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INTRODUCTION

This is a case study of one Bill Thompson's experience related to his decision to run for political office. The campaign and Bill's adjustment to the loss are viewed as a culminating event marking the beginning of a mid-life transition. The campaign event is placed in a wider developmental context with reference to the life task of generativity. A two year follow-up is added to gain this perspective.

His actions and reactions are considered along with those around him in the context of the campaign. What emerges is an attempt to assess the impact of a political campaign and the interaction of Bill's style with the demands that this campaign exerted on him.

None of the names used in this study are the actual names of the people involved. An effort was made to maintain the subject's anonymity and in so doing not only were names altered but identifying information related to places and organizations was also altered. The author created an original draft that used the actual names of people and places to allow the subject, Bill, to certify the record as factual. With one correction, he did so.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO METHOD

As it should be in all research, the choice of method was governed by the nature of the problem and the types of data that would be available in pursuit of relevant issues. The case study, conducted within the dialectical tradition, employing a phenomenological approach to data collection and using a continuous re-immersion style of data analysis, presents unique advantages as well as dilemmas to the researcher and it is important to first consider these dimensions of the project.

Historically, the idiographic-nomothetic controversy has been the arena for discussing the design influences of the intensive case study approach as contrasted with the more common nomothetic procedures. Gordon Allport (1937) advocated to make psychologists aware of the effects that models of human behavior have on the type of scientific evidence that is subsequently gathered. He was concerned that psychology was advancing a mechanistic view of man in that nearly all research done was powered by nomothetic methodology. He objected to what appeared to him to be a "slavish subservience to these (mechanistic, nomothetic, operational) presuppositions" (Allport, 1940, p. 26). This issue was illuminated by a theory versus method matrix (Marceil, 1977) that demonstrated the natural fit between nomothesis and the research assumption that "men are more alike." Allport was interested in allowing
for the pursuit of the uniquess of men and consequently offered support to the techniques of idiography which were better suited to that type of investigation. Though he was often accused of proselitizing for idiography for idiography to supplant nomothetic procedures, his actual intent was to broaden the scope of psychological science.

The wide misunderstanding of Allport fueled a debate about the relative merits of the two approaches to the study of personality (Allport, 1938, 1940, 1946; Baldwin, 1942; Beck, 1953; Carlsen, 1952; Cattell, 1965; Dukes, 1965; Eysenck, 1954; Falk, 1954; Marceil, 1977; Lamiell, 1981; Kiesler, 1981). Holt (1962) described the terms idiographic and nomothetic as being "perennial, hardy seeds in psychology's perceptual garden" (p. 377). And, after a thorough discussion of the issues raised in the debate, he concluded that the terms were purposeless and "ought to do psychology the favor of dying away" (p. 402). But, as Marceil (1977) pointed out some fifteen years after Holt's article, the terms persist and seem to draw their hardiness from their capacity to tap what he called the "implicit dimensions" of the study of personality.

While the theory - method matrix that Marceil drew illustrates the strengths and limitations of both the idiographic and nomothetic method, a parallel connection between method and epistemology made by Rychlak (1968, 1977) raises a basic issue in how learning is approached.
He used different terms to describe the same duality Marceil identified when he outlined the demonstrative tradition and the dialectic tradition as ways of knowing. Where the demonstrative tradition emphasizes the law of contradiction (A is not not-A), and the uni-directional, linear flow of events and the idea that nature can be explained by understanding the individual characteristics of its constituent parts, the dialectic approach views the world as being non-linear and multidirectional and as the place where explanation is sought through a conceptual understanding of patterns. The author's use of the "continuous re-immersion" approach (DeWolfe, 1978) to the data places this study within the dialectic tradition. Both traditions exist within psychology with the demonstrative being more dominant. However, their coexistence has been an on-going dilemma.

This dilemma was articulated in Rychlak's (1968) reworking of modern psychology through Kuhn's (1962) expectation that science evolve into a unifying paradigm. Rychlak (1968) arrived at three possible conceptualizations for the scientific status of psychology - "preparadigmatic", "aparadigmatic" or "metaparadigmatic." He concluded that psychology was "metaparadigmatic" accounting for psychology's concurrent attachment to both traditions or to return to Marceil's term - "implicit dimensions" in the pursuit of knowledge. The terms idiography and nomothesis ultimately persist because they are conceptually attached to the epistemological dualism and as Rychlak (1977, Chapt. 1) concludes, the contrast between the demonstrative tradition and the dialectic tradition has manifested itself in every issue in every page, because such is the nature of human thought.
The conclusions drawn from these ideas relate to the coexistence of these two ways of knowing in psychology and in other sciences.

The metaparadigmatic point of agreement is that both traditions are essential, something with which Allport would readily have agreed. DeWolfe (1978), reflecting on the artificiality of approaching these traditions with an either-or mentality, suggests that

The issue of which approach we should use seems to me to ask a ridiculous question, but ridiculous or not, it seems to be the hub of a persistent (if unnecessary) controversy. My instant reaction to the idiographic vs. nomothetic issue is that, of course, we should use both approaches.

Kiesler (1981) recently observed progress in how clinical psychology employs these two research approaches as applied to psychotherapy.

Where some disagreement still exists is in the role given to the different methods. Bolgar (1965) dissected experimentation into "Discovery" and "proof." She feels that there is "universal agreement" in that the case study is the way to generate hunches, hypotheses, and important discoveries and that nomothetic procedures are best designed to validate these hunches. In this way she agrees with Rychlak (1968) who feels that in any science the creation and formulation of assumptions follow a dialectic course, while the implications that follow are necessarily framed demonstratively.

But should there be a priori limitations on the case study? DeWolfe (1978) notes that there may be a shift in how case studies are being regarded. First, addressing the prior notion delimiting the case study.
In the past even the proponents of the intensive case study method seemed to take the attitude that it was probably ok to do a case study as a pilot study for later "real research" on groups with statistics and levels of significance and such like, but only if cases were extremely rare, or the experimental manipulators of the measurements were very long and difficult.

DeWolfe continues then to note a broadening in the theoretical orientation of the intensive case study. He quotes Liam Hudson (1975):

Psychology has more generally made a something of a fetish of numbers and, ... over the last half century, academic psychologists have conspicuously neglected the form of inquiry that so often leads to insight in other fields - namely the meticulous study of the individual case. (p. 18)

Allport (1942) felt strongly that the scientific value of the case study went beyond the development of hunches or hypotheses and stressed that the individual life was lawful and that the understanding of the uniqueness of one person is a legitimate scientific enterprise.

Taking a different approach, Egon Brunswick (1956) noted the value of the case study when the issue was generalizations across situations.

In fact, proper sampling of situations and problems may in the end be more important than the proper sampling of subjects, considering the fact that individuals are probably as a whole more alike than are situations ... (p. 39)

It can be said that the rationale for proceeding with single-subject studies, keeping in mind methodological considerations, is well established. For example, McNemar (1940) asserts that,

The statistician who fails to see that important generalizations from research on a single case can ever be acceptable is on a par with the experimentalist who fails to appreciate the fact that some problems can never be solved without resort to numbers.

What becomes curious in how infrequently case studies are done and
the chilly reception case studies done in the dialectical tradition receive. Egger and Billingsley (1974) note that,

Among behavioral scientists there seems to exist a basic distrust of idiographic (single-S) research designs. Despite an increasing number of published single-S studies, the creation of journals explicitly devoted to single-S designs (e.g., Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis and Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior) and often eloquent pleas to consider idiographic research ... (p. 148)

Kiesler, (1981) in an "eloquent plea", argues for seeing research as a "multidimensional enterprise" (p. 213). Calling for a broad approach he asserts that in research, either the scientist or the practitioner can use group or single case (experimental, quasi-experimental or preexperimental) designs, in experimental or naturalistic settings, with process or outcome emphases, on analogue or clinical populations.

All these research activities are heuristic, valuable and necessary. But if our profession is to implement multidimensional research we need to stop denegrating all but nomothetic-experimental research as we have done in the past. (p. 213)

This problem of method may go deeper and Lamiell (1981) proposes that the confusion with regard to the use of the two approaches rests with a problem in the identity of the study of personality. Within the field there appear to be two distinct frameworks - the study of individual differences (differential psychology) and personality psychology. He proposes that the comparison of individuals along common attributes be abandoned and offers an alternative framework - the idiothetic. Within this framework the basic problem of personality description would be approaches in an explicitly idiographic manner, while the search for nomothetic principles would center around questions of personality development.
Programmatic research of the type just described would be idio-
graphic in the sense that it would be predicated on an idio-
graphic measurement rationale and would literally involve the study of
single individuals over time. I would also be nomothetic, however,
in that it would seek to confirm, across individuals, the applica-
bility of certain basic principles to an understanding of the
theoretically relevant phenomena. In a word that research would
be idiothetic. (p. 286)

This idiothetic approach is best exemplified in the field of adult
developmental theory. The writings of Vaillant (1977), White (1975)
and Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee (1978) offer an admix-
ture of individual cases from which they outline the emerging patterns.

Some insight into perennial quality of the idiographic-nomothetic
controversy and the basic distrust of idiographic research arises from
how psychology, influenced by culture, regards personality. Bakan (1965)
articulated what he called the "mystery-mastery complex in contemporary
psychology." He claimed that psychology, as an expression of cultural
inhibitions regarding the exploration of personality, is,

in simultaneous pursuit of two objectives: a) to keep the nature
of human personality from being understood, to preserve it under a
cloak of mystery; and b) to master, or predict and control, the
behavior of human beings. (p. 186)

These two objectives - to both keep the nature of personality a mystery
and to master human behavior are incompatible with each other. Subse-
quently, "the methodological juggling that psychologists have engaged
in follows from attempting to serve both these objectives at the same
time" (p. 186).
The art of doing research, in his view, becomes the art of finding a way between the taboo of penetrating the mystery of psychological functioning and the at least symbolic fulfillment of the mastery objective.

This dilemma parallels the "implicit dimensions" of idiography and nomothesis and Rychlak's notion of the dialectical and demonstrative tradition. Mastery of human behavior has been pursued largely through nomothetic procedures following in the demonstrative tradition of presenting hypotheses related to measurable behavior. Mystery is penetrated best with idiographic techniques used within the dialectical tradition which seeks to generate a general interpretation powered by the phenomenological method.

As was mentioned earlier, psychology, in attempting to negotiate these two objectives, has generally opted for mastery over parts of human behavior by remaining within the demonstrative tradition and nomothetic method while simultaneously maintaining mystery by excluding idiographic studies, especially those using a phenomenological approach. In the actual conduct of research, there are certain features which proceed from such a choice. Bakan (1965) lists these features:

1) the subject-scientist distinction
2) the definition of psychology as the study of behavior
3) the choice of lower animals, particularly domesticated animals as the subjects of choice in research
4) the specification of the aim of research as the discovery of "laws"
5) the cultural norm that research consists of the testing of preconceived hypotheses

Because the study under consideration here falls within the dialectical
tradition, is idiographical in its assumption and phenomenological in its method, it differs from the bulk of contemporary research on the features that Bakan sets forth. The methodological decisions made by the author can be further articulated by reviewing the method of this study along Bakan's criteria.

The scientist-subject distinction might well be phrased the observer-observed and to a large extent that will be the case in any investigation. But there is a sense that the scientist is the master and the subject is the mastered. To maintain this perspective the scientist strives to remain detached so as to sustain objectivity about what he observes.

Here is one point where the present study departs from the bulk of nomothetic research. It was the explicit goal of the author to enter the world of the subject not to remain detached. The author adopted a "restricted participation" (Crano and Brewer, 1973) style which occasioned close contact with Bill in all campaign activities. This was most clear in that data was gathered primarily by being with the subject.

The reactions of the investigator were also gathered as an important source of information and to create a record of the investigator's degree of involvement.

This adoption of an interactive scientist-subject model is
desirable in an attempt to understand the experience of the subject-in-his-situation. By coming into contact with the subject and his situation, as it is experienced, the author remains true to the phenomenological method, i.e., to allow the phenomena to manifest themselves as they are.

The definition of psychology as the study of behavior returns us to Allport's (1940) concern that the nomothetic method, used to the exclusion of idiography, constituted a "slavish subservience" (p. 26) to a view of man that is mechanistic and operational. This study departs from this definition of psychology in that it pursues not only the behavior of the subject, but also his experience. Bill's behavior is considered of course, but only as part of the data leading towards an understanding of Bill-in-his-situation. As such, the proper object for observation extends beyond structured behavior to include interviews with Bill (personal documents), third person documents, interviews with those near him and the author's reactions.

The use of animals as the subject choice relates not so much to the literal selection of animals but to the control of experimental variables in laboratory research and the difficulties field research presents regarding the control of variables. For this particular study experimental control surfaced as an issue in the condition of observational constraint, particularly the response-restriction dimension (Crano and Brewer, 1973). The use of animals allows for a high degree of observational constraint which in turn permits easier manipulation
of the unitary independent variable. This has great appeal to an investigator working within the demonstrative tradition, attempting to reject a series of null hypotheses. The study of Bill, a field study, necessitated a high degree of response freedom. Again, if the investigator is to encounter "things as they present themselves" it is desirable to adopt an investigative posture that interferes with the phenomena as little possible.

The notion that the aim of psychology is the discovery of law is wedded to one of the nomothetic theory presumptions outlined by Marcel (1977) that "men are more alike." Kiesler (1981) places this interest in the discovery of universal law in a brief historical context.

As a young and insecure science, we incorrectly began by aping the philosophy of science offered by physics while ignoring models offered by disciplines such as biology and astronomy. Along the way, we also picked up Fisher's model of statistical inference, as Barlow notes, and its exclusive emphasis on nomothetic research designs. All of this pulled our profession away from ecological-naturalistic research approaches and away from intensive study of single cases. (p. 213)

The study of Bill in his campaign is not in the direct pursuit of a law. It seeks neither to confirm nor disconfirm any particular universal belief. Rather, it pursues understanding without prior regard for how the phenomena once organized will contribute to the further development of theory. This is not to say that this study or any case study does not attempt to contribute to theory, it does. But the process is inductive - the data are gathered and, in the process of understanding the emerging patterns, certain constructs and theories are adopted to aid in advancing the interpretation. In this way, the case study
illuminates the construct or theory by articulating the idea in the context of a human experience.

The cultural norm that research consists in the testing of preconceived hypothesis is not consistent with the phenomenological method. The phenomenological method requires that the data be allowed to be perceived as they are and that the investigator not select a priori which data are relevant to his study. He adopts the posture of a receptive listener - open to impressions and the intrinsic lawfulness in the phenomena. Hypotheses are not preconceived. Rather, they are allowed to emerge from the investigator's continuous re-immersion in the data.

Bakan's reflections on the mystery-mastery complex and its influence on the methodology psychology employs offers a clear set of research variables that underlie investigative efforts. In adopting the phenomenological method, and conducting a careful assessment of what this method implies methodologically the author is assured of a good fit between the matter under study and the phenomenological method. The factors associated with that knowledge getting process are thereby also brought to light.

The practical issue that remains is not so much whether to conduct case studies but under what circumstances are case studies the best choice. Dukes (1965) offers these guidelines by outlining five situations that are suited to the study of a single subject.

There seem to be two concepts of uniqueness at work here. Either the individual per se is unique, as in the case of Richard J. Daley, or the subject is not particularly unusual but happens to find himself in a unique situation.

The focus of the majority of case studies and biographies has been on unusual people, i.e., cases from the study of abnormal behavior, especially criminals, politicians, generals and public figures. More recently, however, the interest in adult development has sparked the study of normal individuals, Levinson et al. (1978) restricted their sample to biologists, executives, laborers and novelists. Their selection criteria emphasized diversity rather than any particular or unique characteristic.

The study of Bill, a tenured professor running for the office of councilman, fits the criterion of uniqueness. It should be noted that this study of Bill is not biography in that it is more circumscribed and it is not a simple report of the stress involved in running for
office, though that is included. It is the study of a person-in-a-
situation - a specific person in a one-time situation and it is this
combination of person and situation that is unique.

Duke's second criterion is that of complete population generality.
In this condition it is hoped that the in-depth study of one person will
accurately represent all members of the population. Areas of study
that can assume homogeneity of processes within a group can proceed to
study one individual and extrapolate the results to the rest of the pop-
ulation. Physiological psychology, particularly the areas of sensation
and perception and memory include landmark studies that have employed
a single subject. Ebbinghaus (1895) did extensive research on memory
using himself as his subject; Cannon and Washburn (1912) in their bal-
loon-swallowing experiment established a connection between Washburn's
reports of hunger pangs and kymographic recordings of his stomach con-
tractions; Stratton (1897) used himself to study the effect of contact
lenses that inverted the perceptual field.

To what extent and in what ways might Bill's experience be like
that of other men? On first appearance Bill's decision to run for of-
...
Bill's experience and applied to other's must wait until the analysis is complete. The author will comment on this in the interpretation.

The third criterion is what Dukes calls "adequacy because of the dissonant character of the findings" (p. 77). While a positive finding may take its place as one more bit of evidence in support of a hypothesis, a single negative finding that rejects an assumed universal relationship is as significant as the same finding demonstrated hundreds of times. For example, Teska's (1947) case of a hydroencephalic, 6½ year-old, with an IQ of 113, was sufficient evidence to counter the belief that prolonged congenital hydroencephaly results in some degree of feeblemindedness; Lennenberg's (1962) case of an eight year-old boy who lacked the motor skills necessary for speaking but who could understanding language make it "clear that hearing oneself babble is not a necessary factor in the acquisition of understanding..." (p. 422). This use of the case study is now almost moot given that psychologist's have adopted a more probablistic approach to truth seeking.

In any event, this study of Bill is not organized around a specific hypothesis and so does not relate to this particular criterion. As was mentioned earlier in this section, this study is done in the dialectical tradition where the emphasis is more on discovery than on the proving or disproving of any particular hypothesis.

The fourth criterion is subject sparsity. This relates to both rare occurrences and subjects or situations that for matters of practicality simply cannot be studied in any number. Most studies of multiple
personalities fall into this category, e.g., Prince (1905). Part of the uniqueness of this situation relates to Bill's status as an academic and there are very few academics who choose to pursue political life. So, Bill does constitute a rare event and the study would fit this criterion.

The fifth criterion that Dukes sets out is that of situational complexity. This could mean a situation where the investigation occurs over a great length of time. For example, Burtt (1941) did a study of early childhood memory that required testing 16 years after the material had been presented during infancy. It might also imply expensive or specialized training for the subject or a particularly intricate administration of procedures. This criterion certainly applies to this study. The investigation occurred over a three month period with a follow-up two years later. Another consideration which demanded that the study be limited to a single subject was the necessity of becoming familiar with the local politics and members of Bill's campaign organization. Also, in a study that relies heavily upon the relationship between the investigator and the subject, as this one does, considerable time must be spent in direct contact. In the course of this investigation the author spend in excess of 250 hours in direct contact with Bill and an additional 100 hours with members of his family and campaign staff. This is more explicitly described in the procedure section.

These five criteria offered guidance to the investigator in adopt-
The decisions made by the author in designing this study were determined by the experimental situation. The subject was to be a single individual, complete response freedom was necessary and the primary sources of data were direct observation and personal documents. From this it was determined that the study would be idiographic in nature, the data would be collected by the phenomenological method and the data would be analyzed through continuous re-immersion. These decisions place the study within the dialectical tradition.

Once the data were collected and the process of analysis begun, certain concepts emerged which organized the subject's experience. The author's view of some of the adult-developmental literature and the references to political life represent the notions that proved useful in the interpretation.
While any case study will be unique in its particulars, each such study will be related to larger areas of investigation. This study evolved in a manner that permitted the author to draw on these research areas from which hypotheses emerged.

Lovett (1980) conducted a survey of senior academics who had chosen to leave their academic setting for a different walk of life. She interviewed 43 academics who had already made a change of career or who were in the midst of one. Her research was nomothetic in nature and revealed some general trends in the experiences of the senior academic. Fourteen had found their way into state or federal government (none by election), 15 had settled in the corporate world and 9 were in non-profit foundations or association. Two were self-employed and three were actively looking for jobs at the time of the interview. Most had stayed within their field of study.

Bill is similar to this group by background but his decision to move into public life by seeking elective office is unusual - certainly unusual for an academic.

Lovett includes some data on why each of these academics chose to leave their university and also on whether they perceived their move as
permanent or temporary. Perhaps most interesting from the viewpoint this study is the clear emphasis on the difficulty of the transition itself along with the indication that the stimulus for change in 33 of the cases was fear of stagnation - a phenomenon related to men of Bill's age.

Erik Erickson (1969, 1963) offered a stage-theory formulation of adult development that extends through the entire life span. His theory has served as a prototype for other stage theories in that each stage is not only qualitatively different but is discontinuous with the next. Each stage is thought to have a relatively abrupt termination even though the transition to the next stage may take place over an extended period of time. The stages are thought to build upon one another and the resolution of the challenges proposed by one stage contains the building elements to successfully negotiate the next. The process of personality development evolves by "critical steps, 'critical' being a characteristic of turning points, of moments of decision between progress and regression, integration and retardation" (Erickson, 1963, pp. 270-271).

The seventh stage poses a conflict between generativity and stagnation. This conflict, according to Erikson, tends to surface at about the age of 40. Generativity, as it is used here, means feeling a voluntary obligation to care for others - in the broadest sense a reaching out, a transmitting, a concern for the next generation. It goes beyond
nurturing one's own children on act for 20 and 30 year olds. The individual in this stage feels a concern for the adults that will follow and a need to transmit his values. Such an orientation may be manifested in a shift away from one's own advancement toward taking pleasure in teaching other people or in correcting social injustices.

Those who miss out on the enrichment of generativity tend to lapse into a prolonged stagnation.

For Newman and Newman (1975) stagnation suggests the lack of psychological movement or growth. For example, for the narcissistic adult stagnation invites deterioriated self-satisfaction as the physical and psychological consequences of aging begin to make their impact. Individuals of this type were found to later undergo a form of "conversion" after a serious illness or emotional crisis which forces them to acknowledge the limitations of a self-involved life style; or, the depressed person who does not feel a sense of accomplishment during middle adulthood sees himself as unable to make any contributions to society because he lacks sufficient resources. This line of development is organized around very low self-esteem and manifests doubts about any opportunities for improvement in the future.

Both generativity and stagnation per se must be described in abstract. The particular forms that these developmental phenomena take in peoples lives are as varied as people themselves. It's within an individual's life and then only in retrospect that these constructs take
Levinson (1978), among contemporary theorists, utilizes a combination of the stage theory concept and a Jungian perspective expressed in four polarities whose resolution is the principal task of mid-life. These are attachment/separateness, destruction/creation, masculine/feminine and young/old.

Each of these pairs forms a polarity in the sense that the two terms represent opposing tendencies or conditions. Superficially, it would appear that a person has to be one or the other and cannot be both. In actuality, however, the paired tendencies are not mutually exclusive. Both side of a polarity coexist within every person. At mid-life a man feels young in many respects, but he also has a sense of being old... He feels alternately young, old and in between. His developmental task is to make sense of this condition of in-between to become young/old in a new way, different from that of early childhood (Levinson, 1978, p. 197).

Newman and Newman (1975) consider the issue of stagnation in the context of a developmental fork in the road. They point out that there exists the possibility of stagnation in one's life but there also exists the more desirable alternate-generativity.

Once a person has managed to successfully pursue a career, to manage a household and to raise children, others in the community seek his contributions to societal causes. (p. 319)

Community involvement is an important forum for the expression of generativity. (p. 323)

Their belief is that this development crisis is experienced both as a push from within the individual and as a call from the community. The interaction of the community's needs and Bill's need to respond forms a context within which to consider his decision to run, many of the experiences of the campaign and his response to the election results.
Vaillant, in his longitudinal study of Harvard undergraduates, reported that during their forties and fifties successful men "worried less about themselves and more about their children" (Vaillant, 1977, p. 228). One of his subjects captured this feeling, "passing on the torch and exposure of civilized values has always been of importance to me, but it has increased with each ensuing year" (p. 343). The emergence of self-transcendent concerns was reflected in the professional careers of several of Vaillant's subjects.

In another longitudinal study at Berkeley, California, Haan and Block (1971) compared thirty-year old and forty-five year old individuals to themselves as adolescents and arrived at a similar conclusion. Altruism and other self-transcendent behavior increased over time. Individuals at forty-five were "more sympathetic, giving productive and dependable" than they were at thirty.

Generativity, then, seems to contain this other element - self-transcendence. It also seems to be true that work on this dimension of life cannot be approached directly. This task of mid-life is overarching - spanning a time frame that may cover several years, despite the occurrence of critical events. As such, it is rinsed through this period of life and integrated into most if not all the major life decisions and activities of this period.

Individuals rarely carry an on-going sense of working on a particular developmental task or any feature of the task. This is an
awareness that comes afterwards, sometimes long afterwards. To ac-
count for this Levinson (1968) used a method called "biographical in-
terviewing." It involved the collection of life information over
several years so that the organization of a person's life could emerge.
For the subject of such studies (Levinson, 1978; Davitz & Davitz, 1976;
Gould, 1978) the experience of life is that of being in media res and
it is only later that events take on their developmental meaning.

W. H. Auden once wrote,

When I look back at the three or four choices in my life that have
been decisive, I find that, at the time I made them I had little
sense of the seriousness of what I was doing and only later did I
discover that what had seemed an unimportant brook was actually a
Rubicon.

Farber (1966) had this in mind when he defined two realms of
the will. The first realm of the will is not experienced consciously
during an act and must be inferred after an event. The second realm
is the conscious component; it is experienced during an event. The
second realm of will pushes toward some specific object and in this
way is unlike the first which can be regarded as pure propulsion.

Farber suggests that the important decisions that are made in life
are not consciously experienced as decisions and belong to the first
realm of the will. This realm can be thought of as a subterranean life
current that eludes immediate and direct scrutiny.

In considering Bill's experiences of his campaign, the author
attends to both the overt goings on of the campaign to get at Bill's
direct experience but in the end also attends to the campaign as an
event in Bill's on-going development.

The decision to run, the campaign and the aftermath of the campaign will be considered as a culminating event in mid-life operating within the life task of generativity/stagnation.

Another body of knowledge that offers some perspective to this study is the literature on politics, leadership and power. Kennedy (1979) spoke about power from the perspective gained in a case study of Richard J. Daley, the late Mayor of Chicago. "Power," he noted, "is a subject about which there has been much theoretical analysis but which we will only understand when we meet it in the street."¹ Power and even simple proximity to people of power is a catalyst. Most studies on power and its effects gravitate to the power exercised in high office. Burns (1979) uses an examination of the relationship between Franklin Roosevelt and Joseph Kennedy to describe the dynamics of power. But, as Kennedy (1978) reminds us in the same paper, "For power, wherever it is wielded, is always the same phenomenon." And so, even in the less lofty political arena of a local political race there is power and its effects. It could even be speculated that the form power takes in such a local race is more raw and keenly felt.

From the area of political science there is a limited body of research on those who enter political life that can be considered.

Robert Lane, in *Political Life* cites Mussen and Syszynski's (1942) claim:

There is some evidence to show that, in fact the politically apathetic individual, more than the particular, is likely to be someone who suffers from intra-psychic conflict and, as a consequence, tends to fear any searching explanation. (p. 116)

Lane himself offers that,

People who have a capacity for externalized aggression are more likely to become politically oriented than those for whom such externalized aggression is inhibited. Being against somebody, some group or something is more easily turned into political channels than being impartial or being for something. (p. 118)

This type of general hypothesis offers a starting point in the effort to understand Bill's experience.

In the end, however, this psychological case study is most dependent on the data for the shape and substance of the investigation. Part of the method involves a surrender to the phenomena as they present themselves. Allport (1942) recognized that the process of interaction between theory and inductive material is ambiguous. He also suggested that it was the essence of the methodological problem for case studies built on personal documents.
PROCEDURE

The selection of Bill as the subject of this study occurred after he made public his decision to run for councilman. The notion that his experience would make an interesting case study first occurred to a professor who then mentioned to the author that the N=1 Committee was looking for someone to conduct the study. I was informed a few days later that I could proceed. Prior to this, Bill had been approached to see if he were open to the idea. He was. Once these prearrangements had been completed, observations began. The first day of the study was November 30, 1978.

As most often occurs in case studies, the subject is not systematically searched out. Instead, the subject comes to the attention of the investigator by virtue of some unusual quality he possesses or because he faces an unusual situation.

In Bill's case, his decision to run for public office placed him at the threshold of an unusual experience. His life until then had been that of an academic. He had spent the last fourteen years as a professor at a University, his first appointment after receiving a Ph.D. at the State University.

By contrast, councilmen usually arrive at their office after long
and faithful service in the Regular Democratic organization. And, while Bill had operated on the fringes of local politics through his involvements in community affairs, the path that led him into this political campaign is clearly atypical.

At the age of 43, Bill, who at that time was the chairperson of his academic department, cast himself into a councilman campaign. As a Ph.D. in a Social Science his perspectives and experience of the campaign was expected to be qualitatively different from that of a seasoned Regular Democrat. He constituted an unusual combination of training and experience to be dropped into the political crucible. More importantly, it was anticipated that he would experience the events of the campaign in a manner unique to himself and it will be around that unique experiencing that this study attempts to understand this event in his life.

The data can be divided into four categories: personal documents, the observer's notes, third party documents and three administrations of the Rohde sentence completion test.

The personal documents are tape recordings gathered during interviews. The interviews were conducted between the dates of 1/11/78 and 1/9/81 with the majority (10 of 13) occurring during the last two months of the campaign itself (January and February, 1979). There is also one recording that was done by the subject alone. The interviews typically ran 30 minutes in length and were conducted in the subject's office.
The manner of approach, in Crano and Brewer's (1973) terms, was "unstructured" and imposed little response restriction on the subject. That is, the interviews were not entered into with an agenda of hypotheses or a set of assumptions. The author would, on occasion, raise an issue that had been glossed over or dwell on an event to elicit Bill's reflections but the first rule was to avoid shaping his reactions or restricting his responses. Two raters were asked to rate the interviews on these two dimensions.

The observer's notes referred to are observations made continuously throughout the campaign. These notes contain not only thoughts and reflections but also quotes gathered in situations where a tape recorder was either unavailable or where it would have been obtrusive and possibly have altered the data. These notes represent over 250 hours spent with the subject across literally every type of campaign event -- speeches, coffees, staff meetings, bus stops, TV appearances, interviews and election day.

These notes constitute an important resource as they not only provide information per se but also provide a basis upon which the problems of the observer can be evaluated. They provide a running commentary that addresses campaign events, Bill's reactions to the campaign, the reactions of others to the campaign and their interactions with Bill. This commentary also includes the reactions of the observer himself. And now, some two years after the campaign, the record can be examined, with the perspective time offers, to consider the influences
operating upon and within the observer. A political campaign is a swirling, absorbing event and despite the observer's intent to maintain a carefully measured involvement, he was not immune to the pull of the campaign. This part of the observer's experience was anticipated and the keeping of the notes was designed to provide insight into this feature of the study.

Additionally, the personal reactions of the observer, chronicled in the notes, is a source of data. Recorded were not only the facts, the sequence of events, names and places but also intuitions, images and emerging hypotheses. The agreement the observer made with himself was not to censor, analyze or in any conscious manner de-limit data gathered in this way. One of the unique advantages of a case study is the utilization of data like an unusual image in an observer's log - so potentially rich and so methodologically elusive.

Finally, the Rohde Sentence Completion was administered three times - twice during the campaign and once 2 years later. They were taperecorded due to time concerns and the observer's opinion that if they were given to Bill to take home, they might not be done or would not be done at one sitting. Still another reason for the choice of a verbal administration, was that Bill might be more spontaneous if he had to quickly respond as opposed to being permitted to linger over an item. A verbal administration was also offered the opportunity to observe paralinguistic and non-verbal reactions.
The second of the three Sentence Completions was altered. The observer felt that some of the responses made on the first administration were constricted. So, in an effort to press Bill for greater specificity or in some cases more elaboration, some sentence stems were elongated to include not only the original stem but the initial response to the stem. For example, in the first administration Bill's response to the stem "My childhood" was, "was happy." In the second administration the stem was expanded to "My childhood was happy because..." in the hope that Bill could be more expansive in his response.

There is a methodological give and take involved in doing a case study or for that matter any field study. In the case of this study, Bill's pursuit of the councilman's seat, much of the data were single events - asides made by Bill, first reactions to the election results - observed only by the observer and then gone. No opportunity for verification of others, no trained raters nearby to establish reliability and no control candidate for comparison.

The issue becomes -- how to include these valuable bits of information in a manner that permits conclusions that are free from distortion.

We can first examine this dilemma from the perspective of examiner bias. Recalling Edgar and Billingsley's (1974) focus on "believability" the question is put - how can it be established that the data gathering was free from examiner bias?
The first source of information to consider is the personal documents - the taped interviews. These interviews have been reviewed for examiner bias by asking raters to reflect on the degree response restriction engaged in by the author in his role as interviewer. Two transcripts were selected at random. The raters were asked to consider ten transitions initiated by the investigator and rate each intervention for its degree of response restriction. Raters were given examples of high and low response restriction interventions.

As was mentioned before, it was not expected that the author could maintain a static neutrality within himself nor was this desirable. Author reactions were considered a source of data and that was one of the reasons for maintaining the log. However, it was hoped that, even though the author was making no effort to suppress his reactions, he was not shaping or constricting Bill's responses in his role as the interviewer.

An evaluation of three raters scoring the transcripts for evidence of response-restriction suggest that Bill was given response freedom.

The ratings were averaged and grouped as "hits" i.e., if all three raters found the interviewer's statement or question to be unrestrictive - an extreme 3 pt. range on a 9 pt. scale. A Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1968) was computed and, with seven of the ten statements rated found to be unrestrictive, a value of .70 was found.

A closer examination of the ratings reveals that the ratings fell
at the extreme ends of the scale. This assessment of the interaction between Bill and the author reflects the dual purpose in the interviews. The interviews served primarily to explore certain feelings and events in the campaign. This was the main purpose and this is seen in the predominantly unrestrictive nature of the interviewer's questions. The other purpose the interview served was clarification. Bill was often vague in his responses and the author felt compelled at times to be direct and specific in an attempt to force specificity in Bill's responses. This is also reflected in the rater's reactions in that when they found an item restrictive, they found it to be extremely so.

From this it can be ascertained that the interviewer maintained a clarity of purpose in his interview style - preferring when possible to be unrestrictive and succeeding in doing so.

A further indication of the absence of any systematic bias on the part of the interviewer surfaces in a comparison of the ratings of personality dimensions drawn from the transcripts and the sentence completion tests.

It was reasoned that the data derived from the sentence completion tests would necessarily be free from examiner bias due to the structured nature of the interaction during the tests. So, if the ratings drawn from the sentence completion tests were similar to ratings derived from the interview transcripts, it could be concluded that the degree of bias operating in the interviews was no more distorting than that at work during the administration of the sentence completions.
The average scores of three raters working from the transcripts for each of the eight personality dimensions were compared with the averaged ratings drawn by the three raters given the sentence completion tests. A correlation of \( r = .82 \) was found to exist between the two sets of scores. It should be noted that this correlation mixes within and between rater variance, thus a probability value could not be computed. This issue notwithstanding, it seems that the author in his role of interviewer was not systematically distorting the data.

The observer's log should be free from significant bias as a function of the log's purpose -- a candid, stream-of-consciousness-like record of reactions and thoughts that occurred to the observer throughout the campaign. Observations were recorded without regard for their meaning and the value of these notes rests in their status as a place for on-going self-observation and self-monitoring.

The third person documents have an inherent bias of which the author was aware. They are campaign materials and newspaper accounts. Their sources must be considered. All campaign materials are faith documents of a sort and reflect belief and values. Their import, along with the newspaper accounts, lies not in their being free from significant bias but rather in how they go about reflecting the bias that they strive to express. They often present little in the way of fact but offer a great deal in the effort to understand the climate of the campaign. The caricature, hyperbole and careful posturing created a rich backdrop for the investigation.
The sentence completions do not present a problem in the area of examiner bias exercised in the acquisition of the data. The issue is more the interpretation of the data.

Three raters were given a rating instrument abstracted from an interpretation arrived at by the author. The raters were asked to examine the sentence completion tests and then do the ratings. The ratings were averaged and then recorded as a hit if the averaged score fell within a predicted range (three points on a nine point scale). A Cohen's kappa (Cohen, 1968) was calculated to determine the degree to which the rater's estimation of Bill as represented on the sentence completion tests coincided with the author's interpretation thereby justifying conclusions from the tests being included in this report. The value calculated was .82 — sufficiently high to admit the author's interpretation.

Another consideration in the area of examiner bias is the biased selection of events. In experimental studies this issue is obviated by carefully delimiting the experience of the subject and the precise manipulation of the independent variable. This case study was done in the field and consequently could not avail itself of these controls. But, as is often the case with a field study, it is precisely this subject response freedom that makes the study possible and desirable.

The campaign was from late November 1978 to February 27, 1979. It was a period of intense activity and there were many opportunities for observation and much to observe. The problem of biased selection
of events was handled by simply observing most of them. The author spent over two hundred hours in contact with Bill in the conduct of his campaign. By attending literally every type of campaign event and by being present at the vast majority of events, it can be concluded that there was no systematic exclusion of data based on selection of observations.

**Adequacy of Data**

The next problem in a study of this sort can be framed in the question, "Is the data base adequate?" The simple facts presented above about the extentiveness of the data gathering suggest that the data are adequate. But, in fact, they are two separate issues. Broad sampling does not in itself guarantee data adequacy. In addition, it is difficult to determine the adequacy of the data apart from an adequate interpretation of the data. So, if the data are adequate, they will yield a plausible and thorough interpretation. A plausible interpretation then, one that is true to the data, and to the person under study, makes a good criterion upon which to judge the adequacy of the data. The final issue or problem that must be addressed has to do with whether or not the interpretation of the data is plausible and true to the data.

The interpretation will be considered by both members of the thesis committee and Bill, the subject of the study. These men, thoroughly familiar with the data presented, will be asked, "How does this portrayal resonate with your understanding of the data"?
Their reactions will help shape the final report. As for including Bill, this procedure, sometimes referred to as the "subject's rebuttal" (Allport, 1942, p. 44) uses subject verification to increase validity. The inclusion of the committee members will provide a guarantee of thoroughness in the process of challenging formulations and raising issues that may have been overlooked.

Through this process the guiding principles for the examination of the report are these non-quantitative indicators of validity -- credibility-ad hominem; plausibility; and, internal consistency arrived at through the process of challenge described above (Allport, 1942).
RELEVANT BACKGROUND

Bill's decision to run for the office of Councilman was made public in mid-November, 1978. The student-operated newspaper announced in the edition dated November 17, that Dr. Thompson was joining two other candidates in the race. The other candidates were Ronald Jones, an assistant professor at a small nearby private college, and Joan Kaplan who was the current councilman and a Regular Democrat.

Bill's decision to run was not a choice made quickly. In fact, he had given the matter some thought as early as the prior election in 1974. So, to place Bill's decision in context we need to consider two histories that intersect here. First, there is the history of the local politics and then the events in Bill's life which brought him to the campaign and the decision to run.

The importance of describing the situation Bill entered is grounded in the fact that the present study is a psychological case study in the manner described earlier by Bromely (1977). It differs from psychohistory and biography in that it is time limited and situationally oriented. We are concerned with Bill's experience of this one series of events in his life. This portrayal of Bill that has been derived is to a degree circumscribed by the situation. That is, Bill's
behavior and experiences for this period of time was directly dependent on his perception and construal of the alternative possibilities for action in the campaign settings. The role of the situation in this study warrants consideration and has been carefully chronicled by the author.

First, we will consider the strong currents in the community that later were felt by Bill in the campaign.

Bill ran for the office of councilman in an area that was traditionally Irish and Jewish. Historically, the two local offices of councilman and the politically powerful office of committeeman were carefully shared between these groups. The Democratic Party through the committeeman would slate the candidates to maintain representation from both groups.

Howard Bragg, like his father before him, was committeeman. Unlike his father though, Bragg was politically weak and in recent years the growing Independent political movement had been preparing to challenge him for the councilman's seat within his area. Bragg had beaten back one attempt by enticing Joan Kaplan, a seventyish state representative, to abandon her state position for the councilman's office. Kaplan's long history in the area and the fact that she was Jewish proved to be barely enough to win. However, as the '79 elections approach Bragg realized that Kaplan would not be able to hold her office against the challenge of the young Independent candidate Jones. In addition, the area's population had shifted. Alongside the traditional
ethnic populations was a large number of young people who tended to not identify themselves with a political party. Bragg's own political fortunes hung in the balance. Bragg had to proceed cautiously because he would appear in a particularly bad light if he dumped Kaplan who had done him a favor a few years earlier. She was well liked and Jewish. There were many voters to lose if Kaplan was mishandled and an election to lose if he didn't run a strong candidate.

On January 8th, 1979, Bill submitted to an endorsing body his responses to their General Candidate Questionnaire in which he provides information on his personal background.

From it we can determine Bill's education was uninterrupted and that when he took his first job with the University in 1964 as an assistant professor he had experienced consistent success and advancement.

His academic career was no different in that respect. He had success in publishing his research, co-authored a textbook and was granted tenure - all on schedule and without a lapse in productivity. In 1973, Bill was selected as Chairman of his department and would serve the limit of two three-year terms. Bill began his last year as Chairman at the same time a decision to run for office had to be made.

Bill married late in his education and he and his wife, Nora, moved to the University area just before he began teaching. They have two children, Pat, 16 at the time of the campaign, and Jim, who was 12.
Bill's involvements in the community have paralleled his children's interests. His first involvement was with the local school Education Council from 1971-1973. His oldest child, Pat, was a student there at the time. In 1974 when Pat developed an interest in gymnastics at the local Park District but found there was little or no equipment, Bill launched the Park Athletic Association to secure adequate equipment. At the time of the campaign, his youngest, Jim, was about to enter secondary school and this would mark an end to the time in his life when Bill was the father of young children. No longer could he delimit their world and thus have a better opportunity to guide and protect them. They were in the larger community now and if he were to follow them, he would have to seek area wide involvements.


Many factors contributed to his decision to run for office. Some may have been related to the pull of the community and its needs and others to the internal push to make a mark in the world, continue a career ascent or satisfy an instinct to follow his children into the world. Perhaps Bill had an appetite for power or a need to test himself in an environment other than an academic setting. In a recording Bill made one month into the campaign he reflected on why he entered and what factors he considered.

I had some conflict as to whether I wanted to run because it was leaving a fairly secure job at the University. The negative aspect of it was, the negative part, the reason for not running was that I had the secure job and was a good teacher, I thought, at the University. On the same line, I was at the end of my
administration as a chairperson within the 6th year and had already decided to resign. The research was not going that well. We were doing fairly well. Teaching was getting a little boring and in that respect, it was a push on that end for some change. On the political end, the negative aspects of the office is that it's not a glory type office and it doesn't have extreme legislative power although there's quite a bit of power within the community. The other negative aspect is that people expect you to be their janitor. The Councilman's office is sort of the janitor's office and you get numerous phone calls about dog dirt and papers and garbage not picked up and thinks like this and the positive aspect of the office is that I had been involved in community affairs for 12 or 14 years and enjoyed it. I enjoyed much of it and this was sort of a challenge, a time to try and put together some ideas or to try and push for some ideas that I had been pushing for, for years.

The factors within Bill, as we listen to him reason through the pluses and minuses, are a concern with a loss of security, a fear that he would become stagnant if he were to remain in positions that were familiar to him now, a need to experience challenge in his work, the need to see some of his ideas put into practice, and a concern for welfare of the community that was frustrated by the inefficiency of the incumbent's efforts.

Certain themes are notably present. Bill does not reflect on a personal desire for office. It seems not to be part of his "dream" - Bill does not seek self-aggrandizement in his pursuit of office. He is not driven by a desire to beat his opponent or, put another way, Bill is not strongly against either a person or an organization.

Beyond the content of the reasoning behind Bill's decision there is something very measured and controlled. Bill's words are given to understatement, a realism that is tinged with what might appear on the surface to be cynicism. As we listen to him describe the office
he seeks, we hear little unbridled enthusiasm. Each positive is balanced by some negative. In fact, later in the same recording he characterizes his reaction to the being a candidate as "neutral."

"My initial reaction to becoming a - running for Councilman was fairly neutral. But I thought we could put together some sort of organization, but I had no great positive or negative feelings about it."
This interpretation will focus on the data in two ways. First, Bill's experience of the campaign per se will be considered and then the campaign event will be discussed within a developmental context.

First, it can be said that the Bill who campaigned for the office of councilman was only slightly different from the man before or after the event. The differences were more in degree than kind.

Generally speaking, Bill is more reflective than expressive. This is an example of a part of Bill that underwent a change but only in degree. During the campaign Bill increased in his tendency to control his emotional responses. The major mechanisms he employed to manage himself in the face of the campaign pressures were denial, suppression and rationalization.

Bill would frequently attach the almost automatic phrase, "that doesn't bother me," when mulling over some dilemma or conflict in the campaign. The author came to understand Bill's use of this phrase as meaning, "I can continue despite this," rather than the literal meaning - that whatever it was did not bother him. In any event, Bill made use of the disclaimer to manage his own reactions and, unintentionally, to mislead those around him. Bill tends to be a somewhat private person when it comes to conflict and it served him to maintain others in the belief that for the most part, "nothing bothered him." So, Bill's
use of denial had a dual purpose. It created a persona of the imperturbable candidate, something that is necessary in a political campaign; and, also provided him with the time and privacy he needed to think through his experience. Many campaign evenings were closed with a period of solitude - a time in which he could, "just puff on my pipe, have a beer, and that's it."

It seems clear that a good deal of feeling during the campaign was suppressed. Bill's self-reports involving the stomach distress and the sleep disturbances point in this direction. Supporting this notion is the content of the specific issues that Bill recalls awaking to - the general sense that "he was doing something wrong" and that he was concerned that he would no longer "be liked." For Bill, these are emotionally potent issues that he would consciously contain. These feelings are discussed below.

Finally, Bill's occasional use of rationalization was employed in reframing the intentions of others. Bill knows himself well in regard to anger. He is not comfortable with feelings of anger and rarely sees any purpose in being angry. Rationalizing the behavior of others in the campaign, Bragg, Jones, his own staff, the Democratic precinct captains, etc., acted in a preventative way. It shielded Bill from the feared consequence of anger - alienation from others. This will be discussed further in conjunction with his need to be liked.

Bill's efforts to maintain the appearance of calm reassurance in
the three months of the campaign were considerable. But, it would be an error to conclude from his external manner that Bill was an unemotional man. Paradoxically, the degree to which Bill strove to deny or mute his emotional reactions was an indication of his emotionality and his vulnerability. It is around two areas of vulnerability that the interpretation is now organized.

For the most part, it has been Bill's need to be liked that has led him to develop his skills of compromise and accommodation. But it was the counterpart to that need, an aversion to conflict, that made Bill vulnerable to the interpersonal conflicts that engulfed him at times in the campaign. In this way, Bill bears out Lane's (1962) notion about externalized aggression, "Being against somebody, some group or something is more easily turned into political channels than being impartial or being for somebody." Bill's predisposition toward denying and otherwise muting his aggressive impulses may have contributed to the stress he experienced during the campaign.

It is unlikely that Bill could have done otherwise in this regard. His need to be liked and his sensitivity to the world of friendship is at his center.

Work is of paramount importance to Bill. For him it is both a means and an end. Bill was often unsure if a particular campaign effort was going to be profitable. He also faced the possibility, as all politicians do, that he might lose. Bill's consistent refuge for himself was the reassurance that he was working hard. It was a balm that
he applied to uncertainty and worry. As was mentioned earlier, the fact that he and his staff had "worked their tail's off" was the first thought he offered in defeat. Similarly, his first reaction to the television report of the campaign was not simply the fact of his losing but the pain of not having made it a close race. (The race was later determined to be very close but this was Bill's reaction to an early report.)

Bill's later assessment of his campaign effort as a solid one would become a starting point for other efforts outside the university. This is considered at greater length when the campaign is reviewed as a marker event initiating Bill's mid-life transition.

Not surprisingly, work and Bill's need to be liked are strongly related. Work has value as emotional currency for him. Loyalty, dedication and hard work can be the equivalent of love or liking. Bill was awestruck at the efforts his campaign workers put into his election campaign. He was also a bit uneasy.

Bill is a hard worker who has a capacity to work and persevere. In most cooperative efforts he would do more than his share and consequently he would earn approval and liking of others. In a very basic sense, Bill works in order to be liked and loved. This is true in his relationships with others and it is true of himself. In the campaign, Bill who exerted an enormous effort felt not only indebted to his campaign workers but, "...guilty that they worked so hard and did not
get a reward." This guilt or discomfort is related to Bill's nagging sense of having done something wrong despite his persistence. Bill agonized on this point. Did he do enough? Did he work as hard as he could? If, somehow, he had failed to work as hard as he could, would others still like him? Would he be able to like himself? These questions have implications for Bill's future efforts. How should he proceed in continuing his relationships and his career, given this experience? How much self-esteem or self-doubt would he carry away from the campaign?

These dilemmas are a common legacy of a flawed or abortive attempt at a life change.

Bill's ability to pursue the task was a function of his self-control. He drove himself to persist in a difficult campaign based on his belief that he was doing the right thing. This combination of determination and self-control is what he referred to when he described himself as "low key-high drive." At one point, Bill was described in a newspaper article during the campaign as "somewhat bland." This captured only a small element of Bill's style. It would be true to say that Bill was not a headline-grabber or a grandstander. Bill, the candidate, did not make good newscopy. He is more oriented to behind the scenes work.
His opponent felt that Bill was "a manager not a leader." But this also misses part of the point. Only part of what makes a leader is the ability to function in the arena of front line action. But, in the political world, Bill would be better suited as a campaign manager rather than as a candidate or, for that matter, a better councilman than a candidate. Acknowledging this, two years later Bill would say that he felt that as a candidate his style was "too laid back." In the political arena, where appearances are taken to be substance, Bill may well have appeared bland, managerial and low key.

By personality Bill was ill-suited for the role of candidate. Part of the stress that he experienced in the campaign was related to the poor fit between Bill and the demands that fall on a candidate. However, there is another dimension of the campaign that exacerbated the stresses - Bill's status as a political amateur. While it would be an oversimplification to portray Bill as a sheep among wolves, it would be fair to note that he entered an unfamiliar world and floundered for a time.

His background as an academic fostered belief in the power of an idea. He is not an idealist given to impractical pipedreams. Quite to the contrary, Bill is a practical thinker. But, he is a man who allows himself to be moved or persuaded by force of argument. A good academic, he is willing to consider the merits of all proposals. Consequently he was not at home with the political mentality that deals
overtly with the merits of varied policies and programs but covertly attends to the major determining factor - power. The machinations of the campaign - debates, handshaking, coffees, policy statements, volunteers - were only the arenas. The actual political event was in the perception of the candidate's power. The power to give what is wanted and the power to withhold what is needed. Bill became aware that his daily routine of candidate behaviors was in many respects simple adherence to a formula. He sensed that what he was doing was one step removed from actually influencing people, but he didn't know what else he could do. Bill was a political amateur from the perspective that he was unaccustomed to the use of power.

When Bill assesses his campaign style as "too laid back" he refers to the notion of assertion - his hesitance to be more aggressive. It can be suggested that Bill was not only "too laid back" due to his personality but was even more ambivalent because he found himself in a setting that rewards the unflinching use of power - something he is unaccustomed to. Bill's dissatisfaction with himself as a candidate stems from his awareness that many of his efforts as a campaigner were only correct in form and that the substance, power, operated beyond his amateur's understanding.

Bill's appreciation of the political world developed quickly, though. The post election offer of an appointive position was turned down in large part because Bill sensed the powerlessness of being someone's appointee.
Bill arrived at the beginning of the campaign at a pivotal point in his life. He had managed to move into a senior position at the University and had served the two term limit as the chairperson. He had "become his own man." But now, he was beginning to find teaching undergraduates unrewarding and his interest in continuing to do research was low. If he were to continue this work structure, he would have been settling for something for which he had little enthusiasm. There was no sense of challenge in it for him. And, in terms of generativity and stagnation, he would have taken a step in the direction of stagnation.

Bill's decision to run will be considered as a first event in his mid-life transition. Levinson (1978) describes how it is to stand on the threshold of this developmental period. Some, he acknowledges, do very little questioning during this period that he calls the Mid-Life transition. Their fate may be later developmental crises emerging from unattended movements in their life. A few manage the transition growthfully without any major upheaval in their life. These men are in a "manageable transition." The great majority, though, 80% Levinson estimates, experience, "tumultuous struggles" within themselves and with the external world. His description of this tumultuous experience shared by the majority:

It must involve emotional turmoil, despair, the sense of not knowing where to turn, or of being stagnant and unable to move at all. A man in this state often makes false starts. He tentatively test a variety of new choices, not only out of confusion or impulsive-ness but, equally, out of a need to explore in a particular love
relationship, occupation or solitary pursuit. Every genuine appraisal must be agonizing, because it challenges the illusions and vested interests on which the existing structure is based. (p. 199)

There are several outcomes posited for men who encounter this period of their life.

Sequence A is described as "advancement within a stable life structure." There is a "culminating event" which may precipitate the mid-life transition or it may occur within the transition. The culminating event is occasionedally experienced as a great success but it is much more often the case that it is felt to be a flawed success or perhaps a disappointment.

Sequence B is regarded as involving a serious failure or decline within a stable life structure. Often because earlier developmental tasks were not successfully negotiated, men who typify this transition enter this time needing to accommodate themselves to the fact that their earlier goals are no longer achievable. Occasionally, coming to grips with these limits can stimulate a man to reorganize his life satisfactorily. For others the decline continues.

Sequence C is marked by a breaking out, a trying for a new life structure. The breaking out occurs in response to an intense sense of dissatisfaction with earlier structures. This may be the sequence that begins the most prolonged period of self-examination. Compromise structures are adopted and discarded as with other sequences, some men emerge with growthful new structures, all the better for having struggled, while others remain in one of the compromise structures
and hazard stagnation.

Sequence D is occasioned by an advancement which itself produces a change in life structure. A dramatic success (a culminating event perhaps) alters the lifestyle so profoundly that all other life structures are forced into review.

Sequence E is called simply, "the unstable life structure." Prior efforts at establishing life structures were not successful and such men enter the mid-life transition with little foundation to work from.

Bill's experience seems to most resemble Sequence A. Bill entered the campaign after a successful rise within the university with a successful family and having earned respect in the community.

Bill's life was a stable one - not filled with risks. He lived in the city in which he was born and has remained in the same job setting and community for 14 years. Of all the structure within his life the one available to change was his work.

So, while Bill was entering his mid-life transition, it was still uncertain whether his will be a tumultuous passage or a "manageable transition." Even though Levinson reports that the vast majority of men experience tumult, Bill may well move through this time of his life without any great eruptions in his life style. His experience may be more covert and self-contained.

The campaign has all the markings of a culminating event. And it
certainly has to be regarded as something of a false start for Bill. But even so, it was a start and adventurous one, given the usual exits made by academics from their universities. Bill showed himself to be unafraid of altering a major life structure and, if he has not been too badly burned, he will continue experimenting until he arrives at a satisfactory new structure. Such seems to be the case.

At the outset of the campaign, Bill acknowledged that he was no longer satisfied with the duties that would be his if he remained at the university. As the election approached, however, and he sensed the possibility of losing, Bill rationalized that he could comfortably return to the university in his former position. In the year immediately following the election loss, Bill did pursue some research but was also busy casting about for a project that would carry him in a new direction. In truth, his old work structures no longer excited him. His claim that he was interested in doing some research directly contradicted his feelings at the outset of the campaign. To remain with his old duties would have necessitated a major compromise with himself.

In the second year after the campaign, Bill and a colleague began a collaboration on a new program of which Bill would be the director. This offered him an opportunity to capitalize on his administrative talents, stay with the university and, because the program is targeted at non-academic settings, to traffic in a world of work that holds
new challenges for him.

At the two year follow-up, Bill's interest and vitality were genuine and the new project seemed to provide him with a good outlet for his creative energies as an administrator. What seem to particularly interest him was the encounter this program occasioned between himself and work settings unrelated to academia - banks, business, industry and the like.

It is possible that despite Bill's interest in the new program, it will prove to be a temporary structure and that Bill's fascination with the practical world outside the university will not be satisfied until he has moved into it. Indeed, part of Bill's attraction to the position of councilman was the opportunity to put some of his ideas into practice - to deal in a practical world. Put abstractly, Bill has a need to see some tangible consequence to his ideas and, more generally, to his life. His present position is a half measure that may satisfy him only temporarily. Ultimately, then, Bill will seek work that will test him in a way that will give him a feel for his power to influence events.

Not long after Bill's loss, he was informed that he might be considered for an appointive position. It was an elected state office that had been vacated. Bill had to weigh his desire for office against time away from his family, the fact he could not remain with the university, that it was an appointive office and that his constituency
would not be limited to the area to which he felt an attachment.

Bill decided against it. He did not like the time he would have to spend away from the family. This, for Bill, was a strong consideration but not so severe that he could not have accepted the position if the other features of the office had been attractive. They were not.

The office would be appointive and that would mean that Bill would be indebted to the committeemen that held the appointive power. Bill was not attracted to the prospect of operating under that condition.

There were matters of practicality that seemingly could not be worked out between Bill's duties at the university and his duties as a representative.

Finally, the area he would have represented would have been much larger than the area where he had made his home and where he had invested himself.

In the immediate aftermath of the election loss, Bill was approached by several individuals suggesting that he run again in four years. For the most part, these people were using the notion to convey their belief in Bill and as an indication of their support for him. Bill, it seemed, took it at that and generally gave the impression that he was not interested in running again. His reasons were practical considerations - well thought out. Others felt he would not run but for different reasons.
Bill's campaign manager and others close to him were in agreement that Bill had experienced the election loss as something of a betrayal. Not so much that he felt he was betrayed by any individual but that after 14 years of community service, he felt that his dedication and work had been overlooked. He felt that he had earned a better hearing than he got and that, as he assessed the campaign results, it seemed that people cared more about registering a protest against the Mayor and Bragg than they did for his ideas, dedication and hard work. He felt rejected and betrayed by a process that could undo him so unfairly. It was also something clearly beyond his control and it seemed unlikely to them that he will expose himself again to those forces as a candidate.

Bill remains a community-minded person with strong feelings and while he may not entertain being a candidate again, he may involve himself in local politics. He did not enjoy the personal dimension of politics but he was quite attracted to the pragmatic organizational dimension. A different involvement is possible because Bill does not need to be the candidate. He was never in it for self-aggrandizement or power. Bill is capable of drawing as much satisfaction from helping someone to win as he might from winning himself.

Bill's experience supports several ideas that cut across the developmental literature.

He seems to have used the campaign as a marker event separating
two phases of his life - his academic career wherein he "became his own man" and the initial phase of the mid-life transition.

Operating on the hypothesis that success in prior developmental stages is a predictor of future success in handling developmental tasks, Bill's steady course both during the campaign and especially afterwards, seem consistent with the stable quality of his life prior to the election. Judging from the fact that change seems to occur for him in moderate steps with only moderate risk attached to any move, Bill may be one of the minority that experience a "manageable transition." It appears to be that way so far.

Bill's exit from academic life may be more normative than first appeared. Even though his campaigning was an unusual experience, his next move, the move within the university, is more typical of an academic.

As with most culminating events it was a predictable "false start." And, as a "false start," it also is rather normative in that Bill sees it as somewhat flawed but not without value for him.
THE EVENTS OF THE CAMPAIGN: THE DATA

The campaign involved dozens of meetings and events. The author has selected those events that are representative of Bill's experience and that capture the man and the event in such a way that Bill Thompson emerges as person and candidate.

On December 3, 1978, Bragg called a meeting of local community leaders to "open the selection process." What was at stake was the Democratic endorsement and all that goes with it - workers, money, and votes. More importantly, it was to be the answer to Bragg's problems. Bill's campaign would become enmeshed in larger maneuvers from its beginning.

Bill, by this time, had offered himself as a candidate. It was planned that if a panel of community leaders recommended Bill over Kaplan, Bragg would then be obligated to respond to the will of the people and endorse Bill. In this way he could withdraw support from Kaplan without appearing to have dumped her, while at the same time getting the candidate he wanted without having appeared to have hand selected him. Also, by posturing as having "opened the selection process" he might also increase his appeal to the Independents by escaping the stereotype of the heavy-handed, dictorial committeeman.

Invited to sit on the recommending board were many legitimate
community leaders and some highly regarded university-based individuals but the outcome would not be left to chance because there was a solid core of Regular Democrats.

Kaplan would not show up that day nor would she make more than a very few campaign appearances. Kaplan was to speak first but she was in poor health and had asked an aide to read a brief statement of her credentials. The rumor was that she was enraged with Bragg and would refuse to withdraw from the race thereby dividing the ward organization and clearing the way for Independent Jones.

The next speaker was Jones. He began by making it clear that he was not seeking the Democratic endorsement but that he wanted to appear before the individuals on the board and Bragg himself to say before them what he would be saying later to others. He then proceeded to characterize the meeting as "orchestrated by Bragg to give some legitimacy to dumping Kaplan for Thompson who was already selected." As he spoke he was interrupted by the members of the Regular Democrat organization in the audience who angrily suggested he shut up. He delivered a strong message that created much tension in the Park Field House. When he finished to field questions from the screening committee, he was castigated for having impuned the integrity of the members of the panel by suggesting they were willing or unwilling dupes for Committeeman Bragg.

Bill was last to address the group. He had been working on presenting himself in a forceful manner and he proceeded comfortably
through a statement of his qualifications. After he had answered a few questions and received congratulations on being more dignified than Jones, the panel went to a room to discuss what their recommendation to Bragg would be.

The author approached the local State Representative in the period when the panel was deliberating and asked if in his judgment the meeting was a legitimate attempt to "open the selection process." He felt the meeting was a maneuver on Bragg's part much as Jones had described it and in the end all power rests with the committeeman, "the committeeman giveth and the committeeman taketh away."

Bill received the recommendation of the panel and later that night he got the endorsement of the Democratic Party.

Bill's candidacy was ensnared from the outset in a powerful and turbulent swirl of local politics. It would be difficult for his ideas to be heard in this campaign given the pull of the historical currents. Bill's campaign signal would be drowned out by the noise created in tangential arenas. Independents vs. Regular Democrats; Jones, the cur-sading white knight vs. Bragg, the malevolent committeeman; Bragg cruelly snubbing Kaplan; and developing on the horizon, the Mayoral race and the Blizzard of '79.

Campaign literature from Jones' organization later claimed that the invitations and notices they had received about the meeting indicated that the meeting would begin at 3:30 pm while all other invitations indicated the meeting would commence at 2:30. The article
contended that when the Jones supporters arrived all seats had been
taken. Whether this was an actual case of "gallery packing" or not is
less significant than the Independent's desire to see it as such and
Bragg's desire to escape the characterization. This meeting was one
of the earliest campaign events and yet it contained in microcosm
most if not all the election dynamics that were to be played out over
the next three months.

Bill was endorsed by the Democratic Party. Most often the party's
endorsement for the office of councilman constitutes something of a
political "nihil obstat" insofar as the party is concerned. The candi­
date so endorsed can be counted upon to surrender his vote upon request
to Democratic higher-ups in the City Council. In Bill's case, however,
this was not the case. Bill's candidacy was more an advantage to party
than the party's endorsement was an advantage for Bill. Bill felt that
he could operate as an independent - "a community based councilman,"
able to vote his conscience unfettered by obligation or debt to the
Democratic Party.

Ronald Jones was endorsed by the Independents and had gone out of
his way to make it clear that he was not interested in the endorsement
of the Democratic Party. His credentials as an "Independent" were im­
peccable. It is part of the "Independent" credo that any association
with the Democratic Party, particularly if a candidate accepts their
help, will inevitably lead to a loss of integrity. Jones felt that in
order to operate in the interests of the ward he would have to remain
disassociated from the party.

This issue - association with the Democratic Party - would become
the central issue of the campaign.

Bill would be called upon repeatedly to explain how it could be
that he could accept the Democratic endorsement and not sooner or later
become a "hack." At one meeting after another Bill would be introduced
as "the Democratic candidate," when in fact, Bill was an independent
who had simply received the Democratic endorsement. In an attempt to
define himself, Bill would refer to Jones and his organization as the
"Independents with a big I." While referring to himself as "an inde-
pendent with a small i." This subtle distinction seemed to elude the
electorate whose political lexicon included only the concepts of
"machine candidates" and "Independents."

A local newspaper's endorsement reflects this fact of the campaign
by listing the substantive issues and then resting their endorsement
on the issue of machine politics.

The area has two intelligent candidates who share positive goals
and who see housing and crime as the top problems. Yet they differ
in a vital way. One says he can remain independent-mixed even
though he accepts the City Hall machine's endorsement. The other
knows better; that the machine co-opts or dumps independent thinkers.
Ronald Jones, a vigorous independent, would be an able ally of those
who hope to replace politics-as-usual with dedicated service and
more citizen participation in policy making. He's needed in the
Council.

To counter this, in Bill's literature there was a concerted effort to
convey the idea of Bill's "independence." This was a code word for
maintaining a separate identity from the Regular Democratic Party -- "the machine." In the campaign literature there was never any explicit mention of the Democratic endorsement.

Bill was trying to walk a tightrope in that he had accepted the endorsement of the Democratic Party but did not want to be characterized as the Party's candidate. He established a separate campaign headquarters and a volunteer campaign force to establish his candidacy as an independent force. On the other hand, he did not want to alienate the Regular Democrats in the area. Their workers could be especially helpful.

Ultimately, Bill would not be able to establish himself as an independent candidate who happened to be endorsed by the Democratic Party. He would be seen as the Democratic candidate. Moreover, Bill would be characterized as Bragg's candidate. A good example of this reasoning appeared in a news article dated February 8, 1979. The article notes the two candidates held similar views on many issues and then noted, "The Bragg factor is what differentiates Jones and Thompson."

A similar characterization of Bill's candidacy occurred in an open letter of endorsement for Jones written by the State Representative of the district. In his letter the Representative fuses Bill not only with Committeeman Bragg but also the mayor.

When I was preparing to run for re-election in 1977, not everyone whom I approached agreed to be on my citizen's committee, but Bill Thompson was the only one to say that he wanted to talk first with
Bragg, the Democratic ward committeeman.

Would Thompson likewise refrain from making public statements which would seriously embarrass other political figures, such as the mayor? Would he always support the mayor in council on crucial matters? I believe so. I heartily endorse Ronald Jones for Councilman.

Bill was very aware of this dynamic in the campaign. He was challenged to answer for his association with the Democratic Party at many meetings. At times these characterizations would be frustrating for him but he could understand it as part of the campaign. What was more difficult for him was the dissension within his campaign staff.

Several key members of Bill's staff had their political roots in the Independent political movement and regarded the Regular Democratic machine as a dragon to slay. But, because of their friendship with Bill and their respect for him, they decided to work for him. Their consciences were uneasy, however, and they pressed Bill to posture as an "Independent" and to limit his involvement with the local Democratic organization.

On one occasion a central staff person resigned from the campaign because Bill did not come off "Independent" enough at a particular meeting. On another occasion following a debate with Jones, Bill was derided by two of his closest campaign workers for failing to emphasize the volunteers involved in the campaign. Their fear was that it would appear that Bill was depending on the local ward organization.

These intra-staff conflicts took a heavier toll on Bill. He
expected criticism from his opponents but felt at a loss when it also came from within his own organization. He was a damned-if-you-do-damned-if-you-don't bind and had no quick means at his disposal to handle the situation.

The author was struck on many occasions at Bill's apparent self-control. This element of his style was consistent regardless of his situation. He would be present at meetings of his staff where decisions were being made that would have an effect on his daily schedule and by extension to his fate in the campaign and stand by without intervening. Bill would reply to the author's curiosity on this point stating he had no trouble with delegating authority. He had the ability to restrain himself and permit situations to evolve. His style in his tenure as department chairman was marked by an absence of heavy-handedness. He would accommodate and seek compromise and for this reason Bill was universally well-liked and in most cases quite successful. His campaign rhetoric was organized around the belief that he could "bring people together." Bill trusted in his ability to bring people together and then looked for strength among those people he gathered. He had confidence in others and he had confidence in his ability to work to achieve any reasonable goal.

Bill drove himself hard and people could see this. The author in reviewing his notes of the campaign detected a pattern in his own interactions with Bill that included a running concern about his health, level of fatigue and ability to bear up under the pressures.
All this despite Bill's routine disclaimer that he was fine and that "no, that didn't bother me."

One and a half months into the campaign, a major meeting of the campaign staff was being held at a staff member's house. The topic under consideration was how to teach people to run "coffees." Coffees are gatherings of neighbors to which the candidate comes, gives his speech and then departs after answering a few questions. The issue was raised regarding what to do if a questioner began to run-on on his question. In the moments that followed a range of reactions were voiced that reveal something of how others were viewing Bill in the campaign. (Staffer A) "The coffee chairperson should intervene, we have to rescue Bill. (Staffer B) No, not rescue - protect. (Staffer C) That doesn't sound right - we have to complement Bill."

For Staffer A, Bill was in need of rescue presumably because he could not extricate himself or otherwise handle an awkward situation. This, in fact, was not true but the perception of Bill as not equipped to be tough in a tough situation emerged.

He was also seen as needing protection, this form a staffer who perceived Bill as a commodity - the candidate. Nevertheless, he sensed that Bill was less able to defend himself than was actually the case.

And, he was seen as needing to be complemented. This refinement came from a staffer who was respectful of Bill's academic achievements and was put-off by the condescension implied in the first two characterizations. Still, though, there was the suggestion that Bill was in
need of some other party to jump in and help him. In this latter case the emphasis was on perceiving this helping as a proper complement to Bill's style rather than an indictment of Bill as unable.

It should be kept in mind that while this incident was a single event, the author recognized similar feelings in a variety of others in the campaign. Not to mention the fact that this exchange, brief as it was, struck the author with great impact because it resonated with uncrystallized intuitions regarding the effects of Bill's style.

It became apparent in that moment the Bill evoked those feelings in others. His seeming disregard for himself was manifest in how he was putting in hour after hour on the campaign. His willingness to share the fact that he was tired but then continues despite the fatigue. And, more subtly, Bill, for all his cynicism, operated on the basis of a trust in people. Those around him came to sense these dynamics and especially felt this trust as a vulnerability - a part of Bill that was exposed. Indeed, they came to see that Bill took risks and due to a certain amount of self neglect, those around him rallied to provide him with protection.

Bill's campaign began in the last week of November and would continue through Till February 27th. His vision was to enlist many volunteers from within the community and create a campaign force that reflected the constituency of the area.
The first few weeks of the campaign were filled with optimism - Bill reported that he felt he was on a high. The day after he had received the endorsement of the Democratic Party he was inundated with congratulations. Many assumed that the endorsement of the Democrats was tantamount to election. The politically naive were offering their congratulations as if he had already won the election. Bill never became overly optimistic - it was not his style to chance disappointment by taking success for granted. He was, however, affected by the enthusiasm of those around him.

While Bill had been around politics, he himself had little practical knowledge of all that goes into a campaign organization. He choose aides who had experience in an Independent political campaign. He also had one or two experienced advisors but no one adequately took charge. He faced the situation of being an announced candidate without a clear idea of what to do next.

Perhaps it was his training as an academic and his attraction to ideas but Bill's first act was to purchase several copies of an Independent Councilman's book *How to Win an Election* and distributed these to his small staff. He was also seeking the council of politically savvy people within the university. Later, however, he would observe that he was getting lots of advice but had little notion of what in all of the information he was being offered was sound and what was not.

He bemoaned not having to decided to run earlier because now the campaign was upon him and he had little opportunity to organize and plan.
He had volunteers but some were ill-suited to the campaign slots that needed to be filled. Most of all Bill needed someone to take charge of the campaign. After the first two weeks had passed, the weight of the campaign began to be felt. Bill's sense of being at a loss was testimony to the premature quality of the elation that was felt earlier. The weight of dozens of decisions that needed to be made in the next few weeks began to be felt. Bill admitted that he had underestimated the amount of work involved in what he described as a "minor campaign."

Much had to be done in the early days of the campaign, rent, clean, set-up and staff an office, schedule campaign appearances, develop campaign literature, coordinate volunteers, raise money and develop the campaign staff itself. This is not an exhaustive list but it includes some of the major efforts that were on-going in the early days of the campaign. Bill was involved in many of these efforts directly while at the same time attempting to continue in his role as course instructor and chairman of his department. In the early days of the campaign he was involved in far too many of the details and quickly found himself anxious and tired.

Bill mentioned in a recording he made (1/12) that "the campaign is kicking the hell out of me." He reported consistent trouble with his sleep. His tendency was to go to sleep at 11 p.m. or so and wake up very early - about 4 a.m. and be unable to get back to sleep. He reported that while he was awake during those odd hours he would worry, "You get the feeling in this business time and time again that you've
tied yourself with the wrong people or you have offended a friend or something like this."

He also began experiencing stomach problems. Nora, Bill's wife, recalled he had similar trouble during work on his dissertation. The nature of the stomach problems was stress related and required that Bill take a muscle relaxant.

The combined effect of the demands of the campaign, the lost or troubled sleep and the medication often made Bill sleepy during the day. Bill's fatigue was readily apparent and occasioned some concern from those around him.

We can certainly entertain the notion that Bill's insomnia and stomach problems represent unexpressed feelings and that this tendency to somaticize emotion is a stable characteristic of Bill's. Bill described himself once to the author when this issue was raised directly as "low-key - high-drive."

The picture that Bill creates is that of a non-assuming achiever. The paradox this creates is resolved when we come to understand Bill's capacity to suppress feeling while pursuing a task. Moreover, we might consider the possibility that Bill does this quite naturally - that part of Bill's make-up is an acute sensitivity to the world outside himself paired with a tendency to suppress, deny and rationalize his internal experience.
That is not to say, however, that Bill ignores his feelings. That is too blunt a statement. Bill easily expresses positive feelings and readily acknowledges the discomfort he feels when anxious, depression or uncertain. His tendency however, is in the direction of denial at the time he is experiencing a conflict. When the conflict persists over a long enough period of time, Bill's body dramatizes how strongly he feels and how much he contains.

Ordinarily, Bill would not experience conflict for too long a time because he would spring into action and resolve the issue. The campaign presented him with a double dilemma that exacerbated his problems. First, and most importantly, the nature of some of the conflicts involved being at odds with people he felt close to. Bill felt this stress in running against Kaplan, "...she's an old friend and it's very difficult to run against an old friend." Bill could shrug off conflict with his opponent Jones, that was Jones "just trying to do his job - nothing personal." But, when conflict erupted within his own circle he felt quite a loss, "There were people involved in my campaign that were not particularly satisfied with my responses and I was criticized for it." At one month into the campaign Bill was feeling a tension that comes from his need to get along with people. In the campaign he was finding that there were some people that he just could not satisfy. There were other times when it seemed that whatever he did there were going to be some that would be offended. He could tolerate disapproval from the opposition but from those he depended upon for
support it was very difficult to feel the pressure of performance.

This is something that I need very much - a couple of personal campaign advisors that I can trust, that I can feel comfortable with, that don't challenge everything I say and that prove somewhat low-key and to work with me and say this is what you've got to do and this is why you have to do it.

In addition to the difficulty of being at odds with people, Bill found himself in a situation - the political campaign - that did not avail itself to a quick resolution of the conflicts he was experiencing. Normally, Bill would rely on his skill as an administrator to effect a compromise between himself and others but that was not the case in the "whose side are you on" dimension of a campaign for office.

It should be noted that Bill's remedy for himself was to not seek warm support or understanding of his feelings. He preferred to direct himself outward and focus clearly on the task. If the task were clearly outlined and his role defined, then Bill could endure the interpersonal turmoil (in his campaign) and the tension within himself.

Hard work would normally be the solution. But his situation was confounded by the fact that because his campaign organization was embryonic, Bill was never clear on what he should be doing. This was a difficult state for Bill because, when all was said and done, he would seek comfort in the knowledge that he had run well. Having tried hard resonates with his personality more deeply than winning. So, not knowing whether his efforts day to day were well-conceived was a weight he labored under. In his concession speech to his campaign workers he would focus on having run the good race. He began: "Everyone here has
a lot to be proud of. I was told at the beginning that if you did things correctly and worked your tail off, then that's all you could do." These factors combined in the early weeks of the campaign place Bill under considerable pressure.

Toward the end of January, 1979, a young attorney, Tom Smith entered the campaign and quickly assumed a great deal of responsibility. In an interview (1/30), Bill reflected on this development.

We were looking for somebody initially, to start out, lay out the strategy but nothing seemed to work out. So, we started doing it ourselves, including myself. It would have been very nice if somebody laid out a campaign and told us where to go, how to do this and what to do. But that didn't happen. Now I think the partial solution is Tom doing some organizing and coordination of this thing with Carol doing more of the day-to-day activities. I feel more confident. I get better feedback on my presentations.

By this time the campaign dominated Bill's daily activities. Most of his thoughts were related to the campaign. But, the increased organization within his campaign and the increased clarity of his role as the candidate afforded him a great deal of relief. Bill's narrowed focus is clear when later in the same interview the author attempted to steer Bill in the direction of reflecting on the support he was getting from the people around him. But, as the dialogue shows Bill interpreted the question in terms of the campaign, dusted off the notion of emotional support per se and went directly to the idea of support as coming from a sound structure.

Interviewer: Do you think you derive support from a situation that is well-defined.
Bill: Yeah. Yeah, that's good. I think so.
Interviewer: What about people though?

Bill: Well it's nice to get stroked and not have people hassle you. I think the situation is well-defined. Everybody knows what they are doing and are primarily in agreement, basic agreement. Things go along fairly smoothly - the roles are well defined and the goal is pretty obvious. I think we had more problems when we had less organization. The roles weren't clearly defined. There wasn't a clear definition of who was in charge. People were coming in and out of being in charge and emerging as leaders and then dropping back. Part of it was my own fault. There wasn't anybody there I felt comfortable with.

In addition to assuming responsibility within the campaign organization, Tom was also compatible with Bill. They shared a common temperament in that both possessed a quiet strength that relied more on persuasion than bombast. As Bill describes Tom and the gap he filled, part of himself is being underlined.

Some people I felt were incapable and others, if they were capable, I was afraid they didn't understand the circumstances. They either wanted it to become a very Regular Democratic campaign or they wanted it to be very Independent. This campaign is really more of a campaign that emphasizes unity rather than polarization. Bringing people together rather than trying to polarize. Now we had somebody who is capable of walking that tightrope and who's comfortable with the tightrope.

Once Tom had been in the campaign long enough to have an effect, a good deal of the campaign burden eased for Bill. He continued to suffer from disturbed sleep and some stomach distress but these difficulties were less frequent and less intense. "Tom Smith has been a big help. A lot of decisions that I would have made a month ago, he makes now." (2/7)

It is probably true in politics that more people vote against candidates than vote for candidates. Campaign tactics are often designed
around this dimension - striving to characterize the candidate's opponent as dishonest, inept, immoral or somehow representing a threat to the community. For example, the Monday night before the Johnson-Goldwater election in 1964, an ad was run showing a little girl plucking the petals off a daisy and as the last one was plucked the screen switched to a picture of an atomic explosion and the words "Vote for Johnson." The ad characterized a vote for Goldwater as a vote for nuclear destruction in an attempt to play on the public's notion of Goldwater as too hawkish.

There can be a seamy side to campaigns - a flow of misrepresentations, accusations and counter-accusations often creates an opening for name calling and personal attacks. This is related to the loyalties that are so strong within campaign organizations. Perceived attacks on a candidate are cause for consideration anger and fuel for righteous counter-attacks.

It is the nature then, of a political campaign to be adversarial and a bit like a crusade. It forges a them-and-us mentality. Consequently, there is a natural paranoia that develops within each camp. The author experienced this directly.

The author fashioned his involvement in Bill's campaign to be that of an observer, carefully avoiding the role of campaign worker. For this reason, the author was perceived by some in the campaign as an outsider whose loyalty to Bill had not been demonstrated. Once more, it was known that the author occasionally spoke with Ronald Jones and
had known him for some years prior to the campaign. One evening the author was approached by a major campaign staffer and asked directly if he were passing information to Jones' campaign. To this staffer's credit she was direct and honest in her concern. Yet, it was quite striking that a person like this — a very intelligent and responsible woman — would be so taken up in the campaign that the author's behavior and presence began, in her mind, to smack of double-agentry.

Despite this one event, which reflects the power of a political campaign, the campaign was remarkably free from underhanded tactics. There was a flurry of incidents the two or three days prior to the election. The Independents alleged that their workers were being threatened and intimated. These incidents, if they occurred at all, were attributed to Democratic workers and not to any member of Bill's organization.

Both Bill and Jones were academics and not given by training to the role of adversary though Jones, as the anti-machine Independent, was more at home with the position of fighting against a perceived evil. Bill, quite clearly, was somewhat out of his element. In the interview (1/29) Bill responded to the author's attention to both his relationship with Jones and the degree of tension in debate situations as a measure of his comfort with conflict.

**Bill:** ...the question of strategy. There are some people in the camp that say I should attack him. There are others that say I should ignore him. Don't stoop to his level.
**Interviewer:** Do they perceive you as being attacked?
**Bill:** Yes.
Bill: Well, I think most of the people think that he is trying to label me as a party hack and stuff like that. I am not sure which is which, or which to follow. We will have to see. I tend not to be an attacker.

Bill certainly was not "an attacker." In the 250 hours of contact throughout the campaign the author cannot recall a single incident that could be described as Bill "attacking" Jones. For the most part, Bill adopted a policy of not mentioning him and restrained his campaign discussions to his own record in the community and pressing issues such as housing and crime. A single sentence completion item stands out in support of this part of Bill - Fighting...bothers me (Item #44, test #2).

Extending this element in Bill's style a step further to how other's react to Bill's aversion to conflict, an incident involving his wife, Nora, illuminates this relevance. Following the publication of some of Jones campaign literature wherein Bill was characterized as the Committeeman's puppet, the issue of Bill's reaction was raised in an interview.

Bill: I would have to say that that's politics and just dust it off. I find I'm reading less and sort of skim and really don't take things to heart as much as I did at the beginning of the campaign. I've been too busy trying to put our forces together to worry about the opposition.

Interviewer: Nora (Bill's wife) seems more reactive to the criticism of you than you do.

Bill: Yeah. She attacks every once in a while. I have a tendency to let it slip past and not retaliate I guess. I don't know if that's good or bad but it's my style.

Interviewer: Nora picks up the slack some times.

Bill: She doesn't make public statements - she thinks I should make public statements attacking Jones. It's just not my style.

Others, feeling protective of Bill given his unwillingness to aggressively challenge mischaracterizations, at times lobbied for more
confrontation in the campaign. In the end, however, the campaign Bill conducted was low-key and not combative, i.e., he was not running against his opponent as much as he was campaigning for his programs.

Bill had built his reputation in the community on his dedication and his willingness to work with people toward a goal. The nature of political campaigns calls for both a positive campaign focused on programs and a negative campaign devoted to the opponent's political weaknesses. Bill wanted to avoid the acrimony and divisiveness and so fashioned a campaign that attended to only half of the political realities in the community in 1979.

The major part of the campaign took place during the worst winter weather in the area's history. It occasioned nightmarish transportation problems that were compounded by an inadequate effort at snow removal. The citizenry was enraged and the target for their frustrations was the incumbent Democratic Mayor and his administration.

By the time election day arrived the voters of the city were furious and opted for his opponent to register their protest. The challenger's campaign, which at its inception was considered more of a nuisance than a real political threat, had cashed in on the city's frustration and fashioned a political upset.

In the final weeks of the campaign, the voting public seemed to be of one mind - to vote against the incompetence represented by the
Mayor and the Regular Democratic Party. Bill was associated in the voters' mind with the Democrats and Jones was associated with the "anti-machine" challenger.

In the aftermath of the election, it would seem clear that voter turn-out was increased by the frustration experienced during the blizzard and that the protest vote against the Mayor carried Jones to victory over Bill.

Bill, perceived as Bragg's candidate or a Regular Democrat, saw his campaign ideas and efforts all but eclipsed by events that were out of his control.

Few people were predicting a mayoral upset and Bill, himself, though he was aware of the voter dissatisfaction, underestimated the strength of that frustration.

In an interview recorded one week before the campaign Bill referred to the voters as "blase" and estimated the voter turnout at approximately 40% figure. Perhaps a more careful sounding of the public would have revealed the depth of the voter's displeasure but no one could have predicted that after weeks of heavy snows and sub-zero temperatures election day would be sunny with temperatures in the upper thirties.

The snows were still several feet deep and at each intersection candidate's posters were sticking out of the snow piles. The busy
street corner, one block from Bill's home, seemed to be a small forest with seventeen posters on that corner alone.

Bill left home at 6:15 am and began a long day of handshaking. Bill greeted dozens of people and while everything but the election was discussed in the small talk that went on, the only question being asked was, "Are you going to vote for me?" and each person answered. The code was a simple one. Those who looked Bill in the eye, took his literature or smiled were signaling their yes vote. Those who did not look Bill in the eye and manifested some uneasiness in his presence were equally clear.

Bill had insulated himself against the possibility of losing and perhaps winning. In an interview the day before (2/26) Bill described himself as, "Too tired to be excited." Bill also hedged against the impact of the election by playing down the results. He would reflect on the limitations of the office and the tedium of campaigning to modulate his thoughts of winning. To cushion the thoughts of losing, he would note that he had a career at the university that offered him plenty of opportunity. At one point the author during an interview put the question to Bill directly:

**Interviewer:** Have you been thinking about winning? And, of course, have you been thinking about losing?

**Bill:** I guess I haven't thought much about either one.

- and a bit later:

**Bill:** I really don't have any personal feelings about losing - negative feelings. If I lose, I lose. And, that's it. I think one of the reason's for it is that I have a career here. If I lose the election there's no disaster involved. We've lost the election. I've got plenty of things to do. The only regret I
would have about losing is that people worked so long and hard for me.

Bill consistently shifted the focus away from himself and his feelings for himself and his situation to his warm feelings for those who worked for him.

Bill would go to many of the precincts that day and drop in at the polling places, saying hello to campaign workers and judges, checking on the pace of the voter turnout.

In one precinct Bill and the author were confronted by an aggressive poll watcher who vigorously challenged Bill's right to be in the polling place. There was a small scene involving the police officer on duty asking Bill to leave unless he could produce the proper polling credentials. This confrontation was contrary to Bill's style and unpleasant for him. Not long after this incident Bill suspended his polling place visits, went to his campaign headquarters and, in the midst of all the activity at the headquarters, found a comfortable chair in the back and fell asleep for about an hour.

Two years later, in a follow-up interview, the author inquired about many of the campaign events of which the one just described was fairly brief and minor. Bill, however, remembered it vividly and could even recall the poll watcher's name.

It seems clear that, while Bill managed to exude a tranquil, even manner, this event and ones similar troubled him.
By 3:30 pm there were indications that the overall voter turnout would be very heavy and also that those voters who had indicated that they would vote for Bill were not turning out heavily. The anxiety level in the headquarters varied from person-to-person. Nora, Bill's wife, who had kept the campaign at an arm's distance, was watching television. And, though, some early estimates were being written on a tally sheet, she did not concern herself with them. Nora had been ambivalent about Bill's candidacy from the outset and though she supported him, she was not enamored of the politician's life and was little interested in becoming a politician's wife.

Other member's of the campaign were more agitated. They were busy making phone calls and there was little happy-talk due to the unsettling early results.

As 6 pm arrived and the polls closed, Bill, Phil, who was a campaign aide and a friend, and the author were standing at a corner not far from Bill's home. Phil checked his watch, announced that the campaign was over and offered Bill his congratulations. Bill accepted the handshake but made the congratulations conditional. He suggested we walk to his home where we could check the television station's projections while he cleaned up in preparation for his arrival at his campaign headquarters and the party afterwards.

Seconds after the television came on channel 2 began their review of the elections. There were a few comments about some other races
but as the report got closer to Bill's race we waited quietly. The results were on the screen - the two names: Jones - 55% - Thompson - 45%. There was a check next to Jones name indicating that he was the projected winner. It was unexpected. Bill's reaction was only a single phrase. Bill: "Shit. That's not even close."

There was silence during the remaining results and then a phone call from headquarters asking that Bill come over. Bill went to change while Phil and the author sat somewhat stunned that Bill had lost.

The campaign headquarters was a somber place with no one speaking loudly. A phone would ring bringing news of a precinct and the entire room would fall silent. Whoever answered the phone called the results to a worker who recorded them on the wall where everyone could see them. As the totals came in each worker performed some quick arithmetic determining how many votes would be needed in each remaining precinct in order for Bill to win. As each call came in the number needed rose and slowly the final result was becoming harder and harder to deny. Campaign workers exchanged pained glances.

Bill arrived to cheers and applause that quickly subsided. The room was crowded with campaign workers many of whom were glancing at Bill, waiting for his lead. Finally, Bill addressed the group. His voice was strong. There was no quiver. He was well within himself. It was in moments such as these that Bill's stoicism was a strength. He told the workers that they had a lot to be proud of. He said that he remembered that at the beginning he was told that, "if you did
things correctly and worked your tail off, then that's all you could do." He also mentioned that he felt that they got caught in a backlash, a reference to the mayoral campaign, and that there were influences at work over which they had no control. A worker shouted, "We think your one in a million," a line from a newspaper endorsement that the campaign adopted, and Bill called back, "I think you're one in ten million."

There was a great deal of warm feeling for Bill and a concern that he and his family feel the support of their friends rather than the rejection in the election results.

The group broke up to gather at the Women's Club for the post election party. On the way to the cars, Phil asked Bill if he intended to go to Jones' headquarters and congratulate him. Bill said, "No, they only do that in the movies." Bill went to the Regular Democratic office and then to the party.

The final local totals revealed that Bill had lost to Jones by 714 votes while the incumbent mayor lost by 3162. Bill had been caught in a backlash and his candidacy was clouded by other issues. A newspaper's February 16th endorsement began with this issue clearly framed. "This closely matched race may be a test of whether the labels 'independent' and 'regular' carry more weight than the candidates themselves."

There were reasons for strong feelings - disappointment and frustration. But, in this final action of the campaign event Bill played his long suit and relied on his self-control. By remaining
a bit removed from the emotional turbulence, he got the job done - he "did things correctly and he worked his tail off." He maneuvered around conflict and melodrama like a harbor pilot and in the end found himself surrounded by friends at the post election party.
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