

5-22-1998

The Return of Godzilla: Political Psychology and Monsters

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>



Part of the [Other Political Science Commons](#), and the [Other Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1998) "The Return of Godzilla: Political Psychology and Monsters," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 20 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol4/iss20/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: The Return of Godzilla: Political Psychology and Monsters

Author: Editor

Volume: 4

Issue: 20

Date: 1998-05-22

Keywords: Epistemology, Interpretation, Meaning, Monster

Abstract. This article describes two political psychological functions of monsters in the movies, especially movie series.

The newest Godzilla movie is here. There have been many Godzillas and movie series of other monsters. Often, making, marketing, and distributing monster movies is often a lucrative enterprise. Whence lies the attraction?

First, the monster movie series allows contemporary fears to be identified, expressed, and shared in a familiar and controlled context among an empathic, resonant collective. (The presence of that collective is significant, even if that collective is not physically present at the moment of movie viewing but imagined or fantasized.) In fact, the monster may remain the one constant within an ever-changing world with ever-changing fears--fears of war, violated peace, scientific discoveries, technological applications, new ways of life, and loss of the old and cherished. In psychodynamic terms, the movie series affords repetition compulsion. A psychological experience related to some contemporary fear is repeated until it can be more easily managed and less likely to induce psychological disruption.

Second, the monster movie series allows timeless fears to be identified, expressed, and shared as described above. These fears often comprise the unknown, illogical, the irrational, and the undesired return of real and imagined trauma. In psychodynamic terms, this involves an asymptote of repetition compulsion. A psychological experience related to some timeless fear is repeated until--hopefully--it can be more easily managed and less likely to induce psychological disruption. By the very definition of timeless fears, however, repetition compulsion cannot be successfully carried out. Timeless fears remain, perhaps abating for moments.

Both with contemporary and timeless fears, phenomenological spikes of sheer horror and horrible pleasure indicate aspects of success and failure during and after monster movie viewing. Also, with each, some viewers of the monster movie series may come in and out of their experiences worse for wear. Moreover, the substance of contemporary and timeless fears may relate, merge, be identical. And contemporary and timeless fears are ultimately political. They involve the struggle to maintain an acceptable disparity between the ideal and the real in a world of finite resources and infinite need. Finally, as movies of all types can be used to propagandize, also they can be analyzed to identify themes and vulnerabilities--of contemporary and timeless fears--for propaganda. So, a last convergence between the contemporary and the timeless--Godzilla is us and can be used against us. (See Bigras, J. (1970). The maternal monster, a mute monster. *Interpretation*, 4, 57-104; Carroll, M.P. (1992). Folklore and psychoanalysis: The Swallowing Monster and Open-Brains motifs in Plains Indian mythology. *Ethos*, 20, 289-303; Church, J. (1988). The Black man's part in Crane's Monster. *American Imago*, 45, 375-388; Goldsmith, W. (1975). Beloved monsters: A psychodynamic appraisal of horror. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 7, 17-22; Grotstein, J.S. (1997). "Internal objects" or "chimerical monsters"?: The demonic "third forms" of the internal world. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 42, 47-80; Price, J.S. (1995). The Westermarck trap: A possible factor in the creation of Frankenstein. *Ethology and*

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Sociobiology, 16, 349-353; Schaller, M. (May 16, 1998). Godzilla, present and past. The New York Times, p. A27.) (Keywords: Epistemology, Interpretation, Meaning, Monster.)