

◇◇◇Trump Excerpts◇◇◇

What makes Donald Trump tick? Was his basic character fixed at age five as he has stated? If so, what does it mean that his sister says he was a brat as a young child and that he repeatedly describes himself as working to be the toughest kid in the neighborhood? Are Mitt Romney and other Republican establishment correct in saying he can't be trusted with the presidency? Psychobiographical insights are useful tools in getting at the essence of Donald John Trump. Some topics covered are:

- Trump's narcissism, alpha personality, and sense of himself as seen on the edge of lunacy in pursuit of his vision
- Trump as the reality TV billionaire candidate
- Trump's lifelong habit of raising a ruckus, "playing to people's fantasies," and "testing" people
- Trump's identification with his father
- Trump's lifelong disinclination to have close friends, as opposed to allies
- Trump's name and its meaning
- Trump's pattern of attack/outrageous statement and disavowal
- Trump's embrace of what others see as faults, such as his short attention span
- Trump's attraction to models (wives 1 & 3) and actress (wife 2), 2 of them being foreign born, as his mother was
- Trump's campaign as an exemplar of celebrity politics and entertainment news
- Psychological reasons behind why people vote for Trump

Dr. Elovitz, a presidential psychobiographer, focuses on probing the childhood, coping mechanisms, personalities, style of leadership, successes, failures, and values of candidates. He has researched Trump on the campaign trail, read his books, and the biographical studies of the billionaire real estate and reality TV mogul. Since 1976, he has researched presidents and future presidents, relying on his training as a psychotherapist, historian, and political scientist. He is founder and director of the Psychohistory Forum, a Contributing Editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory*, and editor of *Clio's Psyche*. He has taught at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities, as well as Ramapo College where he is a Founding Faculty Member. Below are excerpts from his article entitled "Reflections on Trump's Celebrity Politics and Psychobiography."

Reflections on Trump's Celebrity Politics and Psychobiography

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

There is a plethora of material available for the psychobiographer examining Donald Trump. A key element in Trump's personality and success is based on his identification with his father. When he writes, "[my father] never yelled at me or had to punish me, but he was always strong, and a little remote, until I joined his business," it is evident that Trump is still presenting an idealized version of a man who expressed his discontent with his "trouble maker" son before sending him off to military school. At birthday parties he threw water balloons and raised a ruckus. In elementary school he describes himself as "a very aggressive kid" and reports being almost expelled for giving his music teacher a black eye (citations are removed from this excerpt). His sister Maryanne Trump Barry, now a federal judge, says "He was a brat." "Donny" Trump's strong identification with his developer father from an early age is indicated in his using his own as well as his two years younger brother Robert's building blocks to make a tall tower. He liked it so much that he proudly describes gluing it together, which of course denied his brother's use of his own blocks.

Trump describes himself as growing into a "pretty tough kid" who "wanted to be the toughest kid in the neighborhood, and had a habit of mouthing off everybody, while backing off to no one" As "a bit

of a trouble maker...My parents finally took me out of school and brought me upstate to the New York Military Academy” There, while he had run-ins, he reports he “learned respect for other people...self-discipline.” After graduating from the New York Military Academy, Donald briefly considered attending film school in California before settling into an education that would set him up to become a successful businessman.

The “Donald” favorably quotes the psychoanalyst Michael Maccoby’s, *The Productive Narcissist: The Promise and Peril of Visionary Leadership* (2003), saying there is a convincing argument that narcissism is a useful quality for starting a business. A narcissist does not hear the naysayers. “At the Trump organization, I listen to people, but my vision is my vision.”

In running for president, Trump has avoided paying the traditional price of serving in the military, working his way up in electoral politics, becoming a policy “wonk,” making political alliances, and being politically correct. He has proclaimed his narcissism rather than insisted that he is just “one of the people.”

Trump grandiosely heralds his own “alpha personality,” determination, “narcissism,” and “vision” bordering on “lunacy.” It is typical Trump to turn what others see as criticism into assets, thus he also praises his short attention span.

There are fairly clear cut patterns that Donald Trump follows on the campaign trail. He commonly declares that he likes someone and then criticizes that person almost in the same breath. Either before or after launching a sharp attack against a person or country, he issues a compliment, however meaningful it may or may not be. When raising the issues of Obama’s or Cruz’ citizenship, he does not definitively make the point but says others will do this. This provides media attention, but also leaves him with some level of deniability. Trump frequently begins criticisms of his competitors with “I like him” or “he’s a good a guy,” and goes on to call them “liars” (Cruz) and “chokers” (Rubio). He says he “loves China” and then declares that “China is ripping us off.” Trump, who is not known for using polite language, demanded on February 25th that the Mexican president apologize for using foul language in a response to Trump’s plan to have the Mexican government pay to build a wall along the Southern border. (I suspect that some of his statements are aimed at “raising a ruckus,” part of what he may see as negotiating ploys, which, in politics, draw the media attention he craves. Other things he says fit in with his idea of “play[ing] to people’s fantasies.”

[The full psychobiographical article may be found in Clio’s Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture, History, and Society in the March 2016 \(Vol. 22, #4\) Issue on pages 277-285. This print journal will be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \\$29.00, \\$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years subscription for \\$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA.](#)

Keywords: Hillary-Clinton, fantasy, celebrity-politics, psychobiography, psychology, Clinton-marriage, fantasy-psychoanalysis

◇◇◇◇2016 Fantasy Politics and Hillary Excerpts◇◇◇◇

Why does the current Republican race for the Presidential nomination have so little to do with the specific policies and programs necessary to run the country? Why is it more about fantasy than reality? Why do fantasies about the Democratic candidates also abound? In this article the author starts with a fantasy analysis of Hillary Clinton and discusses the general issue of the unreality that has so far permeated so much of the 2016 presidential race.

Dr. Elovitz, a presidential psychobiographer, focuses on probing the childhood, coping mechanisms, personalities, political style of leadership, successes, failures, and values of candidates. He has written on the Clintons and specifically on the issue of the pressures on the first woman elected to the presidency. Since 1976, he has researched presidents and future presidents, relying on his training as a psychotherapist, historian, and political scientist. He is founder and director of the Psychohistory Forum, a Contributing Editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory*, and editor of *Clio's Psyche*. He has taught at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities, as well as Ramapo College where he is a Founding Faculty Member. Below are excerpts from his article entitled "Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton."

Fantasy Politics and an Imaginary Analysis of Hillary Clinton

Paul H. Elovitz—Psychohistory Forum

We live in an era of celebrity culture in which appearance becomes increasingly more important than reality—at least in the short run. In the celebrity limelight, reality doesn't seem to make much difference, but rather who's up and who's down. The media also plays a game of choosing a potential nominee to intensely focus on, usually pointing out all sorts of positives about them. I call this the honeymoon "getting-to-know-you" period, which I have observed with Carson, Cruz, Rubio, Sanders, and Trump in this electoral cycle. Sometimes these proclamations become self-fulfilling prophecies if the individuals capture the imagination of others.

Alma Bond in *Hillary Rodham Clinton: On the Couch* depicts Hillary and her relationship with Bill as the popular fantasy that Bill is a hopeless womanizer and Hillary a long suffering wife. When the reality is that when Bill wooed Hillary after she failed the Washington, DC bar exam.(and followed her boyfriend to Little Rock, Arkansas, the couples' friends weren't sure who would run for office first, but Hillary's feminism and Yankee accent were definite negatives.

While Bond's book is based far more on fantasy rather than reality, I can recommend it as a source of amusement if you don't know much about the reality of the Clintons. The book also brings the issue of political process in our era of celebrity and fantasy politics. On a day-to-day basis the actual process of governing is ignored except when the Republicans denounce almost everything Obama does or doesn't do and Clinton wraps herself in his legacy while campaigning among his adherents, especially if they are African Americans. Fantasy abounds in the early part of the 2016 presidential election contest, especially among the Republicans. Donald Trump maintains the fantasies that Obama was not born as an American citizen, that the politicians in Washington are "stupid," that he can build a beautiful wall between the United States and Mexico which the Mexicans will pay for, and that his comments are really not misogynistic, personally abusive, or racist. Articulate, bright, and well-educated 44 and 45-year-old first-term senators like Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio think the country needs them despite the disadvantages of having an inexperienced young senator as president, as we have observed in the last seven years. Yet millions of voters show a preference for those with little experience since those who have considerable experience are subject to constant attacks for what they have and have not done.

In celebrity culture appearance so often trumps reality. Thus among the Republican presidential contenders, would-be nominees who have a real track record of governance such as Bush, Christie, Kasich, and Pataki have mostly had to drop out for lack of support while Carson, Cruz, Rubio, and Trump have at various times gathered far more screen time, general media attention, and been proclaimed as the front runner—however briefly. This is in part because there is decreasing attention to the reality of political accomplishments and attributes of the candidates and increasing focus on who is in the limelight. In the celebrity limelight, reality doesn't seem to make much difference, but rather who's up and who's down. The media proclaims that Trump is the front-runner and is being challenged by Carson, Cruz, or Rubio.

In most cases it appears to increasingly become a disadvantage to have a proven record of governmental accomplishments and failures.

Governing is complex and boring, but horse races are fun. The political horse race draws in voters who, like fans of the racetrack, become excited by the process and seek to choose a winner. The important thing is not who can effectively govern, but who looks and sounds like a winner. Donald Trump thinks he has what it takes to make “crippled America” great again (as best I remember, we’re still the “greatest” power in the world) and promises to transform the country.

The full psychobiographical article may be found in [Clio's Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture, History, and Society in the March 2016 \(Vol. 22, #4\) Issue](#) on pages 296-299. This print journal should be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \$29.00, \$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years subscription for \$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to [The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA](#).

◊◊◊◊ Fuchsman's Obama's Tears of Rage Excerpt ◊◊◊◊

Keywords: Obama's-tears, Obama's-anger, school-shooting, gun-legislation, Obama-as-parent

Tears of Rage: President Obama and the Emotional Legacy of Newtown

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

The Sandy Hook school shootings weigh heavily on President Obama. On January 5th, 2016, he said that our rights to life and liberty were stripped from first-graders in Newtown. He wiped away a tear and said, “Every time I think about those kids it gets me mad.”

Obama has confessed that the day of those killings was the “worst day of my presidency.” On January 7, 2016, the President said Newtown “continues to haunt me.” To understand his anger, we need to look at Obama’s childhood. He then had a “sense of abandonment” and felt “like an orphan.” After infancy, he only saw his divorced father once, and his restless mother sometimes lived on the other side of the planet from her son.

Obama says he wants to give to his daughters what he did not receive. To him, there is no more important job than parenting, even being President. Keeping children safe “is something we can only do together, with the help of friends and neighbors...and the help of a nation.”

Passing legislation to protect families from deadly violence then is central. But under Obama, there is now the largest Republican Congressional delegation since before the Great Depression. In 2016, he said he regrets that “the rancor and suspicion between the parties has gotten worse instead of better,” and a “Lincoln or Roosevelt might have better bridged the divide.” Obama has not always made the effort. Jonathan Alter says that the President “preferred spending his evenings having dinner with his family...to chatting with a bunch of politicians he barely knew.”

With no gun legislation protecting children from violence, his regrets about his political skills gives us a clue as to why this self-questioner, this devoted parent continues to be angered and haunted by Newtown.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, is a professor at the University of Connecticut, where he has taught and served as an administrator for many years, and is on the Editorial Boards of Clio's Psyche and the Journal of Psychohistory. He has published a number of articles on President Obama's life and career, and also writes on trauma, the Oedipus complex, and the nature of being human.

The full psychological article may be found in *Clio's Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture, History, and Society* in the March 2016 (Vol. 22, #4) Issue on pages 277-285. This print journal will be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \$29.00, \$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years subscription for \$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA.

◇◇◇◇ Fuchsman Spielberg Excerpt ◇◇◇◇

Keywords: Spielberg-psychology, Spielberg's-adolescent-fantasies, E.T., Jaws, Schindler's-List, Saving-Private-Ryan, Munich, Bridge-of-Spies, Lincoln

Steven Spielberg: The Quest to be a Moral Male

Ken Fuchsman—University of Connecticut

Steven Spielberg is a phenomenon. He is the only director with five movies on the American Film Institute's list of 100 best motion pictures and he has directed two of the most highly attended films of all time. His movies are the highest grossing of any director in the history of cinema. Not surprisingly, Spielberg is the third richest individual in Hollywood, and ranks 164th on the Forbes list of 400 wealthiest Americans. Of the 29 films he has directed, ten of them have historical subject matters. His astounding creativity, popularity, and concern with the past make him a good candidate for psychohistorical examination. Understanding Spielberg's trajectory entails how he emerged from a certain family milieu, and with specific psychological issues. As he says, "Hardly a single one of my films isn't based on something that happened in my childhood."

Other strands in his movies include a concern with how a man can be moral amidst challenges, and there is a focus on childhood and youth. According to Nigel Morris, in the 1980s Spielberg had a reputation "as a director of adolescent fantasy," and was "saddled with a Peter Pan image." Another recurring motif is an adult male in dangerous or threatening situations. The protagonist may have had moral lapses or committed unethical actions, but somehow comes back to doing the right thing, or pays consequences for questionable conduct. Spielberg values men becoming moral after trials and tribulations.

Since 1993, there have been a series of Spielberg historical films connected to morally complex situations, with male characters becoming honorable and heroic. They were all made after Spielberg's second marriage in 1991 to Kate Capshaw. He found himself with a large family of hers, mine, ours, and adopted children. At around the age Spielberg's parents' divorced, he was finally settling into a comfortable domesticity. Soon some Spielberg films focused on historically significant events.

Spielberg is only one of a few prominent contemporary film directors who will address questions of male morality in perilous situations. As Spielberg acknowledges, many of his films are rooted in his childhood. He has transformed these preoccupations into fully adult concerns. How can men act morally when there is immorality all around? He expresses psychological and ethical questions amidst covering significant events from the past. Spielberg sometimes illuminates and, at other times, evades the complex legacy of history and human character.

Ken Fuchsman, EdD, is a professor at the University of Connecticut, where he has taught and served as an administrator for many years, and is on the Editorial Boards of Clio's Psyche and the Journal of Psychohistory. He has published a number of articles on President Obama's life and career, and also writes on trauma, the Oedipus complex, and the nature of being human. □

The full article may be found in [Clio's Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture, History, and Society](#) in the March 2016 (Vol. 22, #4) issue. This print journal will be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \$29.00, \$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years subscription for \$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA.

◇◇◇Hate, Like Love, Binds Us Together◇◇◇

(This it is one of 14 articles in the Psychology of Fear and Hate March Special Issue)

keywords: hate, love, attachment, political-hatred, murder

Hate, Like Love, Binds Us Together

C. Fred Alford—University of Maryland

On the morning of May 28, 1995, Sinedu Tadesse, a junior at Harvard, stabbed her roommate, Trang-Ho, 45 times as Trang lay sleeping in her bed in their Harvard dormitory. By the time police arrived, Sinedu had hanged herself in the bathroom. Unlike most killers, the Ethiopian student left a detailed diary of her emotional state in the years leading up to the killing.

Sinedu was not a popular student. She had difficulty finding a roommate and was elated when Trang-Ho agreed to share a suite with her. But they did not get along, in part because Trang's boyfriend frequently slept over, and Trang was looking for another roommate. Sinedu found the humiliation intolerable. She wrote in her diary, "You know what I fear? I fear that shitty cringing feeling that accompanies me....Should my rooming thing does [sic] not work out in a way that makes me hold my head high & speak of it proudly." (All quotes in this article are from Melanie Thernstrom, "Diary of a Murder," *The New Yorker*, June 3, 1996, 62-71).

If she could have, Sinedu would have inflicted this terrible cringing feeling on her roommate. Only that, it seems, would have made her feel better, and that, she knew, was impossible. "Our situations would never reverse, for me to be the strong & her to be the weak. She'll live on tucked in the warmth & support of her family while I cry alone in the cold."

It was a situation made worse, or at least more pathetic, by the way so many seemed to confuse them, regarding the roommates as virtually identical non-Western exotics. Even at the memorial service, Harvard's minister could not seem to keep victim and executioner straight, referring to both as victims, asking the Lord to forgive them both. "Media accounts made them sound like twins, petite, hardworking foreign-born premed junior biology majors."

Unable to become Trang-Ho, unable to trade places with her, Sinedu decided to kill herself, while taking Trang-Ho with her. Only that would feed her hatred. "The bad way out I see is suicide & the good way out killing, savoring their fear and [then] suicide. But you know what annoys me the most, I do nothing."

In his novel *Immortality*, Milan Kundera has one of his characters say, "hate traps us by binding us too tightly to our adversary." What Kundera (or perhaps just his character) fails to understand is that this is just what is wanted, hatred allowing us to pretend we want to be free, but never giving us the chance. In hatred, we transform interpersonal bonds into bondage, and relationships into prisons. For a little while,

hate allowed Sinedu to come in out of the cold, as she cocooned herself in the warmth of her hate.

Sinedu's strategy didn't work for very long; it usually doesn't. Hatred culminates in violence when the one who hates comes suddenly and late to reality, recognizing that the intensely desired fusion is impossible. By then, however, the one who hates has given up so much of herself to the desire to be the Other that there is no going back. The self of the hater has been depleted, and no return is possible, only the perverse satisfaction that the one who is hated will share the annihilation—fusion in the realm of entropy.

Hatred is not the opposite of love, love's eternal enemy. Hatred is the imitation of love, creating and preserving imitations of those love relationships upon which psychic structure depends. Hatred is self-chosen bondage to another, bondage serving to structure the psyche. As though slavery was the only alternative to psychic fragmentation. Hatred is self-structure on the cheap. In this regard, hatred is a more complex relationship than is often appreciated.

Some may object to the term psychic structure, as though the term must reify an entity that does not exist. With the term structure I mean nothing more, or less, than history, the stories we tell ourselves to make sense of our lives, and so give them continuity and purpose. The structure created by hatred is history, the history of our hatreds, narratives of our malevolent attachments that help hold self and world together.

Frequently these narratives are expressed in an almost loving recitation of harms suffered and revenge inflicted. The history of one's hatreds constitutes the single most important, most comprehensible, and most stable sense of identity for many people, and more than one nation.

Humans are creatures of attachment. Love is not universal, but attachment is: connection with others. It is an insight that begins with Aristotle's *Politics*, which defines humanity as *zoon politikon*, a political animal, realizing him- or herself only in a community of others.

Hatred too creates communities: the community of those who hate the same Other, and the community between those who hate each other. Or, as Aeschylus has the Furies put it in *The Oresteia*, when encouraging the Athenians to unite: "Let them hate with a single heart. Much wrong in the world thereby is healed."

Kevin Phillips, political advisor to Richard Nixon, who knew a thing or two about hatred, constructed a winning political coalition for Nixon in the 1968 election on the basis of who hated whom. Phillips knew that the strongest coalitions are built not on mutual interest or affection, but shared hatreds. In his office, Phillips had a map of who hated whom: Polish Catholics hate the Jews, who are hated by the blacks, who are hated by just about everybody but the Jews, who really hate the Catholics, who hate northern liberals, except in Massachusetts, where they are the liberals, except when it comes to homosexuals, which makes it hard to be liberal, except that the Massachusetts Catholics hate southern rednecks more, and they all hate the hairy young people, especially the suburbanites, many of whose children are young and hairy (remember, this is the 1960's), which just means that they hate them all the more, only they can't show it politically, so they hate someone else. And so it goes.

Hatred is a political phenomenon far better understood and appreciated by politicians, men and women involved in the practical politics of securing and maintaining power, than by psychological and social theorists.

Hatred as a political force has received far less attention than love and fear, its emotional complements. Love, we learn early, may be translated into patriotism and loyalty, fear into obedience, and the corruption of national spirit in diverse ways, from militarism to appeasement. But what of hatred? What is needed is not a new sub-discipline, the theory of hatred. What is needed is a better understanding of how hatred infiltrates and corrupts all the political virtues, such as patriotism, community, loyalty,

tolerance, and citizenship. What is needed is an analysis of the way in which each of these virtues has its dark side, its correlation rooted in hatred, as when loyalty to one's own nation depends on hatred of others.

Hatred is capable of simulating not just love, but almost all the virtues. Sometimes hatred takes the place of these virtues, as when patriotism is defined as hatred of the enemy. More often, hatred infiltrates these virtues, so that hatred of the enemy becomes so confused with love of country that it becomes almost impossible to sort them out. A better understanding of hatred is not enough, but it's a good place to start.

C. Fred Alford, PhD, is Professor of Government and Distinguished Scholar-Teacher at the University of Maryland, College Park. He is author of over 15 books on moral psychology. His most recent is Trauma and Forgiveness (Cambridge, 2013). Alford is Executive Director of the Association for Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, and Co-Editor of the Psychoanalysis and Society Book Series with Cornell University Press.

◇◇◇◇Educating against Hate◇◇◇◇

Keywords: hate, child-abuse, overcoming-hatred, empathetic-childrearing, corporal-punishment

Educating against Hate

Peter W. Petschauer—Appalachian State University

For years, I have been questioning the implications of the writings that found abuse even in households in which no one reported it. I first noticed a hint of more thoughtful childrearing in German school ordinances, autobiographies, and biographies as early as the 16th century. It had become more noticeable by the 19th century and fully evident by the 20th century.

We generally accept that understanding the needs of children, giving them approval, caring for them, and showing them kindness and sympathy, if not empathy—even friendship—are part of this breakthrough into a form of adult interaction that is uncomfortable with violence and cannot readily condone hate of others simply because they are different or have done something with which we disagree.

Since that time—that is, the 1990s into the first decades of the 2000s—researchers have conducted massive surveys with thousands of students in elementary schools. Here is one finding only: “There was a clear connection between a violent style of parenting with little care on one hand, and violence or other forms of youth delinquency (damage to property, shoplifting) on the part of the young person concerned on the other. Particularly striking was the finding that children who were frequently beaten and were scarcely-loved later became repeat perpetrators of violence almost six times more often than those who were raised in a non-violent and loving way” (16-17).

Pfeiffer offers examples to illustrate similar points. His team discovered a deadly combination in, “The number of registered killings with firearms per 10 million inhabitants in the United States in... 2012 and teachers' right to corporal punishment as an indicator of the repressive way of raising children for six groups of U.S. states” (29). They also found a rising rate of killings from 128 for the first of the above group of states to 501 for the sixth group.

Peter Petschauer, PhD, is Professor Emeritus of History at Appalachian State University, a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum, and a member of its Editorial Board. Among his various books is one on his father's disillusioning experience as an officer in the SS and another on the four women who mothered him. He is the subject of a lengthy Journal of Psychohistory article, “The Impact of a Psychohistorian's Life Experience and Personality on His Career and Scholarship” (Summer 2015).

The full article may be found in [Clio's Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture,](#)

History, and Society in the March 2016 (Vol. 22, #4) issue. This print journal will be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \$29.00, \$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years subscription for \$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA.

◊◊◊◊A Window on Hatred and Persecution◊◊◊◊

Keywords: medieval-antisemitism, antisemitism-images, persecution, cathedrals

A Window on Hatred and Persecution: Anti-Jewish Images in Medieval Europe

Christina Stern—SUNY Rockland

It appears that some Christians in the late 1300s alleged that local Jews desecrated the Eucharistic Host—the wafer that represents (and, according to Catholic doctrine, is in actuality) the body of Jesus. The window shows an image of several Jewish men surrounding and stabbing the wafers. The Jewish figures are portrayed in demeaning and stereotypical terms with menacing facial expressions and exaggerated noses. Several of the men wield daggers, and the wafers were reported to have shed blood when stabbed.

However, there are some scholars today who underscore the positive day-to-day interactions of medieval Jews and Christians. In *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (2007), Jonathan Elukin argues that Christians and Jews largely co-existed and interacted peacefully for most of the Middle Ages, despite the proliferation of anti-Jewish legislation, images, and religious doctrines.

In medieval Europe, images served as a main teaching source. Literacy was the province of a tiny, educated group of elites, and books were relatively rare and expensive items in those centuries before the advent of the printing press (mid-1400s). Thus, the paintings, sculptures, and stained glass windows of Europe's churches played an important role to impart myriad religious and cultural messages.

Some medieval European churches also contain, either within or outside on the exterior walls, drawings or sculptures of medieval Judensau imagery, wherein Jewish figures, sometimes depicted with pointy hats, are shown as engaged in obscene acts with pigs or pig-like creatures. Such images not only mocked Jewish kosher laws but also relied on viewers' feelings of disgust to generate antipathy.

Yet the vestiges of the past still linger in parts of the European landscape. The visual evidence found in some medieval manuscripts and churches attests to a disturbing cultural dynamic that endured for centuries, leading to policies highly detrimental to Jewish communities. The stained glass window serves as a jolting reminder of this history. It is also a starting point for peering into the past and grappling with the tragic legacy of medieval prejudice and persecution.

Christina Stern, PhD, is a professor in the History Department at SUNY Rockland. Her research interests include medieval European history, women, and Catholicism and the history of Jewish and Christian relationships in the West.

The full article may be found in *Clio's Psyche: Understanding Current Events, Culture, History, and Society* in the March 2016 (Vol. 22, #4) issue. This print journal will be available on March 11, 2016. Individual issues may be purchased for \$29.00, \$75.00 a year for institutions, and a two years

subscription for \$82.00 to individuals. Checks should be sent to The Psychohistory Forum/ 627 Dakota Trail/ Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417/ USA.