

The Bias of Temperament in American Politics

Second Edition

William P. Kreml



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2014
William P. Kreml
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kreml, William P.

The bias of temperament in American politics / William P.
Kreml. -- Second edition.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-61163-544-7 (alk. paper)

1. Political psychology--United States. I. Title.

JA74.5.K717 2014

320.97301'9--dc23

2013044081

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

To
Mark Whittington
A Great South Carolinian
A Great American

*At its best, the left foretells the future.
At its worst, it misunderstands the past.*

Contents

Acknowledgments	xi
Introduction	xiii
Part One • The Theory	
Chapter One • The Psychology of Politics	3
References	6
Chapter Two • The Analytic and Synthetic Cognitions	7
References	11
Chapter Three • Reversing the Analytic Bias	13
References	17
Chapter Four • Objective and Subjective Ideologies	19
Chapter Five • Dialectics: Ideal and Material	21
References	23
Chapter Six • The Form of the Dialectic	25
References	27
Chapter Seven • The Aristotelian Inversion	29
References	34

 Part Two • Contexts and Contradictions

Chapter Eight • Beyond the Synthetic <i>a Priori</i>	37
References	40
Chapter Nine • Cognition in Intellectual History	41
References	49
Chapter Ten • The False Prophets	51
Socialism and the Co-ops	51
The New Left	54
Post-Modernism	57
References	61

Part Three • American Political Inequity

Chapter Eleven • America's Legal Dialectic	65
References	73
Chapter Twelve • America's Political Dialectic	75
References	83
Chapter Thirteen • Campaign Finance and Political Parties	85
References	97
Chapter Fourteen • The World	99
References	109
Chapter Fifteen • Religion	111
Epilogue	119
Parties and the Dialectic	122
The First Suggestion—Education	126
The Second Suggestion—Amendments	131
A Third Suggestion—A Green Global Party	136
The New Iron Triangle	144
References	154
Index	155

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my friend Alexander Moore who twice read a draft of this piece and made useful comments, particularly regarding the sequencing of chapters. A hearty thanks to my publisher, Keith Sipe, for his unflinching support of a work that is somewhat off his company's usual script. Finally, my thanks to Nancy Mace Kreml whose editorial assistance is exceeded only by her steadfast and caring support. Any remaining errors are my responsibility alone.

Introduction

Not long ago, I attended a talk given by the noted author and social critic Barbara Ehrenreich at Chicago's Newberry Library. The bulk of her talk concerned the plight of the poor and the plight of women. It was a good presentation, but I was happily surprised when Ms. Ehrenreich did not conclude with the above themes. Near the close of her talk, she spent a few moments discussing something that I had never heard her speak of or write about before, something I thought was important.

Beyond the myriad of discriminations against the poor and women, she offered, there was a further discrimination in the private sector regarding hiring, pay, promotion, job allocation, and the like. That discrimination was based on personality. It was a discrimination that grew out of many employers' use of the standard Myers-Briggs personality inventory to find if and where a potential employee might fit in. This test, created during World War II, grew out of the Jungian introversion-extroversion dichotomy. Ms. Ehrenreich related how private corporations overwhelmingly discriminate against those who demonstrated introverted personality traits in favor of those who demonstrated extroverted traits. More recently, Susan Cain has written *Quiet*, a compelling work that explores examples of how the extrovertive personality is favored over the introvertive personality in a variety of American occupational, educational, and social venues. I confess I had not thought very much about such biases in the context of the private domain. I have long suspected, and have written about, how this kind of discrimination occurred in the public sector, with attendant consequences in

public policy, as well as in the very design of the structures and processes of the American government.

Let me be clear about what I am doing in this short work. Roughly one third of this piece is unabashedly a summary of writings that can be found in other places, generally in books and articles that I have written over the years. The burden of these writings was to describe an original political philosophy, one based upon psychology rather than economics, or any other objective reality. The theory borrows, among other places, from a) the sub-atomic intellectual framework of the Danish physicist Niels Bohr and the English Ernest Rutherford, b) the introversion-extroversion psychological continuum of Carl Jung, and c) a comparison of the kinds of minds of the two great German Idealist thinkers, Immanuel Kant and G. W. F. Hegel.

I have written on this topic over the years because I have become convinced that, outrageous though some of the manifestations of traditional bias continue to be, the greatest bias in American politics may no longer be against groups like African-Americans, women, gays and lesbians, or the like. I believe that the greatest bias in American politics might now be a bias of temperament. The most discriminated-against group in the body politic may no longer be an ethnic group, or even an economic group, or something similar. The most discriminated against of American citizens might well be found *within* all of the traditionally spoken of groups that are part of the American political mosaic. This citizenry is made up of the population that is psychologically introspective, as Ms. Ehrenreich, Susan Cain, and, of course, those like Carl Jung have articulated it. Further, that population has a preference for synthetic cognitive forms, or the apples and oranges kind of knowledge, as Kant and Hegel, although very differently, grappled with such forms.

What an original political theory based upon psychology offers, therefore, is something altogether different from what other political theories offer. If we revere the humane political contributions of figures like Mohandas Gandhi, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela, or even a figure from long ago like Saint Francis of Assisi, why do we not revere the contributions of far less sub-

stantial figures, ordinary people like you and I, who are of the temperament of the above figures, if not of their stature?

Why, in short, do we not recognize the contribution of those whose temperaments contribute in far more humble settings, often in the role of a personal mediator and/or in the role of cementing the bonds within a group, or in being the reconciler of interests, all accomplished in a balance with those of a more competitive, more individualistic temperament? Finally, why do we not recognize the contributions of the temperament that prefers the kind of political structures and processes which facilitate the amelioration of conflict and embrace the public good over the splintered, selfish demands of powerful private interests?

At root, all political theory rests on a standard of equity. Like the rest of any citizenry that is even mildly left of center in its political orientation, I have vigorously endorsed, marched for, and contributed to the movements that supported equity for African-Americans, women, LGBT citizens, the poor, the under paid, soldiers in an unnecessary war, and other discriminated against groups all my life. But note that the above list of the aggrieved was invariably discriminated against on the basis of some objective criteria — that is, on some other-than-mind-based, or subjective, quality. Again, I have long supported, and will always support, those so often justified pleas. But I submit, much like Ms. Ehrenreich and Ms. Cain, that something else is also going on. Once again, I think it goes on, and has gone on, every bit as much in the public as in the private sector.

In the United States, if not in other places in short, there is a political bias that has not yet been dealt with, a bias that not only affects those who suffer the discrimination but even more importantly contributes to the building and maintenance of an imbalanced political system and the creation of its unjust political outcomes. I am hardly the only citizen who believes that the American political system is badly out of balance. The political philosophy that I have attempted to create over many years rests on an intellectual foundation that I hope will expose and lead to the effective correction of such imbalances. I broach the costs of not en-

gaging in what I immodestly think of as a Niels Bohr-like sub-atomic revolution in political thought. We who work in politics, and write about politics, are well behind the physicists and their sub-atomic theory. Maybe it is time that this social science, as well as the real world of politics, catch up a bit with the hard scientists. I think we can do that in politics with a theory I call the Natural, or Psychological, Left.

This work is divided into three parts and an epilogue. The first part, made up of seven minimalist chapters, describes the theory. The second part, of three longer chapters, places the theory into what I hope is a deeper intellectual and political context. Part three's five chapters apply the theory to the American political system as well as to a schema that describes religious history, all containing what I believe to be original diagnoses of cognitively based political imbalances. The epilogue specifically discusses the structural biases of our country's political structures, and makes specific, in some cases constitutional, recommendations for change. And yes, the argument is rather simply dichotomous, but so is digital and this should be only a beginning.