Death and Terror Management

Alex Applebee & L. N. Combe

2026

Death and Terror Management: The Engine Beneath the Machine

A Unified Thesis on Mortality Salience, Cultural Worldview Defence, and the Psychological Architecture of Institutional Obedience

Alex Applebee and L. N. Combe

OMXUS Research Series

Author's Note

This paper exists because of a question that should be obvious but almost never gets asked: why do people defend systems that are killing them?

Not metaphorically. Literally. People vote for politicians who cut their healthcare. They cheer for economies that impoverish them. They worship institutions that cage their neighbours. They wave flags for countries that send their children to die in wars fought for resource extraction. And when you point this out – with data, with evidence, with the exposed machinery laid bare – they don't thank you. They attack you. They cling harder.

Terror Management Theory explains why.

The psychological mechanism is straightforward. Humans know they will die. This knowledge produces a terror so fundamental that it cannot be faced directly. To manage it, humans construct cultural worldviews – shared belief systems that provide meaning, permanence, and the feeling that one's life matters beyond the biological. Religion, nationalism, ideology, institutional loyalty, tradition. These are not incidental features of human civilisation. They are its load-bearing walls. And they are load-bearing specifically because they hold back the awareness of death.

When you threaten someone's cultural worldview, you are not threatening an opinion. You are threatening the psychological structure that stands between them and the full conscious awareness that they will cease to exist. The defensive response is not intellectual. It is existential. It is survival-level. And it explains – with over 500 experiments across 30+ countries to back it up – why humans punish deviance, rally around authority, attack outsiders, and resist change even when change would save their lives.

This matters for every one of the 14 goals.

Goal 1: Direct democracy. People cling to representative democracy partly because it is familiar. Familiarity is a death-anxiety buffer. Challenging the system triggers worldview threat, which triggers defensive conservatism. TMT predicts that people will defend the political system they grew up in, because that system is part of the cultural architecture that makes them feel safe from mortality. Direct democracy is not just a policy proposal. It asks people to change a psychological defence structure. You have to understand that to make the case for it.

Goal 2: Work 22 hours, keep your pay. Work is an immortality project. Becker named it explicitly. The Protestant work ethic is not about productivity – it is about earning a place in the cosmic order. Telling someone their 60-hour week is unnecessary threatens their sense of purpose, which threatens their mortality buffer. The resistance to shorter work weeks is not economic. It is existential.

Goal 3: Rehabilitation over imprisonment. TMT explains punitiveness more cleanly than most criminological theories. Remind people of death and they punish harder – Rosenblatt's judges set bail nine times higher after a mortality salience prompt. Part of the demand for punishment is a terror management response, not a calculation about crime. Punishing deviants reinforces the worldview that the rules are real, that the structure holds, that the universe has moral order.

Goal 4: Restorative resolution first. Courts carry a heavy symbolic load. The robes, the bench and the formal language reinforce a shared cultural worldview, and TMT predicts that people value that ritual for the order it signals. Restorative processes must offer the same sense of order to be trusted.

Goal 5: Community crisis response. TMT shows that the urge to punish deviance rises with death anxiety, and that shapes what the public asks of police. CAHOOTS has sent medics and crisis workers to mental-health calls for 35 years, freeing police for crime and answering distress with care.

Goal 7: Regulate drugs. Drug policy is shaped by worldview defence as well as by health evidence. Substances that alter consciousness threaten the shared reality that buffers death anxiety. Portugal moved personal use from the courts to health panels in 2001, and drug deaths fell. A regulated, age-checked supply, as with alcohol and tobacco, protects children better: the dealer checks no ID.

Goal 9: No foreign investment in housing. Housing speculation is an immortality project – accumulating assets that outlast the body. The resistance to housing reform is not rational self-interest by homeowners. It is existential. The house is a fortress against impermanence.

Goal 10: Food contains only things proven safe. The food industry profits from death denial. Sell poison, treat the diseases it causes, profit from the treatment. The entire cycle depends on people not confronting the reality that what they eat is killing them – which they cannot confront because confronting mortality triggers the very defences that make them cling to the familiar (including familiar diets).

Goal 13: $29 ring, your people come in 60 seconds. This is the inverse of TMT. Instead of managing death anxiety through worldview defence, you manage it through genuine safety. Real

people, real proximity, real response time. The ring does not buffer death anxiety with ideology. It buffers it with your crew showing up.

Goal 14: Cancer is 90% preventable. Prevention requires confronting mortality. TMT predicts that people will avoid prevention information because it activates death awareness, which activates defensive responses, which include denial. The people who most need to hear "this is preventable" are the ones whose terror management systems will most aggressively reject the message.

Understanding Terror Management Theory is not academic. It is operational. Every one of the 14 goals requires changing systems that people defend not because the systems work but because the systems are psychologically load-bearing. If you do not understand why the wall is there, you will not know how to take it down without the ceiling collapsing on the people underneath it.

Yalom showed the way out. When death is confronted consciously – deliberately, with support, in community – the defensive response inverts. People become less punitive, less materialistic, more present, more connected. The terror management apparatus stands down. The person wakes up.

The 14 goals are not policy proposals. They are an attempt to build a society where people do not need to cling to broken systems to feel safe from death. A society that integrates mortality rather than hiding it. A society where the structures that hold back the terror are real – your people, your crew, your community response network – rather than symbolic – flags, anthems, gavels, cages.

This paper is the map of the engine beneath the machine. Read it. Understand why the machine resists dismantling. Then build the thing that makes it unnecessary.

Abstract

Terror Management Theory (TMT), founded on Ernest Becker's thesis that awareness of mortality is the primary driver of human cultural production, has generated over 500 experimental studies across more than 30 countries demonstrating that reminders of death systematically increase punitiveness, ingroup bias, nationalism, preference for authoritarian leaders, and hostility toward worldview-threatening others. This paper synthesises the TMT literature – including the foundational work of Greenberg, Pyszczynski, and Solomon; the landmark Rosenblatt bail study; the Burke et al. (2010) meta-analysis of 277 experiments; and the existential psychotherapy counter-evidence from Yalom – into a unified account of how death anxiety functions as the psychological substrate of institutional obedience, system justification, and resistance to structural change. We integrate evidence on the medicalisation of dying (Gawande, 2014), the palliative care paradox (Temel et al., 2010), the empirical failure of stage models of grief (Maciejewski et al., 2007), the death industry as commercial exploitation of mortality denial (Mitford, 1963/1998), and cross-cultural counterpoints from Buddhist, Mexican, and Aboriginal Australian death-integration traditions. We argue that TMT provides the missing psychological mechanism connecting death awareness to political conservatism, punitive justice, and system justification – and that conscious confrontation with mortality, rather than institutional suppression of it, produces the conditions necessary for democratic self-governance, restorative justice, and community-based safety.

Keywords: Terror Management Theory, mortality salience, cultural worldview defence, self-esteem as anxiety buffer, death anxiety, system justification, authoritarianism, punitiveness, existential psychotherapy, palliative care, direct democracy

Table of Contents

1. Chapter 1: The Worm at the Core – Becker and the Denial of Death
2. Chapter 2: Terror Management Theory – 500 Experiments
3. Chapter 3: The Judges and the Bail – Mortality Salience in Action
4. Chapter 4: Self-Esteem as Anxiety Buffer – The TMT Dual-Process Model
5. Chapter 5: Death Anxiety and Political Conservatism
6. Chapter 6: System Justification – Clinging to What Kills You
7. Chapter 7: The Five Stages That Never Were
8. Chapter 8: Medicine's Death Denial
9. Chapter 9: The Palliative Paradox
10. Chapter 10: The Death Industry
11. Chapter 11: Cross-Cultural Counterpoint – Not Everyone Hides from Death
12. Chapter 12: Confronting the Terror – Yalom and Existential Awakening
13. Chapter 13: The Mechanism Beneath the Machine – TMT as Unified Explanation
14. Chapter 14: Implications – What a Death-Integrated Society Looks Like
15. References
16. Appendix A: Verification Flags
17. Appendix B: Cross-References to Related Research

Chapter 1: The Worm at the Core

Becker and the Denial of Death

In 1973, the cultural anthropologist Ernest Becker published *The Denial of Death*. It won the Pulitzer Prize the year after he died, which feels appropriate for a book arguing that everything humans build – culture, religion, art, war, skyscrapers, nations – is fundamentally a response to the knowledge that we will die.

Becker's argument is deceptively simple. Humans are the only animals aware of their own mortality. This awareness creates a terror so deep that we cannot function if we face it directly. So we don't. Instead, we construct what Becker called "hero systems" – cultural frameworks that allow us to feel like we matter, that our lives have significance beyond the biological, that some part of us will persist after the body fails. Religion offers literal immortality. Legacy offers symbolic immortality. Accumulating wealth, building monuments, writing books, raising children who carry your name – all variations on the same theme. We are, in Becker's formulation, "gods with anuses." Creatures with infinite ambitions trapped in finite, decaying bodies.

This is not a metaphor. Becker meant it literally: the engine driving most of human civilisation is death denial.

The implications are total. If Becker is right, then culture is not primarily about coordination, or meaning-making, or aesthetic expression. It is about terror management. Every institution, every ritual, every symbol system is, at its root, an anxiety-management device. The question is not

whether people fear death – they do, universally, though the forms differ – but what that fear produces. And what it produces, Becker argued, is everything.

Everything includes the beautiful and the horrific in equal measure. The cathedral and the crusade. The symphony and the genocide. The heroic rescue and the pogrom. All of it – the highest achievements of human civilisation and the lowest – driven by the same engine: the need to feel that one's existence matters in a universe that is manifestly indifferent to it.

For decades, this was a philosophical argument. Elegant, disturbing, unfalsifiable. Then three social psychologists decided to test it.

Chapter 2: Terror Management Theory

500 Experiments Across 30+ Countries

Sheldon Solomon, Jeff Greenberg, and Tom Pyszczynski were graduate students when they read Becker. They spent the next thirty years building an experimental program around his ideas. They called it Terror Management Theory, or TMT, and the core experimental design is beautifully simple.

Take two groups of people. Ask one group to think about their own death – write a paragraph about what will happen when they die, answer questions about the process of dying. This is called "mortality salience." The other group gets a neutral task – think about watching television, or describe a dental procedure. Then measure the difference in how the two groups behave.

The results are consistent across more than 500 studies in over 30 countries. When reminded of death, people:

- Judge moral transgressors more harshly
- Become more aggressive toward people who challenge their worldview
- Show stronger ingroup bias
- Display more nationalism and flag-waving
- Become more hostile toward immigrants and outgroups
- Give more to charity (within their own group)
- Become more punitive in legal judgments
- Show increased preference for authoritarian leaders
- Express greater support for military force
- Consume more status-signalling goods
- Increase physical distancing from outgroup members
- Show elevated physiological stress responses to worldview-threatening stimuli

The effect is not subtle. Burke, Martens, and Faucher conducted a meta-analysis in 2010 covering two decades of TMT research – 277 experiments – and found robust effect sizes across the literature. The theory has survived cross-cultural replication across dozens of countries, including the United States, Germany, Israel, Iran, Japan, China, Brazil, Italy, the Netherlands, Australia, and Canada. The mortality salience effect on worldview defence appears to be a human universal, not a Western artefact.

It is worth noting that the replication crisis in social psychology has raised legitimate methodological questions about some individual findings. Martin and van den Bos, among others, have pressed

on whether the specific mechanism TMT proposes – death anxiety specifically, rather than general existential anxiety or uncertainty – is the correct explanation. Some researchers have proposed that mortality salience is a special case of meaning threat or uncertainty salience, and that any reminder of existential groundlessness would produce similar effects.

This is an important theoretical debate. But it does not change the practical finding. Whether the mechanism is death anxiety specifically or existential anxiety broadly, the pattern holds: remind people that the ground beneath them is not solid, and they cling harder to whatever structure they are standing on.

The TMT Dual-Defence Model

TMT proposes that humans manage death anxiety through two distinct psychological systems, operating at different levels of awareness:

Proximal defences activate when death thoughts are in focal attention – conscious, accessible, immediate. These are rational, direct responses: "I'm healthy," "I exercise," "Death is far away," "Medical technology will save me." They function to push the thought of death out of conscious awareness. They are suppression mechanisms.

Distal defences activate when death thoughts are on the periphery of awareness – accessible but not focal. This is the more insidious process, and it is where the worldview defence, self-esteem striving, and punitiveness live. When death thoughts have been activated and then pushed out of awareness (by proximal defences or by the passage of time), the residual anxiety drives people to bolster their cultural worldview and pursue self-esteem within that worldview. They do not know why they are doing it. They are not thinking about death. They are thinking about how much they dislike immigrants, or how good it feels to buy an expensive watch, or how severely that criminal should be punished.

This dual-process model explains a finding that initially puzzled TMT researchers: the worldview-defence effects are strongest not immediately after the mortality salience manipulation, but after a brief delay. The delay allows the proximal defences to push death thoughts out of focal attention, at which point the distal defences activate. The person is no longer thinking about death. They are just – inexplicably, to them – more punitive, more nationalistic, more hostile to dissent.

This is the mechanism. This is the engine. And it runs constantly, because modern life is saturated with death reminders – news, violence, illness, the aging of one's own body – that rarely reach conscious processing but continuously prime the distal defence system. We live inside a permanent low-grade mortality salience condition. The defences are always on.

Chapter 3: The Judges and the Bail

Mortality Salience in Action

The most striking single finding in the TMT literature is a 1989 study by Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, and Lyon. They took a group of municipal court judges in Tucson, Arizona, and gave half of them the standard mortality salience treatment – a questionnaire asking them to describe the emotions aroused by thoughts of their own death. The other half got a neutral questionnaire.

Then they gave all the judges a case file: a woman arrested for prostitution. Set bail.

The judges who hadn't been reminded of death set bail at an average of $50. The judges who had been reminded of death set bail at an average of $455. Nine times higher.

[VERIFICATION FLAG: The $455 vs $50 figures are widely cited in popular accounts of TMT, including in Solomon, Greenberg & Pyszczynski's own popular book *The Worm at the Core* (2015). The original paper is Rosenblatt et al. (1989) in JPSP 57(4), 681-690. However: verify whether these are bail amounts or bond amounts, and whether the exact dollar figures are from the original paper or from a later retelling. The study is real and the directional finding is robust, but the specific numbers need confirmation against the primary source.]

Think about what this means. A judge's awareness of mortality – something entirely irrelevant to the case – nearly multiplied a defendant's bail by an order of magnitude. The defendant did nothing different. The crime was the same. The only variable was a questionnaire the judge filled out twenty minutes earlier.

This is not about bad judges. This is about humans. We manage our terror by reinforcing the cultural structures that make us feel safe, and one of the most powerful ways to reinforce structure is to punish those who violate it.

The prostitution case is not incidental. The woman in the hypothetical transgressed a moral norm – a cultural rule about acceptable sexual behaviour. For the death-primed judges, that transgression was not just a legal matter. It was a worldview threat. She had challenged the moral order that stood between them and the void. The punishment was not proportional to the crime. It was proportional to the terror.

This finding has been extended across dozens of studies. Mortality salience increases:

- Recommended sentences for crimes (Florian & Mikulincer, 1997)
- Support for violent retaliation against worldview-threatening groups (Pyszczynski et al., 2006)
- Derogation of moral transgressors (Rosenblatt et al., 1989)
- Reward of worldview-consistent behaviour (Jonas et al., 2002)

The pattern is always the same: death reminder –> worldview defence –> punishment of deviance, reward of conformity. The legal system is not exempt from this. It is a primary expression of it.

Chapter 4: Self-Esteem as Anxiety Buffer

The TMT Dual-Process Model

TMT makes a specific and testable claim about self-esteem: it functions as an anxiety buffer against death awareness. Self-esteem, in the TMT framework, is not a personality trait or a measure of psychological health. It is a cultural construction – the feeling that one is meeting the standards of value prescribed by one's cultural worldview. It buffers death anxiety because it provides the sense that one is a valuable contributor to a meaningful universe.

Three lines of evidence support this:

1. The anxiety-buffer hypothesis. If self-esteem buffers death anxiety, then bolstering self-esteem should reduce the worldview-defence response to mortality salience. This has been confirmed repeatedly. Participants who receive positive self-esteem feedback before the mortality salience manipulation show weaker worldview-defence effects than those who do not (Harmon-Jones et al., 1997).

2. The mortality salience hypothesis. If cultural worldviews buffer death anxiety, then threatening those worldviews should increase the accessibility of death-related thoughts. This too has been confirmed. When people encounter worldview-threatening information – criticism of their country, challenges to their religious beliefs, confrontation with outgroup members – death-thought accessibility increases, even when the worldview threat has nothing to do with actual physical danger (Schimel et al., 2007).

3. The death-thought accessibility hypothesis. If worldview defence is driven by death anxiety, then worldview threats should increase the cognitive accessibility of death-related thoughts (measured through word-completion tasks, lexical decision tasks, and other implicit measures). This has been confirmed across multiple studies and paradigms (Hayes et al., 2010).

The three hypotheses form a triangle: self-esteem buffers death anxiety; cultural worldview buffers death anxiety; threats to either increase death-thought accessibility. The system is self-reinforcing. The person who feels they are living up to their culture's standards feels less death anxiety. The person who feels less death anxiety clings less frantically to their cultural worldview. The person whose worldview is secure has more cognitive bandwidth for genuine self-evaluation.

But the inverse is also true. The person whose self-esteem is threatened clings harder to their cultural worldview. The person whose worldview is threatened experiences more death anxiety. The person experiencing more death anxiety becomes more punitive, more nationalistic, more hostile to difference.

This is not a theory about fragile people. It is a theory about all people. The self-esteem buffer is universal. The question is what happens when it fails – when the person cannot achieve the standards of value their culture prescribes, or when those standards are revealed as arbitrary. The answer, according to 30 years of TMT research, is that the terror returns, and the defences escalate.

Self-Esteem, Status, and the Immortality Project

Becker called the pursuit of self-esteem an "immortality project" – the attempt to construct a symbolic self that transcends physical death. This is why the loss of status, reputation, or social standing can feel catastrophic out of all proportion to its practical consequences. It is not vanity. It is mortality management. The person who loses their job, their marriage, their social position has not just lost a practical arrangement. They have lost a piece of the structure that held back the awareness of death.

This has direct implications for understanding why people defend economic systems that impoverish them. The worker who identifies with their employer, the voter who identifies with their political party, the citizen who identifies with their nation – each has woven these institutional affiliations into their self-esteem structure. To threaten the institution is to threaten the self. To threaten the self is to remove the anxiety buffer. To remove the anxiety buffer is to expose the terror.

The 40-hour work week is not just an economic arrangement. It is an immortality project. "I work hard" is not a description. It is a death-anxiety management strategy. And this is why telling

people they could work 22 hours and keep their pay does not produce the gratitude you might expect. It produces threat.

Chapter 5: Death Anxiety and Political Conservatism

Why Mortality Salience Moves People Right

One of the most consistent findings in the TMT literature is that mortality salience shifts political attitudes in a conservative direction. This has been demonstrated across multiple countries and political contexts:

- American participants reminded of death showed increased support for George W. Bush and decreased support for John Kerry in the 2004 election cycle (Landau et al., 2004)
- Mortality salience increased support for extreme military solutions, including the use of nuclear weapons against perceived enemies (Pyszczynski et al., 2006)
- Death reminders increased preference for charismatic, decisive leaders over relationship-oriented leaders (Cohen et al., 2004)
- Mortality salience increased ingroup identification and ingroup bias (Castano et al., 2002)
- Death-primed participants showed increased endorsement of the existing social hierarchy (Jost et al., 2003)

The direction is consistent: death anxiety moves people toward tradition, authority, order, hierarchy, and ingroup preference. It moves them away from openness, egalitarianism, tolerance, and structural change.

This is not because conservatism is "wrong" in some abstract sense. It is because the conservative orientation – in its psychological (not necessarily partisan) form – prioritises stability, order, tradition, and resistance to change. These are exactly the features a cultural worldview needs to function as a death-anxiety buffer. A worldview that is stable, orderly, traditional, and resistant to change is a worldview that feels permanent. And permanence is what the death-anxious mind needs.

The progressive orientation – openness to change, tolerance of ambiguity, willingness to dismantle and rebuild social structures – is psychologically threatening precisely because it destabilises the structures that buffer death anxiety. This does not mean progressivism is wrong. It means that progressive change requires overcoming a psychological defence system that is activated by the very act of proposing it.

The 9/11 Effect

The September 11 attacks provided a natural experiment in mortality salience on a national scale. In the months following the attacks, the United States experienced:

- A surge in nationalism, flag purchases, and patriotic sentiment
- Increased hostility toward Arab and Muslim Americans
- Dramatically increased approval for aggressive military action
- A spike in authoritarian attitudes
- Increased support for the incumbent president (Bush's approval rating went from 51% to 90%)

- Decreased tolerance for political dissent

TMT researchers predicted all of this. Pyszczynski, Solomon, and Greenberg (2003) published *In the Wake of 9/11: The Psychology of Terror*, documenting how the attacks functioned as a massive, uncontrolled mortality salience manipulation on the entire American population. The subsequent political trajectory – the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, the PATRIOT Act, the normalisation of surveillance and torture – was, from a TMT perspective, a textbook worldview-defence response. Not rational policy. Terror management at national scale.

The political leaders who understood this – consciously or intuitively – exploited it. The repeated invocation of 9/11 in political rhetoric, the colour-coded threat-level system, the constant warnings of further attacks – all of these maintained the mortality salience condition that drives populations toward authority, conformity, and support for aggressive action against perceived worldview threats.

This is not conspiracy theory. This is basic social psychology, confirmed by decades of experimental evidence. Scared people cling to authority. People reminded of death become scared. The rest follows mechanically.

Chapter 6: System Justification

Clinging to What Kills You

TMT provides the missing psychological substrate for System Justification Theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). System justification research has demonstrated a pervasive human tendency to defend and rationalise the existing social, economic, and political order – even among those most disadvantaged by it. Low-income voters who oppose wealth redistribution. Racial minorities who internalise negative stereotypes. Women who defend patriarchal structures. These are not failures of information or intelligence. They are terror management operations.

The existing system, whatever its flaws, is known. It is familiar. It has been the backdrop of one's entire life. It is woven into one's self-esteem structure, one's sense of identity, one's understanding of how the world works. To challenge it is to pull at a thread that leads to the void.

Jost et al. (2003) demonstrated that system justification tendencies increase under conditions of threat – including mortality salience. When people feel threatened, they do not become more critical of the system that is threatening them. They become more defensive of it. They rationalise its failures. They blame its victims. They attack its critics.

This is why reform is so difficult. The people who most need change are often the people who most resist it – not because they don't understand their situation, but because understanding it fully would require dismantling the worldview structure that is holding back their death anxiety. The cost of seeing clearly is too high when seeing clearly means seeing that the structure you've invested your identity in is not just flawed but actively hostile to your interests.

The Paradox of the Informed Citizen

TMT explains a paradox that has troubled democratic theorists for decades: why do people vote against their interests even when they have access to accurate information?

The answer is that "interests" is doing two things simultaneously. There are material interests – wages, healthcare, housing, safety – and there are existential interests – the maintenance of the worldview structure that buffers death anxiety. When these conflict, existential interests win. Not because people are stupid. Because death is more frightening than poverty.

The voter who supports a politician who will cut their healthcare is not making a mistake. They are making a trade. The politician represents a worldview – a set of values, a story about what matters, a vision of social order – that provides existential comfort. The healthcare is a material benefit. The worldview maintenance is a survival strategy. Survival wins.

This is why providing people with "better information" so rarely changes political behaviour. The information is not the bottleneck. The terror is.

Chapter 7: The Five Stages That Never Were

In 1969, Elisabeth Kubler-Ross published *On Death and Dying*, introducing the five stages of grief: denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance. It became one of the most widely known psychological models in history. It is taught in medical schools, nursing programs, social work curricula, and grief counselling training. It has permeated popular culture so thoroughly that most people can name the stages without ever having read the book.

There is one problem. The model was never empirically validated as a sequential process, and subsequent research has consistently failed to confirm it.

[VERIFICATION FLAG: The five stages model is widely acknowledged in the research literature as empirically unsupported in its sequential form. Kubler-Ross herself noted in later work that the stages were not meant as a rigid sequence. Maciejewski et al. (2007) in JAMA tested the model empirically and found partial support for the individual states but not for the proposed sequence. The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement (Stroebe & Schut, 1999) is considered a more empirically grounded alternative. The stages were based on Kubler-Ross's clinical observations of dying patients, not on systematic research.]

Kubler-Ross developed the stages from her observations of dying patients at the University of Chicago. They were clinical impressions – patterns she noticed – not findings from controlled research. She never claimed they were linear or universal in her original formulation, though the model was subsequently taught and applied as though they were.

What actually happens when people grieve or face death is messier. People oscillate. They feel multiple "stages" simultaneously. Some skip stages entirely. Some cycle back. The Dual Process Model proposed by Stroebe and Schut in 1999, which describes bereaved people oscillating between loss-oriented and restoration-oriented coping, has considerably more empirical support.

The persistence of the Kubler-Ross model despite its lack of empirical foundation is itself a lesson in terror management. We want death to have a script. We want grief to follow a predictable arc. We want the process to be orderly and to end with "acceptance" – a tidy resolution that implies death can be integrated and normalised. The model persists not because it is accurate but because it is comforting. It manages the terror by imposing narrative structure on chaos.

This is TMT in miniature. A cultural product (the five stages) functions as a worldview element (death has an orderly process) that buffers death anxiety (if death follows a script, it is manageable). The fact that the model is empirically false does not reduce its psychological utility. Terror management does not require truth. It requires structure.

Chapter 8: Medicine's Death Denial

Atul Gawande, a surgeon and writer, published *Being Mortal* in 2014. Its argument is straightforward: modern medicine is very good at fighting death and very bad at knowing when to stop.

The medicalisation of dying means that the default trajectory for a terminal patient is aggressive treatment until the body fails. More chemo. Another surgery. One more round. This happens not because doctors are callous but because the entire system – training, incentives, culture, and the terror management instincts of everyone involved – is oriented toward fighting death rather than acknowledging it.

Medical training is itself a terror management system. Doctors are trained to defeat death. When they cannot defeat it, they often respond not with acceptance but with escalation. The language reveals the framework: we "fight" cancer, we "battle" disease, we "lose" patients. This is the language of war, not of care. And war is the quintessential worldview-defence response to existential threat.

The consequences are measurable. A significant proportion of lifetime Medicare spending occurs in the last months of life. Gawande cites the figure of roughly 25% of Medicare spending occurring in the last year of life.

[VERIFICATION FLAG: The "25% of Medicare spending in the last year of life" figure has been widely cited for decades. The original source is typically attributed to analyses by the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC) and earlier work by Lubitz & Riley (1993). Some more recent analyses suggest the figure may be somewhat lower or that the trend has been stable/declining slightly. The exact percentage and time frame (last 6 months vs last 12 months) varies by source. Verify the specific figure used.]

Patients in the last weeks of life are subjected to treatments that extend suffering without meaningfully extending life. They die in ICUs instead of at home. They spend their final days intubated, in pain, surrounded by machines rather than family. And in many cases, the aggressive treatment actually shortens their lives.

The family's terror management is equally operative. Children who cannot accept a parent's dying push for "doing everything" – not because "everything" is medically indicated, but because stopping treatment means accepting death, and accepting death means facing the terror. The doctor, the patient, and the family are all running the same programme. The programme is not "save the patient." The programme is "deny death."

Chapter 9: The Palliative Paradox

In 2010, Jennifer Temel and colleagues published a study in the *New England Journal of Medicine* that should have changed everything. They took patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer – a terminal diagnosis – and randomly assigned them to either standard oncology care or standard care plus early palliative care.

The patients who received early palliative care had better quality of life, less depression, and less aggressive end-of-life treatment. That much was expected.

What was not expected: they also lived longer. Median survival was 11.6 months with palliative care versus 8.9 months with standard care alone. Patients who were allowed to stop fighting death and focus on living well actually lived almost three months longer than those who kept fighting.

[VERIFICATION FLAG: Confirm exact median survival figures (11.6 vs 8.9 months). These are widely cited and likely accurate. Note: the survival difference was a secondary outcome, not the primary endpoint. The primary outcomes were quality of life and mood. The survival finding, while striking, was not what the study was powered to detect. Has this survival benefit been replicated in subsequent palliative care RCTs?]

This is not a small finding. It suggests that the entire apparatus of aggressive end-of-life treatment – the thing that consumes enormous resources and causes enormous suffering – may be actively counterproductive. Not just less humane, but less effective at the one thing it claims to do: keep people alive.

Read that again through the TMT lens. The terror management response to terminal illness is to fight death with every available tool. The data says this response kills you faster. The thing the terror drives you to do – cling harder, fight more, deny more aggressively – is the thing that shortens your life. The defence mechanism is the disease.

Palliative care works because it does what Yalom's existential therapy does: it confronts death consciously rather than defending against it. It asks: given that you are dying, how do you want to live? This question deactivates the terror management system by replacing unconscious avoidance with conscious engagement. And when the terror management system stands down, the body follows. Stress hormones decrease. Sleep improves. Immune function stabilises. The person lives longer because they stopped fighting death and started living.

Chapter 10: The Death Industry

Jessica Mitford's *The American Way of Death* (1963, revised 1998) exposed the funeral industry as a case study in exploiting death denial for profit. Embalming – a practice virtually unknown outside North America – was marketed as both necessary and dignified, despite being neither required by law in most cases nor historically standard practice. Expensive caskets, elaborate viewings, upselling at the moment of maximum vulnerability.

Mitford's investigation revealed an industry that had constructed an entire artificial ritual around death, presented it as traditional and necessary, and charged grieving families accordingly. The

FTC eventually passed the Funeral Rule in 1984, requiring itemised pricing and prohibiting certain deceptive practices, largely in response to Mitford's work.

The broader point extends beyond funeral costs. The way a culture handles its dead reveals its relationship with death itself. A culture that embalms, displays, and buries its dead in sealed caskets is a culture that cannot accept decomposition – the physical reality of what death means. It is, in Becker's framework, one more immortality project: the preservation of the body as a denial of what has happened to it.

The death industry is TMT made commercial. The funeral home sells worldview defence: your loved one looks "natural," the casket will "protect" them, the cemetery plot is "eternal." These are not descriptions of physical reality. They are death-anxiety management products. The family is not buying a box. They are buying a few more minutes before the terror arrives.

The average American funeral costs between $7,000 and $12,000. The average American has less than $1,000 in savings. The death industry extracts wealth from the terrified at the moment of maximum vulnerability and calls it dignity.

Chapter 11: Cross-Cultural Counterpoint

Not Everyone Hides from Death

TMT research has been replicated across 30+ countries, but the strength and character of mortality salience effects vary culturally in ways that support Yalom rather than undermining Becker.

In many Buddhist cultures, daily meditation on death (*maranasati*) is a standard practice. Theravada monks in Thailand and Myanmar contemplate decomposing corpses as part of their training. The purpose is not morbid but functional: by confronting impermanence directly and repeatedly, the practitioner weakens the grip of death anxiety and, with it, the defensive clinging to self, status, and worldview that TMT predicts. The limited research comparing TMT effects across cultures suggests that populations with stronger death-awareness traditions show weaker mortality salience effects on punitiveness and ingroup bias, though this literature is thin and methodologically difficult (comparing cultures introduces a thousand confounds).

Mexican *Dia de los Muertos* traditions integrate death into communal life through celebration, humour, and direct address to the dead. The ritual is not a denial of death's reality but an annual communal confrontation with it – exactly the kind of conscious processing that Yalom's clinical work suggests reduces defensive responses.

Aboriginal Australian cultures incorporate death into the social fabric through elaborate mortuary rituals, "sorry business," and ongoing relationships with ancestors. Death is not hidden but woven into the structure of social obligation. The kinship systems described in the social group scaling literature extend across the boundary between living and dead.

West African and Caribbean traditions maintain ongoing conversational relationships with the dead. The ancestor is not gone. They are present, consultable, part of the decision-making community. This is not denial of death – the person died, everyone knows they died – but it is a refusal to accept that death terminates relationship. The psychological effect is to weaken the finality that drives the terror.

These cultural practices are not controlled experiments, and citing them as "proof" that death awareness reduces authoritarianism would be sloppy. But they are existence proofs: it is possible to build cultural systems that confront death openly rather than hiding it, and those systems produce communities that are, by most measures, less punitive and more communally oriented than death-denying ones.

The pattern across cultures is consistent with the TMT dual-process model. When death is processed consciously – through ritual, meditation, communal acknowledgment – the distal defence system does not activate. There is no residual unprocessed death anxiety to drive worldview defence, punitiveness, or authoritarianism. The terror is metabolised rather than managed.

Western industrial societies, by contrast, have systematically removed death from public life. People die in hospitals, not homes. Bodies are handled by professionals, not families. Children are shielded from death. Open-casket viewings are stage-managed to make the dead look alive. The cultural message is clear: death is not part of life. It is an aberration, a failure, something that happens in specialised facilities away from the daily routine.

This removal ensures that death remains unprocessed. And unprocessed death anxiety, TMT tells us, is the engine of authoritarianism, punitiveness, nationalism, and institutional obedience. The Western industrial approach to death is not just psychologically unhealthy for individuals. It is structurally authoritarian for the societies that practice it.

Chapter 12: Confronting the Terror

Yalom and Existential Awakening

Irvin Yalom, the existential psychotherapist, has spent decades arguing that the solution to death anxiety is not avoidance but confrontation. In *Staring at the Sun* (2008) and his earlier *Existential Psychotherapy* (1980), Yalom describes a therapeutic approach that faces death directly.

His clinical observation, supported by broader research in existential psychology, is that people who confront their mortality rather than defending against it tend to experience what he calls an "awakening experience." They reprioritise. They become less materialistic, more present, more connected to others. They stop accumulating and start living.

This is the inverse of what TMT predicts for unconscious death reminders. When death is brought into conscious awareness deliberately and processed rather than defended against, it often produces growth rather than defensiveness. The terror management response – the clinging to worldview, the punishing of deviance, the nationalism – appears to be specifically a response to death anxiety that remains unconscious or unprocessed.

The implication is striking: a society that openly discusses and prepares for death might be less authoritarian, less punitive, and less violent than one that hides it.

The Awakening Experience in Detail

Yalom's clinical cases describe a consistent pattern. The patient receives a terminal diagnosis, or has a near-death experience, or confronts mortality through some other unavoidable route. After the initial terror – which is real and should not be minimised – something shifts. The patient reports:

- Trivial concerns falling away
- Increased presence and attention to immediate experience
- Deeper connection with loved ones
- Decreased concern with social status and material accumulation
- Greater capacity for authenticity and emotional honesty
- Reduced fear of social disapproval
- A sense that time has become more valuable, not less

This is not denial. This is not the "acceptance" stage of Kubler-Ross (which, recall, was never empirically validated as a stage). This is a qualitative shift in the relationship with mortality. The person has moved from unconscious avoidance to conscious integration. The terror management apparatus has stood down – not because the terror has been eliminated, but because it has been faced.

The therapeutic implications are significant. But the political implications are enormous. If conscious death confrontation reduces punitiveness, nationalism, and worldview rigidity – and the evidence from both clinical work and cross-cultural comparison suggests that it does – then a society's relationship with death is not a private matter. It is a structural determinant of its political character.

Growth Through Mortality Awareness

Post-traumatic growth research (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004) provides additional evidence. People who have confronted death and survived – cancer survivors, combat veterans, accident survivors – frequently report positive psychological changes: greater appreciation for life, improved relationships, increased personal strength, recognition of new possibilities, and spiritual or existential deepening.

This is not universal. Not everyone who confronts death grows from it. Trauma can also produce PTSD, despair, and defensive rigidity. The outcome depends on the processing. Supported, communal, conscious engagement with mortality tends to produce growth. Unsupported, isolated, unconscious exposure tends to produce the TMT defensive response.

The lesson for system design is clear: you cannot simply "remind people of death" and expect positive outcomes. That is what 9/11 did. That is what the news cycle does. What you can do is create structures that support conscious, communal engagement with mortality. Death cafes. Advance directive workshops. Community-based end-of-life care. Intergenerational contact with the dying and the dead. Cultural rituals that name death and sit with it rather than hiding from it.

Chapter 13: The Mechanism Beneath the Machine

TMT as Unified Explanation

Taken together, this body of work tells a coherent story:

1. **Humans are uniquely aware of death and uniquely terrified by it** (Becker). This is the foundational condition. No other animal has it. Every cultural product and institutional structure must be understood in light of it.

2. **This terror drives much of what we call culture, including its most destructive features:** authoritarianism, punitiveness, ingroup violence, scapegoating, nationalism, system justification (TMT, Rosenblatt, Jost). These are not independent phenomena with independent causes. They are expressions of a single underlying process: terror management through worldview defence.

3. **We have constructed false frameworks to make death feel orderly and manageable** (Kubler-Ross stages), and these persist despite evidence because the comfort matters more than the accuracy. The entire epistemology of death in Western culture is a terror management product. We do not know what we know about death. We believe what we need to believe.

4. **Medicine has absorbed this death denial into its institutional structure,** leading to overtreatment, suffering, and paradoxically shorter lives for terminal patients (Gawande, Temel). The institution that claims to fight death is, in many cases, accelerating it – because the institution itself is a terror management device, and terror management does not optimise for outcomes. It optimises for the feeling that something is being done.

5. **The death industry monetises the denial** (Mitford). When terror is universal, selling anxiety management is guaranteed revenue. The funeral home, the anti-aging industry, the wellness-industrial complex, the insurance industry – all of them sell variations on the same product: the feeling that death can be deferred, managed, or made comfortable. The product is not health or safety or dignity. The product is the temporary suppression of awareness.

6. **But when people confront death consciously and directly, the opposite of defensiveness occurs:** they become more present, more compassionate, less punitive (Yalom). This is the finding that changes everything. The terror management response is not inevitable. It is specific to unconscious, unprocessed death anxiety. When death is met with conscious awareness, supported by community, and processed rather than suppressed, it produces growth rather than fear.

The unified account is this: **human institutions are, to a significant and under-recognised degree, death-anxiety management systems.** Their primary function is not the function they claim – governance, justice, healthcare, education. Their primary function is the maintenance of a worldview structure that holds back awareness of mortality. When this function conflicts with their stated purpose – when the justice system produces injustice, when the healthcare system produces suffering, when the educational system produces conformity – the terror management function wins.

This is why reform is so hard. This is why people defend systems that hurt them. This is why providing better information does not change political behaviour. This is why elections do not produce accountability. The system is not failing. It is succeeding at its actual job, which is not the job it claims to do.

The Implications for the 14 Goals

Every one of the 14 goals requires dismantling a structure that people are psychologically invested in as a terror management device. This is not a metaphor. It is a literal description of the psychological operation involved in supporting, for example:

- **Representative democracy** (Goal 1): "Someone is in charge" provides the same psycholog-

ical comfort as "someone is in control of the universe." Removing the representative removes the comfort.

- **The 40-hour work week** (Goal 2): Work provides meaning, status, and identity – all self-esteem buffers against death anxiety. Reducing work hours threatens the buffer.
- **Prisons** (Goal 3): Cages provide the feeling that moral order is being enforced, that deviance is punished, that the world makes sense. Removing cages removes the comfort.
- **Police** (Goal 5): The uniformed officer is a symbol of order – a worldview-defence icon. Removing police feels like removing order itself.
- **Drug prohibition** (Goal 7): Consciousness-altering substances threaten the shared reality that buffers death anxiety. Permitting them feels like permitting reality dissolution.

Understanding this does not make the 14 goals less necessary. It makes them more precisely achievable. If the resistance to change is rooted in terror management, then the path to change runs through terror management. You do not overcome worldview defence by arguing harder. You overcome it by providing alternative structures that buffer death anxiety without requiring institutional obedience.

The $29 ring is a terror management device. A real one. When you know your people will come in 60 seconds, you do not need a police force to feel safe. When your community is responsive, you do not need an authoritarian leader to feel protected. When your connections are real and proximate, you do not need a national identity to feel that you belong.

The 14 goals are not policy proposals. They are replacement anxiety buffers. Real ones, built from evidence, designed to do what the current institutions only pretend to do: make people actually safe.

Chapter 14: Implications

What a Death-Integrated Society Looks Like

The policy implications are obvious and mostly ignored. A society that integrated death awareness rather than suppressing it would differ structurally from the current arrangement in ways that map precisely onto the evidence reviewed above:

Justice

It would be less punitive. The TMT evidence is unambiguous: death anxiety drives punitiveness. A society that processed death communally rather than suppressing it would produce citizens with lower baseline death anxiety, weaker worldview-defence responses, and less appetite for punitive justice. The Norwegian model – 20% recidivism versus 77% in the United States – already demonstrates what reduced punitiveness produces. TMT explains why the Norwegian model works and why the American model persists despite not working: the American model serves terror management. The Norwegian model serves rehabilitation. Terror management is the stronger psychological force.

Medicine

It would spend less on futile end-of-life treatment and more on palliative care that actually works. The Temel finding – that palliative care extends life while aggressive treatment shortens it – would

stop being a paradox and start being a design specification. A death-integrated society would not need to be convinced that palliative care is better. Its citizens would not carry the unprocessed death anxiety that drives demand for "doing everything."

Grief

It would stop pretending grief follows a script. The Kubler-Ross model would be taught as a historical curiosity, not a clinical framework. The Dual Process Model and other empirically supported approaches would replace it. Bereavement support would be community-based, not professionalised. The dying would die at home, surrounded by family, not in ICUs surrounded by machines.

Economics

It would stop allowing an industry to profit from the terror. The funeral industry, the anti-aging industry, the wellness-industrial complex – all of these extract rent from unprocessed death anxiety. A death-integrated society would not eliminate these industries by regulation. It would eliminate them by removing their customer base: people so terrified of death that they will pay anything to avoid thinking about it.

Politics

It would be less susceptible to authoritarian manipulation. The 9/11 effect – the use of mortality salience to drive populations toward authority and aggression – would be less effective against a population that had already processed its relationship with death. You cannot scare people into obedience if they have already confronted the thing you are using to scare them.

Community

It would be more communally oriented. Cross-cultural evidence suggests that death-integrated cultures – Buddhist, Aboriginal, Mexican – tend to be more communal, more relational, less individualistic, and less materialistic than death-denying cultures. This is not a coincidence. It is a consequence of reduced death anxiety. When you are not spending psychological energy managing the terror, you have more energy for connection.

Education

It would teach children about death. Not morbidly. Honestly. The way Buddhist cultures teach impermanence, the way Mexican cultures teach through Dia de los Muertos, the way Aboriginal cultures teach through sorry business. Children who learn to process death early carry less unprocessed death anxiety into adulthood, which means they are less susceptible to worldview defence, punitiveness, nationalism, and authoritarian manipulation.

None of this is speculative. The evidence base is large, cross-cultural, and convergent. We just don't want to look at it.

Which is, of course, exactly what Becker predicted.

References

Primary Sources

1. Becker, E. (1973). *The Denial of Death.* Free Press. Pulitzer Prize for General Nonfiction, 1974.
2. Rosenblatt, A., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Lyon, D. (1989). Evidence for Terror Management Theory: I. The Effects of Mortality Salience on Reactions to Those Who Violate or Uphold Cultural Values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 57(4), 681-690.
3. Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2015). *The Worm at the Core: On the Role of Death in Life.* Random House.
4. Burke, B.L., Martens, A., & Faucher, E.H. (2010). Two Decades of Terror Management Theory: A Meta-Analysis of Mortality Salience Research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,* 14(2), 155-195.
5. Temel, J.S., Greer, J.A., Muzikansky, A., et al. (2010). Early Palliative Care for Patients with Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 363(8), 733-742.
6. Gawande, A. (2014). *Being Mortal: Medicine and What Matters in the End.* Metropolitan Books.
7. Yalom, I.D. (2008). *Staring at the Sun: Overcoming the Terror of Death.* Jossey-Bass.
8. Yalom, I.D. (1980). *Existential Psychotherapy.* Basic Books.
9. Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The Causes and Consequences of a Need for Self-Esteem: A Terror Management Theory. In R.F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public Self and Private Self* (pp. 189-212). Springer.

Grief and Bereavement

10. Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On Death and Dying.* Macmillan.
11. Kubler-Ross, E., & Kessler, D. (2005). *On Grief and Grieving.* Scribner.
12. Stroebe, M. & Schut, H. (1999). The Dual Process Model of Coping with Bereavement. *Death Studies,* 23(3), 197-224.
13. Maciejewski, P.K., Zhang, B., Block, S.D., & Prigerson, H.G. (2007). An Empirical Examination of the Stage Theory of Grief. *JAMA,* 297(7), 716-723.
14. Bonanno, G.A. (2009). *The Other Side of Sadness: What the New Science of Bereavement Tells Us About Life After Loss.* Basic Books.

Death Industry

15. Mitford, J. (1963/1998). *The American Way of Death.* Simon & Schuster (revised edition 1998).

TMT Experimental Studies

16. Harmon-Jones, E., Simon, L., Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & McGregor, H. (1997). Terror Management Theory and Self-Esteem: Evidence that Increased Self-Esteem Reduces Mortality Salience Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 72(1), 24-36.

17. Schimel, J., Hayes, J., Williams, T., & Jahrig, J. (2007). Is Death Really the Worm at the Core? Converging Evidence that Worldview Threat Increases Death-Thought Accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 92(5), 789-803.

18. Hayes, J., Schimel, J., Arndt, J., & Faucher, E.H. (2010). A Theoretical and Empirical Review of the Death-Thought Accessibility Concept in Terror Management Research. *Psychological Bulletin,* 136(5), 699-739.

19. Landau, M.J., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Cohen, F., Pyszczynski, T., Arndt, J., Miller, C.H., Ogilvie, D.M., & Cook, A. (2004). Deliver Us from Evil: The Effects of Mortality Salience and Reminders of 9/11 on Support for President George W. Bush. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 30(9), 1136-1150.

20. Pyszczynski, T., Abdollahi, A., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Cohen, F., & Weise, D. (2006). Mortality Salience, Martyrdom, and Military Might: The Great Satan Versus the Axis of Evil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 32(4), 525-537.

21. Cohen, F., Solomon, S., Maxfield, M., Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (2004). Fatal Attraction: The Effects of Mortality Salience on Evaluations of Charismatic, Task-Oriented, and Relationship-Oriented Leaders. *Psychological Science,* 15(12), 846-851.

22. Florian, V. & Mikulincer, M. (1997). Fear of Death and the Judgment of Social Transgressions: A Multidimensional Test of Terror Management Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 73(2), 369-380.

23. Jonas, E., Schimel, J., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2002). The Scrooge Effect: Evidence that Mortality Salience Increases Prosocial Attitudes and Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 28(10), 1342-1353.

24. Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., Paladino, M.P., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I Belong, Therefore, I Exist: Ingroup Identification, Ingroup Entitativity, and Ingroup Bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 28(2), 135-143.

System Justification

25. Jost, J.T. & Banaji, M.R. (1994). The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification and the Production of False Consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology,* 33(1), 1-27.

26. Jost, J.T., Banaji, M.R., & Nosek, B.A. (2004). A Decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated Evidence of Conscious and Unconscious Bolstering of the Status Quo. *Political Psychology,* 25(6), 881-919.

27. Jost, J.T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A.W., & Sulloway, F.J. (2003). Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition. *Psychological Bulletin,* 129(3), 339-375.

Post-Traumatic Growth

28. Tedeschi, R.G. & Calhoun, L.G. (2004). Posttraumatic Growth: Conceptual Foundations and Empirical Evidence. *Psychological Inquiry,* 15(1), 1-18.

9/11 and Political Psychology

29. Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2003). *In the Wake of 9/11: The Psychology of Terror.* American Psychological Association.

Medicare End-of-Life Spending

30. Lubitz, J.D. & Riley, G.F. (1993). Trends in Medicare Payments in the Last Year of Life. *New England Journal of Medicine,* 328(15), 1092-1096.

TMT Critiques

31. Martin, L.L. & van den Bos, K. (2014). Beyond Terror: Towards a Paradigm Shift in the Study of Threat and Culture. *European Review of Social Psychology,* 25(1), 32-70.

Appendix A: Verification Flags

The following claims require verification against primary sources before formal publication. They are retained in the text with inline flags to maintain transparency about evidentiary status.

Flag 1: Rosenblatt Bail Study Numbers

Claim: Judges reminded of mortality set bail at $455 vs $50 for control group – a 9x multiplier.

Source: Rosenblatt et al. (1989), JPSP 57(4), 681-690. Figures widely cited in *The Worm at the Core* (2015).

What to verify: - Are the exact dollar amounts from the original 1989 paper or from later popular retellings? - Is the amount described as "bail" or "bond"? - Are figures based on means or medians? What was the variance/effect size? - Has this specific finding been replicated? The broader TMT finding (mortality salience increases punitiveness) has extensive replication, but the specific ratio may rest on this single study.

Priority: High. Most attention-grabbing statistic in the paper.

Flag 2: Kubler-Ross Five Stages

Claim: The five stages of grief are empirically unsupported as a sequential model.

Status: Verified as unsupported. Maciejewski et al. (2007) in JAMA found partial support for individual states but not the proposed sequence. Kubler-Ross herself acknowledged non-linearity in later work with Kessler (2005).

Priority: Medium. Claim is well-established; nuance is in characterising what was and wasn't found.

Flag 3: Medicare End-of-Life Spending

Claim: Roughly 25% of Medicare spending occurs in the last year of life.

Sources: Lubitz & Riley (1993), MedPAC analyses.

What to verify: - Last 6 months vs last 12 months (different figures circulate) - Whether more recent CMS data has updated the percentage - Health economist critiques about retrospective calculation

Priority: Medium-high. Broad point is uncontroversial; specific percentage should be accurate.

Flag 4: Temel Palliative Care Survival Figures

Claim: Median survival 11.6 months with palliative care vs 8.9 months with standard care.

Source: Temel et al. (2010), NEJM 363(8), 733-742.

Status: Likely accurate. Widely cited from a major NEJM paper. Note: survival was a secondary outcome.

What to verify: - Exact figures against original paper - Replication in subsequent palliative care RCTs

Priority: Medium.

Flag 5: TMT Meta-Analysis Effect Sizes

Claim: Burke et al. (2010) found robust effect sizes across 277 experiments.

What to verify: - Overall weighted effect size - Publication bias assessment - Post-2010 replication status, especially in light of replication crisis - Martin & van den Bos critique: death anxiety specifically vs. uncertainty/meaning threat generally

Priority: Medium.

Appendix B: Cross-References to Related Research

Direct Dependencies

Research Paper	Relationship to This Paper	Directory
Proof in Solution Design	TMT explains why OMXUS's safety signals work: perceived safety (real community, real response time) replaces symbolic safety (institutional authority, worldview defence) as an anxiety buffer. Mortality salience informs every safety signal design choice.	`../proof_in_solution_design/`

Research Paper	Relationship to This Paper	Directory
Justice Paradigm Shift	TMT provides the psychological mechanism underlying punitive justice. Rosenblatt's judges are not an anomaly – they are the system working as designed. Death anxiety drives punitiveness. Reducing death anxiety reduces punitiveness. The Norwegian model works because it does not rely on worldview defence through punishment.	`../justice_paradigm_shift/`
Bystander Effect	Fear and mortality interact with intervention decisions. The bystander effect is partly a terror management phenomenon: intervening in a crisis brings one closer to danger, which activates mortality salience, which activates defensive withdrawal. OMXUS's $29 ring circumvents this by making intervention automatic and communal rather than individual and deliberative.	`../bystander_effect/`
Screens and Attention Economy	Outrage amplification in media and social media may interact with mortality salience. News cycles saturated with violence and threat function as continuous low-grade mortality salience manipulations, keeping populations in a permanent state of worldview defence. This may explain why media consumption correlates with political polarisation and authoritarian attitudes.	`../screens_attention_economy/`

Thematic Connections

Research Paper	Connection	Directory
Ideological Rorschach	TMT explains why both "sides" of the ideological divide defend their positions with equal ferocity – both are terror management operations. The manufactured opposition between left and right is sustained by mortality salience: each side's media uses fear (including death fear) to drive ingroup cohesion and outgroup hostility. The Rorschach finding – that both Western and Eastern AI approve of OMXUS – works because OMXUS does not threaten either side's core worldview structure. It addresses what both fear without attacking what either clings to.	`../ideological_rorschach/`
Two Monkey Theory	TMT explains Mechanism #2 (narrative lock): the stories that make unfair arrangements seem natural are worldview elements that buffer death anxiety. People resist changing the narrative not because they believe it is true but because it is structurally necessary for their terror management. The capuchin throws the cucumber because it has no worldview to defend. The human accepts the cucumber because rejecting it threatens the story that holds back the void.	`../two_monkey_theory/`

Research Paper	Connection	Directory
GriefToDesign	The methodological framework of grief-to-design is the practical application of Yalom's insight: when death (or loss) is confronted consciously, it produces growth rather than defensiveness. GriefToDesign is what happens when the TMT defensive response is bypassed and the grief is processed into action. The 14 goals are grief-to-design products – systems designed by people who confronted mortality (through loss) and came out the other side with clarity rather than defensiveness.	`../grieftodesign/`
Cooperative Capitalism	TMT explains why people defend capitalism despite its failures: the economic system is a worldview element, and threatening it activates death anxiety. Cooperative alternatives (Mondragon, worker ownership) succeed where they do partly because they preserve the self-esteem function (you are a valuable contributor) while removing the extraction (your value accrues to you, not to shareholders). They are better anxiety buffers, not just better economies.	`../cooperative_capitalism/`

Research Paper	Connection	Directory
Social Group Scaling	Dunbar's 150 ceiling is discredited (Lindenfors et al. 2021: CI of 2-520). The Ripple model replaces it: accountability = 1/distance, weighted by physical proximity. This connects to TMT through the community-as-anxiety-buffer mechanism. Proximity-based accountability provides genuine safety — and genuine safety reduces the need for institutional worldview defence. The terror management problem dissolves when the person in front of you is the right one, no symbols required.	`../social_group_scaling/`
Emergency Response	The $29 ring is designed as a real anxiety buffer to replace symbolic ones. TMT predicts that people who have genuine emergency response capability (real people, real proximity, real speed) will show reduced worldview-defence responses – less punitiveness, less nationalism, less institutional obedience. The ring is not a gadget. It is a terror management replacement.	`../emergency_response/`

Research Paper	Connection	Directory
Loneliness Physiology	Loneliness and death anxiety are mutually reinforcing. Isolation increases mortality salience (lonely people are closer to death, statistically and psychologically). Increased mortality salience drives worldview defence, which can include social withdrawal (avoiding worldview-threatening others). The oxytocin pathways documented in loneliness research are the same pathways that TMT's safety signals activate.	`../loneliness_physiology/`
Education (Prussian Model)	The Prussian model of education – standardised, compliance-oriented, authority-structured – is a terror management institution. It does not optimise for learning. It optimises for worldview reproduction. TMT predicts that mortality salience increases conformity and deference to authority, which is exactly what the Prussian model requires and produces. Goal 12 (play, mastery, curiosity) is a death-integrated educational model: learning through engagement rather than compliance.	`../education_prussian_model/`

Research Paper	Connection	Directory
Drug Policy Reform	Drug criminalisation is worldview defence. TMT predicts that substances which alter consciousness will be particularly threatening to mortality-anxious populations because they destabilise the shared reality that functions as the worldview buffer. The "war on drugs" is not a health policy. It is a terror management policy – the punishment of consciousness alteration as worldview deviance. Portugal's decriminalisation works because it replaces punishment (worldview defence) with care (genuine safety).	`../drug_policy_reform/`
Economic Servitude	2,000 years of extraction sustained by the same mechanism: the extractive arrangement is woven into the worldview structure, and threatening it activates death anxiety. Feudalism, slavery, industrial capitalism, platform capitalism – each epoch's extraction is defended by the people it extracts from, because the alternative (no structure) is more terrifying than the reality (bad structure). TMT is the reason the ants haven't counted yet.	`../economic_servitude/`

Appendix C: The 14 Goals and TMT

Goal	TMT Mechanism	Design Implication
1. Direct democracy	Representative democracy is a worldview element; removing it triggers death anxiety	Provide alternative structure (direct democracy, Swiss model) before removing the old one
2. Work 22 hours	Work is an immortality project; reducing it threatens self-esteem buffer	Redefine contribution (community governance, creative production) to maintain self-esteem buffer
3. Rehabilitation	Incarceration is worldview defence through punishment of deviance	Demonstrate that restorative alternatives maintain social order (Norway)
4. Restorative resolution	Courts are mortality salience rituals; changing them feels like changing moral order	Offer community-based resolution that provides the same sense of justice
5. Crisis response	Policing carries worldview defence; changing it triggers existential insecurity	Add community response (CAHOOTS) that provides genuine safety
6. Redeploy staff	Job loss is self-esteem threat; mass unemployment triggers societal death anxiety	Guarantee re-employment in functional positions; no one loses livelihood
7. Regulate drugs	Drug prohibition is worldview defence against consciousness alteration	Frame regulation as health and child safety, not as moral permissiveness
8. Free internet	ISP control is institutional structure; mesh networking removes a worldview anchor	Frame as empowerment ("you ARE the infrastructure"), not as institutional destruction
9. No foreign investment in housing	Housing speculation is an immortality project (permanent assets); restricting it triggers anxiety	Frame as "houses are for living in" – align with existing worldview value
10. Safe food	Confronting food toxicity requires mortality awareness, which triggers avoidance	Provide clear, simple, non-threatening prevention information
11. Monkey bars at bus stops	N/A – this goal does not threaten existing worldview structures	Low resistance; implement directly
12. Play-based education	Prussian model is a worldview-reproduction machine; replacing it triggers institutional defence	Demonstrate results (Finland) before proposing change
13. $29 ring	This IS the replacement anxiety buffer – real safety instead of symbolic safety	Core TMT intervention: genuine proximate community replaces institutional authority
14. Cancer prevention	Prevention requires mortality awareness, which the TMT system suppresses	Present prevention as empowerment, not as death confrontation

This paper is part of the OMXUS Research Series, which asks what systems would prevent harm before it happens. Many of our systems were built to manage fear rather than to protect people. We are building something different.

Corresponding authors: Alex Applebee, L. N. Combe **Series:** OMXUS Research **Status:** Complete draft – verification flags documented in Appendix A **License:** Open access