Cicero under Attack
Invective Speech in Roman Republican Oratory

Henriette van der Blom

Rome's greatest orator and influential politician, Marcus Tullius Cicero (106 – 43 BC), was a master of political invective. With his oratory, he forced Catiline to flee Rome, provoked Clodius to exile Cicero and raise Cicero's house to the ground, challenged Piso's entire political career, and, ultimately, enraged Marcus Antonius so much with his slanderous abuse that he ordered Cicero's murder. These were extreme outcomes of political oratory in Rome, where invective formed an ingrained part of political life and day-to-day politics, nonetheless they are indicative of the role oratory played in making and breaking political careers and lives in the Roman republic.

Cicero's verbal attacks have become famous for their elaborate use of rhetorical effects and explicit terms to heap abuse on his political opponents. Over a long career at the political top, Cicero honed his skills in employing all the motifs of invective which he had learnt in his rhetorical education. His speeches have been studied by ancient and modern scholars as catalogues of invective motifs, examples of how far Roman politicians could go in defaming a political opponent, and as illustrations of the contexts of invective speeches in Roman republican politics and courts.

In this paper, I should like to explore Cicero and invective from the opposite angle, namely Cicero at the receiving end of verbal abuse. Cicero was ridiculed for being a 'new man' in Roman politics (a man without ancestors in political office), for tyranny in his execution of the Catilinarian conspirators, for corruption in the 'loan' of money in exchange of legal services, for cowardice and insecurity, for his excessive sorrow after the loss of his daughter, and for having divorced his long-standing wife for a rich teenage bride. The evidence of this criticism and slander is scattered over a broad range of sources, but the collection and discussion of this material will allow us to assess how others used invective against Cicero, which categories for abuse were employed and how Cicero reacted to such criticism. The paper will thus highlight an understudied aspect of Roman invective and bring to light material often overlooked in modern scholarship, namely fragments of other Roman republican orators, thereby furthering our understanding of Roman invective oratory.

Dr. **Henriette van der Blom** (D.Phil and M.St. (Oxon); MA and BA (Copenhagen)), Carlsberg Foundation Research Fellow and Research Fellow, Wolfson College, Oxford. Dr. van der Blom is an ancient historian specialised in the Roman republic and early Roman empire (ca. 500 BC – AD 100) and, in particular, oratory and political culture. She has recently published *Cicero's Role Models: the Political Strategy of a Newcomer* (Oxford University Press, 2010) as well as articles on Cicero and Roman politics, and is at present conducting a major research project on the role of oratory for making a political career in Rome.

Berichte über das „Sexualleben" der frühen römischen Kaiser – ein Beispiel von Rufmord?

Jan Meister

Dem Gegner sexuelle Perversion zu unterstellen, ist eine gängige Form des Rufmords. Im politischen Alltag Roms gehörte es zum Standardrepertoire der rhetorischen Invektive, vom Gegner zu behaupten, er sei ein *vir mollis*, ein „weicher Mann", der sich durch einen unmännlichen Habitus und eine von der Norm abweichende Sexualpraktik auszeichnete. Der stereotype Charakter derartiger Anschuldigungen macht es modernen Historikern leicht, in solchen Berichten persönliche Angriffe zu erkennen, deren Wahrheitsgehalt fragwürdig ist. Die Berichte über das „Sexualleben" der frühen römischen Kaiser, die uns in den Kaiserbiographien Suetons überliefert sind, zeichnen dagegen ein deutlich komplexeres Bild: Suetons Caesaren verfügen über unterschiedliche sexuelle Vorlieben und ihre „Perversionen" sind erstaunlich variantenreich. Daraus den Schluss zu ziehen, dass es sich hierbei nicht um Angriffe auf die einzelnen Kaiser, sondern um die getreuliche Schilderung individueller Sexualprofile analog zum modernen Konzept eines Sexuallebens handelt, ist freilich verfehlt.

Der Vortrag möchte hier ansetzen und aufzeigen, dass es sich bei Suetons Berichten über das „Sexualleben" der frühen Kaiser um Beispiele von Rufmord handelt, die freilich nicht mehr ohne weiteres als solche zu erkennen sind, da der Biograph sich seine Informationen aus verschiedenen Quellen zusammensuchte. Es wird von der These ausgegangen, dass Sueton die einzelnen Berichte sammelte, sie aber dabei aus ihrem ursprünglichen Kontext löste – das Ergebnis mag modernen Vorstellungen individueller Sexualprofile nahekommen, doch sollte man sich dadurch nicht den Blick auf Suetons Quellen und ihre Kontexte versperren lassen. In einer Strukturanalyse soll daher versucht werden, diese ursprünglichen Kontexte zu rekonstruieren und aufzuzeigen, warum und in welchen Situationen das Sexualverhalten römischer Kaiser zu einem Thema werden konnte und welche Akteure damit was erreichen wollten. Dabei werden verschiedene Punkte eine Rolle spielen: Einerseits die Grundstruktur des Principats, die den Charakter des einzelnen Herrschers (und damit auch seine *pudicitia*) zu einem zentralen Faktor für die Beurteilung der jeweiligen Herrschaft werden ließ, andererseits aber auch die (im Vergleich zu Politikern der republikanischen Zeit) erschwerte Zugänglichkeit des Herrscher, die einen idealen Nährboden für Gerüchte und Unterstellungen – gerade auch in Bezug auf vermeintliche sexuelle Praktiken – bot. Suetons Biographien, so soll abschließend gezeigt werden, liefern zwar keinen authentischen Einblick in das „Sexualleben" römischer Kaiser, dafür bietet aber die naiv anmutende Art, mit der Sueton die ihm vorliegenden Unterstellungen und Gerüchte rezipierte, möglicherweise einen Einblick in die Wirkmächtigkeit antiker Rufmordkampagnen.

Jan B. Meister studied Ancient History, Classical Archaeology and Medieval History at the University of Basel. From 2006 to 2009 he was research assistant at the department of Ancient History in Basel and since 2009 "wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter" at the Humboldt University in Berlin. His interests lie in the area of body history and political representation in the Late Republic and Early Empire. His 2010 doctoral thesis *Der Körper des Princeps. Zur Problematik eines monarchischen Körpers ohne Monarchie* is currently being prepared for publication.

The Rise of the Tyrant
Character Assassination and Imperial Investiture in Ancient Rome

Martijn Icks

Reading the accounts of ancient authors, one might get the impression that the Roman Empire has only been ruled by the excellent, the insane and the woefully incompetent. While Roman historians and biographers praised the deeds of such perceived paragons of virtue as Augustus, Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, they condemned the crimes of supposedly mad, cruel tyrants like Caligula, Nero and Commodus. The latter were represented as *exempla* of immoral behaviour, embodying every vice that Romans of good standing and character abhorred. Other emperors, such as Claudius, Didius Julianus and Macrinus, were not stigmatized to the same extent, but were still represented as weak or foolish rulers, clearly unable to bear the responsibilities of supreme power.

One of the prime occasions for the assessment of an emperor's virtues and shortcomings was the moment of his accession. Evidently, new rulers used this ritual to present themselves as favourably as possible to their subjects. If all the relevant interest groups – the senate, the soldiers and the citizens of Rome – approved of their rise to power, their position was both legitimate and secure. In contrast, historians and biographers could use descriptions of investiture rituals to commit character assassination on emperors they disliked (usually posthumously). By describing a ruler's conduct at his investiture in negative terms, they signalled that an unworthy individual had risen to power and prepared their readers for what was to come, namely a tyrannical, incompetent and/or decadent reign.

In this paper, I will focus on the investiture of two 'bad' emperors: Otho (AD 69) and Didius Julianus (AD 193). How did ancient authors turn the elevations of these men into exercises in denigration? Which traits and behaviour of the new rulers did they target with their character attacks? What was the significance of the targeted behaviour within the context of the ritual? And what does this ultimately tell us about Roman constructions of 'bad' emperorship?

Martijn Icks is a Marie Curie fellow on the research project "Making and Unmaking the Emperor" at the University of Heidelberg in Germany. This project focuses on the status degradation of Roman emperors through negative representations of rituals, such as imperial investments, banquets and triumphal processions. Icks has studied at the Radboud University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands, where he earned his PhD *cum laude* in 2008 on a thesis about the notorious Roman emperor Elagabalus (r. 218-222). His thesis will be published later this year under the title *The Crimes of Elagabalus: The Life and Legacy of Rome's Decadent Boy Emperor*.

Rufmord in der spätantiken Historiographie
Das Beispiel Prokop

Henning Börm

Mit dem Namen des griechischen Geschichtsschreibers Prokop von Caesarea verbindet sich ein Werk, das die neben Senecas *Apocolocyntosis* berühmteste Attacke auf einen römischen Kaiser darstellt: die so genannte „Geheimgeschichte" (*Anekdota*). In ihr versammelte Prokop wütende Angriffe auf Justinian und dessen Frau Theodora; diese gipfeln zuletzt in dem Vorwurf, der Herrscher sei in Wahrheit ein „Dämonenfürst" mit dem einzigen Ziel, das Römische Reich und die ganze Welt zu verderben.

Im Unterschied zu Seneca und den meisten übrigen antiken Autoren, die Attacken auf Herrscher formulierten, schrieb Prokop über einen lebenden Kaiser. Dies setzte seiner Kritik natürliche Grenzen, und die wütendsten Vorwürfe konnte er überhaupt nur gegenüber einem kleinen Kreis von Vertrauten, nämlich dem Publikum der erst Jahrhunderte später veröffentlichten „Geheimgeschichte", äußern. Sie hatten also nur eine sehr begrenzte Reichweite. Publiziert und rasch im ganzen *Imperium Romanum* verbreitet wurden dagegen die acht Bücher der „Historien", und die Forschung hat längst erkannt, dass sich auch in ihr Kaiserkritik findet – allerdings weitaus subtiler als in den *Anekdota*.

Prokop bediente sich sowohl in der „Geheimgeschichte" als auch in den „Historien" großzügig aus dem traditionellen Fundus an herrscherkritischen Aussagen, die zu seiner Zeit, in der ausgehenden Spätantike, zum Teil bereits seit tausend Jahren gängig waren. Hinzu kamen aber auch neue Vorwürfe, vor allem solche mit religiösem, übernatürlichem Hintergrund. Es lässt sich demonstrieren, dass sich diese Rufmordstrategie gerade im Fall dieses Kaisers anbot.

Doch das eigentlich Innovative findet sich in den zu Prokops Lebzeiten publizierten „Historien": Einerseits wurde von einem antiken Autor geradezu erwartet, innerhalb des Genres Historiographie Distanz zu den Herrschenden zu wahren, um dem Anspruch auf „Wahrhaftigkeit" (ἀλήθεια) zu genügen und sich nicht dem Verdacht der Schmeichelei auszusetzen; doch andererseits musste Prokop bei allzu eindeutigen Angriffen auf Justinian natürlich mit Konsequenzen rechnen. Eine der wichtigsten Strategien, dieses Dilemma zu lösen, ist in den „Historien" der stellvertretende Rufmord: So werden prominente Repräsentanten des justinianischen Regimes, wie der *quaestor sacri palatii* Tribonian und der *praefectus praetorio* Johannes von Kappadokien, von Prokop heftig attackiert – wohlgemerkt erst nach ihrem Tod bzw. Sturz. Zahlreiche Vorwürfe und Unterstellungen, die der Tyrannentopik entstammen, werden insbesondere in Hinblick auf Johannes formuliert; und zugleich gelingt es Prokop, seinen Sturz in einer Weise zu schildern, die ihrerseits geeignet ist, übelstes Licht auf Justinian und Theodora zu werfen.

Doch auch andere Personen werden in den „Historien" attackiert, insbesondere Herrscher – längst verstorbene Kaiser wie Honorius, in dessen Fall der Rufmord besonders nachhaltig wirkte, aber auch „barbarische" Herrscher. Ein Ziel des Beitrags wird es sein, aufzuzeigen, dass auch diese üble Nachrede und negative Verzeichnung nicht Selbstzweck war, sondern eine wichtige Funktion in Prokops Werk erfüllte.

Henning Börm studied History and German Literature at the University of Kiel. His 2006 doctoral thesis *Prokop und die Perser* (Stuttgart 2007) deals with Procopius of Caesarea, the last major ancient historian, and with Roman-Persian relations in Late Antiquity. He has recently edited *Commutatio et contentio. Studies in the Late Roman, Sasanian, and Early Islamic Near East* (Düsseldorf 2010, with Josef Wiesehöfer) and is currently preparing a volume on *Antimonarchic Discourse in Antiquity*. Since 2008, he is „wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter" (assistant lecturer") in Ancient History at Konstanz University, Germany.

Defaming the Prophet and Islam in Medieval Christian Art and Thought

Debra Higgs Strickland

One of the most extensive defamation campaigns carried out in the West during the later Middle Ages was aimed against the Prophet, Muhammad, founder of the Islamic faith whose growing popularity posed the greatest single challenge for the survival of Christianity. The material consequences of this campaign in its military manifestations of the Crusades were accompanied by a steady flow of Western Christian propaganda produced in both literary and visual forms. Perhaps the most direct expression of defamation among Christian artists are the relatively few portraits of the Prophet that survive in disparate artistic contexts but primarily in late medieval manuscript illuminated manuscript copies of different types of Christian texts.

This paper will address the problem of why there was no fixed iconography for the representation of the Prophet Muhammad in Western Christian art of the later Middle Ages and whether the very instability of representation served important cultural and theological purposes. In spite of the ubiquity of his presence in the written sources (polemical literature, chronicle, poetry, drama), portrayals of Muhammad in works of Western medieval pictorial art are surprisingly few. Most intriguingly, these portraits vary widely in form and artistic context. Unlike images of the central holy personages in medieval Christian art, such as Christ, the saints, and the Virgin Mary, images of Muhammad are not instantly recognizable by physical appearance or attributes but rather require additional verbal support for correct identification. Pictured sometimes as a man or as a beast, a monster or even an object, changing representations of the Prophet combined with precise verbal descriptors suggest links to contemporary literary polemic and medieval theological notions of anti-orthodoxy.

A small sample of representative late medieval Christian portraits of Muhammad will be closely examined alongside comparative imagery that will highlight different themes relevant to the cultural meanings communicated in pictures of the Prophet, such as heresy, idolatry and mutability. By considering these images in relation to written texts, some hypotheses will be put forward concerning the ways in which works of art served the larger medieval Christian project of defaming both Muhammad and by extension, Islam.

Debra Higgs Strickland is an art historian and Director of the Glasgow Centre for Medieval & Renaissance Studies at the University of Glasgow. Her research focuses on Christian representations of non-Christians in late medieval and early modern art. Her major publications include *Medieval Bestiaries: Text, Image, Ideology* (1995, published under the name Debra Hassig) and *Saracens, Demons, and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (2003). She is completing a new book on *The Epiphanies of Hieronymus Bosch: Imagining Antichrist and Others from the Middle Ages to the Reformation.*

Two Victims of the Burgundian Propaganda Machine: Louis of Orleans and Isabeau of Bavaria

Tracy Adams

Brother of mad King Charles VI, Louis, Duke of Orleans (1372-1407) continues to be depicted by historians as an oversexed, frivolous, and corrupt scoundrel, while his sister-in-law, Queen Isabeau of Bavaria (c. 1370-1435) is widely held to have been despised by her contemporaries. Furthermore, modern historians often assume the pair to have been lovers. The major reason for the currency of these caricatures is that the most significant and widely-read chronicler of the period, Michel Pintoin, the Monk of St. Denis, was receptive to the propaganda of Louis and Isabeau's enemy, John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy, whose strategies for wresting control of the French kingdom during King Charles's periods of madness included destroying the reputations of his political opponents.

And yet, the Burgundian propaganda machine was not nearly as successful during its own time at destroying the reputations of Louis and Isabeau as later historians, who, misled by the Monk of St. Denis's chronicle, built their assumptions about the pair's lack of popularity into their narratives. In this essay, I first examine the methods by which the Burgundians attempted to assassinate the characters of Louis and Isabeau. I then trace the attitudes of later historians to tease out some of the reasons that they not only transmitted the propaganda but embellished upon it. Finally, I consider what the episode has to offer us as modern observers of political character assassination.

Tracy Adams received a PhD in French from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1998. Associate Professor of French at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, she has also taught at the University of Maryland, the University of Miami, and the University of Lyon III. She is the author of *Violent Passions: Managing Love in the Old French Verse Romance*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, and *The Life and Afterlife of Isabeau of Bavaria*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

A Newcomer in Defamatory Propaganda : Youth (Late 14th-Early 15th C.)

Gilles Lecuppre

From the late 1380s to the late 1420s, youth suddenly emerged as a central theme in political rhetoric, which was used successfully against the legitimate holders of power. The study intends to focus on five cases: Richard II, king of England († 1400), David, duke of Rothesay († 1402), Louis, duke of Orléans († 1407), Louis, duke of Guyenne († 1415) and Charles, duke of Touraine († 1461) – the last four acting as regents or lieutenants of the Scottish and French kingdoms.

Their opponents borrowed various and sometimes contradictory elements which were available and commonplace at the time in politico-moral treaties (mirrors for princes), medical theory and even literature. According to their needs, they pointed at some youthful faults which could also be understood as serious professional misconducts: inconstancy, susceptibility to flattery, frivolity, sins of the flesh, and so on.

Such charges were radical, and not only because they put a question mark over the princes' competence and ability to govern. The fact of the matter is that only one among them, the future Charles VII, survived the disastrous effects of that kind of campaign.

University, clerics and monks played an important part and naturally denounced vices through chronicles, sermons and academic speeches, for the actual rulers did not look like the mature and wise princes who were to be found in traditional mirrors. But their harsh critics stroke a chord with other groups inside political society. High aristocracy and party leaders could not be satisfied with rulers in search of self-assertion; they invoked the prince's youth to impose control on him or to account for his violent death. The English Parliament or the Parisian mob remained touchy about taxes, royal household expenditure and money thoughtlessly wasted on feasts and gifts.

All of them shared a desire for reform, a trend of public opinion which appeared during the 14th century in reaction against the rising modern state. By contrast, an ungovernable young prince, either stubborn or changing, suggestible to bad counsel or short-tempered, pompous or debauched, would perfectly embody an intolerable tyranny. That is why that anti-youth argumentation proved so dreadful.

Graduate of the Ecole Normale Supérieure and holder of the French agrégation, **Gilles Lecuppre** is a senior lecturer in medieval history at Nanterre University. His PhD thesis was devoted to the phenomenon of political imposture at the close of the Middle Ages (*L'Imposture politique au Moyen Âge. Le seconde vie des rois*, Paris, PUF, 2005). His current research deals with the various signs of royal frailty.

Calumniators to the Scaffold!
The Problem of Free Speech in the French Revolution

Charles Walton

"There is no greater crime than calumny." So wrote a pamphleteer during the Fronde in 1649. This writer likened calumny to murder, and even saw it as potentially worse. Jurists of the late eighteenth century also saw calumny as a kind of character assassination, one requiring severe punishment. But how did early modern jurists and legal theorists conceptualize punishing this crime? How did notions about calumny change over the course of secularization during the Enlightenment? How did democratization and the advent of free speech and civil equality in 1789 present new challenges to defining and punishing calumny?

This paper will discuss the evolution of notions about calumny in France in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, examining theological, Enlightenment, and Revolutionary views on the subject. Whereas theological authorities saw calumny as an attack on one's "soul", secular-minded philosophes and jurists viewed it as an attack on one's reputation, and, hence, on one's credit or property. Revolutionaries, who inherited these latter views, faced dilemmas in trying to reconcile the new principle of freedom of expression with persistent demands to see calumniators punished. Determining the boundary between rational critique (a virtue) and passionate calumny (a crime) became especially difficult after 1789. The principle of social hierarchy, which had structured legal and social practices regarding calumny in the Old Regime, gave way to civil equality with the Revolution, upsetting cultural patterns of deference and esteem. National deputies may have held legitimate power in formal terms, but, in practice, if they failed to defend their reputations or the collective honor of those they represented from calumnious attacks, they might lose credibility and, consequently, power. This paper concludes by showing how efforts to create a universal system of education in France during and after the Revolution were partly motivated by a desire to "civilize" speech and curb the calumnious tendencies of democratic society.

Charles Walton is Assistant Professor of History at Yale University and is a specialist of eighteenth-century France. He is the author of *Policing Public Opinion: The Culture of Calumny and the Problems of Free Speech* (Oxford University Press, 2009). His edited collection *Into Print: Limits and Legacies of the Enlightenment, Essays in Honor of Robert Darnton*, will appear in later this year with Penn State University Press. His new research focuses on reciprocity, distributive justice, and the French Revolution.

Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck (1761-1825)
"awkward and deficient as his wife is amiable and accomplished"

Edwina Hagen

Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck (1761-1825) was one of the main ideological leaders of the Patriotic Movement, which stood up against William V, the last Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic. He became an important politician of the Batavian Republic as a member of the National Assembly (1796-1798). From 1798 onwards he was the Batavian ambassador to France. In 1805 Napoleon made him the head of state, with the title of Grand Pensionary, but in effect with the executive power of a republican President, the first and only one in Dutch national history. He only ruled for thirteen months. In 1806 Napoleon Bonaparte replaced him by his younger brother, Louis Bonaparte, who called himself the King of Holland.

Schimmelpenninck's position and faith depended highly on Napoleon Bonaparte's capricious policy, but, as I will argue in my conference paper, his fall from power was also accelerated by a gossip and slander campaign by his own Batavian colleagues. It was said that his wife Catharina Nahuys, who had always played an important role next to him in representational and ceremonial events, exercised the real political power, especially after her husband started to suffer from blindness. Her visibility in the public sphere conflicted with the new political culture of the revolution, which confined women more and more to the domestic sphere.

Edwina Hagen is University Lecturer of Cultural History at VU University in Amsterdam. She is currently working on a biography called *Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninck (1761-1825). President of the Netherlands.*

Character Assassination of 19th-Century Popes

Vincent Viaene

In my paper, I propose to look at character assassination of a peculiar type of charismatic leader: the pope. The reverence surrounding the supreme leader of Catholicism meant that character assassination operated under unique constraints here; but the embodiment of this elevated office in what were, after all, frail human beings, also offered unique openings and incentives for satire. If popes were caught out on weaknesses, they were simply irresistible targets.

Not all of the five popes of the 19th century lent themselves equally well to character assassination. The saintly and mildly reformist Pius VII (1800-1823) was hard to get at. Not so his reactionary successors, the dour Leo XII (1823-1829), the ugly Pius VIII (1829-1830) and especially the easily manipulated former monk Gregory XVI (1831-1846), who suffered many hilarious deaths. Pius IX (1846-1878) was a special case. In spite of his controversial conservative politics, his character flaws were less obvious and satire did therefore not often target his personality. Pius's Secretary of State, the supposedly lascivious and corrupt Antonelli, served as a substitute. Under the vainglorious Leo XIII (1878-1903), in contrast, character assassins once more stalked the papal corridors.

While not discounting questions of personality, the paper will also go beyond these by tracing the transformation of papal character assassination in the course of the 19th century. In the first half of the century, this was a highly ritualised affair, a kind of safety-valve for dissent and popular discontent against the absolute ruler of the Papal States. It was mostly expressed in satirical verse and pen-drawings by the Roman intelligentsia, who aimed their arrows at the pope-king. Satirical verses were attached to 'speaking statues' on specific spots in Rome, and caricatures had an even more limited circulation, being passed along under the counter or in the seclusion of aristocratic salons. In the second half of the century, anti-papal caricature and satire became more prosaic but also more modern: character assassination was now mass-produced and internationalised as anticlerical tropes circulated relentlessly in large print-runs from Rome to Berlin and from Paris to New York. It was no longer the pope as king of the Papal States who was principally targeted, but the pope as leader of political Catholicism. The transformation of papal character assassination thus reflected both changes in the nature of anticlericalism and in that of the papacy – and ultimately, the rise of transnational ideological mass movements with well-stocked repertoires of propaganda.

Vincent Viaene is a Marie Curie Fellow at the University of Oxford. He works on the history of (religious) internationalism and on that of imperialism, including the interaction between these two phenomena. His latest book (as editor, with Abigail Green) is *Religious Internationals in the Modern World*, which will appear with Palgrave at the end of this year.

Maximilian Harden und die Kunst des Rufmordes

Christoph Jahr

Abstract is forthcoming.

How Dugin Turned Me Into a "Pedophile"
A Russian Fascist's Defamation Campaign in the Context of Post-Soviet Politics

Andreas Umland

This autobiographic recollection introduces a recent case study of character defamation within the context of contemporary right-wing extremist studies, and focuses on defamation campaigns as a reaction modus of the post-Soviet Russian ultra-nationalist scene towards Russian and Western research and journalism on it. It outlines the emergence of Aleksandr Dugin's so-called International Eurasian Movement as first a lunatic fringe phenomenon and later a mainstream political movement, and its position within Russian society. It then introduces a particular strategy adopted by Dugin to discredit researchers of his movement and details then a particular episode of the application of this strategy that concerns myself, as a researcher of post-Soviet neo-Eurasianism. The topic of character assassination is highlighted within a concrete, understudied case that reveals its function within a Gramscian battle for cultural hegemony in a post-Soviet transition country. It illustrates the use of libel for discrediting one's political opponent in an "information war" (a label used by the Duginists) conducted within the context of transnational web communities, domestic political publicism, and specialized academic networks.

Andreas Umland, CertTransl (Leipzig), AM (Stanford), MPhil (Oxford), DipPolSci, DrPhil (FU Berlin), PhD (Cambridge) held fellowships at Stanford's Hoover Institution, Urals State University, Harvard's Weatherhead Center, Shevchenko University of Kyiv, St. Antony's College Oxford, and the Catholic University of Eichstaett. He currently is DAAD Senior Lecturer at Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, and editor of the book series *Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society* (Ibidem-Verlag).

Character Assassination in the American Political Context

Jason Smart

Abstract is forthcoming.

Jason Smart has a background in political campaign management and has direct numerous campaigns in the United States. In addition, he has worked for the House Appropriations Committee of the Commonwealth of Virginia for two sessions. Jason holds a BA in Government and International Politics, and in Russian Studies from George Mason University, USA. He is completing his Master's in Political Science at Virginia Tech, USA. Currently he works in the field of democracy promotion in Central Asia.

Vaclav Havel (1977) and Howard Dean (2004) under Media Attacks
Two Case Studies of Character Assassination Attempts

Martina Klicperová-Baker

This study compares two character assassination attacks:

1) A Communist media attack against the dissident Václav Havel. Czechoslovakia in the 1970s was adapting to the Soviet occupation following the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion. By so called "normalization," the Communists strengthened the totalitarian grip on the society. A group of Czech dissidents wrote a declaration Charter 77 in which they documented that fundamental civil rights in Czechoslovakia were on paper only although Czechoslovakia signed the Helsinki Accords (including their human rights chapter). The Communist Party, unwilling to give credence to the manifesto by disputing it, a) launched a smear campaign to assassinate the character of Charter 77 activists, especially Václav Havel, a prominent dissident and co-spokesman for Charter 77 and b) organized an "Anti-Charter campaign" forcing renown performers to swear loyalty to Communism - a blow to Czech cultural patriotism. Czech cultural patriotism was reinforced again when playwright Václav Havel, persistent in his activism, acted as an organizer of the democratic Velvet Revolution in 1989 and became a president of Czechoslovakia (1989-1992) and of the Czech Republic (1993-2003).

2) The media sabotage of the presidential candidate Howard Dean. Howard Dean was a promising progressive candidate in 2004 presidential primaries. Socially liberal and fiscally conservative, he led a clean successful campaign clear of any disqualifying mistakes. Still, he fell out of contention primarily due to the "scream" episode which became a turning point in his campaign. Dean, who stumbled in the Iowa caucus, gave a pep talk in a hall crowded by his campaign volunteers, ending it with an invigorating victory shout. The "Dean Scream," roughed by Dean's recent cold, cleansed of the surrounding cheer, taken out of context and amplified, was presented as unpresidential by the media networks and was repeated endlessly in the following week; the harm was done.

The presentation includes analysis and comparison of both cases, discussion of responsibility of media along with sophistication of the audience and concludes with a stress on the need of civic education for media sophistication in citizens.

Martina Klicperová-Baker is a research scholar affiliated with the Institute of Psychology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and with San Diego State University. Her research and publications focus on psychology of democracy, political culture and civility, transitions to democracy, democratic citizenship and cross-cultural perspectives.

Perception of the Female and Male Presidential Candidates
Experimental Study among the Polish Youth

Ursula Jakubowska

The aim of the study was to examine how the manipulation of information about hypothetical presidential candidates influenced young people's attitudes towards them. The experiment was conducted on 929 subjects (454 women and 475 men), aged 18-25. The amount of information about politicians was manipulated (politicians' gender, political affiliation, moral and competence traits (positive or negative)). The results showed that a female presidential candidate was evaluated better than a male presidential candidate in conditions of positive information, yet, when negative information about candidates was provided, female presidential candidates were evaluated worse than male presidential candidates, especially in regard of their morality.

"Destroy the Beast!"
Approaching the Political Psychology of Character Assassination in History and Today

Eric Shiraev

"Bang!" A headline delivers a fatal blow to a public career of yet another public figure. Never mind all his hard work. Never mind her accomplishments. Everything will be shattered in a rapidly spreading fire of accusations, semi-truths, and innuendo. A political candidate suddenly becomes a "crook". A prominent scientist turns into a notorious womanizer. A female political candidate appears as an eerie "witch". A person's reputation is destroyed rapidly. The character assault in the Internet age falls like an avalanche: quickly and mercilessly.

How does character assassination work? When and why do character "assassins" decide to deploy their dangerous weapons of facts and fiction? How effective are character attacks? Why do many people fall so easily when they are under character attack? Political psychology attempts to answer these questions. It gathers empirical evidence from history, political science, and psychology. It uses descriptive methods and experiments. It describes the targets of character attacks: political candidates and public figures, scientists, artists, and activists. It classifies the key methods of character assassination. It attempts to explain the psychological mechanisms behind successful attacks. It also examines effective defences against such attacks. This research is an early attempt to apply several theories of political psychology to the study of character assassination. This presentation will address at least three questions: Why and when do character attacks occur? Which attack tactics are used? How effective are these tactics?

The presentation will draw from historic cases involving George Washington, Marie Antoinette, Francis Bacon, Franz Mesmer, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, John Watson, Sigmund Freud, Leo Trotsky, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Richard Nixon, Eugene McCarthy, Ronald Reagan, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Mikhail Gorbachev, Bill Clinton, Barack and Michelle Obama, Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and many other historic and political figures.

Eric Shiraev is a professor and author of twelve books and numerous publications in the fields of comparative studies, international relations, political psychology, and history of science. His books include *Russian Government and Politics* (2010), *A History of Psychology* (2011), *Counting Every Vote (2008), America: Sovereign Defender or Cowboy Nation?* (2005), *Cross-Cultural Psychology* (2009, fourth edition), and *The Russian Transformation* (1999). In his publications, he develops a multidisciplinary approach to human behavior and experience.

Images of the Enemy
The Use of the Mental Disease Label to Create Animosity toward Political Figures and Social Groups

Sergei Tsytsarev and Eric Shiraev

In history as well as today, the "mental illness" label is widely used to discredit public officials, denigrate professionals, and libel large social groups. Allegations that a person or a group of people might have a mental illness are a common method of character assassination. Because of the historically strong (and prevalent in every country) stigma attached to mental illness, this label is frequently associated with insanity, madness, instability, and irrationality of those who suffer from a psychological disorder. Large social and ethnic groups are targeted too. In the past, as a form of summary assassination scores dissidents in the former U.S.S.R. in the 1970s-80s (Bloch and Reddaway, 1977) and China approximately in the same period (Munro, 2000) were proclaimed mentally ill. Unable to silence some dissidents by intimidation and using the state-run medical system, communist security officials initiated a policy of diagnosing political "troublemakers" with mental illness. The diagnosis was also used as a legal ground for virtual imprisonment of such individuals in secured mental facilities. One of the most convenient labels used in both countries was "sluggish schizophrenia," the diagnosis of which did not require presence of any acute psychotic symptoms. Yet the patient's criticism of the communist system was commonly labeled as delusional. Labeling political opponents mentally ill allows the authorities to diminish the importance of such opposition and set public opinion against it. This presentation will also discuss the case of terrorism in history and today. This presentation will outline and discuss several types of character assassination with the use of the "mental disease" label. It will describe when and under what circumstances such attacks are launched and whether or not such attacks are effective.

Professor **Sergei Tsytsarev**, PhD graduated from St. Petersburg State University (1977) and earned his PhD in Clinical Psychology at Bekhterev Research Psychoneurological Institute (1982). He had his post-doctoral fellowship in Japan (1988-89). Since 1991, he has been working in the USA. Currently he is serving as a Full Professor of Psychology at Hofstra University (Hemstead, New York), and he teaches a number of courses at both graduate and undergraduate levels. His areas of research and teaching have been forensic psychology, addictions, cross-cultural psychopathology and psychotherapy, and psychology of terrorism. He published more than 100 research papers and book chapters and presented his findings at the numerous scientific conferences in the USA, Russia, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Great Britain, Ireland, Poland, Slovenia, Canada, Mexico and many others. He initiated and conducted some international educational and research projects. As a licensed psychologist, he provides psychological evaluations and psychotherapy in New York.