

[This article appeared in Political Psychology, 1:1 (1979), pp. 3-26.]

Hardball Politics: A Model

Lloyd Etheredge
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

I

Of the varieties of political behavior the syndrome of hardball politics is especially intriguing to a spectator. In this syndrome, tough, ambitious, shrewdly calculating men vie for power and status behind a public veneer of civilization and idealistic concern (e.g., Machievelli, 1944; Caro, 1974; Bailey, 1969; Mayhew, 1974; Halperin, 1974; Bernstein & Woodward, 1974; Newhouse, 1973; O Connor, 1975). The inside stories of what goes on behind the official public facade continually fascinate us, and the traditional journalistic exposés of such realities - always written with a tone of stylized shock and moral scandal - are guaranteed wide readership and are one of the enduring entertainments of the citizen and the professional observer of politics alike.

My purpose is to sketch hardball politics as a subculture of the domestic and international political culture, a subculture constructed and sustained by a particular personality type, men with what is known clinically as a narcissistic personality disorder (Kohut, 1971, 1977).¹ I will argue that such a model, which I will develop as an ideal type, potentially clarifies as a coherent syndrome various aspects of elite political behavior and partially explains the practices of the fascinating although often distasteful, objectionable, and sometimes gruesome political world we observe.

The key internal feature of the narcissistic personality disorder politician (NP) is the simultaneous existence in the mind of two different and unintegrated subjective

FIGURE 1
Internal Splitting in Narcissistic Personality Disorders

Vertically Split-off Sector

Grandiosity, quasi-religious absolute faith in self; vanity; exhibitionism; cold, imperious, hostility; trancelike mental behavior toward idealized objects; propensity to hypomanic excitement

V
E
R
T
I
C
A
L

S
P
L
I
T

Reality Ego

Low self-esteem, shame propensity, hypochondria, worry, insecurity, suspicion.

HORIZONTAL SPLIT
 (Repression)

Repressed childhood demands for confirmation of independent self-worth

experiences of the self.² In the foreground of the mind is a depleted, insecure self. Here is a sense of low self-esteem and of self-doubt, a strong propensity to feel inadequate, insecure, and ashamed, continuing worry about social acceptability, discomfort with intimacy, fear of genuineness, candor, and self-revelation, insecurity and apprehension about (vaguely defined) impending disaster. But in the background, and above, there exists a different, relatively split-off sector of the mind, a grandiose self.³ An unintegrated heir to early childhood feelings and dreams of omnipotence, this sector includes fantasies and drives for grandiose accomplishment, total recognition and admiration, complete dominance of events of the world, and a complete self-confidence. It is a highly charged sector, and much of the individual's life flows from it as an effort to establish himself subjectively in the ongoing social and political drama so that he will achieve recognition as its director, superior to the other participants⁴

With this brief overview, let me turn to a more extended exposition of the model, aligning personality tendencies and characteristics of hardball politics. It will be useful to organize the discussion around eight themes that cohere in these individuals: ambition for the self; deficiencies of love and superficial interpersonal relations; twinship images of hardball opponents; defective ethics; defective humor; aggressiveness; tactical manipulateness, and vanity; partly degenerate (regressed) mental processes; and hyperactivity.

AMBITION

The NP manifests what is known as idealizing transference to the institutions (and especially to the major symbols and highest offices of those institutions) of which he is a part. This, of course, is a natural aspect of the internal hierarchical topography of

ambition, the subjective faith that there is something above worth being ambitious for. The higher the office, the more it is idealized as a location of prestige, honor, recognition, and power, the more desirable it seems. He develops an almost religious awe of these offices.⁵ One could, of course, view the job of congressman or senator or president solely as a tedious, stressful, overly demanding, ethically compromising, uncertain job, a kind of charade or psychodrama forcing the individual to act out public fantasies and anxieties and be the magnet drawing and making oneself the target for everyone's complaints. But to the NP, in his internal psychodrama, it is inconceivable that anyone would want anything else, or any other associations, as the fulfillment of a life.⁶

It is important to be clear that what the NP wants primarily is what he conceives to be a feeling of directorship in the unfolding social and political drama of his times.⁷ He seeks a position of power less to *use* power to accomplish certain specific goals than for the gratifications of being engaged and a top dog. Although he may genuinely dedicate himself to certain ideals of grandiose accomplishment, these typically are symbolic and seldom involve thoughtful and well-elaborated programs. The major story is that, above all, he wants to win, and he imagines a better society to follow (although he is vague on details) once his own will occupies the idealized location on the top.

The ambition is a powerful sustaining force. It can organize an entire life in its service.⁸ But it is a quest whose consummation is always in the distance and there is little genuine pleasure in the striving.⁹ The NP is no Ferdinand the Bull who wants nothing more in life than to sit in the shade of a tree and smell the flowers. The tragic fact is that in his quest for personal salvation and fulfillment he is seldom a happy man; in a sense he is used by society - he is caught up in the push and pull of an ambition that gives him little rest or deep satisfaction. Simpler pleasures pass him by; he is a man made for more

important things.

The narcissistic striving of the NP involves also what is known as mirror transference (Kohut, 1971, pp. 96-98, 251-253, *passim*). That is, he relates implicitly to people (e.g., the public) with the hope and need that they confirm his grandiose strivings, give him public recognition for his accomplishments and vaunted conception of himself. He seeks an echo of applause, love, and unbounded admiration and respect coming back. And he is certain such response is out there, albeit latent and mobilizable, that in their heart the people, the silent majority, know he is right and will eventually respond.⁹ It is difficult to say whether the NP seeks love, or unbounded admiration, or status, or unlimited power or success - these connotations all are correlated in high political office. He is on a public ego-trip - in fact, he wants all of them simultaneously. The public is not important to him in a genuine sense; he perceives them not as autonomous fellow human beings of equal status and respect with whom he works collaboratively in a specialized role, but as a supporting cast of subordinates bolstering his own psychic economy. He will be a public servant but only if he can look down upon (and imagine himself to be looked up to by) the public. Favorable publicity and recognition are, of course, important to the NP rationally to be reelected, but his vanity requires these for more than their strategic value.

Thus, the ambition of the NP involves two kinds of transference simultaneously. He subjectively experiences both an idealized goal above himself and a potentially attentive and supportive public. In both cases there is a probable distortion: the harsher reality is that the majority of a congressman's constituents do not bother to remember his name, and in a pluralist society universal acclaim is a chimera. But it is likely that the NP's hopes and fantasies, the selective absence of reality-testing in his epistemology, are

partially useful to society since they help to sustain his lifelong quest and the dutiful and energetic performance of his roles.

One particular feature of ambition in the NP is worth additional comment: he vastly overestimates the probability of achieving fulfillment of his long-range grandiose project (Kohut, 1971, pp. 150-151).¹⁰ He has an almost religious conviction in his own eventual triumph (Kohut, 1971, pp. 9, 85-88, 97). Such an inner certainty that he will be recognized as the conquering hero is an invaluable source of sustenance in the skirmishes and setbacks that are inevitable in the political arena. The NP (as we shall see in detail later) bases his long-range plans substantially on the strength of these internal fantasies, not on rational prior assessment. He hopes to leave his mark upon history and he is not deterred by realistic calculations before he starts.

In his book *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, Mayhew (1974) has succinctly portrayed the consuming ambitions of congressmen. I shall have occasion to refer to this elegant synthesis often for supporting evidence, although it should be clear that I disagree fundamentally with Mayhew that he has portrayed only rational choice. Rather than writing about rational men, I think he is giving an account of the behavioral coherence and consequences of shrewdness married to a deeply irrational syndrome.

DEFICIENCIES OF LOVE: SUPERFICIAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

The interpersonal relations of the NP are superficial: he has little genuine love and affection for others (Kohut, 1971, p. 228). He does not become involved (even in marriage) to an extent that would divert him from pursuing his own ambitious self-interest. The NP does not let sentimentality or genuine emotion get the better of him.

There often is a facade of cordiality and considerable skill at ingratiation, glad-handing, and interpersonal relations - a kind of Hiya fella, how are you? (to person A), Hiya, fella, how are you? (to person B), Hiya fella, how are you? (to person C). The essential determinant is qualitative, how much true caring for another unique person's welfare, how much true warmth, emotional investment, and love, how much authenticity; how much relating to other people as ends rather than as means? In the case of the NP there is not much of these things.¹¹

There is, however, one area of interpersonal relations - technically, narcissistic object choice - where this inner distance does not apply, in ordinary English, the area of personal loyalties. With people who support or potentially support his grandiose striving, the NP can develop intense emotional involvement.¹² But such relations are vampiresque (he does not form strong bonds of mutual respect and love with autonomous individuals) and he denies such people (e.g., wives and staff) independent lives, molding them to live for him and serve his ambitions. Fundamental disagreement is perceived as disloyalty, and disloyalty will engender a powerful and violent emotional rejection by the NP.

Such a style of interpersonal relations can be quite functional in hardball politics. The NP has permanent interests but no permanent allies (in the phrase sometimes used in a hardball prescription for American foreign policy). He does not let this ambition become encumbered by love or loyalty or personal friendships. He can shift coalitions pragmatically without regret, always in the pursuit of his own success and vindication.

IMAGES OF OPPONENTS

In his image of opponents the NP evidences what is technically a twinship trans-

ference, he perceives other people as essentially like himself, replicas of his own psychodynamics (Kohut, 1971, p. 123, *passim*). All participants are expected to be grown up (sic), to know their self-interest, to look out for number one first, and to engage in shrewd, rational calculation and hardball maneuver for status and power. He thereby occupies a somewhat fearful, insecure, and dangerous psychological world, a competitive, Hobbesian world. Other men in the arena are experienced to be as ambitious as he is himself, just as tough and hard-nosed realist, fundamentally just as self-interested and dissembling, and just as untrustworthy when egotistical self-interests diverge sharply. He expects others have secret desires to be opportunistic, to outmaneuver and defeat him, dominate and control him, trip him up, win away his constituents, expand their spheres of influence, stab him in the back (although with cultural evolution this latter is only figurative in American domestic practice these days).¹³ And, in fact, because there is some reality in this - other hardball players *are* like himself - this intuitive transference can stand him in good stead because there *are* people who will try, opportunistically, to outmaneuver him, undermine him, steal his constituency, dominate and control him, trip him up, or stab him in the back.

Of course, no politician can afford to be completely treacherous, and there are some game rules, expectations, norms of accommodation, surface camaraderie, and alliances.¹⁴ But it is not much of an exaggeration to say that, with his ambition, shame propensity, and faced with others like himself, the NP unfortunately experiences life very much as the accused prisoners in the prisoners dilemma game model so popular among political scientists.

Fortunately not all of American society or all countries play hardball, but the hardball politician lives in an uncomfortable subsystem, a cold, cruel world of dog eat dog.¹⁵

Hardball politics is partly a collective and uncomfortable folie a deux. Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown, wrote Shakespeare, and uneasy, too, lies the head of those who enter the hardball game and aspire to a crown.¹⁶

DEFECTIVE ETHICS

The ethics of the NP differs from ordinary morality. He does not have a strong superego (Kohut, 1971, p. 232). Rather the ideals of his grandiose self (and the fears of social shame and exposure of his depleted self) provide a substitute for ethical restraint. No relatively integrated set of principles and ethics conflict with or subdue his ambitions. He plays hardball without moral qualms about his typical lack of candor, his dissembling, his hypocrisy, his unfair use of a franking privilege, his manipulateness, his using of other people, his wars or invasions for national interest (i.e., national power), his covert activities, his leaks of information to the press which unfairly damage his opponent's reputation, and so forth.¹⁷ The NP wants an edge on what he would achieve by ethical means, and, while fear of exposure will be a deterrent, his character structure does not inhibit him. And he fears, perhaps with some justification, that in hardball nice guys finish last. This is not an honorable undertaking conducted by honorable men through honorable means, Henry Kissinger once commented about American foreign policy formation to one of his subordinates (Woodward & Bernstein, 1976, p. 194). And, in truth, in international politics there are some rough people in the world - and some of them are on our side (Etheredge, 1978).¹⁸

But this is not to say that the NP lacks a sense of morality. The fantasies embedded in the grandiose self include an almost religious sense of moral justification. The NP feels

moral virtue is identical with accomplishment of his grandiose dreams. He believes he will be a high status benefactor to mankind, and achievement and retention of power thus become the sine qua non, his greatest moral quest. He is convinced there exists a higher purpose served by his day-to-day hardball escapades (e.g., Wittrup, 1976). In its most rationalized form the NP gives a name to this vague higher virtue which supersedes normal morality and ethical conduct, *raison d'état*, *staats-raisen*, public interest, or in more recent terminology, national security.

There is an additional element which helps to clarify further the justification for predatory self-interest. The NP perceives others (via twinship transference) as also engaged in predatory self-interested behavior. And, while he believes they will show pragmatic constraint, he does not believe they will show substantial ethical restraint (especially so, it appears, when the opponent is an opposing hardball foreign country). He thus feels justified both because others are seen as playing the same game (there is social approval) and because he is like the bully on the playground who hits another child first partially out of fear that the other child will hit him.

This is not to say, however, that there are no pragmatic norms in hardball politics. In the absence of genuine civility, ethics, love, and attendant generosity, a common concern for doing the right, just, considerate, and responsible thing, the degenerate morality of tough-minded *quid pro quo*, I scratched your back, you scratch my back becomes the element of exchange in hardball. Pork-barreling, the doing of favors (all, of course, registered mentally to be repaid), hard-nosed bargaining, and logrolling became mainstays of elite political practice.¹⁹

There are, however, constraints of shame and embarrassment to cope with. Feeling

potentially ashamed, the NP does much of his scheming in private and conducts most of his deals in back rooms. He has a penchant for secrecy. And players believe everyone else is calculating and maneuvering backstage. No one is believed to have integrity or be sincere or trustworthy except as a semblance, a strategy. But while the secrecy of Realpolitik is sometimes functional, it does not arise only from this source. Rather the NP is also afraid to tell the truth about his hardball politics because he presupposes instinctively (and perhaps correctly) that full public knowledge of himself as a person would bring public rejection (Kohut, 1971, p. 232).²⁰

DEFECTIVE HUMOR

Probably the best single indicator of the NP is his defective sense of humor. (Kohut, 1971, pp. 199,238; Kohut, 1966). He lacks a playful warm detachment about himself and the conduct of human affairs. He takes himself seriously. If he has a sense of humor at all it is displayed in being unkind about someone else: Gerald Ford can't walk and chew gum at the same time, said Lyndon Johnson. The humor of the NP is not the humor of Adlai Stevenson. Rather it is best captured by Hobbes theory of humor, a humor expressing dominance, a touch of malicious superiority rather than a playful amusement.²¹ And the NP does not much care for jokes or funny stories told about himself.

AGGRESSIVENESS, SCORN, AND VANITY

The NP handles many interpersonal and political situations with tactical shrewdness because he retains aloofness and inner distance, a lack of major emotional investment in anything save winning. But just as personal disloyalty will stir his wrath, so will a challenger who threatens the grandiose location he has staked out for himself. Under

conditions of such challenge he experiences cold, imperious rage and an aggressive drive for revenge, for punishment of those lesser men, upstarts so insolent as to question his natural superiority and benevolent wisdom (Kohut, 1973; Nehemiah, 1961, pp. 165-166; Etheredge, 1978, p. 62). Theodore Roosevelt, sending American troops into Cuba in 1906, wrote in a private letter, Just at the moment I am so angry with that infernal little Cuban republic that I would like to wipe its people off the face of the earth (Bailey, 1969, p. 500).

The inner story of such cold, imperious anger is vanity, the psychology of the grandiose self. One patient in psychoanalysis expressed this typical stance when he was leaving a job and his employers were speculating about a suitable replacement. The thought went through his mind of saying, How about God? (Kohut, 1971, p. 149). And as part of his vanity and ambition the NP feels implicit rage that others should have more prominence than himself.

But vanity and the quest for acknowledgment of the grandiose self also occur in stylized but competitive ways in the continued search for publicity and credit-claiming in Washington (Mayhew, 1974). Congressmen and senators and presidents vie with one another for access to the media. This is functional and rational for their own reelections. But it is also an inner compulsion, a messianic drive to portray the self as a heroic champion or defender rising above crass, misinformed, or sinister challengers.

The inner compulsion to win, to control, and to punish challengers is the basis for the maneuvering and more distasteful and ethically dubious practices of hardball politics.

Winning isn't just something, it's the only thing. For those opponents who agree to play the game by the rules, countermoves are limited to those clean and mildly dirty tricks

that participants have grown to know and expect from each other. But those who threaten the game and the very possibility of a grandiose position of the NP himself bring a special rage: dissidents, radicals, and foreign countries are especially threatening to men who have struggled to get to the top playing by the rules.²²

In ordinary times in democratic politics the NP finds it convenient to portray a public image of benevolence, trustworthiness, open-mindedness, and acceptance of democratic norms. This serves his long-range ambitions, and he keeps his resentments and anger in check in dealing with those whose support and trust he seeks to win. But the people who lack an independent power base, who are dependent upon him, his staff, often get the full force of his vanity and frustrations. He can be a bully, petulant, taking as a personal affront any deviation from perfection and any sign his staff is not absolutely dedicating their lives to him, He gives them little autonomy of their own.

It should be clear, however, that stubbornness,²³ imperial determination, and aggression against what are seen as lesser men are not always personally dysfunctional. In politics, the capacity to stick willfully to a course of action despite travails, opposition, and criticism can be a formula for success - whether in creating a revolutionary movement or toughing out the attacks of more conventional opponents. Cromwell and Mao won revolutions, Charles De Gaulle's tenacity, aggressiveness, and narcissism brought him glory and enspirited his nation (although, of course, Richard Nixon's led to his eventual resignation and Wilson's led to defeat).

PARTIALLY DEGENERATED MENTAL PROCESSES

The NP is fascinated by power, his mental life preoccupied with it. He cannot get

away from it and relax because the concern is part of his personality. He directly and viscerally experiences forces, and pressures moving him to act in various ways. In technical terms, his mental processes are relatively regressed and primary process. The NP may have the gift to fashion bold visions, but he usually lacks the detached executive control to be a first-rate artist - often he is only vague, emotionalistic, dull, and vacuous. The NP has a veil of ambiguity and indirectness; there is a slight drunkenness to his thought when he tries to think or speak about important issues (Kohut, 1971, pp. 184,97). And he has a macho, authoritative style, which leads him to speak more self-confidently than either his facts or his own understanding warrant.

It should be clear that the term *degenerated* is used here in a specialized sense. Power exists in the mind, and the subculture of hardball power is a subculture of common regressed mental processes widely shared. The primary process nature of the NP puts him in touch with, and allows him to be intuitively effective within, this subculture. It is quite functional for him; in fact, someone without his sensitivity might be unable to succeed in hardball politics. He would be like Plato's former prisoner in the cave who, returning to the world of shadows and semblances, is unable to perform effectively because his eyes are not attuned to the lack of light (Plato, 1961, p. 749).

I do not wish to be misunderstood: the NP is shrewd, crafty, and astute at what he does. It is simply that this intelligence operates in connection with a part of his mind that functions as if he were in a trance, manipulating vaguely defined, emotionally laden, highly connotative symbols, adopting dramatic poses, exhorting, attacking, defending, declaiming. This is the nature of public utterance in political life, its essence. (Edelman, 1964; Graeber, 1976; Nimmo, 1974; Etheredge, unpublished a, b). What rational accounts of such ambiguity and emotionalism omit is the clinical point that men with

ambition (narcissistic personality disorders) are psychologically predisposed to speak with this slight drunkenness of mind.²⁴

There are other important senses in which the NP's mental processes, while commonly conceived as normal for politicians are, in fact, regressed. As discussed above, he lives partially in a world of fantasy, of reified abstractions, of directly felt forces and pressures; as well, his ambition typically involves major psychic investment in his internal subjective world of grandiose fantasies, substantial overestimation of his probability of ultimate success, and his transferences idealize too much (upwards), stereotype too much (others as like himself), and misconstrue the public as (at least potentially) fully attentive and a responsive cast of supporting characters. In other words, his is in part a borderline character (Figure 2). Murray Edelman has noted this structural similarity of political ambition with partial psychosis in commenting on the similarity of grandiose fantasies in mental hospitals and on the political stage: in both cases the individual feels he could save the world if only given a chance to occupy the top office (Edelman, 1977).

HYPERACTIVITY

There is a final characteristic of the NP syndrome closely allied with grandiose striving: hyperactivity. When he is engaged in, or associated with, projects he considers (grandiosely or heroically) important, his being becomes flooded with energy. He walks fast (typically with the grandiose fantasy that his project is essential to the well-being and functioning of the world, that it will come apart or degenerate if he ceases.)²⁵ He overschedules himself. He works long hours, seldom with time to relax or enjoy recreation. The importance of his own projects may produce so much physiological

FIGURE 2
The Narcissistic Personality Disorder Politician Syndrome as Borderline Psychosis

"Normality"	NP "Borderline" Syndrome	Psychosis
Integrated subjective self	Structural split into two selves (grandiose/depleted)	Complete fragmentation of subjective self
Mature self-esteem	Grandiosity/Shame	Full delusional constitution of grandiose self; cold paranoid grandiosity/ Omnipotent persecutor
Mature self-confidence	Imperial, absolute self-confidence/Hypochondria, continual worry about well-being; insecurity	Full delusional constitution of grandiose self; cold paranoid grandiosity/ Omnipotent persecutor
Mature ambition	Compelling drive to merge with ("attain") idealized powerful offices; Solipsistic claims for attention/Fears of inadequacy	Full delusional constitution of grandiose self; cold paranoid grandiosity/ Omnipotent persecutor
Genuine love, warmth with autonomous individuals	Partial withdrawal of object libido; partial narcissistic bonding	Complete withdrawal of object libido; narcissistic bonding
Secondary process (secularized) reality testing and creative use of primary process under ego control	Partially distorting, idealizing, twinship and mirror transferences; vague awe, primary process "religious" feelings, reified abstractions, and experiences of forces, pressures, power; habitual ambiguity and indirection; marked libidinal intrusions into speech and thought	Massive projection and transference, full deterioration of reality-testing, uncontrolled intrusion of primary process, incomprehensible, illogical, fully emotionally expressive speech and thought.
Mature, playful humor	Deteriorated humor	Absence of humor
Capacity for enthusiasm	Episodes of hypomanic excitement	Auto-erotic tension state

Adapted from Kohut, 1971: 9, 97, et passim

arousal that he needs to turn to alcohol to calm himself.

CODA

Individuals with narcissistic character disorders, while they have a basic skeleton in common, are not identical. Some are out simply for a successful living-out of their wish to occupy the role of a high-status benefactor, others have such fantasies infused with genuine ability and socially useful content, a genuine idealism of heroic accomplishment to produce a better world. (But it is, of course, not a world to be produced now by generosity, love, the simple freeing of individuals from warping roles, and the rearrangements of norms. It is a vision predicated on the grandiose competitive accomplishment, dominance, and survival of the self against countervailing forces: utopia requires triumph; politics precedes ethics.) The syndrome of a narcissistic personality disorder varies in degree and is not a complete description either of all determinants of hardball practice or of other aspects of personality.²⁶ There may be marked intellectual brilliance as in the case of McGeorge Bundy. There may be an energetic extraversion and some genuine warmth and compassion (couched in manipulative calculation) as in the case of Lyndon Johnson. The split between the two aspects of self may be at least partially healed and integrated, producing wisdom, and a sense of humor about political affairs as in the case of Henry Kissinger. Any person is in part a unique blend of many (sometimes contradictory) tendencies.

Nor does it follow that every politician and bureaucratic chieftain plays hardball politics or that they all play it because it is their natural inclination to be a wheeler-dealer. Not everyone in Washington is on an ego-trip. (But, as David Mayhew remarks

pointedly about Congress, There are not many saints 1974, p. 16), At times, perhaps, even the NP (who is himself trapped) wishes it could be different.

SYMPATHY AND THE HARDBALL POLITICS PRACTITIONER

My account of hardball political practice has emphasized the value deprivations engendered by such a syndrome. One could, of course, seek a more balanced account by emphasizing the political virtues of hardball politics in creating and maintaining power and some forms of achievement in an imperfect world, and in providing NP actors who, competing with other NP actors, can reciprocally block the likely triumph of each other. As well, hardball politics is desirable if one values a zero-sum grandiosity, heroism, primary process psychodrama, and winning above all other values, and the primitive and somewhat quaint values of toughness, tactical shrewdness, and inegalitarian pecking orders.

My account has drawn upon a psychoanalytic theory which diagnoses as pathological, by comparison to its ideals, the behavior I have described. But this diagnosis also implies, within a psychiatric mode, compassion for what one sees as the problems of the NP (a compassion which the NP, with his scorn of weakness - softball viewpoints - usually would not reciprocate). How much sympathy and compassion is appropriate to the hardball player who makes others victims of his irrationalities will have to be left to the reader. But it would be appropriate to note Ernest Jones's summary of Freud's image of man and to note also that the NP himself suffers from forces which are mysterious to him (and especially suffers physically from stress and psychogenic illness when success is problematic or he encounters setbacks), and that his ambition is an effort at self-therapy - a lifelong quest to integrate his depleted self with the image of his charismatic idealized

self: The images of the innocent babe or unfolding plant have been replaced, Jones wrote, by more sympathetic and living ones of creatures pathetically struggling with no language but a cry, to achieve the self-control and inner security that civilized man has so far, attempted in vain to attain (Jones, 1956, p. 145).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Politics can often be puzzling if an observer believes too readily the laudable public justifications of the people involved in it. On its face, one might believe political life is made up of philosopher-kings - altruistic, dedicated, thoughtful, and reflective statesmen working as hard as they can to create Utopia just as rapidly as possible. If so, one would infer their motivations would be primarily to learn rapidly about the sources of social ills, extrapolate this diagnosis into policy alternatives, and lead polities to empower themselves to bring forth a qualitatively better world. Yet often it seems not to work this way, at least not very rapidly. Undoubtedly there are many contributing factors to the puzzle of why we do not have a better, more humane world, including inertia and other constraints from the general public (Look at the constituency we have to please, one exasperated politician told me when asked why he thought government did not solve social problems more quickly). Still, this paper has proposed one contributing factor, namely that even altruistic, thoughtful, and dedicated people find themselves in the midst of substantial numbers of other actors who have never deeply considered their political philosophies, who rely on authoritative styles instead of hard evidence, and who place reflection, learning about social problems, and designing remedies as decidedly secondary to a self-therapeutic careerism that vaguely imagines the world's problems to continue because the individual NP does not yet hold high office.

But a system of hardball politics is more than a collection of individual NP s for whom compassion, altruism, and rapid, efficient learning about social ills are secondary. NP s create and sustain a system in which big ego pushiness rather than big think reflectiveness is more crucial to impact in public policy formation. The norms of such a system also undermine the trust, the modesty to admit one does not know the answers already and should invest heavily in research, the calm cooperation, the rationality, the mutual respect, good will, and perhaps especially the good humor that can contribute to problem solving. And such a system may disillusion and alienate those people whose talents, compassion, and special ethical sensitivities can be vital ingredients in solving problems and fostering beneficial transformations of political systems.

The prayer for beneficent transformation of the world and its hardball practices is an old one. From pride, vain-glory, and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness, good Lord, deliver us reads the litany of *The Book of Common Prayer* (Church of England, 1960, p. 70). In his 1837 Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard, Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke eloquently about the disheartening effects of business as usual, that Young men of the fairest promise, who begin life upon our shores, inflated by the mountain winds, shined upon by all the stars of God, find the earth below not in unison with these, but are hindered from action by the disgust which the principles on which business is managed inspire (Emerson, 1950, p. 63). An inspired good will and patience were Emerson s prescriptions to idealistic youth. Yet we seem still to be waiting, still not yet to have devised effective remedies.

II

In the first section of this paper I set forth a model of a hard ball politics syndrome to

describe features of domestic and international political behavior. Drawing upon psychoanalytic observations and new developments in the psychoanalytic theory of narcissistic disorders, I proposed such personality syndromes as the principal causal and sustaining force of hardball practice. But the dependent variable, hardball politics, can be thought to arise from multiple sources, and in this section I want to summarize briefly 13 other personality-based approaches to explaining features of the hardball politics syndrome. The theorists to be discussed often have worked in isolation from one another, and it may serve the purpose of cumulative research to pull them together in one place.

LASSWELL - POWER COMPENSATION (1948)

Harold Lasswell's classic formulation in *Power and Personality* (1948) theorized that a power-motivated syndrome included at least three elements: accentuation of power as a key concern, activity to obtain power both for the individual and for groups and causes with which the individual identified himself, and special concern with expectations about power-related behavior by others. In addition, Lasswell proposed a functional explanation of such behavior, that power was sought to compensate for and overcome low estimates of the self.

An NP formulation converges at several key points with Lasswell's formulation: the concern with an upward mobility of the self, the twinship transference alteration of perception to accentuate power-relevant behaviors by others, a relative diminution of other personal concerns save as these involve power payoffs.

Lasswell also contains an appraisal of the possibility of a structural dichotomy in the

sense of the self, emphasizing that coexistence of both high and low estimates of the self may be especially prominent, although he does not term the high estimates grandiose. In this regard, Lasswell views self-estimates as originating solely in interpersonal experience, by contrast with recent narcissism theorists who believe children begin with a sense of grandiosity and omnipotence, and that a structural split into different subselves arises because of inadequate empathetic nurturing, emotional stimulation, mutuality, and responsiveness in the early family environment.

While other aspects of the NP syndrome may be implicit in Lasswell's work, several are not: first, the tendency to primary process, quasi-religious, imaginative experiences of a metaphysical character of the world: reification, vague religious awe and idealizing tendencies, the experience of the world viscerally as an arena of forces, pressures, postures, and a habitual ambiguity and indirection - the slight drunkenness of normal political behavior. Second, there is no argument, such as the NP model makes from libido theory, that there is a necessary functional withdrawal of warmth from interpersonal relations. Third, an absolute self-confidence in eventual success (albeit coexisting with continual worries of failure) is not postulated. Fourth, the tendency to aggression in ordinary political practice is not given prominence (although Lasswell does believe there is an underlying desire to revenge oneself on the world in retaliation for deprivations, what NP psychoanalytic theorists call narcissistic rage).

Fifth, deviations from mature, playful humor as a key index of the syndrome are not postulated. And sixth, a special susceptibility to episodes of hypomanic excitement and tension states is not postulated.

AUTHORITARIANISM (1950)

The *Authoritarian Personality* (1950) proposed an authoritarianism personality syndrome of 10 related subparts: conventionalism; uncritical authoritarian submission to idealized in-group authority; authoritarian aggression toward unconventional people (including a vigilance about such threats); anti-intraception (opposition to the tenderminded or to imaginative, subjective, or psychological deviations from tough-minded objectivity); superstition (a belief in mystical determinants or fate); stereotypy (use of rigid categories in thinking); power and toughness preoccupations (concern with power, identification with powerful figures, tendency to assert power and strength); destructiveness and cynicism (generalized hostility and vilification of most human beings); projectivity (the belief or suspicion that wild and dangerous things are going on in the world); and ego-alien sexuality (great concern with sexual goings on, perhaps a tendency toward sexual repression) (Adorno et al., 1950; Kirscht & Dillehay, 1967, pp. 5-6; Dillehay, 1978).²⁷

These 10 clusters both diverge and converge with an NP model. The sharpest divergence is on the issue of ambition: although they specified a concern with power themes, Adorno and his co-workers did not postulate any upward ambition on the part of authoritarians. Nor is there explicit attention to a self-therapy theme in ascribing to the authoritarian an effort to *integrate* or overcome a depleted sense of self (although the existence of low estimates of the self and identification with idealized power figures - a harsh superego turned against the self - is present in the original Freudian Oedipal model of a self-critical superego from which it partly derives). Third, there is major disagreement on the issue of conventionality: NP theory is postulated as a common core that holds as well for leaders who create a new order in opposition to conventional mores. Fourth,

there is opposition on the subject of rigidity: the NP is postulated to be highly flexible tactically rather than solely rigid. Fifth, the NP is conceived as lacking genuine ethics while the authoritarian is described as dogmatically moral. Finally, specifications concerning humor and hypomanic excitement are not present in the authoritarian theory.

But there is also similar beliefs about certain clusters: idealizations; concerns with power; vigilance, mistrust, and suspicion about threats to the self; narcissistic bonding to an ingroup and absence of genuine love and warmth of autonomous individuals; aggressiveness, and the primary process (slight drunkenness) states of mind in experiencing forces, themes, and pressures at work in the world.

EYSENCK'S TOUGH MINDEDNESS (1954)

H. J. Eysenck delineated a dimension of personality with political correlates, a tough-minded/tender-minded dimension. Tough-mindedness was strongly associated with aggression and dominance (which Eysenck considered facets of extraversion), and possibly associated with rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity, narrow-mindedness, and mental concreteness. Notably, Eysenck's results disagree with several of the theorists represented here who consider shyness and social withdrawal as more typical of the hardball politics practitioner: Eysenck reports social shyness is characteristic of the tender-minded people in politics, although clearly the simultaneous existence of (logically) contradictory organizations of personality, as posited by NP theory (for example boldness and shyness) would be difficult to identify with Eysenck's factor-analysis technique - as they are similarly hard to pin down with linear scales and with current simple psychometric methods. In recent research Eysenck has found tough-mindedness to load

on his psychoticism scale (Eysenck & Wilson 1978, personal communication), and his suggestions for revised conceptualization are included in the following table.²⁸

ROKEACH DOGMATISM (1960)

Milton Rokeach's *The Open and Closed Mind* (1960) (Ehrlich, 1978) was a self-conscious effort to break from a possible conventionality/conservative bias of the right-wing authoritarianism of Adorno et al. While he was centrally concerned to deal with cognitive structure, Rokeach also specified an extended array of primitive beliefs about the world and associated behavior. With some slight relabels, the items on his scale appear to converge and diverge from an NP theory in the following ways:

Clusters of convergence include ambition and self-aggrandizement (My secret ambition is to become a great man like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare) which Rokeach interprets as a defense against self-depreciation (At times I think I am no good at all) and feelings of self-inadequacy; paranoid suspicion and mistrust are present; there are deviations from logical thinking toward the primary process; tendencies to hold idealized views of some people as authorities (either good or bad); self-righteous identification with, faith in, and ambition for a cause; anger directed toward renegades and disbelievers and a belief in the use of force.

Rokeach also emphasizes inner loneliness (Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place) which might be valuably explored in NP research or work with other syndrome models reviewed here. It is possible (as we shall see later in Berrington's theory) that some of the behavior of the NP could stem from a desire to be loved - and

NP theory would point to blockages in feelings of being loved (i.e., the twinship transference) as engendering such a feeling of isolation. Moreover the acquisition of prestige possessions (Slater & Winter, below) could make a person feel loved and be partly explained by this mechanism.

Points of divergence include Rokeach's postulates of a feeling of urgency (there is so much to be done and so little time to do it), at least if Rokeach sees this as an urgency separate from personal ambition; the compulsive repetition of ideas and arguments; a need for martyrdom; tendency to make party-line changes; heightened avoidance of ideas and people different from oneself; dogmatic unwillingness to compromise; and accentuation of disagreement between in-groups and out-groups.

CHRISTIE AND GEIS MACHIAVELLIANISM (1968)

Research published by Christie and Geis sought to study systematically those individuals who are *effective* in manipulating others (Christie & Geis, 1968, 1970; Geis, 1978). Christie and two political scientists, Robert Agger and Frank Pinner, developed an ideal type picture of the Machiavellian personality. He would be (1) basically cool and independent in interpersonal relations; (2) lack moral and ethical constraint, at least in a conventional sense; (3) be concerned first with winning rather than with a fixed structure of ends; (4) not be irrational in a neurotic or psychotic sense, but if anything be hyper-realistic and over-rational in selecting strategies. An extended array of investigations with their scales indicated support for the features of the syndrome although the strong, direct results appear to be for winning - and then only for males. (The Mach scales have consistent explanatory power only for men). This sex difference is

especially notable because almost all theories reviewed in this appendix have focused upon male behavior. It may be that hardball politics is a syndrome rooted in male, not human (male and female) psychology.

BARBER ACTIVE-NEGATIVE (1972)

James David Barber's *The Presidential Character* (1972) proposed a 2 X 2 classification of men who have become American presidents. Barber found differences in activity, how energetic these men were while in office (a tendency which probably indicates motivation to build and use power); there also were differences in orientation, whether the president was positive about his job, loved it, had fun doing it, enjoyed playing politics - or whether he was negative, seemed driven, unhappy in office, perhaps worried and suspicious, unable to relax from power concerns and enjoy himself.

Barber's book, filled with differentiated, sensitive attention to the determinants of presidential behavior, cannot be summarized briefly. But one difference - the tendency to be rigid and hostile (active-negative) or flexible (active-positive) at times of trouble, stress, and challenge, became a key element in prophecying the behavior of President Nixon. Barber also finds (as Winter does from an independent tradition) that not all people seeking power will be drawn to a hardball politics syndrome - that there are mentally healthy bases to power motivation in some people so that political systems need not recruit only hardball practitioners to top office.

WINTER N-POWER (1973)

David Winter has developed a scoring system for power motivation based on scoring

stories told by subjects about several Thematic Apperception Test pictures. With this measure he has sought to test a series of bivariate hypotheses and build an empirical understanding of the correlates and consequences of this single motive (Winter, 1973; Winter & Stewart, 1978).

Winter's theoretical scheme, given his desire for a careful empirical base, is not rich. But he has established empirically that ambition for impact does go with perceptions of the world which accentuate the power motives of others, he has noted a distinction between Hope of Power and Fear of Power (i.e., power potentially used by others against the self) and conducted studies (almost exclusively with small groups of undergraduates) showing the two sometimes correlate positively. A major result has been a distinction between privatized quest for power and social quest for power, with the suggestion that the first may be compensatory, the second an expression of a generally healthy personality (see Barber's concept of the active-negative president contrasted with the active-positive president). Research in the Winter tradition has also presented evidence that people with a high power motivation would say hostile things to high status people if they could say anything they wanted with impunity, and evidence (again from small samples) that those with high power motivation tend to make themselves publicly visible, enter careers in teaching and psychology (rather than politics), acquire prestige possessions and credit cards, seek offices, prefer lower status friends, take high risks, engage in competitive sports and exploitative sex. Samples on which these correlations are based tend to be male. Winter (1973) and David McClelland (1975) have also published evidence that high power motivation of presidents and high power motivation together with low affiliation motivation in national cultures increase the frequency of wars. As well, there have been extensive studies linking high power motivation with greater alcohol consumption, and studies linking N-power to fear of women (Slavin, 1972).

It may be that Winter is studying behavior which, in American culture, can be considered an American machismo syndrome. Interestingly, in a different sample of German engineering students, Erdmann (1971) found power motivation linked with social isolation and reduced sexual involvement. More recent research with N-power suggests that it is the individual who is high on fear and hope of power simultaneously who more approaches the NP pattern (Winter & Stewart, 1978).

IREMONGER-BERRINGTON PHAETON COMPLEX (1974)

In a 1974 article, Hugh Berrington reviewed and expanded a study of British ministers by Lucile Iremonger, *The Fiery Chariot*. Analyzing prime ministers from Spencer Percival (who entered office in 1809) to Neville Chamberlain (who resigned in 1940), Mrs. Iremonger was struck by the fact these men were typically opposite from the sociable, gregarious, flexible men of equitable temperament one might expect among leaders in a democratic polity. On the contrary, Iremonger found the typical PM to have a Phaeton complex, to combine ambition and vanity and hypersensitivity, discomfort with intimate relationships, shyness and loneliness. He was at times excessively aggressive. He tended to be superstitious and credulous about magic and the supernatural, to suffer from psychogenic illnesses, to look down on the relaxation of most other people, to suffer from depression. He had, she inferred, a subjective sense of omnipotence. He was driven by ambition for total love and admiration. He had a tendency to periodic recklessness and was a devotee of Sir Walter Scott. He disliked school and had an antipathy to sports, especially team sports.

The Iremonger-Berrington model agrees in many respects with the NP model. They place special, and perhaps valuable, emphasis on the characterization of the NP as an

unhappy man. And they provide careful data that prime ministers were several times more likely than the typical Englishman to have suffered the childhood bereavement of the loss of at least one parent, a deprivation they believe was causative of the later behavior they describe. Their attention to early deprivation of loving care, using this objective indicator, is a valuable avenue which has not been systematically pursued by other investigators. At the same time, however, they do not establish that the search for love, compared to other motives such as power, is paramount. They also found a susceptibility to psychogenic illness, although they do not have base rates of other motive types for comparison.

FRIEDLANDER-COHEN COMPENSATORY MASCULINITY (1975)

Saul Friedlander and Raymond Cohen investigated the personal traits of 14 national leaders with a reputation for toughness in nineteenth- and twentieth-century international relations. While their study was exploratory (they did not analyze leaders who preferred cooperative policies to establish that their personalities differed, hence that the personality difference was causal), their findings are striking. In 9 of 11 salient cases the tendency to belligerence rather than cooperation was also evident in domestic political behavior. There were three main common features: rebelliousness to authority (see also Winter's research discussed earlier), dominating exercise of authority, and verbal aggressiveness. They found a combination of intransigence and tactical shrewdness. Shyness, a Social Darwin philosophy that scorned weakness in human beings, mistrust and insecurity bordering upon paranoia, and intolerance of disagreement were also present.

Friedlander and Cohen assemble suggestive evidence that a special origin of these

traits is compensatory masculinity ; for example, their subjects were, as children, strongly dominated by their mothers. (This is particularly interesting since Slater's cross-cultural work [see below] has independently proposed evidence of early mother dominance of male children as a source of belligerent male narcissism.)²⁹ Friedlander and Cohen also report an authoritarian upbringing in 9 of 12 cases, and they suggest - although cautiously and tentatively - that their subjects may have authoritarian personality traits that account for their unusually high war propensities.

MAZLISH REVOLUTIONARY ASCETIC (1976)

Bruce Mazlish has proposed a theory of *The Revolutionary Ascetic* (1976). This is a male who withdraws love from personal relations and shifts it to a creative ego-ideal vision with which he totally identifies. There is cold hostility toward mere mortals, without pity or sympathy. He is independent and masterful, almost godlike in his sense of superiority. He is ruthlessly self-controlled and masochistically critical of baser elements in himself. He rejects dependency on anything or anyone outside his own will. He has a need for hard labor, for striving.

Mazlish's formulation, drawn from classical psychoanalytic theory, corresponds well with the cluster of phenomenology identified in current NP theory; it is a functional account, but it is merged with Eriksonian concerns of identity formation, how an individual comes to terms with the forces in his immediate life and historical circumstances. Mazlish does not emphasize the shaping of perceptions of other actors nor deteriorated humor nor susceptibilities to stress and episodes of hypomanic excitement. It may also be that power-seeking is broader, leading - as McClelland has noted - to alternative behavior such as drinking or (as Winter has noted) to competitive

sports or to machismo or exploitative sex. And of course there may be substantial overlap with conventional NP politicians who seek their revolutionary advance within an established system.

SLATER MALE NARCISSISM (1977)

Philip Slater first developed this theory of male narcissism and its political consequences in a study of ancient Greece (Slater 1968). More recently, he has tested his hypotheses against data from cross-cultural anthropology (N = 100+ tribes), turning up a range of correlates (e.g., low sexual satisfaction of infants, high demands for child achievement and self-sufficiency, general sexual restrictiveness) and impressive correlates of narcissism with tribal warlikeness (Slater, 1977). Slater's measure of narcissism included (1) sensitivity to insult, (2) invidious display of wealth, (3) pursuit of prestige through military glory, (4) bellicosity, (5) bloodthirstiness (e.g., habitual torture of prisoners), (6) boasting, (7) exhibitionistic (individual skill prowess) dancing. Of special interest is the evidence that early female dominance instills the syndrome (see Friedlander & Cohen, above, for a similar argument), the argument that male chauvinism is a correlate of the syndrome, and that fear of dominance by women, sexual repression, and narcissistic homosexuality may be causally implicated.

TUCKER WARFARE PERSONALITY (1977)

In a series of studies, and most recently in 1977, Robert C. Tucker has drawn on Karen Homey's theory of neurosis to sketch a warfare personality. This personality has a basic anxiety, feels isolated, lonely, and powerless in a potentially hostile world. He seeks to compensate by developing an idealized image of himself as a perfect,

superhuman, being. If he identifies with this idealized image he undertakes an ambitious career to prove to others (and to himself) that he is the idealized self.

Inevitably, Tucker believes, such an individual will suffer setbacks. If so, he will experience great anxiety and turn against himself with a flurry of self-hatred. And if the real world fails to acknowledge his pride system by confirming that he is, indeed, his idealized self, he turns a vindictive, arrogant hostility against them to restore his hurt pride. Such hostility may also gain additional energy from externalization of his reproaches against his inadequacy - he seeks to triumph over others whom he scorns as inadequate. Tucker also suggests such a person may have an unconscious need to provoke opposition in order that, by overcoming it, he could experience the winning of the leader role again.

HOLSTI TYPE B (1977)

Ole Holsti, carrying forward a concern with the structure of beliefs in a leader's operational code, has recently completed an extended codebook and analysis of operational code clusters among Bolsheviks and 11 world leaders.³⁰ One particular type, B, (the Bolsheviks, Schumacher, and Dulles) show elements that might account for a hardball politics syndrome. Goals of adversaries are seen as strongly power oriented and to range from expansion to destruction of one's own nation. Adversaries are seen to be rational, careful planners. These type B's have long-run optimism, although they believe the short run is full of ever-present dangers, especially if one does not pursue vigilant deterrence with competence and strong will. All events in politics are closely linked within comprehensive power-seeking strategies. There is tactical pragmatism. There is also little hesitancy to use force when this offers prospects for large gain with limited risk.

These syndromes all have overlapping features, and it is not clear the extent to which they describe empirically different syndromes. As well, the inner stories they emphasize about their subjects reflect partly the different theorists on which they are based - Freud (Adorno et al., Mazlish, Berrington, Friedlander-Cohen, Slater, partly Lasswell), Adler (partly Lasswell), Horney (Tucker, perhaps Barber), Machiavelli (Christie and Geis), Kohut (NP theory) - or whether they are cognitive (Rokeach, Eysenck, Holsti) or eclectic and empirically derived (Barber, Winter). Still, enough in the way of both overlap and disagreement has emerged to warrant comparative empirical tests, and to this end Table 1 summarizes key agreements and disagreements across theorists. (The professional reader will appreciate that I have sometimes been arbitrary in deciding how to score some of these theorists, since most prefer prose description to rigorous lists).

Notably, there is no single issue on which all seem to agree, suggesting (if everyone is right) that hardball politics could gain multiple support in different personality syndromes in different actors distributed within a political and social system. However, it is also possible that earlier theorists took for granted some characteristics that later theorists have been explicit about - e.g., idealization of high office, loneliness, male chauvinism, ethical deterioration, primary process thought, male anger at the authority of other males. It is striking that so many observers believe that the wide range of hardball politics practices arises at least in part from personality predisposition.

NOTES

I am indebted to Dwain Mefford for research assistance and to Lucian Pye, Alan Elms, Hugh Berrington, and Bill Stone for criticisms of an earlier draft. Support for the

research reported here has been provided by National Science Foundation Grant # Soc 77-27470 for a study of executive branch nonlearning.

1. For discussions of narcissism - which is rapidly replacing the sexual repression hypothesis as a principal Freudian left diagnosis of why there is not more love and generosity in the world - see Freud (1914). Fenichel (1945), Kernberg (1975), Volkan (1976), Pulver (1970), Kohut (1971. 1977).

2. There is a possibility that the playing of hardball politics exclusively with other males reflects elements of narcissistic homosexuality: see Slater (1968), Leites (1954), Wolowitz (1965).

This duality is particularly hard to assess with conventional measures since the NP is ashamed of revealing his low self-esteem and, in *part*. feels enormously high self-esteem. For a general discussion

TABLE 1
A Comparison of Personality Syndrome Theories to Explain Hardball Politics

	NP	Lasswell	Adorno	Eysenck	Christie & Geis	Rokeach	Barber	Winter	Berrington	Fried- lander	Mazlish	Slater	Tucker	Holsti
I. MENTAL PROCESSES														
A. Idealizations	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	?	Yes	No	Yes	?	Yes	No
B. Twinship image of opponents; paranoid tendencies	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No	?	?	Yes	No	No	?	?	Yes	Yes
C. Mirror image of mobilizable recognition from public, history	Yes	?	?	No	No	?	?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	?	Yes
D. Primary process symbolic politics, high connotative expression	Yes	No	Maybe	?	No	?	No	No	No	No	?	No	No	No
II. AMBITION														
A. Idealized, grandiose self, absolute self- confidence, vanity	Yes	?	?	Yes	No	No	?	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
B. Depleted, insecure self, worry, sensitivity to criticism	Yes	Yes	?	No	No	Yes	No	?	Yes	Yes	Masochistic	Yes	Yes	No
C. Effort to transform self to idealized self	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	?	Yes	No

III. AGGRESSION

A. Ruthlessness, rage at opponents, critics; stubborn self-assertive rigidity

Yes ? Yes Yes No ? Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

B. Anger at authority of others

Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No Yes Yes No No No

C. Need for enemies

Perceives them No Perceives them No No ? ? Perceives them No No ? ? Yes No

D. Scorn of "lesser" humans (incl. male chauvinism)

Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No Yes Yes Yes Yes No

IV. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

A. "Cool," shy, distant

Yes No Ego-alien sexuality Yes Yes No No No Yes Yes Yes No Yes No

B. Intense reaction to disloyalty

Yes No No No No No No No No ? No No No No

C. Manipulation, Shrewdness

Yes ? ? Yes Yes No No No Yes (?) No No No No No

D. Loneliness

? No No No No Yes No No Yes No No No Yes No

V. EPISODES OF HYPOMANIC EXCITEMENT

A. Stress susceptibility, anxiety if failure threatens

Yes No No No No No No No No Yes No No No No No

B. Psychogenic illness susceptibility

Yes No No Yes No No No No Yes No No No ? No

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	NP	Laaswell	Adorno	Eysenck	Christie & Geis	Rokeach	Barber	Winter	Berrington	Fried- lander	Mazlish	Slater	Tucker	Holsti
VI. DETERIORATION OF WARM, PLAYFUL HUMOR														
	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	?	No	No (?)	No	No	No	No	No
VII. DEFECTIVE ETHICS														
	Yes	?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	No	No (?)	No	No	No	No	No
VIII. OTHER BEHAVIORS														
A. Cognitive rigidity	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1. tough-mindedness	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	?	No	No	?	No	No	No	No
B. Alcoholic tendencies	?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
C. Likes competitive work	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No (?) ^a	No	No	No	No	No
D. Strong need for love (as opposed to adulation from lesser humans or simple loneliness)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes ^b	No	No	No	No	No
E. Prefers friends younger than self	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No

"No" means either that the trait is not discussed or that it is asserted not to be a part of the syndrome.

a. Dislikes competitive team sports, although perhaps not competition.

b. Iremonger infers a strong need for love from an all giving wife or mistress.

Coding for Eysenck's and Berrington's research based on personal communication.

of some of the methodological problems (and evidence for high self-esteem among the politically active) see Sniderman (1975).

4. Early childhood antecedents appear complex and are not fully documented. But they seem typically to include a mother whose indulgence is itself narcissistic, that is the child—rather than being related to as an autonomous person and confirmed and loved for himself—is valued as a product that will fulfill the mother's own narcissism by his heroic accomplishment. Thus, the child's early narcissism is both sustained while (following Lasswell) he is deprived of power as an autonomous individual. See Kohut, 1971; also Pye, 1976.
5. One of the important therapeutic tasks in the integration of the NP is his realization that such idealizations are private intrapsychic fantasies. This may be especially difficult to achieve among politicians because NPs and others with similar traits in the news media join in a "collusion of grandiosity" to define and sustain their collective idealizing private fantasies of "high" public offices as an "objective" social reality. See Volkan, 1976, p. 269; Kernberg, 1970, pp. 51-85; Gedo and Goldberg, 1973 on disillusionment therapy. On efforts to enhance and retain the prestige of the position they occupy and of the institutional ladders they seek to climb, see Mayhew, 1974.
6. It is notable that NPs tend to strive for such offices even in the face of extreme costs. Commenting on the attractions and the enormous demands and risks of the office of Caesar, Grant (1975, p. 257) observes: "In view of the alarming perils involved, it may seem difficult to understand why anyone could be eager to become ruler of the Roman Empire. Yet signs of reluctance were not greatly in evidence. Even in the third century A.D., when a would-be usurper scarcely needed to be a statistical expert to note that the average reign ended rapidly and violently, candidates for the throne still proliferated on every side."
7. Obviously, intellectual pursuits may be heir to the same dream. In working with students on personal psychobiography projects, I find there appears to be a greater desire by some narcissistic liberals and radicals to achieve dominance intellectually, to be an *éminence grise*—although the sample is too small really to draw conclusions.
8. Put somewhat differently, ordinary S-R political punishments and disappointments do not extinguish the NPs long-range behavior. They may hurt his feelings, but he is primarily after a wonderful idealized success which he himself fantasizes, and he thus does not require much external reinforcement. Massive and continual rejection when ambitions run afoul of bad luck or a lack of realistic aptitude can lead to a nervous breakdown.
9. One of the marked features of the NP is that he does not enjoy his work. Fenno remarks that a high proportion of congressmen do not enjoy their work (personal communication). It is a marked feature (counter to what one would expect in a politician) of British prime ministers that they have not much enjoyed associating with other people. See Berrington, 1974; see also Kohut, 1971, pp. 120, 144, 199. The NP cannot enjoy his success either. The image of "history" can also be heir to this mirror transference so the NP receives assurance from how he will appear "in the eyes of history."
10. However, the observation that, "for great power is in general gained by running great risks," may be correct. If so, the inherent inability of the NP to believe his personal failure is a real possibility may eliminate inhibitions to his grandiose strivings that would deter more ordinary men. Hubris may lead to great successes as well as great tragic disasters. The problem of assessing attitudes toward risk is subtle because, while the NP, in one sector of his mind, worries constantly about failure, in another sector of his mind he is convinced it can never occur. The quotation is from Herodotus, 1904, p. 151. See also the discussion of risk taking by a military NP, General Douglas MacArthur, especially with respect to the Inchon landing and underestimation of the Chinese Communists in the Korean War in DeRivera, 1968, pp. 175-180.
11. In the American cultural context some readers may object to this characterization. But see Spinoza (1936, 4, 44): "Ambition . . . (is) nothing but (a) species of madness." See the later discussion of the NP as a borderline character.
12. Kohut, 1971, p. 3. To retain power, "Daley has intuitively known from the beginning (that) a man must surround himself with servitors, people who are totally loyal and utterly dependent on the man, Daley, for their own well-being" (O'Connor, 1975, p. 11).
13. One aspect of these hypochondrical concerns is a fear of death, an aspect of the narcissistic character disorder syndrome which, along with heroic striving, has been discussed in Becker, 1973.
A direct confirmation of worry and hypochondrical concerns among politicians is provided by the research of Richard Fenno, "One of the dominant impressions of my travels is the terrific sense of uncertainty which animates these congressmen. They perceive electoral troubles where the most imaginative outside observer could not possibly perceive, conjure up or hallucinate them." Cited in Mayhew, 1974, p. 35, note 52. The present model disagrees that the uncertainty is causal (animates); it is one correlate of the syndrome. See also the later discussions of faulty reality testing and hyperactivity.
14. See the distinction between normative rules and pragmatic rules in F.G. Bailey 1969, p. 5.
15. Although, of course, there are also unpleasant consequences for the polity if James Madison was correct in *The Federalist* # 10 (Madison, 1961, p. 59) "an attachment of different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power . . . (has), in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with

- mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good." See also the later evidence of heightened war propensity.
16. This degree of pervasive mistrust is documented even for some of the "softer" hardball players in the Department of State. See Argyris, 1967. Argyris has later documented similar hardball behavior among elites of the New York Times. See Argyris, 1974.
 17. See especially Halperin, 1974, for an extended catalogue.
 18. Dean Acheson made a similar point: some goings-on around Washington would make Borgias envious he thought. He also thought the most necessary quality for a secretary of state was a "killer instinct." Another former State Department official put it that the ideal preparation for understanding the territoriality, coalitions, ingroup secrecy, demands for loyalty, and tough macho style in foreign policy formation was to have been a member of a juvenile street gang. See Halperin, 1974. Acheson is cited in Allison, 1971, p. 180. I have been unable to verify the quotation in the original source cited by Allison.
 19. Thus, exchange and bargaining theory are especially relevant at the domestic elite and international levels. See, for example, Blau, 1964.
 20. What the NP fears most in life is separation from his idealized images (i.e., defeat), Kohut, 1971, p. 20.
 21. Hobbes, 1968:126. "Sudden glory is the passion which maketh those grimaces called laughter; and is caused . . . by the apprehension of some deformed thing in another." Hobbes felt people also laughed in delight from self-congratulation.
 22. Nietzsche's remark is doubly relevant to the heroic ambitions and fear-induced mean deeds of the NP. "One will rarely err if extreme actions be ascribed to vanity, ordinary actions to habit, and mean actions to fear" (Nietzsche, 1964).
 23. On the relation of stubbornness to narcissism, see Fenichel, 1945, p. 279.
 24. See also Robins, 1977, pp. 1-34, on the political consequences of such (potentially) visionary primary process shifts.
 25. There is a sense in which the hyperactive NP is trying to hold himself together in the face of such arousal. See Kohut, 1971, pp. 152-153. See also Wallace, 1956, pp. 761-764 for a theory that stress especially affects people who are ambitious and will increase primary process thought processes.
 26. The reader familiar with Janis, 1972, will recognize an agreement between our models: grandiosity, defective morality, defective reality-testing (especially in the area of risk-taking and probabilities of failure (illusion of invulnerability) and the stereotyped images of opponents, although the present model is a broader claim in other respects (hypochondrical fears and concerns, defective humor, superficial love and interpersonal involvement with others as autonomous individuals, a predisposition to aggressiveness, a broader conception of degenerative mental processes, and hyperactivity). I suspect stress (Wallace, 1956) and small group dynamics exacerbate personal tendencies into a collective *folie a deux*. But I also see the basic ingredients of the Janis syndrome as a predisposition of the individuals involved rather than only a predictable result of cohesion in reaction to stress.
 27. For criticisms, see especially Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967.
 28. Criticisms of Eysenck's earlier research may be found in Christie, 1956.
 29. See especially Slater, 1968, 1977: ch. 9, 10, app. A. B.; Wolowitz, 1965.
 30. See also George, 1969.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T.W. et al. *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Allison, G.T. *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.
- Argyris, C. *Some causes of organizational ineffectiveness in the Department of State*. Occasional Paper No. 2 of the Center for International Systems Research. Washington: Department of State, 1967.
- Argyris, C. *Behind the front page: Organizational self renewal in a metropolitan newspaper*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Bailey, F.G. *Strategems and spoils: A social anthropology of politics*. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969.
- Bailey, T.A. *A diplomatic history of the American people*, 8th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- Barber, J.D. *The presidential character: Predicting performance in the White House*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972.
- Berrington, H. The Fiery chariot: British prime ministers and the search for love. *British Journal of Political Science*, 4, July 1974, 345-369.
- Becker, E. *The denial of death*. N.Y.: Free Press, 1973.
- Bernstein, C., & Woodward, B. *All the president's men*. N.Y.: Warner, 1974.
- Blau, P.M. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Caro, R.A. *The power broker: Robert Moses and the decline of New York*. New York: Knopf, 1974.
- Christie, R. Eysenck's treatment of the personality of communists. *Psychological Bulletin*, 55, 1956, 411-430.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. Some consequences of taking Machiavelli seriously. In E.F. Borgatta and W.W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Church of England. *The book of common prayer*. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Cornfield, F.M. *Microcosmographia academica*. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1953.

- DeRivera, J. *The psychological dimension of foreign policy*. Chicago: Charles E. Merrill, 1968.
- Dillehay, R.C. Authoritarianism. In Harvey London and John E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), *Dimensions of Personality*. New York: Wiley, 1978, 85-127.
- Eckhardt, W. Anthropological correlates of primitive militarism. *Peace Research*, 5:2, February 1973, 5-10.
- Edelman, M. *The symbolic uses of politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.
- Edelman, M. *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Ehrlich, H.J. Dogmatism. In Harvey London and John E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), *Dimensions of Personality*. New York: Wiley, 1978, 129-164.
- Erdmann, R. *Machthematik und verhaltensne replikation der winterschen arbeit und der versuch einer item analyse der verrechnungschkissels*. Unpublished Diplomarbeit Phyllis Universitat, Marburg, 1971.
- Emerson, R.W. *The American scholar*. In Brooks Atkinson (Ed.), *Selected Writings of Emerson*. New York: Modern Library, 1950.
- Etheredge, L. *A World of men: The private sources of American foreign policy*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1978.
- Etheredge, L. *Hypnosis and order*. Unpublished.
- Etheredge, L. *Ideology and embeddedness in hierarchical contexts*. Unpublished.
- Eysenck, H.J. *The psychology of politics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Eysenck, H.J., & Wilson G., *The psychological basis of ideology*. Lancaster: Medical and Technical Publishers, 1978.
- Fenichel, O. *The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis*. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Freud, S. On narcissism: An introduction. *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, James Strachey (Ed.). London: Hogarth Press, 1957, XIV, 67-102.
- Friedlander, S., & Cohen, R. The personality correlates of belligerence in international conflict. *Comparative Politics*, 7, January 1975, 155-186.
- Geis, F. Machievellianism. In Harvey London and John E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), *Dimensions of Personality*. New York: Wiley, 1978, 305-363.
- Gedo, J., & Goldberg, A. *Models of the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- George, A.L. The "Operational code": A neglected approach to the study of political leaders and decision making. *International Studies Quarterly*, 13, 1969, 190-222.
- Graber, D.A. *Verbal behavior and politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976.
- Grant, M. *The twelve caesars*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1973.
- Halperin, M. et al. *Bureaucratic politics and foreign policy*. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1974.
- Herodotus. *The history of Herodotus*. Translated by G.C. Macaulay. London: MacMillan & Co., 1904.
- Hobbes, T. *Leviathan*. Baltimore: Penquin, 1968. C.B. Macpherson (Ed.).
- Holsti, O.R. The "operational code" as an approach to the analysis of belief systems: Final report at the National Science Foundation. Grant No. SOC. 75-15368. Duke University, mimeograph, 1977.
- Janis, I. *Victims of groupthink*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.
- Jones, E. *Sigmund Freud: Four centenary addresses*. New York: Basic Books, 1956.
- Kernberg, O. Factors in the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personalities. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 18, 1970, 51-85.
- Kernberg, O. *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Aronson, 1975.
- Kirscht, J.P., & Dillehay, R.C. *Dimensions of authoritarianism: A review of research and theory*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.
- Kohut, H. Forms and transformations of narcissism. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 14, 1966, 243-272.
- Kohut, H. *The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders*. Monograph Series of the Psychoanalytic Study of the Child #4. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.
- Kohut, H. Thoughts on narcissism and narcissistic rage. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 27, New York: Quadrangle, 1973.
- Kohut, H. *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press, 1977.
- Lasswell, H.D. *Power and personality*. New York: Viking, 1948.
- Lasswell, H.D. *Toward world community now*. In Larry Ng. (Ed.), *Alternatives to Violence*. N.Y.: Time-Life, 1968, 118-126.
- Leites, N. *A study of bolshevism*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1954.
- Levinson, David. What have we learned from cross-cultural surveys? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 20, 1977, 757-792.
- London, H., & Exner, Jr., J.E., (Eds.), *Dimensions of personality*. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- McClelland, D. et al. *The drinking man*. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- McClelland, D. *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington, 1975.
- Machiavelli, N. *The Prince*. London: Dent, 1944.
- Madison, J. *The federalist # 10*. Jacob E. Cooke (Ed.), Cleveland and New York: Meridian Books, 1961.
- Mayhew, D. *Congress: The electoral connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Mazlish, B. *In search of Nixon*. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

- Mazlish, B. *The revolutionary ascetic: Evolution of a political type*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Nehemiah, J.C. *Foundations of psychopathology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Newhouse, J. *Cold dawn: The story of SALT*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1973.
- Nietzsche, F. *Human, all too human: A book for free spirits*. Trans. Paul V. Cohn. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.
- Nimmo, D.D. *Popular images of politics: A taxonomy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974.
- O'Connor, L. *Clout: Mayor Daley and his city*. N.Y.: Avon, 1975, 11.
- Plato. *The republic*. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns (Eds.), *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*. New York: Pantheon, 1961.
- Pulver, S.E. Narcissism, the term and the concept. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 18, 1970, 319-341.
- Pye, L. *Mao Tse Tung: The man in the leader*. N.Y. Basic Books, 1976.
- Robins, R.S. Introduction to the topic of psychopathology and political leadership. In Robert S. Robins (Ed.), *Psychopathology and Political Leadership*. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1977. Also *Tulane Studies in Political Science*, 16, 1-34.
- Rokeach, M. *The open and closed mind*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Shamasastri, R. *Kautilya's artasastra*. Mysore: Sri Raghuvveer Printing Press, 1951.
- Slater, P. *The glory of Hera*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Slater, P. *Footholds*. New York: Dutton, 1977.
- Slavin, M.A. *The theme of feminine evil: The image of women in male fantasy and its effects on attitudes and behavior*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Harvard University, 1972.
- Sniderman, P. *Personality and democratic politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Spinoza, B.De. *Philosophy of Benedict De Spinoza*. Trans. R.H.M. Elwes. New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1936.
- Tucker, R.C. *Stalin as revolutionary, 1879-1929: A study in history and personality*. New York: Norton, 1973.
- Tucker, R.C. "The Georges" Wilson reexamined: An essay on psychobiography. *American Political Science Review*, 71:2, June 1977.
- Volkan, V.D. *Primitive internalized object relations: A clinical study of schizophrenic, borderline, and narcissistic patients*. New York: International Universities Press, 1976.
- Wallace, A.F.C. Stress and rapid personality changes. *International Record of Medicine*, 169, 1956, 761-764.
- Winter, D. *The power motive*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Winter, D., & Stewart, A.J. The power motive. In Harvey London and John E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), *Dimensions of Personality*. New York: Wiley, 1978, 391-447.
- Wittrup, D. A candid conversation with Dick Wittrup. *Health Care Management Review*, 1976.
- Wolowitz, H.M. Attraction and aversion to power: A psychoanalytic conflict theory of homosexuality in male paranoids. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 70, 1965, 360-370.
- Woodward, B., & Bernstein, C. *The final days*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.