

Clio's Psyche

Understanding the "Why" of Culture,
Current Events, History, and Society

**Special Issue
on the Psychology of Anti-Semitism
and Judeophilia**

**Volume 17 Number 3
December 2010**

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 17 No. 3

December 2010

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by the Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

E-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz

Co-Editor For This Issue: Ken Fuchsman

Editorial Board

C. Fred Alford, PhD University of Maryland • **James W. Anderson, PhD** Northwestern University • **David Beisel, PhD** RCC-SUNY • **Rudolph Binion, PhD** Brandeis University • **Andrew Brink, PhD** Formerly of McMaster University and The University of Toronto • **Ken Fuchsman, EdD** University of Connecticut • **Glen Jeansonne, PhD** University of Wisconsin • **Bob Lentz** • **Peter Loewenberg, PhD** UCLA • **Peter Petschauer, PhD** Appalachian State University

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum

\$60 two-year subscription to non-members

\$50 yearly to institutions

(Add \$20 per year outside U.S.A. & Canada)

Single issue price: \$18

\$50 two-year overseas online subscription

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest of 500 - 1500 words and a few longer ones.

Copyright © 2010 The Psychohistory Forum

**Special Issue
on the Psychology of
Anti-Semitism and Judeophilia**

**Volume 17 Number 3
December 2010**



Clio's Psyche

Understanding the "Why" of Culture,
Current Events, History, and Society

Volume 17 Number 3

December 2010

Special Issue on The Psychology of Anti-Semitism and Judeophilia

The History and Psychology of Anti-Semitism

- Psychology of Anti-Semitism and Philo-Semitism.....168
Eva Fogelman and Jerome Chanes
- A Contemporary Case of Narcissistic Superiority.....174
Nathan Carlin
- The Evolution of Anti-Semitism: Historical and Psychological Roots..177
Allan Mohl
- The Psychological Story of Anti-Semitism.....182
Sander Breiner
- The Pope Adopts a Kidnapped Jewish Son.....186
Dan Dervin
- Hans Blüher, National Socialism, Freud, and Anti-Semitism.....190
Juhani Ihanus
- Anti-Semitism's New Expression: Anti-Israel.....195
Florette Cohen
- Free Associations on Anti-Semitism, Israel, and Objectivity.....200
Jamashid A. Marvasti
- "A State within a State": Freud's Disavowal of Anti-Semitism.....205
Jay Geller

Judeophilia and Ambivalence

- The Appeal of Orthodox Judaism.....210
Sharon Pace
- Until the Last Anti-Semite Dies.....215
Paul H. Elovitz
- My "Great World" Among the *Goyim*.....221
Wallace Katz
- A Child of Holocaust Survivors Meets the Children of Nazis225
Ruth Neubauer

Follow-up to Binion's Reliving Trauma Symposium

Reliving Trauma Unawares: The Clinical Clincher.....230
Rudolph Binion

Popular Culture

Voyeurism on the Truman Show.....235
Kimberly Mahaffey

Book Review Essays (Listed by author, title, and reviewer)

Jerry Z. Muller, *Capitalism and the Jews*.....241
Paul H. Elovitz

Nancy Hartevelt Kobrin, *The Banality of Suicide Terrorism*.....245
Leah Slivko

Charles Strozier et al., eds., *The Fundamentalist Mindset*.....248
Anna Geifman

Noel G. Charlton, *Understanding Gregory Bateson*.....252
Paul Salstrom

Stanley H. Teitelbaum, *Athletes Who Indulge Their Dark Side*.....254
Jack Fitzpatrick

Memorials

Stalin Scholar Robert C. Tucker.....257
Fred I. Greenstein

Advocate for Children Alice Miller.....260
Peggy McLaughlin

Editorial Board Member and Psychologist Leon Rappoport.....264
Ronald Downey and Paul H. Elovitz

The Influence of Childhood Experience: Robert N. Butler.....266
Nora O'Brien-Suric and Paul H. Elovitz

Bulletin Board.....270

Call For Papers on the Psychodynamics of the Changing Family.....273

The History and Psychology of Anti-Semitism

Psychology of Anti-Semitism and Philo-Semitism

Eva Fogelman—Generations of the Holocaust
Jerome A. Chanes—CUNY Graduate Center

There are very few things in human history that have a history of 2,000 years. Anti-Semitism is one of them. Historians, sociologists, and psychologists have been scratching their heads for centuries in an effort to get at why this is so. The classic Jewish Rabbinic formulation, going back nearly two millennia, hypothesizes “Esau hates Jacob”—Esau, the anti-Semitic ancestor of Edom, Babylonia, Rome, and Christendom: anti-Semitism incarnate, anti-Semitism universal, and above all anti-Semitism eternal. Is this indeed the case? What is the psychology of hatred? How can we shed light on the dynamic of bigotry and hatred in order to understand the history of anti-Semitism?

First, what *is* anti-Semitism? There is no immediately apparent answer to this deceptively simple question. Approaches to this question range from the one-liner “An anti-Semite is someone who hates Jews more than is absolutely necessary,” to Justice Potter Stewart’s declaration in *Jacobellis v. Ohio* (originally referring to pornography), “I know it when I see it.” Perhaps the best definition is a workmanlike one: anti-Semitism is expressed hatred of Jews, without sufficient cause or warrant.

For the purpose of our discussion, we telescope the many different varieties and eras of anti-Semitism into three periods: ancient anti-Semitism, which was primarily *cultural*;

Christian anti-Semitism, which was *religious*; and modern anti-Semitism, which was (and is) primarily *racial*.

While we do not know the ultimate etiology of anti-Semitism, we do know something about the human dynamics that express themselves in anti-Jewish animus—in a word, in psychology. But even here there is no clarity. There are a dozen psychological theories as to what makes an individual an anti-Semite, but there is no satisfactory explanation. Having said this, we can suggest a number of constructs that inform a psychology of anti-Semitism.

What about *philo-Semitism*? Unlike anti-Semitism, philo-Semitism has not been studied extensively, but we can bring some clarity with respect to the psychological makeup of the philo-Semite from my experience studying the social psychology of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust—where a sub-set of the rescuers were found to be “Judeophiles,” synonymous with philo-Semites.

A comprehensive understanding of anti-Semitism is the interaction between socialization in childhood, personality factors, and how situational factors come into play for an individual to act out one’s “dislike of the unlike,” as historian Salo Baron cannily characterized anti-Semitism. Social psychologist Gordon Allport adds in his seminal work *The Nature of Prejudice*, “Attitudes are not prejudices unless they serve a private, self-gratifying purpose for the person who has them” (p. 12).

Despite rampant anti-Semitism in Europe before World War II—anti-Semitism was embedded in the institutions of power—the early psychoanalysts did not inquire into the phenomenon. Freud was a notable exception. In 1900, in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud wrote about his reaction to anti-Semitism in two dreams: “My Uncle with the Yellow Beard” and “My Son the Myops.” In 1909, in the Little Hans case, Freud writes that “the deepest unconscious root of anti-

Semitism is the castration complex.” This idea is further elaborated in his 1919 essay on Leonardo da Vinci, where Freud linked circumcision and castration. A few years later, in 1921, Freud used the example of the Aryan’s repugnance for the Semite when distinct groups of people have ongoing intimate relations. He later said in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930) that such contact becomes an outlet for aggression and facilitates cohesion among group members. In Freud’s last major work, *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), he explored those factors required for anti-Semitism and elaborated on the unconscious motivations of it. These include the fact that the Jews are different; that there is jealousy of the Jews, the “Chosen People”; that Jews are aliens and therefore a convenient target for hostility; and that Jews are successful despite a history of being persecuted.

Beginning with Erik Erikson in 1942, Jews who escaped Nazi-occupied Europe started to think about the tragic fate of their people. In 1946 George Simmel espoused theories that blamed the Jews for provoking anti-Semitic attitudes toward them. Simmel also added that some anti-Semites may be latent homosexuals who use hate as a defense.

In the late 1940s there was major fear in the United States that the Jewish condition would become just as fragile as in Europe, with similarly dire consequences. In order to understand this threat, the American Jewish Committee commissioned a number of the social psychologists who escaped Nazi Germany in the 1930s to study the authoritarian personality in order to understand the potential for serious threats to Jewish security in the United States. The landmark study, *The Authoritarian Personality*, published in 1950, found that those who score high on anti-Semitism are also prejudiced toward other minority groups. The socialization and personality traits of these individuals include: rigid personality exemplified by “there is only one way to do anything,” which stemmed from harsh, unjust, and threatening discipline as

children; strictness; glorification of the parents accompanied by unconscious cynicism; aggression and lack of affection; lack of independence; and submission to authority. The major flaw with the research was that the subjects who were tested with questionnaires, interviews, and projective tests were not individuals who had acted out their hatred of other groups at the time of the study, nor were they avowed fascists.

At the same time as the authoritarian study was published, a more direct study of anti-Semites was conducted by psychoanalysts Nathan Ackerman and Maria Jahoda, who treated 40 anti-Semites, including eight Jews, in psychoanalysis. The transference was facilitated by the fact that the analysts were Jews. Ackerman and Jahoda concluded that anti-Semitic patients tended toward psychopathic and paranoid personalities, exaggerated vulnerabilities, and identity diffusion that manifested itself in inferiority, homosexual tendencies derived from passivity, poor interpersonal relations, and a need to conform. The sense of weakness the anti-Semites feel is defended against by attacking Jews, who are perceived as a weak group. As for their socialization, Ackerman and Jahoda discovered that these anti-Semitic patients grew up with parents who had poor marital relations and felt rejected or narcissistically exploited by the parents.

More than two generations later, the psychoanalyst Martin Bergmann, in an essay on "Antisemitism and the Psychology of Prejudice" noted that "prejudice is always based on unconscious needs" ("Antisemitism and the Psychology of Prejudice" in J.A. Chanes, ed., *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*, 1995). Bergmann continued, "Prejudice implies that we do not see the person as an individual but only as a member of a group. Ego boundary is relatively weak and requires the protection of prejudice in order to maintain it. What is projected are unacceptable and repudiated parts of the self" (Bergmann,

pp.110-113).

Given the right circumstances to act out one's prejudices, motivations will vary, but a consensus has developed around the notion that there is a proclivity toward becoming an anti-Semite if one has experienced certain socialization and possesses a rigid, authority-fearing, dogmatic, or insecure personality.

The same might be said of philo-Semites. Eva Fogelman had an opportunity to interview non-Jews who risked their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust. One group of rescuers was motivated because of love for individual Jews or of the Jewish people. In *Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust*, Fogelman writes that the affinity toward Jews could come from many sources. Some Christians had childhood friends who were Jewish. Others remembered being "*shabbos goyim*," non-Jews who helped observant Jews by turning on lights, lighting ovens, and performing other household chores so that the Jews might be able to observe the Sabbath. Children were often given sweet treats for performing these simple tasks. This helped establish a close relationship with them. A case in point is Oskar Schindler, who lived next door to a rabbi and his family. Another dynamic: some non-Jews suspected that they had Jewish blood. Raoul Wallenberg, for example, was known to have a great-great-grandfather and another relative on his mother's side that were Jews. Other Judeophiles developed close ties to Jews as adults in an intimate love relationship, a professional bond, or an economic dependence. Some felt a closeness to the Jewish people that came from reading and understanding the Hebrew Bible from early childhood. Some of these Judeophiles had never met a Jew, but given the opportunity to rescue one during the Holocaust, they were more than willing. Of course, there are unconscious affinities to Jews, such as feeling that by associating with Jews one's status will be enhanced.

Despite different relationships to Jews, there are commonalities in the childhoods and personalities of these Judeophiles. They grew up with loving parents who explained misbehavior and taught by word and example a tolerance and acceptance of people who are different. Parents or other role models were involved in altruistic behavior and involved the children as well where possible. In early childhood, many of the rescuers experienced a loss and were given empathy and support. The personality that developed from such an upbringing led to an independent individual who did not fear authority, had the ability to withstand anxiety, and was competent.

Ultimately, Judeophiles during the Holocaust did not fear authority and were able to transcend German propaganda that Jews were unworthy of life because they were able to see the Jew as a human being just like themselves. The anti-Semites, in contrast, feared authority and collaborated passively or actively in the destruction of European Jewry.

*Eva Fogelman, PhD, is a licensed psychologist in private practice in New York City. She is the award-winning author of the Pulitzer-nominated Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust, and writer and co-producer of Breaking the Silence: The Generation After the Holocaust. Dr. Fogelman is co-director of Child Development Research and Psychotherapy with Generations of the Holocaust and Related Traumas. **Jerome A. Chanes**, who writes extensively on Jewish public affairs, is the author of three books on anti-Semitism, including the award-winning A Dark Side of History: Antisemitism through the Ages and Antisemitism: A Reference Handbook, and is editor of the forthcoming The Future of American Judaism, a volume in the series The Future of American Religion. They may be contacted at evafogelman@aol.com and jchanes@brandeis.edu or chanes@yu.edu respectively.*

A Contemporary Case of Religious Narcissistic Superiority

Nathan Carlin—University of Texas Medical School

A pastor friend of mine from seminary recently visited me in Houston where I am a professor at a medical school. He was in town for a church-related conference; I offered to let him stay with me for a few days in order to save money. At the end of each day, we would talk for a couple of hours, catching up on each other's lives.

On one of the evenings, we happened to take up the subject of Islam. My friend held the position that Islam is inherently a violent religion because its central sacred text is violent and its founder had blood on his hands. Islam is, as it were, rotten at the core, he suggested, and all attempts at "reforming" or "modernizing" Islam are bound to fail because of this rotten core. This position was offensive to me—all religions, I know from over a decade of study, have blood on their hands. Further, I have also learned that it is inappropriate to characterize any religious tradition; none are monoliths, never mind the fact that the vast majority of Muslims are nonviolent. My friend's assumptions about Islam are apparently informed by the media in this country, which is unfortunate, because to judge Muslims by how they are presented in this country's media would be like judging Christians by the Christian anti-abortion activists who bomb family-planning clinics.

I knew, however, that I would not get very far with this pastor by talking theory and politics. The conversation, I realized, needed to be concrete, or else the discussion would veer off into countless tangents. So I reminded my friend that the Hebrew Bible is quite violent (e.g., Psalm 58.10: "The righteous will rejoice when they see vengeance done;

they will bathe their feet in the blood of the wicked”). My friend agreed. But, he said, “That’s the *Old Testament*; Christianity is a religion of love and peace.” I then reminded him of Paul’s letters, which have been used to exclude women from power (e.g., 1 Timothy 2.11: “Let a woman learn in silence with full submission”). Next, I pointed out that Paul apparently approved of slavery and that pastors in the pre-Civil War years would justify slavery by quoting him (e.g., Colossians 3.22: “Slaves, obey your earthly masters in everything, not only while you are being watched and in order to please them, but wholeheartedly, fearing the Lord”). My friend conceded this point as well. But, he countered, “Jesus is the core of Christianity, and Jesus was about love and peace—Christianity, therefore, is a religion of peace at its core, unlike Islam.”

I then brought up Richard Fenn’s recent book, *Dreams of Glory: The Sources of Apocalyptic Terror* (2006), where Fenn, a psychoanalytically informed sociologist of religion, argues for taking the *Book of Revelation* out of the *New Testament* because, as he reads the text, the book is fundamentally and hopelessly violent. My friend did not concede this point. I refrained from quoting scripture at him—I didn’t, in fact, open up the Bible and directly quote any of the above passages at him, but I mentioned them—if I had, I would have opened up the Bible and quoted these less well known words from Jesus: “*Those who conquer* will inherit these things, and I will be their God and they will be my children. But as for the cowards, the faithless, the polluted, the murderers, the fornicators, the sorcerers, the idolaters, and all liars, their place will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death” (Revelation 21.7-8, my emphasis). It is a small step from verses such as these—words, according to St. John, from the mouth of Jesus—to the crusades of the Middle Ages, when knights literally crusaded for Christ.

If I had pressed my friend further, I would have had to demonstrate problems with Jesus as depicted in the Gospels, because this is the core of Christianity for him, as it is for many Christians. I would have had to point out anti-Semitic portions of the *Gospel of John*, where Jesus talks about “the Jews” as if he were not Jewish (cf. John 9.22, 16.2, 20.19) or in the *Gospel of Matthew* and the *Gospel of Luke* where Jesus derides the Pharisees (Matthew 23; Luke 11.37-54). My friend would have probably answered that Jesus’ critique of the Pharisees in the *Gospel of Matthew* and the *Gospel of Luke*, as well as Jesus’ critique of “the Jews” in the *Gospel of John*, represents a critique of particular forms of Judaism, not Judaism per se.

Such a reply is fair enough, but there is a danger with this kind of disavowal. Indeed, my Jewish friends know the danger of these kinds of responses, because they have lived through, or have had relatives live through, the effects of anti-Semitic preaching—the very passages that I referenced above have been used against them in practice. Moreover, they have heard with their own ears sermons that interpret Jesus chasing the money-changers out of the temple as a rationale for excluding Jews from positions of power or, worse, as a rationale for exterminating Jews when contemporary Jews are understood to be contemporary money-changers (Matthew 21.12-13; Mark 11.15-17; Luke 19.45-46; John 2.13-17; also see the documentary, *The Cross and the Star: Jews, Christians, and the Holocaust*). It seems that if this disavowal was meant to signify that Jesus only intended to criticize particular subsets of Judaism (such as the Pharisees and the Sadducees), then Christians who argue for this interpretation need to find scriptural examples of Jews whom Jesus approved of *who did not join his movement*. Otherwise, it is unclear what the point of making this argument actually is, especially when, in practice, it has led to a great deal of Christian violence against Jews.

Freud, in a number of places in his writings, called upon Jews to give up their own narcissistic belief that God, the creator of the universe, chose them as a special people, and wished good things for them as a people in contrast to the rest of the world. Also, he called on Christians to give up their narcissism as well. If Jews and Christians would give up their own narcissistic senses of superiority, then and only then would a more open society emerge. If we are to speak of a rotten core of any particular religion, perhaps we would be better off speaking about the rotten core of all monotheistic religions. Or, if monotheistic religions are not essentially rotten at the core, we should, at the very least, talk about the tendency of all religious traditions to have more than a few bruises at the core.

Nathan Carlin, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Medical Humanities at the University of Texas Medical School in Houston, Texas. He holds a Master of Divinity degree from Princeton Seminary and a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Rice University. Carlin can be reached at NathanCarlin@uth.tmc.edu.



The Evolution of Anti-Semitism: Historical and Psychological Roots

Allan Mohl—International Psychohistorical Assn.

Virtually every ideology and nationality in Europe had been saturated with anti-Semitism by the time the Nazis developed the “Final Solution.” Over the preceding centuries and decades, essential elements of Christianity, Marxism, socialism, nationalism, Enlightenment, and modern thought had found the existence of Jews to be intolerable. Currently, Islamic extremism has joined this historical pattern. This

paper will briefly attempt to look at the evolution of anti-Semitism and its pervasiveness throughout the Western world, particularly since 324 AD.

Messiah and Apostle

In the first two decades after the death of Jesus, from 30 to 50 AD, all Christians were Jews, and Christianity as a Jewish sect differed little from its many other sects. New converts came mostly from the ranks of other Jews, and those pagans who joined the new religion had to first become Jews before they could be accepted into the Christian faith. The Great Schism between Christians and Jews did not occur until after 50 AD, when the Christian sect was taken to the pagans, who no longer had to follow Jewish dietary laws, and made a world religion. This was both the decision and the accomplishment of one Jewish man, Saul of Tarsus, the real builder of the Christian church, who is generally known by his Christian name of Paul. He became to Jesus what the Talmud became to the Torah—a commentary and a way of life.

The Evolution of Anti-Judaism

Although Jesus, Paul, and Jesus' other early disciples identified themselves as Jews, the basic themes of anti-Judaism were established at the very beginning of the Christian era. The first and by far gravest charge in the indictment was deicide: Jews had rejected Christ. They had not only rejected him, but they had killed him, and since Christ was God, they had killed God. Modern scholarship and morality have both shed doubt on the ancient and cherished theory of Jewish guilt for the death of Christ. The Romans were, after all, the unchallenged rulers of Judea, and crucifixion was a Roman, never a Jewish, form of capital punishment.

Unfortunately, such considerations and questioning were far from the minds of the early converts to Christianity and most of their successors. For almost 2,000 years, or al-

most from the time Constantine made Christianity the only legal religion in the Roman Empire in 324 AD, Christians had to believe in the Nicene Creed that was adopted in 325 AD. The principles of the Nicene Creed stated that all other opinions outside of Christianity were banned and declared heretical. The monopolistic character of the early Church was set, and the Gospel according to Matthew unequivocally placed the blood of Christ on the Jews.

During the so-called Dark Ages, Jews in Europe enjoyed relative tranquility. But the Crusades brought a new Christian militancy, and while this was directed primarily against the Muslims, the crusaders found their first victims in their Jewish neighbors. From time of the Crusades onward, the satanic element began to dominate anti-Jewish polemic. Jews were then seen as children of the devil whose assigned task was to combat Christianity and injure Christians. By the 12th century, they were accused of poisoning wells, ill-treating holy symbols, and murdering Christian children to use their blood for ritual purposes.

Paranoid Fantasies after Emancipation

With the growing intellectual sophistication of Christian Europe, such fantasies began to lose their hold, though they—and the attitudes resulting from them—have shown extraordinary persistence in some areas, and from time to time make a disconcerting reappearance. The myth of a Jewish conspiracy to dominate the world, directed by a secret Jewish government of which all Jews are agents, reappeared toward the end of the 18th century and has continued to survive. For example, a French Jesuit, Abbé Augustin Barruel, published a lengthy book “proving” that the Revolution was the work of a secret conspiracy of Free Masons, Bavarian Illuminati, and other secret societies, all founded by Jews. Some Jews tried to pass as Christians in order to better achieve their deceitful purposes, and they had even penetrated the Catholic Church. According to Abbé Barruel’s

fantasies, Jews sought to be masters of the entire world, converting churches into synagogues and enslaving the remaining Christians.

When in Western countries Jews were finally permitted to emerge from the ghetto and enter into the life of European society, they displayed that additional energy and determination often found in penalized minorities that have to struggle to survive. As a consequence, they have done rather well. Jewish students thronged to the universities from which they had been barred since the Middle Ages and strove to excel. The idea that Jews wielded some secret and diabolical power that enabled them to triumph over good, honest Christians now found new audiences, even in the more advanced countries of Northern and Western Europe. Only in this way could they explain how a few thousand allegedly inferior Jews excel among many millions of superior Christians. The word “anti-Semitism,” in fact, did not exist until 1879 AD, when it was coined by Wilhelm Marr, a German with a Jewish grandfather and perhaps other Jewish relatives, to fit the emergence of an entirely new historic pattern of Jewish-Christian relationship.

Hitler’s Anti-Semitism

There were avowedly anti-Semitic movements in Western Europe before Hitler’s: the Crusades, the Inquisition, and the Black Death epidemics. Jews were frequently burned at the stake and expelled from various cities and countries, such as Spain and Portugal, simply because they were Jews. Then in Germany in 1933, Adolf Hitler’s government, with anti-Semitism as a major plank in its ideology, came to power. In Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, he writes that he became an anti-Semite when he first saw Hassidic Jews from Eastern Europe in Vienna, and through observation of their black hats, side curls, beards, and long black coats, he believed that they were an alien race who deliberately kept themselves apart from Aryan Europe. At the same time, he

felt an even more passionate hatred against those Jews who cast off their strange garb, unlearned their grotesque accents, and passed themselves off as part of Aryan society.

Comments and Conclusion

There are various stages in the evolution of anti-Semitism, which reached its zenith of horror in the Holocaust. First, the three components of Judaism (God, Torah [laws and teachings], and Israel [Jewish nationhood]) often threaten the gods, laws, and nationalism of the non-Jews among whom the Jews live. Second, the Jews' denial of Christ as the living God in the Christian world of Western civilization is another factor. Third, the belief in the Jew as the "other" was replaced by the myth of the Jew as the enemy who must be eliminated. Fourth, an anti-Semitic church had enormous influence over its members. Finally, according to Lloyd deMause, who wrote the pioneering "Evolution of Childhood," there is the reality of pervasive child abuse during the Middle Ages and into the Modern Era, which placed the Jew as a receptacle for poisonous feeling for those individuals who grew up in Christian homes in which they were physically and/or sexually abused. The Jews became the abusive parents to those Christian children who suffered early abuse.

People throughout history defend their despair and shame by finding and restaging their early traumas in the ultimately vain hope of removing the cause of their inner agonies; Jews have historically filled this position.

Allan Mohl, PhD, is a psychotherapist whose practice is in Dobbs Ferry, NY. He is a research associate of the Psychohistory Forum and a past president of the International Psychohistorical Association and may be contacted at mo9al@aol.com.

The Psychological Story of Anti-Semitism

Sander Breiner—Michigan State University

Prejudice against a subjugated minority is common in the history of the world, though the quality, quantity, and extent of it can vary. Anti-Semitism (hatred of Jews, not all Semites) is unique in the world's history. In late 19th century Germany, Wilhelm Marr, a political agitator and publicist, coined the term "anti-Semite" to classify his hatred of Jews. This distinction, which is based upon a confusion of the Semitic linguistics with a nonexistent racial group, was to keep Jews separate from the rest of German society. Marr was far from the first to hate the Jewish people.

The many cultural and scientific advances that the Jews had given to the Egyptians were denied by Mantheo, an Egyptian priest (300 BCE). He published a diatribe against the earlier Semitics as well as the Jews. The Romans would later participate eagerly in denying their debt to Semites, including Jews. On one hand, the Romans' admiration for the Jews' health, intelligence, and beauty drove them to try to obtain this "magic" for themselves. Yet, they disparaged the Jews as fools for allowing their slaves to be automatically freed after seven years' servitude.

There are several unique historical facts regarding Jews and anti-Semitism, which are: Jews have been the object of unreasonable hatred for 2,000 years; despite oppression, Jews have made major scientific and cultural contributions to every society in which they have lived as a minority, thus provoking envy; Christianity, after failing to convert the majority of Jews, became the center and organizer of the most vicious and disruptive anti-Semitism; and Jews do not have to exist in the community for them to be objects of ha-

tred.

Prior to World War One, Jews and Christians lived in many parts of the Islamic world, classified as “unbelievers” who were considered monotheistic brothers since Abraham was the father of both religious groups. For centuries Jews fled Christian Europe to the Islamic world before and after the Spanish Inquisition. Consequently, under Islam Jews lived as second class subjects with much less oppression than in Christian Europe. They were called “a people of the book.” It was only during periods of fundamentalist uprisings that they were targeted as scapegoats. Under the Ottoman Empire (1299-1922), many of them rose to positions of prominence in and out of the government.

However, with the weakening of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century and its collapse at the end of World War I, Christian nations were created in southeastern Europe. In this area of Europe, anti-Semitism flourished, partly due to a Christian middle-class seeking to displace Jews from their niche in society. Things also changed in areas formerly ruled by the Ottoman Empire where anti-Jewish feeling increased with the development of modern Zionism and markedly intensified following the creation of Israel in 1948.

Identification with the aggressor is an important phenomenon in prejudice. In Africa during the period of the sub-Saharan slave trade, slaves began to identify with their slavers, the Muslim Arabs. As a result they became Muslims themselves. Something similar occurred in East Asia. With the dominance of Christian cultural political power in Asia, the Japanese developed many anti-Semitic attitudes without even the presence of Jews.

Howard Stein, a Jewish psychoanalytical anthropologist writing in the *Journal of Psychohistory* in 1977 and 1978 has seen Jews as participating in creating anti-Semitism by being anti-Christian. But even when Jews converted to

Christianity, they were not safe, as occurred in Spain when they were forced to choose conversion or expulsion in 1492. Despite conversion, they and their descendants were killed to prevent the “contamination” of pure Christian blood. However, all the nations on the Mediterranean are part of a closely connected genetic pool, so their fear (not surprisingly) was without any foundation.

In an attempt to understand the psychological underpinnings of anti-Semitism, a well-known and highly respected psychoanalyst, Mortimer Ostow, gathered a number of other colleagues in a special study group. They worked for several years to understand the psychopathology of anti-Semitism. Their conclusions dealt with the primitive magical thinking and sadistic behavior that did—and still does—characterize much of Western Christian civilization. Other psychoanalysts also worked on the subject: Sigmund Freud gave an Oedipal explanation of anti-Semitism that focused on circumcision as it is connected to castration anxiety, while Otto Fenichel declared anti-Semitism is based on scapegoating and projection. Rudolph Lowenstein found that Jews represented the hated child rebelling against the parent. Nathan Ackerman gave a long list of psychological mechanisms behind this hatred, but they in no way specifically pinpointed 2,000 years of this wide-ranging hostility. Psychohistorian Lloyd deMause, not an analyst, referred to the Jews as a receptacle for society’s uncomfortable feelings, particularly anger toward their flawed parents.

While there are many other explanations, none can answer the question, “Why the Jews?” No doubt, extensive psychopathology has existed in every corner of the globe, historically and up to the present. One set of facts stands out clearly: Christianity is necessary. Historically, the peculiar and unique presence of Christian culture and thinking from at least 200 CE has created a fundamentally pervasive, vicious, and destructive anti-Semitism. It has invited all Christians to

discriminate against Jews. It is only in the last 70 years that there has been a significant modification of this irrational anti-Semitism.

The requirements for anti-Semitism include Christian culture and power with a doctrine of anti-Semitism; a majority of the population having pre-Oedipal psychopathology; chronic stress in the population, such as the plague; and leadership that utilizes anti-Semitism for political purposes. Therefore, the resolution of the "diseases of anti-Semitism" requires that three things happen. First, all Christian churches need to put in writing an acknowledgment of the error in past documents related to Jews and anti-Semitism. This information should be widely disseminated in various currently used church documents. Second, since the pre-Oedipal psychopathology experienced as self-hatred is developed in the first three years of life, directing society's attention to resolving that problem is vital. Finally, security in the integrity and stability of the leaders in a democracy is essential. Removing or reducing such stressors will reduce the likelihood of anti-Semitism, and for that matter, other pathological behavior, such as war.

Sander J. Breiner, MD, is a training and supervising psychoanalyst and professor of psychiatry at Michigan State University and Wayne State University. He has published over 100 articles and books. Of special note is his book Slaughter of the Innocents: Child Abuse Through the Ages and Today. Dr. Breiner may be contacted at sjbreiner@comcast.net.

Joseph M. Kramp, recipient of a **Young Scholar Award Membership** in the Forum, has been passing his comprehensive exams with distinction and is writing his Drew University doctoral dissertation proposal to research and write a psychological biography of Ralph Waldo Emerson. This fall he and Angel Duncan married and are residing in Maplewood, NJ.

The Pope Adopts a Kidnapped Jewish Son

Dan Dervin—University of Mary Washington

In Bologna in 1858 a police squad, acting on the orders of the Inquisitor, invaded the home of the Jewish merchant Momolo Mortara, wrenched his crying six-year-old from his arms, and rushed the child off in a carriage bound for Rome. The weeping mother collapsed, but her cries were heard across the city and reverberated over Europe. This historical moment was critical with Italy in its violent throes of unification, and the scandal, as David I. Kertzer's *The Kidnapping of Edgardo Mortara* (Knopf, 1997) demonstrates, "contributed to the collapse of the Church's temporal power." Modern historians have paid little attention to this riveting story, and one wonders if even after Kertzer's study, a 2006 play, and a 2010 opera it still does not get the attention it warrants, especially from Italian historians. Like an exploding flare, the dramatic event lit up several terrains and, in impacting the geopolitical area, indirectly altered the map of Europe. The Church's equivocal attitude toward children was also illuminated.

Couple and family therapist Joan Lachkar has remarked that Judaism is the religion of the father, Islam of the orphan, and Christianity of the son. One might rephrase that to deem it the religion of the child. The Gospels are emphatic on Jesus' admonition to let the children come to him, for such is the kingdom of heaven, and better that a millstone be tied around one's neck and be cast into the sea than he harm one of these innocents. However, as the early Church routed grace and salvation through an intricate network of sacraments, a hierarchical system of power arose. To receive grace, in order to become a legitimate child of God and thus be set on the path to salvation, the faithful must be baptized.

Given the high incidence of child mortality plus the ever lurking dangers of temptation, the earlier the better, for unbaptized souls were lost for eternity.

It is here that additional terrain is illuminated. The Inquisitor's police, we note, acted on a combination of public and ecclesiastical authority, the Papal States then being like any other civil state. The police gave no explanation for wrenching the boy from his parents, but eventually a fuller story emerged. Earlier, the family's Catholic maid, fearing the infant Edgardo might die of an illness, had secretly baptized him, or so she claimed in her secret testimony to the Inquisition. According to Church teachings, a Christian child could not be raised by Jewish parents. Thus, despite problems with her story, the Inquisitor decided to proceed with the seizure of the child (Garry Wills, *Papal Sin: Structures of Deceit*, 2000, p. 41). To be on the safe side, Edgardo was re-baptized at age nine.

Initially, the boy had been whisked away to a monastery, but later was brought to Pope Pius IX who raised him as his own son, a sort of papal mascot or trophy (Wills, p. 42), an un-chosen heir to an alien faith. The Pope told the boy, "you have and I have suffered because of you," referring to the bad publicity the case brought in a period when the Pope would lose the Papal States to Italian nationalism, and defended his action by claiming "I, too, am his father" (Wills, p. 42). To Jewish critics, he reminded them of his earlier generosity in dispensing them from "compulsory attendance at proselytizing sermons" and warned them that, but for his pity, he "could have made you go back in your hole" (Wills, pp. 42-43). The Pope blamed the brouhaha on the "freethinkers, the disciples of Rousseau and Malthus" (Wills, p. 40). When his parents were eventually allowed to visit Edgardo in the Esquiline palace, his mother ripping off his Marion medal was taken as proof of her unfitness as a mother (Wills, p. 41).

In print, a Jesuit argued that if the boy were sent back he might be pressured and even tortured to renounce his faith. “Would it seem right and generous to place the boy on the cross?” he asked, invoking a reenactment of the alleged original Jewish crime of deicide, the rationale for centuries of oppression and persecution (Wills, p. 41). Thus in a deft reversal, the Jewish victim becomes the instigator.

For his part, Edgardo adopted the Pope as his father, declaiming a long poem in his honor, and began preparing for the priesthood. In 1870 when Rome was under siege by Italian armies and Edgardo’s father awaited his 19-year-old son’s liberation outside the Vatican walls, Edgardo opted to escape to an Austrian convent; his father was despondent (Kertzer pp. 264-45). Edgardo subsequently completed his studies for the priesthood in Poitiers and thereafter “dedicated his life to spreading the faith, singing the praises of the Lord Jesus Christ, and traveling throughout Europe, going where he was most needed” (Kertzer, p. 295). In later years he met with his mother, but was unable to convert her (Kertzer, p. 296).

The interpretive lines that open up must remain provisional. Not only is the record scanty, but recent revelations of child abuse especially within the hierarchy expose closed cultures of concealment and conspiracies of silence. Notably disturbing is the case of Cardinal Danneels, Archbishop of Brussels, who forced his young nephew into many years of sexual bondage; the boy was intimidated by Church officials who worked diligently to buy his silence (*New York Times*, 30 Aug 2010, p. A4).

In the absence of data regarding Edgardo’s adopted childhood, we might first consider Leonard Shengold’s *Soul Murder* (1989, 1999). But that concept better applies to Edgardo’s parents who were promised their kidnapped/adopted son’s return in exchange for their conversion. Spiritual se-

duction better applies to Edgardo, and his plight corresponds to an acted-out family romance. Freud introduced the term in 1909 ("Family Romances," *Standard Edition*, vol. 9). It pivots on the child reacting to inevitable disappointments with his mundane parents and coping by recasting him/herself as an orphan/foundling to be adopted by an exalted (royal, divine, etc.) set of caregivers. In this instance, Edgardo's family romance found him, scripted and dictated by the Pope and validated in a glorious future as the Pontiff's chosen, and reinforced by the "son's" virtual disowning of his biological parents.

Meanwhile, let's hope that history is not repeating itself. Pope Pius IX issued a notorious broadside attack on Modernism; our present Pope Benedict XVI rails indiscriminately against the evils of secularism. He listened with apparent approval to a sermon last spring during Holy Week wherein a Benedictine theologian compared his media travails over clerical abuse to a crucifixion. He is currently embroiled in retaining the Easter liturgical prayer for the conversion of the Jews. The papacy is slow to change.

Daniel Dervin, PhD, writes prolifically on a variety of psychohistorical subjects from literature to sports to child abuse to the church in which he was baptized and raised. His books include Enactments, Matricentric Narratives and Father Bosetti in America. Dr. Dervin is a research associate of the Psychohistory Forum and an emeritus professor of literature at the University of Mary Washington. He may be contacted at ddervin@umw.edu.

The Journal of Psychohistory has for 38 years been applying psychoanalytic insights to world events, past and present. With the largest number of readers of psychohistory around the world, this quarterly journal publishes original research into the role of the unconscious mind in society.

For a half-price subscription of only \$34 a year, send your postal address to: Lloyd deMause, Editor, *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 140 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10024 or e-mail it to him at psychhst@tiac.net.

Hans Blüher, National Socialism, Freud, and Anti-Semitism

Juhani Ihanus—University of Helsinki

Hans Blüher (1888-1955), a German writer and philosopher, in *Secessio Judaica* (1922) sought to give the “philosophical foundation of the historical situation of Jewishness and the anti-Semitic movement.” In this pamphlet his definition of anti-Semitism included two main elements, the need to segregate the Jews and the “no-hate attitude”: “Such anti-Semitism that follows from the necessity of recognizing [the secession of the Jews from the host people] is therefore always *sine ira et studio*...There is no reason to hate and defame Jews...An anti-Semite is the one who says that a Jew is a Jew” (*Secessio*, p. 41). Only the first aspect of Blüher’s definition was adopted by the National Socialists.

Blüher had become famous a decade earlier through his controversial trilogy on the German *Wandervogel* movement (1912). He tried to show that the movement contained erotic manly bonding (as a researcher of it, he held homosexuality to be quite normal) and that the members of the movement were searching for manly heroes and a new leader, an ideal father who would act as an aristocratic *Kaiser* for his people. The movement had been started in 1901 by Karl Fischer, who called himself *Der Führer*. There was a partial succession from the *Wandervogel* movement and its masculine-erotic heroism to the Hitler Youth and its warrior heroism. In his work *Führer und Volk in der Jugendbewegung* (*Leader and Folk in the Youth Movement*, 1918), Blüher anticipated “that the leader does not need a folk in order to be the leader, but a folk becomes a folk only through the leader” (p. 3).

During his 1924 imprisonment in Landsberg, Hitler

had ordered *Secessio Judaica* for his reading and had dictated and co-written *Mein Kampf*. According to an eye-witness report, Hitler confessed during the third Nazi Party Congress in Nuremberg in 1927 that Blüher's point of view regarding the practical solution of the Jewish question was also his (see Dietrich Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie [Before Hitler Came: A Historical Study]*, 1964). To Blüher, Hitler was not the hoped-for ideal manly hero, and he distanced himself from the National Socialists from the summer of 1934. The Nazi regime banned Blüher from writing because he had published dubious works, like the one on the role of eroticism in the manly society (1917). After the National Socialists had lost their power, Blüher mocked Hitler as a totally un-German "Neanderthal" and an "erotic cripple." Blüher also devalued womanly, feminized, and regression-prone mother-loving men who cling to infantile needs.

Klaus Theweleit (in his *Male Fantasies*, 2 vols., 1987, 1989) claimed that the manly bond (*Männerbund*) is armor against the emancipation of women. The fear of women surely seems to be one of the underpinnings of *Männerbund*, but there may be other factors working in favor of the Teutonic masculine brotherhood, for example the fear of losing unity, family, and community and the need for a Family to be reunited by the rescuing masculine group, vacillating in relation to both the nurturing Father and Mother. The manly bond was for Blüher mainly a defense organization against the sons' regression to Mother. Blüher's antifeminism is not so much against women (or their emancipation) but against the regressive tendencies of men.

Hans Blüher expressed antifeminism, antisocialist, and anti-Semitic views that took on aristocratic and anti-democratic overtones. Although Blüher himself had a humble background, he longed for high-society contacts. His attitude toward Jews was emotionally ambivalent and he adopted idiosyncratically some stereotypes of the Jews, put-

ting them forth in his writings, without succumbing to likening the Jews to the parasites and the lice, as was the habit in the cruelest forms of anti-Semitism.

Blüher also practiced as a “wild” psychoanalyst whom Freud had read (the manuscript of the third volume of the work on the *Wandervogel* movement) and whom he first praised (in his letter to Blüher, July 10, 1912) as an intelligent, keen observer and a courageous man without many inhibitions. Blüher’s articles were published in psychoanalytic journals in the 1910s. This link was, however, broken when Blüher, in *Secessio Judaica*, started to identify Freud’s thinking (and Jewish socialism) as “corruptive” and, ideologically, “pure materialism,” insisting that such “trends of thought will become fruitful only when they shall pass through a German brain which is in a position to resist their perverted origin” (*Secessio*, pp. 23-24). Soon after this, Freud broke with Blüher, whom he saw totally separated from psychoanalysis and belonging to such German currents that were, like “folk psychoses,” strictly opposed to rational arguments.

Jewish “destructiveness” was presented by Blüher as a pact favoring modernism, which destroyed aristocratic-conservative values and used Reason as a plain instrument for free-floating, nomad-like intellectualism, engaged in philosophy, science, literature, theater, dance, gymnastics, and other cultural production. Non-Zionist Jewishness was deemed by Blühler as being “in the service of a destructive historical influence on the host peoples” (*Secessio*, p. 22). Jews were the “chosen people of the past,” and Germans the “chosen people of the future” (p. 43). One could not simultaneously go the Jewish way and the German way (p. 36). Blüher’s blunt folk diagnostics stated that “every Jew was substantially sick,” the “fate” of the whole Jewish people was “sick,” and the brokenness of every Jew was “incurable” (p. 20). As an omen, the “menacing world pogrom was hanging above their heads” (p. 41). Jewish corruptive thoughts and

destructive influences necessitated the secession of the Jews as a historical event, which was corroborated by growing anti-Semitism (p. 21). Blüher even proposed that anti-Semitism was partly an “intentional product of Jewish propaganda” meant to seduce host peoples to shed Jewish blood and to make them guilty in order to serve the Jews (Blüher, *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth [A Collection of Words of Jesus of Nazareth]*, 1921, p. 313).

In favor of the Aryan mentality, Blüher described the German man as essentially healthy and heroic and claimed that the masculine German world, embedded in homosexual eroticism, will bring forth cultural and spiritual progress. The “feminized” Jews were characterized as incapable of being soldiers, of being part of any “warrior caste,” (*Die Aristie*, p. 58), and in need of exclusion, so that they could be both protected and controlled in their ghettos. The “feminine and servile” essence of the Jews (*Die Aristie*, p. 49) was ubiquitous.

Blüher's works contained a mixture of half-truths, curious paradoxes, scandalous effects, and dandyish poses, and they attracted some members of German literate distinction, such as Rainer Maria Rilke, Franz Werfel, Gottfried Benn, Thomas Mann, and Franz Kafka. For example, Kafka became Blüher's avid reader, and after having read *Secessio Judaica*, he sensed an insuperable difficulty in reviewing Blüher's work: “He calls himself an anti-Semite without hatred, *sine ira et studio*, and he really is that; yet he easily awakens the suspicion...that he is an enemy of the Jews, whether out of happy hatred or out of unhappy love” (Kafka, *Diaries*: 2, 230 [June 16, 1922]).

Blüher wrote of an unavoidable racial segregation: the “German race” and the “Jewish race” were opposed to each other, and nobody could be both German and Jewish. This opposition was reflected in anti-Semitism and Zionism

that were worlds apart from each other. The old-style anti-Semitism tried in vain to refute Judaism by inductive reasoning, by statistics and by appealing to experience. On the other hand, Jews had in vain tried to blend in with their German host people, but their sexuality, their outlook, and their unique way of practicing “mimicry of the blood, of the name, and of the body [*Gestalt*]” (*Secessio*, p. 19) remained only superficially and temporarily westernized. Blüher argued that the Jews in Germany lived in a “latent ghetto” that will become manifest once the Jews are “reghettoized” and separated from the German body. The ghetto was for Blüher “foremost a psychic manifestation” (p. 55), but, of course, there were real-life ghettos behind such mental images.

To see Blüher as a savior of the Jews is hardly possible. His friend Hans-Joachim Schoeps, himself a leading member of the Jewish Youth movement and a pan-Germanist loyal to the National Socialists, esteemed Blüher and held *Secessio Judaica* as “antagonistic toward the Jews” (*judengegnerisch*), not distinctly anti-Semitic (see Blüher’s and Schoep’s co-work *Streit um Israel* [*Controversy Over Israel*], 1933, p. 7); the book was soon confiscated by the German authorities. Such conceptual hair splitting could not erase the Holocaust, the “world pogrom,” for which Blüher failed to set the right coordinates when he wrote his prognosis: “The world pogrom will undoubtedly arrive. Germany will be the only land that will shrink away from the act of murder...It is ignoble to torture an unarmed enemy. The German is no Frenchman” (*Secessio*, p. 57). That the secession of the Jews is a “*painful event*” and a “world catastrophe” (p. 65) was admitted by Blüher, in one of his rare clear moments.

Juhani Ihanus, PhD, is Adjunct Professor of Cultural Psychology at the University of Helsinki, Adjunct Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu, Senior Lecturer and Member of the Board of Directors

at the Open University of the University of Helsinki, and Contributing Editor of the Journal of Psychohistory. He has published books and articles on psychohistory, cultural and clinical psychology and the history of psychology. He may be reached at juhani.ihanus@helsinki.fi.

◇◇◇◇CP◇◇◇◇

Anti-Semitism's New Expression: Anti-Israel

Florette Cohen—City University of New York

Prejudice is normally stigmatized, so people often try to deny or hide their prejudices. The terms modern or symbolic racism were developed because people stopped saying, "I hate blacks." Instead, they simply opposed government policies to promote racial equality and the candidates supporting those policies. Classic anti-Semitism, like other forms of bigotry, has also gone underground. A more socially acceptable avenue for expressing anti-Semitism is opposition to Israel—or modern anti-Semitism. Just as people veil their racism and anti-black prejudice, for example, by opposing busing and affirmative action, people often similarly disguise their anti-Semitism by opposing Israel's national policies.

For this reason, when I saw the Web version of *TIME*'s September 13, 2010 magazine cover story claiming that the Israelis have no interest in achieving peace with the Palestinians, I became alarmed. According to *TIME*'s author Karl Vick, Israelis do not care about the peace process; instead, all that concerns them is making money in a booming real estate market. As someone who has been to Israel several times, this claim was very unsettling. It is impossible not to notice the gun-carrying soldiers at the entrance to

every mall, supermarket, and movie theater. Do people really want to experience the nuisance of airport-like security checks on a daily basis, as long as they are making money? Or is the article perpetuating the age-old anti-Semitic stereotype of the greedy Jew? Some recent experimental findings, in conjunction with a deeper reading of the full article, provided me with the answers I was seeking.

Modern Anti-Semitism Research

My colleagues and I recently began a program of research based on the New Anti-Semitism-Israel model (NASI). The NASI model predicts that when existential concerns or when thoughts of death are brought into conscious awareness, Jews are perceived as threatening to one's cultural worldview because they are different in their beliefs and behaviors compared to non-Jews. This then leads to an increase in anti-Semitism, which can manifest itself in two ways: by developing into overt expressions of anti-Semitism (verbal slurs, defamation of property, bodily harm) or by manifesting itself covertly as hostility toward Israel, which we refer to as modern anti-Semitism. One way to unveil modern anti-Semitism has come to be known as Natan Sharansky's "3-D Test": double standards, demonization, and de-legitimization of Israel.

We conducted a series of studies testing the hypotheses that uniquely human fears of death serve to perpetuate expressions of anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiment and that the two are inexorably intertwined. Experiment One was designed to establish an empirical relationship between anti-Semitism and anti-Israeli sentiment. It consisted of a sample of 151 non-Jewish college students from a large Northeastern university. Three questionnaires were used to assess blatant expressions of anti-Semitism, anti-Israeli sentiment, and anti-Palestinian sentiment. Results confirmed a strong correlation between anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment: when anti-Semitism increases, support for Israel decreases. Experiment

Two revealed that existential concerns prompted participants (161 non-Jewish college students) to perceive the size of Israel as larger than it really is, thus supporting prior research showing that fear and prejudice often leads people to overestimate the size and power of minority groups.

Additional research revealed that double standards apply to Israel regarding human rights violations. Experiment Three differed from the first two experiments in a significant manner—participants consisted of 233 non-Jewish members of the *general population* recruited from doctors' offices in upstate New York and New Jersey. Participants read one of three versions of an article concerning human rights abuses. All three versions of the article were identical, except for our alterations locating the human rights abuses in Palestine, Kashmir, or Chechnya, and the perpetrator nation as Israel, India, or Russia, respectively. After reading the article, participants rated their agreement with possible punishments of the human rights violator, ranging from a national campaign against the target country to the installation of a new government by force. When existential concerns were brought to mind, the level of punishment people wished to inflict on Israel was greater than the level of punishment they wished to inflict on other countries for the *exact same* human rights violations.

In a second set of studies, a non-readily apparent expression of anti-Semitism and anti-Israel sentiment in the form of demonization was assessed through obtaining the impressions of two offensive political cartoons depicting either the Israeli or the Chinese leader eating Palestinian or Tibetan babies, and a Jewish or Chinese man atop the world with a bleeding Arab or Tibetan surrendering beneath. Participants (156 non-Jewish college students) were asked to indicate how "justified" they thought each cartoon was. Results showed that when existential concerns were raised, participants rated the offensive political cartoons of Israel as

more justified than those of China. Collectively, modern anti-Semitism research confirms that anti-Semitism can manifest itself in ways that are not easily detected as prejudice. As such, how are we to interpret Karl Vick's cover story?

A Modern Example of a Classic Anti-Semitic Stereotype

Returning to the original questions prompted by Vick's article: Do Israelis only care about economic prosperity without regard for peace, as he suggests? Or is his article the reincarnation of the classic anti-Semitic "greedy Jew" stereotype? A couple of points suggest the latter. First, according to the Israeli Democracy Institute and Tel Aviv University's 2010 Peace Index, 75% of Israelis support the Israeli-Palestinian peace talks and 62% support direct dialogue, unmediated by the U.S. So what is responsible for the contradiction between the polls and Vick's claim? It would seem that the contradiction lies in who Vick interviewed. While the Israeli Democracy Institute and Tel Aviv University's poll consisted of a representative sample of the Israeli population, Vick interviewed two young Israelis in their early 20s on the beach as they were sunbathing and drinking beer. Behavioral researchers refer to this as biased sampling for a variety of reasons, including the small number.

A comparable example would be *Tonight Show* host Jay Leno asking American teenagers to name the four people etched on Mount Rushmore. Most surveyed could not answer the question; however, those same people easily identified four cast members on MTV's reality TV show *Jersey Shore*. Based on Leno's interview, should we assess all Americans as ignorant fools? If your answer is no, then why should Israel's desire for peace be based on two young Israeli beachgoers? To Vick's credit, the full print article did interview Israeli academics and politicians, most of whom indicated that they did indeed want peace. However, they also said that after many previously failed peace talks, the chance

for its success is unlikely and they therefore occupy themselves with day-to-day concerns, such as the unemployment rate.

This leads me to my second point. According to a 2010 Pew Research poll, the majority of Americans rated the economy as their main concern, with jobs being second and fighting terrorism in the U.S. third. Support for the military abroad came in tenth and fighting crime came in thirteenth. Based on this poll, is it correct to presume that Americans don't care about the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan? Or that Americans could care less if criminals run wild, as long as the economy does well? The answer is clearly no. Why, then, would Israeli concern for the economy reflect a stance against peace? Simply put, it doesn't. Vick is holding Israel to a higher standard than other countries are held to and is demonizing its citizens as uncaring and money-hungry.

Recognizing Modern Anti-Semitism

The picture painted of Israelis in Vick's cover article supports the research conducted on modern anti-Semitism—when one holds Israel to standards of behavior to which other countries are not held (a double standard), interprets things Israel does as manifestations of evil (demonization), and attempts to delegitimize the state of Israel (especially with a goal of eliminating it altogether)—that is anti-Semitism. It is important to note that the “3-D Test” in itself suggests that not all opposition to Israel is anti-Semitism. One can oppose particular Israeli policies or practices without being anti-Semitic, just as one can oppose American, British, or Saudi policies without being prejudiced against Americans, Europeans or Arabs. This recognition, along with the awareness that existential concerns contribute to the rise in anti-Semitism, may aid in reducing a cycle that contributes to anti-Semitism. As people recognize that anti-Semitism is, in part, a defense aimed at existential anxieties which bombard our senses on the nightly news, they may find other means to

assuage their terror and protect against it.

Florette Cohen, PhD, earned her terminal degree from the Social Psychology program at Rutgers University—New Brunswick in 2008. Dr. Cohen is the recipient of several research and teaching awards, including an Executive Women of New Jersey Graduate Merit Award and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) Grants-In-Aid Dissertation Research Award. She is currently an assistant professor at the College of Staten Island of CUNY and may be reached at florette.cohen@csi.CUNY.edu.



Free Associations on Anti-Semitism, Israel, and Objectivity

Jamshid A. Marvasti—Psychiatric Practice

The causes of anti-Semitism are frequently a focus of studies, but it is also important to examine the reactions of those who are targets of anti-Semitism. What happens psychologically to those who are the target of hate? Do victims of trauma/hate develop a sense of entitlement, privilege, defensiveness, over-protectiveness, paranoia, and obsession with cumulative trauma? Do victims contribute to their victimization? Or, do they identify with their aggressors and eventually become offenders? Does the historical evidence support these psychological reactions of victims?

I focus on anti-Semitism, which is actually about hate, but I also explore the issue of love, of being in total love with Israel, which may mitigate objectivity.

Shortcomings in Psychoanalytic Explorations

Psychoanalytic literature reveals a number of theories about the causes of anti-Semitism. However, none of them are *scientifically confirmed* or sufficiently helpful to under-

standing and overcoming it. The problems with identifying causes of these psychological phenomena can be traced to a few shortcomings:

1) The element of objectivity (or lack thereof). This problem is caused by many writers' strong feelings, pro or con, about the subject, based mainly on their heritage.

2) Writers relying heavily on psychoanalytic principles of individual behavior, and using the same principles for group psychology, which may not be appropriate.

3) The lack of delineation between "search" and "research," which are not the same. For example, if a researcher has the sense that anti-Semitism is the result of jealousy, projection, and scapegoating, he may find them in his research if he purposefully searches for them. On the contrary, if one has an impression that the behavior of a group has contributed to negative feelings toward them, he may also confirm that in his research if he searches for it.

4) The psychoanalytic literature about anti-Semitism indicates complex multi-factorial elements contributing to its development.

My impression is that there may also be a very simple explanation for anti-Semitism in some people: parental suggestion. Children listen to their parents and develop a negative feeling toward a group by following their parents' examples. In Iran, many parents have told their children to avoid Gypsies because the nomads may steal them. Therefore, even though many Iranian children have never met a Gypsy, they may still develop anti-Gypsy-ism.

Israel as a Psychological Symbol

Israel, as the heart of Jewish culture, psychologically represents a culture that has been victimized for centuries. Israel also represents a symbolic entity for compensation of past abuse and displacement. Pro-Israel behavior could be interpreted as a defense mechanism against years of humilia-

tion, persecution, and racism, since Israel symbolically represents the realization of a dream of the slaves in the Egyptian Empire, of wandering Jews throughout Europe, and of those who survived the Holocaust.

Israel offers Jews the realization of visions of attaining long-held personal and cultural goals. It has been perceived to be a medication to soothe collective pain because its very existence reverses centuries of trauma and indignities. Such idealized visions, though, remain sacred and free from sin or deficiencies.

For those who say that they are in love with Israel, there is no place left for discrepancy, as love is blind. However, there are those who were in love with Israel but then got “married” to Israel and changed their minds. As the popular phrase goes, “Love is blind, but marriage is an eye opener.” In this sense, those who are married to Israel have open eyes, and like at the end of the honeymoon phase, one must deal with the reality rather than with an idealized vision of the perfect partner. Unfortunately, many individuals claim that opposing Israel’s government is “de-legitimizing” it, and that all must stand with Israel or be considered anti-Semitic.

The Victim’s Reaction to Victimization

Psychologically, victims of trauma and persecution feel helpless, powerless, and vulnerable. One reaction to such a perception is to reverse and overcome the victimized environment in order to gain a sense of authority over one’s own destiny. In this sense, a group may need to become powerful and fully in control of its environment in order to feel safe. Overemphasis on dominating the region may appear to offer a sense of protection and survival.

Is it also possible that some of the Israeli government’s behavior could be analyzed on the basis of psychological reaction of Jews to a cumulative and collective trauma of victimization/powerlessness/persecution? For

those who view Israel as a pristine state, something beyond mere sanctuary, the very act of criticizing the Israeli government for its anti-Palestinian behavior tends to violate their hopes and fantasies of a perfect society. Israel is thus viewed as a symbolic "mother" figure, inviolable and without shortcomings. Those who are in love with Israel cannot, therefore, see anything wrong because of their blind love for it. Self-defense, survival, and preventing another Holocaust are their justification for many unacceptable actions, including, for example, an alliance with the apartheid regime of South Africa, the routine use of torture on Palestinians in Israeli prisons, recent war crimes in Gaza, and the killing of humanitarians on board a Flotilla aid ship.

The Need for an Enemy

Another cause of anti-Semitism is the idea that every group or nation needs a scapegoat and enemy. Nations can split and project unwanted parts of themselves onto another group who eventually becomes the enemy and scapegoat. In that way, Jews may have been the receptacle for many unwanted characteristics for centuries. Howard Stein linked resurgent anti-Semitism in Eastern European countries to their need for boundaries, self-definition, and national identity. Stein explained that the decay of ethnic identity suppression by communism created an intense search for identity, which required an image of an ethnic enemy who would serve as a reservoir for all of the negated and externalized aspects of the ethnic group. He referred to Vamik Volkan's work on the large group's unconscious need for enemies, explaining that in many instances Jews were designated as the enemy, even in countries like Poland, where there were virtually no more Jews. There are reports that members of nationalist regimes in Eastern European countries felt guilty about the negative aspect of communism and for what their people did to the Jews during the Holocaust. They then ultimately "reversed" this guilt and blamed the Jews for their peoples'

sufferings.

Rejection of Jesus by Jews, Splitting, and Projection

There are psychoanalytic theories derived from the historical allegation that Jews rejected Jesus as a Messiah. Some explain that this rejection was one of the original causes of Christian anti-Semitism. Interestingly, the Prophet Mohammed moved from Mecca to Medina and was initially welcomed by the Jews, but they eventually became disappointed in him because he accepted Jesus as a prophet.

Israeli criminologist Shalomo Shoham attributed anti-Semitism and the Holocaust to the conflict between Germanic and Jewish myths: The Germanic people were aggressive and materialistic while the Jews were self-sacrificing and spiritual. The Jews were ideal victims because they refused to accept Christianity; therefore, their foreignness and powerlessness encouraged demonization and scapegoating.

There are numerous psychological theories of anti-Semitism that limited space does not allow me to delve into and cite. Here I will summarize several without attribution. It could be a projective interpretation by Christian society of its own evils, branding the Jews as scapegoats. To another, the roots of anti-Semitism lay in the unconscious castration fear of the uncircumcised. An envy of alleged Jewish political and sexual superiority, as well as an interpretation of contemporary history as the rise of Jewish influence, was also exemplified in Disraeli's influence over Queen Victoria. It is also speculated that the transition of Christian anti-Semitism ranged from right-wing European fascism to "Islamic leftism." Perhaps anti-Semitic European Catholics conflated the modern "Zionist" with the ancient Jews who reportedly crucified Christ and identified the Palestinian with the suffering Christ on the cross.

The following list summarizes my free associations on the subject and explains three different opinions regarding

anti-Semitism:

1) Anti-Semitism is increasing independent of the action of Israel.

2) Israel's violent behavior and occupation of Palestinian territories is the catalyst for anger toward Israel, and there is not an increase in anti-Semitism.

3) Anti-Israel sentiment is a disguise for anti-Semitism.

In my opinion, all three groups are both right and wrong. This situation reminds me of the story of the four blind men who were touching an elephant and trying to explain what the elephant looked like. All were right yet wrong as they felt only part of the elephant and not the whole animal, because that's what they perceived. The "whole elephant" must include the suffering of tortured Palestinians in Gaza and West Bank, which should remind the world of the Jews' similar past experiences and agonies.

Jamshid A. Marvasti, MD, is a child and adult psychiatrist who has practiced for more than 30 years in the U.S. He is a specialist on psychological trauma, terrorism, and child maltreatment, on which he has published articles and books including Psycho-Political Aspects of Suicide Warriors: Terrorism, and Martyrdom (2008). Currently he is editing the book, Managing War Trauma in Veterans. Dr. Marvasti may be contacted at Manchester Memorial Hospital in Connecticut and at jmarvasti@aol.com.

◇◇◇◇CP◇◇◇◇

"A State within a State": Freud's Disavowal of Anti-Semitism

Jay Geller—Vanderbilt University

Freud undertook his most significant discussion of

the different sources of anti-Semitism in his last completed work, *Moses and Monotheism*. This subject concludes the “Application” chapter in the third essay, in which Freud took the analogical model that he employed in his genetic speculations on the history of the Jewish religion—the temporal schema of trauma (early trauma, defense, latency, outbreak of the neurosis, partial return of the repressed material)—and applied it to the entire history of religion. That genealogical account culminated in the triumph of Christianity and its “true, if rightly interpreted” assertion that the Jews were a deicidal people. Freud then proceeds to suggest other possible reasons—necessarily so, given its “intensity and lasting strength”—for “the popular hatred of Jews” (*Standard Edition* 23:89-90). He begins with the frequently fallacious reproach that the Jews are foreigners and thus subjected to the animosity of a gentile majority toward a Jewish minority in order to maintain social cohesion. Then two other reasons that arise out of the Jews’ particular historical happenstances are proffered: what Freud elsewhere called the “narcissism of minor differences” (*S.E.* 21:114)—in part to refute the accusation that the Jews are extremely or even wholly other than their “hosts”—and the irritation generated by the defiant survival of Jewry in the face of continuous oppression and persecution. Freud then elaborates several “deeper motives.”

The first he finds is the jealousy of the younger sibling toward the older, favored child (as if accepting Jewish claims for chosenness). He then restates a version of his first and perhaps most well known theory: the castration anxiety that is here mnemonically triggered by circumcision. In *Moses*, Freud refers to a “portion [*Stück*] of the primaeval past” (*S.E.* 23:91) rather than a cut-off “piece [*Stück*] of [a Jew’s] penis” (*S.E.* 10:36n1). His final explanation draws upon the mechanism of projection: the resentment generated by the moral demands of Christianity is projected upon their original source in the Jewish religion. “The hatred for Juda-

ism [*Judenhaß*] is at bottom hatred for Christianity [*Christenhaß*]" (S.E. 23:92).

What is perhaps most startling about Freud's application of social psychological and psychoanalytic theories to the phenomenon of anti-Semitism is that he is not employing the new genetic model of trauma that he describes in the preceding "Analogy" chapter. There Freud discusses "the splitting of the ego," a restructuring of both his metapsychology and his theory of the genesis of psychopathology, that he presaged in his 1927 "Fetishism" essay and would begin to further develop in two of his last and never completed works: *The Outline of Psychoanalysis* and the essay "The Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence." In *Moses*, Freud describes a split in the ego that is created by a trauma: his primary example is the primal and paradigmatic trauma of (the threat of) castration. Freud theorized a piece of the psyche (other than either the id or the superego) that emerges with the traumatic encounter and remains coexistent with but inaccessible to the ego (that itself developed out of the reworking and integrating of the other earlier experiences). In contrast to the reality-responsive ego, this psychic fellow traveler obeys the paradoxical logic of reality disavowal and, when possible, substitutes a representation for that disavowed reality. There is neither a compromise nor dialectical relationship between these attitudes, but instead a supplemental one. The products of the latter piece of psyche are acted out, even if resisted, by the former. There are symptoms, restrictions on where the *Ich* will go (barriers against the incorporation of certain memories), and changes in an individual's personality, all of which are independent of our normal everyday, psychic processes by which we adapt ourselves to the demands of the world and of rational thought. Freud writes,

They exhibit a far-reaching independence [and] are insufficiently or not at all influenced by external reality...or its psychical representatives, so that they

may easily come into active opposition to both of them. They are, one might say [*gleichsam*], a *State within a State*...which may succeed in overcoming what is known as the normal party and forcing it into its service. If this happens...the path to a psychosis lies open (*S.E.* 23:76, emphasis added).

Here Freud has analogically characterized neurotic phenomena by one of the foremost anti-Semitic accusations (one initially coined about women by Montesquieu in his *Persian Letters*), namely that the Jews constitute a “State within a State.” By implicitly connecting the Jew with the splitting process, Freud has perhaps shed additional light on his own solutions or non-solutions to the problems of anti-Semitism and of the persistence of the Jews. He has employed a social metaphor to describe an individual process that he will then apply to a social phenomenon. Readers are caught here in a series of perspective shifts. On the one hand, Freud describes actual phenomena (that is, the changes in the neurotic’s psyche), and then he intimates (“one might say”) the fantasy associated with such phenomena: the Jews are not a state within a state, but are represented as such. Moreover, it is not the split-off part that compels the compulsive behavior as it is the defense against the fantasy of Jewish *Zwang*. So Freud represents the psychic structure as *gleichsam* in relation to a phenomenon that is itself a *gleichsam* phenomenon, and this errant and inexact choice make this choice of example all the more interesting.

By making reference to the “State within a State” Freud suggests an extrapolation of splitting phenomena onto the collective level, such that relations between groups may be potentially psychotic (and therefore returns to the problem that, as I argued in *On Freud’s Jewish Body* [2007], was already a primary concern in his much earlier *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*). In the case of the Jewish people, circumcision, the custom that keeps the Jews “apart from the foreign

peoples among whom their wanderings would lead them" (*S.E.* 23:30) is the foremost source for generating such a state of affairs. The reason is not just, as Freud argues, because circumcision is a "symbolic substitute" of castration (*S.E.* 23: 91) and thus motivates Christianity's efforts at disavowal; rather both circumcision and the circumcised embody the disavowal because circumcision is apotropaic. Circumcision both asserts the possibility of castration—the foreskin has been removed—and yet denies it—the *glans* is prominent as in an erection. Consequently, while Freud identifies *Judentum* with the advance in *Geistigkeit* (intellectuality) over sensuality and which therefore is identified with the law of paternity (cf. *S.E.* 23:114, 118) over and against maternity's dependence upon the senses, its paradigmatic sign places that "juridical revolution" (*S.E.* 23:114, cf. 83) in question.

Circumcision calls forth the castration complex, which is the crux of sexual difference. Yet even as circumcision asserts the truth of the threat of castration, it disavows it—the circumcised Jew seems to question sexual difference. The "circumcised" Jew, who like the castrated (phallic) woman is a "State within a State" threatening the "normal party" (*S.E.* 23:76), sets up a chain of disavowals that threaten the disavowal upon which the Central European bourgeois society of Freud's time was founded: that of the necessity of woman (and others) for individual (male) development and social cohesion. Where the series of motives for anti-Semitism that Freud explicitly delineates in *Moses* find their source in earlier psychoanalytic theory that are based in error or illusion and generate neurotic response, his new theory of splitting would find the basis of anti-Semitism in delusion and would result in a psychotic response. Perhaps Freud feared—and as subsequent events almost proved out—that to apply the analogy of the response to trauma as disavowal rather than as deferred action, the source of the fourth of his

theories of anti-Semitism, the remarkable survival of the Jews, would be rendered moot.

Jay Geller, PhD, Associate Professor of Modern Jewish Culture in the Jewish Studies Program at the Divinity School of Vanderbilt University, has also taught at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore colleges and at Princeton, Rutgers, and Wesleyan universities. In 2001 he was the Fulbright/Sigmund Freud Society Visiting Scholar in Psychoanalysis at the Sigmund Freud Museum (Vienna). He co-edited Reading Freud's Reading (1994) and published On Freud's Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions (2007). His The Other Jewish Question: Identifying the Jew and Making Sense of Modernity will appear Spring 2011 from Fordham University Press. Dr. Geller may be contacted at jay.geller@vanderbilt.edu.



Judeophilia and Ambivalence

The Appeal of Orthodox Judaism

Sharon Pace—Marquette University

The Talmud teaches that when God gave the torah at Mt. Sinai, a covenant was made with all Jews—those standing there and those yet to come, because all Jewish souls were present at this moment of revelation (*Shavuot*, 39a). Included among those gathered were the souls of people who would be born in a convert's body. Thus, when converts turn to Judaism, they are only becoming who they truly are—children of Abraham and Sarah, coming home after Sinai. The Sinai covenant, to guard the torah, was the agreement between God and Israel, and remains the key for conversion in the orthodox world today. Those who become Jews agree

to live by the torah's commandments. The ancient teaching of the sages—that converts become who they already were—provides a profound insight into the motivations of Jews who join their new family. But what sustains this motivation in the orthodox Jewish world? Here I offer my observations, as a professor of Hebrew Bible/Judaica, as a convert, as a decades-long member of an orthodox synagogue, and as the mother of two adult daughters who became citizens of Israel, concerning the attractions of Judaism as a meaningful way to understand and live in a purposeful world.

In antiquity, the religious conundrum faced by most was whether to believe in one God or in many gods—one author of a universal morality, or many deities of competing realities—each offering a way to look at the world, for good or evil. In today's age of deep skepticism, the question is, instead, whether to believe in God at all. What, then, is the attraction of this ancient faith in such an age? The initial appeal comes from diverse experiences (Simon Schoon, "Noachides and Converts to Judaism," in J. Bremmer et al., eds., *Cultures of Conversions, Roningen Studies in Cultural Change*, 2006, 124). Spouses may be interested because of their partners, spiritual seekers—dissatisfied with the teachings of their own faith—may find Judaism at the end of an investigative road an attractive, vibrant faith (Stephen C. Lerner, "Choosing Judaism: Issues Relating to Conversion," in Rela M. Geffen, ed., *Celebration and Renewal: Rites of Passage in Judaism*, 1993, 71-89). But what keeps people interested, or why did their initial encounters touch something that took root?

For converts to orthodox Judaism, three pillars undergird prospects for a meaningful life of faith, provide a context to live ethically and morally, and open a warm and welcoming community who mark time with joy and celebration. To summarize: converts are attracted by the Jewish understandings of God, Torah, and Israel. These mainstays be-

come a foundation to mapping one's life experiences of reality, to construct meaning and purpose, and to connect with God.

One, a Transcendent Reality

Despite the presence of a world infused with suffering, Judaism believes that God created it as an ordered, meaningful place. The shattered condition of the world calls out for humanity to work as partners with the Almighty to infuse the world with godliness. Defying the philosophies of modernity which hold that existence precedes essence or that suffering is beyond the purview of God, Judaism boldly declares that everything has a purpose—even those things we cannot possibly fathom. It proclaims that God guides and judges the world with justice and mercy and includes in its teachings infinite narratives of Jews (native-born and converts) who nullified their own will for a greater good (Lerner, 74). With such ideals and models, Jews are given guideposts to navigate experiences and choices in everyday life. The Jewish conception of God allows its people to see the everyday acts of waking, seeing, eating, and loving as expressions of blessing. It allows one to have hope that even the brokenness of the world can be used by God, who has a plan that lies beyond human capacity for discernment.

How does one know about this God? Judaism accepts that not all reality is empirically verifiable. Revelation exists—the quintessential event being the revelation at Sinai that occurred upon the Redemption from Egypt. This first redemption becomes paradigmatic not only for the history of the Jewish experience but also touches each individual personally. In every generation there are tyrants, crushers of human freedom, threats to existence itself. Yet, Judaism's narrative asserts that God has structured a universe so that, ultimately, evil will not prevail. And even in times of prosperity and freedom, there can be a myriad of experiences that keep an individual from God—loss, suffering, sadness, angst.

Jewish teaching insists that this person, too, can be brought out of a personal state of slavery.

Judaism does not keep these paradigms of hope and meaning in the abstract. Rather, Sinai is not only about leaving slavery behind, it gives a specific path to Jews that continues even now. How deeply one becomes immersed in the tradition becomes both choice and devotion. The offerings of the Jewish community reflect this commitment to lifetime learning. From the nursery school to the yeshiva, from synagogue classes to sessions held in congregants' homes, from individual instruction by the rabbis to out-of-town retreats, there are dozens of choices to give structure to the Jewish journey.

Two, Torah: Instruction, Teaching, Commandments

With the teachings and commandments given at Sinai, former slaves entered a new land with a new purpose: to have every aspect of life infused with ethics and righteousness—in short, with holiness. To be holy means to be set aside, designated for a special purpose. Every aspect of life—eating and drinking, relationships with family and institutions, business, agriculture, government and education, treatment of the poor and the stranger—were governed by the teachings at Sinai. All were from Moses and ultimately from God. Thus nothing could be subsumed; nothing outside its pale justified. For Jews today, this same way of looking at life is infused in everyday experience. A day opens with prayers to remind one of what is good, to see with what one is blessed. Helping the poor is not optional—giving charity every day is required. Daily life has opportunities that one can be a blessing for others in one's work and relationships. Such acts of kindness are not arbitrary or capricious, for they are part of God's own plan.

Three, the Community of Israel

All of these ideals do not merely live in books or in

teachings. They are manifested, daily and concretely, in the warm, vibrant communities of Jews who mark time by the Jewish calendar. Every Shabbat, the community comes together to read the torah, to pray, to eat a meal together, to enjoy each other's company, and to see their children play together. Sacred times and seasons, in addition, infuse a consciousness of God and love for the community. Everyone has a chance for a new start at Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. The holiday of Sukkot marks the Almighty's protective care, where everyone, no matter wealthy or poor, eats, prays, and celebrates in a simple structure—a *sukkah* (an unadorned hut). People with the means and wherewithal for preparing meals and entertaining seek out those with nowhere to go. Hanukkah lights up the winter doldrums with sparks of spiritual insight and with happy children. Purim sends a reminder that miracles can occur in any age, and Passover brings back the community's roots to Sinai, back to the defining moment of being a Jew. Besides the religious calendar, all of life's joys and sorrows are guided by Jewish instruction and customs. Every baby is welcomed by the community, as is every child's Bar and Bat Mitzvah and wedding. Those gathered say "*mazel tov*" to one another—not only to the one feted—because each milestone is for all Israel. And at the times of sorrow, a *minyan* will be gathered to pray, and congregants will be present for *shiva*.

My observations paint an ideal. But for all their idealism, they are also real. As I look around my congregation every week, I find the enthusiastic students who hear the torah portion, the mothers of disabled children who believe that God has a role for their precious ones, the failed business owners and unemployed who find courage not to give up, and the Russian immigrants who are grateful for every success. I see the healthy and accomplished, as well as the chronically ill or beleaguered, thank God, do a *mitzvah*, support their schools and camps, sign up for a class. I know per-

son after person who will offer a meal; watch a child; reach out in friendship, counsel, and support; extend a handkerchief; write a check. I share the enthusiasm of the young adults, adventurous and committed, who prepare to make *ali-yah*, becoming citizens of Israel under the Law of Return. At the *sukkah* party, born-Jews and converts all lift their glasses and say, “*l’chaim*,”—to life! The ideals of Sinai continue in that humble room called my *shul*, in the warmth of congregants’ homes, in the offices and classrooms of my rabbis, in my daughters’ vibrant Israeli apartment, and in the very way Jews see the world. For the convert whose soul was at Sinai, home can be a precious place indeed.

Sharon Pace, PhD, earned her doctoral degree at the University of Notre Dame in 1985 and specializes in the study of the Hebrew Bible. She is the author of various articles and books including The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12 (1988) and The Women of Genesis: From Sarah to Potiphar’s Wife (1990). She wrote the Biblical commentary for Women’s Stories (1993) and a recent commentary on Daniel (2008). Dr. Pace is associate professor in the Department of Theology at Marquette University in Milwaukee and may be contacted at sharon.pace@marquette.edu.



Until the Last Anti-Semite Dies: Dilemmas of an Agnostic, Ethnic Jew

Paul H. Elovitz—Clio's Psyche

At ages 12 and 13, when most Jewish boys are preparing to and becoming a Bar Mitzvah as a step toward manhood, my resolution to the issue of my Jewish identity was to determine that I would be a Jew until the last anti-Semite died. Below I will describe this identity struggle, my subse-

quent Jewish identity, and provide some analysis of it.

Jewishness Defined by Anti-Semites

The bullies at school demanded, “What are you?” Nervously, I responded, “An American.” This answer never satisfied them, so they demanded, “Where’re your parents from?” My response, “Poland and the Ukraine,” were equally unsatisfying. The next question was, “Do you go to church? What’s your religion?” With a sigh, I would respond, “I am, uh, a Jew, uh, Jewish.” Although this was far from an every day occurrence, and the physical abuse involved was usually only some pushing and shoving, the psychic pain inflicted on me, a bookish Jewish kid in a tough neighborhood of an industrial city, was considerable.

“Am I even Jewish?” I thought. “Don’t Jews go to synagogue and believe in God?” My father was a vocal atheist and my mother, from a family of outspoken Communist atheists in far-off Minnesota, told me she didn’t know if there was a god. Both my parents were quite aware of the ethnicity and religion of people they and their children associated with. If I mentioned a girl my father would ask, “Is she Jewish? A *shiksa*?” People who came into their little store were spoken to in Yiddish, Russian, Polish, and English and subsequently were categorized in terms of ethnicity or religion. In school, the teachers said everyone was equal regardless of ethnic background or religion, except Miss McCourt, who favored those sharing her Irish heritage and never missed a chance to denigrate Italy and Italian kids in a school comprised primarily of the children of recent Italian immigrants. She treated me very well because I loved the history she was teaching and she was a customer of my father. However, I disliked her for her anti-Italian prejudices since I embraced the ideal of equality.

On the Jewish High Holidays my non-believing parents dropped me off at *shul* (synagogue), “out of respect” for

my grandma (Bubbi), but this confused me. The only adult male Elovitzs who went to *shul* were my grandfather (Pa), who nobody in the family liked, and my Uncle Louie, who read the sports section of the local paper rather than the Torah reading. Pa prayed in Hebrew, a language I knew not at all, and most conversations were in Yiddish, which my parents discouraged me from knowing. I could not even sit with my sister since girls and women were separated from males—in fact, few attended.

In the Elovitz family the Bar/Bat Mitzvah equivalent was when my brother, sister, and then I refused to go to *shul*. Wonderful “old country” holiday food at Bubbi’s house was devoured with or without attending services. While we waited for the delicious food on Passover, Pa read endlessly in English from the Bible about God slaughtering the enemies of Israel. Pa slurred his words as he droned on, having drunk too much of his homemade Passover wine. God’s bloody retribution against those who rejected him and his chosen people by killing disgusted me, since my mother taught me people should not kill. I was riveted by my father’s contempt for his father and the religion a Chassidic rabbi had tried to beat into him as a boy in Poland. He always insisted that he only attended these holiday rituals for his beloved mother.

Even at school I could not get away from religion. Weekly denominational religious training, usually at a religious institution near Webster School, was part of the life of almost all the kids, but not mine. My parents refused to sign the standard permission slip allowing children to attend, declaring this practice a violation of the Constitution’s separation of church and state. Consequently, while the other kids happily got out of school one afternoon a week, I joined a small group being read at from the Old Testament by a hated and feared teacher. Anything that brought attention to religion at school made me nervous and, like most kids, I hated to

be separated from those in my class. It only made matters worse when my atheist parents had the family stay home on the major Jewish holidays since it did not “look good” to Christians if they did not appear religious.

If only I could be a fearless, fighting Jew like the Israelis or my father during war and revolution in Poland! When two anti-Semites mocked the trembling concentration camp-surviving proprietors of the candy store across the street, declaring that Hitler had not killed enough Jews, my father physically defended the terrified couple. Subsequently, Dad boasted that the judge punished the bullies and refused to charge him with disorderly conduct because of the righteousness of his cause. This frightened couple afterward looked at my average-sized father as if he were ten feet tall, which was how I viewed him throughout my childhood.

Dad said, “Fight the bullies! You just have to bloody them and they will find someone else to pick on.” He told me to raise my arms and make fists, as he punched the air with the authority of the legendary Joe Lewis. But I had a terrible sinking feeling inside me, and he walked away complaining that Mom had babied me because she didn’t want me fighting.

Aside from worrying about the restrictions on the number of Jews the Ivy League colleges I was applying to would accept, I do not remember knowingly facing any anti-Semitism in high school. In the U.S. Army I did run into a quite physically abusive soldier from Alabama, but as an adult I have not otherwise faced overt anti-Semitism.

Reflections on My Struggle with a Jewish Identity

From the perspective of having been analyzed, analyzed others, written about my early experiences, and taught courses on childhood, I see things differently than I did when I let those who hated and feared Jews define my Jewishness. As an adult, I am a proud Jew who identifies strongly with

my people as having achieved much despite being only about 15 million people in a world of almost seven billion.

Reflecting back on my temporary decision to be Jewish only “until the last anti-Semite died,” I smile. My early adolescent crisis focused on my confusion as to what constituted a Jew and my reluctance to physically fight. Although I idealized my father throughout my childhood, wanting to be a courageous human being and Jew, I much more strongly identified with my mother and her values. She raised me as a secular Yeshiva *bochur* (a Jewish scholar of the torah with minimal practical knowledge of the world); consequently, I felt impotent at times in the face of Gentile aggression. As a prematurely born youngest child, who had also been extremely close to death at age five, she sheltered me and rightfully feared the dangerous neighborhood where we lived. When as a small, sleepless boy I was terrified by the noise of the rats running on the metal ceilings over my bed (as well as our flat being burglarized and my sister sexually abused, which I would not “know” about), she would soothe me with images of “a world with a fence around it,” which she said she would make for me. In retrospect, I realize she was translating her Communist family’s dream of a perfect society into an understandable image for her frightened child, awakened from nightmares confused as to what was reality and what was nightmare.

Mom was an autodidact who only had a few years of night school in America and worked to imprint on her youngest child her dream of pursuing education and ultimately becoming a professor. Although I loved the education part of school, I dreamt of an adventurous life like that of my father. Seeking to please him, I decided I would become a physician until I became openly rebellious in my sophomore year of college.

Rebelling was a way of asserting myself and of indi-

viduating from my family, although it came at a high price of guilt since amidst it my mother ultimately lost her four-year battle with cancer. Serving overseas in the army as a draftee was an important developmental experience for me, since I needed to break loose from the cocoon, the emotional hot-box, of my family. Counterdependency was a vital issue for me and, I would later realize, my father. As an adult I take great delight in both my scholarship and being a practical man who could single handedly build an apartment—my tool collection still gives me great joy. I have stood up to fight bullies, most readily while defending other peoples' rights. My book chapter, "Family Secrets and Lies My Parents Told Me: The Impact of Immigrants on Their Son," covers many aspects of my relationship with my parents.

My rebelliousness had little to do with my Jewishness because by the time I went on to college, although I feared anti-Semitism and had some ambivalence about identifying myself as a Jew, I became quite proud of being Jewish. Being a Jew meant holding up high ideals involving consideration for others, education, enterprise, thoughtfulness, toleration, and survivorship. It did not require believing in God, going to synagogue, being a Bar Mitzvah, or speaking Hebrew or Yiddish. It required brains far more than brawn.

As a result of my Jewish identification, I married a Jew, although my second wife is a nonobservant Roman Catholic, and our grandchildren on reaching age 13 have become Bar or Bat Mitzvahs.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is editor of this publication.

We Welcome Work-In-Progress
Seminar Paper Proposals

My “Great World” Among the *Goyim*

Wallace Katz—SUNY-Stony Brook

I grew up during World War II and the immediate postwar era in Jersey City. As the first male child in my entire extended family, I was especially beloved by my maternal grandparents, who lived in the Bronx. Every Saturday, my father, an illiterate immigrant who came to the United States from the Ukraine in 1919, drove me, my mother, and my sister to the Bronx. As a teenager still living in Jersey City, the trip was sufficient for me to understand that the world was larger than what I knew.

I longed for Saturdays and these trips that brought me in touch with what I identified—via New York—as the “great world.” The Bronx itself had the mysterious subway, the Yankees, the Zoo, the Botanical Garden, and, near my grandma’s neighborhood, Crotona Park. With the help of an uncle I also discovered Coney Island, Orchard Beach, Radio City Music Hall, Rockefeller Center, “Broadway,” and the Grand Concourse. With the help of an aunt and another uncle, a pharmacist who became a millionaire by getting into medical supply when Medicare began, I discovered politics. Both were card-carrying Communists, and they and my grandfather, a social democrat from Galicia and a fine craftsman, helped me understand Trotsky’s famous remark, “You may not be interested in politics, but politics is interested in you.” All these early influences were Jewish as was the neighborhood. But there was a big difference between Jews who lived in the great world and Jews who were parochial, paranoid, and provincial—though I would have hardly used these terms when I was five years old.

My father and mother, though for very different reasons, were non-observant parochial, paranoid, and provincial Jews. My mother was rather overprotective. Because of the

Great Depression she had to abort a child who would have been my older brother; her guilt when I was born, prematurely, accounted for her tendency to overprotect me and worry constantly that I would die, but this was not the whole matter. For reasons that I still don't quite understand, she was also quite afraid of life—she feared dogs, thunder, all other animals, and, to a certain extent, the entire male part of the species. She was blunt to the point of having no Freudian censor. My father was a gentle, sweet, hard-working, and decent man, but his “greenhorn” status and his refusal to learn how to read and write anything (not Russian, not Yiddish, not English) defined his existence in a negative way.

To put it simply, my parents were both afraid of what I called the great world—my mother out of what I think was a problem of female status in a world of early 20th century male dominance and my father because of the experiences of immigration, hardship, and illiteracy. As a bright, even precocious, child, I was quick to see that my parents' fears were not a good model for my behavior. This was especially true to the extent that their fears were rooted in being Jewish. I did not want to go through life fearing *the goyim*, the Gentiles, the others. Quite the contrary, I wanted to befriend these people; I wanted to learn from them, enjoy life with them, and love them as brothers and sisters, as part of the family that I still believe is America. By the time I started at Columbia University in 1955, I had at least begun what my parents never even started: confronting modernity.

Columbia gave me all the useful, appropriate tools for my struggle and it gave me new role models of how to make the leap from my father's *shtetl* (100 miles from Kiev) to the great world not merely of New York, but of Paris, Berlin, Nashville, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Los Angeles, and all points in between. At Columbia I had plenty of male role models to make up for my father's lack in this regard, as well as my mother's animosity toward men. These

included Lionel Trilling, Fritz Stern, Steven Marcus, Rudy Binion, and Meyer Schapiro—all Jews, some of humble background, but all men who helped me to see and feel that I was made for the great world.

But Columbia also introduced me and allowed me to feel at home with *them*, the *goyim*; indeed Columbia did what I wanted it to do—it made me love them. First, there were the dead *goyim*: Homer, Vergil, Plato, Aristotle, and Dante, all the weft and warp of Western culture that had little or nothing to do with Jews, but was intrinsically worthwhile. Then there were some *goyim*, who were very much alive, loving, encouraging, rooting for me, and teaching me: an English economist (whose name slips my mind) who wrote my parents to tell them that it was all right for me to become a professor and that in my first year in college I “showed remarkable promise”; C. Wright Mills, Richard Morse, and this tall, elegant, amazingly erudite, charming, and powerful man, Jacques Barzun, now 103 and living in San Antonio, with whom I wrote my doctoral dissertation.

Although one of my oldest friends, Marshall Berman, has often questioned whether I am ashamed of my Jewish heritage and hinted or explicitly remarked that I am running away from my Jewishness, after careful consideration I know that he is wrong. In *Anti-Semite and Jew*, Sartre says that at times, “Jews make the best anti-Semites.” This can certainly be true, but I suspect—when Jews can become the president of Dupont and Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, and Wesleyan—that there is hardly any reason for Jewish anti-Semitism. Moreover, if I want to make use of Sartre to describe or understand myself, I would speak about my journey from my nuclear family to where I am now as a “project.” In *Search For a Method*, Sartre makes the project a bit too individual (we create and recreate the world together), but he is dead right when he argues that it is our duty and nature to create something new out of what we are given and that it is

always a “project,” partaking surely of the given, but also, sometimes dramatically, “against the given.”

My project in this world has been to live and love the *goyim*: I taught at Wesleyan, where not all my colleagues understood or appreciated my somewhat emotional Jewish temperament, but the quality of the students made up for everything. I lived in Europe for three years and occasionally experienced something of the pre-war or inter-war anti-Semitism. In Paris, an aristocratic landlady called me “*un Juif*” because my trunks, readied for the S.S. France and full of books, might damage her 17th century staircase classified as a “monument historique,” and in Geneva, I ran into a German-Swiss lady who wouldn’t rent me a room because “it was already rented,” but then called the lady who I was renting a room from to say, “How dare you send a Jew to look at my room.”

Other than these two experiences, I personally know nothing about anti-Semitism, and I do not feel my personal life is affected by it, either. I married a blond, blue-eyed knockout of a woman and our relationship lasted for 25 years. We grew apart and ultimately divorced, but never once did I think that our breakup had anything to do with anti-Semitism. While she was a *shiksa*, our divorce was not about her being Gentile and my being Jewish. Some of my best friends are German and I drive a 2001 Volkswagen Golf with a ski rack—the best and most reliable car I have ever owned. I care a good deal more about the fate of Palestinian Arabs than I do about the Israelis who terrorize them, but I don’t want Israel to disappear from the face of the earth. My best work experience came when I was in Washington, D.C. and I worked for an old line elitist WASP, Robert C. Embry Jr., implementing a program that was the catalyst revitalizing the downtowns of many American cities. I care profoundly about improving American cities.

To live my own life, I had to deny my parents' provincial, paranoid fear of *the goyim*. The dynamic I described has in some ways defined my life, but as I grow older—I'm 73—I feel even more strongly that I have had a productive, worthwhile, and interesting life. My hegira away from the *shtetl* to modernity brings to mind that of others, such as Barack Obama's journey to the presidency.

Wallace Katz is currently Associate Editor of Global-ity Studies Journal and both a Visiting Scholar and Fellow of the Center for Global and Local History at SUNY-Stony Brook. He has taught history, humanities, and sociology at CUNY, Wesleyan University, and the University of the South, and worked in Washington D.C. for 20 years, mostly in the sphere of urban policy. He may be contacted at wallace.katz973@gmail.com.



A Child of Holocaust Survivors Meets the Children of Nazi Perpetrators

Ruth Neubauer—Private Practice

The Conference, Its History and Format

At the 2003 meetings of the American Psychoanalytic Society in New York City, I learned of an unusual gathering in Cyprus entitled, "Shaping the Future by Confronting the Past—Germans, Jews and Affected Others." Immediately I knew I would attend this 2004 conference—both my parents escaped Nazi Germany and arrived in New York in the 1930s.

The conference was organized by a group of far-sighted Israeli and German psychoanalysts and psychotherapists, in cooperation with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, utilizing the Tavistock interaction model adapted

for this situation. The goal was to address the consequences of the Holocaust and apply any lessons learned to society. With much apprehension I flew to the conference in Cyprus knowing neither the Tavistock process nor any other participant.

Identity and Language

At the week-long meeting there was a curious undercurrent of a “special relationship” between Germans and Jews, mostly Israelis, forged by having been involved—with different roles—in the terrible chain of events taking place between 1933 and 1945. The “specialness” included a fascination with this history and an inability to mourn its disastrous effects, yet a desire to deal with the implications of its continuing shadowy presence. The conference reflected the gradual breakdown of the minimal contact between these groups and silence about these issues.

“Where would you like to begin?” was the question that began the first large-group meeting. A distressed German Jew complained that he wanted to be identified as a Jew, not a German nor an Israeli. Thus began interminable, daily, wide-ranging discussions of identity: individual, group, multiple, and national.

My mind wandered to the mixed feelings I have regarding the German language. My father loved the language and spoke it, my mother hated it and was ambivalent about speaking it, and I take pride in being bilingual. As a first-generation American born of German-Jewish parents, I understand German but not Hebrew and wondered: am I an American Jew or German Jew?

At the first night’s dinner I heard about the Nazi expulsion of Jewish analysts from German psychoanalytic societies, causing wounds that have not healed. My German table-mate told me how a close psychoanalyst friend of hers in Berlin responded to the invitation to attend this conference:

“If you were Jewish, you would never have asked me that question!” Since I was confused by his utterance, she relayed the rest of his response: “You just don’t understand. Me! Going to a conference of Germans and Jews! Speaking honestly about the past! Identifying myself broadly as a German Jewish analyst! With all those Germans there! And then coming back to Germany!” For him, clearly, this seemed impossible.

Issues of Betrayal

One of the German women in our small mixed group of Germans, Israelis, and me, wept helplessly as she spoke of her mother, who “made a career of being a Nazi by being a musician for them.” Her relentless tears focused my thoughts on our shared feelings of anger, guilt, helplessness, and betrayal regarding our pasts, our parents, and those who either killed or were killed.

As one member of our group spoke of “unfinished mourning,” another suggested that perhaps it’s not about mourning but rather “murder without reparation.” I wondered if all murder is that; there is never reparation for the murdered although mourning must occur. Psychoanalytically speaking, we know we must mourn in order to lessen the splitting within the psyche—what Tavistock colleagues named “the all-or-nothing” psychic position. If we don’t, won’t, or can’t mourn, we get stuck in the all-good-or-all-bad nothing-in-between position. To heal we must grieve as we relinquish our fantasies of perfection and accept ambiguity and imperfection. At that point, growth occurs and acceptance is achieved.

So, there I was agreeing with another teary-eyed German woman whose parents were in the SS. She wept with frustration that she could get no answers from her parents or extended family about what had happened. She spent her life asking, “What were you doing back then?” Talking together

is considerably better than sitting in the conspiracy of silence that reigned for so long, impacting us, the innocent inheritors of the Holocaust. I felt close to this stranger, but I couldn't even come close to crying, although three of the German women in our group cried.

Instead, I thought of my father's 32 relatives who died in concentration camps, remembering my parents' warning that latent anti-Semitism is always present, everywhere. We Jews are the "Others" through so much of history. I began to feel my identification with my German cohort at the conference was a betrayal of my own history, including my ancestors, my uncle and aunt who fled their burning house in the middle of the night with two young children. Was I betraying the memory of the Jews of my father's village in Bohemia (currently the Czech Republic)? They are all gone, and its Jewish cemetery is hidden from view behind bushes, off the main road.

Pain and Suffering, Longing and Belonging

Extensive talk of "violence," "murderousness," and "pain" occurred during the week. There was also a yearning to belong, stemming from fragmentation and detachment. It appeared that Germans felt guilty while Jews felt amputated from their past. What else, we asked, might be missing here?

In the end there was universal hostility, confusion, and pain. I listened to the Germans cry about not being able to talk to their parents and carrying the confusing burden of simply being born German—wishing to deny their own national identity. That is pain, and whether it is Jewish pain or German pain, pain is pain.

I found myself confused, particularly about my allegiance to the Germans' suffering through my familiarity with their language and my uncertain identity with the Israelis who have always been an important part of my personal Jewish history. I also felt some new possibilities in this emo-

tional turmoil. Perhaps I, and others like me, might be able to function as intermediaries in the division between Israelis and Germans trying so hard to speak to each other. Could we offer the possibility of an alternative to find a way out of the dichotomy of German or Israeli?

The groups defined at this gathering were deeply entrenched, though the participants had the remarkable courage to face this human dilemma and explore ways to overcome it. It is still so difficult for Germans and Israelis to dialogue. The fears emanating from history are so ingrained in members of each group. Universally, they are attached to the fears of the unknown, fears of change, and fears of being betrayed or becoming the betrayer.

Strange Connections

At the end of the emotionally exhausting week, my mother called from New York. I risked sharing with her my surprising experience of identifying with the pain of the second-generation Germans suffering with the silence of their parents and their confusion about their own identity and history. I hoped my mother could understand, recognizing that I was asking a lot of her. In Nazi Germany her life had closed in on her. For example, Jews could no longer go to the movies, an image I could grasp even as a child. To survive she had to get on a boat alone and afraid, and leave her home in Frankfurt in 1936 at 22 years of age to come to America. She listened intently on the phone and surprised me by saying she understood. She understood despite losing uncles, aunts, cousins, and friends to torture and death. It was a moment of deep connection for the two of us.

As an American Jew remembering my parents' gratitude and love of America, I am still the child of refugees who feels the need to bridge the culture, history, and life of the past while melding gracefully into the present. Prior to my week in Cyprus, I never knew or considered the ongoing suf-

fering of the children of perpetrators. This was a new and profound reminder that coming together and sitting face-to-face can elicit compassion and understanding. In this case, even for those associated with anti-Semitism and the Holocaust itself.

Ruth Neubauer, MSW, is a clinician in private practice in Denver, working with adults, couples, and groups. She is also co-founder of a program of workshops, support, and consultations for women over 50 making transitions in life. She remains on the faculty of the Washington School of Psychiatry and teaches courses on psychoanalytic concepts to the general public at Denver University's Osher Lifelong Learning Institute. Ms. Neubauer is a musician, published poet, and photographer who may be contacted at ruth-neubr@aol.com. □

Follow-up to the Binion Reliving Trauma Symposium

Reliving Trauma Unawares: The Clinical Clincher

Rudolph Binion—Brandeis University

My *Traumatic Reliving in History, Literature, and Film* (London: Karnac, 2010) describes a widespread normal pattern of re-enacting trauma unconsciously in those three fields. It cites no clinical material apart from a single case of traumatic reliving in a trance called “somnambolic” recorded by Pierre Janet. Since completing this work I have explored Janet’s further examples of traumatic reliving drawn from his decades of practice at the Salpêtrière in Paris and scattered about in his lectures and writings on philosophy and psychol-

ogy. What I have found is a distinctive pathological pattern of traumatic reliving that departs radically from the normal pattern only to clinch it in the final analysis.

The normal pattern is simple: an individual or group re-enacts a traumatic experience in disguise and unawares. As for the pathological pattern, here is how Janet evoked it at the Collège de France on February 18, 1929, when discussing trance behavior in general:

One-track trance episodes [*les somnambulismes monoïdéiques*] are innumerable. I could find hundreds of them straight off in my notes. They are full to the brim with an event that for some reason or other made a lasting impression on the subject. One may react to such an event in different ways. In some cases one may react by copying it, by trying to replay it, to get it going again. In earlier lessons I told you the funny story of the woman who sees a lioness on an outing and then starts playing the lioness, becomes a lioness herself. At times a subject will speak about the event, wonder what he should have done, discuss how to handle it. At other times on the contrary one is emotionally in its grip.

There are trances that repeat such an emotion-charged moment—a fear of something such as that fear of the lion, a fear of fire, of meeting up with a drunk or with an epileptic having a fit, with a dog, or the like.

Here's a curious instance. A youngster sees an epileptic having a fit in the street. He rushes to the sick man's help. The man doesn't understand, fights with the boy, and bites his hand. Our youngster remains absolutely obsessed: 'How I'm being abused. I want to help

and I get bitten for my pains.' So he begins throwing such fits himself in which he tries to bite everyone he encounters.

A girl I've observed closely was arrested in the Bois de Boulogne for improper conduct and taken to the police station. This incident upset her. She has had a single fixed idea ever since: to disguise herself, not to be recognized, to paint her face so that the patrolmen don't recognize her. She is replaying the scene in the Bois de Boulogne. [*L'évolution psychologique de la personnalité* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2005), 264-65--from one listener's transcription.]

Janet's examples elsewhere include notably a young woman who would go into a trance to mime her mother's traumatic death in her care [*Les névroses* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2008), 6-8, 40, *Les médications psychologiques* (Paris: Flammarion, 1919), II 93, 269-75, III, 97-102, *L'état mental des hystériques*, 2nd edition (Paris: Alcan, 1911), 507-44, *La psychanalyse de Freud* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2004), 93, *The Chief Symptoms of Hysteria* (New York: Macmillan, 1920), 39-40, *L'évolution de la mémoire et de la notion du temps* (Paris: Chanine, 1928), 205-15] and another young woman who would call out in a trance to a workman who had rescued her from a fire [*Les névroses*, 41-42. Further: *Premiers crits psychologiques* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2005,) 87-112; *L'automatisme psychologique* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2005), 436-40; *Les médications* II, 205-06, 210, *La psychanalyse*, 51-52, 70, 71, and *L'état*, 72-73; *ibid.*, 194, and *La psychanalyse*, 77; "L'amnésie continue," *Revue générale des sciences* 4 (1893), 169-79, *La psychanalyse*, 53, and *Les médications*, 206-07; *La psychanalyse*, 53-54, 68, and *Les médications*, 207-08; *ibid.*, 207; and *L'évolution*, 269]. In all such cases the sufferers remembered nothing of their somnambulant episodes afterwards.

It is unclear why Janet's traumatic relivers, as against my historic, literary, and cinematic subjects, relived in amnesiac trances detached from their normal lives. They were not mental patients when they were traumatized; on the contrary, several were quite normal before and, trances aside, afterwards as well, nor did they necessarily come across as abnormal even while reliving. To thicken the plot, the syndrome is evidently *démodé* in contemporary psychiatric practice.

In any event, Janet's cases clinch the impression, conveyed by all the traumatic relivers I have studied historically, that they acted in trance-like obedience to a felt imperative. One such normal historic reliver encroached particularly closely on Janet's pathological model: Adolf Hitler, whose felt mission to relive a two-stage trauma originated in an induced hypnotic spell, who pursued that mission with what he himself called the assurance of a sleepwalker, and who would notoriously work himself up into a trance whenever he expounded his core traumatic themes (Jew, gas, poison, cancer). A trauma may also convey a preternatural empowerment to relive. Just as cripples can walk in a somnambulant trance [*Les névroses*, 4], so could a shallow provincial nobody, duly traumatized and entranced, fanaticize millions.

Janet did not highlight somnambulism, let alone traumatic reliving, in his wide-reaching works. Rather, his somnambulant cases, along with numerous other marginal disorders likewise richly exemplified, served his larger purpose of conceptualizing the personality on its pathological edge. I single out the entranced relivings because they complement, and ultimately corroborate, the pattern of traumatic reliving that I have spotted again and again bedeviling history, haunting literature, and now pervading film. Its significance in the overall scheme of historical causality remains to be defined, nor was I able even to ascertain who, singly or collectively, relives which traumas why. But I hoped at least to have shown *how* that mechanism works, thus giving future theore-

ticians a head start. Now, thanks to Janet, I can sign off definitively on that *how*.

I can do so even though, as against the normal pattern of unconscious reliving, Janet's patients would relive transparently in trance-like episodes subject to total amnesia. Superficially the two patterns contrast. But the Janet pattern of alternance between normalcy and unremembered somnambulic reliving is like a parceling into two of a normal reliving—that is, of normal living with a trauma re-enacted unawares. The two patterns thus reconcile around the equivalence of normal unconscious reliving with trance-like amnesiac reliving. Their one remaining difference is that the two simultaneous components of normal reliving (conscious/unconscious) are consecutive moments in the clinical pattern. But once the equivalence of the clinical amnesiac moment with the normal unconscious component is granted, the fact of normal traumatic reliving is validated beyond dispute, given the transparency of the re-enactments in the clinical mode.

Rudolph Binion, PhD, is the Leff Professor of History at Brandeis University and a member of the editorial board of Clio's Psyche. He has lectured and published widely on European political, demographic, and cultural history from a psychohistorical viewpoint—including his book Hitler Among the Germans. Karnac Press has just released his Traumatic Reliving in History, Literature, and Film. Scholarship aside, his playful Flights of Fancy (Rome: Aracne, 2009) is in its second printing. Prof. Binion may be contacted at binion@brandeis.edu. □

The Online Forum Invites You To Participate

Join the lively psychohistory conversation in the online leg of the Psychohistory Forum! Recent discussions on subjects include: Creativity, Free Will, Health Care, Nationalism, Social Darwinism vs. Political Correctness, and Woody Allen. For information and membership contact Molly Castelloe Fong at msc214@nyu.edu.

Popular Culture

Voyeurism on the Truman Show

Kimberly Mahaffey—Ramapo College

The 1998 hit film *The Truman Show* mocked modern voyeuristic society. In it, Truman Burbank is a man whose entire life is captured by thousands of hidden cameras broadcasting to millions without his knowledge. A year later, *EDtv* portrayed a similar story only in this instance, Ed agreed to have cameras follow him. Are these examples of exaggeration or have audiences really found entertainment in the mundane lives of others? Both *The Truman Show* and *EDtv* are reflections of cultural voyeurism expressed through modern media.

Voyeurism is most commonly thought of as a sexual disorder or deviance. Sigmund Freud described it as occurring “when the pleasure in looking becomes a perversion (a) if restricted exclusively to the genitals, or (b) if it is connected with the overriding of disgust (as in the case of voyeurs or people who look at excretory functions) or (c) if instead of being preparatory to the normal sexual aim, it supplements it” (Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, translated and edited by James Strachey, 1962, 23). The American Psychiatric Association likewise defines voyeurism as a sexual disorder involving the unsuspected observance of sexual activity. Their diagnostic criteria includes a recurring, distressing behavior that is paired with intense sexual arousal, fantasies, or urges.

The sexual nature of voyeurism in modern culture is clear. Websites advertise images of young women and girls caught on camera showering, undressing, or engaging in sexual activity. By simply searching the word “voyeurism,” one

will find an abundance of these sites. One, started in 1997, is www.voyeurweb.com, which displays pictures taken through windows and by hidden cameras in locker rooms. Not just women are subject to this. In 1999, hidden camera tapes of members of the University of Pennsylvania men's wrestling team changing and showering in their locker rooms were sold and displayed as pornography on the Internet.

However, modern media is not always overtly sexual in its voyeuristic nature. *America's Funniest Home Videos* is a perfect example of nonsexual voyeurism and exhibitionist media. The show features amateur recordings of people caught in funny, unsuspecting moments and reveals them to the world. Often the subject is surprised, injured, frightened, or humiliated, and the audience laughs at their expense. It hit number one in national ratings after it premiered in 1990 and ran for nearly a decade after.

These "caught on tape" types of entertainment, have become a part of modern culture. *COPS* allows the audience to seek entertainment through the distress of suspects while they are chased, arrested, and interrogated by law enforcement. Similar "caught on tape" shows include *World's Most Amazing Videos*. Episodes have featured situations like volcanic eruptions, BASE jumping, car crashes, and explosions.

However, modern voyeuristic culture goes beyond these examples. Reality television is a rapidly emerging genre featuring ordinary people or celebrities in situations without scripts. Portrayal of unscripted situations began in 1947 with Allen Funt's *Candid Microphone*, which became *Candid Camera* in 1948 and featured ordinary reactions to pranks. Later, the 1964 series *Seven Up!* aired in the UK and featured seven-year olds of varying demographic backgrounds being questioned on their reactions to daily life. Every seven years following, the same individuals were further documented. While the films featured only structured

interviews, at the time they had the new effect of creating celebrities of ordinary people via reality-based media. The 1973 12-part PBS series, *An American Family*, portrayed a nuclear family going through divorce. It was the first series similar to reality shows that air today, such as *Jon and Kate Plus 8*, *19 Kids and Counting*, and *A Baby Story*. These shows have all portrayed documentary-style reality as drama, editing together scenes to create a manufactured reality for an audience.

Modern reality television and voyeuristic media is most evident in the shows that came about in the late 1980s and 1990s. These shows introduced the cinéma vérité style, which has become the feature of reality television popular today. The cinéma vérité style combines naturalistic techniques with devices of editing and camerawork, as well as staged situations and the use of the camera to provoke participants. One year after a similar Dutch series aired in 1991, MTV employed this technique in *The Real World*, which is still running today. Each season features seven young men and women, ranging in age from 19 to 25 and varying in race and social class. *The Real World* is “the true story... of seven strangers...picked to live in a house...work together and have their lives taped...to find out what happens...when people stop being polite...and start getting real” (*The Real World Diaries*, 1996, 7).

The show allows viewers to watch social issues unfold. One alcoholic 1999 cast member was recorded falling down, throwing up naked, and driving drunk, all of which contributed to the season's high ratings. Cameramen were instructed not to interact with the cast under any circumstances, raising the ethical question of whether producers have the responsibility to step out of the role of voyeur and intervene in the lives of others when things go too far. Eventually the producers of *The Real World* did and were able to find help for the young woman and sign her into a rehabilita-

tion program, which was documented on the show. *The Real World, San Francisco*, which aired in 1994, featured an HIV-positive gay man and a homophobic roommate. The season forced audiences to face the struggle with HIV/AIDS and discrimination. The voyeuristic media in this case serves to benefit the voyeur by providing knowledge and the ability to experience a situation they might not otherwise deal with in their daily life.

This is a possible reason as to why culture has adopted such a voyeuristic nature: knowledge is power, and one could argue that this is acquired by watching others in exchange for nothing. They are able to learn about other lives simply by observing on television, websites, or in magazines.

The idea that power is held by the voyeur is evident in “caught on camera” types of voyeuristic media, and even more so in tabloids and exploits of celebrities. The night of the 2008 Grammy Awards, pop star Chris Brown assaulted and hospitalized his then girlfriend, fellow pop star Rihanna. When photos of her injuries surfaced the next day, followed shortly after by nude pictures of her and Brown, one wonders how much of a celebrity’s private life should be made public. Shows like *TMZ* and *E! News* have been criticized for their use of paparazzi photography and video. Stars are chased by the paparazzi in a manner that is clearly unwanted and possibly dangerous. However, photographers who sell to *TMZ.com* and other sites that appeal to a voyeuristic audience can make thousands of dollars a week. Even the sex lives of presidents and other politicians are routinely exposed.

One of the major forces driving voyeuristic media is society’s declining expectations of privacy. Audiences now expect more information to be made public, and little consideration is given to the effects on the observed. Privacy is es-

essentially a social construct, mostly influenced by members of the media. It may be evaluated in terms of the power and ability of individuals to control the information about themselves that others receive. Those observed should have this control.

By bringing alcoholism, discrimination, and assisted suicide to the surface, are we forcing society to face these issues and find truth? The media has influenced the modern mind with images that depict values and societal norms, and engaging with the media helps an individual shape their sense of self. But by participating in the audience of the voyeuristic media, individuals are able to construct their own concept of truth and morality. With this subjectivism, is it ever possible for the media to report an objective truth? Is this why culture has accepted voyeurism? Recent media studies research has focused not on how messages may or may not influence people, but rather on how people choose and use messages. It suggests that audiences decide to participate by being an active member of the media audience for a number of reasons.

Reality and voyeuristic media may be a means to escape the reality that society faces. The nation is currently involved in two wars and an extreme financial crisis, yet through the media one may easily forget. The popular news media seems to spend most time on pop culture or matters involving health and beauty. It was considered breaking news and regular programming was interrupted to report the death of Anna Nicole Smith, a well known television personality and former *Playboy Magazine* centerfold playmate. In the days following, much of the media was dedicated to investigating the possible causes of her death, and who would get custody of her child. The media's choice to focus on stories such as this and the audience's choice to view them is evidence of how much the media serves as a means to escape reality.

Many people are also socially motivated to participate in the media audience. Watching the same shows provides a common ground in social situations. Viewing social interactions through the media may also sometimes supplement a lack of social interactions in one's own life and serve as a means to temporarily satisfy a sense of loneliness, by forming superficial relations with characters. Since the 20th century, a rise in the quantity of visual material available to society has transformed it from thinking in terms of thoughts or values to thinking in terms of images as superficial representations of them.

Essentially, the 20th century was characterized by the desire to expose secrets while still appearing to maintain composure. Americans had a strong desire to maintain private lives, and privacy was challenged during the Cold War with McCarthyism. The 1960s and 1970s were a time when courts justified the invasion of privacy, but Congress also passed laws to protect it. The '60s marked the advent of a culture with an increased interest in the self, particularly after its political turmoil.

It was this that sparked people's fascination with voyeur reality television. People began watching reality television and taking an interest in others' private lives in part because it made them comfortable with private images being public, but also because they feared to some extent that this could happen to them. In their fear they conversely found relief in watching the distress of others. The fear of intrusion made the public more aware of their actions, and thus society acted as if there was always a possibility they were being taped, and as if they were performing for others. This is the effect on society of the voyeuristic media: a society in which people are constantly aware and censoring their actions as if they are in front of an audience.

Kimberly Mahaffey is a senior psychology student at Ramapo College of New Jersey who can be contacted at kmahaffe@ramapo.edu. □

Book Reviews

Jews as Capitalists, Communists, Zionists, and Victims of Nationalism

Paul H. Elovitz—Clio's Psyche

Review of Jerry Z. Muller, Capitalism and the Jews (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010) ISBN 978-0-691-14478-8, 267 pages, Hardcover \$24.95.

How can a man be both a capitalist and a Communist? This was a question I wrestled with from an early age. As a young teenager, my immigrant father, after a conversation in Yiddish with a man I never remembered seeing before, declared with some amazement, “that man is both a millionaire capitalist and a Communist.” His utterance was during the Cold War, when capitalism and communism were presented as polar opposites. They had spoken in a language I only knew a few words of and I puzzled over the comment for several decades as I studied American labor history, explored Communist Russia, and earned a doctoral degree in modern European history. Muller both confirms my understanding of what I learned about the subject and offers additional insights regarding the complex relationship of Jews to capitalism, communism, economic activity, ethnic identity, socialism, and the sociology of religion.

Jerry Muller is an erudite professor of Modern European intellectual history at Catholic University in the American capital. His primary foci are Jews as capitalists and Communists and as the victims of modern nationalism. He

starts with “the conspicuous presence” of Jews “in the history of capitalism” as both a symbol and as a reality (8). In “The Long Shadow of Usury,” he presents evidence that Christianity stigmatized commerce and economic enterprise in general, especially money lending, whereas Judaism did not. Talmudic law, unlike Canonic (Church) law, did not find poverty ennobling. Kings of England and France even established the legal fiction that Christian moneylenders were Jews so as to be under their royal authority, rather than that of Church law (24).

In writing about common characteristics of Jews and Christians over historical periods, always an emotional minefield, Professor Muller makes it very clear up front that only some Jews are good at capitalism, and that Communists and other revolutionaries have typically been only a tiny minority of the Jewish population. Lots of useful endnotes are provided. He argues that “the People of the Book” were predisposed by their commercial tradition and high rate of literacy to do well in modern capitalist societies out of proportion to their numbers. Oriented to this life, not an afterlife, Jews were open to private property, markets, and profits. Their “religious intellectualism” meant continuous contact with books and a culture inclined to abstractions, personal discipline, fine distinctions in argumentation, oral disputation, and finding commonalities (87). All of these traits could be easily transferred from the religious sphere to the secular sphere. Furthermore, he argues Jews showed “a propensity for discovering new wants and for bringing underused resources to the market,” including illicit ones (88).

In 1972, the Nobel Prize-winning libertarian economist Milton Friedman (1912-2006) argued that Jews benefited enormously from “free enterprise and competitive capitalism,” yet “have been consistently opposed to capitalism and have done much on an ideological level to undermine it” (72). Muller thinks Friedman is at least half right since,

politically, Jews favored left-of-center, mostly liberal parties. The historian argues this was for a variety of reasons, including that these parties offered equal citizenship to all, were not based on Christianity as were the rightist parties, and fostered a desire to disprove the stereotype of Jews as greedy money-grubbers through philanthropy and governmental programs to level the economic playing field.

In the last century, anti-Semitism has often been justified by the charge of Jewish communism. The small element of truth in the myth of Judeo-communism was based upon some Jews and those of Jewish origin, although only a tiny minority of the Jewish population and always a minority of Communists, playing a salient role in Communist movements, especially in the Bavarian and Hungarian revolutions at the end of WWI. Early in the Bolshevik Revolution, Moscow's Chief Rabbi is alleged to have prophetically told the revolutionary Trotsky (born Lev Davidovich Bronstein), "The Trotskys make the revolutions, and the Bronsteins pay for it" (140). The intensity of the pogroms amidst the Russian Civil War (1918-21) that killed 70,000 Jews in the Ukraine alone, led most Jews in Russia to see the Communists as the lesser evil, even though many were soon stigmatized and prosecuted as capitalists. There is also the fact that Karl Marx was of Jewish origin and seen as a Jew by his society even though he was baptized as a Christian and wrote the anti-Semitic "On the Jewish Question" in 1844. The Communists installed by Russia as the leaders of the Soviet satellite nations after WWII contained some Jews in prominent positions, heightening anti-Semitism in these countries. As Stalin's anti-Semitism became more overt during the Doctors' Plot, Communist leaders of Jewish descent were not above using anti-Semitism to please Moscow, attempt to nationalize their Communist regimes, and hold on to power. Overall, Muller does a good job of describing the complexities of Jews as Eastern European Communists and victims of

Communist anti-Semitism.

The author, who writes for *The New Republic*, the *Times Literary Supplement*, and the *Wall Street Journal*, believes that capitalism is the basis of modern nationalism. Muller's approach fits in with the modern ideological defense of capitalism, although I find him to be a solid historian in most respects. However, to me as a modern historian, his assertion that capitalism is the foundation of the development of modern nationalism is unconvincing in this case.

When Professor Muller was asked to write for this special issue he declined the invitation, declaring that he had "neither the time nor talents to contribute." Despite his disclaimer, even more than most historians he wanders into a psychological approach to his subject, although to the best of my recollection, he only uses the term "psychological" twice (207, 214). He finds Jews to be the Christian "Other," describes the cases of denial, acknowledges the importance of considerable Jewish investment in their children, writes of national identity, and declares the greedy Voltaire's anti-Semitism to be partly "a classic case of projection" (31). Importantly, the professor is quite aware of the role of fantasy in human relations.

Despite Muller's disclaimer, it is my impression that with a slight change of focus and vocabulary, *Capitalism and the Jews* could be presented as a work of psychological history. By refocusing the approach and adding concepts such as ambivalence, empathy, identification, the narcissism of minor differences, reaction formation, and splitting to the present use of the concepts of denial, fantasy, and projection, this could be a psychohistorical work. But, of course, that is not the interest of this intellectual historian, who draws most of his materials from economics, sociology, and other well-established disciplines.

Despite the author's limitations regarding psychohis-

tory and following from his ideological commitment to capitalism, this book is worth reading for its insights and treatment of a difficult and insufficiently examined subject.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is editor of this journal. □

Truths and Psychoanalytic Insights into Suicidal Terrorism

Leah Slivko—The NJ Institute for Psychoanalysis

Review of Nancy Hartevelt Kobrin, The Banality of Suicide Terrorism: The Naked Truth About the Psychology of Islamic Suicide Bombing (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2010), 978-1597975049, 192 pages, Hardcover, \$24.95.

Suicide terrorism is, indeed, banal. The first part of the title speaks a truth. The subtitle is somewhat off-putting as it professes a “naked” truth and specifies “Islamic,” which deflects from the banality of suicide bombing. There is no such thing as only one “naked” truth; author Nancy Hartevelt Kobrin’s truth may be very different indeed from the truth a suicide bomber is experiencing as he/she sets off on a mission.

Dr. Nancy Hartevelt Kobrin, whose doctoral degree is in Romance and Semitic languages and comparative literature, is a psychoanalyst whose expertise is in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and counter-terrorism. She delves into the extremely painful and horrific topic of the psychology behind the Islamic suicide bomber’s actions. Rather than declare it as “naked” truth, more accurately her book is shedding light on the dynamics of the Islamic family with its clan mentality, idealization and denigration of females, premature separation of the male child from his mother, and the young males’ initiation into the world of men. She provides insights into a culture that accepts domestic violence and

vacillates between shaming and honoring. In my opinion, as a psychoanalyst who has lived under the threat of such violence, reducing suicide/murder through martyrdom to a psychoanalytic interpretation of unresolved rage toward one's mother or father is not helpful in curbing these violent acts against humanity.

The book is both riveting and extremely thought provoking, while at the same time sensationalizing and bringing rationality to the immoral act of suicide-murder. Dr. Hartevelt Kobrin closely studies the men behind many attacks on humanity and highlights how a strong, charismatic leader like Osama bin Laden can give demoralized people a sense of purpose, hope, and belonging. The hunger for these needs to be met is so desperate that primitive aggression overrides the need to protect life itself.

It is important to note the emphasis on family life and its impact on early childhood development. Kobrin is astute in her description of the intimate and yet frightening ritualistic, entrenched belief systems that are perpetuated in Islamic families. When domestic violence, abandonment, and violation of sexual boundaries are committed in the family, a child has a much more difficult time processing primitive and confusing messages, behaviors, and feelings. Consequently their trust in authority figures is, at best, ambivalent. When the child cannot trust their home to contain danger and offer protection and support—the need to belong, and the behavior that goes along with gaining support and belonging—gives a child a focus for coping. Even when families do provide a safe environment for growth, a child must face separation and can only separate successfully if there is safety provided outside of the home by society. Being part of a larger extended family, community, or country means embracing the values and responsibilities that come with belonging.

This past summer, I had the opportunity to visit Nor-

mandy, France and process the Normandy landings by the British, Canadians, and Americans during World War II. I was struck by how young men, the same age as suicide bombers, were given the mission of protecting their country by risking their lives or by destroying the lives of others. The momentum, the importance placed on the mission, and what was at stake propelled these fighters to act as aggressively as possible in ways that would be viewed as “evil” and criminal in daily civilian life. War has different rules and behaviors. Islamic suicide bombers believe they are fighting a jihad—a religious war that has been imprinted on them throughout their history. One cannot extract a full psychoanalytic understanding of the personality of a suicide bomber without acknowledging the impact of group psychology as well as that of the individual.

Dr. Hartevelt Kobrin addresses the concept of projective identification and how the terrorist tends to project his feelings onto the victim and thus never has to address his own terror. I wonder if the act of suicide-murder is a way of mastering one's own terror of living a life with no meaning, no value, and no hope—a life sentence that is very real to those who are born in a powerless society with little hope of change.

Terror and fear are powerful feelings for both perpetrator and victim. They can be both protective and immobilizing. This book is significant because it highlights the fear and terror the suicide bomber, his family, and his community live by, as well as how they translate and share that experience with those who they blame for its cause. Whether it is a mother, a father, or an abstract external object of love and hate such as America or Israel that is feared and terrorized, the challenge remains as to how to put a halt to suicide-murder attacks.

Leah Slivko, LCSW, PsychA, is a psychoanalyst who

practices in Worcester, MA and New York City and is affiliated with the Boston College School of Social Work and the New Jersey Institute for Psychoanalysis. In the 1990s she lived in Jerusalem, where she was on the faculty of Milev, the Crisis Counseling Center for English Speakers during the First Intifada. Ms. Slivko may be contacted at lslivko@hotmail.com. □

Helpful Insights on Fundamentalism Despite an Anti-Religious Bias

Anna Geifman—Boston University

Review of Charles B. Strozier, David M. Terman, and James W. Jones, with Katharine A. Boyd, eds., The Fundamentalist Mindset: Psychological Perspectives on Religion, Violence, and History (Oxford University Press, 2010), xxi, 274 pages, ISBN 978-0-19-5379-66-2, 296 pages, Paperback, \$19.95.

The authors of this scholarly compilation propose a typology of the “fundamentalist mindset” and delineate it as a universal phenomenon. It reveals itself in different traditions and movements, yet evinces strikingly similar psychological features. Wherever it occurs, it typically entails religious or quasi-religious apocalyptic vision and messianic aspirations; a fanatical belief in a cause; the dehumanization of heretics who do not share it; and a co-dependent relationship between charismatic ideologues and the rank-and-file, who fight the millennial struggle between good and evil.

In various settings, the proclivity to develop a dualistic mind frame is evident particularly among individuals who suffer from weak identity. Often, this is related to Robert Lifton’s traumatic paradigm of the “historical dislocation.” This is a crisis of values that occurs during periods of rapid

disintegration of traditional ethical and aesthetic norms and conventional meanings. It is “the dark side of modernization in Muslim societies,” argues Farhad Khosrokhavar in his article on psychology of the global jihadists (p. 154). Other contributors show similar processes as a precondition for the upsurge of fundamentalist creeds elsewhere—from Hindu extremism in India to apocalyptic Christianity in America.

David Redles connects “Nazi millennialism” to “psychic fragmentation that occurs when perception of order is destroyed by rapid and radical change,” as it did in post-World War I Germany. It succumbed to a craving “to reconstruct reality into an ordered and meaningful worldview . . . through racial homogeneity” (p. 158). Redles is right on the mark when he says that the German experience was “spiritual and communal,” entailing “a desire for transcendence” (p. 162).

The same longing, “virtually indistinguishable from religious conversion” (p. 161), marked a violently atheistic variant of fundamentalism in Soviet Russia. Just as the Germans felt “constant tension in the air,” in the 1920s, so too—two decades earlier—“it was as if something was in the air hovering over each and every one of us,” remembered Russian poetess Zinaida Gippius. People “rushed about, never understanding why . . . nor knowing what to do with themselves,” and suffering from lack of purpose, exactly as would scores of Germans. A “sense of imminent annihilation” reigned in Germany; in Russia, before Bolshevik fundamentalism erupted in full force, “one could already begin to sense the smell of burning, blood, and iron,” affirmed renowned lyricist Aleksandr Blok.

This volume does not mention the apocalyptic class struggle and overlooks messianic world revolution; perhaps for the editors, the perpetrators were “freedom fighters,” not fundamentalists. In truth, along with two Communist super-

powers, Russia and China, societies across the globe succumbed to this largest millennial experience in history. It was also the bloodiest—claiming many more victims than the Nazis, yet, unlike them, not held universally as unmitigated evil.

Group paranoia and rage are key attributes of the fundamentalist mindset, as per this volume's definition (p. 11). Never was this more pronounced than under Stalin. The Communist secular theology obsessed with time-and death-management—equally essential to fundamentalist behavior. Beneath orthodox Marxism, the Russian revolutionaries' deeper goal lay in the realm of the existential: to find the ultimate answer to a pivotal quandary of being, its transience and finality, to overcome the inevitability of demise. It was to be overpowered via a brilliant paradox—the elimination of the individual, carrier of death, by integrating him into a collective in the imminent social paradise. communism was a religion of worldwide salvation, to be imposed upon “human material of the capitalist epoch.”

While not limiting fundamentalism to a religious creed, the volume barely differentiates between the two. One of its claims is that as many as 30 percent of Americans identify themselves as evangelical Christians, and the boundaries of a hundred million people often blur “with what . . . might be called fundamentalists.” The book focuses on “the violent potentials in all forms of fundamentalism,” which at times actualize (pp. 3-4). Cited specifically are the ultra-Orthodox Haredi Jews in Israel who, in fact, shun hostilities, refraining even from the non-combat service in the military—ironically, for religious reasons. Nonetheless, as a red thread in this volume, religions are denounced for creating “a culture of violence out of which terrorism and genocide can easily emerge” (p. 97). The charge accompanies a familiar Marxist rant against religion as a coercive gadget in the hands of the “ruling class” (p. 119).

Beyond trivial religion-bashing, the assault aims at the essence of faith. God is analyzed while sitting “on his mighty throne with a smirk of paranoid certitude...” (p. 114). The Book of Revelation is designated as “dangerous and ugly” (p. 119).

Analogous declarations justified public burning of masterpieces that did not fit the totalitarian worldview of the Nazis. The Communists declared it a crime to read books that undermined their secular fundamentalism. In an ironic twist, the reader may consider patently offensive negation of faith an attribute of a fundamentalist mindset. Belief then gets indicted on charges graver than the good-old “opium for the people”—as the cause for global extremism. One extenuating circumstance is that *Gott Mit Uns* on the *Wehrmacht* belt buckles is not God’s endorsement of Treblinka.

Anna Geifman, PhD, is the author of Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917 (Princeton University Press, 1993); Entangled in Terror: The Azef Affair and the Russian Revolution (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000); and La mort sera votre dieu: du nihilisme russe au terrorisme islamiste (La Table Ronde: Paris, 2005). She is the editor of Russia under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion, 1894-1917 (Blackwell, 1999). Her most recent work is Death Orders: The Vanguard of Modern Terrorism in Revolutionary Russia (Praeger, 2010). Geifman is Professor of History at Boston University, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate classes on Russian and Soviet history, modern terrorism, and psychohistory. She also holds a research position at Bar-Ilan University in Israel and may be reached at annageifman@hotmail.com. □

The Multi-talented Gregory Bateson

Paul Salstrom—St. Mary-of-the-Woods College

Review of Noel G. Charlton, Understanding Gregory Bateson: Mind, Beauty, and the Sacred Earth (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008), ISBN 978-0-7914-7452-5, 276 pages, Paperback, \$21.95.

People who know more about Gregory Bateson than his name often know he was Margaret Mead's third husband. If they know still more, they may know he collaborated with Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann in the early days of cybernetics; or that by applying "feedback" to psychology he came up with the double-bind theory (or hypothesis) of schizophrenia, which in turn led to family-process therapy. A few may also know that, well before he died in 1980, Bateson became convinced that unconscious mental activity pervades virtually all life. The "capacity to register and respond to information" he said, is the basic trait "common to all mental systems" (quoted on p. 48).

Noel Charlton emphasizes the continuity from Bateson's early years—such as his youthful fascination with William Blake's art, and his 1930s collaboration with Margaret Mead in studying Balinese art and dance—on through the rest of his eventful career to his late-life assertion of a sort of panpsychism. His career evolved from biology in his youth through anthropology (a half dozen years spent mostly in New Guinea, then Bali) to cybernetics in the 1940s, psychology in the 1950s and on to philosophy and ecology. Systems fascinated him all along but he rarely paused to systemize his ideas—rather he charged ahead with new hunches and new applications without finding much need to discard his old ones. This book shows the continuity in Bateson's lifelong intellectual trajectory.

Born in 1904 near Cambridge (England) as the son of a well-known biologist who was then bringing Gregor Mendel's work on genetics into mainstream biology, Bateson was named Gregory in honor of Mendel. His biographer says Bateson's move to the U.S. is what involved him with enough collaborators to fully develop his insights. By 1940 he was based in New York City teaching Pidgin English for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), and then spent World War II's latter years employed by the OSS in South Asia and China, including a dangerous secret mission in Burma (1944-45). Within several weeks after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, Bateson was connected with a conference and follow-up network of scholars who were trying to re-think the roots of human conflict from the interpersonal scale to the international.

In psychology, Bateson in the 1950s formulated the double-bind theory—the theory (or hypothesis) that schizophrenia tends to affect vulnerable, dependent people who experience frustration in their primary emotional relationships, such as young people who cannot do or say anything that their parents consider acceptable. By the 1960s, Bateson was thinking of the human body and mind as a unified “mental system.” He grew interested in collective psychology and came to view actions based on “conscious purpose” as almost invariably inimical to nature, in that conscious purposes distort humans' innate relationships with other mental systems (pp. 168, 172-74). Bateson believed ecological disaster awaits humanity unless we realize we aren't separate from the rest of nature simply because we know we're thinking. Purposive action he saw as almost invariably self-seeking, thereby bedeviling the mutuality that actually sustains our lives. In an early draft of his last (unfinished) book, *Angels Fear: An Investigation into the Nature and Meaning of the Sacred*, Bateson wrote: “It is my thesis that...religion consists in recognizing not little bits of miracles...but vast aggre-

gates of organization having immanent mental characteristics” (p. 170). Such were the late-life ruminations of a thinker whose mental life had begun in a force-field between genetics and Blake.

Paul Salstrom, PhD, teaches history at St. Mary-of-the-Woods College near Terre Haute, Indiana, and was recently the co-editor of Fritiof Fryxell’s book Ferdinand Hayden: A Young Scientist in the Great West, 1853-1855 (2010). He may be contacted at PSalstrom@smwc.edu. □

Troublesome Athletes

Jack Fitzpatrick—Family Business Resource Ctr.

Review of Stanley H. Teitelbaum, Athletes Who Indulge Their Dark Side: Sex, Drugs, and Cover-Ups (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2009), ISBN 978-0-313-37756-3, 179 pages, Hardcover, \$44.95.

Stanley Teitelbaum’s *Athletes Who Indulge Their Dark Side: Sex, Drugs, and Cover Ups* is a very frustrating book to read. While the book’s subject is interesting, the author is not able to deliver on the promise of providing a compelling psychological explanation of the athletes’ self-defeating behaviors. The book includes vignettes about many accomplished athletes, especially athletes who play baseball, basketball, and football. The vignettes emphasize various incidents where the subjects abuse steroids, cheat in sports and in their private lives, commit murder, gamble, and indulge in a variety of other unsavory activities. Pete Rose, Barry Bonds, Kobe Bryant, Denny McLain, Mark McGuire, Roger Clemons, and Alex Rodriguez are but a few of the prominent professional baseball players scrutinized in this book. As a reader, I had hoped to learn more about the specific motivations that lay behind the behavior of each of the aforementioned players, but none were forthcoming. Instead,

we are given facile generalizations about various players' narcissism, impulsivity, impaired judgment, self-destructiveness, and stupidity.

Teitelbaum has read all the requisite newspaper accounts, biographies, and autobiographies about the players he includes in *Athletes Who Indulge Their Dark Side*, but he has not interviewed any of them, nor has he interviewed any people who know the athletes intimately. His failure to incorporate primary sources is one of the book's major deficits because without primary resource materials, the best the author can do is to rely on platitudes like, "Simply put, they do it [indulge their dark side] because they feel they can!" Phrases like "unbridled hubris," "their acquired distorted self image," "the toxic athlete profile of grandiosity, arrogance, and entitlement," "suffering from a delusional disorder," "a supreme narcissist," "his grandiose sense of invulnerability," "an empathy chip was clearly missing," "self destructive arrogance at its finest," and "if you are consistently treated as someone special, you begin to think of yourself in those terms" are offered without any personal substantiation from the subjects being described and diagnosed. In order for the reader to learn more about the specific psychological dynamics of each athlete and to learn more about why he/she did what he/she did and others with similar experiences did not do it, the author would have needed to obtain more privileged information than he presents in the book. The personal context and the personal psychodynamics of the athletes described in this book are missing; without each of these, the portraits and the explanations for their transgressions is unsatisfying and inadequate.

By way of self-disclosure, I was a college basketball player and a professional baseball player before I became a historian and a psychoanalyst. I knew players in each sport who were narcissistic and some who were self-defeating. I have worked clinically with professional athletes, but the

psychodynamics of each player is always unique and specific to that person. The specifics can inform the general, but the general can throw only a very limited light on the specific actions of each athlete. The book would have been enhanced had the author tried to explain how some athletes excel in the performance of their sport while not being self-defeating in other areas of their lives. What experiences promote personal wellness and wholesomeness, and what factors impede the development of the same?

Taken from another perspective, there may be some utility in looking at neuroscience when trying to understand an athlete's self indulgence. Jonah Lehrer has written about Tiger Woods (who is not mentioned in the book under review), "Self control...is a limited mental resource, a feeble cortical muscle...we can only resist [indulgence] for so long; the defining feature of human willpower is its weakness." This hypothesis raises a crucial issue that potentially could strengthen the explanatory power of any effort to analyze an athlete's self-defeating behavior.

I wish the author had utilized primary resources and had been able to interview some of the athletes he wrote about. I was hoping there was going to be more emphasis placed on trying to link the context of various players' transgressions to their personal life. It would have been good if some space had been devoted to analyzing some athletes who did not "indulge their dark side," so that we could have something to compare. Perhaps another author will be able to fulfill the promise that eludes *Athletes Who Indulge Their Dark Side*.

Jack Fitzpatrick, PhD, holds a doctorate in history from the University of California, Berkeley, and was trained as a psychoanalyst at the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, Kansas. He is a partner in the Family Business Resource Center and president of the Family Business Continuity Foundation.

The father of three adult daughters, he resides in Topeka with his wife, Anne E. Francis, the author of The Daughter Also Rises: How Women Overcome Obstacles and Advance in the Family-Owned Business. He may be contacted at JackFitz@FamilyBizFoundation.org. □

Memorials

Stalin Scholar Robert C. Tucker

Fred I. Greenstein—Princeton University

Robert C. Tucker (1918-2010), Professor of International Studies Emeritus at Princeton University, died after a long illness in his Princeton, New Jersey home on July 29, 2010 at the age of 92. He was particularly known for his psychoanalytically informed contributions to Soviet studies in general and the life of Joseph Stalin in particular (*Stalin as a Revolutionary*, 1973, and *Stalin in Power*, 1992). His 1961 *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx* also remains a standard work, as do his 1969 *The Marxian Revolutionary Idea*, his 1963 *The Soviet Political Mind*, and his 1995 *Politics as Leadership*.

Robert Tucker was born on May 29, 1918, in Kansas City, Missouri. After receiving a BA from Harvard in 1939 and an MA in 1941, he studied Russian, served in the Office of Strategic Services, and went on in 1944 to work in the U.S. embassy in Moscow where he served for the nine years until Stalin's death in 1953. He had meant to stay in Moscow only two years, but he married Eugenia Pestretsova in 1946 and as a Soviet citizen who had married a non-citizen, she was denied an exit visa until after Stalin's death in 1953. Tucker then returned to the United States and completed his doctoral work at Harvard in 1958, which was the basis of his

seminal first book. He was employed at the Rand Corporation and Indiana University before joining the Princeton faculty in 1962, where he was founding director of the university's Russian Studies program until his retirement in 1984.

Readers of *Clio's Psyche* will be particularly interested in Tucker's use of psychoanalytic theory in his biographical volumes. Fortunately, this is a topic on which he wrote in his fascinating and instructive 1982 essay "Memoir of a Stalin Biographer," which is available on the Internet at plaza.ufl.edu/b/paris/essays/tucker_stalin.html. Tucker reports that he was able to arrange for Karen Horney's just-published 1950 *Neurosis and Human Growth* to be sent to him from Washington through diplomatic channels. In that period, the Russian public's idealization of Stalin and through his image the Soviet State had reached almost comic proportions. Gradually it dawned on Tucker that what he was observing in the Soviet Union bore a close resemblance to Horney's construct of the neurotic character type. Such individuals compensate for traumatic childhood experiences by developing idealized self-images which they seek to impose on others. In the case of an individual such as Stalin who has paranoid proclivities, the political system in effect becomes an extension of its leader's personality. Regrettably, his colleagues in Moscow tried to laugh away his psychological interpretation of the Soviet regime's having been organized around Stalin's paranoia. Even after the fall of communism, Professor Tucker told Charlie Rose in a 1996 interview, millions in Russia "see Stalin as he wanted to see himself, as a statist, in belief of Russia as a great power. They find that Stalin is the kind of Stalin that needs to be maintained."

No brief summary can substitute for a reading of Tucker's work. In addition to consulting the essay referred to in the previous paragraph and Tucker's highly readable biographical volumes, the interested reader should consult

JSTOR (www.jstor.org) or some other internet data base to find Tucker's many valuable articles on such topics as the psychology of totalitarianism and charismatic leadership.

It remains to remark on Tucker, the man. He was a courtly gentleman, a broad-gauged intellectual, and a dedicated scholar and teacher. The high esteem in which his students and colleagues held him was evident in their tributes to him at his October 2010 memorial service. In my own case, I never failed to profit from his friendship and collegueship, which were enriched by the time we spent together as Fellows at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences as well as at Princeton. It is an honor to have known him.

***Fred. I. Greenstein, PhD**, took his doctoral degree at Yale University in 1960 and did postgraduate training at the New York Psychoanalytic Society and Institute (1961-82). Prior to settling at Princeton University in 1973, where he directs its Program in Leadership Studies at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, he taught at Yale (1959-62) and Wesleyan (1962-73) universities. Prof. Greenstein is a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and has served as secretary of the American Political Science Association. His specialty is political psychology applied to presidential decision-making leadership and his many books include Children and Politics (1965); Personality and Politics: Problems of Evidence, Inference, and Conceptualization (1969); and The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Barack Obama (2009). Greenstein, who was a featured scholar in these pages, presently serves as Professor Emeritus at Princeton, may be contacted at fig@princeton.edu. □*

Advocate for Children Alice Miller (1923-2010): In Memoriam

Peggy McLaughlin—Ramapo College

At age 87 the European author and child advocate Alice Miller died in her home in Saint-Rémy-de-Provence in southern France on April 14. The cause was amyotrophy, a disease causing muscle wasting and weakening. Dr. Miller brought together knowledge from psychoanalysis, social work, sociology, and history to focus on and advocate for “the damaged child.” Her breakthrough book, *Prisoner of Childhood: The Drama of the Gifted Child* (1979), sold over one million copies, and consequently began to change the way many people thought about childhood. Her 13 books argue that *all* children suffer permanent psychological and sometimes physical damage at the hands of disciplining parents, but her books are thought by many critics to be too sweeping in their conclusions.

Alice Rostovski was born on January 12, 1923 in Lwów, Poland (now Ukraine) into what she described as a “quite ordinary middle class” Jewish family, her father an unsuccessful banker and her mother a homemaker. Although she rarely provided personal details of her life, it is possible to put together a sketchy picture. Through the efforts of her parents she was smuggled out of the Warsaw Ghetto to live under an assumed identity with a Catholic family. Sometimes she was able to slip back into the Ghetto to see and bring food to her parents, but she could do nothing to save them. After the war, she was rescued by a Swiss charity and lived most of her life in Zurich. In Switzerland she completed her doctoral degree in psychology and sociology at the University of Basel in 1953. Subsequently, she trained in psychoanalysis in Zurich and practiced as an analyst. Her marriage to the sociologist Andreas Miller led to the birth of

two children prior to their divorce.

After practicing Freudian psychoanalysis for most of two decades, Miller's repressed memories of the horrors of her past broke through as she started painting in 1975, causing her to question her memories of an idyllic childhood. This occurred at a time when there was considerable controversy over Sigmund Freud's replacing his initial theory of parental and other adult child abuse as the cause of neurosis with his subsequent theory of childhood fantasies of adult abuse. Dr. Miller started writing about the horrors of child abuse, including the severe disciplining of children. In 1979 she terminated her psychoanalytic practice when she came to believe that the analyst-patient relationship reproduced the negative power dynamics of parent and child. This belief also caused her to break with Freudianism. She explained, "In the Freudian view, the parents, not the child, are innocent. This view fits society, it overlooks in Oedipus the abused child, and sees him...only led to killing his father and marrying his mother." For this reason, Miller encourages therapists to help their patients evolve from "silent children" to "talking children." She cautions against saying that disturbed parents were well meaning, because this does not support the child's feeling their own pain and instead sympathizes with the parents. It was at this time, in 1979, that she began publishing. The dramatic rupture from Freudian psychoanalysis is described in *Banished Knowledge* (1990), a semi-autobiographical book in which Miller revealed not only her ideas, but that she was in fact abused as a child.

Dr. Miller did some psychobiography in her analyses of Hitler, Nietzsche, Stalin, Picasso, Dostoyevsky, and many other well-known figures as case studies of the impact of child abuse. Growing up witnessing Hitler's rise to power, Miller wrote that she watched as millions of people "enthusiastically allowed a primitive, arrogant monster to lead them to murder their fellow human beings." Conse-

quently, she spent her life “trying to understand the riddle of such dangerous blindness.” Miller explored these ideas more fully later in her career, focusing on the passivity of the German people toward the Nazis in *For Your Own Good* (1983) and *Thou Shalt Not Be Aware* (1984). She was also especially noted for her argument that Hitler’s painful childhood led to his murderous regime. Her chapter on him does an outstanding job of tying the child Adolf growing up in a highly authoritarian household to his creation of a totalitarian regime in Nazi Germany in which he played the role of his hated authoritarian father, Alois. Unfortunately, Miller did not have the sensibility of the historian and makes some factual errors as to the details of the abuse and the Hitler family. This, however, does not negate her contribution to Hitler scholarship or the relationship of childhood horror to adult political horror on the stage of history. For her contributions she received the honor of being named featured speaker at a conference of the International Psychohistorical Association where this small, frail woman dominated the proceedings.

“Nobody is born evil” was her core belief, but Miller also thought some individuals could come to act in an evil fashion because of ill treatment as a child. Physical ills, psychic pain, and intergenerational violence were among the consequences of child abuse. Miller was also able to broaden and deepen child welfare by enlightening the field with her studies of psychological abuse, which she felt must be recognized and treated. She believed that Freud’s cancer of the jaw was a response to his unwillingness to confront child abuse as a real problem.

Miller’s ideas have influenced therapists and social workers worldwide. Her influence has led to more therapists today being instructed to ask about child abuse. Adults are encouraged to uncover their own early traumas, resulting in the many “victims movements.” The many victims of childhood sexual abuse at the hands of priests, who have found

their voices and spoken out publicly, have tarnished the Catholic Church. Dr. Miller's insistence on listening to the voices of silenced children deserves some credit for this.

The new field of research on "resilient children" supports one of Miller's arguments. She argued that a child can be "saved" if s/he has the chance to connect with at least one person who is kind and encouraging. In several studies of "high risk" children who have overcome their background, one critical protective factor was having an outsider who took a supportive interest in the child.

Alice Miller argued on her website (www.alicemiller.com), that abuse often creates violent adults. "Children assimilate the violence they have endured, which they then glorify and apply later as parents, believing that they deserved the punishment and were beaten out of love." Research arising from the battered women's movement confirms her thesis that abused children often become abusing adults.

Some scholars have argued that Dr. Miller's 13 books are essentially one book, each making the same argument with varied examples. She has been accused of oversimplification and blaming parents for problems that are often caused by biology, class, economics, and historical forces. Despite these and other criticisms, warranted and unwarranted, Alice Miller deserves much credit for moving the crusade against child abuse a huge step forward. She has done much to break down the wall of silence surrounding child abuse in our world and for this alone she deserves to be memorialized.

Peggy McLaughlin, MSW, JD, is a long time member of the Psychohistory Forum who has retired after teaching social work, law, and women's studies at Ramapo College. Her earlier contributions were as a legal services lawyer and social worker. She may be contacted at pegymcl@mac.com. □

Leon Rappoport: Editorial Board Member and Psychologist Remembered

Ronald Downey—Kansas State University

Paul Elovitz—Ramapo College

Clio's Psyche Editorial Board member and psychologist Leon Harold Rappoport (1932-2009) died of colon cancer at his home in Manhattan, Kansas on September 10, 2009 at the age of 77. He was a professor of social psychology at Kansas State University (KSU) for 39 years prior to his retirement in 2003.

Leon Rappoport was born on March 11, 1932 to Minnie (née Himmel) and Jack Rappoport and educated in the public schools of Manhattan, New York prior to earning his bachelor's degree in psychology in 1953 from New York University. During his military service in the U.S. Army from 1954 to 1956, he served as a radio operator and married his wife while stationed in Germany. Following his discharge, he worked in marketing for the Elmo Roper polling firm in New York City. As an avid skier, he applied only to universities in mountainous states, earning his master's and doctoral degrees at the University of Colorado in 1962 and 1963. He did research and learned cross-county skiing in 1963 in Norway while on a National Science Foundation post-doctoral fellowship at the Psychologisk Institutt of Oslo University. In 1964 the Rappoport family moved to Manhattan, Kansas, where he became an Assistant Professor in the KSU Department of Psychology.

Dr. Rappoport taught graduate and undergraduate courses including Psychohistory (with George Kren), Life Span-Personality Development, Social Psychology, Health Psychology, the History of Psychology, the Psychology of

Ethnic Humor, and the Varieties of Consciousness. As an active professional he made many presentations and wrote numerous articles, chapters of books, and reviews. His books include: *Personality Development: The Chronology of Experience* (1972), *Human Judgment and Social Interaction* (co-edited, 1973), and *Psychology and the Problems of Today* (co-edited, 1978). His interests and research projects over the years were eclectic and wide-ranging, on such topics as conflict resolution; combat veterans' opinions regarding the Vietnam war; decision-making in ambiguous situations; the Holocaust; ethnic, gender, and racial humor; nutrition and food preference; post-modernism; preventing nuclear theft; and problems of theoretical psychology. Dr. Rappoport also jogged, led Zen meditation sessions for two decades, played tennis, practiced yoga, read prodigiously, and with friends and family fished, hiked, ice-skated, skied, and swam.

Professor Rappoport was recruited for the Clio's Psyche Editorial Board by his longtime KSU colleague and friend, the late George Kren (1926-2000). Together they edited *Varieties of Psychohistory* (1976), wrote *The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior* (1980, 1994), talked extensively, rode motorcycles, and smoked endlessly. The professor enjoyed retirement, during which he published *How We Eat: Appetite, Culture, and the Psychology of Food* (2003) and *Punchlines: The Case for Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Humor* (2005). For Clio's Psyche, he sometimes refereed articles and occasionally wrote them, serving this publication through e-mail and occasional telephone conversations.

We mourn the passing of this genial colleague and regret that a memorial is so late in coming, because we only learned of his illness and death this summer. Leon Rappoport is survived by his wife, Karen; one of his two sons; two grandchildren; and one sister. A memorial service was

held at the All Faiths Chapel on the KSU campus on October 11, 2009 and memorial memorabilia have been placed in the anteroom of the Kansas State Department of Psychology.

Ronald Downey, PhD, Professor of Psychology at KSU, may be contacted at downey@k-state.edu. Paul Elovitz, PhD, editor of this publication, may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com. □

Exemplifying the Influence of Childhood Experience: Robert N. Butler

Nora O'Brien-Suric—John A. Hartford Foundation

Paul H. Elovitz—The Psychohistory Forum

Robert Neil Butler (1927-2010), a psychiatrist, pioneer longevity expert, and advocate of the aging, died at age 83 of acute leukemia on July 4 after a highly productive life, only three days after last working. In his Pulitzer Prize-winning 1975 book, *Why Survive? Being Old in America*, he expressed his passionate belief that “human beings need the freedom to live with change, to invent and reinvent themselves a number of times through their lives.” He worked to end prejudices against older people, coining the term “ageism,” and pointed out that Alzheimer’s is far from inevitable among those who live long lives.

In addition to about 300 articles and chapters of books, Dr. Butler wrote or co-authored *The Longevity Prescription: The 8 Proven Keys to a Long, Healthy Life* (2010); *Aging and Mental Health: Positive Psychosocial and Biomedical Approaches* (1998); *Life in an Older America* (2001); *The New Love and Sex After 60* (2002 with his late wife, Myrna L. Lewis); and other books.

Butler’s enormous accomplishments included the founding directorship of the National Institute on Aging and

helping to start and lead the Alzheimer's Disease Association, the American Association for Geriatric Psychiatry, and the International Longevity Center. He advocated for the aging before Congress, the public, and the United Nations, and served as chair of the President's White House Conference on Aging in 1995. Quite importantly, he inspired numerous workers in what has become a major field of study in a country in which the life span has been extended on average by 30 years in the 20th century.

Butler as an Exemplar of the Impact of Childhood on Adult Accomplishment

Butler wrote that it was in his childhood that his life mission emerged. In less than a year after his birth in Manhattan on January 21, 1927, his parents separated; he was then raised on a chicken farm in Vineland, New Jersey by his maternal grandparents. His revered grandfather told wonderful stories and involved the small boy in the care of ill chickens at one end of the chicken house, called "the hospital." However, Butler suffered a terrible loss when his grandfather simply "disappeared" without anyone telling him what happened to him. When finally the boy learned his beloved grandfather had died, he deeply resented not being told. Honesty in dealing with issues of aging and death therefore became a lifelong value.

A local doctor helped him through scarlet fever and then took him on his medical rounds in his horse and buggy. The boy thought that if he had been a doctor, as he was to the chickens, he could have helped keep his grandfather alive. In the Great Depression his grandmother lost the farm, leaving the two of them to live on government surplus food, living in a run down hotel, which then burned down. His grandmother became a model of enormous endurance, resilience, and strength in the struggle for survival of the elderly.

In medical school, Robert Butler found he was taught

little of value in the treatment of his elderly patients, so he began to study the biology of the aging body. As a research psychiatrist, he probed the nervous system of older people and he was part of Ralph Nader's investigation of nursing homes. His identification with older people was quite intense; for example, he defended as "life review" the inclination of many elderly people to return to old memories. Two years ago he noted that he had come to fear death less than in earlier years. His was a life well-lived in fulfilling a childhood dream of helping beloved grandparents.

A Gerontologist Remembers Robert Butler

Although I have been a gerontologist for about 25 years, I never imagined that Dr. Butler could or would die. Bob has been a presence in my life since I read *Why Survive? Being Old in America* in the early 1980s. I had already decided on a career in aging, focused on geriatric mental health. He was my hero; he had dedicated his life and career to creating a better society for older people, and I planned on doing the same.

While I had an opportunity to meet him in person when I began working at an aging foundation in 1994, I was both thrilled and intimidated. I was too nervous to speak, but he couldn't have been more gracious and was completely down to earth and quite helpful. He advised the Brookdale Fellowship program I worked on and then I went to work with him at the International Longevity Center (ILC) (www.ilcusa.org). I was always impressed with Bob's abundant knowledge. He could see and say things in a way that no one else could. For instance, he didn't believe in the widely held option that longevity and population aging are economic threats that put a drain on society; he truly believed that health and longevity create wealth. So he commissioned a study to investigate his theory (the report can be accessed at: www.ilcusa.org/pages/media_items/do-health-and-longevity-create-wealth75.php). He believed that health re-

sults in productive engagement throughout life, and he was living proof of that.

Bob Butler was always optimistic, with boundless energy. Each day he had a dozen new ideas. We worked on many projects at once, and while I would need to take a break, he seemed to become more energized the busier he became. We as coworkers fondly called him the "Energizer Bunny." He was a most approachable Renaissance man, who believed strongly that providing appropriate care to older people required an interdisciplinary team. He hired staff from various disciplines and always sought our input on everything. Everyone at the ILC read and commented on chapters of his book, *The Longevity Revolution: The Benefits and Challenges of Living a Long Life* (2008).

The need for all health care professionals to receive support for training in geriatrics is something he worked hard for, lobbying Congress for geriatric fellowship awards for physicians. He planned on doing the same for nurses and social workers once he got his foot in the door. My colleagues and I will honor the memory of Robert N. Butler by working even harder to advance his vision of interdisciplinary geriatric care to build a better society for older people.

Nora O'Brien-Suric, MA, senior program officer at the John A. Hartford Foundation, has worked for two decades in the field of aging, performing many different tasks. She is in the final stages of completing her comparative doctoral study of aging in the Dominican Republic, France, Japan, the U.K., and U.S.A. and may be contacted at nora.obrien@jhartfound.org. Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, edited the March 2008 edition of Clio's Psyche devoted to the psychology of aging and may be contacted at pelovitz@aol.com or at pelovitz@ramapo.edu. □

BULLETIN BOARD

CONFERENCES: On **January 30, 2011**, **Kenneth Fuchsman** (University of Connecticut) will present "The Psychodynamics of the Family Romance Transformed: American Domestic Arrangements Since 1960," at the first 2011 **Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress Saturday Seminar**. Our program committee welcomes additional suggestions for winter and spring Work-In-Progress Saturday Seminars. On **November 15**, in conjunction with **Charles Strozier's** John Jay College of CUNY Terrorism Center, our seminar focused on the psychological study of terrorism, **Anna Geifman** (Boston University) presented "Death Orders," drawing on materials from her recently released volume on terrorism. We are pleased to announce that the International Psychohistorical Association (**IPA**) welcomes presentation submissions for its scheduled **June 8-10, 2011** meeting at the Lincoln Center Campus of Fordham University. At last June's IPA Convention, there were papers by the following colleagues: **Herbert Barry III**, **David Beisel**, **Paul Elovitz**, **Harriet Fraad**, Ken Fuchsman, **Juhani Ihanus**, **Margaret Kind**, **Henry Lawton**, **Jamshid Marvasti**, **Allan Mohl**, **Denis O'Keefe**, and **H. John Rogers**. On **July 7-10, 2011**, the International Society of Political Psychology (**ISPP**) is holding its annual conference in **Istanbul**, for which it is welcoming papers. At last July's ISPP conference in San Francisco, the Psychohistory Forum sponsored the panel "Political Psychology and Psychohistory," with presentations by Ken Fuchsman, Paul Elovitz, and David Beisel. At the conference, **Peter Loewenberg's** outstanding contributions to political psychology, including his work to strengthen and spread psychoanalysis and psychohistory in China, were recognized by his being singled out to receive the Sanford Award. His acceptance lecture, "'Face' in Chinese-American Diplomatic Relations," was well received by a large audience. On **April 13-17, 2011**, Division 39 on Psychoanalysis of the American Psychological Association (**APA**) will be having its meeting in Manhattan at the Park Sheridan Hotel. The International Forum for Psychoanalytic Education (**IFPE**) will be holding its next meeting on **November 11-13, 2011** at the Lago Mar Resort in Fort Lauderdale. At the **October 22-23, 2010** meetings of the Association of the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society (**APCS**), the Psychohistory Forum sponsored panel,

“Social Justice, Ethics, Economics, Greed, Atrocity in War and Psychohistory,” included papers by **Harvey Kaplan**, **David Hoddeson**, Ken Fuchsman, and Paul Elovitz. Additional papers by colleagues affiliated with the Forum included those of **C. Fred Alford** and **Marilyn Charles**. The National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP) November 6, 2010 conference entitled, “Do You Know Me? The Value of Multiple Theories in Psychoanalysis,” was held at the New York Marriott, downtown. **PUBLICATIONS:** Congratulations to **Rudolph Binion** for *Traumatic Reliving in History, Literature, and Film* (2010). **Irene Javors’** new book, *Culture Notes: Essays on Sane Living* ponders the question, “Have we all lost our minds?” **Norman Simms**, who has nearly finished his book, *Alfred Dreyfus: Man, Milieu, Mentality and Midrash*, plans to retire from teaching at the end of this year to devote his time to research and publication. Unrelated to his book, the special issue on anti-Semitism of *Mentalities*, which inspired this issue of Clio's Psyche on the subject, is now available from Norman Simms (nsimms@waikako.ac.nz) in New Zealand. **Marvin Eisenstadt**, who gave up e-mail when he retired from an agency position, chose to electronically publish his 2010 book, *Everything Related to Being a Psychologist*, on Amazon.com's Kindle e-book reader, joining 30,000 other authors on the site. **Nancy Unger’s** upcoming book, *Beyond “Nature’s Housekeepers”: Women in American Environmental History*, will soon be published by the Oxford University Press. **Howard F. Stein’s** new book of poetry, *Seeing Rightly with the Heart*, was released in October. **NOTES ON MEMBERS:** Congratulations to historian and longtime Forum member **Suzanne Adrion** on being awarded tenure at Monroe Community College in Rochester and on becoming a grandmother. Last September **Susan Gregory** traveled to Belfast, London, and Berlin to conduct workshops and interviews. **THANKS** to **Molly Castelloe Fong** for starting and hosting our **Online Forum**, which came into existence in the late summer, and to **Donald Carveth**, **Ted Goertzel**, **Joel Markowitz**, **Merle Molosky** and the many others who are keeping the discourse on a high intellectual and psychological level with a lively exchange. Contact Molly at (msc214@nyu.edu) if you want to join the discussion. Our appreciation to **Flora Hogman** for hosting some Forum meetings and to **Jacques Szaluta** for moderating

sessions. We welcome new members David Hoddeson, Jamshid Marvasti, and Allan Mohl. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, David Beisel, and David Lotto; Patrons Jamshid Marvasti, and Jacques Szaluta; Sustaining Members Andrew Brink, Ken Fuchsman, Mary Lambert, and Peter Pet-schauer; Supporting Members Robert (Bob) Anderson, Rudolph Binion, Susan Gregory, Eva Fogelman, John Hartman, Allan Mohl, Jacqueline Paulson, Mena and Dominic Potts, Burton Seitel-ler, Leon Solomon, Hanna Turken, and Nancy Unger; and Mem-bers Susan Charney, Geoffrey Cocks, Paul Elovitz, Irene Javors, Bob Lentz, Peggy McLaughlin, Geraldine Merrill-Pauling, and H. John Rogers. Our special thanks for thought-provoking materials to Rudolph Binion, Sander Breiner, Nathan Carlin, Jerome Chanes, Florette Cohen, Dan Dervin, Ronald Downey, Paul H. Elovitz, Jack Fitzpatrick, Eva Fogelman, Anna Geifman, Jay Geller, Fred Greenstein, Juhani Ihanus, Wallace Katz, Peggy McLaughlin, Allan Mohl, Kimberly Mahaffey, Jamshid Marvasti, Ruth Neubauer, Nora O'Brien-Suric, Sharon Pace, Paul Salstrom, and Leah Slivko. To Caitlin Adams and Nicole Alliegro for editing, proofing, and Publisher 2003 software application; to Devin McGinley for editing and proofing; and to Tim Kelly, Alex Ruiz, and Professor Paul Salstrom for proofing. Our special thanks to our editors and to our numerous, overworked referees, who must remain anonymous. □

We Wish to
Thank Our Prompt,
Hardworking,
Anonymous Referees
and Diligent Editors

Call for Papers
The Psychodynamics of the Changing Family
The March 2011 Special Issue

Psychological Insights on Numerous Topics Including:

- Case studies of explosive intimacy within the family
- Attachment, counterdependency, and individuation
- Cell phones, instant messaging, and the Internet as instruments of familial connection and separation
- Historical reasons for and changes within family life
- The relationship of family economics and psychology
- The impact of sports, television, and the Internet
- Changing roles of men, women, and children
- Single parenting and the changing American family
- Changing patterns of divorce across American history
- Why do Americans have such a high divorce rate?
- Why do children of divorce have a higher rate of divorce than do children of two parent families?
- Emotional and psychological consequences of divorce on children, divorcees, and society generally
- Family dynamics in polygamous families
- Gender and identity issues for children of divorce, as well as of gay, immigrant, non-married, and single parents
- The role of government, law, political change, and political correctness on changing family patterns
- What can attachment theory and research teach us about the changing family?
- Psychological issues in political and celebrity families
- Insights on familial changes for and from the theories of Freud, Adler, Jung, Sullivan, Winnicott, and others
- Review essays on relevant books and films

Due January 10, 2011

Articles of 500-1500 words (and two long ones) are welcome, as are additional suggestions. Contact co-editors Kenneth Fuchsman at ken.fuchsman@uconn.edu or Paul Elovitz at pelovitz@aol.com

Clio's Psyche
627 Dakota Trail
Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

