

Man in a Group
The Robert Waelder Lecture, 1975.

The Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis—October 17, 1975.

Leo Rangell, M.D.

Introduction by Dr. Henry Kleiner:

Mrs. Waelder, Dr. Rangell, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Welcome to the Waelder Memorial Lecture, sponsored by the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis. Tonight, as we have on two other occasions, we honor the memory of a giant psychoanalyst, Robert Waelder. There are those in this audience who knew Robert Waelder, either as friend or colleague or as a patient. Others know him only through his writing. But in whatever form or contact with him that has been made, we know that he belonged to that very select circle who are steeped in humanistic attitudes and values, qualities so rarely seen and so sadly lacking in the world today. His commitment was to a never ending search for truth, a commitment to which he dedicated his vast erudition and insatiable curiosity.

It is now eight years since his death, and much that Robert Waelder predicted for our society in his book “Progress and Revolution: A Study of the Issues of our Age” has unhappily come to pass, among other things that man’s science and technology would outstrip his wisdom, that his penchant for ideology would surpass his capacity for and willingness to reason. Robert Waelder had his doubts about the ultimate survival of Western Civilization, at least in the form that we know it. He was not too hopeful that the small but persistent voice of reason that Freud spoke of would eventually prevail. Yet he felt strongly that one should strive to make oneself heard above the irrational, strive to make oneself heard above the shouting even though it might be discouraging, that people would be willing to listen, think and understand.

In this context, he related that he’d always tried to live by and up to the historical words of William, Prince of Orange, the 17th Century liberator of the Netherlands who told his troops, “One need not hope in order to

begin, one need not succeed in order to persevere.” These thoughts about Robert Waelder cannot possibly do justice either to the depth of the man or to the scope of his seminal thinking, but as long as there is the science of psychoanalysis, his work will remain as a constant source of knowledge from which present and future generations can draw upon and be enriched.

It is more than fitting that our Waelder Memorial Lecture should be the distinguished and internationally renowned psychoanalyst, Dr. Leo Rangell. Dr Rangell has long recognized the creative genius of Robert Waelder. Just as Robert Waelder was, so Leo Rangell is a highly articulate spokesman for psychoanalysis, enunciating with clarity that which is central and unique to this discipline, distinguishing it sharply from all other theories and therapies of the mind. Then, too, he possesses the ability to apply the concepts of psychoanalysis to a very broad canvas, illuminating with perspective those forces that impinge upon man and determine his behavior.

In 1951, Dr. Rangell demonstrated his creative gifts by winning the Clinical Essay Prize sponsored by the British Psychoanalytic Institute for a paper entitled “The Analysis of a Doll Phobia.” This clinical study is now a fixture in the psychoanalytic literature. Two years later he was again awarded this same prize for his paper entitled “The Psychology of Poise.” Both these achievements were notable in that Dr. Rangell was the first psychoanalyst in the United States to win this award, and the first to win it twice.

Over the years he has contributed to the literature on a wide variety of subjects. Of special interest is a series of papers which focus in depth on a certain aspect of clinical theory in psychoanalysis. Using the analogy of the microscope, Dr. Rangell has elaborated a detailed high-powered view of man’s inner processes which he has termed “the microscopic view.” This is in contrast with the more readily visible level of observation seen at the surface, “the macroscopic view.” In fine detail he magnifies that area in mental life which gives rise to much of the motivational power of human behavior. What is being referred to are the dynamics of man’s intrapsychic processes, his anxiety, the nature, scope and structure of his unconscious intrapsychic conflicts, their sequential development and ultimate outcomes. This entire area has been termed “the human core” by Dr. Rangell. It is this region of unconscious psychic activity that psychoanalysis is so admirably equipped to study from which it can make its own unique contribution to the science of human behavior.

As an integral part of this picture, Dr. Rangell has posited an unconscious decision-making function of the ego. This function is crucially involved in solution of those conflicts centering especially around our choices, our attempted resolutions of the very dilemmas that confront us, whether these are small or large, faced by the ordinary man or those controlling the levers of great power. Understanding these microscopic forces involved in how the individual arrives at his solutions when confronted with inner, intrapsychic choices may have application when extrapolated to larger external entities and events.

Since we live in an age of turmoil, necessitating quick decisions by those in power, insight into the unconscious decision-making function may contribute to an understanding of the psychology of crisis in this age of crisis. Of late our distinguished lecturer has been focusing on an important area on the contemporary scene that is both timely and far-reaching – a scientific study of the problem of integrity. He has described a syndrome which he has termed “The Syndrome of the Compromise of Integrity”. This refers to those ubiquitous forms of behavior that in varying degrees are the outcome of the struggle between man’s internal moral system and his pursuit of self interest and self aggrandizement, a pursuit which at times can be as mindless as it is relentless.

In the contents of a book currently in preparation, he has called power, ambition and opportunism the three horsemen of the syndrome of the compromise of integrity. It should come as no surprise that the book is entitled *The Mind of Watergate, an Analysis of the Problem of Integrity*.

Dr. Rangell received his psychoanalytic training at the New York and Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institutes. He is a graduate of and a training and supervisory analyst at the latter institution. He is Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Clinical Professor (Psychoanalysis) at the University of California, San Francisco, and has been the John B. Turner Visiting Professor of Psychiatry at Columbia University. He has served many terms on the Editorial Board of *The Journal of the American Psychoanalytical Association* and numerous other Journals. His psychoanalytic colleagues have accorded him the honor, nationally and internationally, of electing him twice to the same position of highest office. He has served two terms both as president of the American

Psychoanalytic Association and the International Psychoanalytic Association.

It has been said that much of the opposition to psychoanalysis since its origin is because its insights disturb the sleep of the world. Today in addition to this, there are many societal pressures impinging on this discipline. In these challenging circumstances, psychoanalysis is especially fortunate to have Leo Rangell speak for it. Along these lines, drawing on a very rough kind of analogy, scientists of the mind such as Robert Waelder and Leo Rangell stand in the same relationship to Freud's discoveries that the biologist Thomas Huxley did relative to Charles Darwin's work on evolution. They are the guardians of a body of knowledge that has been painstakingly collected. They are receptive to new ideas, further explorations which indeed they themselves have done, while they are opposed to those revisions put forth without sufficient evidence which if followed would have in fact destroyed the very marrow of science. In a memorable International Presidential address commenting on the profusion of theories and therapies that have proliferated over the years, many of them mutations from and mutilations of the parent body of psychoanalysis, Dr. Rangell remarked, "And over the rubble stands psychoanalysis like a colossus, ravaged and gouged but always there, to the relief even of those who attack it."

In this introduction to Leo Rangell, I would like to paraphrase in relationship to psychoanalysis what was once said of another man in another turbulent era, that it is a singular grace that he is doing the best of things in the most difficult of times. We are honored and privileged to have Dr. Leo Rangell as our third Robert Waelder Lecturer. Dr. Rangell's talk is entitled "Man in a Group." Dr. Rangell.

Lecture by Dr. Leo Rangell – Man in a Group

Mrs. Waelder, Dr. Kleiner, Ladies and Gentlemen,

In casting about for a subject which would be appropriate to the scope and the depth of the man whom this lecture honors, after following a number of different streams of motivation, I felt that I could do him justice only by coming to a topic which would coalesce various streams of input. Among the thoughts that I considered were that such a topic should be: 1) a topical subject of no less than major psychosocial interest; 2) for Waelder, it should

be a study emanating from psychoanalysis; 3) it should be a statement which hopefully would add to the science of psychoanalysis; 4) it should be relevant to the works, the life work, of Waelder himself. And from my own side, a continuation or a derivative, I hoped, of some of my own past interests and writings.

The subject I arrived at is happily, I believe, a composite of all of these. Plus, as a bonus it provides a framework from which I can reflect at certain points to some gray and controversial areas within the field of psychoanalysis its self. This subject to be studied tonight is the individual when he is surrounded by a group. This is a different psychic entity, a different unit than a man when he is alone or a group acting as a whole. It is in fact a psychological unit which can be seen as a bridge between these two entities. In fact in these days of swirling events and of a dizzy intensification of group processes to a point where crisis is the normal, this is a nuclear unit of crucial importance in trying to understand psychosocial life, how many individuals act when surrounded by and part of a group.

I will start at once – as is my *modus operandi* in papers – with a clinical observation to give you a pinpoint around which you can orient yourselves as to what I am talking about. This clinical observation, although drawn from large life, is the equivalent of a look into a clinical case in the more conventional type of psychoanalytic paper – a piece of human behavior that provokes the observer to try to explain the internal dynamics of what is happening. The observation is this: that of some forty men around Richard Nixon in his inner circle, only one human being said “No” to what he was being asked to do and left the group.

All of these “men under Nixon” were superior achievers, “tops of their class” at the most prestigious Law Schools. All could smell the scent of potential advance to the next rung, toward or near the highest position of political power themselves, all were tied to these important and precarious roles that gave them pause as to their overt actions. They all froze and “went along”. Their names have become well-known, Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Colson, Liddy, Magruder—more famous than the one person that left. The latter is relatively forgotten, Hugh Sloan, Jr. His wife, who was in on the secret information, told him she would leave him if he stayed, at which he left his position and the group. He was subsequently pilloried by his colleagues for his agonizing decision, for having deserted them during their troubled times, and he suffered for this.

The importance of this statistic which I select to start is primarily that it is now a peripheral and sidelined observation. However, and on the contrary, it is a biopsy of the theme of this paper, the leitmotif – although not so light in its implications – of the phenomena that will be under study. And important because rather than being eccentric or unusual, it is, I will tell you – and at least this is what I argue – a widespread and almost universal type of phenomenon under the stress of the particular group pressure that those forty men were operating under, not for a day, not for one decision, but for years, and for their typical decisions of that entire period of that phase of their lives.

You might not know that long after the Watergate has passed, in a poll conducted in cooler times, 65% of business executives polled stated that they would have done the same thing as the men who went along with the chief executive. Sixty-five percent said that they would have done it; we don't know how many of the other 35 would have done it without saying it. The widespread and almost universal nature of this observation is topped by the icing on the cake when I tell you that in a relaxed moment, when reporters were interviewing Archibald Cox – again, long after this was all over – they asked him what he thought of the people who did what they did and how he might have acted under the circumstances. And this supremely honest man said to the reporters, “I've often worried about that, and I can't say honestly that I am sure that I would have done differently.”

The subject is one that I approach with you with trepidation because at a time when wounds are being healed, the natural tendency is to re-repress. For this reason, even a look into the contents of this national boil is unwelcome in the depths, and therefore I assume, with you just as with me, it requires work to keep it on the surface because it is valuable to keep it under the microscope of the students of human behavior.

Now the architecture of my talk will be observations, followed by an attempt to understand them theoretically. And this is how all my scientific writings oscillate between observing phenomena and then trying to muse about them and to use the analytic framework of understanding to understand the phenomena that are visible. But first, before I get into the next set of observable data, a digression on the methodology which should be explained as to what happens when a psychoanalyst uses observations not from a clinical case, or two or three analytic patients under his observation,

but by viewing the body politic, by viewing the national public in a way that a psychoanalyst views individual behavior.

Say to an analyst “direct observation,” and he thinks automatically of child development. We are all creatures of conditioning and habit. Actually direct observation as data collection spans the life cycle from birth until death. It includes spontaneous observations in the arena of life as much as formal and controlled observations in a nursery school, which is part of the formal psychoanalytic training in many Institutes. Such direct observations can extend from individuals to groups, from the smallest group to the largest group formations. I do not go along with the sharp distinction analysts make between clinical and applied psychoanalysis.

The most significant insights for human understanding come from a combination of vertical and horizontal studies, of reconstructions from analyses and constructions from life. Each complements the other to complete the circle of knowledge. We have been used to thinking about complementarity with regard to child and adult analysis; every Pre-Congress of the international stresses the value of direct observations in child analysis to the body of psychoanalysis. But I want to stress something tonight, which has never, to my knowledge, been stressed didactically, that direct observations of human life, not just of the children’s stage of psychosexual development up to age five, but of human life from five until ninety also complements psychoanalytic theory, practice and understanding.

This is not new. Many things that are old are never articulated. Every analyst during every analytic hour oscillates between microscopic and macroscopic observations. Under his purview are not only macroscopic observations about his patient’s entire life, the 30 or 40 or 50 years that are unfolding before him, deriving from this immediate observation of what the patient just dreamt about or told him in free associations, but every analyst has the opportunity at least to understand from the macroscopic analysis of an analytic hour the widest social phenomena. He can understand these looking outward from the deepest individually obtained insights. For example, the illumination which Freud’s description of the Oedipus complex in his patients cast about neuroses is matched only by what it explains of non-neurotic life, general life, not just life in the analytic chamber. From the dreams and associations of patients, from their primitive fantasies of eating and being eaten, of merging with those they love and depend on by devouring and being devoured, and from later development, the transference

of the cavernous mouth and what Rene Spitz calls “the primal cavity,” to the dentate vagina, I came to understand and was even able to predict the immediate box office success of the movie, Jaws.

Robert Waelder showed us the widest span. Just as Freud traversed from intrapsychic conflicts to civilization and its discontents, Waelder spanned from the mechanism of anxiety and the minute functions of the system ego to giving us, before his death, a sweeping view, in the book that Dr. Kleiner referred to, “Progress and Revolution”, of no less than the global history of man, from his anthropologic beginnings to the present moment.

I cannot refrain from sharing with this audience a flattering personal experience. A young analyst from another country, after having heard me deliver an address in Paris, at which in fact I introduced some of the ideas which I will elaborate further in this lecture dedicated to Robert Waelder, wrote me what I think is a fan letter in which he confided in me, among other things ... he also talked about other ideas that I had expressed there ... he said to me, “You know, I have a hobby – and I hope you don’t think I’m presumptuous – of guessing the analytic genealogies of well-known analysts whom I hear or read about. You don’t have to answer this question, but I’ve made a guess that you were analyzed by Robert Waelder.” This was out of the clear sky, in another country, and Waelder was nowhere around, nor had there been any reference to him. “Or,” he said, “if not Waelder, then by Otto Fenichel.” Unfortunately for me, neither of these was true, and I had never lived closer to Waelder than the 3,000 miles which separate Philadelphia and Los Angeles. But I did look up to him with a distant identification, and I often had the pleasure of sharing the scientific platform with Robert Waelder.

To turn next to some observational data ... as I say I oscillate between observing and explaining ... and again from the opposite direction than is usual with psychoanalysis. I will start this time from the social frame, the outside frame of behavior, from which I will proceed to an intrapsychic examination, rather than the other way around, as for example, with Jaws – to which I have just referred--understanding the intrapsychic first and making speculations from there about outer social phenomena.

From a detailed study still ongoing, of the most compelling and socially disturbing experience of our recent time, the break-in into the Watergate, I will at this time cite only some early conclusions. I am

confronted here with the necessity to make a few conclusions from massive data – only some that apply to our present contiguous area of study. I do this not only because this subject is relevant on today’s scene--and analysts are often accused of not being relevant--but more importantly because I feel that analysis can indeed reach this area of behavior. Psychoanalytic thinking can explain much more than it can influence. It can also, however, influence much more than one might think, and a continuous refinement of theory and technique can increase the area which is accessible to psychoanalytic influence.

From a welter of material I am in the midst of, I will make a few summary statements. One is that the study of Watergate as I went into it is not the psychobiography of a man, but rather the deep psychology of the long marriage between Nixon and the people. Without this link and bond, the Nixon phenomenon and the Watergate event that grew out of it would never have found their places on the stage of history. There were two phases to the Nixon era: the 2 ½ year Watergate itself and the 25-year prelude to it. With either one alone, without the heavy weight added by the other, there is every likelihood that Nixon would have survived and had a 7th crisis which he would have added to his belt (Nixon wrote of his “Six Crises”).

The Watergate break-in was not the illness any more than the outbreak of any symptom is looked upon as the beginning of the disease process. It was not even the first appearance of the symptom. Often in a case history an earlier occurrence of the same symptom can be seen to have been forgotten or overlooked and is extracted and becomes visible in the substrate behind the presenting symptom. In this case, I can point to the now-famous Checkers speech of 20 years before. Accused of an illegal slush fund used for campaign purposes, Nixon went on the air, where he displayed for the first time the composite attitude of guilt, innocence and pugnaciousness that charmed and won him the appeal of the common man. Pat did not have a mink coat but a plain Republican cloth coat. And, whatever people say, they will keep the little, spotted cocker spaniel, Checkers, given to his children as a gift after his nomination.

Nothing was looked into about the actual facts at that time, nor were there tapes then to push people to look further as there were 20 years later. Nixon was not yet important enough to have kept tapes to do himself in. The American people elected Richard Nixon to his second term as President by a record landslide six months after the Watergate break-in and one month after

the Washington Post had announced that the crime extended into the White House--and after his nickname had been “Tricky Dick” for a quarter of a century. This is a major datum of this study. There are many reasons given as to why the American people were insensitive to what had happened during those six months and during the one month when it was overt in the newspapers, but to the analyst, nothing but an examination of the unconscious of a person—or group-- making a decision, pushing a lever and making a choice between alternatives, explains what seems to be irrational or otherwise inexplicable behavior.

Four years before that, the same electorate, at a time when the name of Senator Joseph McCarthy had become an embarrassing shame to the nation, on a par with--and it was the only event the shameful feeling of which was on a par with--the present Watergate, elected the same Nixon to the Presidency, in spite of the fact that his political rise had risen directly out of that similar origin of shame. Nixon’s propensity to change his face to the opposite when it was propitious to do so, was approved. The people have been in a long collusion with Nixon and his psychic modes both before and since the Watergate event. This support – and this is my main theme in the larger work – was not in spite of but precisely because of the two faces of Nixon.

I wish to suggest that there was a strong identification with this central trait from the beginning of Nixon’s political career. With it went an unconscious promise, to those who went along, of a resolution of all intrapsychic conflict. Every impulse and every defense could be satisfied in turn. Consistency was dethroned as a value. There would be no need any longer to make any choice. As the only quotes from my forthcoming longer work on Watergate, I will quote these few lines: “Who would not like to be able to do the right thing for the wrong reasons? To do the wrong thing and be cheered? To say one thing and do another? To get credit for what others have proven is right and you have always opposed? It is an intrapsychic dream come true.”

This national experience pointed to an intrapsychic state of man which has always existed but which seems to have received a more open, probably preconscious stamp since this massive emotional experience. And I think that the pattern of having two faces almost overtly, and of double-edged ideas and of combining opposites and of inviting people not to have to make choices, perhaps will now unfortunately be the permanent stamp of

American, and I will go on to say, not just American but of human politics. The only one who has a chance for the Presidency of the United States today is a conservative who acts like a liberal. The only one who can oppose him is a liberal who acts like a conservative. An out-and-out person who is liberal or conservative is not even being thought of by the middle group of the populace, which reflects an inner aversion to having to make a decision about impulse or defense or any of the myriad intrapsychic dilemmas that agonize human life.

In contrast to the views of some social commentators, focusing more on the President's resignation, that "an indignant public and a relentless press" proved that our system works, neither of these were determining factors in bringing about the final outcome. The fall of Nixon came about from evidence produced and provided only by himself, an ironic contribution from one whose chief characteristic was not telling the truth. With this unexpected cooperation, the system worked. Without it, we never know when it does not. The people themselves, a close study of the record shows, participated in the cover-up. They were also against it but to a much lesser degree. For over two years, they evaded or distorted all logical pointers until the unwelcome facts could no longer be denied.

So much for this cluster of observational data into which this is the merest glimpse. To look back at that period as the pathology of one man is like a screen memory in an individual history, except more monumental and gross in what it attempts to cover. In his historic confrontation with Senator McCarthy, Edward R. Murrow told the American people, "The actions of the Junior Senator from Wisconsin have caused alarm and dismay amongst our allies abroad and given considerable comfort to our enemies. And whose fault is it? Not really his. He didn't create this situation of fear; he merely exploited it. The fault is not in our stars but in ourselves."

Every nation must bear the responsibility of its own history, writes Joachim Fest in his massive study of Hitler. Every performer must interact with his audience. Hitler's biography, says Fest, "is the story of an incessant, intensive process of interchange. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that Hitler's rise was made possible only by the unique conjunction of individual with general prerequisites. He was not so much the great contradiction of the age as its mirror image." And Jacob **Burckhardt** in his reflections on history speaks of the mysterious coincidence between the egotism of the individual

and the communal will. Analysts traditionally follow clinical observations with theoretical explanations of what has been observed.

I should like now to skip several hundred pages of the book in progress to give you – in equally skeletal form as the material of observation which I have given you – some of my theoretical concepts about the data that was exposed by this earthquake through the very foundation of our national character. There is one thing an analyst can do following massive psychosocial events. There has still been little or none of it, I believe, following this one, that is, to learn from them. To attempt to learn from this material now I will turn to the opposite direction, going from one pole to the other, that is to turn now from these horizontal observations to vertical insights which come from the depths of accumulated, individual analyses by myself and my colleagues and analysts throughout the world since the history of psychoanalysis almost a century ago. Most of the data from which learning and insight can take place lies fallow, relatively unexplored. Every now and then some contribution to theory is made from data which has been there for years, but is suddenly understood after years have gone by. Understanding lags, and comes about long after the material or evidence is available to be seen.

Although analysis is exclusively a one-to-one relationship, which is pointed to by many of its critics to its discredit, every patient in every analytic hour brings his surrounding group with him into the hour as his inner conflicts rage around his instinctual objects, as we euphemistically call his fellow human beings. And as his intrapsychic conflicts rage around what analysts call, in their accepted terminology, the self and object representations in the system ego. From understanding these curious interactions of intrapsychic forces, foci of group relations extend outwards like pseudopods into the social world. Separate theories of interpersonal relationships, or as in modern times, the theory of object relations, are not necessary to introduce the knowledge of groups into psychoanalysis. Group relations are there without that. Unfortunately, many of these new schools – and here I am addressing myself to one of the gray and controversial areas within the field of psychoanalysis, as I promised you I would-- lift up and emphasize one element at the expense of another. Unfortunately, pragmatically speaking, the schools which tried to emphasize object relations do so at the expense of internal relations. And the school that emphasizes interpersonal conflict does so at the expense of intrapsychic conflict. Any psychoanalyst who concentrates only on intrapsychic conflict

and leaves out interpersonal understanding is doing only half of his job. The whole picture, the total psychological influence of the social surround focusing down and converging upon the individual is the interest of the total psychoanalyst.

So as we look at the groups from the inside, sort of looking through a microscope, looking outward, getting a round picture from an inner lens, we see that from such historical developments over the years, it was the social milieu in the Vienna of 1890 from which Sigmund Freud extracted his knowledge about sexual impulses and repressed sexuality in men and women throughout the world, not just in women in Vienna. Another Holocaust, the holocaust of World War II was used by Freud to extract knowledge of the aggressive instinct in the individual man. During the wild and uninhibited 1920's and 1930's, when the need for control was in the air, the role of the ego was added to the psychoanalytic theoretical armamentarium. From America in the 1970's and also in the 1960's, we might be able to extract some psychological understanding of the equally basic problem of man's integrity. As I think of this and tell myself that I am into a cutting-edge field that is somewhat new, I am immediately confronted with an inner critic with whom I carry on a dialogue, that this "new" is as old as man. Man's integrity has been studied and questioned and noted on the printed page ever since history has been recorded. But that was also the case with sex and with aggression and with control. It was always something as old as man, and yet something which is never looked at, from which man turns his inner gaze, and loculates off a section of himself which he wants to keep dear and treasured and unknown.

So from this upheaval, this violent, social upheaval--which we all like to forget but which I think we have to at least remember to see what we can come away with from the point of view of understanding--we turn to looking at this curious phenomenon of the national blight on integrity which stained American history in the last few years, and actually long before the last few years. The whole experience of the Vietnam War for example was not the Watergate period of 2 ½ years, but a period of American history for 10 or 15 years which has the same psychological substrate or background as far as character or logical action are concerned, and the overlooking of certain inner portions of the personality. In my outgoing Presidential Address to the International Psychoanalytic Congress in Paris in 1973, I introduced into the psychoanalytic literature a description of the Syndrome of the Compromise of Integrity, which I recommended be included into psychiatric and

psychoanalytic nosology. I pointed out at that time that I was discussing something not at the tip, but more importantly, what was happening at the base of the population pyramid. The stimulus for that paper was the revelation of the Ellsberg papers which had been revealed just before the Paris Congress. Watergate had just been breathed about and started to be investigated, but nobody knew the extent of that involvement at the time. So that was prior to the knowledge of the Watergate. The Ellsberg Papers which stimulated me to talk about the Compromise of Integrity at the top, but also its role at the bottom, involved, as you will remember, not the then-President of the United States, but the previous three or four Presidents and their total administrations, people who were generally not looked upon as without integrity.

To this endemic syndrome, which I introduced and made overt before it hit the front pages, I added form and substance after the national shame burst into the light. The media of this country through the last 2 ½ years have been replete with discussions of “the sick society.” Watergate did not cause but exposed a degree of deterioration in personal conduct and relationships which varied from mild deceit and corruption to the most horrendous scandal in the political group life of man. From national politics down to every local political level—actually not limited to politics. which unfortunately became a word where people tried to place all that was unacceptable in behavior, the better to be able to discard it--the “sick society” was exposed in business, education, professional life, throughout the halls of academia, and even into the are of sports, man’s recreation.

As I thought about the sick society and tried to put it into its diagnostic place in my coming book, I realized that the neuroses, which are part of individual idiosyncratic sickness, are certainly stimulated and at least partly brought about by what happens externally. Neither alone is sufficient; both play a part in the final syndrome. Anxieties, phobias, depressions, obsessions, to whatever extent they did exist in Nixon or the 40 men under him, or in the the much larger group of people who supported these 40 and then mainly the one, do not explain the relentless opportunism and the astonishing defect in integrity which were displayed, and which Nixon displayed from the beginning to the end of his career. Neuroses result in inner suffering, not in offenses to others, and they result from a breach of an inner code, not from a breaking of society’s rules. But the behavior in the particular type of illness in society we witnessed here on a large scale is not intrinsic to the neuroses and psychoses as we know them.

And here I find an area which is the only area in which I differed from Robert Waelder in my book review of his book on Progress and Revolution. Just as I disagreed with Waelder that tyranny and injustice is limited to Europe and the Eastern countries and somehow is not found as much in America, I found throughout his book that Robert Waelder's great love for his adopted country caused him to have a somewhat rosy and, I think, inappropriately optimistic picture about American character as compared to any other type of character, and just as I disagreed that the negative forces of the human mind stop on this side of the Atlantic or Pacific, so in reverse do I disavow that the syndrome of the compromise of integrity, which I am describing via Watergate is an American phenomenon. It is a phenomenon of the human race. Now to look at this phenomenon which we saw in Watergate but which we also see in Winegate in France or in the scandal that resulted in Willie Brandt leaving the top position in Germany, or that invaded the House of Parliament in England some years ago – these are human, not national phenomena. To try to explain them, I come now to the next section of my paper which is some summary formulations to explain the observational data which I have been describing to this point.

The Watergate Complex is not a group of buildings in Washington, D.C., but a complex deep in the mind of man. It is a Greek tragedy, American style. The rise and fall of the man Nixon is very much, in its pathetic way, connected with an identification of the people with a leader who both rises from humble origins and then has a fall mostly because of an intrinsic self destructiveness within himself, one with which all man can identify. I see as a complex, the Watergate Complex – which I think by now can really be labeled a specific Complex and not the Apartment Complex – which is to the superego what the Oedipus Complex is to the id.

The analyst's structural point of view, central to his operative theory, is a tri-partite not a dualistic view. There is a constant ongoing tension between the ego and the superego, between man's ego goals and his superego values equally strong as the constant tension between his ego and his id. This structural view with the entire metapsychology from which it arises applies now more, not less, because by inclusion of the super ego, the third pole in this triangle, more is explained than just by the dualistic opposition; therefore, to comment on another much debated area which psychoanalysts will reverberate to, it is not metapsychology which is in crisis. While analysts talk today about the crisis of metapsychology. it is not metapsychology which is in crisis, but what it explains. What is in crisis are

the new syndromes and the sicker conditions and the more dangerous states to which metapsychological explanations apply.

There is a conflict of interests in every human being. The basic conflict I am talking about is not the conflict between his ego and his id which causes individual neuroses, but the conflict between his ego interests, ego goals or impulses – what were originally called ego instincts by Freud – and superego principles. And what man strives for in every outward, final piece of behavior is an integration of the three. Strangely, the word integration enters, but in another sense, in a moral, judgmental sense, an integration in the sense of integer, wholeness – When the id, the ego, the superego and the external world can be combined into one piece of behavior or attitude which is harmonious to the whole human character, man acts without conflict and constructively. Compromises, when the ego faces these three or four different poles which are pressing in on it, compromises can occur in many different directions. A compromise of the id leads to a neurosis. A compromise of reality leads to a psychosis. A compromise of the superego leads to C of I, as I, for abbreviation, refer to the Compromise of Integrity. This requires, I might say, a whole, big new perspective and orientation on the part of the understanding analyst. He is now observing and judging not the interstices of a neurosis, whether a person is a hysterical character or an obsessive character, but viewing the dichotomy between neuroses and behavior in which it is the superego that is compromised. If we add to this vast field of Compromise of Integrity intellectual dishonesty, and pursue that trait in human interaction, we see that we are dealing with a segment of human behavior which I think is second to none.

This syndrome occurs at all intellectual, socioeconomic or political levels. It occurs as much in radical as in conservative political attitudes. And as Waelder pointed out, these inner processes come to the fore repetitively even following idealistic, revolutionary movements in which the basic nature of man takes its successive turns on the stage of history. Currently, when analysts speak of borderlines, they mean the border between neurosis and psychosis. Equally or even more common is a borderline between neurosis and C of I. These borderline clinical situations occur at all levels, from mild to severe, from mere slips of the tongue to the most massive neuroses of entire populations in today's world. Generally thought of by analysts as narcissistic, borderline states, they are in my opinion more complicated constructions in which it is not pressure from the id but a lapse of the superego and a gain for the person's ego interests that are the

determining dynamics. While drives are by no means uninvolved, it is tensions and conflicts at the other end of the intrapsychic spectrum that I believe are the weakest links in the causative chain of events.

Here I have a different view of the new type of patient and his pathology in the population today from the narcissistic conditions popularly referred to in the analytic and psychiatric literature, a movement I begin to sense as a group phenomenon, a psychiatric and psychoanalytic fad of the moment. Every analyst, in seeing his patients against the background of group behavior and interests, has to separate himself from the pressure of the crowd, i.e., when a group becomes a crowd and goes along without discrimination to whatever the interest of the moment might be.

I see a number of clinical conditions for which various parameters are being automatically recommended--this is another gray, controversial area in analysis--not from regression due to increased pressure from the id, but from a separation of behavior from the influence of the superego. The result is the same kind of lack of consistency and giving up of the major superego value, which is the value of living by superego values. This was what was given up so notoriously in the Nixon administration, less conspicuously in the population which lived during that era than the major participants themselves, but which continues to live on, or at least becomes visible now, in the populations since then. Rampant compromise with the superego, rather than an increased pressure from the id, causes the alienation and the anomie that is so much mentioned today as central to the new patient, the new sickness, and the sick society.

It is this syndrome, I believe, which is the price of civilization today. Freud made a historic contribution some years ago when he said, "Neurosis is the price of civilization." The price of modern civilization is this syndrome of the separation from the superego, which results -- now this was a national phenomenon during the last years -- a loss of the treasured state of sincerity. No one had much trust in the sincerity of the spoken word of the leaders and regretfully even of each other, and it is a return of sincerity which is most sought for by the population today, but also equally avoided. A great happiness came over the people when they felt that their new President, after Nixon's departure, if he had nothing else, was sincere. The loss of contiguity between ego and superego had slipped away. That was responsible for the youths of the '60s being so disillusioned with their

parents at that time, who then, as they come into their '30s and '40s, repeat the same pendular history.

For the remainder of this talk, I will come back to the surface again. I feel as if have been in the psychic depths for the last 15 minutes, and am getting the bends as we reach the top to the horizontal again, back macroscopically to man in a group. Returning from looking at a nucleus to looking at the mass, the latter is either benign or malignant depending on what took place in the nucleus. If the nucleus was malignant, the organism, the mass is malignant. If the nucleus is whole but intact and integrated, the mass has integrity. This subject is as large as life itself. When we talk about men in groups, we span situations in which we view man in a dyadic group, in the Oedipal triangular group, in his family group, then his extended family, his peers, his friendships, the ever widening concentric rings around him into wider and wider social areas. Finally there is his relationship to his socioeconomic group surround, which includes his institutional and even his national affiliations.

Group character, I believe, brings us into an investigation of man beyond symptoms and ordinary character and leads to a new dimension of psychoanalytic interest. The group character of an individual is less available in the analytic situation than other types of character formations and qualities more attuned to solitary or limited relationships. Character behaviors in larger groups, by virtue of being diffused out into the external milieu, are less capable of becoming ego alien, which is the requirement for analyzing them. For a person to analyze a character trait, he has to make it non-syntonic or alien to his observing ego, in which case he can then, with the aid of the analyst, take an analytic look at it. While instinctual discharge takes place more from a person to his small, intimate groups, medium and larger groups, which are based in life on common bonds, values, goals, and identifications are more the arena of the discharge of his ego interests--or sublimated drives, which are filtered through ego requirements.

It is very interesting in this connection that Freud described the analysis of the ego in a book coupled with group psychology. The title of the book was *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. His major contributions about the superego came first from *Civilization and its Discontents*, the widest group of all. These medium and large groups, which will be the center of interest for the rest of this talk, bring out both the positive and negative in man's life, the most advanced and humanistic

tendencies of which man is capable but also his most regressive and narcissistic ones.

Ambition, the desire for power, and the trait we call opportunism are all normal and desirable human traits which we try to inculcate into our children. We are amiss and feel badly if our child is growing up without ambition. We complain about that. We are disappointed if he continues to be powerless, helpless, slow or devoid of learning, or mastery. We complain if he fails or demurs to take advantage of opportunities. But any of these three, which Dr. Kleiner pointed out I call the Three Horsemen of the Syndrome of C of I, can undergo malignant degeneration. Ambition can become ruthless, power sadistic, and opportunism can become the seizing of advantages with no concern for consequences to another human being.

The psychic unit of an individual when he is alone--his id, ego, superego balance – which constitutes a person when he is alone with his fantasized objects – changes and loses its stability when he moves into the field of medium or large-size group participation. Such a move is accompanied by a relative downplaying of the dyadic and friendship relationships dominant in smaller group inter-relations. Years ago, I (196x) wrote a paper on friendship in which I examined microscopically, intrapsychically the dynamics in small group formations. I did not think along the same lines then, but I see it dovetails with this interest. When an individual enters a large group, his id, ego, superego ratio is subject to change. The id is almost the most stable, the least changeable. His ego style is somewhere in the middle; it is subject to some change under group pressure. His superego is the most dissolvable in the group, the least structured – sometimes so much so that I don't think the superego deserves to be called a structure.

You can see the superego melt under group pressure within moments, and I can even see it melt in small conversations when an individual is next to a powerful figure towards whom he has anxiety, or in some other dynamic way in which he gives up his superego for the moment (or longer). Born of the group, the superego remains the link between the individual and the group. The group, which initially imposed it, can later permit its dilution or ablation. This fluidity of the superego makes the human being susceptible to change which has both beneficial and deleterious effects.

It is very positive that a person can change his values. That can lead to the possibility of developmental improvement, availability to education, improvement in treatment, and benefit from a benign group process or surround. But it also has negative potentials as the Achilles heel of human conduct, leaving the individual and the total external field subject to regression, to fads, whims, to influences by a group around the individual as a group changes from a group to a crowd to a mob or a pack. The crime of silence, for example, or what one author called “the immorality of consent” is not present when the individual is alone contemplating how he should act under certain pressures. But a crime of silence is universal in group settings from the loftiest to the lowest levels. The ability “to speak up” can hang in the balance in someone at a rather low level of intellectual development to people in the most sublime surroundings where the courage to speak is completely lost under the influence of the group superego that floats in the air, not claimed by anyone immersed in such an atmosphere.

Separation-individuation, as all other stages of development, never die, nor are they indeed ever fully achieved. In my paper on Poise and the Snout that Dr. Kleiner referred to, I (1954) pointed out how social poise which provides social security – in a different sense than the conventional social security—causes every individual, when he enters a room of people, to try or aim intrapsychically to snuggle into the space and into the group, establishing a contiguity and a symbiotic interchange with the group (as in the original rapprochement stage) in a friendly way. What he fears most is sticking out in a vulnerable way subject to being chopped off, separated, alienated from the “established” group of people. The need to belong, or to be attached, which I wrote about from those observations, which harkens back to an old paper of a Hungarian analyst named Imre Hermann, who wrote a classic paper on Clinging and Grasping. Dr. Shapiro is looking for classic, old papers for the Philadelphia Bulletin—such a classic was Hermann’s paper on Clinging. Hermann is now having his 85th birthday celebration. He is in Hungary--a now younger, small, vital group is around him—his original paper, I have just been told, is being republished in the Psychoanalytic Quarterly in honor of his 85th birthday.

In line with this need to grasp, cling, become re-attached, the group around one becomes the fused object, sort of a mutual fund of objects to each individual, a conglomerate of all his objects. This results in a concentrated need for group approval and fosters a dependence on the group, coalescing from all previous levels of development, not only oral, not only

clinging, or attachment, but also levels from later development, possessing from the anal level, and even loving and being close to in a more mature sense from the later Oedipal phase. But the result of this interaction between the individual and the much needed, in fact the indispensable group approval, makes group processes in conflict with individuality. It is for that reason that resignation in protest from any group is a rarity. A book was written recently called *Resignation in Protest*--it describes one member of the British administration who read Neville Chamberlain's manifesto when he returned from Hitler with the Munich agreement--and he said, just as Hugh Sloan said, and he was the only one in the Nixon administration to say this, he said "This document ends all decency between human beings." And he tearfully resigned from his post in the British administration which he had worked during his entire life to achieve.

The author of this book then goes on – there are two authors – they go on to point out how rare resignation in protest has been throughout history and how it has dwindled to the point where today in this country it is almost unheard of. To quote from that book (by Weisband? and Frank), "The costs of ethical autonomy in this society are prohibitive and the rewards minimal. It is both dangerous and costly for those best placed to speak out, the insiders. One almost has to be a bit mad to resign in protest. Nice, sensible insiders keep quiet." Phenomenological observations by analysts show that social anxiety, which is a derivative of these group processes, is the most common phobia we see in our patients. Yet we are not in the habit of labeling this a phobia. When we talk about a phobic patient, we ask, "What is he phobic to?" And they usually give some localized object. One is phobic to high places, or to elevators, etc. But social phobias, the fear of people, because of this ambivalent relationship in which one's insides are turned inside out in the presence of outsiders, is the most common clinical observation I make in my entire practice through the decades that I have practiced psychoanalysis.

It is not only the superego but ego functions of judgment and discrimination that are also impaired in such group processes. A group is not an influence toward rationality, or toward scientific advance, or creativity. We do not see a statue to a Committee. These processes invade professional life as well. They have influenced psychoanalytic life from the beginning until now, up until the London Congress, our last group get-together where the line between rational and irrational was sometimes difficult to discern. I must say that in judging such phenomena, one needs to be careful not to be

judgmental, and to separate the illogical, observations or conclusions you disagree with, from the irrational, in which reality is mutilated, at times to the immoral, in which arguments are propounded because of an enhancement of the self, which has happened during many phases of psychoanalytic divisiveness. I believe this was the case during the highlight plenary debate of the last Congress, where the listening group responded to charisma rather than to reason; often this is one step away from the group being susceptible to a demagogue.

A number of analysts at the London Congress this summer were unhappy with the constant search for rationality and the truth, reacting affectively in support of a quote of Keats about “the irritable search for fact and reason”. It is indeed often irritating to keep up that search. This can be a valid and understandable reaction during the course of any prolonged exploratory endeavor, resulting in the rejection not of the search but the value of the rational. An analyst might ask: “to which section of the personality is the effort irritating?”, and would explain: “to various ego and superego goals”. In what I have been describing, the superego gives up.

I will trail off now and follow these observations to an important next and last chapter, that of treatability. Is all or part of this syndrome treatable? Some parts are and some are not. The shadow of these phenomena on the large area of psychoanalytic technique--which is shared in the aim of child upbringing, in development and education, and psychoanalytic treatment with respect the relationship and differentiation between the individual and the group--is not just the acquisition of groupness but an equal capacity to be alone. From separation-individuation onward, one needs to develop the possibility of being solitary as well as to achieve a healthy need for objects. Rather than to describe withdrawal from groups automatically as part of being schizoid, it is sometimes indicative of another specific psychopathology, namely an incapacity to be alone.

This was the reverse title of a paper by Winnicott, and also of a talk I gave about 10 or 15 years ago which I never published, on “The Capacity to be Alone”, living a normal and healthy blend of narcissism and object love. While in the neuroses the anxiety which is uncovered is usually found to be unrealistic and therefore the patient has the possibility of suffering less, in C of I, the guilt which has been absent or submerged is often found to have been realistic but avoided. Therefore, sometimes it is a good outcome if a person feels more guilt rather than less--and then does something about it, to

make the guilt no longer appropriate. It is also quite impressive that when a psychoanalyst opens his mind to some new area. or looks and observes in a new way, he comes to see phenomena on the analytic couch ready to be worked with which he had not recognized before. I cannot tell you how many patients in the last few weeks, while I was thinking of coming here, brought in, to my amazement as though I had never heard it before, feelings they had in groups the day before the hour.

All these negative processes in man are counterbalanced by an equal – we hope equal – weight of processes in the positive direction. Aggression is balanced by libido. The instincts are balanced by the ego. Groups bring out the good and the bad. After the Watergate event and experience, a book which became an immediate number one best seller, is called “Winning Through Intimidation”, in which the author tells people how not to be intimidated but how to be opportunistic and intimidating instead on the way to an exercise of power for their own ego enhancement. On the other hand, loyalty to a group, which “did in” all the President’s men – you know, Magruder, Colson, Haldeman, all claimed they did what they did because of loyalty--loyalty is a good word. It is fine to cultivate, it is not a bad trait; it is only when in the service of the lax or worse moral force, when it is linked up with the regressive rather than the progressive forces of man that it has to be seen and judged otherwise.

Robert Waelder (this is a quote I was looking for before), who sees everything and never leaves anything out, after a lengthy book in which he put his finger on the multiple forces of human history also said, “Some things are due to chance, luck.” I highlight that; that is so often overlooked. It is very lucky sometimes when your child, off to college, rooms with whom he does. What an influence that person may have on your adolescent-about-to-be-an-adult child over and above any influence you may have already had.

Finally, Waelder, in closing his book “Progress and Revolution”, addresses a worry that many may have about aggression being an instinctual drive. If in addition to all the negative things he described about human nature, to which I have added even more, people become too discouraged, Waelder offers some consolation by quoting Denis de Rougement, “If aggression is part of man’s nature, it is also man’s nature to pass beyond his nature”.

And with that, I thank all of you and am very happy to be here.