

THE ISPP PANEL ON SUBJECTIVITY

SUBJECTIVITY IN PSYCHOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL THEORY:
A NEW PARADIGM? International Society of Political
Psychology, George Washington University, Washington
DC, June 19, 1985.

The Structure and Form of Subjectivity in Political Theory and Behavior, by Steven R. Brown, Kent State University. Attention in this paper is drawn to works by Anthony Downs (*An Economic Theory of Democracy*, 1957) and Marvin Zetterbaum (*Review of Politics*, 1982) to illustrate in two single case studies how Q methodology conjoins the efforts of objectivists and subjectivists alike in a general science of political subjectivity. In the first study, Q sorts administered under diverse conditions of instruction replaced various of Downs's logical categories--e.g., costs, benefits, rationality, party differential, etc.--as well as feeling states (Lasswell, Simon), and the three factors which resulted demonstrated the form and structure of the person's decisional calculus vis-a-vis a sample of possible courses of action, such as legalizing abortion, reducing pollution, increasing pressure on the Sandanistas, and funding more MX missiles. The 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon provided the context for the second study which incorporated Q sorts representing Rousseau's "citizen" and "natural man," along with other theoretical perspectives as suggested by Zetterbaum. The resulting two factors revealed a harsh, unbending pro-Israeli perspective (citizen) and a more thoughtful viewpoint expressing the common good. The paper concluded with a discussion of Aristotelian and Galileian modes of thought, the former equating lawfulness with observed regularities in classes of data, the latter alone supporting the possibility of lawfulness at the level of the single case.

How to Make a Good Cup of (Political) Tea, by William Stephenson, University of Missouri. Psychiatrists Griggs and Green (*British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 1983) derived a norm, based on 20 responses, about how to "make a good cup of tea"--e.g.,

go to the kitchen, get the kettle, pour water into it, boil the water, etc., all in the objective mode--and tested through-disordered schizophrenics against this norm. (None failed the test!) But subjectivity was entirely overlooked, and an example is presented showing how subjectivity enters in. The point of the demonstration was to answer Lasswell's question, in *The Future of Political Science* (1964), "how shall we conceive of subjective events, to occupy a central position in the problems of man and his future?" Lasswell was concerned with the intellectual fragmentation of political science, and he conceived of a solution in terms of events as expressions of one fundamental energy (duration), eventuating in authoritative decision structures: Duration had the properties of *awareness* (consciousness, replaced in Q by communicability) and *referentiality*, the latter permitting us to bring past and future into the present. The resulting decision structures are Q factors (exemplified in a study of Freeman Dyson's thesis on weapons and hope), and the conflicts which they summarize are quantum theoretical, e.g., in the complementarity of the factors. Examples are given of intellectual fragmentation in terms of the ad hoc conclusions drawn from political studies (such as those by Buchanan and Cantril and by Almond and Verba, along with a forum on peace in the September 1984 issue of *Political Psychology*). Politics is entrapped in Lasswellian duration, as in the anticommunist and anticapitalist symbols of the cold war, and Q offers to give operational substance to Lasswell's conceptualizations by providing a quantum science which conceives of subjective events as central to all problems of humankind and its future, hence provides an alternative to those sciences which have fashioned themselves on the logic of Popperian objectivism.

Psychoanalysis as a Hermeneutic Science and the New Paradigm of Subjectivity: A Prolegomena, by Richard B. Ulman and Peter B. Zimmerman, psychoanalytic psychotherapy (private practice), New York City. A distinction is drawn between the hermeneutic position (that psychoanalysis is concerned with meaning and interpretation) and the natural science position (ob-

serving, explaining, understanding, and predicting causes and effects), and the argument is advanced that psychoanalysis is best conceptualized as a hermeneutic science of subjectivity, meaning, and self (experience). The hermeneutics of Habermas, Ricoeur, Steele, Leavy, and Atwood and Stolorow are outlined and contrasted with the neopositivist positions of Grunbaum and Edelson, and a synthetic merger is advanced which conjoins psychoanalytic self psychology (Kohut), hermeneutic science (von Wright), intersubjectivity (Stolorow), and Q methodology (Stephenson). Kohut's discovery of the central function in the mental life of the patient of the analyst's narcissistic countertransference reactions renders necessary an empathic-introspective mode of observation, and provides a bridge to Atwood and Stolorow's intersubjective principle. Q methodology is regarded as compatible with this emerging hermeneutic science due to its emphasis on the subjective frame of reference of the experiencing person: "...it is particularly the recent work of Atwood and Stolorow on intersubjectivity that holds the greatest promise for forging a theoretical and methodological alliance with a psychoanalytically-oriented and sophisticated Q-methodology.... We contend that an alliance between intersubjectivity and Q-methodology will significantly enhance the consolidation and growth of the new paradigm of subjectivity."

In his comments concerning the above papers, James Glass (Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland, College Park) generally approved of Brown's emphasis on observation as opposed to a priori categories, on decision as being located in feeling space, and on the need to remain close to the particularities of concrete cases; of Stephenson's emphasis on self reference, his attack on Popper's objectivism, and the central role he gives to communicability; and of Ulman and Zimmermann's efforts to advance a psychoanalysis scientifically without sacrificing the hermeneutic issues of meaning and interpretation. Glass then raised questions about the role of the unconscious in Q methodology, about whether observation and interpretation can be separated, and about whether it was

necessary to ground truth in science alone. A brisk discussion ensued among members of the panel, and between the panel members and an audience of 20-25 persons.

Nov 14-16, Sheraton University Hotel, Philadelphia
Panel scheduled for the 1985 meeting of the
Northeastern Political Science Association

EMPIRICAL POLITICAL THEORY AND Q METHODOLOGY

Conceptions of Political Corruption

Kathleen Dolan, University of Maryland

Moral Conflict in Organization: A Q-test of Organizational Behavior

Ann Martino, Dickinson College

Conceptions of Representation: A Study of Delegates to Party Conventions

James Carlson (panel chair), Providence College
Richard Martin, Slippery Rock University

NEWS, NOTES & COMMENT

Q Methodology at Minnesota

Graduate students in political science at the University of Minnesota are initiating several Q studies, three of which had taken fairly definite form by the time a small Q interest group met with Steven R. Brown during consulting sessions May 7-8. Davida Alperin is generally interested in political coalitions, not of the party kind as found in legislatures, but in broader interest groups and social movements, especially