
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 1, Number 4

March, 1995

In Memoriam: Erik Erikson (1902-1994)

Leon Rappoport
Kansas State University

Psychohistorians in general, and psycho-biographers in particular, could do worse than to claim Erik Erikson as a founding father. Along with many others, a good deal of my work of the past thirty years — teaching classes in psychohistory, personality development, and conducting research on the Holocaust — has been directly informed by his pathbreaking

(Continued on page 2)

Thoughts on the 1994 Congressional Election

Ted Goertzel
Rutgers University

The conservative landslide in the 1994 elections raises some difficult questions for students of cycles in the mass psychology of the American electorate. The election of Bill Clinton seemed to confirm the Schlesingers' hypothesis that periods of liberal and conservative dominance alternate in approximately fifteen-year cycles. The Schlesingers documented this pattern for a period of over 200 years of American history, so it is difficult to dismiss it out-of-hand. But even a 200-year period is not enough to be statistically confident of a pattern in such a long cycle, so this theory will remain speculation for a very long time.

What does seem to be clearly operating is a shorter cycle tied to the presidential term. Many observers have noted this, and Lloyd deMause has examined it from a psychohistorical point of view. Clinton has had a very short honeymoon period, followed by an exceptionally strong disillusionment. This may have something to do with the role of Hillary in the administration. For a time, she seemed almost a co-President, which seems to have built up what Bion called a "pairing assumption" in the mass psyche. This means that unconsciously people expect a pair of leaders to "give birth" to something new and exciting which will transform the world. Thus, people expected dramatic change from the "first couple", and when Hillary's health reform failed they felt cheated and abandoned. And they used the 1994 election to punish the Clintons for doing that to them.

There is support for this interpretation in

(Continued on page 2)

IN THIS ISSUE

Will the 1996 Presidential Election Resemble 1948?	3
The Apocalyptic Imagination	4
The Use of Dreams by the Father of Medicine	6
George Kren: A View from Kansas	7
On Schindler	12
The English "Jew Bill" of 1752 and Laurence Sterne's Fears of Circumcision	13
Cocaine: The Industry of Pleasure	14
War, Peace, and Conflict Resolution — Researchers' Activities	15
Communism: The Dream that Failed — Research Group Meetings	17
Psychohistory Forum Meeting Schedule and Abstracts	18
Editorial Board for Clio's Psyche	19
Bulletin Board	20

theoretical studies. *Childhood and Society*, for
In Memoriam: Erik Erikson
(1902-1994)

(Continued from page 1)

example, has become a classic foundation text in developmental psychology, while at the same time serving as a major resource for therapists, psychobiographers, and others concerned with questions of culture and personality.

Then there are his biographical studies of Luther and Gandhi: outstanding creative efforts which virtually defined the field of psychobiography for my generation and firmly established its legitimacy as an area of scholarly-intellectual discourse. And at a more popular level, when the phrase "identity crisis" became something of a household word in the late 1960's, it was largely owing to Erikson's articulation of this concept. Especially admirable in this connection I think, was his stubborn resistance against demands for a positivist definition of identity: "The more one writes about this subject [identity], the more the word becomes a term for something as unfathomable as it is all-pervasive. One can only explore it by establishing its indispensability in various contexts" (*Identity, Youth and Crisis*, 1968, p.9). What an exemplary expression of intellectual *chutzpa* [assertiveness, nerve]!

Apart from his substantive achievements, however, there is another more figurative sense in which Erikson was emblematic of psychohistory. Just as the field itself has been characterized by a history of marginality, so too was Erikson's own life. Born out of wedlock to a Danish Christian mother but raised in Germany as a Jew by his adoptive father, he grew up rejected by anti-Semitic Germans for being Jewish, and by Jews for looking like a Nordic Gentile. Then, after several marginal *wandervogel* [wanderlust] years, he trained with Freud's circle in Vienna, was analyzed by Anna Freud, came to the States in 1933, and after a short time walked away from the opportunity to gain a PhD at Harvard.

We will undoubtedly soon be seeing psychobiographies of Erikson that will document his life and work in detail. Meanwhile, it must

suffice to acknowledge that with his passing we have seen the last of those extraordinary Freudian *conquistadors*, and the end of an era.

Leon H. Rappoport specializes in social psychology and has collaborated with George

all the unfair and irrational attacks on Hillary on
Thoughts on the 1994
Congressional Election

(Continued from page 1)

the talk shows and other popular media, despite her obvious popularity with the liberal media. I have no sympathy for this sexist assault on an intelligent and dedicated woman, but I do believe that both Bill and Hillary got swept up in the mass enthusiasm engendered by the pairing assumption and tied their fate to a plan which was not politically viable.

I don't believe that the Republican victory was inevitable. If Bill and Hillary had done something more modest but successful on health care (perhaps, some kind of catastrophic coverage for the uninsured), and had made some substantive changes in the welfare system, I believe we would be talking about the emerging Democratic majority today. I think the Schlesingers were right in that there is an alternation between active and passive moods in the mass psyche. What has happened is that the conservatives have taken the initiative with an activist agenda for change just when it seemed that the new liberal President and his wife were dropping the ball.

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 1, No. 4

March, 1995

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum
 627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-6866

Fax: (201) 848-0454

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD

Associate Editor: Bob Lentz

Subscription: free to members of The Psychohistory Forum, \$18 yearly to non-members, \$22 outside USA & Canada

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest that are 300-600 words.

I also believe that there are generational cycles in the political culture, as Strauss and Howe observed in their book *Generations: The History of America's Future*. The best evidence of this is Newt Gingrich's preoccupation with the Tofflers' ideas on "future shock." The emerging Republican leadership may be "conservative" in a lot of its political ideas, but it is culturally-attuned to the baby boom generation. Strauss and Howe, as well as the European generational theorists they rely upon, are more focused on this sort of cultural pattern than on shifts in public policy preferences.

Ted Goertzel is a professor of sociology and Director of the Forum for Policy Research at Rutgers University-Camden. □

Will the 1996 Presidential Election Resemble 1948?

Herbert Barry, III
University of Pittsburgh

President Clinton in early 1995 is way down in the public opinion polls and has received much of the blame for the Republican victory in both houses of Congress in the election of November, 1994. The 1996 presidential election, for which Clinton has already announced his candidacy, promises to be similar to that of 1948. In that year, Truman had low popularity ratings and was widely blamed for the Republicans' gaining the majority in both houses of Congress in 1946. Yet, Truman was reelected in 1948, contrary to the predictions of most public opinion polls. I believe that in early 1995, the reelection of Clinton is more probable than was the reelection of Truman at the equivalent time, early 1947. Clinton's advantages are based on his presidential situation and on his style of leadership.

Clinton in 1996 will be the 13th president who becomes his party's candidate for reelection four years after winning the election against his predecessor or against a member of his predecessor's party. The election was won by nine of his 12 predecessors who were in the same situation. Voters usually give a second

term to a president who replaced a president of the opposing party. Truman was one of nine vice-presidents who became president because of the death or resignation of his predecessor. Only four of these presidents, including the only president from Missouri, were their party's nominee and the winner of the next election.

Clinton's presidential leadership is both assertive and conciliatory. He proposes ambitious, idealistic initiatives but is willing to cooperate and compromise with the Republican majorities in Congress. He tries to regain the allegiance of Democrats who have recently voted for Republicans.

Truman's aggressive leadership and rejection of the Republican domestic program antagonized many voters. Many people have attributed Truman's election in 1948 to his aggressive denunciations of the "do nothing Republican Congress" and Dewey's appeals for national unity and conciliation. In my opinion, Truman would have won by a larger margin if he had been more conciliatory or if Dewey had been more aggressive.

The winner of the 1996 presidential election will depend partly on events from early 1995 until late 1996. I believe that Truman's defiantly liberal domestic policies impaired his popularity during the corresponding interval from early 1947 to late 1948. There were serious efforts to deny him the Democratic nomination for president. General Eisenhower probably would have won the Democratic nomination if he had been willing to accept it. Many Democrats supported Thurmond, the States' Rights "Dixiecrat" candidate, or Wallace, the Progressive candidate. General Eisenhower probably would have been elected if he had sought and won the Republican nomination in 1948 instead of 1952. Dewey was probably the strongest alternative Republican nominee.

Clinton appears to be in a more advantageous position. His domestic policies should help to maintain slow growth of productivity and inflation. His foreign policies should promote peaceful settlement of disputes. If a crisis requires military intervention by the United States, such an action should increase Clinton's popularity. Compared to Harry Truman's situation, in 1996 the Democrats

should be more united behind Clinton, even if Jesse Jackson becomes an independent candidate for president. General Colin Powell is an unlikely possibility for the role of General Eisenhower. The Republicans are unlikely to nominate a candidate as well-known and as acceptable to voters as was Dewey. Thus, despite the best efforts of the pundits to politically bury our only president from Arkansas, the "man from Hope" is likely to be president as we reach the second millennium.

Herbert Barry, III, is a psychologist whose specialties include birth order and presidential leadership. □

The Apocalyptic Imagination

Charles B. Strozier
John Jay College, CUNY

Excerpts from a speech given at the International Psychohistorical Association Convention, June 10, 1994, with the permission of the author.

What is this apocalyptic we all talk of now? Is it a mood we are in, or something that began with the creation of culture? Does it have a content? Surely, it must be more than a mood. It seems even to have a topography: these united apocalyptic states, this America. We live in it and are of it.

Certainly it's everywhere, in the gods of nuclearism and the reincarnated hopes of New Ageism, equally among the lowly and the empowered of Wall Street. Elsewhere in the culture some swear by the truth of the apocalypse in flowing robes and shaved heads or in plush churches with neon crosses hanging over giant altars. Pat Robertson and the Christian Coalition would like to take over the Republican Party and create a theocratic state: Pat the Ayatollah — an image we will probably be spared because he is so stupid. Billy Graham drew 750,000 people to Central Park a couple of years ago. The only hope for secularists was that Paul Simon had earlier drawn a million. A slender reed.

It's not new, this concern with the end of

the world, but it has renewed vitality in the nuclear age. As Robert Jay Lifton has put it, nuclear threat breaks our natural and organic connection with death. And without ultimate meanings at the individual or collective level, however that is symbolized, we have little on which to ground our lives and on which to center ourselves. At some level we live "as if" lives, pretending to a psychologically false coherence and integrity. For at least several decades it has been impossible for anyone with only one eye half-open to fully trust a human future. And the consequences, which we are only just beginning to understand, are enormous.

Most strikingly, with a loss of ultimate meaning comes violence. Among the Christian fundamentalists the violence is not always readily apparent, for the theory so deftly shifts agency. We fail God's hopes in this last and final age (in the elaborate theory of premillennial dispensationalism) and in anger He wreaks havoc during tribulation; Antichrist is a man, born in 1948 to coincide with the creation of Israel many believe, in whom Satan literally dwells; and at the final judgment (the second death for nonbelievers) God rewards and punishes according to starkly simple criteria set out in John 3:3. In such an ideology we are passive agents, victims of divine judgment and genocide. That's what the book of Revelations describes: Biblical genocide.

But the violence of the apocalyptic, at least as we live with it, also comes much closer to home. In the theology of the Nation of Islam, a large-headed and disgruntled scientist, Mr. Yacub, exiled 6,600 years ago from Mecca to the island of Patmos, no less, (where John received his vision that makes up the book of Revelations), this Yacub maliciously created from among his 59,999 followers the race of blue-eyed white devils. Such stark imagery controls the historical narrative among the dispossessed in a racist society that creates an underclass and is then surprised when its inhabitants riot. (The cost of rebuilding south-central Los Angeles, if in fact it is ever carried out, will be two-tenths of 1 percent of the cost of the S&L bailout. It puts looting in some perspective). But it's the full-scale race war we really fear, that explosion of rage we can barely name but which at some level we know would have a certain justice to it. Riots are the

apocalyptic foreplay, one might say. They generate the desire to hurry it up and get it over with.

It's made us all thanatoids sitting in front of our TV's. In such a deformed culture that has always been stubbornly Christian and is now solidly fundamentalist (according to current polling data 90 percent of Americans believe in God, well over a third believe in the reality of the devil, the same percentage expect to be raptured, half believe in angels, and 80 percent expect to be called before God at the final judgment to answer for their sins as described in Revelations 20), it is hardly surprising that fundamentalist ideology makes the most apocalyptic sense. Certainly in numbers it has the votes, for it grips the imagination of a quarter of the population (that's some 60 to 70 million people).

I'm interested in the fundamentalists as a kind of distilled essence of what I call the endism in our culture (with endism defined as the location of the self in some future narrative). The fundamentalist eschatology tells an odd, if evocative, story about the approaching end of human history and God's re-created universe after the return of Jesus. One woman I interviewed, for example, whom I call Mary, told me that God, in preparation for the great battles that mark the end times, is "plopping out" more boys than girls. God will then "destroy this world and heaven by fire, melt it down, and there will arise a new city, the new Jerusalem." Rev. Lester, in turn, a Baptist minister, takes acute pleasure in the punishment awaiting nonbelievers, whose biological death will be gruesomely violent and can only await the terrors of eternal damnation in the lake of fire after their resurrection and second death. "I'm kind of looking forward to all this stuff," he said, following a long description of end-time horrors. Monroe, a former CEO himself who went through a conversion experience in his 40s and became a missionary to the rich and powerful on Wall Street, spoke to me of the "astounding GNP" and the "super productivity" of the earth during the millennium. And, finally, Otto, a meek man and fervent believer in his late 40s, stressed the reversals during the millennium, when those nonbelievers who survive tribulation will at best drive the buses and take out the

garbage while the resurrected and now eternal faithful rule with Jesus from Mt. Zion in Jerusalem.

But we should not mistake symptom for cause, or reaction for event. In the most profound sense, the disease is human-created threats to existence, whether with a nuclear bang or an environmental whimper, to paraphrase T. S. Eliot. The best we can do is react, like the fundamentalists searching with their "signs" for empirical evidence of the unknown. It is by our own hands that the end of human life is now scientifically possible, by our own hands that we have created these vast and irrational structures of potential destruction. It is one thing to imagine the end, another to make it real.

The imaginings, of course, have a long history, from roots in Zoroaster (as described recently by Norman Cohn in *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to Come*) and from there into Judaism and early Christianity, to the dread that gripped Europe before the Year 1000, to powerful millenarian movements in the middle ages, and to the *fin-de-siecle* movement in the 19th century that began in France in the 1880s. As Elaine Showalter has noted, out of such chaos come many forms of social distress, especially sexual ones, which she connects to the gender anxieties of the late 20th century. I am more impressed, however, by the way Susan Sontag joins nuclear threat to our ongoing encounter with AIDS. Steven Jay Gould has estimated a quarter of the world's population could die from AIDS before it's all over. That's well over a billion people. It's not "Apocalypse Now," says Sontag, but "Apocalypse From Now On."

Can we avoid it? I don't know, but I have been impressed by two things in my work with fundamentalists. One is the way they authentically touch the real. They sing and talk of blood running up the bridles of their horses, but is that stranger than living a numbed "as if" life? Touching death and letting in the terror of ultimate destruction can warp you psychologically, but perhaps their cry gives voice to what otherwise lies even more dangerously buried in the American self. They are unsteady, these fundamentalists, no doubt about it, and in social life pursue policies that we must firmly resist. But there is a certain

authenticity in their read of our psychohistorical condition. I would prefer that Christians were centered on the Sermon on the Mount. But it may be that the fundamentalist shift in emphasis to the book of Revelations speaks to a deeper truth.

Second, among the fundamentalists the only ones I have found who can play with apocalyptic ideas and yet draw vital energy from them that fully supports a human future are in those communities of suffering, especially among blacks, whose lives approximate that of the early Christians tragically suffused with actual violence and persecution. These are people who know from the end time. They live it on a daily basis. But in contrast with so much of white fundamentalism, in them standing at the brink empowers rather than deadens, and magical notions of the return of Jesus work together with passionate commitments to rebuild torn families and neighborhoods, run soup kitchens and special after-school programs for troubled adolescents. Rev. Charles, whom I know well, of an end-time church in Harlem is quite clear about his political role as a black leader. He preaches in the major key of the apocalyptic and is a literalist in his reading of the Bible, but he was explicit in an interview that if he hadn't been a minister he would have been a revolutionary.

The Biblical story that Rev. Charles felt made the most sense out of his life history and commitments was that of Jonah. This "first and greatest evangelist" was a messenger of God sent to warn the citizens of Nineveh that they risked destruction unless they repented of their evil ways. Jonah, who at first resisted carrying out God's commandment by fleeing (just as Rev. Charles delayed his "calling" in the ministry), eventually accepted his responsibility. He then reached Nineveh in time and convinced its inhabitants of their impending doom and the urgent need for them to repent of their sins. The citizens of the city fell down and worshipped, and even the king put on sackcloth and sat in ashes. Similarly, Rev. Charles saw his role as that of warning a doomed people of the need to beg God's forgiveness. "I think one of the roles of our church or any end-time church," he said, "is to make people aware." They then must change "their life-style and their attitude toward

life," he continued, "and their attitude toward God, and their attitude toward each other." It is only the pressure of destruction that can force such a radical transformation; standing at the edge of the Apocalypse, Rev. Charles felt, was a powerful motivator.

The ironic end of the Biblical story, however, which was hardly lost on Rev. Charles, is that Jonah's success and the repentance of Nineveh only bought some time. As the book of Nahum, which is the sequel to that of Jonah, makes clear, after about a century God in fact carried out the destruction of the city so totally that it disappeared from the face of the earth. For Rev. Charles, who commented in the interview on this final end of Nineveh in a near whisper of terror, such is the paradox of faith and action. He sought to instill hope within awareness, or soon someone without "God in his heart" will "push the button." At best we can only buy time, and even that takes a huge effort and commitment. But we cannot give up, even though our ultimate destruction is assured. We must and can only act in a godly way to make a human future worthy of muting God's fury. It is an ambiguous lesson, to be sure, but perhaps it is the only spiritually honest theology in an age of real and evil threats to human existence.

Charles B. Strozier teaches history and co-directs the Center on Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College. He was the founding editor of The Psychohistory Review. His most recent book is Apocalypse: On the Psychology of Fundamentalism in America. □

The Use of Dreams by the Father of Medicine

J. Donald Hughes
University of Denver

Of ancient peoples, the Greeks had most to say about dreams. They preserved traditional wisdom concerning the visions of the night. Dream interpreters, *Oneriokritai*, were available for consultation, and among them were men and women of psychological insight who understood ancient lore. Greeks respected their dreams, believing that, among other things, they are a means of curing illnesses. These beliefs were

also typical of neighboring civilizations, but the Greeks more consistently than others tried to give a rational account of dreams and a scientific approach to interpretation.

A statue of Onerios, god of dreams, stood in a sanctuary of the healer god Asclepius at Sicyon, and with good reason. Dreams were used as a means of restoring physical and mental health at numerous centers. Each shrine had a priesthood of healer-seers who guided pilgrims and interpreted dreams. It was believed that a dream would occur to both patient and priest on the same night, a coincidence called *symptoma*, the root of the word "symptom." Incubation (*enkoimesis*) consisted of sleeping overnight in the god's chamber, often circular in shape. The dream could heal directly, or it could give advice or a prescription. Priests wrote down the dream as soon as the patient emerged. Many tablets inscribed with dreams have survived. An intelligent priest at a sanctuary gained practice through hearing thousands of dreams and might become a respected healer (*therapeutes*) who could recognize the meanings of images and relate them to patients' problems and process of improvement. The restoration of health that occurred as a result of incubation was never attributed to the priests, but always to the god.

The first discussion of dream interpretation as an aid to scientific medicine may be found in a book attributed to Hippocrates, bearing the title *On Dreams (Peri Enhyption)*, and dating from the fifth century BCE. The author is interested in the medical value of dreams as a diagnostic tool in ascertaining the patient's state of health or illness. The underlying assumption here is that mind and body are interdependent parts of the human totality, and that a physician gains a much-improved chance of curing the mind-body organism if the aid of both parts is enlisted. One of the aids to diagnosis that the mind offers is the content of dreams. Dreams happen when sleep frees the mind (which he calls *psyche*, or "soul") from its dependence on the body: "All functions of body and soul are performed by the soul during sleep." The mind can enter into unconscious communion with the physical state of the body and express this as well as its own state in dreams.

Hippocrates says that ordinary dream interpreters have little success with dreams that deal with physical and mental health. Unskilled in medical matters, they recommend only that their clients pray to the gods. He believes "that prayer is indeed good, but while calling on the gods a man should himself lend a hand." The book then tells how to interpret dreams as medical indications. Natural dreams, that is, those that represent normal salutary actions, are held to indicate a healthy state. But contrary dreams of struggle demonstrate that there is disturbance in the body due to some excess or deficiency. The treatment prescribed usually is limited to emetics, diet, massage, and various exercises, including voice exercises. Hippocrates recognizes the importance of psychological factors in treatment: the gods may not cause or cure disease, but the patient's prayer may still improve his state of mind and help the healing process. Most of the book consists of a list of the images that might be seen in dreams and their possible medical meanings. The interpretation is clear and easily applied. For example, dreaming of rain or hail means that one will suffer from running phlegm (a sinus cold, perhaps), and should diet, go for long runs wearing a heavy cloak, and take vapor baths. Hippocrates' view of dreams as a diagnostic aid was followed by other medical scientists such as Herophilus of Alexandria and Galen of Pergamum.

The Hippocratic discussion of dreams was a valuable advance in human thought on the subject. As George Sarton said, it was an "attempt to explain rationally the mysteries of dreamland and apply them to healing purposes. The author of that book was a distant ancestor of Freud." Yet modern commentators on Hippocrates have missed an important fact. That is, he recognizes the function of dreams as indications of psychic problems (*Mania*) or the general state of psyche. For example, a dream of wandering stars is symptomatic of "a disturbance of the soul arising from anxiety" (probably because of the displacement of elements within the psyche), and should be treated by having the patient contemplate things that will make him happy and full of good humor. A dream of eating shows "depression of the psyche," no doubt because the dream indicates the filling of a

deficiency or need. This case could serve as a classic example of compensation. Thus Hippocrates took a pioneering step toward the use of dreams as an aid to psychoanalysis.

J. Donald Hughes is the John Evans Professor of History at the University of Denver where he teaches ancient and environmental history. □

George Kren: A View from Kansas

Bob Lentz

George Kren, this issue's featured, distinguished psychohistorian, lives and works in that other Manhattan — Manhattan, Kansas — where he is Professor of History at Kansas State University. He treasures the academic freedom and social community around the University as well as the psychoanalytic expertise of the Menninger Foundation in nearby Topeka. George is unique among psychohistorians in having a long-time collaborator, Leon Rappoport, a Kansas State University social psychologist. Their two psychohistory volumes are Varieties of Psychohistory (as editors) and The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior. Among George's other works, including seven chapters in books and thirty-eight journal articles, are a book, Scholars and Personal Computers, and four articles on microcomputers in the social sciences and humanities. He is also quite an accomplished photographer. George expressed his straightforward views on psychohistory, psychoanalysis, and what our culture defines as "normal" from his home in Manhattan.

CP: How do you define "psychohistory"?

GK: Psychohistory brings psychological studies to history. It's a recognition that major motives and therefore major actions are determined by the subconscious and are not immediately accessible to direct observation. I do not think psychohistory is or ought to be a separate discipline. Rather, it has the potential of significantly increasing our range of

understanding history generally.

CP: Of which of your psychohistory works are you most proud?

GK: The major one is *The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior*, which is now out by Holmes and Meier in a revised paperback edition with a couple new chapters. It is a joint work, done with Leon Rappoport, who is a social psychologist. It uses psychohistorical concepts as a means of comprehending the Holocaust. We had started out with the question of how people can do these things. We ended up recognizing that the individual perpetrators tend to be by any standard definition quite normal. So then we moved to how groups behave and were led to a recognition of the centrality of Hitler, and an examination of the Hitler psychobiographies.

We came to the fairly unpalatable conclusion that the people who do the most horrible things are eminently "normal" — that almost anybody can, with a fairly minimal amount of external conditioning, be made to participate in the most horrendous acts. We were at first strongly influenced by writers such as Theodor Adorno and Henry Dicks who had emphasized the authoritarian family, the prevalence of corporal punishment, or a domineering father as explanatory principles of why individuals commit atrocities. Since then the work of Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo has shown how easy it is for "normal" people to engage in destructive behavior. We need to recognize that normalcy is a cultural construct, not an objective statement of fact, in the sense that cancer is an objective statement of illness. The problem is that our culture regards any number of acts of violence (see any film on Vietnam which includes scenes of the interrogation of prisoners, or depicts "search and destroy" missions) as normal and legitimate.

CP: What are you working on now?

GK: I'm writing a general book on the Holocaust for students. It will be published in about a year-and-a-half by Harlan Davidson. At this time I've finished the first draft and now I'm taking account of all sorts of new literature that has come out, and also making sure that it doesn't sound as if it were translated from the

German as all my first drafts do.

CP: About your youth — you were born in Austria in 1926. Will you share the story of your coming to America?

GK: My experiences were fairly typical for European Jews of my generation, however, in terms of their effects on me, significant! They include being the object of very explicit anti-Semitism, getting beaten up in school, experiencing the *Anschluss* (the absorption by Germany of Austria) in March of 1938, attending a Jewish boarding school near Berlin where during *Kristallnacht* Storm Troopers came in and busted up the school. I recall going to live with an aunt and uncle in Berlin after the school closed. That night my uncle was arrested and sent to Oranienburg. In April of 1939 my sister and I were sent to England, where I lived in a youth hostel until the outbreak of war in September, 1939. I was then evacuated to an English working class family in Sussex. I came to the United States in 1941. My parents had arrived some months earlier.

CP: How did you end up in Kansas, at Kansas State University?

GK: After a few beginning college teaching positions in Ohio and Illinois, the idea of teaching at an university appealed to me. There was a job opening at Kansas State and I applied without really knowing where Kansas was. And I said, “Oh, for a few years, this wouldn’t be bad.” And I ended up staying in Kansas. Though the quality of students was not what it was at Oberlin (my first job), teaching here has been enjoyable and rewarding. I’ve had a chance to teach and explore what I’ve wanted. Nobody has complained about my doing psychohistory and said that it’s not blue chip. I could teach anything I wanted to as long as I could get students. I could teach courses in psychohistory and the history of childhood, sometimes cooperatively with Leon Rappoport.

CP: How did you come to psychohistory?

GK: Well, my own major work was in intellectual history. In that context the role of Freud in European thought was important to me. I looked at Freud from the point of view of cultural history. But I really got into

psychohistory by working on the Holocaust.

CP: Who was important to your development?

GK: I got my PhD in history in Madison at the University of Wisconsin with George Mosse who is one of the preeminent scholars in the United States. Mosse, my *Doktorvater* [doctor/father role model], was decisive in my development. Not that we always agreed! He would certainly speak of Freud’s influence in intellectual history but emphasize cultural rather than psychological factors. Thus, he would explain Hitler primarily in terms of the long tradition of German anti-Semitism and the long tradition of German racism without even mentioning Hitler’s childhood.

One of the influences I picked up purely by accident while I was in college was a brilliant little magazine called *Politics*, edited by Dwight Macdonald. There I first learned of Wilhelm Reich whom I found interesting, not because I found his hobbies that congenial, but because of his notion that the psychological dimension can play a major role in history.

CP: What impact did Erik Erikson have on you?

GK: More the specific Luther biography than the theoretical work, though I’ve used his childhood material in the history of childhood course. Erikson’s *Young Man Luther* shows that his theology is not something purely abstract but really responds to specific human needs. Luther could not deal with the authoritarianism and the judgmental nature of his father. Hence, his re-creation of God as the kindly, forgiving father who was different from his own. And the example I use to illustrate psychohistory to my students when we talk about Erikson, is that in Roman Catholic theology the Virgin Mary figures as a major intercessor between a sinner and a judgmental God. If you look at a typical German family, that is not an unknown role for the mother, who frequently mediates between the son and the father. The father wants to punish the son but the mother will say, “Oh, he didn’t really mean it, forgive him this time.” But Luther’s mother by all accounts was quite the opposite. When Luther’s father hit him, she’d say give him a few more for her. And Luther got

his revenge, didn't he? Look at the role of the Virgin in Protestant theology! In other words, the concept of the Virgin Mary as the intercessor is grounded — is not simply invented — in a typical family situation. Similarly, Protestant theology can be connected to Luther's own experience. These kinds of things in theology I've found very useful in saying, "Here's what you can do with psychohistory. You can get away from simple issues or reductionism and determinism. Here are other ways of looking at the situation."

CP: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

GK: For about half-a-dozen years Leon Rappoport and I taught a course on the history of childhood which was fun to teach but which was not altogether popular with mothers who found the emphasis on the history of corporal punishment and the notion that it is not an ideal way of raising a child very offensive, since most believed in it. There was a general sense that all this concern over corporal punishment is complete nonsense — it's basically good for children. I did a smaller class in the seventies, in which I had students write their childhood biographies. You could make a case, on the basis of their descriptions, that some of the things that had been done to them could be properly labelled abuse. But none of them resented it. They said this is how we're going to bring up our children. The one book that influenced me on childhood is Joseph Rheingold, *The Fear of Being a Woman*. It's an analysis which argues that women at times have a real hatred for their children, and that this accounts for child abuse. It's worthwhile noting that childhood is not the ideal experience, and that everything ranging from punishment to abuse is not accidental but is grounded in some psychological need.

CP: Was there any special training that was most helpful to your becoming a psychohistorian?

GK: No, I wish I had had some more. I've not had an analysis and now strongly regret this. I wish I had had more of a chance really to work in a clinical setting. I've learned primarily by my own readings and talking with people.

A major thing was the monthly seminar group at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, about 50 miles from here. The Mid-America Psychosocial Study Group lasted for about 20 years. Very simply, about 10 or 15 or 20 people got together to discuss papers. That was significant in that it brought me in touch with some psychoanalytically-oriented people. Paul Pruyser was a key figure in this program and I learned a great deal from him.

CP: Please tell us about your experience teaching psychohistory.

GK: For a while in the seventies, when psychohistory was popular [at Kansas State], Leon Rappoport and I taught it, which allowed us to introduce students to the literature. I think people who had taken our courses have begun to see the world a little differently. Then interest dropped and we couldn't get students.

We tried to start a psychohistory program at Kansas State with the Menninger Foundation, a great source of psychoanalytic expertise. (It's still one of the major centers in the country.) Graduate students would do history courses and write a dissertation in psychohistory at Kansas State and also take courses and do some clinical work at the Menninger Foundation. We got some funding which allowed me to bring everybody who was anybody in psychohistory in for a lecture; it was a wonderful year! We had Lloyd deMause, John Demos, Peter Loewenberg, Rudy Binion, and Bruce Mazlish. The program didn't make it because of one problem we could not solve. We could not get money to support the graduate students. Neither one of us now teaches a psychohistory course, but I devote a substantial amount of time to it when I teach historiography to graduate students.

CP: Why do you feel interest in psychohistory dropped?

GK: A number of reasons. One, Freud and psychoanalysis are very much part of the liberal ethos, the notion that one's own personal problems can be solved by rationally analyzing them. Freud attempted to rationally comprehend the irrational. A great humanistic faith in the individual coupled with a very explicit anti-religious ideology is, I think, central. The New Conservatives sneeringly call it "secular

humanism.” And, the political and cultural shift to the right has succeeded in undermining secular liberal values of which Freudianism is a part.

The second reason is the general decline of psychoanalysis as we move towards an increasing pharmacological way of dealing with therapeutic issues. Third, the general failure of people in psychohistory (with a few exceptions) to establish themselves successfully in academic life. They never got a real foothold. In the seventies any number of colleges and universities were offering courses in psychohistory — now very few do [to the best of my knowledge].

And, the other thing, of course, is that the at-times acerbic differences within psychohistory have not helped. It sort of reminds me of the 16th-century Anabaptist sects! In Kansas, whenever you disagree with somebody, people find it almost ill-mannered or offensive. But, certainly, having divergent views and debating them and seeing alternative interpretation is all for the good. I've just never been pleased with the lack of civility that has appeared at times.

CP: So, what is psychohistory's future from here?

GK: I don't see it doing very much as a separate field. But I don't see this as negative. Its main thing is to leaven regular history. These days when you're writing about anything which includes behavior, as history obviously does, I don't think that you can write it, even if you're not a psychohistorian, without some attention to psychology. Having said that Napoleon wanted to conquer Russia because he was ambitious doesn't explain anything!

Now, there's the risk that anything can be misused — and I guess psychohistory has a greater risk of being misused because of the lack of the kinds of checks and balances you have for more conventional history where people can recheck your sources. But I think it has left a permanent imprint. Historians are going to write differently about women then they did 15, 20, years ago. It won't be, “the Americans went west, taking with them their goods, cattle and women.” Nobody's going to say that anymore! And if someone states that he has a recurrent

nightmare that he is at the front shooting a machine gun and that the bullets instead of shooting out just leave the barrel and fall to the ground, no one is going to reach for a manual on ballistics to see if that could possibly be true.

CP: Several times you've mentioned Leon Rappoport with whom you've been collaborating since 1967. You were a historian before a psychohistorian, he's a social psychologist. Others say that integration or synthesis or convergence of history and psychology best occurs within one and the same individual. How do you view individuals from the different fields collaborating?

GK: It was not, is not, that I do the history and he does the psychology. I've done enough psychology so that I could do it on my own and he's done some history. It was much more that we could both speak the same language and had worked out a structure where we could mutually explore new ideas, criticize each other and say, “Look, let's try this more radical way.” And it gets us somewhere at times! For example, one of the statements we tried out in the Holocaust book, “Let's suppose that the Holocaust and anti-Semitism are not connected.” On the face of it, a totally foolish thing — they obviously are connected. But it led us to explore the eugenic elements of the Holocaust — that people had a very positive view of race and sought to create a racial utopia.

CP: What do you feel psychohistorians need to do to strengthen our work?

GK: Psychohistorians need to write so that those with no training in psychohistory or those who do not accept psychoanalytic theory find the argument itself, in its specifics, convincing. That is not easy. I think Erikson did it to a significant extent. And secondly, there must be — the key thing in history — a real respect for the evidence. There's a book, a psychobiography of Hitler by Norbert Bromberg and Vera Volz called *Hitler's Psychopathology*, which comes close to being one of the worst psychohistory books I've ever read! For example, the book says that when Hitler was in the army during World War I he was court-martialled for engaging in homosexual activity with an officer. There's not one iota basis of fact on that! Everything has to meet the conventional

test of historical evidence and has to be convincing in its own right without reference to theory. You can not be deductive in psychohistory. You use whatever theoretical competencies you have as a way of organizing your material, as a way of developing an argument, but when you finally present it you leave the theory out.

CP: How can psychohistorians have more impact in academia?

GK: Just by publication of good psychohistory books. The psychoanalytic profession has lost interest in cultural and intellectual issues. The whole medicalization of psychoanalysis has created a gulf so that what's happening in psychoanalysis only tangentially touches non-medical people. And, I think the general right-wing climate would suggest that psychoanalysis which had been the soil which had nourished psychohistory is on its way out. Because of the increasing cost of medical care it's going to be a luxury that fewer and fewer people can afford.

CP: Should we still try to recruit new people?

GK: I don't think we're really going to recruit people. I think people recruit themselves to psychohistory, in terms of their own experience in one way or another. They see it, and simply as long as someone is there with books they can read or people they can talk to — can correspond with — that's about as much as you can do, making collegiality available to them. I do not see programs like we tried with Menninger ever getting off the ground.

CP: And, in conclusion?

GK: The Holocaust has been central for me, led me to psychohistory and philosophy, trying to comprehend the nature of the human being — overall, a depressing journey. The general literature regards the people who ran the Nazi camps as abnormal, but the Americans who went and tortured people in Vietnam are defined as normal. I know of only one article that has ever raised the question whether torture in the service of a counterinsurgency has any psychological dimensions. In *Varieties of Psychohistory*, the anthology Leon and I did in 1976, we included an article by a psychiatrist

who talks about a medic who ends up shooting an elderly Vietnamese farmer. If you look at the whole treatment of Lt. Calley and My Lai, nobody ever thought that any psychological dimensions were involved. The culture regards it as normal. Nobody has ever looked at an executioner as involving anything psychological. I'm curious about these people who inject others with lethal solutions. One of the things they do before the injection is clean the skin with alcohol, I suppose as a way of creating the illusion that they are being professional! We have separated private and public conduct and act as if acts done for the state, frequently involving doing harm to others, have no psychological significance, do not provide some kind of sadistic satisfaction. Perhaps the time has come that we define doing harm to others, whether done as a free enterprise activity or done as part of an officially-sanctioned activity, as not legitimate. Auden summarized this very succinctly in a poem written at the outbreak of World War II:

I and the public know
What all schoolchildren learn,
Those to whom evil is done
Do evil in return. □

On Schindler

George Kren
Kansas State University

A recent critically important work by Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland*, documents how easy it was for "ordinary men" to participate in mass killings. Indeed, in 1945 when we fully learned what happened in Auschwitz, Treblinka, Sobibor, and other camps, we — particularly psychohistorians — sought to find explanations as to how people could do such things. But today, after a half-century study of the Holocaust, after the investigations of Milgram and Zimbardo, we know better, and know that "ordinary people, simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part, can become agents in a terrible destructive process" (Milgram).

A few individuals at the risk of their own lives attempted to save others' lives. The Oliners in *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*, basing themselves on testimony of survivors and interviews with rescuers, attribute the heroic behavior to moral values associated with certain psychosocial and developmental factors, emphasizing that this behavior was based on moral values acquired in the context of caring, anti-authoritarian families. "For some rescuers...[it] was a matter of heightened empathy for people in pain....And for a small minority, it was a question of loyalty to overriding autonomous principles rooted in justice or caring (p.249)." Clearly this does not apply to Oskar Schindler, who, by conventional standards was immoral, a womanizer, a black marketeer, and probably an alcoholic. Leon Rappoport and I, in a recent article, "Amoral Rescuers: The Ambiguities of Altruism" *Creative Research Journal* 6 (1-2) pp.129-136 (1993), attempted to examine the psychological sources of his (and also those of Siegfried Jagendorf's) motives for rescuing Jews. As far as Schindler is concerned we find no contradiction between his "immorality" and his willingness to take major risks to save "his" Jews, but perceive the source for his passionate actions in a dynamic of narcissism and grandiosity placed into the service of altruism. Pitting himself against ferociously powerful forces Schindler was able to affirm his superiority on an almost daily basis.

I find some problems in Henry Lawton's analysis of Schindler in the first issue of Clio's Psyche, which completely fails to recognize the conditions prevailing in Poland between 1942 and 1945. Lawton treats the film as if it were fiction rather than an essentially accurate portrayal of historical events. He is correct in noting that Schindler's action permitted him to feel superior to the Nazi's, but to hold that his recruitment of Jewish slave labor "because they will accept exploitation in the hopes of staying alive" is utterly untenable. Schindler did not enslave Jews. He ran an operation which was designed to save their lives. He even requisitioned relatives of his workers from the main camp, where many were dying. When challenged about the children he had included in his list he fobbed off a story that their small

fingers were needed in production. At the end when he feared that the SS might kill his Jews he acquired weapons for them, and used his money to bribe Nazi officials. By no stretch of the imagination may we perceive *Schindler's List* as a fantasy apology for capitalism.

Spielberg provides a somewhat sanitized view (probably on the not-necessarily incorrect ground that the American public could not face seeing the reality of what happened) of the death camps. Focusing upon a real Schindler who is not a fictional character, the film shows how this *bon vivant* was overcome with revulsion over the Nazi cultivation of death, and, affirming a love of life and Eros, insisted (to use a phrase of Thomas Mann's) that death shall have no dominion. The psychological sources for his heroism — and his actions properly demand that term — were rooted in his "immoral" life style which made him affirm life. □

The English "Jew Bill" of 1752 and Laurence Sterne's Fears of Circumcision

Norman Simms

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Recently, I published an article on the Jews in Laurence Sterne's novel *Tristram Shandy*.¹ The novel seemed to be obsessed with circumcision. Sterne was alert to the general mania that accompanied the so-called "Jew Bill" of 1752 to give a select number of Jews naturalization. Newspapers and street speakers stirred up fears that, should Jews gain citizenship, they would force all Englishmen to undergo circumcision. The novelist looked with scorn at the popular anti-Semitism stirred up by the debates,² but used the occasion to mix into his novel traditions pertaining to circumcision and castration. Tristram Shandy, whose name alludes to Aristotle's dictum, *post coitu tristam est* (after coitus there is sadness), had his upper nose crushed by forceps at delivery. A few years later the maid allows him to pee out the window; the casement falls and little Tristram has his lower nose crushed.

Sterne identified with Tristram, and

contemporary readers had difficulty separating the man from his works. Arriving from obscurity in Yorkshire to become the talk of London, Sterne played up this confusion. His correspondence, when the novel was appearing, may be indicators of the novelist's unconscious.

In January, 1760, Sterne reacted to criticism that *Tristram Shandy* wantonly encourages female unchastity. He declares his motivation for writing is "not to be *fed*, but to be *famous*."³ The letter moves into anxiety deriving from fears about masculinity: "An author is not so soon humbled as you may imagine — no, but to make the book better by castrations, that is still *sub judice*, and I can assure you, upon his chapter, that the very passages and descriptions you propose that I should sacrifice in my second edition are what are best relished by men of wit, and some others whom I esteem as sound critics — so that, upon the whole, I am still up, if not above fear, at least above despair, and have seen enough to shew me the folly of an attempt of castrating my book to the prudish humors of particulars. I believe that short cut would be to publish this letter at the beginning of the third volume, as an apology for the first and second."

Resistance turns to defiance, even aggression. Why should Sterne see the charge striking at his maleness? The answer is that the pen/penis runs through literary history, as does the notion that an author's books are his offspring, so threats to them are attacks against maleness.

In April, 1760, in a letter to David Garrick, the pain is displaced from penis to finger. He writes "Dear Sir, — 'Twas for all the world like a cut across my finger with a sharp pen-knife. I saw the blood — give it a suck — wrapt it up — and thought no more about it."⁴ Then the associations lead him towards something more ambiguously expressed: "But there is more [that] goes [in]to the healing of a wound than this comes to — a wound (unless it is a wound not worth talking of — but by the bye, mine is) must give some pain after." This threat derives from a sore place where creativity and potency meet, and where the figure of a threatening and protecting father collides with anxieties over criticism.

In this same letter to Garrick, Sterne

rejects rumors that he is planning to give Tristram a tutor based on Bishop Warburton: "The report might draw blood from the author of *Tristram Shandy* — but could not harm such a man as the author of the *Divine Legislation*."⁵ This passage is tied to what happened when Moses tried to enter Egypt with his uncircumcised son, Gershom. An angel stood in the road; the prophet was stunned, but Moses' wife circumcised the baby; the angel stood aside.⁶ In this dream-like text, Warburton becomes the angel, Sterne the infant and Moses, and the public the female-circumciser.

Once Sterne is established with a steady income, the "castration complex" disappears from his letters. But the anxiety is present always, lurking in the last books of the novel, in events such as Tristram's impotent journey through France,⁷ Uncle Toby's futile wooing of Widow Wadman, and the "truncated" conclusion, which is nothing but "a cock and bull story."

¹Norman Simms. "The Missing Jews and Jewishness in *Tristram Shandy*" *The Shandean* 4 (1992) 135-152. The background details to the argument put forward here are noted and referred to in this article.

²Samuel Richardson, another novelist, for instance, wrote to Elizabeth Carter on 17 August 1753 of "the foolish, the absurd Cry" raised in the past few years against the Jews; cited by T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben O. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 549.

³The letters are edited by Sterne's daughter, Lydia Sterne de Medallc and published in *The Works of Laurence Sterne* (London: George Rutledge and Sons, n.d.), p.561.

⁴*Works*, p.562

⁵Warburton's *Divine Legislation of Moses* was one of the key texts in trying to accommodate Christianity (the Law of Moses transformed into the New Testament of Jesus) to Deism. Warburton was therefore a controversial figure in the debates over orthodoxy in mid-century.

⁶How Sterne came to know of these rabbinical *midrshim* and *debatos* is explained in my article; see Note 1 above.

⁷Arthur Cash calls *Tristram Shandy* "the first novel in our literature which gives a central place to the theme of impotence" (*Laurence Sterne: The Later Years* (London and New York: Methune, 1986), p.258, n.160).

Norman Simms is director of the Institute for the History of Mentalities and teaches literature at the University of Waikato in Hamilton, New Zealand. □

Pleasure

Alberto Fergusson
University of the Andes

For some years now I, and others in Bogota, have been working to develop some ideas related to drug use, drug trafficking and, especially, a psychohistorical perspective that might lead us to understand something more about drugs and drug-related problems. In 1990, with a Colombian historian, I wrote an essay called "The Industry of Pleasure" which was published in September, 1991, in *Occasional Documents* (Andes University of Bogota) and in the *Journal of the Colombian Society of Psychoanalysis*. Here I am summarizing some of our basic ideas, including some recent developments, which I am putting in the form of three hypotheses. It is my hope that scholars elsewhere will want to join in our project.

I. The Pleasure of Drugs

Much has been said about the use of drugs, drug traffickers and drug trafficking. But I have always wondered why so little has been said with regard to the relation between drugs and pleasure. It seems obvious to say that everything that has to do with drugs begins with the capacity these substances have to produce pleasure. But little attention has been paid to such an obvious fact. So my first hypothesis has been that we must include the study of pleasure in our efforts to understand anything which has to do with drugs. This hypothesis is a "truism." It tries to demonstrate that if the capacity to produce pleasure were not present in drugs, then there would be no such thing as drug-related problems. If we wish to understand what happens to addicts we must bear in mind that they are addicted to a substance that generates pleasure and not only to a substance that is also potentially harmful. If we wish to understand the enormous problems related to drug traffickers, we must also bear in mind that they are people who dedicate their lives to produce substances which generate pleasure rather than only to an industry which generates severe health problems and corruption.

II. The Full Narcissistic Pleasure

My second hypothesis has to do with the very specific type of pleasure, a masturbatory form of pleasure, associated with drug addiction. Freud was the first one to point out the relation between masturbation and addiction. He said that "masturbation was the single great habit...the primary addiction."

In "The Industry of Pleasure," we propose and describe the existence of what we called the Full Narcissistic Pleasure. It is a private, secret and self-censored pleasure, which is nevertheless conscious. Such pleasure, according to our hypothesis, underlies both masturbation and addiction. When someone smokes nicotine, or drinks coffee, or uses alcohol or cocaine, he or she experiences a most individual pleasure in his whole self (body and mind). In our view, the way in which such pleasure is handled internally determines the future "choice" between simple drug use or addiction. It is a narcissistic pleasure only if and when it is self-sufficient. It becomes narcissistic if it can be obtained without other people, and if it doesn't lead you to experience pleasure with others. In our view object-libido [love of another] is strong and narcissistic-libido [self love] is weak in those who use drugs and never become addicted. One of our basic endeavors for the future should be to try to differentiate simple use from addiction.

Let us state all that I have said before in a different way: some people become addicted to a masturbatory pleasure, a Full Narcissistic Pleasure, that they obtain through the use of certain substances. Other people develop enormous and very lucrative activities by creating industries which produce substances that generate pleasure, mainly masturbatory pleasure in others.

III. Blinders From Our Superegos

I have always been amazed by the way both drug addiction and drug trafficking are handled while other, very similar problems, are faced differently. In my view the basic difference has to do with the enormous amount of infantile ethical and moralistic considerations which tend to impregnate the whole matter.

That is why my third hypothesis is that some of the difficulties we face when handling

drug problems in therapy and in society are related to our attitudes towards masturbatory pleasures. We see drug traffickers as evil men who dedicate their lives to produce substances which produce forbidden Full Narcissistic Pleasures.

Conclusion

I want it to be clear that I am not trying to deny the obvious harmful effect drugs have in individuals and in society. What I am arguing is that if we don't study and understand the unconscious elements involved, we shall not be able to really do something efficient with all the suffering which drugs generate as a result of their production, trafficking and consumption. I am also saying that amongst those unconscious elements, the very peculiar and individual Full

Narcissistic Pleasure is most important. My basic findings come from my work as a psychoanalyst. With some of my analysands I have been able to study in detail the use of drugs, and also the incredible fantasies and myths with regard to "drug lords" and drug trafficking. Finally, everything seems to arrive to the same point: drug lords are seen as people who dedicate their lives to satisfying their own forbidden pleasures, i.e., they kill those they don't like and they can possess any woman they want.



Appeal for Assistance

These hypotheses form the basics of a research project I wish to continue to develop with the help of scholars and therapists. Among other materials I need more material from lives

HUMAN SACRIFICE TABLE		
	Real	Symbolic
Type I - Sacrifice of the Dying		
I.A. Useful killing	cannibalism	gingerbread men
I.B. Wasted killing	(see Double Identity Table below)	toy guns
Type II - Sacrifice of the Living		
II.A. Wasted Wealth	potlatch	burning religious candles
II.B. Useful Wealth	Marshall Plan	N/A

of addicts, drug dealers and drug lords. I also need fantasies, day and night dreams from non-addicts and non-traffickers, with regard to addicts and traffickers. Materials from childhood are of course most useful. I need

DOUBLE IDENTITY* TABLE (List of Type I.B., Wasted Killing, Victims)

Age-group	Example	Age-group	Example
infants	universal	adults	
small children	Incas	men	ancient Greece
adolescents		women	Hindus
boys	soldiers	older people	ancient Egypt
girls	Mayans	different religion living in the community	Jews
		different ethnic group living in the community	Gypsies

* **Double identity** is the concept that, in order to be an adequate sacrifice victim on behalf of the group, the individual must have two (or double) characteristics: 1) be a member of the group, and 2) yet somehow be weaker or different from the people in the group.

These tables were taken from *Blood of the Beloved* (manuscript in preparation) by Mary Coleman.

Communism: The Dream that Failed — Research Group Meetings

Paul H. Elovitz

The Group, having completed its intensive research on Karl Marx the man, turned to the allure of twentieth-century communism, primarily in America. The December 10th meeting raised a large number of questions along these lines, including: Why were so many people drawn to communism in the 1930s and 1940s? What did so many see in Marx and the Soviet experiment? Why were so many seduced by Stalinism? Why did they strive to justify Russian communism despite the crimes of Stalin? Why in the end did almost all of them become disillusioned? What made some people willing slaves of the Marxist movement? Why there was such a sharp dichotomy between what people said and did? Why did some find it to be the best-of-all-worlds to be a capitalist-Marxist? Why did some people become unconscious hypocrites? Why do many Freudians maintain a Marxist man-is-good position in public? There was a tendency to return to the questions of what people wanted from Marx and what in him dazzled so many.

Many different answers were provided for all of these questions. What follows are only a few. Among Marxists envy was a powerful emotional motivation. Jews drawn to Marxism had a powerful expectation it would spell the end of anti-Semitism. To young American leftists in the 1930s and 1940s the appeals of communism were an intellectual cover for sexual freedom, belief in a perfect country in Russia, a sense of intellectual and moral superiority to bourgeois society, and a martyrology as well as justifiable aggression against the "class enemy" and those who did not agree with them. There was also the special sense of being part of a secret society and a heroic masochistic element in Marxism. These appeals were extraordinarily powerful to many people. The perfect society Marxists sought need not be real, but it was in their heads. The belief system short-circuited the superego. On a personal level it helped some adjust to America. Immigrants and children of immigrants were the first generation to go to college where they felt

very uneasy. They wanted to transform America into a perfect society like the Russia of their fantasy. Humans blind themselves for the dream, and this impulse among Marxists was quite strong. There was the right fit between what the Soviets offered and what many aspiring intellectuals needed. In the Marxist mind opposites were in absolute coexistence.

This participant depicted communism as a means of Americanization for a largely immigrant membership. At the most extreme, in the late 1920s 90 percent of the American Communist Party was in the sections speaking foreign languages. I also suggested there are both capitalist and socialist inclinations in all people. The capitalist impulse comes from the two year old in all of us saying "ME!" "ME!" "ME!" "I WANT WHAT I WANT WHEN I WANT IT." (Note that the capitalist impulse starts out as pure *id.*) The socialist impulse comes from three sources: from our recollection of getting according to our need in the womb, from our mother saying "share with your siblings and playmates" and from our envy of others and fear of others' envy. The first socialist society was in the womb.

Some individual Marxists were examined. Joe Slovo, who immigrated from Lithuania to South Africa at age nine, never lost his belief in Marxism. It was what inspired him to take on and have some success as a communist enemy of Africaner apartheid and ally of Nelson Mandela. The late Irving Howe was suggested as another example of an individual attracted to Marxism. He was a professional socialist who had the applause of the world. Howe's first language was Yiddish, yet he became, for awhile, somewhat anti-Semitic. In the end he held to liberalism and socialism while becoming quite successful.

◆◆◆

The January 28th meeting represented, in my view, the Forum small group seminars at their best. In it, a member probed with great emotional and intellectual honesty the origins of his attraction to Marxism and the reasons he, as a very young man, rejected the Soviet Union version of communism as not really Marxist.

Paul Elovitz participates in the

1995 Psychohistory Forum Meeting Schedule (Partial)

Date	Topic	Presenter
4/8/95	“Swartout’s Stress Reactions and an Early Indian War”	Andrew Brink, PhD (formerly of McMaster University and the University of Toronto)
4/29/95	“The Non-Rationality of Nationalism”	J. Lee Shneidman, PhD (Adelphi University)
9/16/95	“Love and Work in Margaret Mead”	Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, PhD (Rutgers University)
	“Towards a Psychobiography of Linus Pauling”	Ted Goertzel, PhD (Rutgers University)

Papers and the locations of meetings in New York City are mailed to members approximately one month before each meeting.

Communism Research Group when he is able. Lee Shneidman and Ralph Colp are its Coordinators. □

Abstracts

“Swartout’s Stress Reactions and an Early Indian War”

Roeloff Swartout, first Sheriff of Wiltwyck (Kingston, N.Y.) and a relative of the author, played a crucial role in the Second Esopus War (1665). As part of a biographical study of this migrant from The Netherlands to New Amsterdam, the author is examining the ways in which earlier trauma preconditioned him to help provoke this early Indian war.

The presenter is a trustee of The Holland Society of New York and has recently given up academic appointments to devote his time to writing. Most of his books have been on obsession and creativity.

“The Non-Rationality of Nationalism”

See our December issue for a brief article by our presenter, Lee Shneidman of Adelphi University, on the non-rationality of nationalism.

“Love and Work in Margaret Mead”

Margaret Mead (1901-78) was an innovator in the human sciences whose special field of interest was psychological anthropology.

At age 23, she went half-way around the world by herself to conduct her still famous study of Samoan adolescence. She was a pioneer in gender studies, and was one of the first to propose that gender is a social construct. By the age of 50, she had become a well-known popularizer of anthropology. She married and divorced three times and enjoyed intimate relationships with men and women. She raised her daughter with the aid of a surrogate mother in a cooperative household from which she was often absent. Yet, Mead’s autobiographical writings are strikingly unreflective about all of these unusual choices. A reading of documents regarding her family background offers a means to explore this extraordinary personality and her work.

The presenter is an historian and documentary film maker working on a book and film on this extraordinary anthropologist.

“Towards a Psychobiography of Linus Pauling”

In a forthcoming biography, *Linus Pauling: A Man and His Science*, Ted Goertzel examines the psychological factors which explain Linus Pauling's (1901-1994) varied and seemingly incongruous life history. He was awarded Nobel prizes for chemistry and for peace. He got a hostile U.S. government to see the harmfulness of nuclear testing and a closed-minded Soviet government to realize that they were corrupting science with dogma. At the peak of his prestige and renown Pauling shocked his friends and admirers by launching a crusade to prove that Vitamin C was a cure for the common cold and a preventative and treatment for all kinds of diseases, including cancer. While expecting to get a third Nobel award for medicine, he went from scientific hero to lonely crank.

In the book, using original data gathered by his own parents in the 1960s, Goertzel probes Pauling's childhood experiences. He also

Ongoing Research Projects of The Psychohistory Forum

Forum members are welcome to join in the Ongoing Research Projects (Groups) listed below. Members-at-a-distance receive most of the research papers by first class mail.

Apocalypse, Cults and Millennialism

Communism: The Dream That Failed

Industry of Pleasure — Colombian Cocaine

**Multicultural Identity and the
Psychodynamics of Immigration**

**Personality of Presidents and
Presidential Candidates**

Teaching Psychohistory

War, Peace and Conflict Resolution

An information sheet, perhaps for a

colleague, is enclosed. For information on all Forum activities contact:

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD
The Psychohistory Forum
627 Dakota Trail

Editorial Board for Clio's Psyche

Ten distinguished psychohistorians from different schools of thought have answered in the affirmative our request to formalize our Editorial Board. They have endorsed our firm commitment to understanding the "why" of history while avoiding psychological terminology and jargon so that the layperson can read our materials without reaching for reference works. They will help set the direction of our publication and select topics and featured psychohistorians as well as serve as referees (readers). As Clio's Psyche continues to grow, the Board will guide us in increasing our readership, including at colleges and universities, and in applying for funding. We are honored to welcome the following as stakeholders in our publication.

David Beisel, PhD
Rockland Community College, SUNY

Rudolph Binion, PhD
Brandeis University

Andrew Brink, PhD
Formerly of McMaster University and
The University of Toronto

Ralph Colp, MD
Columbia University-Retired

Joseph Dowling, PhD
Lehigh University

Glen Jeansonne, PhD
University of Wisconsin

George Kren, PhD
Kansas State University

Peter Loewenberg, PhD
UCLA

Peter Petschauer, PhD
Appalachian State University

BULLETIN BOARD

NOTES ON MEMBERS AND THEIR RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS:

Congratulations to **Timothy Mitchell** on the publication of *Flamenco Deep Song* (Yale University Press). Professor Mitchell now is working on *The Right to Hate: A Psychohistory of Spanish Anticlericalism*. To **Scott Thompson** on *The Price of Achievement in the Reagan Years* (Castle, 1994). And to **George M. Kren** and **Leon H. Rappoport** on the release of a revised paperback edition of *The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior* (Holmes and Meier).

NETWORKING INQUIRIES:

Andrew Brink would like to start a new Research Group on psychological characteristics of founding families, especially in the New Netherlands colony he knows so much about. If interested, write him at 382 Moxley Road, Greensville (Dundas), Ontario, L9H 5L5. **Norman Simms** (University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand) would like to organize a Group on the formation of modern consciousness in the 17th and 18th centuries.

TRAVEL: Conalee and **Lee Shneidman** have just returned from a trip to the Far East. Joni and **Peter Petschauer** traveled last year to Vladikavkaz, Ossetia (an autonomous Russian republic next to Chechnya). **Don Hughes**, after resting from a month of doing environmental history and giving a paper at the World Archeological Congress in India in the late fall, took a trip to the Amazon rain forest in Peru. **Ted Goertzel** recently visited his son, "the professor," at the University of Waikato in New Zealand and had a nice conversation with Norman Simms. The world certainly feels smaller.

SUNBELT MOVES: The onset of winter found **Marga Speicher** on the move from New Jersey to San Antonio, Texas, and **B.K. Ramanujam** from Chicago to Bakersfield, California. We hope these members-at-a-distance enjoy their new environs.

AUDIO CONFERENCE REPORTS: **Mary Coleman** of our War, Peace and Conflict Resolution Research Group had an interesting conference with Professor Elovitz' psychohistory seminar at Ramapo College in which she described the theory of the nonviolent confrontation she participated in as a member of the Congress of

Research Group involved Ramapo psychohistory and Western civilization students in their research.

HOLOCAUST EDUCATION: Teaching about the Holocaust and genocide is now required in New York and New Jersey so Paul Elovitz gave an all-day workshop on a psychohistorical approach to teaching these subjects to seventy-five high school teachers last December 6th that was sponsored by the Ramapo Holocaust Center. The emotional high point of the workshop was the comments of a Bosnian student which served as a reminder of the genocidal dangers in our world.

OMISSIONS: In our December issue we omitted, in a list of **Professor Rudy Binion's** psychohistorical/psychobiographical works in English, two fine books we heard about at our Forum meetings while they were being written: *After Christianity* (1986) and *Love Beyond Death* (1993). We also neglected to thank **Ted Goertzel** for his assistance in producing that issue.

MEETINGS: The Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH) held a standing-room-only meeting last January 6 at the American Historical Association Meeting in Chicago at which Fred Weinstein of SUNY presented "Contemporary Issues on Psychohistory." Congratulations to **Vivian Ann Rosenberg** of Drexel University and the Forum who was the recipient of the \$400 Langer Prize for the best article in *The Psychohistory Review* in the last three years. The Group for the Psychohistorical Study of Film will examine *Pulp Fiction* and *Rebel Without a Cause* on March 11, 1995, in New York City. **Andrew Brink** will present at the Forum's next meeting on April 8 (Saturday) (see page 18). The International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP) is meeting in Washington July 5-9, 1995, and the theme is "Nation-Building and Democracy in Multicultural Societies."

OUR THANKS to our members and friends for their support which makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Patrons Herb Barry and an anonym; a Sustaining Member — Ralph Colp; Supporting Members Andrew Brink, Alexander Papiasvili, Marga Speicher and Jerome Wolf; to new Contributing Members Arthur Mack and Scott Thompson. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Herb Barry, Mary Coleman, Alberto Fergusson, Ted Goertzel, Don Hughes, George Kren, Leon Rappoport, Norman Simms and Charles Strozier.

ISSN 1080-2622
