Dear Professor Isaac,

Our article, “Is the Tea Party Libertarian, Authoritarian, or Something Else?” develops and tests a novel hypothesis about the ideological sources of support for the Tea Party. Ever since the movement first emerged in early 2009, both scholarly research and press accounts of the Tea Party have struggled to understand the contradiction between its libertarian and authoritarian currents. To resolve this puzzle, our paper has taken an unorthodox approach of blending historical political theory and quantitative methods.

From Nietzsche we take the idea of misarchism; it was his term to describe the laissez-faire ideology of Herbert Spencer, who combined three disparate attitudes – anti-government, pro-state, and moralistic – into a single perspective. We examine Spencer’s political philosophy and Nietzsche’s critique of it to demonstrate how it is distinct from both libertarianism and conventional conservatism. We then conduct a factor analysis of nine different attitudes from the 2012 American National Election Study. We demonstrate that statism and moral traditionalism are intercorrelated on a dimension distinct from attitudes toward government. Regression analysis then shows that the interaction of anti-government and morally statist ideological factors is one of the strongest and most robust predictors of Tea Party support. Multiple robustness checks suggest that the correlation between misarchism and support for the Tea Party is not an artifact of model selection, missing values, or parametric modeling assumptions.

*Perspectives on Politics* is the first journal to which we are submitting this manuscript. *Perspectives* is our ideal venuefor three reasons. First, the article investigates a broadly interesting and timely political puzzle in a creatively synthetic fashion, precisely the kind of scholarship *Perspectives* seeks to foster: namely, what (if anything) is the ideological character of one of the most significant and still perplexing political movements of the past decade? The puzzling nature of the Tea Party’s contradictory ideological currents has been raised in both the popular and scholarly press, yet scholars still have no especially satisfying explanation. This is important because, as we suggest at the end of the article, if Tea Party support is partially driven by a misarchist ideology, then it is unlikely to disappear as a movement after Obama leaves office or the economy recovers. In short, if we are correct, then the tendency which the Tea Party reflects is likely here to stay and its influence on politics would require more scholarly attention than implied by most previous research which doubts the existence of a serious and unique ideological character in Tea Party support. Second, we are submitting to *Perspectives* because it is a generalist rather than specialist politics journal and our approach is emphatically generalist. Because we draw on political theory and political science, and we use both intellectual history and statistical tests as support for our argument, an article of this kind would only fit in a generalist journal with as wide and sophisticated a readership as *Perspectives*. Third, we believe that our paper is a valuable example of how political theorists and quantitative methodologists can collaborate to answer questions that neither can answer on their own. A common critique of many quantitative studies in political science is that they are theoretically weak, and overly focused on methods rather than problems. A common critique of political theory is that while interpretations of contemporary political life might be interesting or insightful, they can be overly abstract or empirically unsophisticated. By taking these critiques seriously and approaching an important question with both traditions at once, we hope this article combines the strengths and minimizes the weaknesses of both.