characterized this personality as having a strong inclination to stereotype individuals as strong or weak, superior or inferior. Such personalities would be disposed to search for safety in discipline and orderliness.

To summarize, almost all of the sub-syndromes included in authoritarianism had been described in previous studies, except for anti-intraception and projectivity which had been analyzed in the epistemological parts of the "Elements of Anti-Semitism," from Adorno and Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. They maintained that "in a certain sense, all perception is projection . . . but false projection confuses the inner and outer world and defines the most intimate experiences as hostile. Impulses which the subject will not admit as his own even though they are most assuredly so, are attributed to the object—the prospective victim."[43]

Second, there was a methodological tradition to which Fromm had contributed significantly. He was the one who searched for consistent response patterns described as syndromes. There had been exploratory studies by others, however, such as a study by R. Stagner[44] mentioned by Adorno et al. Stagner had developed a procedure to measure tabooed issues such as fascism. He had realized that it would be impossible to ask directly the extent to which people agreed with fascism, so he distilled basic elements of the ideology from the writings of fascist leaders and from scientific literature on fascism. Such basic elements were: "nationalism or opposition to internationalism; imperialism; militarism; racial antagonism; anti-radicalism; middle-class-consciousness, defined as a superior attitude toward the working class; and the benevolent despot or strong man philosophy of government."[45] Next, Stagner translated these ideological elements into questions suitable for a heterogeneous sample, and concluded that at the core of fascism ". . . the attitude of class superiority, . . . the anti-radical attitude, . . . nationalism and racial antagonism are manifested."[46] This procedure was followed by Gundlach,[47] Katz and Cantrill[48] and Edwards.[49] And this procedure, by then certainly not yet conventional, was adopted by Adorno et al. who also benefited from Adorno's earlier content analysis of the writings and speeches of virulent anti-Semites.[50] To conclude, Adorno et al. certainly benefited from methodological developments contributed to by previous researchers in this field of (potential) fascism and its correlates and particularly from the contributions of Erich Fromm.

Conclusions and Discussion

In this study we have tried to detect both theoretical and empirical contributions that eventually became incorporated in the classic concept of authoritarianism. We have shown that Fromm was working on this concept from the late 1920s to the beginning

of the 1940s, time and again elaborating original ideas derived from Kracauer within the framework of a synthesis of Marxian and Freudian theories. He described the core elements of authoritarianism: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, superstition, and identification with power and toughness. More importantly, he gave a psychoanalytical account of the personality structure of authoritarians. Other substantial elements as sub-syndromes of authoritarianism were derived from psychoanalytical descriptions by Erikson and Maslow. The unique contribution of Adorno and Horkheimer was that they analyzed the historical patterns considered to be relevant to the formation of authoritarian personalities.

From a methodological point of view, Fromm paved the way to construct syndromes out of consistent response patterns. Fromm's methodological procedures were improved by Stagner, followed by many others. Given this background, we view the theory of authoritarianism as the fruitful synthesis of psychoanalytical insights with empirical elaboration within the framework of a somewhat pessimistic historical analysis.

Why was Fromm denied the intellectual credit for his contributions? The main reason for this must be sought in the changes the ISR went through during two decades.[51] From the beginning of the 1930s, the two leading thinkers were Horkheimer, who was the director of the ISR, and Fromm. This changed after the emigration to the US, especially when Adorno joined Horkheimer in New York in 1938. The disillusioned Horkheimer turned to Adorno in his need for a new philosophy of history which could explain the recent drama of Nazism, Stalinism, and capitalism. In the dark perspective of Adorno's and Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* there was little room for Fromm's positive orientation which had been a constant element in Fromm's work. He turned from Marxism to the more humanistic orientation of his later work which made him famous, starting with *Escape from Freedom*.

This change in the ISR did not take place without personal frictions. Fromm left the Institute and was more or less considered an enemy who had left the more serious theoretical work for easy popular success. Adorno especially had always disliked Fromm and resented his earlier influence on Horkheimer. Given this background we can understand why Fromm's contribution to the theory of authoritarianism was minimized as much as possible by Adorno but also by Horkheimer, who was co-director of the general project "Studies in Prejudice." The other authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* did not know about the earlier efforts by Fromm, because they had been published in German and some of them not until 1980.

Notes

1. Theodor W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, R. Nevitt Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality*, Short Revised Editon (NY: Norton, 1982).
2. Ibid., p. 157.
3. Ibid., p. 154.
4. Ibid., p. 3.
5. Jos Meloen, Loek Hagendoorn, Q. Raaymakers, L. Visser, "Authoritarianism and the Revival of Political Racism: Reassessments in the Netherlands of the Reliability and Validity of the Concept of Authoritarianism by Adorno et al.," *Political Psychology*, 9 (1988):413–429.
6. R. Christie and Marie Jahoda, *Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality"* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954).
7. R. Brown, "The Authoritarian Personality and the Organisation of Attitudes," in R. Brown, *Social Psychology* (NY: The Free Press, 1965). Loek Hagendoorn, *Het nazisme als ideologie* (Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1982).

Scheepers, P. and Baars, J., 1993: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of the Authoritarian Personality,, In: Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 29 (No. 4, Oct. 1993), pp. 345-353.

8. J. P. Kirscht, and R. C. Dillehay, *Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory* (Lexington· University of Kentucky Press, 1967). Jos Meloen, *De autoritaire reaktie in tijden van welvaart en krisis* (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 1983).

9. K. M. Goldstein and S. Blackman, *Cognitive Style* (NY: Wiley, 1978). W. Vollebergh, *The Limits of Tolerance* (Utrecht: ISOR, 1991).

10. B. Altemeyer, *Right-wing Authoritarianism* (Canada: University of Manitoba Press, 1981). B. Altemeyer, *Enemies of Freedom* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988).

11. Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination. A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923–1950* (Boston: Bantam, 1973). For instance, Jay's observation (p. 240) that "The authoritarian personality" still followed the methodology that was outlined in Horkheimer's 1937 article "Traditional and Critical Theory" has been shown to be incorrect. Martin Jay, "Positive und negative Totalität. Adornos Alternativentwurf zur interdisziplinären Forschung" in Wolfgang Bonss and Axel Honneth, Eds., *Sozialforschung als Kritik* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982); 67–86.

12. Rolf Wiggershaus, *Die Frankfurter Schule* (Munchen and Wien: Hanser, 1986).

13. Jan Baars, *De mythe van de totale beheersing. Adorno, Horkheimer en de dialektiek van de vooruitgang* (Amsterdam: SUA, 1987). Jan Baars, "De ontcjfering van flessenpost," *Kennis en Methode. Tijdschrift voor wetenschapsfilosofie en wetenschapsonderzoek* 12 (1988):158–162.

14. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985).

15. Erich Fromm, *Arbeiter und Angestellte am Vorabend des Dritten Reiches. Eine Sozialpsychologische Untersuchung (1929)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagenstalt, 1980).

16. Marie Jahoda, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Hans Zeisel, *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal* (1933) (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975).

17. Siegfried Kracauer, *Die Angestellten. Aus dem neuesten Deutschland* (1929) (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1971).

18. It is not exactly clear who took care of the data collection. Wolfgang Bonss mentions in his book *Die Einübung des Tatsachenblicks* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982) Weiss, Herzog, Schachtel, and Lazarsfeld. But Samelson points out that Fromm mentions various names in various studies. F. Samelson, "Authoritarianism from Berlin to Berkeley: On Social Psychology and History," *Journal of Social Issues*, 42 (1986):191–208. Fromm's analysis had probably been inspired by Lazarsfeld who published a paper pertaining to this procedure some years earlier. Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Some Remarks on Typological Procedures in Social Research," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, 6 (1937):119–139.

19. Fromm, *Arbeiter und Angestellte*, p. 231.

20. Ibid., p. 246.

21. Ibid., p. 248.

22. Wolfgang Bonss, "Kritische theorie und empirische Sozialforschung: Anmerkungen zu einem Fallbeispiel," in Fromm, *Arbeiter und Angestellte.*

23. Robert Briffault, *The Mothers. A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions* (London: Methuen, 1928). Robert Briffault, "Family Sentiments," *Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung* 2 (1933):355–381.

24. Max Horkheimer, *Dämmerung. Notizen in Deutschland* (1934) (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1974): p. 342.

25. Erich Fromm, "Ueber Methode und Aufgabe einer analytischen Sozial psychologie," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 1 (1932):28–54. Erich Fromm, "Die psychoanalytische Charakterologie und ihre Bedeutung für die Sozialpsychologie," *Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung* 1 (1932):253–277.

26. There appears to be a strong consensus that Fromm deserves the credit for this intellectual enterprise. Michael Billig, *Ideology and Social Psychology* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1982). Wolfgang Bonss, *Die Einübung des Tatsachenblicks* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982). Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination*. Samelson, "Authoritarianism from Berlin to Berkeley." Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism* (Oxford: University Press, 1978). Jan Baars, *De mythe van de totale beheersing*, P. Scheepers, A. Felling, J. Peters, "Social Conditions, Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism: A Theoretical Model of the Early Frankfurt School Updated and Tested," *European Sociological Review*, 6 (1990):15–29.

27. Fromm, "Ueber Methode und Aufgabe," p. 46.

28. Ibid., p. 35.

29. Erich Fromm, "Sozialpsychologischer Teil," in M. Horkheimer, *Studien über Autorität und Familie* (Paris: Alcan, 1936), p.122.

30. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of An Illusion* and *Civilization and its Discontents*, Standard Edition, Vol. 21 (NY: International Universities Press, 1978).

31. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, as cited in Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) (London: Verso: 1979): p: 97. Wilhelm Reich, *Characteranalyse* (1933) (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1981). An early literary presentation of the authoritarian-masochist character was given by Heinrich Mann in his book *Der Untertan* (1918) (München: DTV, 1984).

32. Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (NY: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941).

33. Horkheimer, "Zum Problem der Voraussage in den Sozialwissenschaften," *Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung* 2 (1933):412.

34. Adorno and Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*.

35. Ibid., p. 231.

36. Baars, *De Mythe van de Totale Beheersing.*

37. *The Authoritarian Personality*, p. 71.

38. W. G. Sumner, *Folkways* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1906).

39. The Authoritarian Personality, p. 150.

40. Ibid., p. 1

41. Erik H. Erikson, "Hitler's imagery and German youth," *Psychiatry*, 5 (1942):475–493.

42. Abraham H. Maslow, "The Authoritarian Character Structure," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 18 (1943):410–411.

43. Baars, *De Mythe van de Totale Beheersing.*

44. R. Stagner, "Fascist attitudes, their determining conditions," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7 (1936):438–457.

45. Ibid., p. 450.

46. Ibid., p. 455.

47. H. Gundlach, "Confusion Among Undergraduates in Political and Economic Ideas," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 32 (1937):357–367.

48. D. Katz and H. Cantrill, "An Analysis of Attitudes Toward Communism and Fascism," *Journal of Abnromal and Social Psychology*, 32 (1937):356–366.

49. A. L. Edwards, "Unlabelled Fascist Attitudes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 36 (1941):575–582.

50. Theodor W. Adorno, *The Psychological Technique of Martin Luther Thomas' Radio Addresses.* Gesammelte Schriften (vol. g-1) (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975).

51. Wiggershaus, *Die Frankfurter Schule*, p. 298–307.

Scheepers, P. and Baars, J., 1993: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of the Authoritarian Personality,, In: Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 29 (No. 4, Oct. 1993), pp. 345-353.