

A New Agenda ... Values, World Society, Modelling

<https://sites.google.com/site/gordonburmathsocsci/home/a-new-agenda>

A New Agenda seeks to explore all aspects of society using all the academic disciplines paying special attention to values ... with special interest in modelling ... not disinterested in practice ... and aspiring to high academic standards.

Commentary, March 2017

No. 39

Your abstract please! ... Oxford ... Kenneth Arrow (1921-2017)

1 Peace and Conflict, Oxford, September 2017	1
2 A taster: a few of the panels at the conference Civil resistance, violent conflict and post-conflict reconstruction Interventions for Protecting Civilians in Armed Conflict Political Dimensions of Peacekeeping and Domestic Security	3
3 Practice: a call	4
4 A proposal and a call, (i): An interdisciplinary set of panels: Economics and society Geography and society Psychology and society Philosophy and society Sociology and society	4
5 A proposal and a call, (ii): <i>Values, World Society and Modelling</i>	5
6 A proposal and a call, (iii): Trump: what are the implications for peace and conflict in the USA and in the world?	6
7 Trump? – a truth-seeking and non-partisan view?	6
8 Kenneth Arrow (1921-2017) ... and other Nobel Prize economists	10
9 Psychology and society	12

1 Peace and Conflict, Oxford, September 2017

Conflict Research Society (CRS) annual conference
Host: *Changing Character of War Programme*,
Pembroke College, Oxford University.

September 18th and 19th, 2017, Monday and Tuesday

CRS 2017

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/ourevents/crs-conference-oxford-2017/>

submit paper abstract

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-paper/>

submit panel

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-panel/>

The annual conference of the Conflict Research Society (CRS) will be hosted by the Changing Character of War programme at Pembroke College, University of Oxford on 18-19 September, 2017. We invite you to submit panel and individual paper proposals that bridge theory, empirics and practice in peace and conflict research. The conference theme is Ending Violence In Turbulent Times. We are, therefore, particularly keen to invite submissions that discuss the mechanisms underlying the onset, continuation and resolution of all forms of violence, from interpersonal, to criminal, to large-scale organised war. The conference seeks to generate debate and relationships between scholars and practitioners interested in key issues surrounding the dynamics of violent political conflict, dialogue, diplomacy and peacebuilding. The conference will continue its tradition of multi-disciplinary focus and is open to the full range of quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches to the subject.

The CRS is a multidisciplinary organisation of peace and conflict researchers and practitioners. The annual conference provides an opportunity for those involved in peace and conflict studies to present cutting edge research and to interact with those involved in conflict resolution, peacemaking and peacebuilding activities in the field. Each year the conference attracts around 100 academics and practitioners from the UK, Europe and further afield.

The Changing Character of War Programme (CCW) is devoted to the interdisciplinary study of war and armed conflict. It is a successful, policy-relevant research programme based in Pembroke College, University of Oxford, and enjoying global influence and international partnerships. Directed by Dr Robert Johnson and Dr Annette Idler, with a Programme Committee chaired by Professor Dominic Johnson and a large number of Research Associates, CCW is unique in its delivery of high-quality, high-impact research, combined with practice, policy and advisory engagement. The CRS is delighted to be working with CCW on this year's conference.

The Keynote speakers and winner of the Conflict Research Society Book Prize will be announced in the new year. In recent years the book prize winners have included Steven Pinker for *The Better Angels of Our Nature*, Kathleen Cunningham for *Inside the Politics of Self-Determination*, Joshua Goldstein for *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide*, Kevin Avruch for *Context and Pretext in Conflict Resolution* and Kristin M. Bakke for *Decentralisation and Intrastate Struggles: Chechnya, Punjab, and Québec*.

We will be emailing you more details on the keynote events shortly, but for now we would like you to make a note of the date in your diaries and submit your proposals.

Individual and panel proposals should be submitted online by March 17, 2017. Panel Proposals should include a title, abstract (less than 200 words) and a list of four papers. Individual paper proposals should likewise include a title and abstract. Looking forward to seeing you in 18-19 September, 2017 for another great conference!

2 A taster: a few of the panels at the conference

Panel: Civil resistance, violent conflict and post-conflict reconstruction

Sir Adam Roberts

Emeritus Professor of International Relations, Oxford

<http://www.politics.ox.ac.uk/associates/adam-roberts.html>

Richard Caplan

Professor of International Relations, Oxford

<http://www.politics.ox.ac.uk/academic-faculty/richard-caplan.html>

Anke Hoeffler

Research Officer, Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University

<http://www.economics.ox.ac.uk/Academic/anke-hoeffler>

Panel: Interventions for Protecting Civilians in Armed Conflict

Chair: Corinne Bara

Discussant: Hannah Smidt & Hannah Dönges

Panel abstract

While protection of civilians has become the core task of contemporary UN peace operations, it is one of most challenging tasks to achieve. Successful protection requires not only military power, but also various forms of interventions to influence the behavior of armed actors and a profound understanding of the conflict context. This panel explores different types of interventions for protecting civilians in civil wars. It adds an innovative perspective by moving away from a purely military perspective, analyzing forms of soft power and their effect towards protection of civilians. It furthermore contributes by proposing a number of conditioning factors relating to the types of actors that carry out violence against civilians that may enable or hinder successful protection. The panel combines qualitative and quantitative research methods. By mixing various methodological traditions, the panel offers an opportunity for a fruitful discussion of the topic from different perspectives.

Papers

1. Sabine Otto “Protecting Civilians: The Role of Pro-Government Militias during UN Peace Operations”
2. Jessica di Salvatore “Radio for Peace: Can UN Broadcasting Prevent Violence against Civilians?”
3. Hannah Dönges “Peacekeeping and Protection of Civilians in South Sudan”
4. Allard Duursma “Obstruction and Intimidation of Peacekeepers: How Armed Actors Undermine Civilian Protection Efforts”
5. Lisa Hultman (with Angela Muvumba Sellström) “International Intervention and Insurgents: Prevention and Persuasion against Atrocity”

Panel: Political Dimensions of Peacekeeping and Domestic Security

Chair: Sabine Otto

Discussant: Lisa Hultman & Sabine Otto

Panel abstract

The effectiveness of peacekeeping is traditionally evaluated with respect to its direct impact on the conflict and on violence directly related to it. However, contemporary peacekeeping operations have a number of mandated tasks that go beyond maintaining ceasefires or monitoring the implementation of peace agreements. Peacekeeping is also a political intervention that may have effects on a number of political outcomes. This panel contributes to the growing literature that examines the impact of peacekeeping on a broader set of outcomes. First, it focuses on the political activities by the peacekeeping operations themselves and their effects on politics and political violence. Second, the panel analyzes how and to what extent peacekeepers establish a secure environment for the civilian population, free from other forms of collective violence, that allows for peaceful elections and the return of refugees.

Papers

1. Corinne Bara “The Impact of Peace Operations on Collective Violence in the Postwar Period”
2. Stefano Costalli & Andrea Ruggeri “Peace at Home? UN Peacekeeping Operations, Refugees and Returned Refugees”
3. Hannah Smidt “Making Electoral Peace: How Peacekeeping Activities Influence Electoral Violence”
4. Govinda Clayton & Han Dorussen “The Political Side of Peacekeeping”

3 Practice: a call

If you would like to present a paper on practice, please go to:

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-paper/>

It is the blend of theory, research and practice that makes the CRS conference quite special.

4 A proposal and a call, (i): An interdisciplinary set of panels

If you would like to present a paper in any of the following areas, please go to:

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-paper/>

The aim of these panels will be to look at society from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Not always relating explicitly to peace and conflict, nevertheless the disciplines provide the conceptual framework on which the study of peace and conflict is based.

Economics and society

Geography and society
Psychology and society
Philosophy and society
Sociology and society

Economics and society

See for example, section 7 below.

Geography and society

See for example:

Steve Pickering. *Understanding geography and war. Misperceptions, foundations and prospects*. London: Palgrave. 2016.

<http://www.palgrave.com/us/book/9781137522160>

Psychology and society

See for example, section 8 below.

Philosophy and society

See for example:

Dennis Bury has drawn my attention to the emerging field of "Intellectual Humility":

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/ppls/philosophy/research/impact-and-outreach/free-online-courses/intellectual-humility>

Sociology and society

5 A proposal and a call, (ii):

Values, World Society and Modelling

If you would like to present a paper on this topic, please go to:

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-paper/>

This topic is my own special interest – here is my abstract for the conference:

Values, World Society and Modelling – the fourth Yearbook

‘World Society’ was a book written by John Burton, founder of the Conflict Research Society. Values were evident in his challenge to power politics and his attention to ‘basic human needs’. Modelling was advocated by Michael Nicholson, founding director of the Richardson Institute of Conflict Studies. Adopting the perspective of these two scholars, the yearbooks comment on contemporary world events. The first two yearbooks (2014 and 2015) contained chapters by Kevin Avruch and Kevin Clements on the work of John Burton. The yearbooks contain a strong emphasis on modelling deriving from Gordon Burt’s book on mathematical social science. The 2015 Yearbook in particular focuses on the foundational notions of space and time and how social aspects vary over space and time. Particular attention is given to value spaces. The 2016 Yearbook will include: Shakespeare 1616-2016, a detailed analysis of world religion, intervention, Ireland 1801-1916-2016 and the US presidential elections. The (fourth) 2017 Yearbook will – inter alia - address the following questions:

How do Trump, Xi Jinping and Burton relate to psychology of individuals?; tensions within society?; politics?; world economy?; military tensions throughout the world?; cultures and ideologies?

6 A proposal and a call, (iii):

Trump: what are the implications for peace and conflict in the USA and in the world?

If you would like to present a paper on this topic, please go to:

<http://conflictresearchsociety.org/submit-a-paper/>

How does Trump relate to ...

... the psychology of individuals?

... tensions within US society? ... tensions in the UK, in Europe and elsewhere?

... US politics? ... domestic politics in the UK, in Europe and elsewhere?

... the US economy? ... the world economy?

... military tensions throughout the world?

... cultures and ideologies within US society? ... in the UK, in Europe and elsewhere?

... experts, public and us – our understanding of the world?

7 Trump? – a truth-seeking and non-partisan view?

Metropolitan/establishment/Enlightenment v. others

Diversity of discourses ... polarisation ... truth-seeking and non-partisan

Trump – the null hypothesis: no significant difference

Unclear historical precedent

Social significance is elsewhere

Anti-Brexit, anti-Trump can be criticised ...

... the mirror criticisms of Brexit and Trump

The final incidence of different options

Metropolitan/establishment/Enlightenment v. others

In the last few years there have been several conflicts between X and a variety of opponents, X being metropolitan*/establishment/Enlightenment.

*geography is a factor.

X v. UK as a Christian country Chapter 6 in my 2014 Yearbook

X (UK) v. Scottish independence Chapter 10 in 2014 Yearbook

<http://www.cambridgescholars.com/values-world-society-and-modelling-yearbook-2014>

X (Charlie Hebdo) v. the Muslim killers Chapter 4 in my 2015 Yearbook

X (same-sex marriage) v. status quo, Ireland Chapter 8 in my 2015 Yearbook

<https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbXnb3Jkb25idXJ0bWF0aHNvY3NjaXxneDo3ZTFiNzZlNTU4YWUz> .

X v. Brexit Chapter 8 in my 2016 Yearbook

X (Clinton) v. Trump Chapter 9 in my 2016 Yearbook
<https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnxnb3Jkb25idXJ0bWF0aHNvY3NjaXxneDo3ZDk2ZjNjMDI2MzNhNTFl>

X (Macron) v. le Pen, France, presidential election

[Macron followed his meeting at Downing Street with an address on Tuesday night to more than 2,000 French expat at central hall in Westminster. He reiterated his call for nationals to return home and British banks, researchers and academics to move across the Channel after Britain leaves the [European Union](#).

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/feb/21/emmanuel-macron-vows-aggressive-fight-against-far-right-on-uk-visit>

<https://www.ft.com/content/6fecf850-f85b-11e6-9516-2d969e0d3b65>

Over 200,000 French people live in London, making it the 'sixth largest French city' - 300,000 French people live in the UK in total.

Kidd, Patrick. "Crowds hope Gallic messiah will be mightier than le Pen." *The Times*, February 22, 2017: 10.]

Diversity of discourses ... polarisation ... truth-seeking and non-partisan

As is discussed in the above sources, society contains a great diversity of discourses and genres of discourse regarding any given topic. This diversity becomes particularly apparent when the topic acquires salience, for example when conflict breaks out. Even when the conflict appears to be between just two sides, diversity can still be identified.

Views about Trump are polarised ... indeed are becoming increasingly polarised.

<http://www.people-press.org/2017/02/16/in-first-month-views-of-trump-are-already-strongly-felt-deeply-polarized/>;

<http://static.politico.com/39/51/79db278d40d1a48e50747d74b48a/170217-fox-news-media-poll.pdf>.

This may make it difficult for people to make true statements about Trump because there will be a tendency to allow one's statements to be coloured by one's general opinion of Trump.

Certain groups of people in society put forward claims that their statements are more objective, or at least less detached or less coloured. Academics claim detached truth; and third parties claim balanced truth. Experts and media likewise.

In the Conflict Research Society we aspire to seek the truth and to be non-partisan. Council meetings over the years have considered specific cases and the decisions have always reinforced that aspiration. In our present group I suspect that there are strong commitments either for or against Trump. So special efforts may need to be made to satisfy this particular aspiration. Here I seek to chart the ingredients of a detached position in relation to Trump and also some of the arguments used by Brexit/Trump.

Trump – the null hypothesis: no significant difference

The null hypothesis is the standard benchmark in experimental psychology. The hypothesis is that there is no significant difference between the object being examined and some baseline object. Applied to Trump, the null hypothesis takes the form:

There is no significant difference between Trump and A ...
... A being Obama; or other presidents; other incoming presidents; other republican presidents; other sexual-misconduct presidents.

The constraints of reality mean that policies will not change hugely.

Where change occurs it will not be unprecedented: as before a Republican favours business and military and nationalism and accuses the media and academia of bias and lack of patriotism.

Unclear historical precedent

Some comment that ‘they said Hitler wouldn’t be any different but look what happened’. However there are usually both false positives and false negatives available in any appeal to historical precedent.

Boris Johnson of course used a rather different historical precedent: ‘He’s not Hitler – he’s the elected president.’

Diverse and opposing historical precedents have been used in arguments relating to intervention, for example in Libya – and regarding the Arab Spring in general.

Social significance is elsewhere

Trump, for or against, is irrelevant to fundamental social aspects such as robots taking jobs, globalisation, global warming.

Anti-Brexit, anti-Trump can be criticised ...

The establishment has neglected sections of the population.

Media was/is biased.

Polls were wrong.

Warnings of terrible consequences were wrong.

Complaints about the election in the aftermath of losing it.

Attempts to reverse the democratic decision.

‘Dom’. “Elite pollsters are at it again.” January 7, 2017.

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/where-stands-public-opinion-on-brexit-six-months-on/#comment-1240>

Aldrick, Philip. “Bank chief says Brexit won’t damage short-term growth.” *The Times*, February 22, 2017: 11. [Andy Haldane, Bank of England’s Chief Economist]

Finkelstein, Daniel. “It’s time Brexit deniers faced up to reality. Whatever changes the House of Lords makes to the Article 50 bill, it’s delusional to think the referendum can be reversed.” *The Times*, February 22, 2017: 25.

Table 1 Percent of US voters who have Trust in four institutions

	NGOs	Media	Government	Business
Clinton voters, pre-election	62	57	57	50
Clinton voters, post-election	60	51	46	45
Trump voters, pre-election	42	21	25	50
Trump voters, post-election	47	15	26	60

Burrell, Ian. “Mainstream media must counter fake news.” *The Times, Future of media and entertainment*, February 22, 2017: 6.

Edelman Trust Barometer

<https://www.slideshare.net/EdelmanInsights/2017-edelman-trust-barometer-trust-and-the-us-presidential-election?ref=http://www.edelman.com/trust2017/trust-and-us-presidential-election/>
<http://www.edelman.com/trust2017/trust-and-us-presidential-election/>
<http://www.edelman.com/trust2017/>
<http://www.edelman.com/executive-summary/>

... the mirror criticisms of Brexit and Trump

[to be developed]

The final incidence of different options

[to be developed]

References

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-39042884> macron

Curtice, John. *What UK thinks*. February 21, 2017

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/is-brexit-causing-voters-to-switch-parties/>

Curtice, John. *What UK thinks*. February 16, 2017

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/is-labours-brexit-dilemma-being-misunderstood/>

John Curtice is Senior Research Fellow at NatCen, Professor of Politics at Strathclyde University, and Chief Commentator on the What UK Thinks: EU website.

What UK thinks.

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/is-brexit-causing-voters-to-switch-parties/>

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/>

<http://natcen.ac.uk/>

<http://ukandeu.ac.uk/>

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/comment-analysis/>

<http://whatukthinks.org/eu/comment-analysis/comment/>

Whipple, Tom. “Rambling on may be a sign of dementia.” *The Times*, February 21, 2017: 19: “Towards the end of his presidency, Ronald Reagan’s press conferences became more rambling.”

<https://aaas.confex.com/aaas/2017/webprogram/Paper18786.html>

8 Kenneth Arrow (1921-2017) ... and other Nobel Prize economists

“Lawrence H. Summers remembers his uncle, Nobel Prize-winning economist Kenneth Arrow

Farewell to Kenneth Arrow, a Gentle Genius of Economics

My mother’s brother, the Nobel economist Kenneth Arrow, [died this week](#) at the age of 95. He was a dear man and a hero to me and many others. No one else I have ever known so embodied the scholarly life well lived.

I remember like yesterday the moment when Kenneth won the Nobel Prize in 1972. Paul Samuelson—another Nobel economist and, as it happens, also my uncle—hosted a party in his honor, to which I, then a sophomore at MIT, was invited. It was a festive if slightly nerdy occasion.

As the night wore on, Paul and Kenneth were standing in a corner discussing various theorems in mathematical economics. People started leaving. Paul’s wife was looking impatient. Kenneth’s wife, my aunt Selma, put her coat on, buttoned it and started pacing at the door. Kenneth raised something known as the maximum principle and the writings of the Russian mathematician Pontryagin. Paul began a story about the great British mathematical economist and philosopher Frank Ramsey. My ride depended on this conversation ending, so I watched alertly without understanding a word ...”

Wall Street Journal, February 25, 2017

<http://larrysummers.com/2017/02/25/farewell-to-kenneth-arrow-a-gentle-genius-of-economics/>

See also: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kenneth_Arrow

Kenneth Arrow’s General Impossibility Theorem

Back in the 1990s the Conflict Research Society would occasionally hold summer evening meetings. Usually there were just a handful of people sitting round a table in a small tutorial room in Cedric Smith’s department in UCL. Michael Nicholson was explaining to us about Kenneth Arrow’s General Impossibility Theorem: in general, democracy is impossible.

Three people have to decide between three options. If one of the people is the dictator then the dictator simply dictates that his preferred option is what will be chosen. Democracy provides an alternative method of choosing. This method will consist of a majority vote between each pair of options and the option which defeats all the other options will be the option which is chosen.

In most situations this democratic method works well.

However consider the situation where the people have the following preferences:

person A prefers X to Y to Z
person B prefers Z to X to Y
person C prefers Y to Z to X

Voting between X and Y, X wins by 2 votes to 1.

Voting between Y and Z, Y wins by 2 votes to 1.

However ...

Voting between X and Z, Z wins by 2 votes to 1.

In other words there is a 'voting cycle'. This is a situation where the democratic method is unable to generate a unique choice. So, in general, democracy is impossible in all situations.

The conditions for an equilibrium

One might say that the voting cycle indicates a lack of equilibrium in the political system. And it was for his work on the conditions for an equilibrium in an economic system – the market economy - that Kenneth Arrow received his Nobel Prize for Economics. See below.

Those of us working in peace and conflict research are interested in the conditions for equilibrium in social interaction systems. This is the province of game theory. And so we now introduce John Nash ... it was for his work on the conditions for an equilibrium in a social interaction system that John Nash received his Nobel Prize for Economics.

Perhaps too we can mention Walter Isard. We know him as the founder of peace science but he was also the founder of regional economics. In a sense we can think of his work as concerning the conditions for an equilibrium in a geographically interacting system.

“General equilibrium theory[[edit](#)]

Main articles: [General equilibrium theory](#) and [Arrow–Debreu model](#)

Work by Arrow and [Gérard Debreu](#) and simultaneous work by [Lionel](#)

[McKenzie](#) offered the first [rigorous proofs of the existence of a market clearing equilibrium](#).^[18]

For this work and his other contributions, Debreu won the 1983 Nobel Prize in Economics.^[19]

Arrow went on to extend the model and its analysis to include [uncertainty](#), the [stability](#). His contributions to the general equilibrium theory were strongly influenced by [Adam Smith](#)'s *[Wealth of Nations](#)*.^[citation needed]

Written in 1776, *The Wealth of Nations* is an examination of [economic growth](#) brought forward by the division of labor, by ensuring interdependence of individuals within society.^[20]

In 1974, The American Economic Association published the paper written by Kenneth Arrow, *General Economic Equilibrium: Purpose, Analytic Techniques, Collective Choice*, where he states:

“From the time of Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* in 1776, one recurrent theme of economic analysis has been the remarkable degree of coherence among the vast numbers of individual and seemingly separate decisions about the buying and selling of commodities. In everyday, normal experience, there is something of a balance between the amounts of goods and services that some individuals want to supply and the amounts that other, different individuals want to sell. Would-be buyers ordinarily count correctly on being able to carry out their intentions, and would-be sellers do not ordinarily find themselves producing great amounts of goods that they cannot sell. This experience of balance indeed so widespread that it raises no intellectual disquiet among laymen; they take it so much for granted that they are not supposed to understand the mechanism by which it occurs.”^[21]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kenneth_Arrow

9 Psychology and society

See the first issue (February) of *Psychology, Society and Modelling*:

<https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbmxb3Jkb25idXJ0bWF0aHNvY3NjaXxneDoyNDk1YmUxZmQ2Y2ZhOWIw>

Here are a few subsequent items in brief.

Political psychology:

<https://www.kent.ac.uk/courses/postgraduate/1206/political-psychology#!overview>

Rhodes, Ella and Jon Sutton. “Psychologists and Donald Trump.” *The Psychologist*, March 2017

https://app.thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/editions/com.thebritishpsychologicalsociety.thepsychologist.issue.edition_0317a/data/15965/index.html

Alex Haslam:

[*The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power*](#)

(Psychology Press, 2011; co-authored with Steve Reicher and Michael Platow)

[*The Social Cure: Identity, Health and Well-being*](#)

(Psychology Press, 2011; co-edited with Jolanda Jetten and Catherine Haslam).

Bennett, Rosemary. “Life changes you, 60-year study finds.” *The Times*, February 21, 2017: 1-2.

Harris, Matthew, Caroline Brett, Wendy Johnson and Ian Deary. “Personality stability from age 14 to 77 years.” *Psychology and Aging*, 31, 8, 862-874.

[http://www.research.ed.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/personality-stability-from-age-14-to-age-77-years\(570f260c-8fa6-4bab-892f-0a0657e573fa\).html](http://www.research.ed.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/personality-stability-from-age-14-to-age-77-years(570f260c-8fa6-4bab-892f-0a0657e573fa).html)

There is evidence for differential stability in personality trait differences, even over decades. We used data from a sample of the Scottish Mental Survey 1947 to study personality stability from childhood to older age. The 6-Day Sample (N = 1,208) were rated on six personality characteristics by their teachers at around age 14. In 2012, we traced as many of these participants as possible and invited them to take part in a follow-up study. Those who agreed (N = 174) completed a questionnaire booklet at age 77 years, which included rating themselves and asking someone who knew them well to rate them on the same six characteristics on which they were rated in adolescence. Each set of six ratings was reduced to the same single underlying factor,

denoted dependability, a trait comparable to conscientiousness. Participants' and others' older-age personality characteristic ratings were moderately correlated with each other, and with other measures of personality and wellbeing, but correlations suggested no significant stability of any of the six characteristics or their underlying factor, dependability, over the 63-year interval. However, a more complex model, controlling rater effects, indicated significant 63-year stability of one personality characteristic, Stability of Moods, and near-significant stability of another, Conscientiousness. Our results suggest that lifelong differential stability of personality is generally quite low, but that some aspects of personality in older age may relate to personality in childhood.

Hitler's personality

Ian Kershaw wrote an authoritative biography of Hitler.

Kershaw, Ian. *Hitler. 1889-1936: Hubris*. London: Allen Lane, 1998.

Kershaw, Ian. *Hitler. 1936-45: Nemesis*. London: Allen Lane, 2000.

I have looked up the index of both volumes – '2' indicates an item which also appears in Index 2; and ['2'] indicates an item which also appears in Index 2.

Index 1, 817

acting ability, arrogance, aversion to alcohol, cleanliness fetish, [charm2], courage2, detachment, egocentrism, egomania2, [exploitation of others2], fantasist, hesitancy, [hubris2], hypersensitive to personal criticism, [hypochondria2], idleness, inaccessibility, intelligence, lack of regular working pattern, love of music, manipulating, [megalomania2], obsession with the grandiose, opinionated, opportunism, personality shaped by Vienna and first world war, [preoccupation with his own mortality2], prima-donna histrionics, problems with personal relationships, [profound contempt for human existence2], prudishness, rages2, restlessness2, secretiveness2, self-confidence2, [self-glorification2], [sense of political mission2], sexuality, [skilled dissembler2], stubbornness, suicidal tendencies, uncertainty, Valhalla mentality, vegetarianism2, wit

Index 2, 1095

charm, courage, egomania, exploitation of others, hubris, hypochondria, megalomania, preoccupation with his own mortality, profound contempt for human existence, rages, restlessness, secretiveness, self-confidence, self-glorification, sense of political mission, skilled dissembler, Valhalla mentality, vegetarianism