Political psychology

James Walter (Monash University)

Paul ‘t Hart (Australian National University and Utrecht University)

Draft chapter for R.A.W. Rhodes (ed.), *The Australian Study of Politics in the Twentieth Century*. To be published 2009.

Political psychology: a field and its themes

Political psychology, foreshadowed in the 1930s (Lasswell, 1930), emerged as a distinct subfield of political science in the mid-1970s in the United States, although its intellectual roots are commonly traced back centuries to early French crowd psychologists such as Tarde and LeBon (van Ginneken, 1992). Its emergence in modern form, with the application of formal psychological theory to politics, dates from the early twentieth century, with Sigmund Freud (1927, 1930), but also impelled by founders of the new discipline of political science, such as Graham Wallas (1908).

Studies of individual political actors dominated political psychology from the early twentieth century until the 1950s. These were strongly influenced by psychoanalytic assumptions, deriving from Freud's own biographical essays, but given impetus by Harold Lasswell's (1930) psychologically informed interpretations of the motives behind political engagement, of political discourse as the key to attitudes (Lasswell *et al*, 1949) and of the uses of power (Lasswell, 1948). Lasswell seeded the fields of personality and politics (Greenstein, 1987), attitude formation and its relation to ideology (Lane 1962, 1969) and studies of power, including dispositions of power in international relations (Etheredge, 1978).

From the mid twentieth century, there was a burgeoning of interest in a second domain—mass political behaviour—that all but eclipsed the focus on individuals as activists (Kuklinski 2002). In part this was driven by desires, on the one hand, to understand widespread dispositions that explained the descent into totalitarianism (Adorno *et al.*,1950), and, on the other, to identify the conditions that encouraged

dispositions conducive to democratic pluralism (Almond and Verba, 1963). More recently, an emphasis on theories of social cognition—how people make sense of others and of themselves—has inflected the domains both of personality and politics research (Axelrod, 1976) and of mass political behaviour research (Mutz, 1998; Althaus 2003; Stenner, 2005). Just as the 'behavioural turn' dominated political science from the 1950s, the 'cognitive revolution' has impacted on most subfields of politics at present, and political psychology is no exception.

Today, political psychology is well entrenched in the International Society of Political Psychology of around 800 members. The ISPP sponsors a respected journal (*Political Psychology*; 2006 ISI rankings: 16/85 in political science and 24/46 in social psychology), holds well-attended annual conferences all over the world, organizes postgraduate summer schools, hands out awards, and counts among its past presidents some of the world's most distinguished political scientists (e.g. Fred Greenstein, Robert Jervis). There is also a political psychology section within the American Political Science Association (APSA), which hosts 10-15 panels during the annual APSA conferences, and gives out its own awards.

Furthermore, the field has been consolidated in a growing number of handbooks, anthologies and other overview volumes (Knutson, 1973; Hermann, 1986; Iyengar and McGuire, 1993; Kressel, 1993; Delli-Carpini, Huddy and Shapiro, 1994; Renshon and Duckitt, 2000; Kuklinski, 2002; Monroe, 2002; Sears, Huddy and Jervis, 2003; Jost and Sidanius, 2004), textbooks (Stone and Schaffner, 1988; Garzon Perez, 2001; Cottam *et al*, 2004) and high-profile book series (with Cambridge University Press and Duke University Press, among others). The field's emergence has not remained

confined to the English-speaking world (see e.g. van Ginneken and Kouijzer, 1986; Lipowatz, 1998; Moser, 1998; Araki, 2004; and the journals *Zeitschrift für Politische Psychologie* [German], *Psychología Politica* [Spanish]). Arguably the emphasis on a positivistic, quantitative form of scholarship has been dominant in the United States, whereas in some other parts of the world the relative prominence of interpretive methods and psychoanalytic theory has been bigger (Garzon Perez, 2001). Finally, important contributions to political psychology appear regularly in top-level journals in both political science and social psychology. Some political psychologists defy contemporary narrow career incentives and manage to make regular contributions to both (e.g. Philip Tetlock, David Sears, Howard Lavine).

What is distinctive about political psychology as an academic enterprise? Answers to this question vary among its practitioners. This is partly due to the fact that the field comprises political scientists 'borrowing from psychology' (to better explain their traditional object of study), as well as psychologists 'looking over the fence' (applying their analytical toolkits to study the object of political behaviour on which their discipline does not normally focus). Within the field, the former are far more numerous, although paradoxically many of its 'founding fathers' belonged to the latter. With the institutionalization of the field, particularly in North America, specialized graduate training programs have, however, been churning out steady numbers of genuinely interdisciplinary scholars equally literate in significant portions of both disciplines and up with both fields' state of the art (quantitative) research methods.

The common denominator is the ambition to describe and explain the human dimensions of political phenomena. In other words: use concepts, theories and methods from the field of psychology (e.g. cognitive, social, motivational and even biopsychology as well as psychoanalysis) to analyze the behaviour of political actors and/or explain political situations or outcomes in psychological terms. Hence political psychologists study the beliefs, values, drives, emotions, interpersonal relationships, group behaviour and intergroup relations that political actors display when making politically relevant choices (e.g. voting) or otherwise engaging in politically consequential behaviour (e.g. political activism, discrimination, violent conflict). They do so in the belief that these psychological factors help explain those behaviours, as distinct from contextual and situational factors that tend to be favoured in sociological, historical and institutional theories of politics.

Part of political psychology's research agenda has emerged in direct opposition to economical models of political behaviour and public policy, particularly rational choice explanations and realist explanations and game-theoretical explanations of international relations and foreign policy (e.g. Jervis, Lebow and Stein, 1985; Jervis, 1989; Ripley, 1993), but more recently the missionary zeal to criticize those approaches seems to have abated. Instead, perhaps as a sign of growing self-confidence, political-psychologist theories now compete more with one another (for example, Huddy, 2001, 2002 versus Oakes, 2002; *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 2003).

As noted above, the field has been bifurcated with one cluster of scholars focusing on elite behaviour and one on mass behaviour in politics. The former comprises of

psychological studies of political leaders, individual and collective political decision making, and political communication and persuasion. The latter addresses objects of study such as political attitudes and socialization, voting and political activism, and cooperation and conflict in intergroup relations. Both of them have partly been motivated by a fascination with (and abhorrence of) the human capacity to display seemingly irrational, violent and outright evil behaviour not just in their private lives but in the public realm. Dating back to Tarde and LeBon's treatises on the 'madness' of crowds, a long line of political psychologists have studied the dark sides of politics – policy fiascos (Janis, 1982; 't Hart, 1994; 't Hart *et al*, 1997); intergroup stereotyping, racism and discrimination (Sears, Sidanius and Bobo, 2000); popular support for extremist leaders and parties (Stenner, 2005); flawed and dangerous leaders (Kellerman, 2004); patterns of conflict escalation and war (White, 1986); and the resultant torture, mass killings and other 'crimes of obedience' (Lifton, 1986; Kelman and Hamilton, 1989; Zimbardo, 2007).

With such preoccupations being a driving force behind the enterprise, there is always a risk of it being (seen as) 'politicized.' And indeed there have been assertions that some of the leading research programmes within the field have displayed a left-wing bias (Tetlock, 1994a, 1994b, 1995), which may be self-consciously welcomed by some (e.g. White, 1986) but strongly disputed by others committed to their work as being 'objective' in its methods if not perhaps in its choice of research questions (Sears, 1994). Overall, as in the discipline of psychology itself, the trend has been to 'harden' the approach academically, with a positivist approach dominating most of the research done, and a steady efforts by many to absorb the upshot of the cognitive

(and, soon perhaps, the neurological) turn in psychology into the research agendas and theories of political psychology.

During the last two decades political psychology has become part of the political science mainstream as reflected in the contents of leading journals, programming of conferences, and absorption into national associations' structures. This is particularly so in the US and Germany, and it has had historical prominence in many Spanish speaking countries, where 'political sociology' has long been the umbrella term encompassing both sociological and psychological studies of political behaviour. In other countries, like the Netherlands, France and Sweden it is gaining mainstream visibility and recognition. But in places like the UK and Canada it is still very much at the margins of the profession. What about Australia?

Australian political psychology today: an oxymoron?

From the vantage point of 2008, it is difficult to discern the existence of this subfield in contemporary Australian political science. First, there is no professional society or section devoted to it. Second, an internet survey of Group of Eight course guides shows that the subject is taught only sporadically at major Australian universities, and where this is the case it is more due to individual devotees (Graham Little and John Cash at Melbourne; Hyam Gold at Monash; David Adams at ANU) than a continuous, collective effort of any department. Thirdly, an examination of the contents of the *Australian Journal of Political Science* from 1967-2007, we found only ten articles that could be reasonably classified as contributing towards political psychology. This

is so small a number that the conclusion that political psychology has had little uptake in this country is difficult to avoid.

Somewhat more positively, we found 25 contributions by Australian and/or Australian-based scholars to *Political Psychology* (from 1978-present) but the overall number is augmented heavily by the no less than 12 articles published between 1981 and 1998 by a single individual (John J. Ray, University of NSW). Many of these were short contributions to the ongoing, sometimes fierce, debate on the measurement and correlates of authoritarianism in that journal. The total number does go up if one keeps including articles by Australians working overseas (such as Leonie Huddy, SUNY Stony Brook, who is now a leading scholar within North American political psychology, see e.g. Sears, Huddy and Jervis, 2003) or retrospectively appropriates the previous outputs of foreign scholars who migrated to Australia (such as Paul ‘t Hart, ANU, see e.g. Preston and ‘t Hart, 1999; Bynander and ‘t Hart, 2006; Boin, McConnell and ‘t Hart, 2008) who do regularly publish there. Also, some of the most important social psychologists contributing to political psychology reside in Australia (John C. Turner, Catherine Reynolds, both ANU; Leon Mann, Melbourne, whose 1977 book *Decision Making* with Irving Janis inspired many political psychologists focusing on elite decision making) or spent long periods here (Alex Haslam).

All this does not change the big picture: Australian scholars have a limited presence in the main international forum of political psychology scholarship. Partly this is simply because Australia is a small intellectual community, partly because incentives to publish in international journals have not been very strong here. And we note that some Australians publishing in this field (Alan Davies and Graham Little, for

instance) have emphasized monographs and chapters rather than journal articles. But it also reflects the sheer lack of resonance that this subfield has enjoyed in the mainstream of Australian political science.

This is odd because as in many other countries there is a sustained interest in political attitudes, political participation and especially voting in this country. But its key practitioners (Clive Bean, Murray Goot and Ian McAllister, among others) work squarely in the sociological mould of survey analysis. Likewise, political leadership dominates representations of Australian politics in popular history and in daily journalism where, as Graham Little once said, it is 'as if politics and its leaders have to fill a space left by God and religion'. Governments are personalized, their achievements named for a prime minister or a president, their rise and fall closely mapped onto the strengths and weaknesses of a leader. Yet leadership is a minority research area in Australian political science (as it is world-wide), and psychological study of Australian political leadership is almost non-existent today. The work that has been done has been overwhelmingly descriptive. No recent anthology on prime ministers, for instance, pays attention to Weller's (1989) important ground-work in *Malcolm Fraser PM*, develops common approaches to measuring which qualities have advantaged or incapacitated incumbents in office, draws lessons about leadership, or links with any body of theory or typology developed elsewhere. Greenstein's (2001) group study of US presidents attempting a range of these things in a modest way, and without excessive reliance on reductive models, shows strikingly what most Australian approaches omit.

The 'Melbourne School' in political psychology

Things have not always been this way. The history of psychoanalysis in Australia shows its early influence on inter-war social scientists, including some whose interest was in politics, such as Elton Mayo, Ernest Burgmann and some of the WEA intellectuals (Damousi, 2005). Oscar Oeser, South African in origin, with doctorates from Germany and Cambridge and experience in British “mass observation” research, was appointed professor of psychology at the University pf Melbourne in 1946. Here he undertook pioneering Australian urban and rural community studies (Oeser and Emery, 1954; Oeser and Hammond, 1954), which included aspects of socialization and of community power relations. Raewyn Connell, now one of Australia’s most significant sociologists and social theorists, whose doctorate and first job was in Government at the University of Sydney, pioneered the study of political socialization in Australia (Connell, 1971). Connell’s later work on class (e.g., Connell, 1977), education (e.g., Connell, 1982) and gender (e.g., Connell 1987) maintains attention to questions of power and politics.

Between 1970 and 1990 a sustained interest in the psychological dimensions of politics developed in what was later – mostly pejoratively – called the ‘Melbourne School’—by which was meant the late Professor Alan Davies and his students at the University of Melbourne (even though it was a more widely held interest, and in cities other than Melbourne). The ‘Melbourne School’ was in fact a signifier invented by those who not only had no interest in the questions and methods Davies pursued, but also were uneasy about seeing them admitted to the political science agenda.

The psychoanalytic approach of Davies, Little and their collaborators and students was clearly at odds with the positivist tenor of Australian social science at the time, but ironically resonated better with no less positivistic, but psychologically literate US scholars such as Fred Greenstein (see Walter, 1992). Its chief proponents were noticed and recognized internationally, with Davies and Little along with Ross Fitzgerald (Griffith University) being among the founding members of ISPP; the election to the ISPP Governing Council of Alan Davies (1984-5), Angus McIntyre (1984-5) and John Cash (2000-1) and editorial board memberships to *Political Psychology* for McIntyre (1986-9) and Little (1999-2000). Marginal at home, respected abroad, let us retrace the steps of the 'Melbourne School' and outline some of its key contributions.

The pioneer: Alan Davies

Although he did much other work during his career, at the core Davies was preoccupied with individuals and their political behaviours (see Walter, 1998). His reference points initially were American social scientists of the inter- and immediately post-war period: he was both an analyst, and a manifestation, of the Americanization of the social sciences after the war. He exemplified the late fruition of modernism in Australia, at a time when the benchmark was the United States. He developed working relationships with US-based counterparts like Fred Greenstein and Robert Lane (and the Canadian, Christian Bay). Reading his works, the impression is that he came to Freud through Harold Lasswell and Henry Murray but then embarked on his own distinctive journey—in which direct contact with London-based psychoanalysts (and especially the Tavistock Institute) became an important element.

The frameworks Davies' developed can be appreciated in three essential works: *Private Politics* (1966), an essay on 'The Tasks of Biography' (1972) and—perhaps his *summa* (apart from an enormous, incomplete and unpublished manuscript on dreams)—*Skills, Outlooks and Passions* (1980). One can gain a strong sense of his voice in the posthumously published *The Human Element* (1988).

In *Private Politics* (1966) Davies presented a series of case studies, based on interviews, of how activists build up their political outlooks and of how those public positions are shaped by private needs and private meanings. In 'The Tasks of Biography' (1972) Davies drew on John Dollard's 'tiny lost classic' (Davies' words), *Criteria for the Life History* (1935), to distil seven criteria to determine 'What should go into the ideal biography?…How can biography be brought closer to meeting social science demands?' Davies describes this work of Dollard, a social anthropologist who turned to psychoanalysis and then to psychiatric practice, as 'a culture chip far-flung, wild, doomed, Berlin psychoanalysis half-learnt, earnestly "applied" in the Chicago of Al Capone' (Davies, 1972, p. 107). Yet it seemed to him 'still…the most vital exploration of the interface of biography and social science' (Davies, 1972, p. 107). Davies' elucidation of Dollard's criteria stressed:

- The subject as part of a cultural series;
- The body as part of the story;
- The family's role in transmitting culture;
- The formation of specific traits and attitudes (to which Davies added, map the political outlook!);
- The continuous, related character of experience through childhood to adulthood;

- The specificity of social situation (to which Davies added, specify the style of work!); and
- The necessity of a coherent, objective set of necessary terms.

Applying these to a series of prime ministers, including Page, Chifley, and Bruce, Davies concluded that the political life ideally falls 'into four parts: childhood, outlook, career, and style of work' (Davies, 1972, p. 117). These tenets were to be the foundations of Davies' *Skills, Outlooks and Passions* (1980), where particular ways of working and thinking are shown to have their origins in childhood experience and decisively to shape career outcomes. Borrowing from Harold Lasswell (skills) and Robert Bales (outlooks), but drawing on thirty years of wide reading in psychoanalysis, this book showed the potential of theory to assist in the explanation of an extensive range of individual political behaviours.

One manifestation of Davies' influence is its traces in the work of his contemporaries, evident in the texts and footnotes of many of the biographies written by his colleagues in Melbourne, and arguably shaped by friendship, conversation and dispute with Davies. Biographies by Geoff Serle, Allan Martin and Roger Joyce (among others) belong to this group. Martin provides a case of a writer who showed a close interest in psychological theory early in his work on Parkes (and while he was in Melbourne) (Martin, 1974), only to draw back from the challenge (once in Canberra) (Martin, 1980). He was to mount a spirited defence of this retreat (Martin, 1984). Others have shown what he lost through this withdrawal (see Rickard, 1981), and Martin soon encountered persuasive psychoanalytic corrections to some aspects of his interpretations of Parkes (from McIntyre: McIntyre, 1988), and Menzies (from Brett) (see Martin, 1993; and compare Brett, 1993). Even so exhaustive and resolutely

conventional a biographer as Roger Joyce was to acknowledge in a footnote his reliance on Karen Horney (and, indirectly, his debt to Davies) in his biography of Samuel Griffith (Joyce, 1984; see Davies' discussion of this in Davies, 1988, p. 14).

The innovative consolidator: Graham Little

Davies' closest successor, Graham Little, was to have a significant impact on public debate. This may have been partly because, as Wallace-Crabbe argues (Crozier, 2000), Little was a more disciplined thinker, and partly because—with his British origins and a postdoctoral stint at Yale—he had his own international networks and actively maintained them. It was also undoubtedly due to Little having developed—through radio, television and journalism—a capacity to reach out to a general, educated audience. He was to be much more of a public figure than Davies ever aspired to be. Little published rigorously theoretical and innovative works, for a specialist audience, which advanced beyond anything Davies had attempted (such as his work on leader-follower relations in *Political Ensembles*, 1980). At the same time, he was capable of translating psychological insight into journalism for the popular press, and of the engaging conversational prose style that graced his memoir, *Letter To My Daughter* (2000). Far from living in Davies' shadow, he ventured often into terrain that Davies had not pioneered (see, for instance, his book on *Friendship*, 1993). Then, too, he could take one of Davies' organising principles (for instance, the injunction to look for the passions implicated in politics) to develop his own unique book on *The Public Emotions* (1999).

Little contributed unique insights into the links between leaders and followers in developing a typology of 'political ensembles' crystallising around 'strong', 'group' or 'inspiring' leaders (*Political Ensembles*, 1985). His later study of Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan and Malcolm Fraser as exemplars of the 'strong leader' in action illuminated the political transitions of the 1980s (*Strong Leadership*, 1988). Little's trenchant portrait of Thatcher as the strong leader *par excellence,* adapting the conventional traits to her own ends, implied that women could dominate by beating men at their own game. Little's was a vital contribution for two reasons: he took the psychosocial approach to politics into the public domain; and he was the brotherly figure whose ongoing interest and encouragement made the link between the aristocratic Davies and the younger cohort who came to form the 'Melbourne School' diaspora.

The working styles of Davies and Little ensured that the Melbourne School was evanescent: it would not survive their passing. They worked through conversation and sociability. Though strong intellectual links were forged with peers abroad (especially in the UK and the US), they rarely engaged with the Australian Political Studies Association, except as curious observers, nor did they build links with other university politics departments. Despite his works on local government, Australian democracy, society and class, Davies was more interested in why people engaged in politics than in political institutions, and in the work styles and skills of activists rather than their public roles. This set him at odds with the descriptive and pragmatic temper of politics elsewhere. That the networks he developed relied as much on local interdepartmental friendships, social contacts (with practising psychoanalysts) and a following in the pub and café based 'salons' of Carlton as on the University (whose

internal politics he disdained) meant that despite the students he attracted and trained, no secure departmental base was established. Little was even more a conversationalist (tellingly, his landmark television series of conversations with celebrities was titled *Speaking For Myself*), even less interested in administrative minutiae, than was Davies. Both men attracted disciples (and in Little's case, devoted friends); neither built institutions. They encouraged individuals to pursue their interests in the field, rather than consolidating around a common program that could be sustained without them.

The Melbourne School 'diaspora'

The ripples of influence from Davies' and Little's interest in the psychosocial, nonetheless, resonated in the work of a younger cohort. Some turned to the application of psychoanalytic approaches to large social and political questions, often in turn moving into social theory (see, for instance, John Cash's work on Northern Ireland, 1996). Angus McIntyre, with others, took Davies' dictum about attending to the whole of the life course to heart and made an original contribution in identifying the effect of aging on political leadership (MacIntyre, 1998). Warren Osmond's (1985) biography of Frederic Eggleston—one of the best intellectual biographies of the past thirty years—was significantly shaped by his interchange with Davies and Little as the book evolved. Walter (1980) used Davies' framing questions about biography to analyse Gough Whitlam's career, outlook and work style (and their origins in formative influences). This was one of the first Australian psychobiographies that tried to link language presentation to habits of thought and thence to personality (Walter, 1981). The analysis of language and public

documentation as the key to understanding a career, however, was to be even more central in Judith Brett's landmark, award-winning study of Robert Menzies (Brett, 1993).

There followed then a further group—now making their careers—who had in their turn worked with Cash (and Little), Brett, Walter, McIntyre and so on. Anthony Elliott (1992; 1999), Stan Anson (1991) and Anthony Moran (2002, 2005) can be cited as indicative examples. Little's influence, in particular, is clearly acknowledged in Amanda Sinclair's and Valerie Wilson's (2002) study of leadership, in Mike Richard's (2002) study of Ronald Ryan and in Don Watson's (2002) widely read book about Paul Keating. The psychosocial impress is also evident in Paul Strangio's (2002) biography of Jim Cairns. The work goes on today (for example, Brett and Moran, 2006; Elliott and Lemert, 2006; Walter and Strangio, 2007; Brett, 2007).

Conclusion: a subfield in search of practitioners?

How might we explain the contemporary predicament of political psychology in Australia? How, more specifically, have historical factors affected current practice? First, the highly contested nature of the psychoanalytically inspired 'Melbourne School' has been an influence. It was not only that there was a positivist mainstream (this was not peculiar to Australia), but also that the group that founded post war political science was so small that the intellectual differences between perhaps half a dozen figures established divisions with long-term effects. While Davies had some allies (Colin Hughes in Queensland, Sol Encel at UNSW—but in sociology), it is clear that influential figures such as Henry Mayer (professor at Sydney) and Robert

Parker (professor at ANU) disdained his approach. Davies mischievous sallies against such peers did not help: he concluded a review of Mayer's *The Press in Australia* (1964) by remarking, 'if we get the press we deserve, when will we get the *book* on the press we deserve?' Thus, most of the founding departments of politics and government, in which the generation that would staff the expansion of tertiary education in the 1960s and 1970s were trained, chose to ignore the subfield of political psychology altogether.

Within Australian political science, training in advanced research methods has been comparatively weak. The 'Melbourne School', despite Davies' long-term participation in the *Australian Society* series, emphasised inductive and qualitative approaches. More generally, quantitative methods are rarely insisted upon as a core requirement in undergraduate politics majors, let alone in thesis based postgraduate research, and among practitioners, have mainly been utilised in polling analysis and electoral survey work. Yet such tools have become increasingly salient in advances in political psychology in Europe and North America.

Another factor may have been that practitioners of political psychology moved away from politics into the interdisciplinary projects of the 1970s and 1980s (feminism, Australian studies, cultural studies, for example), or else, following the eclectic bent that Davies and Little encouraged, shifted disciplines altogether. John Cash, for instance, moved from politics to social theory; Anthony Elliott is now identified as one of Australia's leading sociologists; James Walter taught Australian studies for most of his career before returning to politics; Judith Brett, too, has held a chair of Australian studies; Douglas Kirsner teaches psychoanalytic studies in a philosophy

department; Amanda Sinclair works in a business school; Victoria Hattam teaches at the New School of Social Research (and Fran Hattam became a practising psychoanalyst). The students of this 'Melbourne diaspora' in turn have published in a range of disciplines: social theory, sociology, psychotherapy, Australian studies, history, philosophy, business leadership, even criminology—their output is not easily captured in a scan of political psychology. But, by extension, outside a small coterie, Australian political science is missing a fertile source of concepts, explanatory theories and rigorous research methods for grasping 'the human element' (Davies, 1988) in politics at both the mass and the elite level. Young historians, instead, now appear more likely to utilise psychological insight in social explanation (see Damousi and Reynolds, 2003; Damousi, 2005).

What are the prospects of a revival of political psychology in Australia? The human capital to do so is certainly there; the second and third generation of 'Melbourne school' scholars are active and working today, and at a place like ANU there is some potential critical mass. Given the lack of sustained teaching, let alone postgraduate training in the area in Australia there is, however, no generation of talented and ambitious 'Young Turks' to provide the necessary drive and zest. If political psychology is to be re-built in this country, the initiative to do so will have to come from the existing reservoir of senior and mid-career scholars in Melbourne and Canberra. So either they join up and give the necessary push, or it is quite likely that this fertile subfield of Political Science will be lost to the Australian profession for a long time to come.

Bibliography

Adorno, T.W. *et al*., *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1950).

Almond, Gabriel, and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

Althaus, Scott L., *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will of the People* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Anson, Stan, *Hawke: An Emotional Life* (Ringwood: McPhee Gribble/Penguin, 1991).

Araki, Y., and J. Kawata (eds), *Handobukku Seiji Shinrigaku* (Tokyo: Hokuju, 2003).

Axelrod, Robert, *Structure of Decision: The Cognitive Maps of Political Elites* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

Boin, Arjen, Allan McConnell, and Paul ‘t Hart (eds), *Governing After Crisis: The Politics of Investigation, Accountability and Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Brett, Judith, *Robert Menzies’ Forgotten People* (Sydney: Sun Australia, 1993).

Brett, Judith, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class: from Alfred Deakin to John Howard* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Brett, Judith, and Anthony Moran, *Ordinary People’s Politics: Australians Talk About Life, Politics and the Future of Their Country* (North Melbourne, Vic.: Pluto Press Australia, 2006).

Brett, Judith, *Exit Right: The Unravelling of John Howard* (Melbourne: Black Inc., 2007).

British Journal of Social Psychology, 42 (2), 2003. Theme issue on social dominance versus social identity theory.

Bynander, Fredrik, and Paul ‘t Hart, ‘When Power Changes Hands: The Political Psychology of Leadership Succession in Democracies’, *Political Psychology*, 27 (5), 2006, 707-30.

Cash, John, *Identity, Ideology and Conflict: The Structuration of Politics in Northern Ireland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Connell, R.W. *The child’s construction of politics*, (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1971)

Connell, R.W. *Ruling class, ruling culture: studies of conflict, power, and hegemony in Australian life* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

Connell, R.W. *Making the difference: schools, families and social division,* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1982)

Connell, R.W. *Gender and Power: society, the person and sexual politics,* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1987).

Cottam, Martha *et al*., *Introduction to Political Psychology* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004).

Crozier, Michael, ‘Obituary—Graham Little’, *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 35 (2), 2000, 313-16.

Damousi, Joy, and Robert Reynolds (eds), *History on the Couch: Essays in History and Psychoanalysis* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2003).

Damousi, Joy, *Freud in the Antipodes: A Cultural History of Psychoanalysis in Australia* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2005).

Davies, A.F., *Private Politics: A Study of Five Political Outlooks* (Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1966).

Davies, A.F., ‘The Tasks of Biography,’ in A.F. Davies, *Essays in Political Sociology* (Melbourne: Cheshire, 1972) 109-17.

Davies, A.F., *Skills, Outlooks and Passions: A Psychoanalytic Contribution to the Study of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

Davies, A.F., *The Human Element: Three Essays on Political Psychology* (Fitzroy, Victoria: McPhee Gribble/Penguin, 1988).

Delli-Carpini, Michael X., Leonie Huddy, and Robert Y. Shapiro, *Research in Micropolitics: New Directions in Political Psychology*, Volume 4. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1994).

Dollard, John, *Criteria for the Life History* (New York: P. Smith, 1935).

Elliot, Anthony, *Social Theory and Psychoanalysis in Transition: Self and Society from Freud to Kristeva* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992).

Elliot, Anthony, *Psychoanalytic Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

Elliot, Anthony, 'Celebrity and Political Psychology: Remembering Lennon', *Political Psychology*, 19 (4), 1998, 833–52.

Elliot, Anthony, and Charles Lemert, *The New Individualism: The Emotional Costs of Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Etheredge, Lloyd S., *A World of Men: The Private Sources of American Foreign Policy* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1978).

Freud, Sigmund, *The Future of an Illusion* (London: Hogarth Press, 1927).

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents* (London: Hogarth Press, 1930).

Fromm, Erich, *Escape from Freedom* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941).

Garzon Perez, Adela, 'Political Psychology as Discipline and Resource', *Political Psychology*, 22 (2), 2001, 347-56.

Grattan, Michelle (ed.), *Australian Prime Ministers* (French Forest, N.S.W: New Holland, 2000).

Greenstein, Fred I., *Personality and Politics 2nd ed* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Greenstein, Fred I., *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Clinton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Hermann, M.G. (ed.), *Political Psychology* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986).

Huddy, Leonie, 'From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory', *Political Psychology*, 22 (1), 2001, 127–56.

Huddy, Leonie, 'Context and Meaning in Social Identity Theory: A Response to Oakes', *Political Psychology*, 23 (4), 2002, 825-38.

Iyengar, Shanto, and William J. McGuire (eds), *Explorations in Political Psychology* (Durham, Duke University Press, 1993).

Janis, Irving L., *Stress, Attitudes, and Decisions: Selected Papers* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982).

Jervis, R., R. N. Lebow, and J. G. Stein, *Psychology and Deterrence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985).

Jervis, Robert, 'Political Psychology: Some Challenges and Opportunities', *Political Psychology*, 10 (3), 1989, 481-93.

Jost, John T., and James Sidanius, *Political Psychology* (New York: Psychology press, 2004).

Joyce, R.B., *Samuel Walker Griffith* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1984).

Kellerman, Barbara, *Bad leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2004).

Kelman, Herbet C., and V. Lee Hamilton, *Crimes of Obedience: Toward a Social Psychology of Authority and Responsibility* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

Knutson, Jeanne N., *Handbook of Political Psychology* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973).

Kressel, Neil J. (ed.) *Political Psychology: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1993).

Kuklinski, Jim (ed.), *Thinking About Political Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Lane, Robert Edwards, *Political Ideology* (New York: Free Press, 1962).

Lane, Robert Edwards, *Political Thinking and Consciousness* (Chicago: Markham Pub. Co., 1969).

Lasswell, Harold D., *Psychopathology and Politics* (Chicago: University Press, 1930).

Lasswell, Harold D., *Power and Personality* (New York: Norton, 1948).

Lasswell, Harold D., Nathan Leites and associates, *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1949).

Lifton, Robert Jay, *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (London: Macmillan, 1986).

Lipowatz, Thanos, *Politik der Psyche: Eine Einführung in die Psychopathologie des Politischen* (Vienna: Turia & Kant, 1998).

Little, Graham, *Political Ensembles: A Psychosocial Approach to Politics and Leadership* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Little, Graham, *Strong Leadership: Thatcher, Reagan and an Eminent Person* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Little, Graham, *Friendship: Being Ourself With Others* (Melbourne: Text Publishing, 1993).

Little, Graham, *The Public Emotions: From Mourning to Hope* (Sydney: ABC Books, 1999).

Little, Graham, *Letter To My Daughter* (Carlton, Victoria: Scribe, 2000).

Mann, Leon, and Irving Janis, *Decision Making* (New York: Free Press, 1977).

Martin, A.W., 'Henry Parkes: in Search of the "Actual Man" Underneath', *Historical Studies*, 16 (63), 1974, 216-34.

Martin, A.W., *Henry Parkes: A Biography* (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1980).

Martin, A.W., *Robert Menzies. Volume 1, 1894—1943: A Life* (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1993).

Martin, Allan, 'Elements in the Biography of Henry Parkes', in James Walter and Raija Nugent (eds), *Biographers at Work* (Brisbane: Institute for Modern Biography, 1984) 43-51.

Mayer, Henry, *The Press in Australia* (Melbourne: Lansdowne, 1964).

McAllister, Ian, *Political Behaviour: Citizens, Parties and Elites in Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1992).

McIntyre, Angus (ed.), 'Precipitate Politics in the Face of Death: The Case of Henry Parkes', in Angus McIntyre (ed.), *Aging and Political Leadership.* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988) 111-56.

Monroe, Kristen, *Political Psychology* (Mahwah, New Jersey: L. Erlbaum, 2002).

Moran, Anthony 'The Psychodynamics of Australian Settler-Nationalism: Assimilating or Reconciling With the Aborigines?' *Political Psychology*, 23 (4), 2002, 667–701.

Moran, Anthony, *Australia: Nation, Belonging and Globalization*, (New York: Routledge, 2005).

Moser, Helmut, *Politische Psychologie. Politik im Spiegel der Sozialwissenschaften* (Weinhelm: Beltz, 1998).

Mutz, Diana C., *Impersonal Influence: How Perceptions of Mass Collectives Affect Political Attitudes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Oakes, Penelope, 'Psychological Groups and Political Psychology: A Response to Huddy's "Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory"', *Political Psychology*, 23 (4), 2002, 809–24.

Oeser, O.A. and F.E. Emery, eds *Social structure and personality in a rural community* (London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954)

Oeser, O.A. and S.B. Hammond, eds *Social structure and personality in a city* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954).

Osmond, Warren, *Frederic Eggleston: An Intellectual in Australian Politics* (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1985).

Preston, Thomas, and Paul 't Hart, 'Understanding and Evaluating Bureaucratic Politics: The Nexus Between Political Leaders and Advisory Systems', *Political Psychology*, 20 (1), 1999, 49-99.

Putnam, Robert, D., *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (London: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

Renshon, Stanley A. and John Duckitt, *Political Psychology: Cultural and Crosscultural Foundations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Richards, Mike, *The Hanged Man: The Life and Death of Ronald Ryan* (Carlton, Victoria: Scribe Publications, 2002).

Rickard, John, ‘Parkes and Whitlam: The Search for the “Actual Man Underneath”’. *Historical Studies*, 19 (77), 1981, 602-6.

Ripley, Brian, ‘Psychology, Foreign Policy, and International Relations Theory’, *Political Psychology*, 14 (3), 1993, 403-16.

Sears, David O., ‘Ideological Bias in Political Psychology: The View from Scientific Hell’, *Political Psychology*, 15 (3), 1994, 547-56.

Sears, David O., James Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo (eds), *Radicalized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000).

Sears, David O., Huddy, Leonie, and Jervis, Robert L., *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Serle, Geoffrey, *John Monash: A Biography*, (Melbourne: MUP in Association with Monash University, 1982).

Sinclair, Amanda, and Valerie Wilson, *New Faces of Leadership* (Carlton South, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2002).

Stenner, Karen Lee, *The Authoritarian Dynamic* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Stone, William F., and Paul E. Schaffner, *The Psychology of Politics* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1988).

Strangio, Paul, *Keeper of the Faith: A Biography of Jim Cairns* (Carlton South, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2002).

‘t Hart, Paul, *Groupthink in Government: A Study of Small Groups and Policy Failure* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).

‘t Hart, Paul, Eric Stern, and Bengt Sundelius (eds), *Beyond Groupthink: Political Group Dynamics and Foreign Policymaking* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997).

Tetlock, P. E., 'Political Psychology or Politicized Psychology: Is the Road to Scientific Hell Paved with Good Moral Intentions?' *Political Psychology*, 15 (3), 1994a, 509-29.

Tetlock, P. E., 'How Politicized is Political Psychology and Is There Anything We Should Do About It?' *Political Psychology*, 15 (3), 1994b, 567-77.

Tetlock, P. E., 'Agreeing to Disagree: A Respectful Reply to a Senior Statesman of Political Psychology.' *Political Psychology*, 16 (3), 1995, 671-5.

van Ginneken, Jaap, and R. Kouijzer (ed.) *Politieke Psychologie. Inleiding en Overzicht* (Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom, 1986).

van Ginneken, Jaap, *Crowds, Psychology, and Politics, 1871-1899* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Wallas, Graham, *Human Nature in Politics* (London: Constable, 1908).

Walter, James, *The Leader: A Political Biography of Gough Whitlam* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1980).

Walter, James, 'Language and Habits of Thought: Biographical Notes on E.G. Whitlam', *Biography*, 4 (1), 1981, 17-44.

Walter, James, 'Biography, Psychobiography and Cultural Space', in Ian Donaldson, Peter Read and James Walter (eds), *Shaping Lives: Reflections on Biography* (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, 1992) 260-85.

Walter, James, 'Australian Democracy and the American Century', in H. Bolitho and C. Wallace-Crabbe (eds), *Approaching Australia: Papers from the Harvard Australian Studies Symposium* (Massachusetts: Harvard, 1998) 199-216.

Walter, James, and Paul Strangio, *No, Prime Minister: Reclaiming Politics From Leaders* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2007).

Watson, Don, *Recollections of a Bleeding Heart: A Portrait of Paul Keating PM* (Milsons Point: Vintage, 2002).

Weller, Patrick, *Malcolm Fraser PM: A Study in Prime Ministerial Power* (Ringwood, Victoria: Penguin, 1989).

White, Ralph K., *Psychology and the Prevention of Nuclear War* (New York: New York University Press, 1986).

Zimbardo, Phillip G., *The Lucifer Effect: How Good People Turn Evil* (London: Rider, 2007).

Paul 't Hart is professor of political science at the Research School of Social Sciences, ANU, as well as professor of public administration, Utrecht School of Governance, Utrecht University. His major research interests include public elites and leadership, political group dynamics, crisis management. Recent books: *The Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership Under Pressure* (CUP 2005), *Observing Government Elites* (Palgrave 2007, with R. Rhodes, M. Noordegraaf), *Governing After Crisis* (CUP 2008, with A. Boin, A. McConnell), *The New Eurocrats* (Amsterdam University Press 2008, with K. Geuijen *et al*), *Public Leadership: Perspectives and Practices* (ANU E-Press 2008, with John Uhr) and *Dispersed Leadership in Democracy* (OUP 2009 forthcoming, with J. Kane and H. Patapan).

James Walter is professor of political science and Head of the School of Political and Social Inquiry at Monash University, and emiritus professor of Australian Studies at Griffith University. His research interests include political leadership, biography, the history of ideas and institutional policy regimes. His recent works include: *The Citizens' Bargain* (UNSW Press, 2002, with Margaret MacLeod), *Ideas and Influence: Social Science and Public Policy in Australia* (UNSW Press, 2007, edited with Peter Saunders), and *No, Prime Minister: Reclaiming Politics From Leaders* (UNSW Press, 2007).

SELECT (TOP 15) BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anson, Stan, *Hawke: An Emotional Life* (Ringwood: McPhee Gribble/Penguin, 1991).

2. Brett, Judith, *Robert Menzies' Forgotten People* (Sydney: Sun Australia, 1993).

3. Brett, Judith, and Anthony Moran, *Ordinary People's Politics: Australians Talk About Life, Politics and the Future of Their Country* (North Melbourne, Vic.: Pluto Press Australia, 2006).

4. Cash, John, *Identity, Ideology and Conflict: the Structuration of Politics in Northern Ireland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

5. Connell, R.W. *The child's construction of politics,* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1971)

6. Davies, A.F., *Private Politics: A Study of Five Political Outlooks* (Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, 1966).

7. Davies, A.F., *Skills, Outlooks and Passions: A Psychoanalytic Contribution to the Study of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

8. Little, Graham, *Political Ensembles: A Psychosocial Approach to Politics and Leadership* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1985).

9. Little, Graham, *Strong Leadership: Thatcher, Reagan and an Eminent Person* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988).

10. McAllister, Ian, *Political Behaviour: Citizens, Parties and Elites in Australia* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1992).

11. McIntyre, Angus (ed.), *Aging and Political Leadership.* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988).

12. David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy and Robert Jervis (eds), Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (New York: Oxford University Press 2003).

13. Osmond, Warren, *Frederic Eggleston: An Intellectual in Australian Politics* (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1985).

14. Paul ‘t Hart, Eric Stern, Bengt Sundelius (eds), *Beyond Groupthink: Political Group Dynamics and Foreign Policymaking* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1997).

15. Walter, James, *The Leader: A Political Biography of Gough Whitlam* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1980).