

The Forum

President Reagan's Counseling

Lloyd S. Etheredge'

President Reagan's psychological model of economic behavior is a very different idea of how society operates than the individual rational choice models used by economists. It would be a major contribution to American public policy to develop direct measures of imagination and determine whether people do relate to government, as a higher presence, from within a larger-than-life drama.

KEY WORDS: political economy; mass psychology; leadership; imagination therapy.

For decades, economic policy has been the territory of economists, governed by their idea that we are a nation of rational choices. President Reagan has changed the assumptions. He is using ideas familiar to psychoanalysts and clinical psychologists to diagnose the problems of the American economy and design a course of treatment. He has posed a set of problems which political psychologists can solve with great benefit to the intelligence of national policy.

The president's idea is simple. He says our economy's lack of vitality is produced because government has become a powerful, substantial presence "above" us here in America. Over the past 30 years as, in our national imagination government became "bigger," we grew subjectively smaller to develop a national dependence. There was a "zero-sum" effect on each person's mind: As "it" (government) assumed more responsibility in national life, "we" (the people) took less. The work ethic disintegrated; productivity increases stopped; the economy stalled.

The president's economic policy follows logically. It is intellectually serious and urgent: He must provide national psychotherapy for a depressed, passive nation that expects its therapist to have a prompt and magical solution.

To effect the change he desires, our president-psychiatrist has designed a national psychodrama to inspire us, to create open space, and to reduce our idealized illusions. He is warm and supportive. He is cutting taxes and expenditures to make government above us "smaller." It may not be a cure we like, and there will be painful withdrawal symptoms, but we must again take responsibility for our own lives.

From personal experience, Dr. Reagan knows he is right. The dire predictions of his theory, made 30 years ago, appear correct to him. And in his autobiography, *Where's the Rest of Me?*, he sketches how he, too, was once dependent, in his case on the Hollywood studio system. He was well paid but unhappy, reading scripts written by others, never getting the leading dramatic roles he wanted to play. But then he became more assertive, struck out on his own. Once he became his own man, life started to work for him. He made a successful second marriage. Speaking his own ideas, he was elected Governor of California. Now he has the leading role in the country.

Other aspects of the president's life and experience confirm the same intuitive truth. He enjoys exhilaration, and a sense of freedom, when he rides the open range on horseback, the experience of the open range for free entrepreneurship he has told us we will regain in our national psychology by cutting back that "big government" in the sky. When he escapes to California from Washington and clears brush on his ranch, he feels recharged. He knows we will feel that way too, as the American Congress "stays the course" to effect the psychological transformation he wants.

To be sure, this is a closed system of beliefs. Evidence is always interpreted in the light of what the president calls his "basic principles." If the economic recovery is slow, it only means problems of dependency and addiction to big government are deep in our national psyche. So he is under an even greater obligation to persevere until we regain our independence and self-confidence and restart the economy. He has no choice.

From the president's perspective there is likely a second cause of a slow recovery, a cause psychoanalysts and clinical psychologists often cite: We are resisting. To an unprecedented degree, American news media refuse to discuss a national problem in the language a president uses. He has been stonewalled. *CBS News* has run nightly stories about the sufferings imposed by Reaganomics but has not yet discussed the real national problem, our psychology of dependency. It is as though the Eastern liberal news media are so addicted to the drama of an activist government, so psychologically dependent, so accustomed to demand that the president do something, that they will never admit even the possibility he could be profoundly right.

If Reagan is right, these skeptics slow the cure. The president can cut taxes and expenditures; these are actions in physical reality. But the stakes

are *psychological* reality. For the therapy to work we must agree — that the diagnosis of dependency is right, that big government is receding, that the therapist knows what he is doing.

It is also possible our actor-president is wrong. A powerful bond to government may be true of only 2% of the population: actors, intellectuals, reporters, the people who give money to political causes or end up in Washington. How can we tell?

The president has profoundly challenged the discipline of economics. His idea about how the economy works does not come from the hundreds of complex equations of their mathematical models. The basic problem, in his view, is simple: The economy is deeply *political*; we orient ourselves dependently toward government in a larger-than-life drama.

Lacking objective evidence, we now are adrift and debates about economic policy are decoupled, without intellectual integrity. Administration economists have given no evidence to support the intuitive psychological ideas about the economy the president uses to set policy. They have developed no national indicators for the substantiality of images of a "big" government in the sky, for changes in achievement motivation, for the alleged zero-sum allocations of responsibility.

Now, as we "stay the course," we navigate blind, on faith alone. Congress has applied no rules of evidence. The *Report* of the U.S. government's Council of Economic Advisers is intellectually irrelevant; it would be rejected as a test of the president's theories by any psychology department.

If the president is right, good national psychological indicators will tell us. And, refining our understanding, they might improve the president's policy. John F. Kennedy cut taxes and the economy leaped ahead — but Kennedy also talked about achievement — a New Frontier, a man on the moon by 1970. If psychodrama is needed, perhaps these are the themes to emphasize.

The president is not speaking in metaphors. He believes he is talking about our reality: solid, strong constituents of a national imagination, constituents so powerful in their effects as to destroy the health of a multitrillion dollar economy and our national spirit. His theories reflect ideas many psychologists have voiced seriously in the past: Psychoanalysts have told us that, via transference, many people relate to government authority, in our "mass psychology," the way as children they regarded their magically powerful parents; David McClelland of Harvard explained the economic rise and fall of civilizations by changes in the imaginations of citizens.

Currently, empirical evidence bearing upon the president's fundamental assumption is indirect and inconsistent. Self-report attitude measures seem to deny his model: Americans say they blame *themselves* for economic hardship. Yet macrolevel studies of election results, and individual-difference measures of self-interested and "socio-tropic" voting, suggest Reagan is cor-

rect and responsibility for management of the economy is assigned to the party in power.

Such measures of attitudes and voting are open to different interpretations as reflecting either rational and secular or psychodramatic processes. Alone, they cannot dispel the fog. The deeper question is the psychological nature of American government, and what is needed is that our public debates begin to be informed by evidence, from appropriate, clinically derived measures, of the location and substantiality of citizens' experience of government and the nature of the emotional bonds to it.