

妻子买花了。”如果对方做了一件自私或烦人的事情,便认为是对方的人格缺陷造成的:“她冲我大吼是因为她是个泼妇。”弗兰克没有说黛伯拉追着要和他说话,他很生气,他没有说由于自己没有和黛伯拉说话,才令她心情沮丧;他称她是个疯狂的人。黛伯拉没有说弗兰克聚会后没有和她说话,是因为他疲惫不堪,她用今晚刚刚发生的事情来证实他是个消极的人。

潜在看法之所以能够带来重要的后果,是因为潜在看法影响夫妻之间争吵的方式、甚至争吵的目的。如果夫妻双方争吵的前提是“双方都是好人,但是都做了错事而且又相当固执,或者由于暂时的情境压力做出了愚蠢的事情”,那么就会有改正和互相妥协并达成一致意见的希望。但是不幸福的夫妻变换了这个前提。因为夫妻双方都是自我辩护的高手,他们相互指责对方不愿意向自己性格良好的方向转变。如果他们不想承认自己的错误,或者不去改进令对方烦恼或痛苦的习惯,他们就会说:“我控制不了自己,生气时,很自然地会提高声音。这是我的行为方式。”在这句话中,可以听得出他们在自我辩护。当然,因为他们是能够控制自己的,所以每次与警官、雇主或大街上一个令人讨厌的300磅的陌生人说话时,他们便不会提高声音。

然而,大吼大叫的那位反驳道,“那是我的行为方式”,他(她)也几乎不可能给对方自我原谅式辩护的机会。相反,他或她很有可能将其转化成羞辱:“那是你的行为方式——你真像你妈!”一般地来讲,这样的回答并不是指你的母亲在跳探戈舞时精湛的技术和天赋,而是说你的基因像你的妈妈,无可救药,别无它法。当人们觉得没有任何办法时,他们就会感觉自己受到了不公正的指责,就好像由于个子矮或脸上有雀斑而被人批评一样。社会心理学家朱恩·坦尼(June Tangney)的研究发现,如果一个人所受到的批评不是因为所做的事情而是因为他个人本身,便会引起这个人的羞辱感和无助感。⁶ 由于被羞辱的人无法逃避羞辱引起的孤独感,坦尼发现被羞辱的一方往往会生气地回击:“你让我觉得自己做了件糟糕的事情是因为胜任不了,应当受到指责。既然我认为自己可以胜任,不应该受到责难,那么你用这种方式羞辱我,就应当受到谴责。”

到目前为止,夫妻双方的争吵已经到了羞辱和责备对方的程度了,争吵的

目的也改变了，这时不再是为了努力解决问题、甚至改进对方的行为；而只是伤害、羞辱、责备对方。因此，羞辱会导致疯狂（失去理智），能够激发自我辩护，会拒绝达成一致意见，并且会产生最具破坏性的情绪：蔑视。心理学家约翰·哥特曼(John Gottman)在早期研究中，追踪研究了700多对夫妻，他发现蔑视（带有讽刺和挖苦的批评称为嘲弄）是最能导致夫妻关系直线下降的原因之一。⁷哥特曼给出了下面这个例子：

弗洛伊德：可以捡起我的吹风机吗？

尹格瑞德(Ingrid)(嘲笑)：“捡起你的吹风机？”捡起你那该死的吹风机。我是谁，你的保姆？

弗洛伊德：不可能，如果你是我的保姆，至少应该知道怎样洗衣服。

像这个例子中双方之间的蔑视，具有很强的破坏性，这是因为它毁坏了自我辩护的目的，破坏了彼此的自我价值感，让对方感觉到没有被爱、不受尊重。如果夫妻之间出现蔑视，例如，“我不珍视你的价值”。这就说明夫妻关系已经十分危险了，我们认为蔑视是离婚的信号，这不是因为蔑视导致双方想分开，而是因为蔑视反映了夫妻双方心理疏远。蔑视只会导致年复一年的争吵，弗兰克和黛伯拉夫妇就是这样的例子。然而争吵又改变不了对方的行为，如果夫妻间出现了蔑视，他们便会将自己封闭起来，心里想着：“你没有一丁点改变的希望；你毕竟太像你的妈妈了。”生气，反映了问题还有希望得以改正。如果希望破灭了，就只会留下憎恨和蔑视，蔑视是无望的表现。

○ ○ ○

夫妻关系不和或者以消极的方式看待对方，首先会带来什么影响呢？由于你性格上存在缺陷，或者我认为你性格上有缺陷（而不是可以原谅的怪癖或外

界压力),所以和你在一起才不幸福吗?显然这是在朝着两个方向发展。但是由于大多数新婚夫妇并非从抱怨和责备开始新生活的,心理学家经过多年的追踪研究才弄明白,是什么原因导致了一些夫妻的关系呈螺旋状下降;他们还得知夫妻关系不和,通常情况下首先是产生消极想法,责备对方,但与生气、悲伤或其他消极情绪状态出现的频率没有直接关系。⁸ 幸福美满的夫妻和不幸福的夫妻只是对彼此的行为看法有所不同,即便面对的是同样的情境和行为,也是如此。

这就是自我辩护成为危害婚姻关系罪魁祸首的原因。夫妻双方都是以一种特殊的方式解释配偶的行为,来调节冲突和烦恼引起的心理失调。而这种特殊的解释又让他们的关系进一步恶化。那些饱受彼此羞辱和责备的夫妻最终将会离婚。正如他们所做的,他们会进一步寻求证据来证实自己对对方的消极看法和蔑视。一开始,他们把婚姻的负面影响最小化,而现在又过分强调婚姻的负面影响。试图寻求任何微不足道的证据来支持他们现在的观点。婚姻关系形成后,夫妻双方会无视对方的优点,然而最初,正是这些优点才促使两个人相爱的。

哥特曼发现了一个“神奇比率”,即美满的夫妻关系中积极交流(如,爱、亲情和幽默)与消极交流(如,烦恼和抱怨)之比为 5:1。这是婚姻关系的引爆点,当这一比率低于 5:1 时,夫妻关系就会出现問題。哥特曼还发现:“如果夫妻双方在情绪上反复无常,一天之内吵架 11 次,或者是情绪上沉默无语,一年才只吵一次,这些都不重要;关键是要看积极交流与消极交流的比率是多少。反复无常的夫妻之间可能会经常大喊大叫,但是他们会用 5 倍的时间去爱和弥补。”“相对较为安静、没有冲突的夫妻,可能不如其他类型的夫妻那样充分表达他们的感情,但同样,他们之间的相互批评和轻视也较少。——比率仍然是 5:1。”当大于或等于 5:1 时,所有的失调一般都能向着积极的方向转化。例如,社会心理学家阿雅拉·派恩斯(Ayala Pines)在研究婚姻枯竭时,报告了一向幸福的艾伦如何因为没有丈夫购买的生日礼物而引起失调。艾伦是如何减少这种失调的呢?“我会像以前一样向他诉说此时的想法,我会告诉他,我希望他给我

买礼物,任何东西都可以,”艾伦对派恩斯说,“当我那样做的时候,我自认为可以开诚布公地表达自己全部的情绪,甚至是消极情绪,这真是太好了……我所排解掉的消极情绪会一去不复返。”¹⁰

然而,当这个比例小于 5:1 时,所有的失调一般地都会向着消极方向转化。面对同样的情况,夫妻双方就会用疏远对方的方式来排解自己的失调。派恩斯报告了唐娜(Donna)的案例:唐娜的婚姻不美满,她和艾伦一样遇到了同样的问题——丈夫没有买生日礼物。艾伦理解了丈夫的行为,而唐娜却不能:

实际上,我是在生日那天下定了离婚决心的,生日对我来说是个标志性的日子。早上 6 点钟我接到了欧洲堂妹的电话,她祝我生日快乐。他静静地坐在那里,听着别人送给我的祝福,而他却没有祝我生日快乐……我猛地意识到谁才是真正爱我的人,而面前的这个人并不爱我。他不珍惜我,他不爱我。如果他爱我,他就不会那样对我。他会为我做出一些特别的事情。

当然,唐娜的丈夫有可能不爱她、不欣赏她。但是,我们没有从唐娜的丈夫那里聆听这个故事;也许他以前也试着给她买过生日礼物,而她都不喜欢。大多数人并不是因为没有收到生日礼物而决定离婚。因为唐娜已经认为丈夫的行为不仅没有改进,还变得无法容忍,现在她把丈夫所做的任何事情都毫无疑问地看成是“他不珍惜我、不爱我”的证据。实际上与大多数配偶相比,唐娜持有更多的证实偏差:她告诉派恩斯,不论什么时候只要丈夫惹自己沮丧、心烦意乱,她都会记到“憎恨簿”上。她的憎恨簿记录了她决定离婚的所有理由。

当夫妻关系到了这种地步的时候,他们也会开始修正以往的记忆。现在鼓励双方做的,不是将消极的事情置之不理,而是将所有的消极事件都说出来,从而消除对过去事情的歪曲——或彻底地忘记——这主要是为了让双方都明白自己不是与一位陌生人结婚,而是与一位魅力十足的人结婚。临床心理学家朱莉·哥特曼(Julie Gottman)在治疗过程中遇到了一对怒气冲冲的夫妇,哥特曼

问：“你们两人是怎样认识的？”妻子轻蔑地说：“那时候，在学校里，我误认为他很精明。”¹¹在这段回忆中，那位妻子声称选择自己的丈夫没有错误；而是她的丈夫有问题，他装出一副聪明的样子欺骗了她。

约翰·哥特曼的研究发现：“就像夫妻双方无法准确回忆自己的过去一样，也很难预料一桩婚姻的未来。”¹²其实，夫妻双方能够在意识到他们的婚姻很危险之前，危机就已经开始了。哥特曼和他的研究小组成员对 56 对夫妇进行了深度访谈，三年之后，又访谈了其中的 47 对夫妇。在第一次访谈时，没有一对夫妇准备离婚，但是研究人员当时就百分之百地断定 7 对夫妇会离婚。（研究者推测剩下的 40 对夫妇中有 37 对仍然会生活在一起，这个推测非常准确。）在第一次访谈中，那 7 对夫妇已经开始重温他们的过去，并讲述一些细节来证实他们对婚姻的失望。例如，他们对哥特曼说他们结婚不是因为已经如胶似漆地相爱了，而是因为婚姻似乎是“自然的事情，生活的下一步”。已经离婚的夫妻回忆道，结婚后第一年尽是磕磕绊绊，有很多失望的事情。一位将要离婚的男子说：“许许多多的事情都错了，但是我现在记不起来了。”然而，幸福的夫妻把同样的困难称之为“沟沟坎坎”，而且把这些困难看成是挑战，最终他们在幽默和关爱中自豪地渡过了难关。

多亏记忆有重温的魔力，这样我们就可以为自己辩护。许多夫妇离婚时，都记不起自己当初为什么要结婚，似乎是一种不需手术的脑白质切除，终结了双方曾经拥有的甜美回忆。我不止一次地听人们说：“我知道，自己在婚后的一周里犯下了大错。”“但是为什么你会生下三个孩子，并且在随后的 27 年里仍然在一起生活？”“噢，我不清楚；好像是生活所迫，不过那只是猜测。”

当然，一些人确实是理智地权衡利弊后才决定离婚的；但对于大多数人来说，这样常常是重温过去，减少失调。我们是如何知道这点的呢？因为即便是面对同样的问题，只要有一方或双方决定离婚，自我辩护就会改变。虽然夫妻关系离他们所期望的还相差很远，但是只要双方决定要维系下去，他们就用支持自己观点的方式来减少失调：“实际上没有那么糟糕。”“大部分人的婚姻比我更糟糕——或者肯定也好不到哪里去。”“他忘了我的生日，但是他做了好多

其他的事情表明他爱我。”“我们有一些需要解决的问题，但是总的说来我是爱她的。”然而，如果一方或双方开始考虑离婚，他们就会努力为离婚寻找理由，以减少失调：“这桩婚姻的确太糟糕了。”“大部分人的婚姻比我幸福。”“他忘记了我的生日，就说明他不爱我。”许多夫妻在离婚 20 年或 30 年之后，还会冷冷地说“我从未爱过你”。

最后那句残酷的谎言足以表明说话者急需为自己辩护。如果是因为明显的外部原因（比如，因为一方生理上或情感上出轨），夫妻离婚便不需要额外的自我辩护。如果夫妻是协议离婚，或经受离婚的痛苦之后，最终又成了好朋友，那么这样的夫妻就会认为，没有必要急于贬低前配偶或忘记以前比较幸福的时光，因为他们会说，“那是无法预料的”，“我们只是分开了”，或者“我们结婚时都很年轻，知道的都太少”。但是如果离婚是折磨人的、事关重大而且付出很大代价的，特别是一方希望分开而另一方不同意，则会让双方都感到痛苦。另外，离婚还不可避免地会伴有生气、痛苦、伤害以及悲痛等情绪。因此，夫妻会体验到失调的痛苦。离婚后发泄怨气是很多人调节失调的方式。

如果你是被抛弃的，就可能会体会到自我迷恋型失调：“我是个好人，而且我曾经是非常好的配偶”和“我的配偶抛弃了我，这是怎么回事？”你可能会断定自己没有想象中那样好，或者你是个好人但却是个极为糟糕的配偶，但是几乎没有人通过给自己抹黑的方式来减少失调，相比之下，很容易通过给对方脸上抹黑的方式（比方说，说自己的配偶很难相处、自私自利等）来减少失调。一般人不会意识到自己采用了这种调节失调的方式。

如果是你主动提出离婚的，你也会体验到失调，由于你给曾经爱的人带来了痛苦，你会通过辩护来减少失调。因为你是个好人，好人是不会伤害别人的，所以你的配偶本来就应当被抛弃，他（她）或许比你已经感受到的还要糟糕。研究离婚问题的专家，常常对那些满腹怨气的夫妻感到困惑，这些怨气看起来毫无根据，但又都是针对最先提出离婚的那个人的；专家们正在研究人们如何通过行为减少失调。我们的一位朋友，现在非常悔恨儿子离婚，她说：“我不理解我的儿媳，她为了一个爱慕她的人而离开了我的儿子，但是却没有嫁给那个人，

也没有做全职工作,所以我儿子必须给她生活费。而我的儿子也不得不做一份自己并不喜爱的工作来满足她的要求。由于是她离开了我的儿子,而且她又有了另一重关系,因此她对待我儿子的方式是残酷的、令人费解的,而且还带有报复性。”然而,从她儿媳的角度来考虑,她对待前夫的行为则是完全合理的。如果她的前夫是个很好的男人,她就应该和他待在一起,不是吗?

婚姻调解人和其他任何试图帮助处于痛苦婚姻中的人们,都明白这个过程。调解人唐纳德·萨波斯奈克(Donald Saposnek)和契普·罗斯(Chip Rose)说,夫妻双方“一方喜欢贬低另一方,例如,‘他软弱无能,整日酗酒’,或者‘她是个两面派,自私自利、经常撒谎,因此,永远不要相信她’。倘若夫妻俩离婚前矛盾重重,那么离婚数年之后,他们也能清楚地记得对方以前极端负向的性格”。¹³他们这么做是为了贬低前配偶,维护自我以减少失调。他们急需给自己找理由。所以,对一方“属于……”,另一方“不值得……”这样的问题,丝毫不让,据理抗争。由于前夫(妻)是个很坏的人,所以还强烈要求孩子的监护权并且反对前夫(妻)拥有探视权。双方都认为,对方不好是由他们自己造成的,不是环境所迫。一方的任何行为都可能激起对方自我辩护式的反驳。瞧,在互动的过程中,一方对另一方的憎恶又加深了。一方的举动导致了另一方的不良举动,双方都用恶劣行为互相报复,如,列举一些事实证明前夫(妻)固有的“邪恶”品质。

如果夫妻关系已经到了需要寻求调解的地步,也就表明他们已经从婚姻金字塔顶下滑很远了。唐纳德·萨波斯奈克告诉我们,在所调解的4 000多例监护权案例中,“我从未听到有人说‘既然她是个真正的好母亲,孩子们和她关系更密切,我的确认为她应该拥有孩子的监护权’。事实上,双方总是在想‘我是孩子父母中较好的那一位,因而更应该拥有孩子的监护权’。即便是承认自己的行为带有报复性,他们也不会对另一方有丝毫理解,仍然要为自己辩护:‘他破坏了我们的家庭,他是咎由自取。’他们之间达成的一致意见往往是某种妥协,双方都认为:‘迫不得已我才放弃了自己的观点,我为此已经筋疲力尽了,调解已经花尽了我的积蓄……尽管我很清楚自己才是孩子比较好的依靠。’”

根据失调理论我们可以预言:最急于为离婚进行辩护的人,正是最初对自己的离婚决定犹豫不决,或者对自己的单方面决定产生负罪感的人。随后,丧失孩子监护权的一方会失望万分,他们急于为自己所受到残酷的、不公平的对待辩护。由于双方都用一些确定的记忆和前配偶近来的拙劣表现来支持自己的新观点,所以,前配偶也就彻底地变成了一个十恶不赦的人。通过自我辩护,人们的想法得以明确,内疚变成了愤怒。爱情故事也就变成了憎恨簿。



我们的同事莱奥诺·蒂菲尔(Leonore Tiefer),一位临床心理学家,给我们讲述了在治疗过程中遇到的一对夫妻。这对夫妻结婚10年了,年近40岁,但他们还不打算要孩子,这是因为决定要孩子之前,彼此都想对每一个问题讨论清楚,甚至是抚养问题。他们不知道如何平衡她的职业和夫妻共同生活之间的关系,因为她仍然希望工作。他们没有对他喝酒达成一致意见,因为他认为自己必须喝酒。双方都有对另一方进行反驳的理由。

然而,决定他们婚姻失败的,不是生活中的困难,而是夫妻双方固执的自我辩护。“他们不知道成为夫妻要放弃些什么,”蒂菲尔说,“双方都想做自己有权做的事情,而不去讨论影响婚姻生活的一些重要问题。只要彼此生气了,就不再讨论,因为实际上讨论也可能是要求对方妥协或者从对方的立场上考虑。体谅,对他们来说非常困难,双方都认为自己的行为比对方的行为合理。因此,他们使用以往的怨恨来为自己现在的观点以及不愿意改变或原谅的行为找理由。”

相比之下,结婚多年的夫妻就知道如何最低限度地减少自我辩护。换句话说,他们在维护自己的空间之前就已经先替对方考虑了。美满、稳定的婚姻关系中,夫妻双方可以毫无戒备地倾听对方的批评、对方关心的问题及建议。用我们的话说就是,他们能够让步,而进行自我辩护的理由是“我就是那种人”。他们消除了因忽视对方而带来的小摩擦所引起的失调,他们也会减少因自身的

错误以及解决这些错误遇到的主要问题所导致的失调。

我们曾访谈过几对结婚多年的夫妇,他们是弗兰克和黛伯拉所羡慕的那种类型。这些结婚多年的夫妇都说他们婚姻关系密切、彼此相互恩爱。我们没有问他们:“婚姻长久的秘密是什么?”因为他们并不知道其中的奥秘;他们只会说一些陈词滥调,而这些对婚姻并没有什么指导作用,例如“我们从不生着气睡觉”或“我们一起分享打高尔夫球的乐趣”。(的确会有许多美满的夫妻生着气睡觉,但这是因为他们在很累的时候不愿意争吵;的确也有一些夫妻并不分享彼此的嗜好和兴趣,但他们却很恩爱。)我们询问他们的是,多年来他们如何有效地降低“我爱这个人”和“这个人做的一些事情让我很生气”所引起的心理失调。

查理(Charlie)和玛可欣(Maxine)夫妇给了我们一个惊喜的答案。查理和玛可欣夫妇已经结婚 40 多年了,像所有的夫妻一样,他们也有许许多多的分歧,也很容易闹矛盾,但是他们把大多数分歧看作生活的一部分,并认为不值得因为分歧而生气,而是接受这些分歧。查理说:“我喜欢下午 5 点钟吃晚饭;我妻子喜欢晚上 8 点吃晚饭;最后我们达成了一致意见——我们 7 点 55 分吃晚饭。”最重要的是他们处理重大问题的方式,查理和玛可欣从 20 岁刚出头便开始恋爱,查理被玛可欣那沉着冷静的气质深深地吸引;他说她是人间仙子。而玛可欣则被查理的激情所吸引,他做每件事情都激情四射。但是当查理对爱、性、旅游以及那些令她毛骨悚然的电影充满激情时,她就会生气。查理在生气的时候会大喊,会拍桌子,这在玛可欣的家庭里是不可想象的。在婚后的几个月里,玛可欣含着泪对查理说,他生气时自己感到很害怕。

查理的第一反应是为自己辩护。他并不认为提高嗓门是他所希望的特质,但他将这种特质看成是自己的一部分,反映了自己诚实的一面。“我父亲生气时也是大喊,拍桌子,”他对她说,“我爷爷也是大喊,拍桌子!我很正常!我别无他法,这是一个男人该做的。你想让我像一个懦夫那样开口就谈自己的‘感受’吗?”当自己平静下来的时候,查理就会考虑自己大喊大叫、拍桌子可能给玛可欣带来怎样的影响。他意识到自己能够慢慢地、逐步改变自己的行为,于是,

他尽量减少发火，而且发火时也尽量保持平静。同时，玛可欣也开始改变自己，不再为自己的想法（任何形式的生气都是很危险的，有百害而无一益）找理由（“我的家人生气时从不表现出来，因此，我认为生气时不表现出来是唯一正确的方式”）。当她作出这些改变时，也学着去辨别哪些是生气时正常的感受，如拍桌子；哪些方式是具有破坏性的，如大哭和躲避（这些恰恰是她“一向”的习惯）。

多年后，另外一个问题又渐渐出现了。他们也像许多夫妻一样，根据擅长的原则分配任务。玛可欣沉稳的一面减少了，变得不自信了，害怕面对困难；她不再抱怨饭菜不好，不再抱怨用具破损。因此，退还不好用的咖啡壶，找服务员理论，或找不愿安装水管的房东讲理等等，这些问题都是由查理出面处理。“这方面你比我强”，她会说，因为他的确如此。然而，一段时间过后，查理就开始厌倦承担责任，讨厌玛可欣的顺从。“为什么老是让我去处理那些不愉快的事情？”他暗自想。

查理又要面对着选择了。他可以置之不理，说那是她的行为方式，然后继续去处理各种难以应付的事情。然而，查理认为玛可欣应该学习如何更加自信，这对她来说，不但会对婚姻有帮助，而且在许多场合下都是非常有帮助的。最初，玛可欣说：“那是我的行为方式，你娶我的时候，就知道了这一点。这么多年过去了，也没有什么改变。”随着他们之间谈话的深入，她不再无所顾忌地进行自我辩护，而是开始倾听他所关心的事情。只要有事情发生，她就会体验着他的感受，去理解他认为这样分配家务劳动不公平的原因。她意识到，自己在选择家务劳动时，不能只受原有思维的限制。她报名参加了自信心训练班，很认真地实践着自己在课堂上学到的东西，更好地坚持自己的权益，不久以后，她便可以很有信心地说出自己的想法并且往往会取得效果。查理和玛可欣都清楚，他没有变成听话的小羔羊，她也没有变成母老虎；人格、经历、基因和脾气，一定程度上决定了人们会有多大程度的改变。¹⁴但是他们两人都朝着积极的方面发生了改变。在他们的婚姻中，自信心和对怒气的建设性表达已经习以为常了。

在美满的婚姻中，针锋相对、迥然不同的观点，相互冲突的生活习惯，甚至

是生气时双方之间的拌嘴,都能够使夫妻关系更加亲密,会帮助对方学习新的东西,并促使夫妻双方对自己的能力和局限重新加以审视,这样夫妻双方的感情就会更加亲密。但做到这一切并不容易。自我辩护掩盖了我们的错误,保证我们只做自己愿意做的事情,并会最大可能地减少对自己爱人的伤害,因此放弃自我辩护会令人局促不安、痛苦难忍。没有了自我辩护,我们的情绪也许会变得赤裸裸、毫无掩盖,这样就会造成一系列遗憾和损失。

然而,在最终加以权衡时,我们认为放弃自我辩护是值得的,因为不管痛苦有多深,最终它都会告诉我们一些非常重要的东西,都能使我们洞察并接受自我。作家和社会活动家薇薇安·戈尼克(Vivian Gornick)在65岁的时候写过一篇散文,这篇散文非常坦诚,令人赞叹不已。文中讲述了自己为了在工作和爱情之间找到一个平衡点,为了让生活建立在双方都遵守的和平主义原则之上,一生中所作出的努力。“我以前经常写有关独身生活的文章,是因为我没有弄明白为什么我会独身生活。”她写道。多年来她作出的回答是性别歧视(这也是她那一代人作出的较多回答):男性逼迫强健的、独立性强的女性在职业和婚姻之间作出选择。这是不正确的,虽然性别歧视破坏了许多婚姻。但是,今天的戈尼克意识到,这仅仅是答案的一部分。回顾过去,她常常自我辩护,并且自我辩护总能让她感到自己生活很舒适,如果当初没有自我辩护,她就能明白自己应该在婚姻关系中担当什么角色,她意识到:“孤独都是自己造成的,我需要更多关注的应该是自己的愤怒、自我分裂的人格,而不是性别歧视。”¹⁵

“现实是,”她写道,“我独身生活,并不是因为自己的政见,而是因为我不知道如何与另一个人很好地去相处。每一位爱过我的男士在离开我之前,我几乎都在折磨他。我会因为任何事情打电话找他,从不会落下一件,而且每一次我都用双方都很讨厌的方式让他作出解释。当然我说的每一件事情也并非一点道理没有,但是不论其中有多少道理,都不应当成为爱情生活的绊脚石。”

第七章



创伤、分歧与战争

他们有强烈的欲望，充满了怒火，像大海一样盲目地愤怒，如火一般急躁。

——《理查二世》，威廉·莎士比亚(William Shakespeare)

吉姆(Jim)在一年前坦白了自己的那段风流韵事，但他发现，至今自己的妻子戴安妮(Diane)仍在生气，他们的每一次谈话最终都会转移到这件事上来。他每次与妻子的目光接触，都会看到她的眼睛里充满了猜疑和痛苦。妻子难道认识不到这只是一个错误吗？他并不是这个地球上第一个犯此错误的人。毕竟他已经诚实地坦白了这件事，并且结束了那段关系。他也道歉了，千万次地跟妻子讲，自己非常爱她，并且希望婚姻能够持续下去。难道妻子不理解自己吗？难道妻子不能只看他们婚姻中令人快乐的一面，而忘掉这段挫折吗？

戴安妮发现，丈夫的态度让人难以置信。她觉得丈夫希望因坦白了自己的过失并且结束了不正常的关系而受到称赞，而不是受到谴责。难道自己的丈夫

不理解自己吗？难道自己的丈夫不能不去为自己辩护，而重视她的痛苦和悲伤吗？丈夫从未道过歉，就是道歉也只是敷衍了事，难道他就不能诚恳地、真心实意地道歉吗？妻子并不需要丈夫屈服，只是希望他能够明白自己的感受，并且真心地道歉。

但是吉姆发现，自己很难按戴安妮要求的那样给她道歉，因为妻子一直怒气冲冲，这让他感到妻子是在报复他。妻子的愤怒，在他看来就像是在说“你所犯下的罪过不可饶恕”，“你竟然对我做出这种事，简直不是人”。吉姆为因自己对戴安妮造成的伤害感到深深的自责，只要能让她感觉好一点，他愿意把整个世界都给她，但他并不认为自己犯了天大的罪过，也不像戴安妮说的那样“不是人”。他并不愿按戴安妮所要求的那样卑躬屈膝地道歉。所以，他试图让戴安妮相信那事情并不严重，那个女人对他一点也不重要。然而戴安妮却认为他那样解释是因为在他看来自己现在的痛苦完全是多余的。她从他的反应中得到的信息就是“你根本没必要心烦，我什么事都没做错”。所以吉姆的解释让她更加恼火，而她的恼火让吉姆更难体会到她所受到的伤害和应予以的补偿。¹



2005年，法院对事关特瑞·夏沃(Terri Schiavo)生死的家庭纠纷最终判决一出，所有美国人都被彻底搞糊涂了。在这场诉讼中，特瑞的父母状告她的丈夫迈克尔·夏沃(Michael Schiavo)剥夺了特瑞的生命权，并放弃治疗机会。一个记者写道，“真是难以置信，特瑞·夏沃的丈夫和父母曾经有过共同的家、共同的生活和共同的目标，但现在他们之间就像被一片大海隔开”。当然，考虑到人们自我辩护的特性，这也就不难理解了。在特瑞和迈克尔刚结婚的时候，她的父母跟他们的关系非常亲密，就像处在金字塔的顶端。迈克尔将自己的岳父岳母称为爸爸妈妈。在他们俩开始创业的时期，辛德勒(Schindlers)夫妇曾经帮他们支付租金。1990年，特瑞·夏沃脑部受到严重创伤的时候，辛德勒夫妇便搬过去和女儿女婿一块住，以便照顾女儿，就这样过了三年。之后，他们之间

因为钱的问题出现了裂痕。1993年，特瑞在治疗中发生了医疗事故，迈克尔·夏沃赢得了官司并获得赔偿，其中75万美元用于对她的护理，30万美元用于妻子看护人的损失。一个月之后，特瑞的丈夫和她父母因为这一判决争吵起来。迈克尔·夏沃说，争执的起因是岳父想从医疗事故赔偿中分得一部分。而辛德勒夫妇却说，分歧在于使用何种治疗方法，他们想用特别护理，而特瑞的丈夫则坚持保守治疗。

这个判决是第一棵稻草，强迫特瑞的父母和她的丈夫就“该怎样进行治疗”以及“谁应得到这笔钱”作出决定，因为双方都认为自己有权对关乎特瑞生死的事情作最终决定。因此，迈克尔·夏沃阻止辛德勒夫妇接触妻子的医疗记录；辛德勒夫妇则试图阻挠迈克尔·夏沃继续做女儿的看护人。迈克尔·夏沃认为岳父对赔款的要求是非常粗鲁的，所以他被激怒了；岳父岳母则认为迈克尔·夏沃不为妻子着想，动机很自私，也被激怒了。² 此时，通过媒体和一些投机取巧的政客，全国都见证了这个家庭最后的、激烈的对质，他们互不妥协，完全没有理性，根本无助于问题的解决。



1979年1月，伊朗发生了叛乱，国王穆罕默德·礼萨·巴列维(Mohammad Reza Pahlavi)为了安全起见逃到了埃及。两个星期后，这个国家迎来了新的原教旨主义领导人，在十几年前被伊朗国王放逐的阿亚图拉赛义德·鲁霍拉·霍梅尼(Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini)。10月份，基于人道主义立场，卡特政府很不情愿地允许伊朗国王在美国短暂停留，以治疗他的癌症。霍梅尼因此公开指责美国是“邪恶的撒旦”，并鼓励伊朗人民游行示威反对“伊斯兰教的敌人”——美国和以色列。成千上万的人响应了他的号召聚集在德黑兰的美国大使馆门前抗议。12月4日，几百个伊朗学生占领了大使馆主楼，控制了大部分工作人员，把其中52人作为人质扣押了444天。他们指责伊朗国王从伊朗人民手中偷走了几百万美元，他们要求他带着赃款返回伊朗接受审判。伊朗人质

危机就是当时的9·11；据一名历史学家说，这件事的电视覆盖率和报道广度超过了二战以来的任何事件。泰德·科佩尔主持了美国广播公司的深夜新闻节目《美国被俘人质》，该节目每天报道事件的进展，非常受欢迎，因此当人质危机结束后，这个节目仍保留下来作为《夜间新闻》节目继续播放。美国人的注意力集中到了这个事件上，他们被伊朗人的行动和要求激怒了。于是，他们迁怒于伊朗国王；但他们到底为什么愤怒呢？



到目前为止，我们已经在本书中讨论了几种一定会导致错误的情境——记忆歪曲，错误定罪，受误导的治疗行为。现在，我们将目光投向几个更为麻烦的领域：感情背叛、家庭不和与暴力冲突。我们的例子所涉及的范围从家庭争吵到十字军圣战，从一般的吝啬到有计划折磨，从婚姻中的过错升级到战争。这些朋友之间、兄弟姐妹之间以及国家之间的冲突，可能在起因和形式上存在根本差异，但是它们都与自我辩护这一顽固的思维方式交织在一起。在总结这种普遍存在的思维方式时，我们不想忽略其构成的复杂性，也不想暗示所有的表面现象都是一样的。

有时候对立双方都同意其中一方应该受到谴责，就像吉姆和戴安妮两个人的例子。吉姆本来可以尝试推卸责任，比如声称戴安妮是个很差劲的妻子，所以他才会出现这种风流韵事，但是他没有那样做。有时候，有过错的一方试图用冗长的借口和自我辩护来否定自己的过错，但孰是孰非仍然是十分明显的。被奴役的人们不可能因为奴隶的身份而承担部分责任，儿童不可能去挑逗恋童癖患者，妇女不可能要求被强奸，犹太教徒不可能屠杀自己。

不过，我们希望从一个更为普遍的问题开始：在许多情境下，谁应该受谴责并不那么确定，谁挑起的争端，甚至什么时候开始可能都不清楚。谈到凌辱、不可原谅的过失和创伤以及无休止的争吵，每个家庭都会有自己的故事，比如“她没有参加我的婚礼，而且她甚至也没有送给我一件礼物”，“他窃取了我应该得

到的遗产”，“当父亲病重的时候，我的兄弟全不见了，我不得不一个人照顾父亲”。在这些矛盾中，没有哪一方会承认自己在没有受到挑衅的情况下撒谎、偷窃或欺骗的；只有坏人才会那么做，就像只有无情的孩子才会在父母需要的时候离开自己的父母一样。因此，任何一方都指责对方应当受到谴责，以此来证明自己是正确的；任何一方都会像理智的、有道德的人所做的那样，对冒犯或挑衅仅仅这样回应：“好，你责怪我没有去参加你的婚礼，但7年前当我精神都快崩溃的时候你却不见了，你到哪里去了？”“的确，我从自己父母的财产中得到了一些财产，但那不是偷——40年前是你而不是我走进了大学校门，从那时起你得到的已经很多了。”“不管怎么样，爸爸总是更喜欢你，他对我总是非常苛刻，所以现在应该由你来照顾他。”

在大多数出现裂痕的关系中，每一方都会指责另一方天生自私、顽固、小气，并且具有挑衅性。但是，人们进行自我辩护的需要实际上超越了人格特质。辛德勒夫妇和迈克尔·夏沃很可能并不是特别固执或者特别缺乏理性的人。更确切地说，他们相互之间出现的固执和缺乏理性的行为，不过是12年来互动的结果：不断进行决策（在这个问题上是在抗争还是放弃？抵制还是妥协？），决策后所进行的自我辩护，以及为了降低失调和感情困扰而采取的进一步行动。一旦在自己的选择中越陷越深，他们也就无法回头了。特瑞的父母发现，要证实自己最初所选择的“让他们女儿活着”这一合乎情理的决定是正确的，他们现在就必须证实自己随后所作的第二个决定也是正确的，即不惜一切代价维持女儿的生命。因为特瑞的父母无法接受自己的女儿已经脑死亡的事实，所以他们指责迈克尔希望特瑞死掉，因为她已经成了负担，指责他是一个支配性强的丈夫、奸夫、谋杀犯。迈克尔也要证明自己“让妻子自然死亡”这一合乎情理的决定是对的，他也走上了一条无法回头之路。为了证实自己选择的正确性，他指责特瑞的父母受到了投机取巧的媒体的操纵，因为特瑞的父母否认了自己遵守对特瑞所作诺言的权利，他对特瑞的承诺是不会让她这么活下去的。辛德勒夫妇因迈克尔·夏沃不听从他们或不接受他们的宗教信仰而非常生气。迈克尔·夏沃则对辛德勒把这件事情在法庭和公众面前公开感到气愤。双方都感到对方

的做法是令人讨厌的,并深深地感到对方背叛了自己。是谁挑起了有关特瑞的死亡控制权的最终争执呢?他们都说是对方。是什么使得事情变得如此难以处理?是自我辩护。

当伊朗学生在1979年控制了那些美国人质的时候,这个事件看起来像一场无意义的挑衅行为,是一场完全出乎美国人预料的突发事件;美国人认为自己无端受到了一群疯狂的伊朗人的攻击。但是在伊朗人看来,是美国人首先挑起事端的,因为美国的情报部门帮助了1953年的政变,那场政变使伊朗经过民主选举的、被认为是神赐的领导人穆罕默德·摩萨德(Mohammed Mossadegh)下台,随后伊朗国王登位。在过去的10年里,许多伊朗人都是满怀对伊朗国王肆意聚敛财富的怨恨成长起来的,并深受美国西化的影响。在1963年,伊朗国王镇压了由霍梅尼领导的伊斯兰教原教旨主义起义并把传教士流放境外。因为有人发起反对伊朗国王的政府,伊朗国王命令他的秘密警察组织萨瓦克去镇压反对者,这激起了人们更大的怨恨。

那么人质事件到底是从什么时间开始的呢?是美国支持反对摩萨德的政变之时吗?是美国维持对伊朗国王的武装供应之时吗?是美国对萨瓦克所干的残忍事情表示默认之时吗?是美国允许伊朗国王赴美治疗之时吗?是伊朗国王开始流放霍梅尼之时吗?或者是什叶派领导人胜利归来后发现当时正是很好的机会,可以通过将国民的注意力集中在美国身上来巩固自己的力量之时吗?是伊朗学生自愿成为霍梅尼的政治担保人而在大使馆前抗议之时吗?大多数伊朗人的选择能证实他们对美国的愤怒是合理的,大多数美国人的选择答案也能支持他们对伊朗的愤怒合理。每一方都确信自己是受害者,且有权进行报复。是谁造成了人质危机?他们都指责是对方。是什么使这件事情如此难以处理?是自我辩护。

在人们编织出来为自己的生活、爱人和损失辩护的故事中,那些用来说明某一方是不公平和伤害的实施者或接受者的故事是最为引人注目的,而且会产生最为深远的影响。在这些例子中,自我辩护超越了具体的对手(爱人、父母和儿童、朋友、邻居或者国家)和实际的争吵(性出轨、家庭遗产继承、土地分界线、

信心丧失或者军事入侵)。我们都做过令他人感到愤怒的事情，同时也都被别人所做的事情所激怒过。我们都可能有意或无意地伤害过他人，他们可能会永远将我们视为坏人、背叛者、无赖。而且我们也会觉得自己受到了一连串不公平的对待，受伤的伤口好像从来没有完全愈合过。自我辩护最为明显的特征就是，它允许我们眨眼之间从一个角色转换到另一个角色，并且瞬间可以再变回来，不需要运用我们所学过的任何一种角色转化知识。在某种情境中感觉到自己好像是不公平的受害者，并不能减少我们不公平对待他人的可能性，也不会使我们变得更加同情受害者。这就好像横隔在两种体验系统之间的一堵砖墙，会阻碍我们看见墙的另一面。

那堵砖墙存在的原因之一就是，即使疼痛的真实程度一样，人们所感觉到的疼痛常常也要比实际的疼痛更为强烈。那个古老的笑话——其他人断腿是小事一桩；我们自己若断了指甲就非常严重——可以被用来准确地描述我们的神经传导。英国的神经科学家在一个“以牙还牙”的实验中将人们进行了配对。每一对都被一个装置联结起来，这一装置会在食指上施加压力，要求每一个参与者对同伴施加的强度要与同伴施加给自己的强度相同。尽管他们试图努力去做，但他们无法公平地做到这一点。每次其中一个同伴感觉到了压力，他就会以相对大一点的力量去还击，并觉得他所施加的强度就是刚刚能够感觉到的。研究者们推断，这种疼痛的增加是“神经加工的自然产物”。³ 它帮助我们解释为什么一开始只是打着胳膊玩的两个男孩，很快会被发现非常激烈地扭打在一起，以及为什么两个国家会发现自己处于不断升级的相互报复之中：“他们不能以眼还眼，他们会以牙还眼。我们必须报复——让我们行动起来。”每一方在为自己所做事情的正确性进行辩护时，仅仅为了追求数量上的对等。

社会心理学家罗伊·鲍迈斯特(Roy Baumeister)和他的同事们，展示了自我辩护如何让人们将做过坏事后所产生的不良感觉最小化，以及如何将作为受害者的正当感觉最大化。⁴ 他们询问了 63 个被试以获得一个关于“受害者故事”的自传式说明，让他们描述自己被他人激怒或受到伤害时的情景，以及“行凶者故事”，即他们惹恼他人时的情景。在描述某些人犯罪或做出其他错事的

内疚感时,他们并不是在一般人所理解的犯罪意义上使用“行凶者”这个术语的,本章中我们也同样如此。就像他们一样,我们用这个术语来表示那些做出伤害和冒犯他人行为的人。

我们可以从这两种视角对如下现象给以解释:司空见惯的对承诺和保证的不断破坏;对规则、义务或预期的违反;性出轨;秘密的泄露;不公平的交易;撒谎;以及金钱和财产冲突。请注意,这并不是婚姻顾问和调解人在描述案件时呈现的那种“他说过/她说过”的研究;这是一种“他这样说/他那样说”的研究,在这类研究中,每个人都要报告他们分别站在双方立场上时的体验。研究人员解释说,这个方法的好处就是“避免将行凶者和受害者作为不同类型的人来解释。我们的方法指出,普通人是怎样把自己定位为受害者或行凶者的——也就是说,在我们的方法里,人们在叙述中建构他们自己关于每一种角色的体验”。此外,人格的差异与此无关。可爱的、和善的人和固执的人一样,都可能成为受害者或行凶者,并为自己进行辩护。

然而当我们创建“有意义”叙述的时候,我们采用的的确是一种自利的方式。行凶者会试图减少他们的道德负罪感;受害者则希望扩大他们道德上的无辜性。由于我们分别处在墙的不同一侧,我们会系统地歪曲自己对事件的记忆和解释,从而在“发生了什么”和“我们自己看到了什么”之间建立起最大化的一致性。通过识别这些系统的记忆偏差,研究者们向我们展示了两个对手如何相互误解对方的行为。

在他们的叙述中,行凶者会采用不同的方式来降低因意识到自己做错事情而产生的失调。很自然,首先是声称自己根本没有做错什么:“我对他撒了谎,但只是为了保护他的感情。”“的确,我从姐姐那里拿走了那只手镯,但是无论如何它最初是我的。”只有少数行凶者承认自己的行为是不道德的、伤害是故意的或者存有恶意。大多数人会说他们的冒犯行为是合情合理的,研究者笑着补充道:“而且他们中的一些人,对这些事情非常坚持。”大多数行凶者至少在回顾中报告,他们所做的都是合情合理的;他们的行为可能有些遗憾,但是考虑到当时的环境是可以理解的。

第二种策略就是承认做错了，但是进行申辩或尽可能让错误最小化。“我知道我不应该有一夜情，但是在这个广袤的宇宙中，这么做造成什么伤害了吗？”“趁妈妈生病的时候把她的钻石手镯拿走是不对的，但是她肯定希望我拥有它。而且在此之外，我姐姐得到的比我多得多。”超过三分之二的行凶者声称他们这样做有外部的或者可减轻他们罪行的环境因素在起作用，“我自己就像孩子那样无所顾忌”，“我最近常常处于巨大的压力之下”。但是，受害者不愿意承认对他们行凶的人所讲的这些可以原谅的借口。接近一半的行凶者声称自己“不能补救”已经发生的事情；他们是在一气之下那样做，并非有意为之。另外一些行凶者则干脆绕过这个问题，坚持说是受害者激怒了他们，或者受害者应该承担部分责任。

第三种策略是，当背对这堵墙而且不能否认或最小化自己的责任时，行凶者就会承认他们做了一些错误而且有害的事情，然后试图尽快把这一页翻过去。无论是否接受这一指责，大多数行凶者都热切期望化解自己失调的负罪感，及时将那些事件忘记。在描述事件的时候，他们更像受害者。他们把事件描述成已经过去的孤立事件，这些事件并不能代表什么，也没有后续的消极影响，而且可以肯定地说对当前没有任何意义。许多人甚至为故事讲述了一个愉快的结局，给人一种一切完好的感觉，提供的是这样一条线索：“现在一切事情都很好，我们之间的关系并没有受到损害；实际上，今天我们成了好朋友。”

从受害者的角度来看，受害者对行凶者的辩解也有不同的反应方式。这些可以概括为：“哦，是吗？没有伤害？好朋友？把这个情况告诉那些海军陆战队队员。”行凶者可能希望很快忘记这件事情并将它掩盖起来，但是受害者却对此记忆犹新；对行凶者而言可能微不足道、可以遗忘的事情，但对于受害者而言则可能是一生愤怒的源头。63位受害者中只有一个人的故事描述了行凶者已经因他的行为受到审判，并且没有考虑到行凶者的行为“已经无法弥补”。与此同时，大多数受害者报告了关系破裂和争吵后导致的持续的消极后果。超过一半的人说，这类事情已经对他们的关系造成了严重的影响。这些影响包括持续的敌意、信任缺失、遗留下来的负性情感或者甚至是友谊的终结，而他们显然没有

将这些告诉行凶者。

此外,虽然行凶者认为他们当时的行为有一定的意义,但是大多数受害者说自己不能明白行凶者的意图,甚至在事件过去很长一段时间后也是如此。“为什么他会那样做?”“她是怎么想的?”行凶者不能理解的动机是受害者身份和受害故事的核心部分。“他不仅做了可怕的事情,而且他知道那是非常可怕的事情!”“为什么她就不能承认她对我有多么粗鲁?”

他不能理解和她不会承认的理由之一就是,行凶者在全力以赴地证明自己所做的是正确的,而另外一个理由就是他们的确不清楚受害者的感受。许多受害者最初抑制了自己的愤怒,护理着自己的伤口并且思考着该怎么做。他们数月、有时数年,甚至数十年地反思自己的痛苦和委屈。我们认识的一位男士告诉我们,在结婚18年后,他的妻子“突然地,在午餐上”宣称她想离婚。他说:“我试图发现自己错在哪里,而且我告诉她自己希望能够补偿,毕竟已经同床共枕18个年头了。”那位妻子在离婚这件事情上思考了18年;而伊朗人则思考了26年。到最后,当许多受害者有机会来表达他们的痛苦和愤怒(尤其是那些行凶者已经掩盖或者遗忘的事情)时,行凶者便会感到困惑。无疑,大多数行凶者都认为受害者的愤怒是过激的反应,但是很少有受害者这么认为。受害者会想:“过激?但是在说出来之前我已经思考了很长时间了。我认为这是一个力度不够的反应!”

一些受害者为自己的后续愤怒和斤斤计较辩护,因为愤怒本身就是一种报复,是惩罚冒犯者的一种方式,即使是冒犯者希望事情得到平息,他也已经远离了这个场景或者消失得无影无踪。在小说《远大前程》中,查尔斯·狄更斯(Charles Dickens)提供给我们一个难以忘怀的郝薇香(Havisham)小姐的形象。郝薇香小姐在她婚礼的那天被抛弃,之后她的余生便一直以受害者自居,她充满了愤怒,穿着她那件黄色的婚纱,她收养艾丝黛拉(Estella)以便报复所有的男人。许多受害者都不能释放自己的感情,因为这样做会不断解开自己的伤口,他们会反复地询问自己:“这种坏事情是怎么发生在我的身上的?我是那么好的一个人。”这可能是我们一生中所遇到的最为痛苦的失调问题。因此,难

以计数的书本都会提供精神上的和心理上的建议,以帮助受害者找到结束的方式,求得心理上的和谐。

不管是吉姆还是戴安妮,不管是夏沃还是辛德勒夫妇,或者在伊朗人质危机中的行凶者和受害者之间的隔阂,以及自我辩护习惯所产生的后果,都可以通过让双方讲述同一个故事的形式反映出来。无论是个人层面还是国家层面的行凶者,在书写自己的历史时都会为自己的行为辩护并认为这些行为是由对方激起的;他们自身的行为是明智的而且是有意义的;如果他们做错了或者走得太远,至少从长远来看是最佳的选择;而且至少这一切都已经成为过去了。在书写同样的一段历史时,受害者则往往将行凶者的行为描写成肆意妄为、没有意义,或者说他们是在故意作恶、非常残忍;而他们自己的报复行为则十分恰当、符合道义;事情本身也不会向最好的方向发展。实际上,所有的事情都会向最糟糕的方向发展,而且我们对这一切仍然感到很恼火。

因此,生活在北部和西部的美国人所了解到的独立战争,是旧历史遗留的事情,他们英勇的联合部队迫使南方势力放弃了罪恶的奴隶制度,北方人打败了叛国者杰弗逊·戴维斯(Jefferson Davis),使这个国家保持了统一(北方人掩盖了自己作为奴隶制度的行凶者和教唆者的罪行)。但是大多数居住在南方的白人讲述的却是不同的故事,其中有一种说法简直是活灵活现,一直流传至今。我们英勇的邦联军队其实是贪婪粗暴的北方人的牺牲品,他们击败了我们伟大的领袖杰弗逊·戴维斯,摧毁了我们的城市和传统,而且仍然试图破坏我们的国家权力。我们南方人与你们所谴责的美国佬之间没有任何联系;我们将继续维护我们联合政府的旗帜,谢谢你,那就是我们的历史。奴隶制度可能会随风消逝,但是它并非自愿退出。因此,历史总是由胜利者来书写的,而受害者只能将历史保留在自己的记忆之中。

邪恶的行凶者

在阿布格莱布监狱里,特种兵查尔斯·格拉纳(Charles A.

Graner)和一等兵林恩迪·英格兰(Lynndie R. England)站在一群赤裸裸的受害者后面,洋洋自得地跷着拇指,照片是如此令人恶心,以至于在第一眼看到它的几秒钟里,我竟然将它当成了蒙太奇……肆无忌惮、恬不知耻地把自己的快乐建立在他人的痛苦之上,对此我们已经司空见惯。此时我记起了:自己最后一次看到的剪辑是一组私刑照片。⁵

——作家卢克·桑提(Luc Sante)

有的时候要定义“好”很难,但定义“坏”一般是不会出错的:每个孩子都知道什么是痛苦。因此,当我们故意给其他人造成痛苦的时候,我们很清楚自己在做什么。我们是在作恶。⁶

——以色列小说家和社会批评家阿默斯·奥兹(Amos Oz)

在侮辱嘲笑伊拉克囚犯并令他们感到痛苦的时候,查尔斯·格拉纳和林恩迪·英格兰清楚自己在做什么吗?他们知道自己是在犯罪吗?不,他们并不知道。也就是说阿默斯·奥兹错了。奥兹忽视了“我们都是好人”这种自我辩护的力量。即使让别人遭受了痛苦,也是他们罪有应得。我们并未犯罪,恰好相反,我们正在做善事。社会生活中在那些不想也无力减少失调的人中,相对而言很少有人为此付出很大的心理代价:内疚、痛苦、焦虑、噩梦和一个个失眠的夜晚。生活在亲手制造的恐惧之中,不仅良心受到谴责,而且更要接受心灵的煎熬。正因为如此,大多数人都会尽可能地为自己辩护,以减少内心的负罪感。在前面的章节中我们可以看到,为什么离婚夫妇想方设法地证明对方伤害了自己。对别人的伤害越深,越需要进行自我辩护,以维护我们的面子和自我价值。正因为那些受害者罪有应得,所以对他们进行伤害反而会令我们更加憎恨他们,进而导致了对其变本加厉的伤害。

这种机制已被实验研究多次证实。基斯·戴维斯(Keith Davis)和爱德华·琼斯所进行的一项实验中,一些学生观察了另一个学生接受访谈的情况,在实验者的要求下,他们不得不告诉另外一个学生自己认为所观察的人很肤浅、不值得信赖,而且乏味单调。作出这一令人难以接受的评价的结果是,被试

们成功地使自己相信那个受害者应当受到自己的批评，而且他们还发现这个人不如受到伤害之前那么有吸引力了。尽管事实上被试们很清楚，那个人并没有做出什么该受指责的事情，而自己伤害他不过是按照实验者的要求去做，但是他们的心理仍然发生了变化。⁷

所有行凶者都是如此吗？当然不是，并不是每一个人都觉得需要靠诋毁受害者来减少失调。那么在你看来，哪种人最容易这样做呢？是那些自我评价很高、自我价值感很强的人，还是那些没有安全感、自我认可度极低的人呢？失调理论认为是前者。对那些自尊心低的人而言，粗暴地对待他人或者盲目地按照他人所说的去做，并不会和他们的自我概念发生太多冲突。甚至，他们更倾向于自我否认和相对平庸，因为他们认为自己并不完美。而那些有极高自我认可度的人如果伤害了别人，则必须让自己确信他们所伤害的是一些可鄙之徒，因为像自己这样的好人是不会伤害无辜的，受到伤害的那些家伙肯定是罪有应得。戴维·格拉斯(David Glass)通过实验肯定了如下说法：行凶者的自尊心越强，他们对受害者的诋毁就越多。⁸

在行凶者的眼中，是否所有的受害者都是一样的呢？并非如此，这会因受害者的无助程度而异。假如你是一个士兵，在搏斗中杀死了一个全副武装的敌人，你会有负罪感吗？可能不会。这种经历可能是不愉快的，但也不会产生失调，无需太多的自我辩护，“不是他死就是我死……我杀死了一个敌人……我们必须胜利……我们别无选择”。但设想一下，你正在执行一项爆破任务，这个屋子里藏有敌人和军队，你和战友们夷平了这个地方，事后才发现那个房子里只有老人、妇女和孩子。在这种情况下，大多数的士兵会努力寻找借口进行自我辩护，以减少杀害无辜平民造成的失调，而其中最重要的一种方法就是诋毁和辱骂，“蠢蛋，他们本不应该躲在那里……或许他们在帮助敌军……所有这些人都是蠢贼、亚洲佬、下等人”或者像威廉·威斯特摩兰(William Westmoreland)将军^①在提到越南战争中大量的伤亡者时所作的著名评论：“东方人的命不如

① 美国陆军四星上将，1964年至1968年越南战争期间任驻越美军最高指挥官，后来曾担任过美国陆军参谋长。——译者注

西方人的命值钱,他们如野草一样多,东方人的命很贱。”⁹

因此,失调理论会预言:与面对孤立无助的受害者相比,当所面对的受害者全副武装而且能够进行抵抗时,行凶者会感到没有必要通过诋毁他们来减少失调。在爱伦·博施德(Ellen Berscheid)和她的同事们所做的一项实验中,实验者让被试们相信自己将对他人实施的电击是学习实验的一部分。有一半的人被告知随后会变换角色,因此受害者可以进行报复。正如所预料的,只有那些认为受害者毫无反击之力的被试才会受到诋毁。¹⁰这些被试的情形与斯坦利·米尔格拉姆在1963年进行的服从实验中的被试极为相似。在按照实验者的要求对学习者的施加极其危险的电击后,大多数被试都会通过责备受害者来进行自我辩护。正如米尔格拉姆自己所说的:“在对受害者实施了侵害行为之后,大多数人都对受害者进行了严厉的批评。例如,‘像他那样愚蠢固执的人活该受电击’,是比较普遍的评价。一旦对受害者实施了伤害,这些人就会觉得受害者一无是处,由于受害者自身智力和性格存在缺陷,所以这些惩罚是不可避免的。”¹¹

这些研究的潜在含义是非常可怕的:将有很强自尊心的行凶者和孤立无援的受害者联系在一起,你便会理解为什么残暴行为会逐步上升。这种残暴行为不仅仅发生在虐待狂或精神病患者这类失去理性的人身上,它也会(而且往往会)发生在正常的人身上。这些正常的人指的是那些拖家带口的“文明”人,他们同其他人一样喜爱音乐、美食,喜欢做爱,也少不了家长里短的事情。这是社会心理学文献中有大量记载的发现之一,但也很难为人们所接受,主要因为它们所带来的强烈失调:“我怎么可能和那些进行谋杀与虐待的罪犯有共同点呢?”如果认定受害者是十恶不赦之徒,应当受到这样的对待,人们便更有可能消除心中的疑虑。¹²我们从不敢让他们的一丁点人性之光走进我们的心扉,因为它的出现可能会让我们面对碰碰舞(Pogo)^①那美妙台词所隐含的令人没齿难忘的真理:“我们都会遇到敌人,而那就是我们自己。”

① 一种发明于20世纪70年代的现代娱乐形式,在摇滚乐现场,人们伴随着音乐节奏蹦来蹦去并互相碰撞,以求心灵的宣泄与松绑。——译者注

相反,如果罪犯恰好是我们中间的某个人,大多数人会通过自我防卫或降低自身行为的严重性和非法性,来减少内心的失调。他们会做出一些表面上看来同敌人所做所为根本不同的事情。例如,一般认为只有像埃迪·阿明(Idi Amin)或萨达姆·侯赛因这样的坏人才会采取严刑逼供。而约翰·康洛伊(John Conroy)在《普通人做出的令人寒心的行为》一书中宣称,不仅仅是专制国家的审讯者们会违反《日内瓦公约》中“禁止对生命和人尤其是各种犯人的摧残,对身体的戕害、严酷的刑罚……(以及)对人格尊严的践踏,尤其是进行羞辱和诋毁”。在对监狱管理人员虐待囚犯案件的调查中,康洛伊发现,不论在英国、南非还是在以色列、美国,他所调查的每一支军队、每一个警署几乎都在对他们的侵害行径进行自我辩护。事实上,他们对囚犯的折磨比我们更严厉、更致命:

(南非的)布鲁斯·摩尔(Bruce Moore)国王告诉我,当他对囚犯实施电击时,一般都会避开他们的生殖部位,但是其他国家极有可能不会……胡戈·加西亚(Hugo Garcia)告诉我们,阿根廷要比乌拉圭严酷得多。欧米·克契瓦(Omri Kochva)打保票说,越南战争中的美军要比土著军队堕落……与爱尔兰共和军所创的酷刑相比,英国人颇为自己的理性方式深感欣慰。以色列人则经常讲,与阿拉伯国家的刑罚相比,我们的刑罚要黯然失色很多。¹³

关于阿布格莱布虐囚事件的公正调查显示:美军审讯员对嫌疑恐怖分子采取了睡眠剥夺、无理由延长隔离时间、性虐待、人为降温、殴打等多种残忍的审讯手段,这种情况不仅仅发生在阿布格莱布,在海湾地区和其他“黑幕”国家也是司空见惯。怎样为美国公然违反《日内瓦公约》的行为进行辩护呢?一种方式是声称,即使有过那样的行为,也不能称得上是虐待。“我们并没有虐囚,”乔治·布什说,“整个事情一直存在选择的余地。”另一种降低失调的方式是,将虐待囚犯视为正当的行为。詹姆斯·英赫夫(James Inhofe)称,每个在阿布格莱

布监狱的囚犯都是罪有应得,因为他们是谋杀犯,是恐怖分子、叛乱者。他们中很多人都杀死过美国人。看来他并不清楚大部分囚犯只是未经正式审判的轻刑犯。事实上,很多军事观察员通知国际红十字会,监狱中70%—90%的伊拉克犯人都是被冤枉的。¹⁴

对于虐囚事件的辩护就像一枚定时炸弹。专栏作家查尔斯·克罗萨莫(Charles Krauthammer)说:“如果恐怖分子在纽约安放了一枚一小时内爆炸的定时炸弹,爆炸的伤亡将达到100万人。这时你抓住了知道炸弹地点的恐怖分子,但他拒绝透露任何信息。这样,问题来了:如果你知道将他的拇指吊起来就可以知道炸弹的消息并拯救100万人的生命,你会这样做吗?”克罗萨莫认为大家一定会这样做,不是出于任何人的命令,而是自己的道德责任。¹⁵你没有时间打电话给《日内瓦公约》的监督执行者们询问这种做法是否会得到允许;为了从恐怖分子嘴里获取关于炸弹的信息,你会去做任何事情。

很少有人否认,在上述情况下用定时炸弹这种理由对虐囚行为进行辩护是合情合理的。但是问题在于这种情况非常少见,即便是在没有阴谋和爆炸的情况下,“拯救生命”也可能被当作正当的借口。美国国务卿康多莉扎·赖斯(Condoleezza Rice)曾因为支持美军在秘密监狱中的虐囚行为,在去德国访问的途中遭到反对者的袭击,她认为对于罪犯来说任何的审问手段都不足为过。她还提醒反对者要清楚对嫌疑犯的审问都是基于这样的理由,“停止一切恐怖活动,拯救无辜的生命”,这样的理由在美国和欧洲同样适用。¹⁶但是她似乎没有意识到,这种审问同样伤害了无辜的生命。赖斯也承认,美国以怀疑与恐怖活动有关为由对一名无辜德国市民长达5个月的不公正对待是“错误的做法”。

如果某些情况下的虐囚行为被认为是正当的,那么它便很容易扩大到其他情况:我们将不仅仅对那个知道炸弹下落的人采取虐待行为,而会对某个可能知道相关消息的人,或者是某个5年之内可能知道相关信息的人,也采取同样的行为,最后发展到对任何一个我们怀疑的对象进行虐待。国际特赦组织会长威廉姆·舒尔茨(William Schulz)通过对以色列、巴勒斯坦人权组织的调查证实:在1987—1993年间,以色列军人在审问过程中使用了虐待犯人的方法。他

说：“当审问的内容涉及炸弹等危险物品时，虐待被认为是正常的手段。”¹⁷ 美军第 82 空降师的一名中士曾经描述了虐待伊拉克囚犯的过程：

犯人在监狱中称我们是“杀人的疯子”……当犯人被带进审讯室，游戏便开始了。我们互相比赛，看这个犯人在昏倒或精神崩溃之前能坚持多久。这种折磨的环境会维持两天，不给他们提供水和食物等生活必需品。上级告诉我们那些犯人都是罪人，但是有时候上级的说法是错误的。¹⁸

“有时上级的说法是错误的”，这位中士说道，但是我们对待犯人的做法却是相同的。

对于虐囚行为的批评大多针对的是它的合法性、道德性和有效性。社会心理学家却提供了不同的视角：虐囚事件会对罪犯个人以及普通民众产生什么样的影响。大多数人都认为政府的所作所为是为了国家利益，政府知道自己在干什么以及什么是正确的选择。因此，假如我们的政府宣布虐囚行为是为了打击恐怖主义，大多数民众便会同意政府的做法。然而，长此以往，整个民族的道德状况会逐渐恶化。民众迈出了同意虐待犯人这一小步，实质上是踏上了良心泯灭、欲罢不能的不归路。通过不承认自己的政府做出了不道德和非法的行为来减少失调，不加鉴别的爱国主义会让人们从“金字塔”顶端向下滑落。

一旦行凶者谋划好了某个罪恶活动时，他（她）一定会避免在心中出现这样互相矛盾的结论，“我们是好人”与“我们正要进行犯罪活动”。即使是最为残忍的人也认为自己是好人。例如，被称为“巴尔干屠夫”的斯洛博丹·米洛舍维奇（Slobodan Milosevic），因为他的种族清洗政策而直接导致了 20 万克罗地亚人、波斯尼亚穆斯林人和阿尔巴尼亚人的死亡。他因战争罪、反人类罪和种族屠杀罪而受到指控，在持续近 5 年的审判中，他对于那些罪行拒不承认。塞尔维亚人总是穆斯林教义的牺牲品。战争就是战争；他只是对塞尔维亚人的屠杀作出了正面回应。里卡多·奥里西奥（Riccardo Orizio）曾对其他 7 位独裁者进

行过采访,这些人包括:埃迪·阿明、让·克洛德·杜瓦利埃(Jean-Claude “Baby Doc” Duvalier)、米拉·马尔科维奇(Mira Markovic,米洛舍维奇的妻子)、中非共和国的让·贝德尔·博卡萨(Jean-Bédél Bokassa)。每个人都认为自己所犯下的罪行——包括枪杀和迫害反对者,操纵选举,导致民众的饥寒交迫,侵占国家财产,发动侵略战争——都是为了国家利益。如果他们不这样做就会导致骚乱、无政府状态和流血事件。他们决不承认自己是暴君,反而坚持认为自己是作出自我牺牲的爱国者。¹⁹ 路易斯·梅南(Louis Menand)分析道:“个体认知失调的程度是由反对者的压力所造成的。我们在审判杜瓦利埃的海地法庭上看到这样的条幅:一个在海地推行民主政治的革命者却不得不面对历史的审判。这个条幅的署名是:终生总统,让·克洛德·杜瓦利埃医生。”²⁰

如果“为了国家利益”这样的理由还不够充分的话,这里还有更为通用的减少失调的方法:“那是他们这样做的,与我无关。”希特勒也曾讲过类似的话,当时的“他们”指的是那些第一次世界大战中签订《凡尔赛公约》的战胜国以及德国国内的犹太“寄生虫”。问题在于,他打算追溯到多久来证明是别人先挑起事端的呢?再想想我们开头所提到的伊朗人质危机,受害者可以提供非常悠久的记忆,来说明他们有非常充足的理由进行报复活动。穆斯林与基督教之间的战争持续了几个世纪,战事起起落落,到底谁是胜利者,谁是失败者呢?这个问题恐怕很难回答,但是我们可以研究一下交战双方是如何为自己的行为辩护的。

9·11事件之后,布什政府决定对恐怖主义采取主动出击的态度,认为这将是新世纪的宗教战争,大多数美国人对此表示同意。在西方,宗教战争有某种正面的含义,会使人联想到正义的使者——例如葛培理(Billy Graham)的圣战、圣十字足球队、十字军战士;当然还有蝙蝠侠和罗宾(Robin)。历史上的宗教战争开始于一千多年以前,结束于13世纪,确实经历了很长的时间。然而,大多数穆斯林对这种比喻感到愤怒和警觉。对他们来说,十字军带来的是持续至今的屈辱和牺牲。在1095年第一次东征中,基督教徒攻占了穆斯林圣城耶路撒冷并残忍杀害了城中所有的居民,这些集体记忆都栩栩如生地保留在穆斯林的心中,就好像发生在昨天一样。

宗教战争确实给欧洲的基督教徒提供了大肆屠杀穆斯林“异教徒”的机会。(很多犹太人在从欧洲去耶路撒冷朝圣的路上被杀害,所以一些犹太学者把宗教战争称为“第一次大毁灭”。)目前西方的观点认为,宗教战争是不幸的,但就像所有的战争一样,它们也会带来各种好处,例如,宗教战争打开了文化交流的大门,使西方的基督教和东方的穆斯林有了正面的冲突和碰撞。在一些书中提到基督教在战争中不过是在正当防卫,战争是由于那些穆斯林对前基督教国家的人侵引起的。例如,罗伯特·斯宾塞(Robert Spencer)在他的新书《针对伊斯兰(以及圣战)的错误政治导向》中大胆宣称:“圣战是一场自卫战争。”因此,西方国家并不是许多穆斯林眼中的行凶者。我们是受害者。

究竟谁才是受害者?这个问题的回答取决于你对历史的反思程度,在宗教战争开始的100多年前:基督教徒长期占领了原本属于耶路撒冷的城池,包括埃及、西班牙和土耳其。1095年,教皇乌尔班二世(Pope Urban II)劝说法国贵族发动了一场针对所有穆斯林的圣战,重新夺取了耶路撒冷的控制权,为欧洲国家拓展他们的贸易路线提供了可能;这场圣战可以将富裕贵族中的武士组织在一起并把平民动员起来成为统一的武装力量;同样可以把已经分裂为东正教和罗马教的基督教世界重新统一起来。教皇宣布,杀掉一个穆斯林就是基督教徒的一次赎罪,在战争中勇于杀敌的人将不会经历长久的炼狱痛苦而直接升入天堂。为了自己的理由而煽动殉道者去赴死,这种做法听起来是否颇为熟悉?其中根本没有圣洁可言。

对于欧洲的基督教徒来说,第一次宗教战争是经济利益上的巨大胜利,这不可避免地激起了穆斯林有组织的报复。到12世纪末,穆斯林领袖撒拉丁(Saladin)重新夺回了耶路撒冷和附近大部分城池的控制权(撒拉丁与英王理查德一世于1192年签订了和平条约)。残忍而血腥的宗教战争由穆斯林发动并以他们的最终胜利而结束。那么究竟是谁开的头?

对于以色列与阿拉伯之间纷扰复杂的战事来说,恐怕双方都可以列出一大堆听起来很有道理的理由。2006年7月12日黎巴嫩真主党军队绑架了两个以色列士兵,埃胡德·戈德瓦塞尔(Ehud Goldwasser)和伊利达·雷吉夫

(Eldad Regev)。作为报复,以色列向真主党控制的黎巴嫩地区发射火箭弹,造成了很多平民伤亡。历史学家蒂莫西·佳顿·阿什(Timothy Garton Ash)在研究了双方随后的报复性活动后写道:“冲突究竟是从什么时候、什么地点开始的呢?”是7月12日吗,还是此前一个月以色列炮击杀死了7个巴勒斯坦平民的事件?还是可以追溯到一月份,哈马斯获得选举胜利之时?或者是1982年,以色列入侵黎巴嫩的时候?还是1948年以色列建国?对于“是什么挑起战争?”阿什的回答是,19世纪和20世纪以来欧洲人的反闪米特人心态造成的恶意,其中包括沙俄对犹太人的大屠杀,法国暴民在“德莱弗斯案件”审判时喊出的“打倒犹太人”的口号,以及纳粹大屠杀。欧洲人对犹太人的歧视性排外无疑加强了犹太复国主义的势力,也推动了以色列在巴勒斯坦的扩张和以色列建国。

当我们批评以色列军人杀害黎巴嫩平民的时候,而且当我们批评联合国军队以恢复哥得沃森(Goldwasser)为名进行监管的时候……我们必须记住,如果不是欧洲人早在几十年前坚持把每一个叫哥得沃森的人驱逐出去的话,所有的事情都不会发生。²¹

阿什把事件的开始追溯到了两百年之前。其他的学者则可能会追溯到两千年之前。

当人们开始思考“在这件事情上谁先开的头?”这个问题时,不管“这件事情”是什么——家庭纠纷或国际争端——他们都不认为挑起是非的责任在自己身上。当人们决定谁是行凶者谁是受害者的时候,大家都认为被削弱或被毁灭的一方是受害者。有多少争论是从人们气急败坏地说出“但……那又该如何解释?”这句话时开始的。在你描述任何一方的残暴行为时,总会有人提出反驳:“但对方也做过一些好事,那又该如何解释?”

我们完全能够理解受害者报复的心理。但是报复往往会导致最初的行凶者减少自己的罪恶感并低估自身行为的伤害程度,同时也会令受害者觉醒,从

而使整个事件陷入无休止的压迫与复仇的循环里。“任何一次成功的革命，”历史学家芭芭拉·塔奇曼(Barbara Tuchman)观察到，“都会适时地对已经被罢免的暴君再加洗劫。”为什么不这样做呢？这样做，不管是胜利者还是受害者都会感到心理平衡。

真相与和解

有这样一则很受人们喜爱的古老佛教寓言：一群僧人经历了路途遥远的朝圣之后，正走在回自己寺院的路上。他们艰苦跋涉，翻过了高高的山峰、险恶的峡谷，直到有一天一条汹涌的大河挡住了去路，那里站着一个年轻美丽的女子。她走到年老的僧人面前说：“您能行行好，帮我过河吗？如果你们不帮我，留下我一个人过河，肯定会被河水冲走的。”老僧人和蔼地笑了笑说：“好的，我帮你过河。”说着就背起她，带她过了河。在河对岸，他轻轻地把姑娘放了下来。姑娘道谢后便离开了，僧人们继续赶路。

又赶了5天的路，僧人们终于回到了寺院。一回到寺院，他们就愤怒地质问老僧人：“你怎么能那样做？”并且警告他：“你违犯戒律了——你碰了那个女子！”

老僧人淡淡地说：“我只是背她过了河，你们已经背了她5天了。”

这些天来，僧人们的心里一直放不下那个女子；许多行凶者和受害者也是多年承受着内疚、悲伤、愤怒和复仇的负担。怎样才能放下这些负担呢？任何一个尝试对反目成仇的一对夫妻或者两个国家进行斡旋的人都会明白，要想让他们放弃自我辩护有多么难，特别是当他们已经斗争了很多年的时候。在这些年里，他们始终坚守着自己的位置，越来越不可能相互妥协、达成共识。因此，斡旋人和谈判代表也就面对着两项具有挑战性的任务：让行凶者认识并弥补自己对别人造成的伤害；同时设法帮助受害者证实他们所受到的伤害并放弃复仇的冲动。

例如，如果夫妻双方中一方深深地伤害或背叛了另一方，怎样对他们调解

并打破僵局呢？临床心理学家安德鲁斯·克里斯滕森和尼尔·雅各布森给出了三种可能奏效的方法：第一，行凶者必须单方面放弃自己的感觉，真正认识到受害者的愤怒中隐藏着大量的痛苦，真心地自责和道歉；第二，受害者单方面停止反复的谴责，因为毕竟错误已经发生了，所以应该表现自己的痛苦而不是愤怒，这更能引起行凶者的同情和关怀而不是自我防御。“如果让当事者单方面做到上面两点是很困难的，对很多人而言几乎是不可能的。”克里斯滕森和雅各布森说道。²²他们建议的第三种办法是最困难的，但也是最有效的，而且能够长期解决冲突：双方同时放弃自我辩护，同意沿着可能重新走到一起的道路前进。如果仅仅是行凶者单方面道歉并试图弥补，那么他的行为可能并不会那么真诚，也不一定会缓解和消除受害者的痛苦。同样，如果仅仅是受害者单方面的放弃辩解并原谅对方，行凶者可能也就没有了改变的动机，因此可能会继续做出不公平的、无情的行为。²³

克里斯滕森和雅各布森谈的是两个人之间的冲突。但是在我们看来，他们的分析也同样适用于群体冲突。在群体冲突中，第三种方法不仅是最好的方法，而且是唯一奏效的方法。在南非，种族隔离制度很容易留下一些后遗症，主张维持现状以及现状所赋予特权的白人一方会因自我辩护而产生愤怒，黑人一方作为受害者也会因自我辩护而带来愤怒。这种情况促使两个勇敢的人——白人弗雷德里克·德克勒克(Frederik de Klerk)和黑人纳尔逊·曼德拉(Nelson Mandela)共同行动，避免了大多数革命所带来的流血冲突，创造条件使自己的国家走向了民主。

德克勒克于1989年当选为总统，他知道激烈的革命已经是不可避免的。反对种族隔离制度的斗争逐步升级；其他国家实施的制裁正在严重影响国家经济；被取缔的非洲国民大会(非国大)的支持者们越来越倾向于暴力，他们杀害、拷打被认为可能与白人政权合作的人。德克勒克原本有希望通过制定压制性更强的政策拼死保住白人的权力。相反，他取消了对非国大的禁令，释放了已经在监狱里关了27年的曼德拉。对曼德拉来言，他本可以让自己的愤怒将他毁灭，他可以下定决心待在狱中进行很多人认为是合法的复仇。相反，为了自

己终生为之奋斗的目标，他放弃了自己的愤怒。“如果你想与自己的敌人和平相处，你就必须和他们一起工作，”曼德拉说，“这样他便会成为你的伙伴。”1993年，他们两个人同时获得了诺贝尔和平奖，第二年曼德拉当选南非总统。

实际上这个新生的民主政府所做的第一件事情，就是成立由大主教德斯蒙德·屠图(Desmond Tutu)担任主席的真相与和解委员会(此外，还分别建立了有关侵害人权、特赦、赔偿与复兴三个委员会)。真相与和解委员会的目标，是为暴行的受害者提供一个法庭，在那里他们的遭遇会得到倾听和确认，在那里他们的尊严和公平感将得到重建，在那里他们可以当着行凶者的面发泄自己的不平和愤恨。作为获得特赦的交换条件，行凶者必须放弃对罪行的否认，放弃各种借口和自我辩护，承认他们所造成的伤害，包括拷问和谋杀。委员会强调：“我们需要理解而不是复仇，需要弥补而不是报复，需要对他人的仁慈而不是伤害。”

委员会的目标是振奋人心的，只是在实践中并没有完全兑现。委员会导致了许多抱怨、嘲笑、抗议和愤怒。很多种族隔离的黑人受害者，像死于狱中的激进主义分子蒂芬·比科(Stephen Biko)的家人，对行凶者获得特赦感到非常愤怒。很多白人犯罪者很冷漠，没有真正的自责，没有为任何事情进行道歉，而且很多种族隔离政策的白人支持者对他们同伴的招供也充耳不闻。南非并没有变成天堂；它仍然受到贫困和高犯罪率的困扰。但它成功地避免了一场流血战争。心理学家索罗门·史奇莫(Solomon Schimmel)在那里旅游的时候，正在撰写一本有关不公与暴行的受害者方面的书籍，他从政策和文化的角度进行了一些访谈，希望听到人们有关愤怒和复仇愿望的讲述。“给我留下最深印象的是，”他写道，“白人和黑人之间没有什么深仇大恨，他们共同协商希望建立一个种族和谐、经济公平的社会。”²⁴

只有当人们不再试图为自己辩护之后，才能够做到只有理解没有仇恨，只有补偿没有报复。越南战争结束多年后，老兵小威廉·伯洛莱斯(William Broyles Jr.)返回了越南，他曾在这里看到并且做过很多令人恐惧的事，这些一直困扰着他，他希望能够得到解脱。他说他之所以去那里，是想见一下从前的

敌人，“实实在在的人，而不是想象中的样子”。他到了一个小村子，这里曾经是海军陆战队的一个基地，在这里他碰到了一个是越共的妇女。交谈中，他意识到她的丈夫正是在他和他的队员巡逻的时候被杀害的。“你的丈夫可能是被我和我的队员杀死的。”他说。妇女很平静地看着他，说：“但那是在打仗，战争已经结束了。生活还要继续。”²⁵不久，伯洛莱斯对自己的越南“疗伤之旅”进行了反思：

我以前常常夜里做噩梦。从越南回来以后，我不再做了。也许由此得出更大的结论有些过于个人化色彩，但是这的确让我明白了，要想结束一场战争就必须去面对你曾经面对过的敌人。你的确是在缔造和平。在历史中没有什么是一成不变的。



第八章



置之不理,还是爽快承认

有个人长途跋涉寻找世界上最聪明的人;在找到之后,他问这位智者:“怎样才能获得幸福的人生?”

“作出正确的判断。”智者答道。

“可是,聪明的智者,”这个人又问道,“怎样才能作出正确的判断呢?”

“通过错误的判断。”智者说。

2006年1月26日,发生了一件令人震惊的文化事件:奥普拉·温弗瑞(Oprah Winfrey)用了整整一个节目的时间为自己的一个错误道歉。她曾经推荐过詹姆斯·弗雷以及他撰写的一部关于吸毒上瘾和戒毒的自传体回忆录《岁月如沙》,她的推荐使此书的销量突破了百万册。1月8日,一个颇具影响力的网站“证据确凿”(the Smoking Gun)发布了这样的消息:弗雷书中的大部分内容都经过了编造和美化,并非他的真实经历。奥普拉对这条消息第一个作出了

反应：我曾经支持和赞扬过这个人，但是现在看来他欺骗了我——这是大多数人可能作出的正常反应。如果继续站在弗雷的一边，她就必须掩饰心中被欺骗的感觉。在“证据确凿”网站披露这个消息没多久，拉里·金在节目中采访弗雷时，奥普拉还打进电话表达对弗雷的支持：“弗雷在书中写到的关于履行职责的那些话引起了我的共鸣，我认为这些话也在激励着其他人。”同时她还补充道，如果说有什么人犯了错误的话，那应当是出版商；她和制作人都相信了出版商的话，认为那是一部非虚构的作品。

站在道德金字塔顶端的奥普拉，已经迈出了试图继续自己当初对弗雷支持的第一步。但是那些关于“出版商犯了错误”、“我的制作人应该受到指责”或“书中的感情真相比事实真相更令人感到可信”的言论，却使她从道德金字塔的顶端滑落下来，这种推卸责任的逻辑在我们的生活中比比皆是，奥普拉也在所难免。也许她一直受到自己良心的谴责；也许她的制作人试图帮她脱离困境，认为她对弗雷的袒护对她的名誉毫无帮助。但不论是出于何种原因，奥普拉选择了最直接而并非拐弯抹角的方式，勇敢地对错误承担了责任。她邀请弗雷参加电视节目，并开门见山地对自己的那个电话道歉：“我对那个电话表示遗憾。”她对自己的观众说：“我错误地认为事实如何无关紧要，对此我感到非常抱歉，因为那与我的信念相违背。我之所以会打这个电话是因为我确实喜欢书中表达的某些信息——那时我收到了很多表达感动之情的电子邮件，那些赞美之词在很大程度上蒙蔽了我的判断。感谢那些坚持原则的人们，事实证明，你们是绝对正确的。”¹

她对弗雷说：“因为我确实感到被你欺骗了，所以现在与你的交谈也变得困难，我感到十分难堪，你欺骗了我们所有的人。”华盛顿邮报专栏作家理查德·科恩(Richard Cohen)曾经批评过弗雷的撒谎行为，并指责奥普拉的表现令人失望。在节目结束后，奥普拉对他说，自己对弗雷当时的反应感到很失望，因为弗雷说：“有时候批评是有建设性的，所以我要谢谢你。你是对的，错的是我。”你是对的，错的是我？美国人在日常生活中无数次地听到自己的配偶和父母说着这样悦耳的话，还有那些电视名人、自以为是博学者和政治家也是如此道

歉的。科恩还对奥普拉说：“新的一年就要开始了，我仍然认为你是一个好人，因为承认错误需要很大的勇气，我一直不能做到这一点。”

在整个节目中，奥普拉自始至终在同詹姆士·弗雷讨论那本书，而弗雷则自始至终在为自己的行为辩护：“我想，写书和出书都是一个错误。”奥普拉快失去理智了。弗雷就是做错事情的那个人，她用拉里·金的话来提醒他，但是他还是不承认。奥普拉问道：“你认为自己说谎了吗？或者你认为自己做错了吗？”弗雷犹豫着说道：“我想，二者都有。”

弗雷：我的意思是，我认为我曾来过这里并诚实地与你谈论。你知道，我曾经这样，我必须承认……

对弗雷的反驳：你在说谎。

在节目的最后部分，纽约时报作家弗兰克·里奇(Frank Rich)出现在节目中，他回应了理查德·科恩的指责，声援了奥普拉的决定，认为不应该为增加书籍的销量而扭曲事实。“最困难的事情是承认错误”，他说，奥普拉告诉他并不希望得到赞美。她说：“承认错误并没有想象中的那么困难。”



如果通读了这本书后，我们会发现承认错误的确是件困难的事情。对于心理治疗师琳达·罗斯来讲，在发现自己被误导多年之后，她提出了恢复记忆的理论。对于格拉斯来讲，头脑中错误的恢复记忆，导致了她多年的家庭破碎。对于地方检察官托马斯·瓦尼斯来讲，他得知了自己曾经指控过的一个强奸犯在监狱服刑20年后被证明是无辜的。对于夫妻和政治领导人而言，他们所期望的是从暴怒和报复的漩涡中解脱出来。错误消耗了这些人生，也消耗了那些关心他们的朋友和同事们的人生。

小韦恩·黑尔(N. Wayne Hale Jr.)会同意我们的结论，他曾是2003年美

国国家航空航天局负责人,在他的任期内发生了哥伦比亚飞船的爆炸事件,7名宇航员死亡。黑尔在一封致航天飞机全体工作人员的信中承担了这次事件的全部责任:

我曾经有机会而且得到过信息,但是却并没有好好利用,不知道法庭会给我什么样的判决,但是我一直受到良心的审判和折磨,因为我没能阻止哥伦比亚号的爆炸。我们可以对如下特征加以检讨:疏忽、无能、分心、信念缺失、缺少理解和沟通、缺乏毅力和勇气、懒惰。最糟糕的是我没有理解所听到的信息,没有做到光明磊落。因此不能够将眼光放得更长远些;我对哥伦比亚的爆炸负有责任。²

这些勇敢的人直指我们内心的丑恶,我们从内心深处试图通过自我辩护来免遭失调的痛苦,但是灵魂却在不停地拷问。减少这种失调,会使我们多数人花费很多时间和精力来保护自我并支撑起自尊,以免认为自己比其他人更愚蠢、更容易犯错误。但多数情况下这种精力消耗是不必要的,琳达·罗斯仍然是一位出色的心理治疗师,托马斯·瓦尼斯也依然是一位很好的检察官,格拉斯最终把父母接回了家。韦恩·黑尔荣升为约翰逊太空基地的美国国家航空航天局总负责人。

联想一下自己的情况吧!如果我们听到自己的配偶、父母或长大成人的子女说:“我要对自己所犯的错误负责;我们总是为了这个事情吵架,现在我知道了,你是正确的,我错了。”或者,在开会的时候听到自己的上司说:“我希望在作决定之前能知道任何可能犯错的情况。”一个严厉的检察官在会议上宣布:“我犯了一个可怕的错误,我忘记重审一件案子,那个案子刚刚有了新的证据,失误让无辜的人进了监狱。我会道歉,但是仅仅道歉是不够的,我会重新检查审判过程的错误,不会再让无辜的人蒙冤。”

我们会怎样看待这样的人呢?我们会不尊重他们吗?事实上,如果他是我们

的错误！这个人真可怕！”如果他们是专业人士或政治领袖，你便会认为假如让更有水平的人来处理，也就不会发生这样的事情了。最后一个勇于向全国人民承认错误的美国总统是约翰·肯尼迪。他轻信了高层军事专家的言论和错误报告，那些人告诉总统一旦美国侵占了古巴海湾，那里的人们会欢呼雀跃并推翻卡斯特罗政权。事实证明，这次入侵是一次灾难，但肯尼迪从中吸取了教训。他重新组织了智囊团并表示以后决不轻易接受军方的建议。这个改变让他成功地摆脱了随后的古巴导弹危机。在入侵古巴海峡之后，肯尼迪曾对采访他的记者说：“政府正确对待了这次失误，有个智者说过‘如果不尽快改正，失误就会变成错误’，没有争论和批评，政府和国家就不能取得任何胜利——共和政体也就不会存在。这次入侵古巴海湾的活动失败了，所有的责任都在我，是我一个人的错误。”肯尼迪的支持率因此而大增。

我们需要听到这样的话，我们也渴望听到这样的话：“我绷紧了神经。我必须保证再也不会发生类似的事情。”并不是每个领导人都可以领会到肯尼迪讲话的精髓的，就像罗纳德·里根(Ronald Reagan)在伊朗门丑闻中的反应，我们可以将此归结为：“我本人并没有做错任何事情，但这发生在我所领导的团队中，所以我认为自己也应该承担一些责任。”³ 这样说是不能奏效的。极受尊重的民意调查研究者丹尼尔·扬基洛维奇(Daniel Yankelovich)报告，尽管民意测验发现公众对我们这些重要的民意机构往往心存疑虑，但在这种表面现象的背后却是对诚实和正直的“真诚渴求”。“人民需要这类机构透明化运作，”他说，“将一个人的真实面目向外界展示，按自己所认可的行为标准去生活，表现出个人对社会的责任心。”⁴

民众需要权威爽快承认错误，不需含糊其词或拖泥带水。下面举个例子，这是关于最近在医疗系统内发起的一项活动，这个活动鼓励医生和医疗单位勇于承认并纠正自己的错误。（我们谈论的是人们在诚实方面的错误，这是人性的弱点，而不是因不负责任而造成的事故。）一般认为，大部分医生在诊断和治疗的过程中会固执地坚持自己的意见，这种做法容易造成医疗纠纷。但这种说法是错误的。对医院的调查显示，当医院和医生为自身的错误道歉后，患者一

般是不会起诉医院的,错误被及时纠正后,类似的情况也就不会再发生了。外科医生兼哈佛大学公共医疗政策教授卢西安·李珀(Lucian Leape)说:“对于患者来说,医生作出承诺不会再犯同类错误,使得患者的病痛有了意义,这比坚持医疗鉴定重要得多。”⁵

医生进行自我辩护的第二个理由是,承认错误会使医生丧失无所不能、从不犯错的光环,而这个光环是患者相信医生诊断的重要依据。这个观点也是错误的。试图建立医生无所不能形象的人总会失败,甚至会背负铁石心肠和傲慢自大的骂名。患者和他的家人可能会悲伤至极,因为医生没有告诉他们病情的真相并为之道歉。事实上,一个胜任的医生在明知自己错误的情况下依然可以充满自信,就像一般人勇于承担错误的后果一样。在《纽约时报》的散文专栏中,外科医生理查德·弗里德曼(Richard A. Friedman)曾经非常成功地概括了勇于承担后果的困难和收获:“像所有的医生一样,我的职业生涯充满了错误。”在一次治疗中,他忽视了患者可能出现的药物反应,使她死于医疗事故。“不用问,这次失误搞得我几乎发疯。我不清楚问题出在哪里,但是我清楚这的确是自己的责任,所以我向家属如实奉告并道歉。他们最初感到震惊和气愤,并很自然地向我和医院发难,但是最终他们认为这是一次真诚的赔礼道歉并不再追究法律责任。大部分患者会原谅技术上的失误,而不能原谅良心上的错误。”⁶

宽恕一个真诚认识到自己错误的人,并不只是神职人员的责任。当我们被迫面对自己的错误并勇敢承担的时候,获得的是令人激动和放松的经验。职业顾问鲍布·卡顿(Bob Kardon)告诉我们这样一件事情,有一次他负责在非营利的国际会议上组织研讨会,这个研讨会就是关于纯粹简单的“错误”,有20个国际组织的领导人参加。卡顿告诉他们,参加这个研讨会的唯一条件,是告诉大家自己作为一个领导人的犯错经历,不要试图通过改正错误的过程来抹杀它,也不要回避自己应该承担的责任。他不允许那些领导人来粉饰这些错误,也就是说“要与错误同在”:

当我们还没有察觉的时候,错误已经在慢慢逼近。在事情做到一

半的时候,高级官员可能已经犯下了大错,譬如,由于没有按时获得一笔拨款而导致所在的机构损失成千上万美元。参与者往往很难面对这一错误,他们会尽量讲一些有关成功或者从错误中调整过来的趣闻。我严格执行了会议的规定,禁止他们有任何挽回颜面的行为。研讨会进行到一半的时候,笑声已经充满了整个会场,那些听起来近似神经质的笑声,是巨大压力的一种宣泄。那笑声特别刺耳,以至于吸引了其他会场的人员。

卡顿的训练告诉我们,实事求是地说出“嘿,我确实把事情搞砸了”这句话,而不提供任何借口进行自我辩护(如实事求是地说出“我犯了个低级错误”而不是说“我丢球是因为太阳直射到眼睛了”、“刚好有一只鸟飞过”、“因为阴天”、“因为一个球迷喊我傻瓜”),是多么困难的一件事情。一位朋友在参加了一日驾校学习后告诉我们,当那些违规者前来报告自己的违规情况时,惊人的一致出现了:没有人对自己的违规行为负责。他们都在为自己超速驾驶、无视停车标志、闯红灯、违规进行U型转弯辩护。他对那些冗长而牵强的借口感到非常厌倦。轮到他的时候,他最初也有同样的冲动并因此感到羞愧,但最终还是克服了,他说道:“我闯了红灯,我深刻认识到自己的错误并感到很后悔。”在片刻的寂静之后,会场内为他的坦诚爆发出欢呼声。

承认错误需要一大堆充分的理由,一开始你可能会从你的家庭、你的公司、你的同事、你的敌人、你的传记作者,总之你可能找到的任何人那里寻找理由。心理学家鲍勃·阿伯森(Bob Abelson)曾经有过一个学生,他一直在坚持自己的观点,尽管这个观点与其他学者的研究结果相左。阿伯森最后温和地问他:“你是主动承认自己的错误,还是让其他人证明你的错误呢?”承认错误是有很多好处的。别人会更喜欢与你交往,有些人会吸取你失败的教训;你的错误也可能刺激其他人的灵感。孩子们会明白每个人都会面临当众承认错误的窘境,即使成年人也不例外。在错误还只是一粒种子的时候,认识并改正它,总比让它长成根枝繁茂的大树要好得多。

放弃自我辩护,低头承认错误,意味着心灵的放松和更加良好的人际关系,我们为什么不这样做呢?我们都很希望看到别人做出勇于承担责任的行为,但是我们自己却为什么很少这样做?首先,在很多情况下,我们认为没必要这样做,自我辩护的行为几乎是自动形成的,我们意识不到,它会避免因自己做错事情而出现失调的感受。“错误?我不可能犯错误……那棵树是自己跳到我的车上的……无论如何,我有什么必要为此道歉?是她先开始的……他偷了东西……这些都不是我的错。”其次,美国存在一种错误恐惧的文化氛围,错误总是与不负责任和愚蠢的特质联系在一起的。所以,即便是在已经发现错误的时候,人们也不愿意去承认它,因为一旦承认了,就意味着自己是个只会胡扯的笨蛋。如果我们希望更多的人愿意承担错误并积极改正,我们就必须克服以上所讲的那两个障碍。

当我们在家庭、记忆、治疗、法律、偏见、冲突和战争等领域重蹈自我辩护的覆辙时,失调理论可以为我们提供两点启示:首先,减少失调的能力会使我们在很多方面受益匪浅,可以维护我们的信念、自信、决心、自尊和幸福。其次,这种能力也会给我们带来很大的麻烦。人们为了维护自己最初决定的正确性,可能会走向自我毁灭的泥潭。他们可能会更加粗暴地对待自己所伤害的人,因为他们会坚信他们的受害者是罪有应得。他们会坚持自己工作中一些过时的甚至有害的做法。他们会支持虐待者和暴君,因为他们觉得这些人和自己都站在正义的一边。极端的异教徒可能会有一种消灭自己对立面的冲动,因为他们几乎不存在心理失调的问题。

减少失调是一个复杂的心理过程,但这并不意味着我们一定会受到它的控制。人类通常不想改变,但是我们仍然具有改变的能力。有人认为很多自我保护机制形成的错觉和盲区都是大脑活动的结果,这种结论对于喜欢辩护的人来讲是一种解脱。大脑是用来保护自尊和信念的吗?的确,大脑可能会告诉我们糖是最好吃的食物,但我们还是会选择多吃蔬菜。当我们感到自己受到攻击的时候,大脑会令我们勃然大怒吗?的确如此——但是我们仍然会多思考一下,然后选择使用木棍来对付那个家伙。对于我们大家来说,对失调如何起作用加

以理解，会帮助我们改变最初的冲动，保护我们免受伤害。

对失调的适应

或许失调理论的最大启示在于：我们不可以坐等他人良心发现、人格转变、注意突然改变，或者指望他人突然坦诚起来，承认自己的错误，去做正确的事情。任何组织和个人都会尽可能采用对自己有利的方式来减少失调，这导致了他们不断为自己的错误辩护并坚持自己一贯的做法。他们不会承认自己的失误导致了那些无辜的人身陷牢狱之灾。他们不希望他人指出投资千万的新药项目失败的原因。即便是最亲密的人，当我们用事实向他们指出他们最相信的自利记忆时，也不会表现得开心愉快。

最终对折磨我们这些平常人的这种狭隘性的矫正是比较少的。由于我们大多数人缺乏自我矫正的能力，而且我们的认识盲点使我们不能达到理想的境界，所以人类就必须通过适时的外部矫正来降低未来再犯同样错误的可能性。在合法的领域里，我们会发现对审问进行强制录影是防止歧视的便捷有效方法；任何歧视和威胁的迹象都会被监控者发现。我们要担心的不仅仅是政策上的歧视，还有司法上的歧视，例如对医生错误进行截肢的玩忽职守行为，检察官会倾向于无视患者的痛苦而选择免于惩罚。绝大部分的判决在公众的视线之外，接近 95% 的案件是由警察直接派送检察官而没有经过陪审团的审阅。对于很多场合来说，权力大于一切，在罪犯的判决方面很多人会不择手段地赢得胜诉。⁷ 律师们在法庭上积极地为自己的当事人申辩（是为了违抗法庭判决），因为他们并不是原告方并且具有改变判决的力量；就像重审中央公园案件的是罗伯特·摩根索，而最初对理查德·迪由特提起指控的是萨克拉门托^①地区检察官，这说明了为什么独立机关会授权给第三者决定是否重新审理某个案件。有关人员之间不能存在利益冲突，不能为已经作出的判决辩护，没有好朋

① 美国加利福尼亚州首府。——译者注

友需要保护,而且不需要去努力减少失调。⁸

然而,很少有组织会欢迎来自外部的监督和矫正。如果某些权威希望不惜一切地维护他们的认知盲点,那么就需要有公正的审查委员会来提升他们的眼界;假如到了一定的地步,甚至会作出违背他们意愿的裁定。科学领域采取的是独立的模式,尽管看起来只是亡羊补牢,但来自外部同行的评议仍然不失为一种极佳的范例。科学和医学方面的杂志,清醒地意识到当利益冲突对研究的污染而且曾经被一些伪造数据的研究者所欺骗,他们正在制定更为有力的措施来减少带有偏见的、腐败的、欺骗性的研究成果发表。很多研究者都号召增加评议过程的透明度,审判体系的改革者也在寻找类似的解决办法。如果我们人类不可避免地受到狭隘意识的困扰,那么减少和更正错误只有在完全透明的条件下才能进行。

组织管理顾问沃伦·本尼斯(Warren Bennis)和波特·奈尼斯(Burt Nanus)建议:组织机构可以对承认错误的举动进行奖励,将这种方法固化为组织文化的一部分,而不是像现在这样消极地对待有过错的人。这种观念的转变一定要从领导层开始。他们讲述了IBM创建者小汤姆·华生(Tom Watson Sr.)的一个传奇故事,这个故事在40多年里一直起着激励作用。“IBM公司中的一个大有前途的小主管被卷入了公司的危机中,这个危机会让公司损失上千万美元,”他们写道,“这的确是件很糟糕的事情,当华生把出错的主管叫到办公室时,那个年轻人脱口而出:‘我猜想你一定是要炒我的鱿鱼了?’华生说:‘你不要把事情看得太重,我们只是花了一千万美元给你上了一课!’”

在日常生活中我们又该怎么做呢?组织亲戚们成立外部的评议委员会来评判家庭纠纷?还是把父母对孩子的质问全部录制下来?在私人关系的处理中,我们只会忠于自己的感受,只能靠自知来约束自己的行为。一旦意识到心理失调可能发生,就要及时地把它们扼杀在“摇篮”中,像奥普拉所做的那样,在自己从金字塔顶端滑落很远之前及时采取措施。就像挑剔别人的行为那样,通过反省和批判自己的行为,我们有可能打破自我辩护造成的恶性循环。我们只需要在“我们所感受到的”和“我们该如何反应”之间进行片刻思考,考虑一下我

们是否真的愿意在一月天里去购买独木舟，是否真的愿意“赔了夫人又折兵”，是否真的愿意坚持某种与事实相悖的信念。在大脑将我们的想法存入原有的定型之前，我们可能已经改变了主意。

认识到自己处于失调状态可以帮助我们作出更机警、更敏锐、更明智的选择，而不会任由习惯性的自我保护机制来为自己消除失调。假定你的死对头在小组会议上提出了一项改革预案，你可能会认为“像她这样的白痴是不会提出什么好建议的”，你不加思考地否决了她的提议，可能仅仅是因为你很不喜欢这个女人（而且，你自己也承认，你感到在获得领导的认可方面她与你存在竞争）。或者，你会给自己留点余地，问道：“这会是一个不错的建议吗？如果它出自我的团队，我会如何看待它呢？”假如这是一个好的建议，那么你可能会同意这个建议但仍然不喜欢她这个人。你完全可以将信息和提供信息的人区分开来。

我们的目标是搞清楚导致痛苦的两种不协调的认知，然后找到一种途径来积极地加以解决；或者，在我们不能解决的时候，学会加以适应。1985年，好友兼同盟罗纳德·里根的一次行动给以色列总理希蒙·佩雷斯（Shimon Peres）带来了失调。里根接受了参观德国比特堡二战士兵公墓的邀请，这被视为两国战后和解的重要标志，佩雷斯对此感到非常气愤。此举也激怒了很多集中营的幸存者，因为那个公墓里埋葬着49个纳粹军官。里根最终还是去了那个公墓。当记者询问佩雷斯对里根的行为有何感想时，他既没有以个人的名义加以指责，也没有故意缩小这次访问所造成的影响。他选择了第三种方法，他说：“朋友仍然是朋友，错误仍然是错误。”¹⁰

稍作片刻的思考，我们便可能像佩雷斯那样将利益与失调清晰地区分开来：我们很有可能维持友谊，而不会让它在盛怒之下终止；在其他情况下可能忽略的错误，此时会受到恰如其分的批评，犯错误的人会得到应有的惩罚和警告。人们可以保持对自己的民族、宗教、政党、家庭和配偶的偏爱；然而，反对来自他们的不合宜、误导性、不道德的行为或者政策，并不意味着对他们不忠诚。

在一次外伤研究治疗心理学家的在线讨论会上，一位年轻的心理咨询师提出了自己对某个领域的独到见解。但是他对那些心理学家们的反应却没有足

够的心理准备,专家们认为这个研究毫无价值而且没有理论依据。他们的反应使那位年轻学者陷入极大的困惑之中,一方面是“我对这个研究付出了太多的精力、时间和金钱”,另一方面是“我崇拜的专家认为我的研究是一派胡言”。对此,人们常用的减少失调的策略是,要么把那些专家当作象牙塔中的白痴,要么将专家们的建议全部接受并积极改正,而后者可能是大家都能接受的策略。

他写道:“虽然自己一时难以接受那些批评,但还是要感谢专家们的关注。”他在仔细阅读了建议后,总结到自己确实有些急于求成,忽视了研究本身的理论基础。随后又补充道:“我自己的经历可以提供参考,对于错误信念的及时纠正也是科学态度的一部分,即便那样做并不容易。如果在时间、金钱等方面的投入越多,人们所抱的希望和期待会越大,相应地就越容易自负,当遇到不同的意见时所感受到的挑战也会越大。那是一种令人蒙羞的经历。”¹¹

令人蒙羞,这便是问题的关键所在。在认识到我们的心理需要平衡后,就更会拒绝那些对我们的信念、决策和偏好进行质疑的信息,这些信息都会揭示犯错的可能。它也导致我们错失正确的机会。自信是一种很好的品质,没有人希望遇到一个对患者的病情无所适从的医生,同时我们还是希望医生可以吸取教训不断进步。每个人都希望永远充满激情与自信,让生活富有意义并多姿多彩。然而对正确的极端追求很容易让人变得自以为是。当自信的品质不是产生于谦虚和对失误的接纳时,人们便很容易由健康的自信心变为盲目自大。本书中,我们看到了很多这样的例子:心理治疗学家曾经确信自己可以弄清所恢复的记忆是否准确;学者和法官曾经确信自己可以远离利益的纷争;警察曾经认为可以辨认出嫌疑犯是否撒谎;检察官曾经认为他们可以证明某个涉嫌犯罪的团伙有罪;丈夫和妻子们曾经认定自己对事件的描述是正确的;一些民族曾经认定自己的历史是独一无二的。

我们在一生中会面临很多的抉择,这些决策不一定全错,也不一定全对。有些会导致无法预测的后果。如果不是用自负的方式来证明自己的行为,我们就有机会体会到生命的复杂性,这里所说的复杂性指的是自己和别人的意见可能很难统一,对自己有利的事情未必对别人也有利。一位我们称之为贝蒂

(Betty)的女士说:“我知道艰难的决定是什么样的。”

当我决定与结婚 20 年的丈夫离婚时,我的一个女儿对我的决定表示支持,她说:“怎么这么久才离婚呢?”但这个决定对另一个女儿却被视为一场灾难,她对我的愤怒延续了多年。我思考了很久,也不能解开这个疙瘩,我指责女儿不能理解我的感受。结果是我变成了一个专制的母亲,而我的女儿变成了自私自利、缺少管教的问题青年。随着时间的流逝,我不能再这样下去了,这样下去我会永远地失去女儿。我回想着她曾经的温柔和体贴,意识到她并不是故意捣蛋,她不过是一个被我们离婚所摧垮的孩子。最终我和她坐在一起,并告诉她,虽然我仍然觉得离婚对我而言是一个正确的决定,但是我可以理解对她所造成的伤害,并希望她可以把自己的感受告诉我。她说:“妈妈,请带我去中央公园野餐吧,就像我小时候那样。”于是我们这样做了,这标志着我们彼此的和解。从那以后,每当我 100%地认定某个决策时,我总是会重新考虑一下。

贝蒂没有必要承认自己作出了错误的决策;事实上,她并没有做错什么。但是她必须放弃认定自己正确的需要。

一定是有人搞错了——出错的是我

在美国,记住自己的错误被认为是不健康的,神经病患者总是想着自己的错误,精神病患者不断地叙说着自己的错误。

——剧作家丽莉安·海尔曼(Lillian Hellman)

心理失调很难克服,但是我们对错误的态度却不难改变。在盖蒂斯堡战役中的“皮克特冲锋”,致使罗伯特·李(Robert E. Lee)将军率领的 12 500 人的

部队战死过半,他说:“所有这一切都是因我的错误造成的。我对士兵的要求太高了。”¹² 尽管因错误地估计形势而犯下了致命的错误,但是罗伯特·李依然是大家心中伟大的将军。他对自己葬送了几千条生命的错误都可以供认不讳,而那些闯红灯的人为什么会死不认账呢?

大部分美国人认为自己能够认可“从错误中吸取教训”这句话,但那只是随口说说罢了,他们实际上认为只有傻瓜才会犯错误。再加上这个国家的著名传统:对于发生在一个月之前的事情都会具有很强的遗忘症,这种态度就说明,人们对待错误就像看到熟透的西红柿一样,巴不得马上扔掉——即使在某些情况下又不得不捡起来。

相信傻瓜才会犯错误的人,可悲之处在于他们还会犯同样的错误,不会从中吸取教训。他们会重蹈覆辙,而骗子们则会因此而紧盯不放。每个人都有可能成为骗子的牺牲者。大约四分之一的美国人被骗子骗过,有的损失不大,有的损失则比较惨重:你被告知自己中了 100 万美金的大奖,如果要领取首先要交上一定数额的税金;你可能用高于市价 10 倍的价格去买一枚金币、一张包治百病的床,等等。每一年电视购物会从美国人兜里骗取 4 亿美金的收入,而老年人最容易上当受骗。

骗子们总能看透人们的失调以及因此而进行的自我辩护。他们知道,当人们处在“我是一个聪明而负责任的人”和“我在杂志购物中花了上千美元,那些东西和假的彩票信息我其实并不需要”这两种认知之间时,很少有人会为了减少失调而否认自己是一个聪明而负责的人,所以大部分人会为证明自己的钱花得正当而继续花更多的钱。这种减少失调的方法保护了自尊,但却会导致人们将来继续犯同样的错误:“如果我订更多的杂志,那么我就会中大奖了。”或者“那些投资顾问不会骗我的,他们是在基督教电台中做的广告。”老年人特别容易从这个角度去减少失调,因为他们大部分人很害怕承认自己输了——输掉了自己的金钱以及分辨能力。而且,他们不想以丧失自己对生活的控制权为代价,去向自己的成年儿女们让步。

认识到失调如何起作用,可以帮助我们更好地反思自己是怎样将事情搞砸

的，这种技能同样也可以帮助我们的朋友和亲戚。我们常常会从最良好的愿望出发，做出最糟糕的事情来：威吓、说教、胁迫、恳求或者辩护。社会心理学家安东尼·普拉卡尼斯(Anthony Pratkanis)对骗子如何对付老年人进行了研究，他讲了这样一个令人伤心的故事：这一家人都在责备那个被骗的人，“你难道看不出来那个人是个小偷，整个事情是一个圈套吗？你被骗了！”普拉卡尼斯说：“这种别人看来最自然不过的反应，也许是作为家人和朋友最不应该做出的。这样的说教会让受害者更加封闭自己而不能走出被骗的阴影。”对此，有过失调经历的人都能够明白。叫喊着“你到底在想什么？”的意思就是“伙计，你是个傻瓜”。这样的评价会令受害者更不愿意说出自己的想法。然而，他们会投入更多的金钱，购买更多的杂志，因为他们希望挽回脸面，证明自己的想法是正确的，证明自己并非又老又蠢。¹³

普拉卡尼斯说，因此，如果希望将受害者从被骗的边缘拉回来，首先要给予他理解和支持。能够提供帮助的亲人可以鼓励受害者讲出他们受骗时的想法，也就有可能理解他们的想法及其形成过程。他们会说：“请告诉我你为什么相信他呢？他是怎么吸引你的？”而不是说：“为什么你要相信那样一个混蛋呢？”骗子们往往具备很多人性的优点——他们友善、彬彬有礼，很有集体荣誉感，喜欢互赠礼物和结交朋友。有这些特质的人即便某些时候会给人添麻烦，也不会让人们感到没有安全感或者无能。这是佩雷斯的第三种方法：清晰地认识并区分他们。“我，是个正派、聪明的人，犯了错误；我仍然是个正派、聪明的人，错误仍然是错误。我现在想做的是如何补救自己的错误。”

在美国文化中，错误和愚蠢密不可分地联系在一起，但这并不代表其他国家的文化也有这个特点。在20世纪70年代，心理学家哈罗德·斯迪文森(Harold Stevenson)和詹姆士·斯蒂格勒(James Stigler)对亚洲和美国在校儿童的数学表现发生了浓厚的研究兴趣：在5年级，得分最低的日本班级的表现，也要比得分最高的美国班级强。为了找出这种现象的原因，哈罗德和詹姆士在此后的10年里对于美国、日本和中国的初中班级进行了比较研究。他们通过观察一个日本男孩的课堂表现找到了原因。那个男孩正在黑板上做三维绘图

的数学题。他在这个题目上花了 45 分钟,一直重复着相同的错误,斯迪文森和斯蒂格勒都对他失去了耐心和信心。但是那个男孩自己并没有因此丧气,美国学者也发现了自己为什么会比男孩表现还糟。“美国的文化中认为错误是严重的心理浪费。但是在日本,人们却并不是这样看的。在日本,错误、失误和困惑都是学习过程的一部分。”¹⁴(那个男孩最终还是解决了难题,并赢得全班的掌声。)研究者还发现与日本和中国相比,美国的家长、老师和学生都更加相信数学能力是天生的;如果你拥有这种能力,那么你不必用功学习;反之如果没有,尝试也没什么价值。与此相反,亚洲国家的人则认为数学方面的成功和其他领域一样,需要持之以恒和坚持到底的精神。在前进的道路上一定会有挫折,你必须吸取教训并改进方法;这并不意味着你是个傻瓜。

犯错误是科学家和艺术家在启蒙阶段必须经历的事情,因为他们有自由实验的机会,验证一种观点失败后,再试试另一种,并做好犯错误的准备。有个经典的故事,经常被小学生广为传播,那就是托马斯·爱迪生(Thomas Edison)在经过上万次失败发明了灯泡后接受的一次记者采访。他告诉那个记者:“我并没有失败,我成功地发现了一万种原料都不适合做灯泡。”现在大部分美国儿童都拒绝不断尝试的自由,拒绝失败成百上千次的经验。儿童的这种心理,归根结底就是害怕失败。教育孩子学会成功是必要的,但是教育他们不要害怕失败同样重要。当儿童或成人害怕失败时,他们就会害怕冒险。他们不能承担错误的结果。

美国儿童害怕失败,还有一个很重要的原因:他们会因为犯错误而对自己先天的能力产生怀疑。在对美国在校儿童进行了 20 年的研究之后,心理学家卡罗尔·德威克(Carol Dweck)指出了斯迪文森和斯蒂格勒的研究中发现的文化差异的原因。在她的实验里,一部分儿童因为接受新挑战而获得表扬。另一部分则因为智力和能力而受到表扬,这种表扬类似于家长经常对孩子说的:“约翰,你真是个数学小天才。”但是这句简单的表扬可能会对不同的孩子产生不同的影响。亚洲的孩子可能在没有完全成功之前就因努力而受到表扬,结果是:与那些因为能力而获得表扬的孩子相比,他们会表现得更好,也会有更多的学

习收获。他们更倾向于把错误和批评视为改进的有用信息。¹⁵而那些因为能力而受到表扬的儿童，更关心自己在别人眼中是多么与众不同，而不太注意学习的实际收获，他们会对表现不好和犯错误进行心理防卫，这样很容易使他们陷入自我否定的怪圈：如果做得不够好，就会形成这样的失调：“我很聪明但是被难住了。”然后很快丧失了对学习的兴趣（我想做的话就一定能做好，但是我现在不想做了）。这些儿童长大后会变成害怕犯错误或者不想承担责任的人，因为这样做会证明自己并非不聪明。

德威克发现了对学习和错误的不同理解方式（它们可以证明你是愚蠢还是具有潜力）并不是由人格特质所决定的。它们只是一种态度，是可以改变的。德威克致力于矫正那些学生对学习和犯错的态度，方法出人意料的简单：以同样的方式教导初中生和大学生，告诉他们智力并非遗传而来的特质；就像会骑自行车一样，它只是一种能力，是一种经过努力可以掌握的技巧。这样的课程一定要讲给那些从小被告知智力是遗传而来的孩子们。他们接受了这种观点之后，有了更强的学习动机，获得了更好的成绩，也更愿意学习了，遇到困难之后也不再自暴自弃。

这些事情讲起来容易，但做起来很难。当你遇到难题的时候，试着对自己说：“我出错了。我需要知道问题出在哪里。我不想再犯同样的错误了。”德威克的研究令人鼓舞，因为它适合所有年龄的人群。人们经过学习能够认识到：错误并不是需要加以否认或者为之辩护的可怕的失败经历，而是帮助我们不断成长的人生必修课。



我们国家的棒球运动与孕育它的美国社会存在着重要的区别：从少年棒球联盟到职业运动联盟，任何一场棒球比赛的记分都包括跑动、击中和失误三个方面的内容。没有人想要失误，但是大家都知道失误无法避免。棒球比赛中的失误是必然存在的，在医学、商业、科学、法律、爱情和生活中也同样如此。在最

终进行分析时,对某个民族特性的评价以及对某个个人品质的评价,都不取决于是否会犯错误,而是取决于犯错误之后的做法。

2004年10月8日,也就是伊拉克战争爆发一年半之后,乔治·布什和约翰·克里进行了第二次总统竞选辩论。此时,美国军队在伊拉克陷入了战争的泥潭:死亡人数在持续上升,军费猛增到上亿美金,伤员也在不断增加,而布什曾说过战争会很快结束。于是,交锋出现了:

琳达·格莱宝(Linda Grabel):布什总统,你在过去的4年里作出了很多决定,影响了百万人的生活。请列举三个你认为错误的决定,还有你是怎么纠正的。谢谢。

布什总统:(人们在讨论错误时)他们只是想问:“在攻打伊拉克这个决定上你错了吗?”我的回答是:“绝对没有。”这是个正确的决定。现在你问我做错了什么事情,我想我在人员的任命方面犯过一些错误,但是我不想指出他们是谁,我不想在国家电视台上伤他们的感情。

在随后的两年里,随着伊拉克形势的发展,布什总统仍然坚持自我辩护,从“金字塔”顶向下滑落。他坚持认为攻打伊拉克是正确的,而且我们取得了战争的胜利,我们所能做的就是保持耐心、坚持到底。在2006年的中期选举中,很多专家都认为那是一次针对战争态度的选举,共和党在参众两院都遭到了失败。

大多数公众终于松了口气。的确,现在乔治·布什不得不改变他在伊拉克的政策,而且最终他可以体面地这样去做:他可以讲,自己同意采纳伊拉克研究小组的意见(或者他的将军们,或者是人民的意愿),逐步从伊拉克撤军。但是任何一个了解自我辩护心理的人都会预言,布什会走向相反的一面:他对灾难的“应对措施”会不断重复自己以往的做法。由于已经从“金字塔”顶滑下很远,而且越来越深地陷入了自我欺骗之中,布什已经失去了选择的能力。

2007年1月,在本书即将出版的时候,乔治·布什向全国发表了演讲。他

说，在指挥战争的少数战术上“犯下了错误”，他会对这些错误负责。但是他仍然坚定地认为，当初作出攻打伊拉克的决策，对于打击恐怖主义至关重要。那么，他所推出的新策略是什么？——投入更多的军队和资金。对他而言，任何其他选择都是不可思议的。这意味着他将会犯更大的错误。



注释^{*}



导 言

1 “Spy Agencies Say Iraq War Worsens Terrorism Threat,” *The New York Times*, September 24, 2006; the comment to conservative columnists was reported by one of them, Max Boot, in “No Room for Doubt in the Oval Office,” the *Los Angeles Times* op-ed, September 20, 2006. For a detailed accounting of George Bush's claims to the public regarding the war in Iraq, see Frank Rich (2006), *The Greatest Story Ever Sold: The Decline and Fall of Truth from 9/11 to Katrina*. New York: The Penguin Press. On May 25, 2006, with his ratings below 30 percent, Bush finally admitted that he had been wrong about something, sort of. Not about the war or any of the decisions related to it, but about his choice of words. When he used “tough talk” such as “bring it on” and “wanted, dead or alive,” Bush said, “I think in certain parts of the world it was misinterpreted.” In October 2006, shortly before the midterm elections, the White House announced Bush would no longer be using his familiar “stay the course” line because it implied the administration was not “flexible” about Iraq policy. Nonetheless, in a press conference on October 25, with violence in Iraq at record highs, Bush said there would be no major changes in his overall strategy and that he was committed to “getting the job done.” When asked whether the United States was winning the war, he said, “Absolutely, we’re winning.”

2 The American Presidency Project (online), www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php, provides documented examples of every instance of “mistakes were made” said by American presidents. It’s a long list. Bill Clinton said that “mistakes were made” in the pursuit of Democratic campaign contributions, and later joked about the popularity of this phrase and its passive voice at a White House Press Correspondents dinner. Of all the presidents, Richard

* 因为注释中涉及大量参考文献,为方便读者查询,我们没有翻译。——译者

Nixon and Ronald Reagan used the phrase most, the former to minimize the illegal actions of the Watergate scandal, the latter to minimize the illegal actions of the Iran-Contra scandal. See also Charles Baxter's eloquent essay, "Dysfunctional Narratives: or: 'Mistakes were made,'" in Baxter (1997), *Burning Down the House: Essays on Fiction*. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.

3 Gordon Marino (2004, February 20), "Before Teaching Ethics, Stop Kidding Yourself," in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B5.

4 On the self-serving bias in memory (and the housework study in particular), see Michael Ross and Fiore Sicoly (1979), "Egocentric Biases in Availability and Attribution," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, pp. 322 - 336. See also Suzanne C. Thompson and Harold H. Kelley (1981), "Judgments of Responsibility for Activities in Close Relationships," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, pp. 469 - 477.

5 John Dean, interviewed for *Playboy* by Barbara Cady, January 1975, pp. 65 - 80. Quote is on p. 78.

6 Robert A. Caro (2002), *Master of the Senate: The Years of Lyndon Johnson*. New York: Knopf, p. 886.

7 Katherine S. Mangan (2005, April 1), "A Brush With a New Life," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A28 - A30.

8 See, for example, Sherwin Nuland (2003), *The Doctors' Plague: Germs, Childbed Fever, and the Strange Story of Ignac Semmelweis*. New York: Norton/Atlas.

9 Ferdinand Lundberg and Marynia F. Farnham (1947), *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex*. New York: Harper and Brothers, p. 11 (first quote), p. 120 (second quote).

10 Edward Humes (1999), *Mean Justice*. New York: Pocket Books.

第一章

1 Press releases from Neal Chase, representing the religious group Baha'is Under the Provisions of the Covenant, in "The End Is Nearish," *Harper's*, February 1995, pp. 22, 24.

2 Leon Festinger, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter (1956), *When Prophecy Fails*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

3 Leon Festinger (1957), *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. See also Leon Festinger and Elliot Aronson (1960), "Arousal and Reduction of Dissonance in Social Contexts," in D. Cartwright and Z. Zander (eds.), *Group Dynamics* (third ed.), New York: Harper & Row, 1960 - 1; and Eddie Harmon-Jones and Judson Mills (eds.) (1999), *Cognitive Dissonance: Progress on a Pivotal Theory in Social Psychology*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

4 Elliot Aronson and Judson Mills (1959), "The Effect of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, pp. 177 - 181.

5 See, for example, Harold Gerard and Grover Mathewson (1966), "The Effects of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group: A Replication," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, pp. 278 - 287.

6 For a good review of the research on this bias and its many applications, see Raymond S. Nickerson (1998), "Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises," *Review of General Psychology*, 2, pp. 175 - 220.

7 Lenny Bruce (1966), *How to Talk Dirty and Influence People*. Chicago: Playboy Press and New York: Pocket Books, pp. 232 - 233.

8 Steven Kull, director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the

University of Maryland, commenting on the results of the PIPA/Knowledge Networks poll, June 14, 2003, "Many Americans Unaware WMD Have Not Been Found."

9 Drew Westen, Clint Kilts, Pavel Blagov, et al. (2006), "The Neural Basis of Motivated Reasoning: An fMRI Study of Emotional Constraints on Political Judgment During the U. S. Presidential Election of 2004," *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18, pp. 1947 - 1958.

10 Charles Lord, Lee Ross, and Mark Lepper (1979), "Biased Assimilation and Attitude Polarization: The Effects of Prior Theories on Subsequently Considered Evidence," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, pp. 2098 - 2109.

11 Doris Kearns Goodwin (1994), *No Ordinary Time*. New York: Simon & Schuster/Touchstone, p. 321. (Emphasis in original.)

12 In one of the earliest demonstrations of postdecision dissonance reduction, Jack Brehm, posing as a marketing researcher, showed a group of women eight different appliances (a toaster, a coffeemaker, a sandwich grill, and the like) and asked them to rate each item for its desirability. Brehm then told each woman that she could have one of the appliances as a gift, and gave her a choice between two of the products she had rated as being equally appealing. After she chose one, he wrapped it up and gave it to her. Later, the women rated the appliances again. This time, they increased their rating of the appliance they had chosen and decreased their rating of the appliance they had rejected. See Jack Brehm (1956), "Postdecision Changes in the Desirability of Alternatives," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52, pp. 384 - 389.

13 Daniel Gilbert (2006), *Stumbling on Happiness*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

14 Robert E. Knox and James A. Inkster (1968), "Postdecision Dissonance at Post Time," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, pp. 319 - 323.

15 Katherine S. Mangan (2005, April 1), "A Brush With a New Life," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A28 - A30.

16 For example, see Brad J. Bushman (2002), "Does Venting Anger Feed or Extinguish the Flame? Catharsis, Rumination, Distraction, Anger, and Aggressive Responding," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, pp. 724 - 731; Brad J. Bushman, Angelica M. Bonacci, William C. Pedersen, et al. (2005), "Chewing on It Can Chew You Up: Effects of Rumination on Triggered Displaced Aggression," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, pp. 969 - 983. The history of research disputing the assumption of catharsis is summarized in Carol Tavris (1989), *Anger: The Misunderstood Emotion*. New York: Simon & Schuster/Touchstone.

17 Michael Kahn's original study was "The Physiology of Catharsis," published in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, pp. 278 - 298, in 1966. For another early classic, see Leonard Berkowitz, James A. Green, and Jacqueline R. Macaulay (1962), "Hostility Catharsis as the Reduction of Emotional Tension," *Psychiatry*, 25, pp. 23 - 31.

18 Jon Jecker and David Landy (1969), "Liking a Person as a Function of Doing Him a Favor," *Human Relations*, 22, pp. 371 - 378.

19 Benjamin Franklin (2004), *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (introduction by Lewis Leary). New York: Touchstone, pp. 83 - 84.

20 Ruth Thibodeau and Elliot Aronson (1992), "Taking a Closer Look: Reasserting the Role of the Self-Concept in Dissonance Theory," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, pp. 591 - 602.

21 There is a large and lively research literature on the "self-serving bias," the tendency to believe the best of ourselves and explain away the worst. It is a remarkably consistent bias in human cognition, though there are interesting variations across cultures, ages, and genders. See Amy Mezulis, Lyn Y. Abramson, Janet S. Hyde, and Benjamin L. Hankin (2004), "Is

There a Universal Positivity Bias in Attributions? A Meta-Analytic Review of Individual, Developmental, and Cultural Differences in the Self-serving Attributional Bias," *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, pp. 711 - 747.

22 Philip E. Tetlock (2005), *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. In clinical psychology, the picture is the same: There is an extensive scientific literature showing that behavioral, statistical, and other objective measures of behavior are consistently superior to the clinical insight of experts and their clinical predictions and diagnoses. See Robin Dawes, David Faust, and Paul E. Meehl (1989), "Clinical Versus Actuarial Judgment," *Science*, 243, pp. 1668 - 1674; and W. M. Grove and Paul E. Meehl (1996), "Comparative Efficiency of Formal (Mechanical, Algorithmic) and Informal (Subjective, Impressionistic) Prediction Procedures: The Clinical/Statistical Controversy," *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2, pp. 293 - 323.

23 Elliot Aronson and J. Merrill Carlsmith (1962), "Performance Expectancy as a Determinant of Actual Performance," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 65, pp. 178 - 182. See also William B. Swann Jr. (1990), "To Be Adored or to Be Known? The Interplay of Self-Enhancement and Self-Verification," in R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (eds.), *Motivation and Cognition*, New York: Guilford Press; and William B. Swann Jr., J. Gregory Hixon, and Chris de la Ronde (1992), "Embracing the Bitter 'Truth': Negative Self-Concepts and Marital Commitment," *Psychological Science*, 3, pp. 118 - 121.

24 We are not idly speculating here. In a classic experiment conducted half a century ago, social psychologist Judson Mills measured the attitudes of sixthgrade children toward cheating. He then had them participate in a competitive exam with prizes offered to the winners. He arranged the situation so that it was almost impossible for a child to win without cheating, and also so that it was easy for the children to cheat, thinking they would not be detected. (He was secretly keeping an eye on them.) About half the kids cheated and half did not. The next day, Mills asked the children again how they felt about cheating and other misdemeanors. Those children who had cheated became more lenient toward cheating, and those who resisted the temptation adopted a harsher attitude. See Judson Mills (1958), "Changes in Moral Attitudes Following Temptation," *Journal of Personality*, 26, pp. 517 - 531.

25 Jeb Stuart Magruder (1974), *An American Life: One Man's Road to Watergate*. New York: Atheneum. Haldeman's comments, p. 4; the golf-cart story, p. 7.

26 Magruder, *An American Life*. Liddy's first proposal with the "mugging squads," p. 194 (the prostitutes would be "high-class," Liddy assured the group, "only the best," p. 195); "If [Liddy] had come to us at the outset . . .," p. 214; "decisions that now seem insane . . .," "We were past the point of halfway measures," p. 215.

27 The number of total participants is an informed estimate from psychologist Thomas Blass, who has written extensively about the original Milgram experiment and its many successors. About 800 people participated in Milgram's own experiments; the rest were in replications or variations of the basic paradigm over a 25-year span.

28 The original study is described in Stanley Milgram (1963), "Behavioral Study of Obedience," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, pp. 371 - 378. Milgram reported his study in greater detail and with additional supporting research, including many replications, in his subsequent (1974) book, *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. New York: Harper & Row.

29 William Safire, "Aesop's Fabled Fox," *The New York Times* op-ed, December 29, 2003.

第二章

1 James Bruggers, "Brain Damage Blamed on Solvent Use," *The [Louisville] Courier-Journal*, May 13, 2001; Bruggers, "Researchers' Ties to CSX Raise Concerns," *Courier-Journal*, October 20, 2001; Carol Tavis (2002, July/August), "The High Cost of Skepticism," *Skeptical Inquirer*, pp. 42 - 44; Stanley Berent (2002, November/December), "Response to 'The High Cost of Skepticism,'" *Skeptical Inquirer*, pp. 61, 63; his quote ("My research yielded important information ...") is on p. 63; Carol Tavis's reply to Berent, same issue, pp. 64 - 65. On February 12, 2003, the Office for Human Research Protections wrote to the vice president for research at the University of Michigan, noting that the university's Institutional Review Board, of which Stanley Berent had been head, had "failed to document the specific criteria for waiver of informed consent" for Berent and Albers' research. The case of CSX, its arrangement with Stanley Berent and James Albers, and their conflict of interest is also described in depth in Sheldon Krinsky (2003), *Science in the Private Interest*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 152 - 153.

2 Joyce Ehrlinger, Thomas Gilovich, and Lee Ross (2005), "Peering into the Bias Blind Spot: People's Assessments of Bias in Themselves and Others," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, pp. 680 - 692; Emily Pronin, Daniel Y. Lin, and Lee Ross (2002), "The Bias Blind Spot: Perceptions of Bias in Self versus Others," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, pp. 369 - 381. Our blind spots also allow us to see ourselves as being smarter and more competent than most people, which is why all of us, apparently, feel we are above average. See David Dunning, Kerri Johnson, Joyce Ehrlinger, and Justin Kruger (2003), "Why People Fail to Recognize Their Own Incompetence," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, pp. 83 - 87.

3 Quoted in Eric Jaffe (2004, October), "Peace in the Middle East May Be Impossible: Lee D. Ross on Naive realism and Conflict Resolution," *American Psychological Society Observer*, 17, pp. 9 - 11.

4 Geoffrey L. Cohen (2003), "Party over Policy: The Dominating Impact of Group Influence on Political Beliefs," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, pp. 808 - 822. See also Donald Green, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler (2002), *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven: Yale University Press. This book shows how once people form a political identity, usually in young adulthood, the identity does their thinking for them. That is, most people do not choose a party because it reflects their views; rather, once they choose a party, its policies become their views.

5 Emily Pronin, Thomas Gilovich, and Lee Ross (2004), "Objectivity in the Eye of the Beholder: Divergent Perceptions of Bias in Self versus Others," *Psychological Review*, 111, pp. 781 - 799.

6 When privilege is a result of birth or another fluke of fortune, rather than merit, many of its possessors will justify it as providing benefits they earned. John Jost and his colleagues have been studying the processes of system justification, a psychological motive to defend and justify the status quo; see, for example, John Jost and Orsolya Hunyady (2005), "Antecedents and Consequences of System-Justifying Ideologies," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, pp. 260 - 265. One such system-justifying ideology is that the poor may be poor, but they are happier and more honest than the rich; Aaron C. Kay and John T. Jost (2003), "Complementary Justice: Effects of 'Poor But Happy' and 'Poor But

Honest' Stereotype Exemplars on System Justification and Implicit Activation of the Justice Motive," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, pp. 823 - 837. See also Stephanie M. Wildman (ed.) (1996), *Privilege Revealed: How Invisible Preference Undermines America*. New York University Press.

7 D. Michael Risinger and Jeffrey L. Loop (2002, November), "Three Card Monte, Monty Hall, Modus Operandi and 'Offender Profiling': Some Lessons of Modern Cognitive Science for the Law of Evidence," *Cardozo Law Review*, 24, p. 193.

8 Dorothy Samuels, "Tripping Up on Trips: Judges Love Junkets as Much as Tom DeLay Does," *The New York Times* fourth editorial, January 20, 2006.

9 Melody Petersen, "A Conversation with Sheldon Krinsky: Uncoupling Campus and Company," *The New York Times*, September 23, 2003. Krinsky also recounted the Jonas Salk remark.

10 See Krinsky, *Science in the Private Interest*, note 1; Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie (1997), *Academic Capitalism*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press; and Derek Bok (2003), *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; Marcia Angell (2004), *The Truth about the Drug Companies*, New York: Random House; and Jerome P. Kassirer (2005), *On the Take: How Medicine's Complicity with Big Business Can Endanger Your Health*, New York: Oxford University Press.

11 National Institutes of Health Care Management Research and Educational Foundation (2003), "Changing Patterns of Pharmaceutical Innovation." Cited in Jason Dana and George Loewenstein (2003), "A Social Science Perspective on Gifts to Physicians from Industry," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 290, 252 - 255.

12 Investigative journalist David Willman won a Pulitzer Prize for his series on conflicts of interest in bringing new drugs to market; two of them include "Scientists Who Judged Pill Safety Received Fees," *Los Angeles Times*, October 29, 1999; and "The New FDA: How a New Policy Led to Seven Deadly Drugs," *Los Angeles Times*, December 20, 2000.

13 Dan Fagin and Marianne Lavelle (1996), *Toxic Deception*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing.

14 Richard A. Davidson (1986, May-June), "Source of Funding and Outcome of Clinical Trials," *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 1, pp. 155 - 158.

15 Lise L. Kjaergard and Bodil Als-Nielsen (2002, August 3), "Association between competing interests and authors' conclusions: Epidemiological study of randomised clinical trials published in *BMJ*," *British Medical Journal*, 325, pp. 249 - 252. See also Krinsky, *Science in the Private Interest* (note 1), chapter 9, "A Question of Bias," for a review of these and other similar studies.

16 Alex Berenson, Gardiner Harris, Barry Meier, and Andrew Pollack, "Dangerous Data: Despite Warnings, Drug Giant Took Long Path to Vioxx Recall," *The New York Times*, November 14, 2004.

17 Richard Horton (2004), "The lessons of MMR," *The Lancet*, 363, pp. 747 - 749.

18 Andrew J. Wakefield, Peter Harvev, and John Linnell (2004), "MMR — Responding to retraction," *The Lancet*, 363, pp. 1327 - 1328.

19 Wikipedia, under the entry "Thimerosal," has an excellent, balanced review of the entire controversy surrounding this chemical (variously spelled thimerosal and thimerol), used commonly since the 1930s as a preservative in vaccines and many household products, such as cosmetics and eye drops. In recent years, some consumer groups became concerned about the possibly toxic effects of mercury contained in this preservative, claiming it causes autism and other diseases. The Wikipedia entry represents their concerns fairly, but shows that their

arguments have largely been based on anecdotes, exaggerated fears, unsupported claims, and the antivaccine research conducted by Mark Geier and David Geier, president of a company specializing in litigating on behalf of alleged vaccine injury claimants.

As for the research, in a study of all children born in Denmark between 1991 and 1998 (over half a million children), the incidence of autism in vaccinated children was actually a bit lower than in unvaccinated children: See Kreesten M. Madsen, Anders Hviid, Mogens Vestergaard, et al. (2002), "A Population-Based Study of Measles, Mumps, and Rubella Vaccination and Autism," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 347, pp. 1477 - 1482. Moreover, after vaccines containing thimerosal were removed from the market in Denmark, there was no subsequent decrease in the incidence of autism: See Kreesten M. Madsen et al. (2003), "Thimerosal and the Occurrence of Autism: Negative Ecological Evidence from Danish Population-Based Data," *Pediatrics*, 112, pp. 604 - 606. See also L. Smeeth, C. Cook, E. Fombonne, et al. (2004, September 11 - 17), "MMR vaccination and pervasive developmental disorders: A case-control study," *The Lancet*, 364, pp. 963 - 969.

The reaction of many parents of autistic children to this news is itself a story of dissonance. Having committed themselves to the belief that thimerosal is the agent responsible for their children's autism, they have rejected the conclusions of this research and statements in favor of vaccination from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, the Institute of Medicine, the World Health Organization, and the American Academy of Pediatrics. Interestingly, as the Wikipedia entry points out, public resistance to vaccination programs began in 1853 and has remained active ever since, the thimerosal controversy simply being the latest addition.

20 Dana and Loewenstein, "A Social Science Perspective on Gifts to Physicians from Industry," note 11.

21 Robert B. Cialdini (1984/1993), *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion* (rev. ed.). New York: William Morrow.

22 Carl Elliott (2006, April), "The Drug Pushers," *The Atlantic Monthly*, pp. 82 - 93. Quote by his brother on p. 91.

23 Carl Elliott (2001, September 24), "Pharma Buys a Conscience," *The American Prospect*, 12, archived as www.prospect.org/print/V12/17/elliott-c.html.

24 C. Neil Macrae, Alan B. Milne, and Galen V. Bodenhausen (1994), "Stereotypes as Energy-Saving Devices: A Peek Inside the Cognitive Toolbox," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66, pp. 37 - 47.

25 Marilynn B. Brewer (1993), "Social Identity, Distinctiveness, and In-Group Homogeneity," *Social Cognition*, 11, pp. 150 - 164.

26 Charles W. Perdue, John F. Dovidio, Michael B. Gurtman, and Richard B. Tyler (1990), "Us and Them: Social Categorization and the Process of Intergroup Bias," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, pp. 475 - 486.

27 Henri Tajfel, M. G. Billig, R. P. Bundy, and Claude Flament (1971), "Social categorization and intergroup behavior," *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, pp. 149 - 178.

28 Nick Haslam, Paul Bain, Lauren Douge, Max Lee, and Brock Bastian (2005), "More Human Than You: Attributing Humanness to Self and Others," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, pp. 937 - 950.

29 Gordon Allport (1954/1979), *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, pp. 13 - 14.

30 Jeffrey W. Sherman, Steven J. Stroessner, Frederica R. Conrey, and Omar A. Azam (2005), "Prejudice and Stereotype Maintenance Processes: Attention, Attribution, and

Individuation," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, pp. 607 - 622.

31 Christian S. Crandall and Amy Eshelman (2003), "A Justification-Suppression Model of the Expression and Experience of Prejudice," *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, pp. 414 - 446, quote, p. 425. See also Benoît Monin and Dale T. Miller (2001), "Moral Credentials and the Expression of Prejudice," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, pp. 33 - 43. In their experiments, when people felt that their moral credentials as unprejudiced individuals were not in dispute — when they had been given a chance to disagree with blatantly sexist statements — they felt more justified in their subsequent vote to hire a man for a stereotypically male job.

32 For the interracial experiment, see Ronald W. Rogers and Steven Prentice-Dunn (1981), "Deindividuation and Anger-Mediated Interracial Aggression: Unmasking Regressive Racism," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, pp. 63 - 73. For the English- and French-speaking Canadians, see James R. Meindl and Melvin J. Lerner (1985), "Exacerbation of Extreme Responses to an Out-Group," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, pp. 71 - 84. On the studies of behavior toward Jews and gay men, see Steven Fein and Steven J. Spencer (1997), "Prejudice as Self-Image Maintenance: Affirming the Self through Derogating Others," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, pp. 31 - 44.

33 Paul Jacobs, Saul Landau, and Eve Pell (1971), *To Serve the Devil* (Vol. 2: *Colonials and Sojourners*). New York: Vintage Books. Quote by Charles Crocker, p. 81.

34 Albert Speer (1970), *Inside the Third Reich: Memoirs*. New York: Simon & Schuster, p. 291.

35 Doris Kearns Goodwin (2005), *Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

36 Jeb Stuart Magruder (1974), *An American Life: One Man's Road to Watergate*. New York: Atheneum, p. 348.

第三章

1 Quoted in George Plimpton (1997), *Truman Capote*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday, p. 306. We are taking Vidal's version of this story on the grounds that he has never had compunctions about talking about either subject — politics or bisexuality — and therefore had no motivation to distort his memory.

2 Anthony G. Greenwald (1980), "The Totalitarian Ego: Fabrication and Revision of Personal History," *American Psychologist*, 35, pp. 603 - 618.

3 Edward Jones and Rika Kohler (1959), "The Effects of Plausibility on the Learning of Controversial Statements," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 57, pp. 315 - 320.

4 See, for example, Michael Ross (1989), "Relation of Implicit Theories to the Construction of Personal Histories," *Psychological Review*, 96, pp. 341 - 357; Anne E. Wilson and Michael Ross (2001), "From Chump to Champ: People's Appraisals of Their Earlier and Present Selves," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, pp. 572 - 584; and Michael Ross and Anne E. Wilson (2003), "Autobiographical Memory and Conceptions of Self: Getting Better All the Time," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, pp. 66 - 69.

5 Marcia K. Johnson, Shahin Hashtroudi, and D. Stephen Lindsay (1993), "Source Monitoring," *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, pp. 3 - 28; Karen J. Mitchell and Marcia K. Johnson (2000), "Source Monitoring: Attributing Mental Experiences," in E. Tulving & F.

I. M. Craik (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

6 Mary McCarthy (1957), *Memories of a Catholic Girlhood*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Co. "With the tin butterfly in his hand," p. 80; "I suddenly remembered," p. 82; "The most likely thing," p. 83.

7 Barbara Tversky and Elizabeth J. Marsh (2000), "Biased Retellings of Events Yield Biased Memories," *Cognitive Psychology*, 40, pp. 1 - 38; see also Elizabeth J. Marsh and Barbara Tversky (2004), "Spinning the Stories of Our Lives," *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 18, pp. 491 - 503.

8 Brooke C. Feeney and Jude Cassidy (2003), "Reconstructive Memory Related to Adolescent-Parent Conflict Interactions: The Influence of Attachment-Related Representations on Immediate Perceptions and Changes in Perceptions over Time," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, pp. 945 - 955.

9 Daniel Offer, Marjorie Kaiz, Kenneth I. Howard, and Emily S. Bennett (2000), "The Altering of Reported Experiences," *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 39, pp. 735 - 742. Several of the authors also wrote a book on this study. See Daniel Offer, Marjorie Kaiz Offer, and Eric Ostrov (2004), *Regular Guys: 34 Years Beyond Adolescence*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

10 On "mismemories" of sex, see Maryanne Garry, Stefanie J. Sharman, Julie Feldman, Gary A. Marlatt, and Elizabeth F. Loftus (2002), "Examining Memory for Heterosexual College Students' Sexual Experiences Using an Electronic Mail Diary," *Health Psychology*, 21, pp. 629 - 634. On the overreporting of voting, see R. P. Abelson, Elizabeth D. Loftus, and Anthony G. Greenwald (1992), "Attempts to Improve the Accuracy of Self-Reports of Voting," in J. M. Tanur (ed.), *Questions About Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys*. New York: Russell Sage. See also Robert F. Belli, Michael W. Traugott, Margaret Young, and Katherine A. McGonagle (1999), "Reducing Vote Overreporting in Surveys: Social Desirability, Memory Failure, and Source Monitoring," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 63, pp. 90 - 108. On misremembering donating money, see Christopher D. B. Burt and Jennifer S. Popple (1998), "Memorial Distortions in Donation Data," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, pp. 724 - 733. College students' memories of their high-school grades are also distorted in a positive direction; see Harry P. Bahrick, Lynda K. Hall, and Stephanie A. Berger (1996), "Accuracy and Distortion in Memory for High School Grades," *Psychological Science*, 7, pp. 265 - 271.

11 Lisa K. Libby and Richard P. Eibach (2002), "Looking Back in Time: Self-Concept Change Affects Visual Perspective in Autobiographical Memory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, pp. 167 - 179. See also Lisa K. Libby, Richard P. Eibach, and Thomas Gilovich (2005), "Here's Looking at Me: The Effect of Memory Perspective on Assessments of Personal Change," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, pp. 50 - 62. The more consistent our memories are of ourselves in the present, the more accessible they are. See Michael Ross (1989), "Relation of Implicit Theories to the Construction of Personal Histories," *Psychological Review*, 96, pp. 341 - 357.

12 Michael Conway and Michael Ross (1984), "Getting What You Want by Revising What You Had," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, pp. 738 - 748. Memory distortions take many different paths, but most are in the service of preserving our self-concepts and feelings about ourselves as good and competent people.

13 Anne E. Wilson and Michael Ross have shown how the self-justifying biases of memory help us move psychologically, in their words, from "chump to champ." We distance ourselves from our earlier "chumpier" incarnations if doing so allows us to feel better about how much

we have grown, learned, and matured, but, like Haber, we feel close to earlier selves we thought were champs. Either way, we can't lose. See Wilson and Ross, "From Chump to Champ," note 4.

14 The full text of *Fragments*, along with the true story of Wilkomirski's life, is in Stefan Maechler (2001), *The Wilkomirski Affair: A Study in Biographical Truth* (translated by John E. Woods). New York: Schocken. Maechler discusses the ways in which Wilkomirski drew on Kosinski's novel. For another investigation into Wilkomirski's life and the cultural issues of real and imagined memories, see Blake Eskin (2002), *A Life in Pieces: The Making and Unmaking of Benjamin Wilkomirski*. New York: W. W. Norton.

15 The Will Andrews story is in Susan Clancy (2005), *Abducted: How People Come to Believe They Were Kidnapped by Aliens*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. On the psychology of belief in alien abduction, see also Donald P. Spence (1996), "Abduction Tales as Metaphors," *Psychological Inquiry*, 7, pp. 177 - 179. Spence interprets abduction memories as metaphors that have two powerful psychological functions: They encapsulate a set of free floating concerns and anxieties that are widespread in today's political and cultural climate, anxieties that have no ready or easy remedy; and, by providing a shared identity for believers, they reduce the believers' feelings of alienation and powerlessness.

16 Maechler, *The Wilkomirski Affair*, p. 273. See note 14.

17 Maechler, *The Wilkomirski Affair*, p. 27.

18 Maechler, *The Wilkomirski Affair*, p. 71. Wilkomirski accounted for having restless leg syndrome by telling a horrifying story: that when he was in Majdanek, he learned to keep his legs moving while he slept or otherwise "the rats would gnaw on them." But according to Tomasz Kranz, head of the research department at the Majdanek Museum, there were lice and fleas at the camp, but not rats (unlike other camps, such as Birkenau). Maechler, p. 169.

19 On the physical and psychological benefits of writing about previously undisclosed secrets and traumas, see James W. Pennebaker (1990), *Opening Up*. New York: William Morrow.

20 On imagination inflation, see Elizabeth F. Loftus (2004), "Memories of Things Unseen," *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, pp. 145 - 147; and Loftus (2001), "Imagining the Past," in *Psychologist*, 14 (British Psychological Society), pp. 584 - 587; Maryanne Garry, Charles Manning, Elizabeth Loftus, and Steven J. Sherman (1996), "Imagination Inflation: Imagining a Childhood Event Inflates Confidence That It Occurred," *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 3, pp. 208 - 214; Giuliana Mazzoni and Amina Memon (2003), "Imagination Can Create False Autobiographical Memories," *Psychological Science*, 14, pp. 186 - 188. On dreams, see Giuliana Mazzoni, Elizabeth F. Loftus, Aaron Seitz, and Steven J. Lynn (1999), "Changing Beliefs and Memories through Dream Interpretation," *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 2, pp. 125 - 144.

21 Brian Gonsalves, Paul J. Reber, Darren R. Gitelman, et al. (2004), "Neural Evidence that Vivid Imagining Can Lead to False Remembering," *Psychological Science*, 15, pp. 655 - 660. They found that the process of visually imagining a common object generates brain activity in regions of the cerebral cortex, which can lead to false memories of those imagined objects.

22 Mazzoni and Memon, "Imagination Can Create False Autobiographical Memories," note 20.

23 The effect is called "explanation inflation"; see Stefanie J. Sharman, Charles G. Manning, and Maryanne Garry (2005), "Explain This: Explaining Childhood Events Inflates Confidence for Those Events," *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 19, pp. 67 - 74. Preverbal children do the visual equivalent of what adults do: They draw a picture of a completely

implausible event, such as having a tea party in a hot-air balloon or swimming at the bottom of the ocean with a mermaid. After drawing these pictures, they often import them into their memories. A week later, they are far more likely than children who did not draw the pictures to say yes, that fanciful event really happened. See Deryn Strange, Maryanne Garry, and Rachel Sutherland (2003), "Drawing Out Children's False Memories," *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17, pp. 607 - 619.

24 Maechler, *The Wilkomirski Affair*, p. 104. See note 14.

25 Bernstein's letter; Maechler, *The Wilkomirski Affair*, p. 100; Matta's defense of Wilkomirski, p. 97; our emphasis.

26 Richard J. McNally (2003), *Remembering Trauma*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, p. 233.

27 Michael Shermer (2005, February), "Abducted!" *Scientific American*, pp. 33 - 34. Quotes on p. 33.

28 Clancy, *Abducted*, p. 51. See note 15.

29 "One night I woke up": Clancy, *Abducted*, p. 34; "I've been depressed," p. 34; baffling symptoms such as missing pajamas and unexpected nosebleeds, p. 33.

30 For example, Giuliana Mazzoni and her colleagues showed in their laboratory how people can come to regard an impossible event (witnessing a demonic possession when they were children) as a plausible memory. One step in the process was reading about demonic possession, in passages that said it was much more common than most people realized, accompanied by testimonials. See Giuliana Mazzoni, Elizabeth F. Loftus, and Irving Kirsch (2001), "Changing Beliefs About Implausible Autobiographical Events: A Little Plausibility Goes a Long Way," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 7, pp. 51 - 59.

31 "I couldn't be touched": Clancy, *Abducted*, p. 143. Will Andrews, "I was ready to just give up," and his wife's question, p. 2. See note 15.

32 Clancy, *Abducted*, p. 50.

33 Richard McNally, personal communication.

34 Richard J. McNally, Natasha B. Lasko, Susan A. Clancy, et al. (2004), "Psychophysiologic Responding During Script-Driven Imagery in People Reporting Abduction by Space Aliens," *Psychological Science*, 5, pp. 493 - 497. See also Clancy, *Abducted* (note 15), and McNally, *Remembering Trauma* (note 26), for reviews of this and related research.

35 It is interesting, nonetheless, that the autobiographies that once served as inspiring examples of a person's struggle to overcome racism, violence, disability, exile, or poverty seem today so out of fashion. Modern memoirs strive to outdo one another in the gruesome details of the writer's life. For an eloquent essay on this theme, see Francine Prose, "Outrageous Misfortune," her review of Jeannette Walls's *The Glass Castle: A Memoir* for *The New York Times Book Review*, March 13, 2005. Prose begins, "Memoirs are our modern fairy tales, the harrowing fables of the Brothers Grimm reimagined from the perspective of the plucky child who has, against all odds, evaded the fate of being chopped up, cooked and served to the family for dinner."

36 Ellen Bass and Laura Davis (1988), *The Courage to Heal: A Guide for Women Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 173. This statement remains in the revised and expanded third edition, 1994, on p. 183.

37 For the best full account of this story, see Moira Johnston (1997), *Spectral Evidence: The Ramona Case: Incest, Memory, and Truth on Trial in Napa Valley*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Quote describing the charges, p. 160.

38 Mary Karr, "His So-Called Life," *The New York Times* op-ed, January 15, 2006.

第四章

1 The story of Grace was told to us by psychologist Joseph de Rivera, who interviewed her and others in his research on the psychology of recanters. See, for example, Joseph de Rivera (1997), "The Construction of False Memory Syndrome: The Experience of Retractors," *Psychological Inquiry*, 8, pp. 271 - 292; and de Rivera (2000), "Understanding Persons Who Repudiate Memories Recovered in Therapy," *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 31, pp. 378 - 386.

2 The most comprehensive history of the recovered-memory epidemic remains Mark Pendergrast's 1996 *Victims of Memory* (second ed.). Hinesburg, VT: Upper Access Press; revised and expanded for a Harper Collins British edition, 1996. See also Richard J. Ofshe and Ethan Watters (1994), *Making Monsters: False Memory, Psychotherapy, and Sexual Hysteria*, New York: Scribners; Elizabeth Loftus and Katherine Ketcham (1994), *The Myth of Repressed Memory*, New York: St. Martin's Press; and Frederick Crews (ed.) (1998), *Unauthorized Freud: Doubters Confront a Legend*, New York: Viking. For an excellent sociology of hysterical epidemics and moral panics, see Philip Jenkins (1992), *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Great Britain*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

The specific example of the woman who claimed that her father molested her from the ages of five to twenty-three is known as Laura B., who sued her father, Joel Hungerford, in the state of New Hampshire in 1995. She lost.

3 Two of the earliest and still best books on the day-care scandals and claims of widespread cults that were promoting ritual Satanic sexual abuse are Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker (1995), *Satan's Silence: Ritual Abuse and the Making of a Modern American Witch Hunt*, New York: Basic Books; and Stephen J. Ceci and Maggie Bruck (1995), *Jeopardy in the Courtroom: A Scientific Analysis of Children's Testimony*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Dorothy Rabinowitz, a *Wall Street Journal* editorial writer, was the first to publicly question the conviction of Kelly Michaels and get her case reopened; see also Rabinowitz (2003), *No Crueler Tyrannies: Accusation, False Witness, and Other Terrors of Our Times*. New York: Wall Street Press Books/Free Press.

A related epidemic was the rise of alleged cases of multiple personality disorder, now called "dissociative identity disorder." Before 1980, there were only a handful of such cases; by the mid-1990s, by one estimate, there were some 40,000. When the MPD clinics were closed by successful lawsuits against psychiatrists who had been inducing the disorder in vulnerable patients, the disorder began to fade away, though not completely. See Joan Acocella (1999), *Creating Hysteria: Women and Multiple Personality Disorder*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. On hypnosis and other means of creating false memories of abduction, multiple personality disorder, and child abuse, see Nicholas P. Spanos (1996), *Multiple Identities and False Memories: A Sociocognitive Perspective*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

4 For example, in February, 2005, a Boston jury convicted a 74-year-old former priest, Paul Shanley, of sexually molesting twenty-seven-year-old Paul Busa when Busa was six. This claim followed upon the Church scandals that had revealed hundreds of documented cases of pedophile priests, so emotions understandably ran high against the priests and the Church's policy of covering up the accusations. Yet the sole evidence in Shanley's case was Busa's memories, which, Busa said, he recovered in vivid flashbacks after reading a *Boston Globe*

article on Shanley. There was no corroborating evidence presented at the trial, and indeed much that disputed Busa's claims. See Jonathan Rauch, "Is Paul Shanley Guilty? If Paul Shanley Is a Monster, the State Didn't Prove It," *National Journal*, March 12, 2005, pp. 746–747; and JoAnn Wypijewski, "The Passion of Father Paul Shanley," *Legal Affairs*, September–October 2004. Other skeptical reporters included Daniel Lyons of *Forbes*, Robin Washington of *The Boston Herald*, and Michael Miner of the *Chicago Reader*.

5 Some studies find that combined approaches — medication plus cognitive behavior therapy (CBT) — are most effective; others find that CBT does as well. For a review of the issues and bibliography of research studies, see the American Psychological Association Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice (2006), "Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology," *American Psychologist*, 61, pp. 271–283. See also Dianne Chambless et al. (1998), "Update on Empirically Validated Therapies," *The Clinical Psychologist*, 51, pp. 3–16, and Steven D. Hollon, Michael E. Thase, and John C. Markowitz (2002), "Treatment and Prevention of Depression," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 3, pp. 39–77. These articles contain excellent references regarding empirically validated forms of psychotherapy for different problems.

6 Tanya M. Luhmann (2000), *Of Two Minds: The Growing Disorder in American Psychiatry*. New York: Knopf. Her findings echo precisely what Jonas Robitscher described about his profession in 1980, in *The Powers of Psychiatry*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

7 For an excellent review of the issues and the rise of pseudoscientific methods and practices in psychotherapy — including unvalidated assessment tests, treatments for autism and ADHD, and popular therapies — see Scott O. Lilienfeld, Steven Jay Lynn, and Jeffrey M. Lohr (eds.) (2003), *Science and Pseudoscience in Contemporary Clinical Psychology*. New York: Guilford. And for the other side of the story, articles on the most important contributions of clinical science, see Scott O. Lilienfeld and William T. O'Donohue (eds.) (2007), *The Great Ideas of Clinical Science*. New York: Routledge.

8 On evidence that hypnosis is effective for a large number of acute and chronic pain conditions, see David R. Patterson and Mark P. Jensen (2003), "Hypnosis and Clinical Pain," *Psychological Bulletin*, 29, pp. 495–521. Hypnosis can also add to the effectiveness of cognitive-behavioral techniques for losing weight, quitting smoking, and other behavior problems; see Irving Kirsch, Guy Montgomery, and Guy Sapirstein (1995), "Hypnosis as an Adjunct to Cognitive-Behavioral Psychotherapy: A Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 2, pp. 214–220. But the evidence is overwhelming that hypnosis is unreliable as a way of retrieving memories, which is why the American Psychological Association and the American Medical Association oppose the use of "hypnotically refreshed" testimony in courts of law. See Steven Jay Lynn, Timothy Lock, Elizabeth Loftus, Elisa Krackow, and Scott O. Lilienfeld (2003), "The Remembrance of Things Past: Problematic Memory Recovery Techniques in Psychotherapy," in Lilienfeld, Lohr, and Lynn, *Science and Pseudoscience in Contemporary Clinical Psychology* (note 7); and John F. Kihlstrom (1994), "Hypnosis, Delayed Recall, and the Principles of Memory," *International Journal of Experimental Hypnosis*, 42, pp. 337–345.

9 Paul Meehl (1986, Summer), "Psychology: Does Our Heterogenous Subject Matter Have Any Unity?" *Minnesota Psychologist*, p. 4.

10 Bessel van der Kolk's deposition was taken by attorney and psychologist R. Christopher Barden in van der Kolk's office in Boston, MA, December 27 and 28, 1996. This deposition was available online at the Web site of attorney Timothy Conlon, representing the plaintiffs. On Conlon's Web site, under "Deposition of Bessell [*sic*] van der Kolk," the psychiatrist is still described as "a leading authority on trauma and its effect on memory," and the dates of

the deposition taken by Barden are noted; but the deposition itself has since been removed.
<http://www.tjcesq.com/CM/OnlineDocuments/OnlineDocuments19.asp>.

11 John F. Kihlstrom (2004), "An Unbalanced Balancing Act: Blocked, Recovered, and False Memories in the Laboratory and Clinic," *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 11. He added that "if confidence were an adequate criterion for validity, Benjamin Wilkomirski might have gotten a Pulitzer Prize for history."

12 Sigmund Freud (1924), "The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex," in J. Strachey (ed.), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19). London: Hogarth.

13 Rosenzweig wrote: "On two separate occasions (1934 and 1937), first in gothic script and then in English, Freud made a similar negative response to any attempts to explore psychoanalytic theory by laboratory methods. This exchange clearly underscored Freud's distrust of, if not opposition to, experimental approaches to the validation of his clinically derived concepts. Freud consistently believed that the clinical validation of his theories, which were based originally and continuously on his self-analysis, left little to be desired from other sources of support." In Saul Rosenzweig (1997), "Letters by Freud on Experimental Psychodynamics," *American Psychologist*, 52, p. 571. See also Saul Rosenzweig (1985), "Freud and Experimental Psychology: The Emergence of Idio-Dynamics," in S. Koch and D. E. Leary (eds.), *A Century of Psychology as Science*. New York: McGraw-Hill. This book was reissued by the American Psychological Association in 1992.

14 See, for example, Lynn et al., "The Remembrance of Things Past," note 8.

15 Michael Nash offers one example in his 1994 article, "Memory Distortion and Sexual Trauma: The Problem of False Negatives and False Positives," *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, 42, pp. 346 - 362.

16 McNally, *Remembering Trauma*, p. 275.

17 The recovered-memory advocates in question are Daniel Brown, Alan W. Schefflin, and D. Corydon Hammond (1998), authors of *Memory, Trauma Treatment, and the Law*, New York: W. W. Norton; their rendering of the Camp Erika study, p. 156. For a review of this book that documents its authors' long association with the recovered-memory movement, their belief in the prevalence of Satanic ritual-abuse cults, and their endorsement of the use of hypnosis to "recover" memories of abuse and generate multiple personalities, see Frederick Crews's "The Trauma Trap," *New York Review of Books*, 51, March 11, 2004. This essay has been reprinted, with other writings exposing the fallacies of the recovered-memory movement, in Frederick Crews (2006), *Follies of the Wise*. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker & Hord.

18 Rosemary Basson, Rosemary McInnes, Mike D. Smith, Gemma Hodgson, and Nandan Koppiker (2002, May), "Efficacy and Safety of Sildenafil Citrate in Women with Sexual Dysfunction Associated with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder," *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, 11, pp. 367 - 377.

19 Joan Kaufman and Edward Zigler (1987), "Do Abused Children Become Abusive Parents?" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57, pp. 186 - 192. Ever since Freud, of course, there has been a widespread cultural assumption that childhood trauma always, inevitably, produces adult psychopathology. Research has shattered this assumption, too. Psychologist Ann Masten has observed that most people assume there is something special and rare about the children who recover from adversity. But "the great surprise" of the research, she concluded, is how ordinary resilience is. Most children are remarkably resilient, eventually overcoming even the effects of war, childhood illness, having abusive or alcoholic parents, early deprivation, or being sexually molested. See Ann Masten (2001), "Ordinary

Magic: Resilience Processes in Development," *American Psychologist*, 56, pp. 227 - 238.

20 For example, William Friedrich, Jennifer Fisher, Daniel Broughton, et al. (1988), "Normative Sexual Behavior in Children: A Contemporary Sample," *Pediatrics*, 101, pp. 1 - 8. See also www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/101/4/e9. For an excellent review of the behavioral-genetics research on the stability of temperament regardless of a child's experiences, see Judith Rich Harris (1998), *The Nurture Assumption*. New York: The Free Press. That nonabused children often have nightmares and other symptoms of anxiety, see McNally, *Remembering Trauma*, note 16.

21 Kathleen A. Kendall-Tackett, Linda M. Williams, and David Finkelhor (1993), "Impact of Sexual Abuse on Children: A Review and Synthesis of Recent Empirical Studies," *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, pp. 164 - 180; quote is from the article's abstract on p. 164. The researchers also found, not surprisingly, that the children's symptoms were related to the severity, duration, and frequency of the abuse, whether force had been used, the perpetrator's relationship to the child, and degree of mother's support. In contrast to the predictions of recovered-memory therapists, about two-thirds of the victimized children recovered during the first twelve to eighteen months.

22 In reviewing the research, Glenn Wolfner, David Faust, and Robyn Dawes concluded, "There is simply no scientific evidence available that would justify clinical or forensic diagnosis of abuse on the basis of doll play." Wolfner, Faust, and Dawes (1993), "The Use of Anatomically Detailed Dolls in Sexual Abuse Evaluations: The State of the Science," *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 2, pp. 1 - 11.

23 When the little girl was asked if this really happened, she said, "Yes, it did." When her father and the experimenter both tried to assure her by saying, "Your doctor doesn't do those things to little girls. You were just fooling. We know he didn't do those things," the child clung tenaciously to her claims. "Thus, repeated exposure to the doll, with minimal suggestions," the researchers cautioned, "resulted in highly sexualized play for this one child." Maggie Bruck, Stephen J. Ceci, Emmett Francoeur, and Ashley Renick (1995), "Anatomically Detailed Dolls Do Not Facilitate Preschoolers' Reports of a Pediatric Examination Involving Genital Touching," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 1, pp. 95 - 109.

24 Thomas M. Horner, Melvin J. Guyer, and Neil M. Kalter (1993), "Clinical Expertise and the Assessment of Child Sexual Abuse," *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, pp. 925 - 931; and Thomas M. Horner, Melvin J. Guyer, and Neil M. Kalter (1993), "The Biases of Child Sexual Abuse Experts: Believing Is Seeing," *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 21, pp. 281 - 292.

25 More than fifty years ago, Paul Meehl showed that relatively simple mathematical formulas outperformed clinicians' intuitive judgments in predicting patients' outcomes; see Paul E. Meehl (1954), *Clinical versus Statistical Prediction: A Theoretical Analysis and a Review of the Evidence*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; and Robyn Dawes, David Faust, and Paul E. Meehl (1989), "Clinical versus Actuarial Judgment," *Science*, 243, pp. 1668 - 1674. Meehl's findings have been repeatedly reconfirmed. See Howard Grob (1998), *Studying the Clinician: Judgment Research and Psychological Assessment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

26 Our account of the Kelly Michaels case is based largely on Ceci and Bruck, *Jeopardy in the Courtroom* (note 3); and Pendergrast, *Victims of Memory* (note 2). See also Maggie Bruck and Stephen Ceci (1995), "Amicus Brief for the Case of State of New Jersey v. Margaret Kelly Michaels, Presented by Committee of Concerned Social Scientists," *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 1(2) [entire issue].

27 Quoted in Pendergrast, *Victims of Memory*, p. 423; note 2.

28 Jason J. Dickinson, Debra A. Poole, and R. L. Laimon (2005), "Children's Recall and Testimony," in N. Brewer & K. Williams (eds.), *Psychology and Law: An Empirical Perspective*. New York: Guilford. See also Debra A. Poole and D. Stephen Lindsay (1995), "Interviewing Preschoolers: Effects of Nonsuggestive Techniques, Parental Coaching, and Leading Questions on Reports of Nonexperienced Events," *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 60, pp. 129 - 154.

29 Sena Garven, James M. Wood, Roy S. Malpass, and John S. Shaw, III (1998), "More Than Suggestion: The Effect of Interviewing Techniques from the McMartin Preschool Case," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, pp. 347 - 359; and Sena Garven, James M. Wood, and Roy S. Malpass (2000), "Allegations of Wrongdoing: The Effects of Reinforcement on Children's Mundane and Fantastic Claims," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, pp. 38 - 49.

30 Gabrielle F. Principe, Tomoe Kanaya, Stephen J. Ceci, and Mona Singh (2006), "Believing Is Seeing: How Rumors Can Engender False Memories in Preschoolers," *Psychological Science*, 17, pp. 243 - 248.

31 Debra A. Poole and Michael E. Lamb (1998), *Investigative Interviews of Children*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Their work was the basis of the new protocols drafted by the State of Michigan Governor's Task Force on Children's Justice and Family Independence Agency (1998, 2004); see http://www.michigan.gov/documents/FIA-Pub779_13054_7.pdf. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) also has prepared an investigative interview protocol that is widely used in research and assessment. For a good review, see Debra A. Poole and Jason J. Dickinson (2005), "The Future of the Protocol Movement" (invited commentary), *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, pp. 1197 - 1202.

32 Ellen Bass and Laura Davis (1998), *The Courage to Heal: A Guide for Women Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 18.

33 In one study, researchers drew random samples of American clinical psychologists with Ph. D. s from names listed in the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology. They asked respondents how often they regularly used certain techniques specifically "to help clients recover memories of sexual abuse": hypnosis, age regression, dream interpretation, guided imagery related to abuse situations, and interpreting physical symptoms as evidence of abuse. Slightly more than 40 percent said they used dream interpretation; about 30 percent said they used hypnosis; the fewest, but still about 20 percent, used age regression. About the same percentages disapproved of using these techniques; those in the middle apparently had no opinion. Debra A. Poole, D. Stephen Lindsay, Amina Memon, and Ray Bull (1995), "Psychotherapy and the Recovery of Memories of Childhood Sexual Abuse: U. S. and British Practitioners' Opinions, Practices, and Experiences," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, pp. 426 - 437. More recent replications have found that the percentages have not changed appreciably.

34 The notion that childhood sexual abuse is a leading cause of eating disorders has not been supported by empirical evidence, according to a metaanalysis of the leading studies. See Eric Stice (2002), "Risk and Maintenance Factors for Eating Pathology: A Meta-Analytic Review," *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, pp. 825 - 848.

35 Richard J. McNally (2005), "Troubles in Traumatology," *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 50, pp. 815 - 816. His quote is on p. 815.

36 John Briere made this statement at the 12th International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect in 1998, in Auckland, New Zealand. These remarks were reported by the *New*

Zealand Herald, September 9, 1998. The paper quoted Briere as saying that “missing memories of abuse are reasonably common, but evidence suggests that false memories of abuse are quite uncommon.” See <http://www.menz.org.nz/Casualties/1998%20newsletters/Oct%201998.htm>.

37 Quoted in Pendergrast, *Victims of Memory*, p. 567; note 2.

38 Hammond made these remarks in his presentation, “Investigating False Memory for the Unmemorable: A Critique of Experimental Hypnosis and Memory Research,” at the 14th International Congress of Hypnosis and Psychosomatic Medicine, San Diego, June 1997. Tapes of Hammond’s talk have been offered by The Sound of Knowledge, Inc.

39 For example, one group of psychiatrists and other clinical experts asked the United States Department of Justice to pass a law making it illegal to publish excerpts of children’s testimony in the actual day-care cases. The DOJ refused. Basic Books was threatened with an injunction if it published Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker’s *Satan’s Silence*, an exposé of the day-care hysteria; Basic Books did not comply with their demands. The American Psychological Association was threatened with a lawsuit if it published Stephen Ceci and Maggie Bruck’s *Jeopardy in the Courtroom*; the APA delayed publication for several months. Our source is personal communications from the investigators involved.

40 In the preface to the third edition of *The Courage to Heal* p. 14, Bass and Davis responded to the scientific criticism directed at their book and attempted to justify their lack of professional training: “As authors, we have been criticized for our lack of academic credentials. But you do not have to have a Ph. D. to listen carefully and compassionately to another human being.” That is true, but as we hope we have shown in this chapter, some training in science might prevent all those well-meaning, empathic listeners from leaping to unwarranted, implausible conclusions — especially when those conclusions can have tragic consequences. The authors did not attempt to correct any of the mistakes they made in the first edition, apart from making a few brief modifications and adding a self-protective caution that if your therapist pressures you to remember abuse, find another therapist. And oh, yes, for the third edition they talked with a “small number” of women who originally thought they might have been sexually molested but who instead found their pain stemmed from “emotional abuse” or other early trauma.

To our knowledge, neither Bass nor Davis has ever acknowledged that they were wrong in any of their basic claims about memory and trauma. According to her Web site, Laura Davis has moved on to the next trend, advocating reconciliation for families that have been broken apart by allegations of sexual abuse.

41 National Public Radio’s *This American Life*, episode 215, aired June 16, 2002.

第五章

1 Timothy Sullivan (1992), *Unequal Verdicts: The Central Park Jogger Trials*. New York: American Lawyer Books/Simon & Schuster.

2 Reyes confessed because, entirely by chance, he met one of the convicted defendants, Kharey Wise, in prison and apparently came to feel guilty about Wise’s wrongful incarceration. Later he began telling prison officials that he had committed a crime for which others had been wrongly convicted, and a reinvestigation began. Steven A. Drizin and Richard A. Leo (2004), “The Problem of False Confessions in the Post-DNA World,” *North Carolina Law Review*, 82, pp. 891 – 1008; see p. 899.

3 See www.innocenceproject.org and Barry Scheck, Peter Neufeld, and Jim Dwyer (2000),

Actual Innocence. New York: Doubleday.

4 Emphasis in original. Samuel R. Gross et al. (2004), "Exonerations in the United States, 1989 through 2003." <http://www.mindfully.org/Reform/2004/Prison-Exonerations-Gross19apr04.htm>. This research was subsequently published in a law journal; Samuel R. Gross, Kristen Jacoby, Daniel J. Matheson, Nicholas Montgomery, and Sujata Patil (2005), "Exonerations in the United States, 1989 through 2003," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 95, pp. 523ff.

5 Quoted in Richard Jerome, "Suspect Confessions," *The New York Times Magazine*, August 13, 1995, pp. 28 - 31; quote is on p. 31.

6 Daniel S. Medwed (2004), "The Zeal Deal: Prosecutorial Resistance to Post-Conviction Claims of Innocence," *Boston University Law Review*, 84, p. 125. Medwed analyzes the institutional culture of many prosecutors' offices that makes it difficult for prosecutors to admit mistakes and correct them.

7 Joshua Marquis, "The Innocent and the Shammed," *The New York Times* op-ed, January 26, 2006.

8 *Harmful Error: Investigating America's Local Prosecutors*, published by the Center for Public Integrity, Summer 2003, reports on their analysis of 11,452 cases across the nation in which appellate court judges reviewed charges of prosecutorial misconduct. The center gave Marquis a chance to respond; "Those few cases," "The truth is that . . .," p. 110. <http://www.publicintegrity.org>.

9 Quoted in Mike Miner, "Why Can't They Admit They Were Wrong?" *Chicago Reader*, August 1, 2003.

10 The main problem with the Voice Stress Analyzer is that the confirmation bias gets in the way. If you think the suspect is guilty, you interpret the microtremors as signs of lying, and if you think the suspect is innocent, you pay them no attention. For a bibliography and review of some of this research, see <http://www.polygraph.org/voicestress.htm>.

11 Quoted in Paul E. Tracy (with the collaboration of Ralph Claytor and Chris McDonough) (2003), *Who Killed Stephanie Crowe?* Dallas, TX: Brown Books, p. 334.

12 The account of Vic Caloca's involvement in the case, including the quotes by him, comes from a story written by investigative reporters John Wilkens and Mark Sauer, "A Badge of Courage: In the Crowe Case, This Cop Ignored the Politics while Pursuing Justice," *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, July 11, 2004. Druliner's quote is in Mark Sauer and John Wilkens, "Tuite Found Guilty of Manslaughter," *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, May 27, 2004.

13 Deanna Kuhn, Michael Weinstock, and Robin Flaton (1994), "How Well Do Jurors Reason? Competence Dimensions of Individual Variation in a Juror Reasoning Task," *Psychological Science*, 5, pp. 289 - 296.

14 Don DeNevi and John H. Campbell (2004), *Into the Minds of Madmen: How the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit Revolutionized Crime Investigation*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, p. 33. This book is, unintentionally, a case study of the unscientific training of the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit.

15 Quoted in Tracy, *Who Killed Stephanie Crowe?*, p. 184; note 11.

16 Quoted on CBS's *Eye to Eye* with Connie Chung (1994).

17 Introductory comments by Steven Drizin, "Prosecutors Won't Oppose Tankleff's Hearing," *The New York Times on the Web*, May 13, 2004.

18 Edward Humes (1999), *Mean Justice*. New York: Pocket Books, p. 181.

19 Andrew J. McClurg (1999), "Good Cop, Bad Cop: Using Cognitive Dissonance Theory to Reduce Police Lying," *U. C. Davis Law Review*, 32, pp. 389 - 453. First quote, p. 394; second, p. 429.

20 This excuse is so common that it, too, has spawned a new term: “dropsy” testimony. David Heilbroner, a former New York assistant district attorney, wrote: “In dropsy cases, officers justify a search by the oldest of means: they lie about the facts. *As I was coming around the corner I saw the defendant drop the drugs on the sidewalk, so I arrested him.* It was an old line known to everyone in the justice system. One renowned federal judge many years ago complained that he had read the same testimony in too many cases for it to be believed any longer as a matter of law.” David Heilbroner (1990), *Rough Justice: Days and Nights of a Young D. A.* New York: Pantheon, p. 29.

21 McClurg, “Good Cop, Bad Cop,” note 19, p. 391, quoting from the City of New York Commission to Investigate Allegations of Police Corruption and the Anti-Corruption Procedures of the Police Department: Commission Report 36 (1994), referred to as the Mollen Commission Report.

22 Norm Stamper (2005), *Breaking Rank: A Top Cop's Exposé of the Dark Side of American Policing*. New York: Nation Books. See also “Let Those Dopers Be,” Stamper's op-ed essay for the *Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 2005.

23 Quoted in McClurg, “Good Cop, Bad Cop,” note 19, pp. 413, 415.

24 In Suffolk County, New York, in September 1988, homicide detective K. James McCready was summoned to a home where he found the body of Arlene Tankleff, who had been stabbed and beaten to death, and her husband, Seymour, who also had been brutally attacked. (He died a few weeks later.) Within hours, McCready declared that he had solved the case: The killer was the couple's son, Martin, age seventeen. During the interrogation, McCready repeatedly told Martin that he knew he had killed his parents because his father had briefly come out of his coma before dying and told police that Marty was his attacker. This was a lie. “I used trickery and deceit,” McCready said. “I don't *think* he did it. I *know* he did it.” The teenager finally confessed that he must have killed his parents while in a blackout. When the family lawyer arrived on the scene, Martin Tankleff immediately disavowed the confession and never signed it, but it was enough to convict him. Martin was sentenced to fifty years to life in prison. Bruce Lambert, “Convicted of Killing His Parents, but Calling a Detective the Real Bad Guy,” *The New York Times*, April 4, 2004.

25 Quoted in Tracy, *Who Killed Stephanie Crowe?*, p. 175; note 11.

26 Fred E. Inbau, John E. Reid, Joseph P. Buckley, and Brian C. Jayne (2001), *Criminal Interrogation and Confessions* (fourth ed.). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers, p. 212.

27 Inbau et al., p. 429.

28 One of the most thorough dissections of the Reid Technique and the Inbau et al. manual is Deborah Davis and William T. O'Donohue (2004), “The Road to Perdition: ‘Extreme Influence’ Tactics in the Interrogation Room,” in W. T. O'Donohue and E. Levensky (eds.), *Handbook of Forensic Psychology*, pp. 897 – 996. New York: Elsevier Academic Press.

29 Louis C. Senese (2005), *Anatomy of Interrogation Themes: The Reid Technique of Interviewing*. Chicago: John E. Reid & Associates, p. 32.

30 Quoted also in Saul Kassin (2005), “On the Psychology of Confessions: Does *Innocence* Put *Innocents* at Risk?” *American Psychologist*, 60, pp. 215 – 228.

31 Saul M. Kassin and Christina T. Fong (1999), “I'm Innocent! Effects of Training on Judgments of Truth and Deception in the Interrogation Room,” *Law and Human Behavior*, 23, pp. 499 – 516. In another study, Kassin and his colleagues recruited prison inmates who were instructed to give a full confession of their own crime and a made-up confession of a crime committed by another inmate. College students and police investigators judged the videotaped confessions. The overall accuracy rate did not exceed chance, but the police were more

confident in their judgments. See Saul M. Kassin, Christian A. Meissner, and Rebecca J. Norwick (2005), "'I'd know a false confession if I saw one': A Comparative Study of College Students and Police Investigators," *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, pp. 211 - 227.

32 This is why innocent people are more likely than guilty people to waive their Miranda rights to silence and to having a lawyer. In one of Saul Kassin's experiments, seventy-two participants who were guilty or innocent of stealing \$100 were interrogated by a male detective whose demeanor was neutral, sympathetic, or hostile, and who then tried to get them to give up their Miranda rights. Those who were innocent were far more likely to sign a waiver than those who were guilty, and by a large margin — 81 percent to 36 percent. Two thirds of the innocent suspects even signed the waiver when the detective adopted a hostile pose, shouting at them, "I know you did this and I don't want to hear any lies!" The reason they signed, they later said, was they thought that only guilty people need a lawyer, whereas they had done nothing wrong and had nothing to hide. "It appears," the experimenters concluded mournfully, "that people have a naïve faith in the power of their own innocence to set them free." Saul M. Kassin and Rebecca J. Norwick (2004), "Why People Waive Their Miranda Rights: The Power of Innocence," *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, pp. 211 - 221.

33 Drizin and Leo, "The Problem of False Confessions in the Post-DNA World," p. 948; note 2.

34 For example, one teenager, Kharey Wise, was told that the jogger was hit with a "very heavy object" and then was asked, "Was she hit with a stone or brick?" Wise said first that it was a rock; moments later, that it was a brick. He said one of the others had pulled out a knife and cut the jogger's shirt off, which wasn't true; there were no knife cuts. Saul Kassin, "False Confessions and the Jogger Case," *The New York Times* op-ed, November 1, 2002.

35 New York v. Kharey Wise, Kevin Richardson, Antron McCray, Yusef Salaam, and Raymond Santana; Affirmation in response to motion to vacate judgment of conviction, Indictment No. 4762/89, by Assistant District Attorney Nancy Ryan, December 5, 2002. Quote on page 46.

36 Adam Liptak, "Prosecutors Fight DNA Use for Exoneration," *The New York Times*, August 29, 2003. See also Daniel Medwed, "The Zeal Deal," for a review of the evidence of prosecutorial resistance to reopening DNA cases; note 6.

37 Quoted in Sara Rimer, "Convict's DNA Sways Labs, Not a Determined Prosecutor," *The New York Times*, February 6, 2002.

38 "The Case for Innocence," a *Frontline* special for PBS by Ofra Bikel, first aired October 31, 2000. Transcripts and information available from the PBS *Frontline* Web site at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/case/etc/tapes.html>.

39 Drizin and Leo, "The Problem of False Confessions in the Post-DNA World," p. 928, note 200 no that page; note 2.

40 In a famous case in North Carolina, where a victim identified the wrong man as the man who raped her, DNA was eventually traced to the true perpetrator; see James M. Doyle (2005), *True Witness: Cops, Courts, Science, and the Battle Against Misidentification*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Sometimes, too, a "cold case" is solved with DNA evidence. In Los Angeles in 2004, detectives working in the newly formed cold case unit got samples of semen from the body of a woman who had been raped and murdered years earlier, and checked them against the state's database of DNA from convicted violent felons. They got a match to Chester Turner, who was already in prison for rape. The detectives kept submitting DNA samples from other unsolved murders to the lab, and every month they got another match with Turner. Before long, they had linked him to twelve slayings of poor black prostitutes. Amidst the general exhilaration of catching a serial killer, District Attorney Steve Cooley

quietly released David Jones, a retarded janitor with the mental age of a child, who had spent nine years in prison for three of the murders. If Turner had murdered only those three women, he would still be at large and Jones would still be in prison. But because Turner killed nine other women whose cases were unsolved, Jones was the lucky beneficiary of the efforts of the cold case unit. Justice, for him, was a byproduct of another investigation. No one, not even the cold case investigators, had any motivation to check Jones's DNA against the samples from the victims during those long nine years. But the new team of detectives had every motivation to solve old unsolved crimes, and that is the only reason that justice was served and Jones was released.

41 Deborah Davis and Richard Leo (2006), "Strategies for Preventing False Confessions and their Consequences," in M. R. Kebbell and G. M. Davies (eds.), *Practical Psychology for Forensic Investigations and Prosecutions*. Chichester, England: Wiley, pp. 121 - 149. See also the essays in Sandra D. Westervelt and John A. Humphrey (eds.) (2001), *Wrongly Convicted: Perspectives on Failed Justice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

42 Quoted on the PBS show *Frontline*, "The Case for Innocence," October 31, 2000.

43 D. Michael Risinger and Jeffrey L. Loop (2002, November), "Three Card Monte, Monty Hall, Modus Operandi and 'Offender Profiling': Some Lessons of Modern Cognitive Science for the Law of Evidence," *Cardozo Law Review*, 24, p. 193.

44 Davis and Leo, "Strategies for Preventing False Confessions . . .," p. 145; note 41.

45 McClurg, "Good Cop, Bad Cop"; note 19. McClurg's own suggestions for using cognitive dissonance to reduce the risk of police lying are in this essay.

46 Saul M. Kassin and Gisli H. Gudjonsson (2004), "The Psychology of Confession Evidence: A Review of the Literature and Issues," especially the section on "Videotaping Interrogations: A Policy Whose Time Has Come," *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5, pp. 33 - 67. See also Drizin and Leo, "The Problem of False Confessions . . .," note 2; Davis and O'Donohue, "The Road to Perdition," note 28.

47 Quoted in Jerome, "Suspect Confessions," p. 31; note 5.

48 Thomas P. Sullivan (2004), "Police Experiences with Recording Custodial Interrogations." This study, with extensive references on the benefits of recordings, is posted on the Internet at <http://www.law.northwestern.edu/wrongfulconvictions/Causes/custodialInterrogations.htm>. However, further research has shown that the camera angle can bias observers' judgments, especially if the camera is focused exclusively on the suspect and does not include the interviewer(s). G. Daniel Lassiter, Andrew L. Geers, Ian M. Handley, Paul E. Weiland, and Patrick J. Munhall (2002), "Videotaped Interrogations and Confessions: A Simple Change in Camera Perspective Alters Verdicts in Simulated Trials," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, pp. 867 - 874.

49 Davis and Leo, "Strategies for Preventing False Confessions . . .," p. 145; note 41. In Canada, the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Heads of Prosecutions Committee established a Working Group on the Prevention of Miscarriages of Justice. Their Report on the Prevention of Miscarriages of Justice, released January 2005, is available at <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/dept/pub/hop/>.

50 Thomas Vanes, "Let DNA Close Door on Doubt in Murder Cases," the *Los Angeles Times* op-ed, July 28, 2003.

第六章

1 John Butler Yeats to his son William, November 5, 1917. In Richard J. Finneran, George

- M. Harper, and William M. Murphy (eds.), *Letters to W. B. Yeats*, Vol. 2. New York: Columbia University Press, p. 338.
- 2 Andrew Christensen and Neil S. Jacobson (2000), *Reconcilable Differences*. New York: Guilford. We have taken excerpts from the story of Debra and Frank at the opening of chapter, 1, pp. 1 - 7.
- 3 See Neil S. Jacobson and Andrew Christensen (1998), *Acceptance and Change in Couple Therapy: A Therapist's Guide to Transforming Relationships*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- 4 Christensen and Jacobson, *Reconcilable Differences*, p. 9; note 2.
- 5 There is a very large body of research on the way a couple's attributions about each other affect their feelings about each other and the course of their marriage. See, for example, Adam Davey, Frank D. Fincham, Steven R. H. Beach, and Gene H. Brody (2001), "Attributions in Marriage: Examining the Entailment Model in Dyadic Context," *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, pp. 721 - 734; Thomas N. Bradbury and Frank D. Fincham (1992), "Attributions and Behavior in Marital Interaction," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, pp. 613 - 628; and Benjamin R. Karney and Thomas N. Bradbury (2000), "Attributions in Marriage: State or Trait? A Growth Curve Analysis," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 295 - 309.
- 6 June P. Tangney, Patricia E. Wagner, Deborah Hill-Barlow, et al. (1996), "Relation of Shame and Guilt to Constructive versus Destructive Responses to Anger Across the Lifespan," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 797 - 809.
- 7 John Gottman (1994), *Why Marriages Succeed or Fail*. New York: Simon & Schuster. Fred and Ingrid are on p. 69.
- 8 See, for example, Benjamin R. Karney and Thomas N. Bradbury (1995), "The Longitudinal Course of Marital Quality and Stability: A Review of Theory, Method, and Research," *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, pp. 3 - 34; and Frank D. Fincham, Gordon T. Harold, and Susan Gano-Phillips (2000), "The Longitudinal Relation between Attributions and Marital Satisfaction: Direction of Effects and Role of Efficacy Expectations," *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, pp. 267 - 285.
- 9 Gottman, *Why Marriages Succeed or Fail*, p. 57; note 7.
- 10 Quoted in Ayala M. Pines (1986), "Marriage," in C. Tavis (ed.), *Every Woman's Emotional Well-Being*. New York: Doubleday. Ellen's story is on p. 191; Donna and her "hate book" are on pp. 190 - 191.
- 11 Julie Schwartz Gottman (ed.) (2004), *The Marriage Clinic Casebook*. New York: W. W. Norton. The story of this couple is in chapter 4, "Extramarital Affairs: The Pearl in the Oyster," by Julie Gottman, p. 50.
- 12 John Gottman, *Why Marriages Succeed or Fail*, p. 127; for his description of the fifty-six couples, see p. 128; note 7.
- 13 Donald T. Saposnek and Chip Rose (1990), "The Psychology of Divorce," in D. L. Crumley and N. G. Apostolou (eds.), *Handbook of Financial Planning for Divorce and Separation*. New York: John Wiley. Their article is available online at <http://www.mediate.com/articles/saporo.cfm>. For a classic study of the ways that couples reconstruct their memories of their marriage and each other, see Janet R. Johnston and Linda E. Campbell (1988), *Impasses of Divorce: The Dynamics and Resolution of Family Conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- 14 Jacobson and Christensen, *Acceptance and Change in Couple Therapy*, note 3, discuss new approaches to help partners accept each other rather than always trying to get the other to change.
- 15 Vivian Gornick (2002), "What Independence Has Come to Mean to Me: The Pain of

Solitude, the Pleasure of Self-Knowledge,” in Cathi Hanauer (ed.), *The Bitch in the House*. New York: William Morrow, p. 259.

第七章

- 1 Our portrayal of this couple is based on the story of Joe and Mary Louise in Andrew Christensen and Neil S. Jacobson (2000), *Reconcilable Differences*, New York: Guilford, p. 290.
- 2 The story of the Schiavo family battle is drawn from news reports and the in-depth reporting by Abby Goodnough for *The New York Times*, “Behind Life-and-Death Fight, a Rift that Began Years Ago,” March 26, 2005.
- 3 Sukhwinder S. Shergill, Paul M. Bays, Chris D. Frith, and Daniel M. Wolpert (2003, July 11), “Two Eyes for an Eye: The Neuroscience of Force Escalation,” *Science*, 301, p. 187.
- 4 Roy F. Baumeister, Arlene Stillwell, and Sara R. Wotman (1990), “Victim and Perpetrator Accounts of Interpersonal Conflict: Autobiographical Narratives about Anger,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, pp. 994 – 1005. The examples of typical remarks are ours, not the researchers’.
- 5 Luc Sante, “Tourists and Torturers,” *The New York Times* op-ed, May 11, 2004.
- 6 Amos Oz, “The Devil in the Details,” *the Los Angeles Times* op-ed, October 10, 2005.
- 7 Keith Davis and Edward E. Jones (1960), “Changes in Interpersonal Perception as a Means of Reducing Cognitive Dissonance,” *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, pp. 402 – 410; see also Frederick X. Gibbons and Sue B. McCoy (1991), “Self-Esteem, Similarity, and Reactions to Active versus Passive Downward Comparison,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, pp. 414 – 424.
- 8 David Glass (1964), “Changes in Liking as a Means of Reducing Cognitive Discrepancies between Self-Esteem and Aggression,” *Journal of Personality*, 32, pp. 531 – 549. See also Richard M. Sorrentino and Robert G. Boutilier (1974), “Evaluation of a Victim as a Function of Fate Similarity/Dissimilarity,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, pp. 84 – 93; and Richard M. Sorrentino and Jack E. Hardy (1974), “Religiousness and Derogation of an Innocent Victim,” *Journal of Personality*, 42, pp. 372 – 382.
- 9 Yes, he really said it. See Derrick Z. Jackson, “The Westmoreland Mind-Set,” *Boston Globe*, July 20, 2005. Westmoreland made these remarks in the 1974 Vietnam documentary *Hearts and Minds*. According to Jackson, “The quote so stunned director Peter Davis that he gave Westmoreland a chance to clean it up.” He didn’t.
- 10 Ellen Berscheid, David Boye, and Elaine Walster (Hatfield) (1968), “Retaliation as a Means of Restoring Equity,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, pp. 370 – 376.
- 11 Stanley Milgram (1974), *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper & Row, p. 10.
- 12 On demonizing the perpetrator as a way of restoring consonance and maintaining a belief that the world is just, see John H. Ellard, Christina D. Miller, Terri-Lynne Bauml, and James Olson (2002), “Just World Processes in Demonizing,” in M. Ross and D. T. Miller (eds.), *The Justice Motive in Everyday Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 13 John Conroy (2000), *Unspeakable Acts, Ordinary People*. New York: Knopf, p. 112.
- 14 Bush made his remark on November 7, 2005, after news that detainees were being held in secret “terror jails” and the abuses at Abu Ghraib prison had been exposed. Inhofe made his comments on May 11, 2004, during the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings regarding

abuses of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib prison. In February 2004, the International Committee of the Red Cross had issued its finding, "Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the Treatment by the Coalition Forces of Prisoners of War and Other Protected Persons by the Geneva Conventions in Iraq during Arrest, Internment and Interrogation." This document is available at http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2004/icrc_report_iraq_feb2004.htm. Under #1, "Treatment During Arrest," see point 7: "Certain CF [Coalition Forces] military intelligence officers told the ICRC that in their estimate between 70% and 90% of the persons deprived of their liberty in Iraq had been arrested by mistake."

15 Charles Krauthammer made the case for the limited use of torture in "The Truth about Torture: It's time to be honest about doing terrible things," in *The Weekly Standard*, December 5, 2005.

16 Remarks of Condoleezza Rice at Andrews Air Force Base, December 5, 2005, as she was departing for a state visit to Europe.

17 William Schulz, "An Israeli Interrogator, and a Tale of Torture," letter to *The New York Times*, December 27, 2004. A year later, the *Times* reported the case of Ibn al-Shaykh al-Libi, a former Al Qaeda leader, who was captured in Pakistan by American forces and sent for "questioning" to Egypt. The Egyptians sent him back to the American authorities when he finally confessed that Al Qaeda members had received chemical weapons training in Iraq — information the Americans wanted to hear. Later, Libi said he made the story up to appease the Egyptians, who were torturing him (with American approval). A *Times* editorial in the aftermath of this story (December 10, 2005) noted that "torture is a terrible way to do the very thing that the administration uses to excuse it — getting accurate information. Centuries of experience show that people will tell their tormenters what they want to hear, whether it's confessing to witchcraft in Salem, admitting to counterrevolutionary tendencies in Soviet Russia or concocting stories about Iraq and Al Qaeda."

18 An anonymous sergeant describing the handling of detainees in Iraq in a Human Rights Watch report, September 2005; reprinted with other commentary in "Under Control," *Harper's*, December 2005, pp. 23–24.

19 Piccardo Orizio (2003), *Talk of the Devil: Encounters with Seven Dictators*. New York: Walker & Company.

20 Louis Menand, "The Devil's Disciples: Can You Force People to Love Freedom?," *New Yorker*, July 28, 2003.

21 Timothy Garton Ash, "Europe's Bloody Hands," the *Los Angeles Times*, July 27, 2006.

22 Christensen and Jacobson, *Reconcilable Differences*, p. 291; note 1.

23 For a thoughtful analysis of the social and personal costs of forgiveness that is uncritical and premature, letting perpetrators off the hook of responsibility and accountability for the harm they caused, see Sharon Lamb (1996), *The Trouble with Blame: Victims, Perpetrators, and Responsibility*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

24 Solomon Schimmel (2002), *Wounds Not Healed by Time: The Power of Repentance and Forgiveness*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, p. 226. Psychologist Ervin Staub, himself a Holocaust survivor, has been studying the origins and dynamics of genocide for many years, and most recently has devoted himself to the project of reconciliation between the Tutsi and Hutu in Rwanda. See Ervin Staub and Laurie A. Pearlman (2006), "Advancing Healing and Reconciliation in Rwanda and Other Post-conflict Settings," in L. Barbanell and R. Sternberg (eds.), *Psychological Interventions in Times of Crisis*, New York: Springer-Verlag; and Daniel Goleman (2006), *Social Intelligence*, New York: Bantam Books.

25 Broyles told this story in a 1987 PBS documentary, "Faces of the Enemy," based on the book of the same title by Sam Keen. It is still available on VHS and DVD from PBS.

第八章

- 1 All quotations are taken from the transcript of Oprah's show, January 26, 2006.
- 2 "Wayne Hale's Insider's Guide to NASA," by Nell Boyce. NPR *Morning Edition*, June 30, 2006. The full text of Hale's e-mail to colleagues is available online.
- 3 Reagan's defense started out well — "First, let me say I take full responsibility for my own actions and for those of my administration" — but then he added a series of "but they did it"s: "As angry as I may be about activities undertaken without my knowledge, I am still accountable for those activities. As disappointed as I may be in some who served me, I'm still the one who must answer to the American people for this behavior. And as personally distasteful as I find secret bank accounts and diverted funds — well, as the Navy would say, this happened on my watch." And this is how he took "full responsibility" for breaking the law: "A few months ago I told the American people I did not trade arms for hostages. My heart and my best intentions still tell me that's true, but the facts and the evidence tell me it is not."
- 4 Daniel Yankelovich and Isabella Furth (2005, September 16), "The Role of Colleges in an Era of Mistrust," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B8 – B11. Quote on p. B11.
- 5 Posted on the Web site of an advocacy group called The Sorry Works!, a coalition of physicians, hospital administrators, insurers, patients, and others concerned with the medical malpractice crisis. At Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York and several other medical schools, residents are learning how to acknowledge mistakes and apologize for them, as well as how to distinguish a bad outcome that is not their fault from one that is. See Katherine Mangan, "Acting Sick," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 15, 2006.
- 6 Richard A. Friedman, "Learning Words They Rarely Teach in Medical School: 'I'm Sorry,'" *The New York Times* Science section, July 26, 2005.
- 7 *Harmful Error: Investigating America's Local Prosecutors*, published by the Center for Public Integrity, Summer 2003. <http://www.publicintegrity.org>.
- 8 Faced with a wave of verified wrongful convictions, Great Britain has adopted a number of reforms. For example, the government established the Criminal Cases Review Commission, an independent council to investigate allegations of misconduct and suppression or falsification of evidence. In 1984, in response to several high-profile wrongful convictions that proved to have been based on coerced confessions, England and Wales passed the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, which made it illegal for police interrogators to lie about evidence to induce confessions and required all interrogations to be recorded. According to Richard Leo, although British interrogation today is more conversational and designed to get information rather than confession, the confession rate has not declined since passage of this act. See Richard Leo (2007), *Police Interrogation and American Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 9 Warren G. Bennis and Burt Nanus (1995), *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge* (rev. ed.). New York: HarperCollins, p. 70.
- 10 Quote from Shimon Peres in Dennis Prager's *Ultimate Issues*, Summer 1985, p. 11.
- 11 This message was posted on the listserv Teaching in the Psychological Sciences, May 1, 2003.
- 12 Quoted in Charles Baxter (1997), "Dysfunctional Narratives; or: 'Mistakes Were

Made,” in *Burning Down the House: Essays on Fiction*. Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf Press, p. 5. There is some dispute about the second sentence of Lee’s remarks, but not about his assuming responsibility for his disastrous actions.

13 Anthony Pratkanis and Doug Shadel (2005), *Weapons of Fraud: A Source Book for Fraud Fighters*. This book is available free from the AARP; for more information, go to www.aarp.org/wa.

14 Stigler recalled this story in an obituary for Harold Stevenson, the *Los Angeles Times*, July 22, 2005. For their research, see Harold W. Stevenson and James W. Stigler (1992), *The Learning Gap*, New York: Summit; and Harold W. Stevenson, Chuansheng Chen, and Shin-ying Lee (1993, January 1), “Mathematics Achievement of Chinese, Japanese, and American Schoolchildren: Ten Years Later,” *Science*, 259, pp. 53 – 58.

15 Carol S. Dweck (1992), “The Study of Goals in Psychology,” *Psychological Science*, 3, pp. 165 – 167; Carol S. Dweck and Lisa Sorich (1999), “Mastery-Oriented Thinking,” in C. R. Snyder (ed.), *Coping: The Psychology of What Works*. New York: Oxford University Press; Claudia M. Mueller and Carol S. Dweck (1998), “Praise for Intelligence Can Undermine Children’s Motivation and Performance,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, pp. 33 – 52. Dweck has also written a book for general audiences: Carol S. Dweck (2006), *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House.



后记



在决定本书作者的排序时,我们采用了抛硬币的方法;这种做法可以很好地体现我们之间的合作。然而,自始至终,我们两个人都坚信自己是在与一位更有天赋的合作者一起工作。因此,从开始的那一天起,我们便为从事这样一个可以互相激励、互相学习乃至给双方都带来乐趣的项目而互相感谢。

本书得益于一些同行们认真而又挑剔的审阅,这些同事是从事记忆、法律、夫妻治疗、商业和临床领域研究与实践的专家。我们特别要感谢以下这些同行,他们从各自的专业领域对相关章节进行了准确的评价,给了我们极好的建议:安德鲁斯·克里斯滕森、底波拉·戴维丝、杰拉德·戴维斯(Gerald Davison)、玛丽安娜·加里、布鲁斯·海(Bruce Hay)、布拉德·哈伊(Brad Heil)、理查德·列夫、斯科特·利林菲尔德(Scott Lilienfeld)、伊丽莎白·洛夫特斯、安德鲁·迈克莱尔、蒂翁·波勒切克(Devon Polachek)、莱奥诺·蒂菲尔以及唐纳德·萨波斯奈克。我们也感谢来自以下朋友的评论、意见、故事、研究以及其他信息:科恩(J. J. Cohn)、约瑟夫·德·瑞威拉(Joseph de Rivera)、拉夫·哈伯、罗伯特·卡顿(Robert Kardon)、苏·卡森、波特·奈尼斯、黛伯拉·

普勒(Debra Poole)、安东尼·普拉卡尼斯、霍莉·司脱金(Holly Stocking)、迈克尔·扎戈尔(Michael Zagor)。我们还要感谢德博拉·克蒂(Deborah Cady)和卡里尔·麦克里(Caryl McColly)在编辑方面所给予的帮助。

从本书开始构思到最终问世,我们温文尔雅的代理商和好朋友鲍布·莱舍尔(Bob Lescher)都参与其中。无论是合约的签订,还是本书的内容,莱舍尔都付出了极大的热情,我们感谢他所提供的帮助。而且,鲍布还为我们找到了代理编辑简·艾西(Jane Isay),一位可以带来快乐的工作伙伴。简所具备的优雅、技巧和幽默感,足以让作者们明白初稿中的错误,并激发我们一次又一次地进行修改。她鼓舞着我们的士气,并帮助我们不断地对文稿加以润色与改进。她是一位罕见的凡事都亲自动手的编辑,她的故事和想法已经融入本书之中。我们也要感谢来自哈科特(Harcourt)的富有天赋的助理编辑詹娜·约翰逊(Jenna Johnson),他对本书从完成到出版的整个过程都进行了指导。最后,我们想感谢主任编辑戴维·霍夫(David Hough),一位对本书的一切(包括本书作者)都喜爱有加的男士,他让我们的写作过程变得毫无痛苦而且深受教益。我们还要感谢具有非凡校对技能的玛格丽特·琼斯(Margaret Jones)。

最为重要的是,我们要将我们的感谢和爱献给我们的配偶,罗南·卡西(Ronan O'Casey)和维拉·阿伦森(Vera Aronson)。我们生活中的错误是由自己造成的,并不能归咎于我们所选择的人生伴侣。

Carol Tavis 和 Elliot Aronson



译者后记



呈现在读者面前的,是美国社会心理学家卡罗尔·塔夫里斯和我们这个时代最著名的社会心理学家之一艾略特·阿伦森新近合作推出的一部作品。本书首先是写给如你我一样会犯错误的普通大众的,作者寓社会心理学原理于生活之中,通过大量的生活案例和实验研究,启发人们关注人类自我所固有的一种心理误区——尽一切可能为自己的错误辩护,并将自己的决策和行为合理化。正是由于这一误区的存在,人们会在不知不觉之中陷入危险的自我欺骗之中,走向偏执乃至残忍,其结果是造成人与人之间的矛盾和隔阂,甚至导致不断升级的杀戮与战争。自我辩护会让那些负有较大责任的社会决策者,例如政治家、学术权威、医生、法律工作者、心理治疗师等,偏离自己的职业准则和客观价值,对公众的利益带来威胁,甚至造成难以估量的损失。由此看来,本书对于处在社会关键位置上的决策者,具有极为重要的启发意义和治疗价值。而在一个民主、开放的社会里,作为一个普通大众,为了维护自身的利益和社会正义,无疑应当承担起监督决策者出现此类错误的责任。在作者看来,引导人们(包括社会决策者和普通大众)走出误区的关键在于:认识到个体乃至人类是在不断

尝试错误中成长的,我们要从内心深处真正承认自己所犯下的错误。在阅读本书的过程中,读者会感受到其价值已经远远地超越了社会心理学领域。需要交代的是,对于英文 Self-justification 这个术语,国内一般将它译作“自我辩解”。在翻译阿伦森的另一部巨著《社会性动物(第九版)》(华东师范大学出版社2007年12月出版)时,译者将该术语译作自我辩护。尽管这一译法至今还没有受到质疑,但译者仍没有十足的把握,毕竟中英对照词典给出的中文译法二者兼而有之。好在作者在本书导言中对自我辩护和自我辩解做了较为明确的区分,表明对该术语的翻译矫正还是有些必要的,而这种区分对于专业研究者而言则似乎并非可有可无。本书翻译分工如下:导言、第一章、第二章、后记:邢占军;第三章:王丽萍、黄立清;第四章:张燕;第五章:曲夏夏、孟凡菊;第六章:孟凡菊;第七章:张天、邢占军;第八章:张倩妹。我本人又对全书进行了审校。由于能力和水平所限,误译、漏译在所难免,真诚地期盼来自读者的批评指正!

邢占军

2008年9月于泉城济南

