
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 3, Number 1

June, 1996

Special Theme: Publishing in Psychohistory

Meet the Editors

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the
Psychohistory Forum

The opportunities for publication in the field of psychohistory are quite extensive. There are at least a half-dozen publications which regularly welcome psychological-ly/historically informed articles on subjects such as psychobiography, childhood, dreams, group dynamics, the mechanisms of defense, mourning, politics, repressed memories, terrorism, violence, and war. In most of these publications there is a long-standing psychohistorical interest in the Holocaust, Presidential personality, and the

paradigm of psychotherapy as well as in Freud and the other pioneers of the exploration of unconscious processes. In this issue we will interview or have articles by such leading present and past editors in the field as David Beisel, Lloyd deMause, Bruce Edwards, Stanley Renshon, Larry Shiner, and Norman Simms.

The three best known psychohistorical publications are *The Journal of Psychohistory*, *The Psychohistory Review*, and *Political Psychology*. As an historian I will start with the oldest of these publications, *The Psychohistory Review*, which began as a newsletter and is presently celebrating its twenty-fifth year of continuous publication. It was founded by the Group for the Use of Psychology in History

IN THIS ISSUE

Special Theme: Publishing in Psychohistory

Meet the Editors 1
Paul H. Elovitz

Lloyd deMause, Editor
The Journal of Psychohistory..... 5
Bob Lentz

Larry Shiner, Editor
The Psychohistory Review..... 11
Melvin Kalfus

Stanley A. Renshon, Editor
Political Psychology..... 14
Bob Lentz

Mentalities/Mentalités..... 17
Norman Simms

Mind and Human Interaction..... 19
Bruce Edwards

Paul H. Elovitz, Editor, *Clio's Psyche*..... 20
Pauline Staines

How "Neglected" Is Psychohistory?..... 23
David R. Beisel

Feature Articles

Displaced Targets of Pat Buchanan's Anger 24
Herbert Barry, III

On Capital Punishment: Doing Time and
Dead Man Walking 25
H. John Rogers

Reflections on Rogers' "Doing Time" and
"Dead Man Walking" 28
Jennefer V. Mazza

On Teaching Psychohistory:
A Precarious Enterprise 29
Mel and Margot Goldstein

Review of the First Special Student Edition of
Clio's Psyche..... 31
David D. Lee

Wish List..... 32

Bulletin Board..... 32

(GUPH) which is affiliated with the American Historical Association and is published at the University of Illinois at Springfield. Though most of its articles are on psychobiography, it includes other approaches as well. For example, historians concerned with the history of ideas can often find articles of interest and I have noticed a regard for the paradigm of psychotherapy. It is an easy publication to read (both in terms of print size and style) and it is most moderately-priced due to the university subsidy and the fact it now comes out three, rather than four, times a year. Larry Shiner of the University of Illinois at Springfield took over as editor when Charles Strozier took on the responsibility of co-directing the CUNY Center on Violence and Human Survival that Robert Jay Lifton founded after leaving Yale University. (See the interview with Lifton in the December, 1995, issue of **Clio's Psyche**).

The Journal of Psychohistory is a very different publication than *The Review*, mostly because of its focus on childhood and group-fantasy analysis. It was founded in 1973 as *The History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory*, but changed its name in 1980 because there were not enough articles being submitted on childhood and librarians were reluctant to order a journal which seemed to deal mostly with childhood. Fortunately, children have remained a central interest of the publication, though the amount of original research on the history of childhood submitted for publication regrettably remains limited. It has been a voice for an outspoken psychohistory. Its founding editor and publisher, Lloyd deMause, has extensive academic (and some psychoanalytic) training, though he has worked primarily in the field of publishing rather than academia. It welcomes articles on a variety of subjects including childhood and the family, dreams, fetal development, group-fantasies, political psychology, psychoanthropology, psycho-biography, and repressed memories.

Political Psychology, the Journal of the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP), is in its 17th year of publication. The articles are predominately by the members of the highly successful parent organization, though anyone is welcome to submit papers. Currently,

it is the most academic of the three publications in the sense that in turning its pages one will more readily find abstracts, numerous references within the text, smaller print, and arguments perhaps less accessible to the layman than in the two previously-mentioned journals — or, for that matter, **Clio's Psyche** and *Mind and Human Interaction*. The scope is broader than the title may indicate to many: the publication focuses on, but is not limited to, politics. Stanley Renshon, its editor, is a political psychologist at the CUNY Graduate Center who has recently become a practicing psychoanalyst. He sees political psychology as covering a broader area than psychohistory *per se*, though many people in the field would not agree with him.

Two newer, shorter publications have begun to make their mark on psychohistory: one

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 3, No. 1

June, 1996

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum
627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417
Telephone: (201) 891-7486

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD
Associate Editor: Bob Lentz

Editorial Board

David Beisel, PhD RCC-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 • Leon Rappoport, PhD Kansas State University ☐

Advisory Council of the Psychohistory Forum
John Caulfield, MDiv, Boynton Beach, FL • Melvin Kalfus, PhD Boca Raton, FL • Mena Potts, PhD Wintersville, OH • Jerome Wolf, Larchmont, NY ☐

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum
\$25 yearly to non-members
\$35 yearly to institutions
(Both add \$4 outside USA & Canada)

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest that are 500 - 1500 words.

you are reading and the other is *Mind and Human Interaction*, produced at the University of Virginia School of Medicine. Vamik Volkan, a Turkish-American psychiatrist, is the latter journal's founding editor, though right now day-to-day operations are in the hands of Bruce Edwards, a political scientist. Its *forte* is the psychodynamic understanding of ethnic and national conflicts and the process of peacemaking. Its authors are drawn from many national and ethnic backgrounds and its articles reflect their experiences as anthropologists, diplomats, historians, political scientists, psychoanalysts, and so forth.

Clio's Psyche is the newest publication in our field, having been established in June, 1994. We are open to a wide variety of subjects including childhood, disease (especially AIDS), ecopsychology, methodology, political leadership, psychobiography, psychoeconomics, and violence. Our *forte* is interviews with major contributors to psychohistory and our unique features include a bulletin board of psychohistorical activities as well as obituaries of deceased colleagues aimed at both commemorating them and maintaining a record of the development of our field.

Clio's Psyche is eager to publish original documents, such as Henry James' letter on a visit to Charles Darwin (December, 1995, issue), which fit into our format and review essays of major books and the media. As editor, I am especially interested in articles on the psychological process of renunciation of such formerly normal behaviors as *apartheid* and all forms of racial segregation, the blood feud, child and wife abuse, female subjugation, floggings, hangings, incest, infanticide, polygamy, public burnings (the *auto-da-fé*), and slavery as well as the very limited renunciation of dictatorial rule and world-wide warfare. Also, the ways in which groups hold onto behaviors formally renounced by most individuals.

The Psychohistory News, not (as is commonly thought) *The Journal of Psychohistory*, is the official newsletter of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA). *The News* reports on all aspects of the IPA and has recently added features such as interviews

and profiles of new members. Jay Sherry, its current editor, has rejuvenated this publication making it a true quarterly. He welcomes submissions from all IPA members.

Norman Simms, founder and editor of *Mentalities/Mentalités*, increasingly has turned his publication to psychohistory and has personally published in **Clio's Psyche** and *The Journal*. *Mentalities/Mentalités* comes out twice a year. After teaching in New Zealand for two decades, Simms has moved to Ben Gurion University of the Negev in Israel. His is far from the only journal publishing psychohistorical materials outside of the United States. A few years ago in Spain I meet Adela Garion who edits *psicologia politica*. This publication has articles in both English and Spanish and welcomes submissions from scholars around the world. In 1994 Robert Liris of Vichy, France, began publication of a 60-page psychohistory journal, *Or le temps: Revue Francaise de Psychohistoire*.

You may wonder who are the editors, where do they come from, and what are their interests? David Beisel was born in Hazelton, Pennsylvania; Lloyd deMause in Detroit; Larry Shiner in Oklahoma City; Stanley Renshon in Philadelphia; Vamik Volkan on Cyprus and Bruce Edwards in Doylestown (Buck County), Pennsylvania; and Jay Sherry and Norman Simms in New York City, while Bridgeport, Connecticut, was where I was born and raised. More information on the lives of the editors is included in the following interviews and articles.

The research interests of the editors vary considerably. Lloyd deMause has published a number of books on subjects as varied as childhood, fantasy analysis, Presidential personality, and psychohistorical methodology. Larry Shiner has published non-psychohistorical books on Alexis de Tocqueville and the secularization of history. New York University Press has just released two of Stanley Renshon's books — on Clinton and on the methodology of studying Presidential candidates. He has four other books, three of which are edited, including one on the political psychology of the Gulf War. Vamik Volkan is the author of a variety of important books on conflict resolution, including *The Need To Have Enemies and Allies: From*

Clinical Practice to International Relations, as well as *The Immortal Attaturk* (with Norman Itzkowitz of Princeton University). Jay Sherry is a social studies teacher in a New York City high school. He is currently researching Jung's career and hopes to eventually write a book on the subject. Norman Simms is the author of numerous books and articles including *My Cow Comes Home To Haunt Me: European Explorers, Travellers...* in 1994. My own list of articles and chapters is lengthy. In addition, I have edited *Historical and Psychological Inquiry* (New York: International Psychohistorical Association, 1990) and co-edited the forthcoming, *Immigrant Experiences: Personal Narrative and Psychological Analysis* (Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press).

Two of the three major journals in the field have traditional refereeing systems and the third has a less formal, systematic one aimed at encouraging innovation. During the nine years that David Beisel was editor of *The Journal of Psychohistory* he followed a consistent system of peer review. The subject is very much on my mind as editor of a publication which strives to establish and maintain the highest standards. When **Clio's Psyche** began in 1994 we did not referee articles, but since our first year we have informally refereed unsolicited articles and some which are solicited. Currently, we are examining the mechanics and consequences of eventually submitting all articles to referees — providing there is enough time for submissions on contemporary issues. Presently, the articles we reject are mostly unsolicited, but we require that most articles be rewritten. This is not easy for a few authors who feel so invested in their writing that our editorial attempts at clarity for our readers are experienced as unwelcomed intrusions. The associate editor or I make an initial judgement about the suitability of the submission and then we confer. We then submit certain materials to members of our Editorial Board or others with expertise in the subject matter. Before we formalize a system we will carefully explore its implications for our readers and the field.

But will a traditional refereeing system ultimately stifle innovation? **Clio's Psyche**

strives to be innovative in its task of developing the new paradigm of psychohistory. If the referee system is based upon an older paradigm, is there not a serious risk that it will smother the creativity of the newer one? Psychohistory, like all new methods of understanding, is being developed by a relatively small group of innovators. Do we have the human resources to have an effective referee system? If we had taken the time to referee our articles on the Hebron Massacre, the Oklahoma City bombing, and other current events, wouldn't they have lost their timeliness? These are questions with which we, in producing a small, new publication, must come to grips.

There are many other questions, worthy of consideration, about psychohistory publications which I have heard colleagues ask. Is *The Psychohistory Review* so centered on psychobiography that it is not close enough to the cutting edge of psychohistory? Is *The Journal of Psychohistory* so closely associated with the ideas of its founding editor that its significant contributions are too readily dismissed by some top people in our field? Is *Political Psychology*, as one devoted ISPP member noted to me the other day, losing its position on the cutting edge of knowledge in its drive to become more academic? Can *Mind and Human Interaction* become a mainstream psychohistorical publication with its focus primarily on ethnic and national conflict as well as violence? Can **Clio's Psyche**, with its emphasis on avoiding jargon, stay true to its mission statement and gain both a lay and a psychohistorical audience?

Many fine psychobiographical articles are published in journals which are not psychohistorical *per se*: for example, in *American Imago*, *The International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, and *The Psychoanalytic Review*. These also welcome literary studies which one does not usually find in the five journals mentioned above. However, in recent years there has been a growing interest in the relationship of literature and history; psychohistorical aspects of this renewed concern is beginning to be manifested in psychohistorical journals. Several journals which were mentioned to me in the course of my research for

this article are *History and Memory* (Saul Friedlander is one of the editors) and *JPC: Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society*. Even more importantly, at the present time there are many mainstream journals which have occasional psycho-biographical articles. In the concluding article to this special "Publishing in Psychohistory" section, David Beisel provides an encouraging, bibliographic survey of the extent to which psychohistory and psychohistorians are being published.

Psychohistory is now a part of the consciousness of educated America. It has become sufficiently mainstream so that the current editor of *The Psychohistory Review* need not regard himself as a psychohistorian while doing an admirable job as editor. Biographers and intellectual historians are two categories of researchers who regularly use psychohistorical materials and methods without necessarily identifying themselves as psychohistorians. Readers now have access to an enormous backlog of psychohistorical research and methodology. These can be applied to recent events to provide unique insights. The opportunities for writing in the field are quite extensive. Editors and referees of psychohistorical journals are not primarily making their determination to publish or reject on the basis of the prior publication record of the author or institutional affiliation, but rather on the quality of the ideas and the literary style. If you are planning to write for these publications, my recommendation is that you first read them to get a sense of which one is most likely to say "yes" to your materials. All of the publications, other than the one newsletter, *The Psychohistory News*, welcome submissions by individuals who are not members of any sponsoring organization. We also recommend that you ask your libraries to order (usually at institutional rates) these fine psychohistorical publications, so that others will know about our exciting field.

Paul H. Elovitz writes for a variety of journals. Besides being the editor of this publication, he is the former editor of The Psychohistory News and a Contributing Editor of The Journal of Psychohistory. □

Lloyd deMause, Editor *The Journal of Psychohistory*

Bob Lentz
Psychohistory Forum

Lloyd deMause is Director of The Institute for Psychohistory, Editor of The Journal of Psychohistory, and a past President of the International Psychohistorical Association. He was born in Detroit, Michigan, on September 19, 1931. He graduated from Columbia College and did postgraduate training in political science at Columbia University and in psychoanalysis at the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis. He has published over 80 scholarly articles, is on the editorial board of several other publications, and has lectured widely in Europe and America. DeMause edited and contributed to The History of Childhood (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1974) and Jimmy Carter and American Fantasy (with Henry Ebel) (New York: Two Continents, 1977) and wrote Foundations of Psychohistory (New York: Creative Roots, 1982) and Reagan's America (New York: Creative Roots, 1984). We ("BL") conducted the interview with him ("LdM") in June, 1995.

BL: How do you define psychohistory?

LdM: Psychohistory is the study of historical motivations. If psychology is the study of individual motivation, psychohistory is the study of large groups of people, particularly of those that are important to history. There are three kinds of psychohistory: the history (or evolution) of childhood, the study of large groups (or group-fantasies), and psychobiography, which connects the first two. Psychohistory started out being mainly psychobiography with Freud and Erikson — their studies of da Vinci and Gandhi and Luther. Both Freud and Erikson essentially skipped the history of childhood portion of it. Erikson never mentioned that Luther was swaddled or similar to everybody else in his time. So, because there was so much work done on psychobiography in the past hundred years I have tended to mainly stress the history of childhood and group

psychology or group-fantasies. Psychobiography is still important, though. I have some in my Reagan book and other places.

BL: Of which of your many psychohistorical works — books, publications, organizations — are you most proud?

LdM: It's fun to do organization work like the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA). I'm very pleased that there are branches of the Institute for Psychohistory abroad that study my work. But for the most part, I'm really at heart just a scholar and a metatheorist of social theory. I'm a careful researcher. If anything, I over-footnote and over-reference most of my material. I'd rather not be president or any other officer of the IPA and I just turned down an invitation to a European trip next year. I really want to spend the next 20 years sitting right here doing nothing but putting all of my research into first *The Journal* and then book form because I have so much to say that I haven't even begun to write.

I suppose that *Foundations of Psychohistory* is more important than *Reagan's America* because it has the most childhood material. But the book I'm writing now, *The Emotional Lives of Nations*, will probably be the most important because it will sum up what I know about group-fantasies. The next book, *The Psychohistory of the West*, will be the second most important because it will take the evolution of childhood period by period and show what kind of family life, sexual life, personality, and institutions came out of it.

If you want me to say what I'm most proud of, I wouldn't even mention something psychohistorical unless bringing up children is psychohistorical. I have a son 29 (from my former marriage), a girl 13, and a boy 8 — I'm really an equal parenting partner with my wife — and that's probably what I've spent more time on in my life than psychohistory, and what I'm most proud of. They're terrific kids.

BL: Some see your helping mode of parent-child relationships as overly optimistic. Do you still feel as strongly positive toward it as you did 25 years ago?

LdM: Yes, I really do. My older son and

his friends are good examples of the results of the helping mode of parenting. They would no more think of going to war than the man in the moon, unless they're being invaded. And most of the social craziness just simply isn't there. They're simply missing the traumatic basis for social re-enactment. And it doesn't take all that much to be a good parent. But there are still so few parents who bring up their children without hitting them and without manipulating them for their own emotional satisfaction. I don't demand that children be perfect. I used the word "helping" because that was the most innocuous, simple, little, and pleasant word I could find for "We'll help you grow up." That's not such a big deal, is it?

BL: No, it's not. Is *The Emotional Lives of Nations* close to being published?

LdM: No, I'm going to do it in *The Journal of Psychohistory* bit by bit, as I always do, because if you put a book out you don't sell very many. If I put it in *The Journal* it can attract attention chapter by chapter, and people can comment on it and use it in class. And eventually it will get to be a book.

BL: I've seen reference to your new work on the neurobiology of psychohistory.

LdM: That'll be part of Chapter 3 of *The Emotional Lives of Nations*. There have been some recent advances in neurobiology that give a sense of what's happening in the brain as nations trot off to wars, or have revolutions or depressions. Essentially, psychological events looked at a different way, from the other side of the coin, are also physiological events. There's no reason why you can't move back and forth between those two as a psychiatrically-oriented clinician might do with individuals. In America we are currently suffering from severe serotonin depletion, and neural transmitter imbalances of the catecholamines. You can measure this and get some sense of the rise and fall of suicide rates, admissions to hospitals, and certain kinds of diseases.

My theories are based on the notion that history, like individual life, contains emotional problems that are created by re-enactment of early traumas. I think that's new in the sense of

the discovery of the evolution of childhood and its connection with the evolution of history and institutions — history as a re-enactment of early traumas because we all have them in common, even perinatal trauma. They're so early that I always study group-fantasies with pre-verbal material because the traumas are pre-verbal. I don't think anybody else has studied the sequence of group-fantasies in terms of the phases of group-fantasies as you pass through leadership phases — long phases of innovation, of depressions, of mania, and then war. Why, every time you go to war, do you say you're going to be "reborn" by it? Why do you always say you're "reborn" in history? And the phases are quite lawful — they follow certain patterns. Much of my work on phases hasn't even been published.

What we psychohistorians are doing, I think, is examining a separate part of the brain that is devoted to social activities. I call it the social alter. It stores all of our traumas in a dissociated neural network. It doesn't invade our regular daily life. We stuff things into it to just continue functioning and we then act them out on the social stage together. Groups are very useful for that. We sort of switch in and out of these social alter personalities. I even think I can watch people do it as they talk politic-ese. Newt Gingrich will start talking about how children cannot be dependent anymore so we've got to take all of their welfare away from them, *and* how we ought to give every ghetto child a laptop computer so he can get onto the Internet. This man was a different personality when he voiced the first idea than when he said the second. I think he was in his alter personality in the first instance, tapping into his own childhood as the unwanted child of a teenage mother, and then he snapped out of it and switched to his "I'm just plain Newt" and remembered that the previous day he had been surfing the Internet and wished everybody could do that, too. In the first, he's talking about himself, about his own stored emotions, but he doesn't know it. That's how you can write big, thick books as people do constantly about war and never mention the words "anger" or "fear." The emotions somehow get dissociated.

It's this dissociated part of the brain that I

think psychohistorians examine and no one else does — not psychoanalysts, not therapists in general. When you're on the couch, your analyst stays away from your political and religious opinions, knowing that it is the deepest, earliest, most fearsome fantasies, and feelings, and traumas that are buried. Why should a good therapist duck religious and political opinions? If you're most vociferous and most irrational about those, then that's what he ought to get into. Well, psychohistorians are the ones who tend to get into those and that's why people back away from us. Of the five to ten thousand people I pull in every year through my publicity efforts and speeches and radio programs, only a few hundred join the IPA? That's unbelievable, yet it's true. Well, I watch them come and go. I get to know them personally. And I find that they're just scared. Scared. Clinicians don't want to go past the couch. They could be thrown out of their professions. Academics could lose their jobs. Graduate students could be thrown out of the graduate program and flunk their orals. Now, obviously, that has more profound meaning than just, oh gosh, saying we're scary because we talk about awful things.

BL: Why did you start *The Journal*?

LdM: No one else would publish my writing! I wanted to tell people what I'd found. I was excited! And I couldn't tell just my neighbor and my wife. I had something new in looking at old problems in different ways. I'm in the business of affecting other people's view of society. I appeal to those people out there who are social theorists. Unfortunately, as with most new paradigms, it's only the young people — the students in those courses who are given my books — who love it. For the most part I can't get past the academics. As Thomas Kuhn says, the only solution to that is to let them [the older generation of academics] die out. I'll appeal to the next generation.

BL: Is there certain material that you prefer for *The Journal*?

LdM: I'll be pleased to get almost anything. I really don't do psychoanalytic studies of literature because *American Imago*, *The Psychoanalytic Review*, and various other international journals do a lot of it. I don't take

yet one more "Hamlet had an Oedipus complex" and "Somebody else had an Oedipus complex." If it's a literary character with some reality basis that shows how much in Chaucer they're jumping in and out of the beds of the little girls, that's fine. So, too, I tend only to do psychobiography if it's very rich in childhood. Just "Here are Abraham Lincoln's adult traits and I think that they mean he was a depressive." tends not to get too far with me, unless it's embedded in childhood.

We're very catholic. There is no "line" from the editor. I just wrote a review of Rudy Binion's books. I consider Rudy to be one of the greatest psychohistorians. Yet he disagrees totally with my whole childhood focus. But he's a superb archivist — his work is worth gold.

BL: Does *The Journal* have a referee system? Do you send submissions to referees?

LdM: Sometimes, where there are qualified experts who have some knowledge that qualifies them to judge the submission. But most articles for *The Journal* are submissions by people who are uniquely qualified in their areas, who have no peers. Just as articles for early psychoanalytic journals by Freud, Abraham, Ferenczi and others weren't sent to a bunch of traditional psychiatrists, who knew nothing about the new field of psychodynamics, so, too, I wouldn't dream of sending an article by Alenka Puhar on child abuse and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, or David Beisel on the psychological causes of WWII, or Jean Goodman on multiple personalities in 16th-century possession cases, to a list of traditional academics who usually are unqualified to judge their work. I myself as editor check out each article at the library for accuracy of references, simply because I learn so much doing so. But when you are establishing new paradigms, as Kuhn says, rather than doing "usual science" that simply extends previous paradigms, the usual referee system is more damaging than productive.

BL: Will you share with us about your early career?

LdM: I started out as the son of a General Motors executive, going to a General Motors Institute in Flint, Michigan, and starting

to work for Cadillac Motor Car Division as an accountant. But I then decided to join the army to get the GI Bill to come to Columbia in New York City to re-do my undergraduate career. After I came back from Korea I was very much interested in why those little Korean kids were living underneath those bridges, and starving to death at the end of the war that I had joined over there. So, I was going to be a career diplomat and majored in political science. Then I started psychoanalytic treatment and training, and decided to try and apply it. But Columbia University threw me out while I was doing my doctorate, saying there's no combining political science and mental health.

I remember that Professor Dean, the head of the political science department, said, "Saying what you want to on your PhD is like saying you like strawberry ice cream. It's a taste of yours. But I don't know anything about psychoanalysis, so you can't use it." I was going to study Hitler and he said, "No, you can't do that." Four years later he was *Dean* Dean of Columbia College, standing on the barricades for the students who were saying that we ought to get out of the war in Vietnam, and he said to them, "What you want around Columbia — we're not, after all, a democratic institution — what you want is like saying 'I like strawberry ice cream.'" And then James Kunen wrote a book, *The Strawberry Statement*, which was made into a movie, about the Columbia student uprisings. And I thought to myself, I was just four years too early! I would have had the whole Columbia College behind me if I had waited a little longer!

BL: By the late sixties, then, you were working on the history of childhood?

LdM: Yes. I was the research head of *American Imago*. I tried to take it over, make it less literary and more psychohistorical, and failed. I was doing childhood history myself, since it was obvious to me that childhood was the key to history. I found that most psychoanalysts, other psychotherapists, and historians did not follow me. Even the family historians I got to write *The History of Childhood* finally nearly threw me out of the book even though I was editor. I thought they would do the main job and I would write a little

foreword that would summarize their material. But their material — they whitewashed so much! They would bring a 13th-century Tuscan dialect recording of Morelli saying that the parents were really loving to their children: “I put my hand on my wife’s belly and said, ‘I’m not going to beat this child up, and send him out to wet-nurse, and do terrible things to him, like was done to me. I’m going to be different’.” I said, “That’s wonderful! That’s the spirit of the Renaissance — a rebirth of humanism. Now, let’s turn the microfilm reader and see what finally happened.” “My child has just died at the age of seven. Why did I send him out to wet-nurse? And why did I beat him? And why did I never give him any of my time? And why was I so mean to him all the time? I didn’t carry out my promise’.” I said, “That’s good, too — put that in.” “No, no, we don’t want to put that in. That makes him look bad. And anyway, he seems distraught.” I said, “So, say he’s distraught. But put it in. That’s also the Renaissance. Great aspirations, but you can’t make it.” No, they wouldn’t do it. They were cutting out all the material that was emotionally important. So I wrote my own article at the beginning with my own research and all of the people had a revolution and wanted to throw me out of the book, saying that they wouldn’t appear in a book with me, that they didn’t agree with it at all.

BL: Why is there such a reluctance to do the history of childhood?

LdM: It’s hard work, and why have we overlooked child abuse for millennia? Even Freud did. He saw that there was plenty of child abuse around him but didn’t really believe it caused anything. About the patients that came to him he said, Yes, they were all sexually abused but this has nothing to do with hysteria because everybody’s sexually abused, so how can it etiologically have any bearing on this particular syndrome? Of course, in some sense he’s right. You’d have to redo your whole theory. But the fact that most of the people in his society — most of the children, most of his patients — were quite obviously swaddled, sexually-abused, and beaten to a pulp — Freud and all the psychoanalysts around him said all this had absolutely no effect. Beating and raping of children — which I think was the reason they

came to him, the reason they were sick — he said had no influence.

Family experts might do some family history — how many people lived under one roof in 1780 in England versus in 1810, or how property passed down. But parent-child relations? No. The history of childhood is not mentioned in family history courses or social history courses or feminist history courses. You’d think the feminists would pay some attention. Yet they’re absolutely, totally blank on it.

BL: What kind of training or experience should a person enter the field with today?

LdM: Well, they should have some therapy for themselves. (I’m in my 26th year of analysis.) They should take one of the social sciences. And they ought to take a reasonable amount of depth psychology — whether it’s psychoanalytic or other is of less importance, I think, than that they know what the literature is in general.

BL: What about clinical exposure?

LdM: It’s nice, but not absolutely necessary if you have a lot of therapy, because you have to look inside yourself and literally identify and then dis-identify with the aggressors. One thing I don’t like in psychohistory is continuously identifying with victims and saying, for example, “Well, everybody was killed in the Holocaust and the psychology of the victims is interesting.” What we need to know is *why* the *perpetrators* did it in the first place. So, I keep asking the same people, “Identify with the Nazis [to gather your initial material] and give me a good analysis of Nazis — you’ve got some autobiographies of Nazis.” I get no answers from them. People who are very much involved. “I’m a Jew and I can’t,” they’ll say to me, “because that will excuse the Nazis.” No! Understanding people does not excuse them! Understanding doesn’t mean you’re *for* the murderer and murder, *for* the aggressor and aggression. But you first have to understand them to stop it. And why just plain people become murderers. There’s an awfulness to society that is hardly suspected. We’ve just begun to see it.

BL: Who was important to your development?

LdM: Well, I suppose the best teacher I had was C. Wright Mills. He was in the Sociology Department at Columbia. I was his research assistant and helped him write *White Collar*. He had a lot of energy and would come in and throw his motorcycle saddlebags down and say, "All right! There's fourS fiveS six of us. We're going to divide up the problems of the world into six and solve them!" Which I felt was a good way to start out a project. Rather than "Learn the 52 counties of England by next session.", which was what Jacques Barzun said in our first class and then I dropped his course. I honestly didn't learn much at Columbia other than Mills' spirit.

BL: As you look back over your career to-date, what would you do differently?

LdM: I would learn a lot more languages — Latin and Greek and so on. I have to depend on and pay people to translate all the original material. But you can only do so much.

BL: In a December 5, 1994, *New Yorker* article you said that a good scientist should try to predict. What about prediction in psychohistory?

LdM: I think a good psychohistorian — or any other scientist — ought to be using his or her predictions because we don't have any way to experiment. Even in psychology you've got some animal experiments in laboratories where you can actually go into the hippocampus to see if it's being depleted of serotonin. In history, you just don't. I can't go out and change the face of history. Nor do you ever have a second chance at anything. Every morning, one or more of my friends in psychohistory call and ask, "What does that cartoon mean?", or say, "It looks like we're going to war.", or, "What will Clinton do to respond to all these cartoons and other material that say he's a wimp?" This kind of constant prediction is the best you can do. And I think it's important to do it. I try not to be too proud of it because I'm wrong more often than I'm right. But my being wrong makes me modify my hypothesis.

We're still at that early stage in a science

where our first job is postulating bold hypotheses and modifying or disproving them and starting over. What we want to do, I think, is make all of those things that we're now so terribly familiar with *unfamiliar*. We know what war is. My God, do we have to study another war?! You've got whole libraries full of wars. And depressions. And shootings of Presidents. What we need to do is make them seem problematic for the first time, whereas before they just seemed natural. That's what Freud did on individuals, I think. Before him, "They're hysterical. Well, it must be in the genes, or their constitution." And everybody nodded. And he listened, and he listened, and he said, "Well, wait a minute. What was the previous trauma, what do you associate it to? And then what happened? What was the first time you did that?" He strung it back and essentially found the way the brain stores memories, strung on these clumping mechanisms and neurons, and made it unfamiliar again. Then he asked the right questions. I don't think we're asking the right questions.

BL: What are the right questions?

LdM: A right question is, "What are the motivations for social action?" We need to bring emotions back into the social sphere from which they have been thrown out by historians, sociologists, and everybody else. Durkheim started sociology based on the fact that you don't have to study the psychology of any individual at all, you don't have to study emotions, and wrote a book saying that in suicide you don't even have to know what the emotions of anybody are to understand it. To bring psychology back in, to find out what the real emotions are, trace those back to their sources, sticking close to the empirical record. Watching more closely what's really happening in front of you is the task.

When Dave Beisel [SUNY<Rockland Community College], who is now teaching his 5,000th psychohistory student, starts students out he plunges them right into their own childhood, he has them go talk to their mother and grandmother and see what they were like in their childhood. He has them go right out to the newsstand and pull in all the editorial cartoons they can and plunge right in and say, "What's the emotion?" He doesn't care if any of them have taken a course in Freud.

You don't need a course in Freud! If you look at the cartoons and you see nothing for three or four months but women like Lorena Bobbitt and Hillary Clinton with knives, then you know there's some fantasy abroad that women are out there with knives. And when suddenly, the day that O.J. Simpson allegedly stabs his wife with a knife, all those disappear and for the next four months only men have knives, then I don't care what your theoretical system is — you have a psychohistorical observation that you have to explain somehow. So, I want to plunge into the empirical material, both present and past, and see what the emotions are.

BL: Going back to that *New Yorker* article for a minute, do you feel six months later that we're still in a manic period and that another war is coming?

LdM: It's yet to be seen whether Clinton will be a Bush and actually carry it out [as Bush did in Panama and the 1991 Persian Gulf War] because he's afraid of being called a wimp or whether he will be a Carter who just pushed his foot into the ground and said, "I will not do that." Carter went as far as to send a helicopter [into Iran during the 1979-1980 hostage crisis] but when that helicopter crashed he didn't put the rest of the troops in. And we threw him out because he didn't. With Clinton, it has to do with what's going on in his head right now, and in the heads of his advisers. His mother left him when he was very, very young, although the grandmother wasn't so bad. The stepfather beat him up, and actually had a gun, and beat up the mother, so that wasn't so good. Maybe he's got enough trauma in him to say, "I have to play that out on the historical stage." So far, though, he's pretty much dug his feet into the ground. Though he was ready to go to war in Haiti, wasn't he? Except for Carter who came in and ruined it for him!

BL: How can psychohistorians strengthen our work today? Have more influence?

LdM: We strengthen our work just simply by doing more research and more writing and more sharing with each other. Encourage each other and don't backbite. I honestly don't worry too much about influence. You hear about

the bombing in Oklahoma City and next day I get 20 phone calls from newspapers, radio programs, and TV programs. There's enough people listening to us if we have the answers. I've suggested, for instance, that we ought to have nuclear tension monitoring centers around the world so that in case there's another Cuban missile crisis, you ought to have somebody to pick up the phone and call just like you have a suicide hotline to say, "Gee, I'm about to jump out the window. Is there anything you can say to dissuade me from this?" A couple people in the UN thought it might be a good idea. Nothing was done. Meanwhile we've got branches abroad, we're getting the beginning of the ability to do it ourselves. The influence will come.

BL: How would you like to see psychohistory develop over the next decade or so?

LdM: I hope it'll be around in a decade! I really consider its survival a miracle because humans' capacity to deny their emotional problems, that they act out on the social stage, is so vast, so enormous, and so collusive. Newt Gingrich will come on stage and say, "We've got to take all the money away from all these children because they're getting too dependent on welfare, on food stamps, and on school lunches." For the most part we collude, "There's no psychological problem in that." Just as we once colluded in saying schizophrenia, multiple personality disorder, and other kinds of individual problems were just craziness. We don't say, "Now, what happened? How can you have this? There's something goofy going on here." We have to overcome that vast collusive denial.

The Journal of Psychohistory is published quarterly. The subscription rate is \$48 annually. Send both editorial and subscription inquiries to Lloyd deMause, Suite 14H, 140 Riverside Dr., New York, NY 10024, telephone (212) 799-2294. □

Larry Shiner, Editor
The Psychohistory Review

Melvin Kalfus
Lynn University

It will no doubt startle some readers to learn that the editor of *The Psychohistory Review* is not himself a "working psychohistorian." Larry Shiner notes that both his early training and the preponderance of his career since has been devoted to the study of philosophy and related intellectual issues. Prior to becoming editor of *The Review* in 1988, Shiner had produced only a few book and essay reviews that could be classified as psychohistorical. Even today, Shiner teaches "mostly 18th- and 19th-century cultural and intellectual history."

But Shiner sees an advantage to this in his editorial role, asserting that it is therefore easier for him "to keep some distance" from the work submitted to him. He can be "more even-handed" in his evaluations and editorial advice, since he himself has "no stake in any school of psychohistory." Rather, he is interested in maintaining "the intellectual and academic standards of *The Review*." Of course, he adds, he leans strongly upon his Board of Editors and others "with special expertise" in making decisions about acceptability of both the solicited and unsolicited articles. He notes that *The Review* must reject about "75% of what comes in." Often, rejected articles are good enough to be published, but are only tangentially-related to psychohistory.

Interestingly, Shiner and his colleagues have confronted the question of whether or not to change the name of the journal, which some have viewed as "a burden" — especially in light of the assault upon psychohistory on the part of such eminencies as Jacques Barzun, David Stannard, and Gertrude Himmelfarb. It was felt that the "bad press" about psychohistory had made many young scholars, particularly in the academic community, "afraid to come out of the closet as 'psychohistorians'." But, Shiner notes cheerfully, psychohistory is still in fact a well-established and positive "identifier" — the only interdisciplinary term that suggests a relationship between clinical psychology and history. "It implies a real attempt to integrate these disciplines," he says, "to make use of clinical models, frameworks, and theories to enlarge our

understanding of historical issues."

Psychohistory may be "a red flag" to some, Shiner states, "but it is what we *do*, and what we have been doing now for almost twenty-five years." Indeed, the twenty-fifth anniversary issue of *The Psychohistory Review* will be published as the Fall/Winter edition of the 1996-97 year. Charles Strozier, Lawrence Friedman, Peter Loewenberg, Peter Gay, Robert Jay Lifton and various members of the Board of Editors have agreed to produce articles for the landmark issue.

"We hope to demonstrate the fact that psychohistory is alive and well in the 1990s," Shiner says. As a field and a discipline, he adds, it has survived all the controversies and attacks. "Today, many of the ideas proffered by psychohistorians have made their way into the work of historians identified with other approaches and specialties." He cites as an outstanding example Lynn Hunt's *Family Romance of the French Revolution* — which "makes a very direct use of psychoanalytic and other psychological theories in trying to understand the passionate nature of the anti-monarchical sect." This and similar works, he says, clearly demonstrate the fact that people of respected standing in history are no longer afraid of psychohistory. "We are no longer ghettoized — no longer an isolated community, talking to itself," he asserts.

The sixty-one-year-old Shiner is a Midwesterner who studied history as an undergraduate at Oberlin and received his doctorate in philosophy at the University of Strasbourg in France. He believes that his dissertation work gave him an early insight into the kind of interdisciplinary thinking that is essential to the doing of psychohistory. He was studying the work of Frederick Gogarten, a German theologian who, following World War II, had been a leading radical thinker in German theology, clearly under the influence of Martin Heidegger. When Shiner delved into Gogarten's work of the 20s and 30s, however, he found that Gogarten had been associated with the German Christian movement, including "a brief flirtation with Nazism." For Shiner, the crucial question was: "How someone so modernistic after the

war could have been committed to politically-reactionary authoritarianism? Why would [such a man] have joined up with the Nazi fellow-traveling group?" Looking back at it now, Shiner reflects on the psychohistorical questions he might have pursued had he been acquainted with the discipline as a young scholar. After visiting with Gogarten (then almost 80) and his wife Gottingen, Shiner had been left with a profound methodological question: "How do you know, and how do you find out, what a person *really* thought?" But he believes now that he would have been led by that question not just to writing a psychobiography about Gogarten himself, but rather to study the psychodynamics of the entire class of German intellectuals, Heidigger included, who were so attracted to racist ideology.

Following his first teaching post (in the philosophy department of Cornell College in Iowa), Shiner did post-doctoral work in France, working on the unpublished manuscripts of Edmund Husserl. He looks back on this period (the 1960s) with some amusement. Instead of having a good time in the *cafés* of Paris, "I spent hour after hour toiling in the basements of the Sorbonne." He also felt at times a little anachronistic. His phenomenological technique was already considered out-dated by followers of the new deconstructionist school. He friends told him "to get out of the basement and go listen to one of Derrida's lectures." Nevertheless, his work on Husserl led Shiner to develop his own thinking on "the secularization of history" — the redefinition of historical time and space after the Middle Ages.

In 1971, Shiner joined the faculty of Sangamon State University (now absorbed into the University of Illinois system) in Springfield, Illinois, excited at the idea of creating an innovative curriculum based upon an interdisciplinary approach — "teaching so many new courses with new colleagues in so many fields." Shiner was drawn to history and became a member of that program, as well as the philosophy program. It was then that he met Chuck Strozier who was producing *The Psychohistory Review* as a newsletter. Shiner was drawn into the journal through doing book reviews and some work on methodology. In

1988, when Strozier was preparing to leave Sangamon for his present position at John Jay College, in New York, he asked Shiner to become the new editor of *The Review*. Since Shiner considered himself more of an intellectual historian than a psychohistorian, it was with a good deal of anxiety that he agreed.

Shiner had just finished a book — after six-years study — on Alexis de Tocqueville's memoir of the 1848 Revolution in France (*The Secret Mirror: Literary Form and History: Tocqueville's Recollections*, [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988]). Shiner notes that Tocqueville's parents were awaiting the guillotine when Robespierre and his regime fell. "Had not the Reaction occurred, there would never have been an Alexis." Virtually a product of the conflict between egalitarianism and liberty in a revolutionary democracy, Tocqueville's view of the events of 1848 were inevitably a function of his personal history. Even now, Shiner remains tempted to undertake a more psychohistorical approach to Tocqueville, but he recognizes that it would be a formidable task. "It's very hard to find Tocqueville in his works," Shiner says, "he was very reticent about his inner life." He would have to get to Tocqueville's letters — not readily available to American scholars. "But I'd sure like to rescue him from his intellectual guardians," Shiner adds.

Shiner's current project builds upon the work of Paul Oskar Kristeller — a Renaissance specialist now retired from Columbia. One of Kristeller's most influential books is *The Modern System of the Arts* — in which he argues that the notion of "the five fine arts" is a construct of the 18th century. Shiner has been laboring for seven years to flush out Kristeller's thesis and bring it into the 19th century. He foresees two-years more work. While Shiner once again is personally pursuing intellectual history rather than psychohistory, he certainly seems to have acquired a broad view of the field of historical investigation and has sought to enlarge the boundaries of interdisciplinary study.

Indeed, this need seems to be fundamental to Shiner's approach to *The Psychohistory Review*: "We have attempted to broaden the journal — to include history of art

and culture.” There is a danger in this, which he recognizes: “It’s important that they remain historical pieces; there are other publications that deal with psychology of the arts.” Nevertheless, he asserts also that while it “has to be in the ballpark, we want to enlarge the ballpark.” Many of the manuscripts *The Review* receives, he notes, are psychobiographical. In response, Shiner has “recruited articles” in other areas of psychohistorical work — gender studies and the “new cultural history,” for example, or, as in the case of a recent issue, Peter Stearns’ [Carnegie Mellon University] concept of “the history of emotion.”

Shiner is in fact particularly interested in soliciting work from, and seeking to reach, people who have not heretofore thought of themselves as psychohistorians. “Maybe,” he muses, “the ultimate aim of psychohistory is to put itself out of business — by becoming an essential part of the doing of history which has forced historians to change the way they focus upon certain historical problems and has introduced new methods and new perspectives into the work of historians in general. It should be a goal of psychohistorians to open a dialogue with the entire field of history and with other fields, too,” he says, “with art history, with literature, and philosophy. We can help reverse the trend of dividing-up history.”

In achieving *The Review*’s goal of bringing together clinical psychology and academic history, the challenge, Shiner notes, is to maintain “the high standards of historical research that are appropriate to the discipline and to make sure that the psychological insights draw upon clinical models that can be articulated.” It is hard to expect an historian who specializes in the 15th century to also have a doctorate-level understanding of psychology, he observes, “but certainly one needs a good working knowledge.” There are, of course, a handful of historians who are also credentialed as clinical psychologists. “The rest of us do the best we can to master both areas.”

In conclusion, Shiner stated that if *The Psychohistory Review* has a “particular niche,” it is to be the journal that meets the standards of the historical profession while dealing

responsibly with the methodology of the clinical profession. “That in a nutshell,” he concludes, “is what *The Review* has always been about.”

The Psychohistory Review is published three times each year. The subscription rate is \$22 annually. Send inquiries to the Editor, *The Psychohistory Review*, University of Illinois at Springfield, Springfield, IL 62794-9243.

Melvin Kalfus is an adjunct professor at Lynn University in Boca Raton, Florida, and a Member of the Advisory Council of the *Psychohistory Forum*. He is also a past president of the International Psychohistorical Association. He was featured in the Winter, 1996, issue of *The Psychohistory News*. □

Stanley A. Renshon, Editor *Political Psychology*

Bob Lentz
Psychohistory Forum

Stanley A. Renshon was born July 1, 1943, in Philadelphia. He received his PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania in 1972 and was a Postdoctoral Fellow in psychology and politics at Yale University, 1972-1973. He is Professor of Political Science at the City University of New York (CUNY), Developer and Coordinator of the Interdisciplinary Program in the Psychology of Political Behavior at the CUNY Graduate School, and a certified psychoanalyst with a private practice. Renshon was a founding member of the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP) and was appointed Editor of *Political Psychology*, the Journal of the ISPP, in 1992. He consults to governments, agencies, organizations, and individuals on the psychology of decision-making. His most recent books are *High Hopes: The Clinton Presidency and the Politics of Ambition* (New York: New York University Press, 1996) and *The Psychological Assessment of Political Candidates* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).

BL: What would you like to share with our readers about your career?

SR: I think I'm an illustration of what is increasingly becoming the norm in political psychology: people in the field who are actually trained in the field. They are not only political scientists who have read Freud, but they're political scientists who have gone ahead and acquired particular training in psychology. Jeanne Knutson, the woman who founded the ISPP, was a PhD both in psychology and in political science. Arnie Rogow, one of the field's early practitioners [and author of *James Forrestal: A Study of Personality, Politics, and Policy*] was a PhD in political science but then went on to a training analysis at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. Harold Lasswell, back in the thirties, graduated with a PhD from the University of Chicago and went to Vienna to study with Freud. The model has been that if you're serious about the field you need to be serious about getting the training to be expert in it.

I've gone along those lines. I spent a postdoctoral year at the Department of Psychiatry at Yale, studying with Bob Lifton. I went back to school and enrolled in a clinical psychology doctoral program. After that I went on to get psychoanalytic training and am now a certified psychoanalyst. So, in my own life and experience the interconnection of the two fields runs very deep. I've always made this analogy: If you're a political scientist and want to be a China specialist, you need to learn the Chinese language and know about Chinese culture. People who are serious are getting serious training.

BL: Who was important to your development?

SR: My intellectual mentor, and personal friend, was Harold Lasswell. I remember meeting him in New York at the University Club the first year I got out of graduate school. We literally talked for five hours about a whole range of subjects of interest to us both. I remember walking out of the University Club literally filled with the excitement of the stimulation of having talked with him. We became good friends and met for dinner at least once a week. We did some traveling together. In my opening statement for the Journal

[*Political Psychology*] I made note of how much I owe to Harold and my hope that the Journal will reflect the standards that he gave us for the field.

BL: What are you working on now?

SR: I have two books that are coming out this spring. The one out already is called *High Hopes: The Clinton Presidency and the Politics of Ambition*. It's a psychologically-framed biography of Clinton and his Presidency. This book is very gratifying to me because it is the first time that I have taken on such a full-scale biography of a political leader. *High Hopes* represents a milestone personally — the end of my process of psychoanalytic training and the beginning of my feeling comfortable and competent as an analyst.

The second book will be out in June. It's called *The Psychological Assessment of Presidential Candidates*. It's a study of how the issue of Presidential psychology came to be so important, and lays out the theory of character which I hope will be useful for assessing Presidential candidates and other political leaders. I've been working on this book for about ten years, so it's a pretty big book. It's publication feels like the end of another long process — and I feel happy with that, too.

I would say another thing I'm very proud of is my analytic practice — it's terrific. I've always felt like my practice has really informed my understanding of psychoanalytic work. That, in turn, has made me able to understand the theory a lot better and able to apply it adequately. But I also get a deep satisfaction from working with people, figuring out what's going on, and feeling like I'm making some impact.

BL: How was *Political Psychology* started?

SR: It started in 1979 shortly after the founding of the ISPP. The founding organizer of the Society was also the moving force behind the Journal: Dr. Jeanne Knutson, a woman with a very bright mind and a whirlwind psychology. She served as its first editor. Since then there have been several editors: Joseph Adelson, a psychologist, from the University of Michigan;

Margaret Hermann of the Mershon Center at Ohio State University; Alfred M. Freedman of the New York Medical College; and myself.

BL: Please tell us about the Journal's mission statement which appears at the top of the inside front cover, opposite "Contents."

SR: The mission statement is my creation. I wanted to emphasize that the Journal is interdisciplinary and that it explores the relationships and interrelationships between psychology and political process. I also wanted to emphasize that we draw upon diverse disciplinary sources which are of real importance in the field. The one other thing that I tried to emphasize was that we take political psychology seriously — we emphasize that people have to seriously focus on psychological *processes*. It's not enough to use a variable which might be psychological and then do nothing more with it.

BL: What is the Journal's relationship to psychohistory?

SR: I see our purview as somewhat broader. We publish from time to time what might be called traditional psychoanalytic psychohistorical studies. But we also do much more because the field of political psychology is very diverse.

BL: Please tell us about the Journal's process of peer review.

SR: The first step is that I read every paper that comes in to see whether or not it generally meets our minimum benchmark: that it's a serious examination of some interrelationship between psychological and political process, that it's well-written, and that it's based on data that will show some value when people look at it.

Then the article is sent out to three reviewers — anonymously, of course. Each article is reviewed in the context of its own framework — for example, psychoanalysis, regression analysis, or survey research — by people who have that expertise.

Once we get the reviews back, I set aside the ones that are clearly acceptable. We get a small number of papers — between 12-15% — that at least two, and usually all three, reviewers

say, "This is a very good piece, this should definitely be published. However, I think the author should do this, or he might look at that, or this argument's not quite clear." I will write a tentative acceptance with the understanding that the author consider the comments of the reviewers and send me a cover letter telling me what he or she has chosen to do or not do. I'm simply, for my own process, interested in what the person does with the comments of the reviewers. It seems to me the author should always have the opportunity, and has the obligation, to take into account what the reviewers have said.

Generally, most composite reviews are of the "revise and resubmit" variety. The reviewers will say there's merit in the paper but they'll point out where they feel the author needs to address issues, and recommend that the paper be revised or rewritten. I write to the author and enclose the anonymous reviews, but without requiring that the author take in and do whatever the referees actually suggest. Rather, all we ask is that the author makes clear why he or she has chosen to, or not chosen to, follow the suggestions of the reviewers. I send the author's resubmission along with the cover letter explaining his or her choices to the original reviewers (and I may add an additional reviewer). My instructions to the re-reviewers are, essentially: here's the revised version of the paper, here's what your colleagues said about it before, and here's how the author responded to those suggestions, what do you think now? At this point the re-reviewers will most likely say either we should publish the paper or it really still doesn't match up to what they think should be published in the Journal.

Some papers are clearly not acceptable. In such cases, I may only have one reviewer tell me there's something worth publishing there. We send the author a letter saying that we're sorry that our editorial decision is adverse. We send along anonymous copies of all the reviews.

It's very important to spend time with reviews. We try to use reviewers who take the time to give good, substantive comments. I have a list of reviewers that I have assembled over the years and I have made systematic efforts to

expand that list. They might be members of the Editorial Board or others.

BL: How long does the review process take?

SR: We promise to have a decision back to authors within four months. Eighty-five percent of the cases are within 2-3 months.

BL: Is the Journal primarily a publication for the members of the ISPP?

SR: It is the official journal that's sponsored by the Society [the ISPP]. The Society is made up of political psychologists, self-defined, and so the Journal is designed to reflect the diverse interests of the Society's members. But it's also meant to reach many, many people who are not necessarily members of the Society. Anyone may submit articles.

BL: How do you view the Journal's impact?

SR: There are a couple ways to look at impact. First, you can ask about institutional subscription rates and you can ask whether or not those are going up. Ours are going up, even in this very tight economic crunch. That reflects well on the Journal because libraries are cutting back enormously.

The second element is professional judgment. When I read other journals in the fields of political science and psychology, *The American Political Science Review* or *The American Psychologist*, for example, I look for references to articles from the Journal. Increasingly they're occurring. It's also true that articles from the Journal are increasingly turning up in books. That is a good indication because it means that people are reading the Journal — that the arguments being made in the Journal are being read, taken in, and made part of what people are doing in their professional lives.

The third leg of impact is, I think, public impact, which is more in the line of opinion makers, or opinion elites — people who are conversant with *The New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and *The New York Review of Books*, for example. I've tried to bring people in from outside of academia to publish in our Journal. We invited William Schneider, the

CNN political pundit, to do a piece when we did a symposium on the Clinton Presidency. Bringing in people from outside is an important method by which you build an impact.

BL: What are your plans for the Journal's future?

SR: What I've tried to do the last four or five years is to put the Journal on a solid, sound academic base to cement the infrastructure, and to reach out and do special issues and special symposiums. We will have an issue published on the psychology of the Holocaust and we've done a symposium on the physical health of Presidential candidates. We had what I thought was a terrific symposium run by Phil Tetlock [University of California< Berkeley] on politicized psychology and political psychology, looking at the question of value biases in the field. We have a special issue in development on cultural and cross-cultural political psychology, which has been in the works for three years and is now very close to publication. We have a new special issue in progress on gender issues in political psychology. I don't expect the Journal to do anything radically different because I believe we have been making good, steady progress — and that's what you do in life and with journals.

BL: How do you see political psychology developing in the next decade or so?

SR: I'd like to see theories which are more composite in nature, sharper in focus, and more closely linked to context.

When I say "composite," I always have thought of the application of political psychology theory as being comparable to an ophthalmology exam: the doctor puts different combinations of lenses in front of your eyes and asks, "Is this more clear, or not as clear?", until you say, "Not as clear." Consider political decision-making. Here you've got a particular concrete problem which shapes the way you need to look at it. You need to understand how people's cognitive processes work, how people frame decisions, how they weigh information, and what kind of emotions they bring to their decision-making. So, that is an illustration of composite theory. Political psychologists need to be aware of a

diverse range of theories so that they don't only apply one theory no matter what the issue is they're looking at — that can lead to mistakes.

I think sharpness of focus, or specificity, is very important. When I wrote the Clinton book, I thought the question of "Does Clinton's character influence his Presidency?" was ridiculous — of course it influences his Presidency! The question should be, "What aspects of his character influence what things in what circumstances?" So, specificity is the second thing I can see the field developing toward — that's called refining theory.

And, third, it's important to truly link psychological dynamics more closely to context. Political psychologists always talk about behavior being a joint function of the environment and the person, but then they go on as if the environment didn't matter. The environment enhances the importance of psychology because the environment itself has psychological properties which people have to deal with. For example, the circumstances that the President faces all have a different resonance for him — they all have different pulls on him, and they all give him an array of options from which he's going to try to select one or more to try to shape what goes on. We have to understand the context to clarify what his psychology was in choosing one or another possible response.

I'd like to add a word of caution to the field. I think that one of the largest dangers that has faced the field is that there has been a tendency among some practitioners to adopt global theories: one-thing-explains-all. For example, back in the old days it used to be that swaddling explained the Russian character and Russian civilization. Social causality is a lot more complex. One-factor theories have also created the perception that the field has had to overcome, not without difficulty, that it's very reductionistic. So, anything in the field that I see nowadays which smacks of that "one-big-factor-and-I've-found-it-and-it-explains-it-all" seems to me to be not only empirically wrong — that's not the way the world operates — but also a gross disservice to the development of the field.

Political Psychology is published quarterly. Send editorial inquiries to Stanley Renshon, CUNY, 33 West 42 Street, New York, NY 10036-8099. The subscription rate in North America is \$68. Send subscription inquiries to Blackwell Publishers, 238 Main Street, Cambridge, MA 02142. □

Mentalities/Mentalités

Norman Simms, Editor
Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Israel

Though the first number of *Mentalities/Mentalités* did not appear until March, 1982, the plans were in the works a long time before that, perhaps as far back as 1974 when I made my first trip to Romania. In Bucharest I met with Dr. Alexandru Dutu who introduced me to the concept of the history of mentalities: a very systematic and formal approach to textual analysis of historical and literary documents based on careful coordination of the texts with the contextual social, political, economic, and religious phenomena. My idea was to create a journal in English as well as French which would bridge the gap between literary studies, folklore, cultural history, and psychoanalysis, all of which had appealed to me for almost my whole professional career. While I had some experience in publishing small literary journals back in New Zealand, the idea of a scholarly journal was at first daunting. But I needed some vehicle for staying in touch with my new colleagues in Europe — and, as it turned out, in America and elsewhere as well. The journal would be my umbilicus, to use psychohistorical terms.

Dutu started giving me names — and I was shocked because these were the "greats": Daniel Henri Pageaux at the Sorbonne; Peter Burke from Britain; Georges Duby at the College de France; Richard Hoggart from London; Ilija Konew from Sophia, Bulgaria; Zoran Konstantinovic from Innsbruck, Austria; Walter Leitsch at the University of Vienna; Emmanuel LeRoy Ladurie, the librarian of Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris; Adrian Marino of Romania; and Jacques Marx at the Free

University in Brussels. One by one the “greats” joined the editorial board, and even started to send articles and book reviews. Later, when I was diagnosed with cancer and told I had six weeks to live — how much effort you can try to stuff into a month and a half if you think it is your last! — and then the weeks stretched into months and the months into years and I was still bucking the system, well, I realized that I was living in order to be worthy of the friendship and cooperation of such great European scholars. I can only hope that they realize even a fraction of the immense debt of gratitude I owe to them.

The early years of *Mentalities/Mentalités* has a very high proportion of work by these key thinkers from all over Europe and North America, and even gradually from Asia and the Pacific, and I have always been unable to understand why our reputation and subscriptions remain relatively low. Perhaps it was that the journal was published infrequently (twice a year), or looked somewhat amateurish (many librarians see us as easy prey for cost-cutting because of the non-professional layout), or that in the late eighties Robert Muchembled, one of the key French players, started his own new journal in Paris called *Mentalités* and took the contributors who were regularly coming to us in French. A key factor for keeping the journal going under adverse conditions was our emphasis on book reviewing. We have always seen this as central and vital because it allows for a survey and monitoring of scholarship in the field, and also of what is not being done but cries out for publication. We also favored lengthy review essays and synthesizing reviews of several books. I see book reviewing as a central dialectic-dialogic activity.

It always comes as a pleasant surprise when people come up at conferences and seminars and tell how much they enjoy reading *Mentalities/Mentalités*. Friendship and support in the last five to six years has come from numerous Europeans, New Zealanders, and Americans, including Lloyd deMause. More recently, help has come from two French colleagues, Robert Liris, one of the founders of the French Society for Psychohistory, and William Theaux, the founder of plural analysis, both of whom have helped me see how to adjust

the history of mentalities so as to accommodate these more psychoanalytic-based disciplines. I am optimistic enough to dream of some institutional support suddenly appearing. Perhaps when I am comfortable enough in Israel, I can negotiate something here.

We are different from, say, *The Journal of Psychohistory*, in being text-orientated for the most part and deeply committed to literature and the arts as forms of group consciousness and fantasy. We unashamedly use techniques taken from literary theory, along with anthropology and philosophy. Our version of the history of mentalities and of psychohistory is humanist rather than social science at its core although there are plenty of overlaps and leakages. Anyone may contribute, so long as the article or review deals in some way — including pointedly contra — with *mentalités* or psychohistory or plural analysis. We accept comments and questions about previously published material, as well as reports and notices on conferences, seminars, and exhibits. The reviewing process is that most articles are sent to me on recommendation by one of the members of the editorial or executive boards; that plus my own approval constitutes acceptance. Where I disagree a third editor is called in; we have never had to go beyond that. Our main languages for publication are English and French. We prefer footnotes — or endnotes — rather than those distracting parenthetical names and dates. I think we are very old fashioned in this regard, and I personally think of what I am doing in terms of 18th-century correspondence, aided by modern electronic means.

Besides being editor of *Mentalities/Mentalités*, I am a university lecturer, just moved to Israel, and so have the ordeal of absorption to a new country and a new language and culture to worry about. I am revising a book on fantasy and symbol in the Book of Judith, *The Biblical Decapitator of Holofernes* [a general of Nebuchadnezzar], for the publisher, and I have a project on the origins of language and consciousness. I also write poetry and short stories, help edit anthologies of poetry, and in the past have edited several small cultural magazines, including the Literary Section of the *New Zealand Jewish Chronicle*. I am putting

together a small anthology of Beer Sheva and Negev Poets to "Affirm Life" after the most recent terrible spate of terrorist bombings in Israel. I do what I can.

Mentalities/Mentalités is published twice yearly. Send editorial inquiries to the author at Ben Gurion University, Box 653, Bar Sheva 85104 Israel. The subscription rate is \$30 annually. Send subscription inquiries to Outrigger Publishers, PO Box 1198, Hamilton, NZ, or to the author

Norman Simms was born in 1940 in Brooklyn, New York. He received his doctorate in English Literature in 1969 from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. After four years at the University of Manitoba in Canada, he lived in New Zealand for 25 years before moving in 1995 to Israel, where he teaches English Literature from the 14th through 18th centuries. □

Mind and Human Interaction

Bruce A. Edwards, Managing Editor
Center for the Study of Mind and
Human Interaction

Mind and Human Interaction was initiated in 1989 by Vamik Volkan, Director of the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction of the University of Virginia School of Medicine. [See the profile of Dr. Volkan and the Center in the September, 1995, **Clio's Psyche**.] The journal started as a newsletter to inform people of the research and activities of the Center, which focuses on the interaction of national or ethnic groups, especially those in conflict. The current editorial staff consists of Vamik Volkan (a psychiatrist and psychoanalyst); Maurice Apprey (a psychotherapist who trained in child analysis with Anna Freud and whose PhD is in "Human Science Research"), Co-editor; and the author (a political scientist with a master's degree in international relations) who is Managing Editor.

Mind and Human Interaction's primary topics are the psychodynamics of large groups, applied psychoanalysis and psychology, and

political psychology. For the past two years each issue has had a focus, often fairly broad so that a range or spectrum of ideas can be presented. We try to put together articles that complement each other, illuminating a common thread, even though they may seem to be on very different topics. For example, the May, 1996, issue will feature a range of articles on cults and religious fundamentalism: psychoanalytic and psychobiological theories of cults, ecological psychology, a psychobiography of the leader of the Japanese cult responsible for the Tokyo subway gas attack, and a paper on Islamic fundamentalism. The following issue will cover youth, conflict, and change. The next issue after that will focus on transgenerational transmission of trauma. We also try to cover recent events. Past issues have included papers on the Oklahoma City bombing, the Waco standoff, Arab-Israeli relations, transformations in the former Soviet Union, and the war in Chechnya. Such a multifaceted and interdisciplinary approach is the only way that one can begin to understand the complex nature of human conflict and cooperation.

Mind and Human Interaction has an interdisciplinary approach, so anyone can contribute. The authors come from many different disciplines and parts of the world. Our editorial board has university faculty members from at least half-a-dozen fields, so there will most likely be someone who can effectively review almost any paper that comes in. We try to avoid papers that are too technical and filled with jargon or terms that are not widely understood.

The journal aims to be accessible to anyone, and the wide range of readers reflects some success in this: diplomats and government officials, members of international organizations, clinicians, businessmen, lawyers, and theologians, all from many different academic fields including anthropology, ethnic studies, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. There is no true organizational affiliation or base of membership, although it certainly is influenced by the work of the faculty and staff of the Center which has international associates in numerous countries, from Brazil to Russia. Our wide range of readers suggests that

the journal is successful in furthering the understanding of the role of psychological mechanisms in many aspects of life, from the individual to the family to the larger and larger groups of community, state, nation, and culture. When we get letters from people in different disciplines supporting our work or complimenting a specific issue or article it means that we are making progress. It's great to see an individual who formerly had a very rigid perception of another group begin to understand why, to develop some empathy for the "other," and change over time.

We face the same challenges of any other publication: getting good articles, marketing and subscriptions, time and money. But we are hopeful and optimistic that applied psychoanalysis and psychology, as they relate to large group conflict and an interdisciplinary approach to such complex problems, will continue to gain acceptance in both domestic and international circles. Given the emotional content and the transgenerational transmission of traumas evident in so many conflicts such as in the Balkans, the Middle East, the former Soviet republics, and Northern Ireland, and elsewhere as well as in race and ethnic relations here in the US, it seems that it must be considered if there is any hope of lasting change and resolution of these destructive and deadly cycles.

Mind and Human Interaction is published quarterly. The subscription rate is \$30 annually. Send both editorial and subscription inquiries to the author, Drawer A, Blue Ridge Hospital, Charlottesville, VA 22901, tel. (804) 982-3827, fax (804) 982-2524, e-mail <brh-mind@virginia.edu>.

Paul H. Elovitz, Editor Clio's Psyche

**Pauline V. Staines
The Psychohistory Forum**

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, was born in Bridgeport, Connecticut. He is founder and Director of the Psychohistory Forum; past president of the International Psychohistorical

Association (1988-90); editor of Clio's Psyche; a psychotherapist in private practice; and editor of Historical and Psychological Inquiry (1990) as well as the author of numerous other publications. Elovitz originated the Immigrant Psychodynamics Project and is the co-editor of the forthcoming Forum-sponsored book, Immigrant Experiences. After teaching at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities, in 1971 he became a founding faculty member at Ramapo College where he offers courses on history, leadership, psychohistory, and the Holocaust.

PS: Why did you start **Clio's Psyche** in 1994?

PHE: To further develop and leave a printed record of some of the ideas we as psychohistorians usually just talk about. I felt a need to communicate more effectively with members of the varying Psychohistory Forum research groups as well as members-at-a-distance who kept joining an organization I had initially started as a New York-centered Philadelphia-to-Hartford group. Currently, half of our membership is outside of this region with a number living around the world. By 1994 the Forum had enough members to support a modest publication financially and with scholarly materials. Associate Editor Bob Lentz's willingness to work on all aspects of **Clio's Psyche** made it possible to turn an idea I had been working on since 1990, into a reality.

PS: Is it a publication just of, by, and for the Psychohistory Forum?

PHE: No! We actively seek to have articles of psychohistorical interest from a large variety of sources, within both the academic and clinical communities. I like to see articles by colleagues from other psychohistorical groups. Unsolicited articles from non-members are welcomed. However, we are not inclined to have repeat articles by people who choose not to become members or subscribers since we are totally dependent on membership dues and gifts to cover our administrative, printing and mailing costs.

PS: How did you become a psychohistorian?

PHE: Partly by accident! In 1968 while teaching at Temple University I meet Sidney Halpern, an ancient history professor. When we spoke of the Western Civilization course we were each teaching, I realized he had a much more profound understanding of history because he was analyzing the unconscious dynamics of historical personalities and change. This was not something I had learned in graduate school at Rutgers where one of my instructors drove out (to Harvard) the only student who spoke openly of psychohistory. I audited Sid's Western Civilization and American History courses and borrowed many books from him by Edmund Bergler, Norman O. Brown, and Freud. Today I smile at the rather simplistic nature of Bergler's books, but they were important to my self-education in the late 1960s. Under Halpern's tutelage I learned to begin to think psychohistorically. When he died in 1994, I devoted considerable time to properly commemorate him with a thoughtful obituary and a Sidney Halpern Psychohistorical Award Fund.

PS: Was Professor Halpern the only reason you became a psychohistorian?

PHE: Certainly not! As Sid was fond of saying, there are no accidents in the unconscious. I had many profoundly personal reasons for becoming an historian and a psychohistorian, some of which I spell out in my family history chapter in the forthcoming book, *Immigrant Experiences*.

PS: What special training was most helpful in your becoming a psychohistorian?

PHE: My own psychoanalysis. It enabled me to really understand the power of the unconscious and the incredible complexity of the mechanisms of defense. Working with patients is also incredibly helpful in the same regard. Ten years of psychoanalytic training was an enormous help. I started out with an academic model, thinking that the five years of weekly psychoanalytic class work would be the important part of my task. After about three years I realized that it was the case presentation seminars and the control analyses which were next most important after my own analysis. In

case presentation I, and my fellow psychoanalytic candidates, initially thought that there was one correct answer as we struggled to interpret the case one of us presented, mostly from patients in the Low Cost Clinic. We soon learned that our varying interpretations, based on different theoretical frameworks, case loads, and personal experiences, each shed a variety of lights on the case.

PS: Why did you start the Psychohistory Forum?

PHE: To continue the Saturday Work-in-Progress Meetings which Alice Eichholz and I had pioneered at the Institute for Psychohistory from their inception in 1974. In 1983 the Institute dropped the Saturday workshops when it decided to switch its format to one of public education with large lectures. So, I, together with Henry Lawton as associate director, started the Forum.

PS: What happened to Alice Eichholz and Henry Lawton?

PHE: After a few years Alice moved to Vermont to work as an adult education teacher specializing in what I call psychogenealogy. Henry was turning his energies to writing *The Psychohistorian's Handbook* and to film studies. Henry's face would always light up when we talked about films. About six years ago he started a successful, New York-based psychohistorical film group of which I am a founding member.

PS: I think the readers would like to know about the Forum's Saturday work-in-progress meetings.

PHE: These were started in 1983 and have been happening about a half-dozen times a year ever since. Usually ten to twenty psychotherapists (of the most varied theoretical frameworks), historians, and other academics and professionals as well as a few laypeople sit around for three or more hours and discuss a short paper that has been mailed out to people on our membership list a month before. Almost all of our time is devoted to an in-depth discussion which usually spills over into a two-hour lunch. Papers often have a surprisingly positive effect on members-at-a-distance since they keep

rejoining the Forum and sometimes send in written communications. Just the other day I received a letter from a colleague I have never met, who lives half-a-continent away. He said that the Forum is his "favorite think-tank." He has just finished a book which Yale University Press is considering for publication. I hope he will be able to present his materials to the Forum.

PS: What about the Forum's research groups?

PHE: We started them so that we could grow, yet continue the tradition of small group work. One example is the Communism < The Dream that Failed Research Group. I consider it to be a great success because a small group of talented researchers have some wonderfully productive meetings which do not require my administrative involvement. I especially recall one presentation when I was awed by the intellectual courage of a colleague who was probing his own familial, intellectual, and psychological reasons for being drawn to Marxism.

On the other hand, one group we tried to start was dropped because no one came to the organizational meeting and the subject matter was perhaps too close to that of another group. The usual problem is, how do we get people who live in disparate parts of the country together to develop a common purpose and agenda? Some groups meet at regular sessions of the Forum devoted to their subjects and others meet at the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) convention panels sponsored by the Forum. I would be delighted if we could make similar arrangements with the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP) and the Group for the Use of Psychohistory (GUPH).

PS: How can the research groups become more effective?

PHE: We need to spread the administrative leadership to more people. Because of my disparate interests and publications, I can co-direct several groups: The Childhoods and Personalities of Presidential Candidates; Teaching Psychohistory; and War, Peace, and Conflict Resolution. But for the

groups to achieve their full potential, more people have to accept administrative responsibility as coordinators or directors. I would like to step down from two of these groups. Apocalypse, Cults, and Millennialism is a new group with which half of our incoming members want to affiliate and which has already done some good work, yet we still need a coordinator.

PS: What do you think will ensure the importance of psychohistory to future generations and the permanence of the Psychohistory Forum and **Clio's Psyche**?

PHE: Individual people die. Ideas survive. Psychohistory will thrive in the future because it helps people have a better grip on their internal dynamics and societal reality. There is need for multi-disciplinary exchanges based on depth psychology to think more profoundly and solve individual and societal changes. On this basis the Psychohistory Forum and **Clio's Psyche** will live on long after the deaths of Paul Elovitz and many others who have made it possible.

I am a strong believer in applied psychohistory. Robert Jay Lifton with the Center on Violence and Human Survival and Vamik Volkan with the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction have led the way in showing the practical basis of psychohistorical knowledge in dealing with concrete contemporary issues of war and peace. When we help society with its problems it will pay more attention to our ideas.

Founding organizations and publications such as the Forum and **Clio's Psyche** is rather like becoming a parent. You always mention your children — especially in your will. You do all you can within your power to help create an environment of permanence. Other people who have a powerful emotional stake in what we are doing may respond similarly, but money is never enough. One needs valuable ideas and living, breathing people to provide the next generation of leadership. Consequently, I encourage my students, younger colleagues, and most people who come to our organization to step into the shoes of leadership.

Pauline Staines has worked for the Psychohistory Forum since early 1991 and became its Administrator in 1993. She emigrated to the US from England in 1987 and has over thirty years of professional office experience, including working in Norfolk, England, for the US's European Exchange Services manager. Last December she moved from New Jersey to Florida where she continues as administrator. □

How "Neglected" Is Psychohistory?

David R. Beisel

SUNY-Rockland Community College

Psychohistorians, if one goes by their own judgments, seem to feel either neglected or like an embattled species. The causes for these feelings (and their consequences for the reception, or lack of reception, to psychohistorians' work) may someday be fully explained, but, whatever their intrapsychic reasons (projecting one's own resistances, totalizing from the resistances of others, displaying several degrees of grandiosity, or secretly wishing to remain small in numbers or even to fail), psychohistorians understandably may currently feel neglected or embattled for some very good reasons.

America is in the midst of one of its periodic anti-insight crusades. The current anti-psychological, anti-psychotherapeutic, and anti-Freudian mood takes many forms, some of which have been documented by myself, and others like Sandra Bloom, in the pages of *The Journal of Psychohistory*. Recently, popular science writer Carl Sagan has joined the anti-Freudians in his *Demon-Haunted World: Science as a Candle in the Dark* (1996), where he writes that some child abuse exists, but "There is no hidden memory to be retrieved (page 153)."

My article "America in Denial" (*The Journal of Psychohistory*, Winter, 1994, pages 245-256) argued that the current mood is, in fact, a predictable backlash among an older psychoclass whose own painful, repressed feelings have been intolerably unleashed by

psychological insights in popular works, such as Gloria Steinem's *Revolution from Within* (1991), and by the publicity surrounding the recovered memories of child and child sexual abuse revealed by several celebrities in the 1980s and 1990s.

Despite this backlash, the popular media has not been completely silent about either psychobiography or psychohistory; alert readers can find an occasional good word in *The New York Times*, its *Book Review and Magazine*, and, sometimes, even in *The New York Review of Books*. Studies like Klaus Teweleit's *Male Fantasies* (1987-1989) on the *Freikorps* and W.W. Meissner's 1994 psychobiography of Loyola have been reviewed by the popular media. Lloyd deMause was profiled in the "Talk of the Town" section of the *New Yorker* in 1994, and books by Peter Gay and Robert Jay Lifton continue to be regularly and widely reviewed.

Still, an early goal of many psychohistorians was not to obtain media notoriety, but to be taken seriously. They wanted to get a hearing from historians and convince some of them. They hoped to eventually see psychohistory enter the scholarly mainstream as a part, if a necessarily controversial part, of the historian's craft. In an untitled article in *The American Historical Review* twelve years ago (vol. 89, 1984), Bruce Mazlish voiced the hope that acceptance was already at hand: "Psychohistory is healthy, is here to stay, and having passed through its faddish stage need no longer be subject of either overactive attacks or defenses." But a year later, while Peter Gay's *Freud for Historians* (1985) was widely praised, its *New York Times*' reviewer felt it wouldn't convince many of Gay's colleagues.

So, despite nearly a quarter century of continuous publication of *The Journal of Psychohistory* and *The Psychohistory Review*, 18 annual conventions of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), and the appearance of vigorous new publications like **Clio's Psyche**, years can pass without a single psychohistorical paper being presented at annual meetings of the American Historical Association (AHA).

This is distressing, but may be occasionally offset when one finds positive comments in most unlikely places. Distinguished historian of Nazi foreign policy and World War II, Gerhard Weinberg (*A World at Arms* [1994]), whose careful, traditionalist analysis has always relied heavily on rational models, had a surprisingly kind word for psychobiography in an address before the Society for Military History, which was printed in *The Journal of Military History*, and reprinted in his collected essays, *Germany, Hitler & World War II* (1995, page 311).

More importantly, signs from textbook publishing suggest that, without fanfare, psychohistory has been slowly entering the historiographical mainstream. Excerpts from William Langer's 1957 AHA Presidential address, "The Next Assignment," show up in Dennis Sherman's popular collection of readings, now in its fourth edition (1995), *Western Civilization: Sources, Images, and Interpretations*, vol. 1: *To 1700*, (pages 249-51). Sherman's second volume, *Since 1660*, reproduces an early modern painting on maternal care and prints excerpts from Aries' *Centuries of Childhood* (1962), Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1961), Fromm's *Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (1970), Bettelheim's *The Informed Heart* (1960), and Rieff's *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer* (1979) (pages 15, 20, 268, 278-80, and 292-3 respectively).

Rita Botwinick's excellent text, *A History of the Holocaust* (1996), makes the case for a psychological dimension by introducing the notion of an authoritarian personality (page 6) and later focusing on Robert Waite's *The Psychopathic God* (1977, pages 66-72). Another text from Prentice Hall is even more impressive: Jackson Spielvogel, *Hitler and Nazi Germany: A History* (third edition, 1996), with its extensive treatment of Hitler's psychology, citing Waite, Walter Langer, and Rudolph Binion, and including in "Suggestions for Further Reading" Helm Stierlin, *Adolf Hitler, A Family Perspective* (1976); Peter Loewenberg, "Psychohistorical Perspectives on Modern German History," *The Journal of Modern History* (1975); and Robert Jay Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors* (1986).

Psychohistory has also found its way into the popular D.C. Heath series, *Problems in European Civilization*, published since the 1950s. Its updated *The Nazi Revolution* (third edition, 1990), edited by Alan Mitchell, excerpts almost all of Waite's early *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (1971) essay, "Hitler's Guilt Feelings," and many of the central arguments made by Peter Loewenberg in "Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort" from *The American Historical Review* (1971).

It has taken twenty years, but the psychohistorical message of the texts and essays cited here is presumably beginning to reach a larger audience of traditional history students. This should encourage us all to feel a little less "neglected."

David R. Beisel teaches history and psychohistory, is past president of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) and past editor (1978-87) of The Journal of Psychohistory, and serves on the Editorial Board of this publication. □

Displaced Targets of Pat Buchanan's Anger

Herbert Barry, III
University of Pittsburgh

Patrick Joseph Buchanan has considerable influence on current United States politics. His speech denouncing moderates in addition to liberals at the Republican convention in 1992 contributed to the defeat of President Bush. Buchanan now has the opportunity to contribute to the defeat of prospective Republican nominee Bob Dole in 1996.

Pat Buchanan was born in 1938 and grew up in Washington, DC. His father, William Baldwin Buchanan, became senior partner in a large accounting firm. His mother, Catherine Elizabeth Crum Buchanan, was a former nurse. The first four of their nine children were boys, born within a span of four years. Pat, the third in sequence, manifested verbal superiority from an early age. The four boys shared the same

bedroom and competed vigorously with each other, physically and intellectually.

Their father was an authoritarian head of the family who tried to be a good parent. Unfortunately, he had a bad role model. When William was 11-years-old, his own father, Henry Martin Buchanan, deserted the family. William Buchanan's resentment affected his subsequent treatment of his sons. He was a highly punitive father, frequently beating his sons with a strap. Pat and his brothers were also subjected to the authoritarian discipline of parochial school and the Catholic Church.

William Buchanan encouraged Pat and his brothers to fight each other and boys outside the family. Pat Buchanan's behavior as an undergraduate at Georgetown University, 1956-61, was a contrast to Bill Clinton's at the same university, 1964-68. Buchanan frequently fought other young men. He was suspended for a year for assaulting two policemen who had arrested him for a traffic violation. Many sons of authoritarian fathers act out in this fashion.

The adult Pat Buchanan exemplifies identification with the aggressor. Contrary to rebellion against the principal source of his anger, he professes exaggerated love and devotion toward his father, the parochial school, and the Church. He defends the Church's traditional doctrines and his father's admiration of Douglas MacArthur, Joe McCarthy, and General Franco. Lavish praise of his father is included in Pat Buchanan's autobiography, *Right from the Beginning* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1988). In the paperback edition (Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1990) an epilogue reproduces the author's eulogy of his father, who died in 1988.

Pat Buchanan's autobiography and speeches denounce abortions, illegal immigrants, imported merchandise, the United Nations, atheists, and Communists. These antagonists are classic examples of displaced targets of aggression. His principal themes are anger and fear, contrary to the dominant Christian doctrines of love and trust.

Pat Buchanan's autobiographical account of his aggressive behavior as a young man reveals the original target of his displaced anger.

Referring to his brothers and father, he writes (page 229), "...the game chickens had reached an age where they were taking on the game rooster, and everyone else." The author usually writes very clearly and forcefully, but this is a confusing statement in accordance with the ambivalent mixture of love and hate that motivates displacement of anger onto a substitute target. (The adjective "game" probably refers to the slang meaning of "plucky" and to the violent fights between gamecocks.) The same confusing metaphor is repeated later in the autobiography, referring to his relationship with his father several years later (page 306): "The game chicken and the game rooster could now walk the beach together, without argument." His anger against his father was being more thoroughly displaced onto substitute targets.

In Buchanan's 1996 campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination, he emphasized the insecurity of workers whose companies are downsizing or making products that may be undersold by foreign imports, and whose jobs may be given to immigrants. He also extended the displaced targets of his anger to executives of domestic companies in addition to foreign workers and immigrants. He thereby exploited the anxieties of many Americans in order to win their votes. His dominant theme was not sympathy and problem solving for his audience. Instead, it was anger against the sources of the threats to their jobs.

Herb Barry, a psychologist whose specialties include birth order and Presidential leadership, is co-director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on Presidential Childhood and Personality. □

On Capital Punishment

**H. John Rogers, Attorney-at-Law
Martinsville, West Virginia**

Part 1: Doing Time: From the State Penitentiary to Harvard Law School in One Year

The first real job I had was as a guard at the old West Virginia Penitentiary in

Moundsville. I went to work there in early March of 1963 and stayed until late August of that year. I was 22 years old. In the preceding four or five years, I probably worked at a couple dozen jobs while I was in school and during summer vacations, but this was the first one where I had to fill out retirement forms.

I had graduated from West Virginia University the preceding June with an AB in political philosophy, six varsity letters in track and cross country, and a burning desire to be just like Ernest Hemingway when I grew up. So I had to experience life. I spent a couple of months working as a "swamper" (which is as miserable as it sounds) on a pipeline construction job to put some money together. Then I was off to New York where I hung around Greenwich Village, coming home for Christmas. (I remember my father saying some-time during my visit, "There's a thin line between being on the road and being a bum.") Then it was down to Miami and Key West. The bartender at Sloppy Joe's assured me that I was sitting in Papa's chair. However, unlike Papa [Hemingway], I ended up passing out.

From there it was on to New Orleans for a couple of weeks, and then I decided to hitchhike to California. But it took me a couple of days to make 50 miles through Cajun country, so I went back to New Orleans and called Mom. My father's prophecy seemed to be coming true: I was no longer a vacationing student.

"You have a job any time you want one, honey," my mother said, when I called home looking for sympathy.

"Where?" I asked skeptically. West Virginia was John Kennedy's economic poster child in 1963, and the joke about the "3R's" in West Virginia schools being "Readin', Ritin', and the Road to Akron [for a factory job]" was no joke back then.

"The prison," she said. "I talked with Mr. Schupbach and he said just come and see him." Herbert Schupbach was our long-time county delegate in the state legislature. "Just a political stroke," I thought. After all, I had studied the process. But it was a face-saving reason to come home. I went to see Mr. Schupbach and filled out the one-page

application.

Three or four days went by, and I more or less forgot about the job. I was, in today's vernacular, "hanging with my homeboys" — shooting pool, drinking 3.2 beer, and slipping into the school gym at night to play basketball. It was as if my four years of college had been a dream. I was comfortably re-established at square one.

Mom woke me one morning at nine o'clock. "The prison called," she said. "You're going to work at midnight, but they want you up there as soon as you can get there to meet the warden."

O.C. Boles was a large man who had retired from the state police, and then was elected sheriff in Wood County. He had picked the right horse in the 1960 gubernatorial election, W.W. Barron, which led to his appointment as warden. (Barron later was sentenced to federal prison, along with six or eight of the top officials in his administration.) I remember the warden looking at me for a long time with the cold, appraising eye of an old woodhick trying to figure out if some marginal tree was worth the effort to cut down and haul away.

"Well, son, I don't know who you know in Charleston," he said, his eyes narrowing into hard points, "but we got a call from the governor's office this morning to put you to work. That doesn't mean we have to keep you, though. We've never had anybody here that went to college before, so we'll have to see how things work out. We'll start you off, like everybody else, in one of the towers."

By the time the sun rose the next morning, I was ready to quit. Prison life wasn't what it was cracked up to be! I thought I knew boredom, but I hadn't even scratched the surface. This particular tower — the traditional starting place for new guards — was about five short paces across. I had a shotgun, a rifle, a telephone, a clock, and a buzzer. I was to call the guard in the control center every half-hour and report, and I was to push the buzzer every 15 minutes. The buzzer signal registered on some mechanical log. I almost went crazy waiting for those 15 minutes to tick by. It's harder than it sounds.

The guard turnover at the prison was so high that after a couple of months, I moved up to the afternoon shift. Since I was the new man, I moved around a lot filling in for people who had regular assignments: the dining hall, South Hall (which held the half-dozen inmates on death row), and the prison yard. Every time — every single time — I walked across the prison yard by myself, one of the convicts would whistle at me. During the day, there would be 600 to 800 men out there, so I couldn't identify him. (When the early feminists complained about being whistled at by construction workers, believe me, I empathized. My face still gets red when I think about my anonymous admirer.) In another 20 years, confinement in this prison would be ruled "cruel and inhuman treatment" by the State Supreme Court of Appeals, but it was worse when I was there. There were over 2,000 inmates back then, and some of them were triple-celled — two in the bunk and one on the floor — in a space that wouldn't make a good-sized closet. In the early 1960s the *New York Times* said that the prison had the highest per capita murder rate of any prison in the US. A stabbing occurred one time I was on duty in the yard.

Some time in late July, Lt. Barlow called me into his office. It had been five years since there was an execution, he said, but there was going to be one. My name was one of those that was drawn in a lottery of the guards' names. You either participated in the execution or quit. "We don't accept volunteers," Lt. Barlow said. "There are some people who volunteer but we turn 'em down." Then, with a look of disgust crossing his face, he said slowly, "Can you imagine someone who would volunteer for *that!*" His last statement shocked me because Barlow was as hard-nosed as they come, and I knew that he had presided over the last execution or two. My role, fortunately, was to be a relatively minor one: a party of four escorted the prisoner from the holding cell, where he had spent his last night alive, to the electric chair, a distance of maybe 20 feet. Other guards would strap him in once we brought him to the chamber.

Lt. Barlow and I walked from the holding cell to the door of the death chamber. He fumbled with his keys for a few seconds and then unlocked the door and swung it open. He

reached inside, switched on the light, and then stepped back. "Take a look," he said. I stepped up to the open door and sucked in my breath. There it was! A crude wooden chair with straps and wires, looking like something kids had put together on a summer afternoon. "So there is how they kill people," I thought.

Lt. Barlow's right hand locked around my arm and he planted his left hand in the middle of my back, giving me the "bum's rush" through the door, like a bartender in a cheap dive who was getting rid of a drunk. I fought back but it was no use. Momentum was on his side. I was standing directly in front of the electric chair, wondering what in hell was going on. Had the old man flipped out? He let go of my arm and his other hand fell to his side. "They always hesitate when they get to the door," he said. "So you really have to shove them through."

"Hesitate?" I thought. "Oh, my God, yes. You'd have to pry my fingers off the jam!" But then I realized that I had been "had," so to speak. All that remained to be done was shove me in the chair. Lt. Barlow showed me around the room: there were three buttons behind a wooden panel, the observers' section, and a telephone. "That's if the governor calls at the last minute."

The good news is that the governor did call, and later that fall the governor granted the man an indefinite stay of execution. When the legislature abolished the death penalty in 1964, he commuted the man's sentence to life imprisonment. By then, I was finishing my first year at Harvard Law School. The day Professor James Vorenberg briefly addressed the death penalty in my criminal law class, I got nauseous and had to leave. A face had been attached to the concept, a very human face.

Part 2: Dead Man Walking

"I used to be a liberal like you, John," the man said evenly, leaning back in the driver's seat of his Lincoln and taking a long drink from the beer can in his right hand. We were talking shop and knocking off a few beers as we hurled down a dark West Virginia highway towards home. "You wait until they come in and murder your mother and your father and your sister. I want to know what you'll think about capital punishment

then," he said, turning slightly and flashing a broad smile. "Just put yourself in my place for a minute and tell me what you'd think."

That smile, from the early 1970s, danced across my frontal lobes during the first part of Tim Robbins' film, *Dead Man Walking*, the first serious treatment of capital punishment since Truman Capote's book, *In Cold Blood* (which was also made into a feature film.) Robbins, a fine actor himself, wrote and directed the film. It is based on the account of a Catholic nun's relationship with men on death row in the Louisiana state prison at Angola. Susan Sarandon plays the nun, Sister Helen Prejean. Robbins created the composite character of Matthew Poncelet, played by Sean Penn, from two characters in the book.

My inquisitor was not Bernard Shaw taking a cheap shot at Michael Dukakis during the Presidential debates ("What would you do if someone raped your wife?"). He was a labor lawyer in his mid-30s and "he knew whereof he spoke." His parents and sister had been murdered some months before in a plot that would later be traced to the top of the union hierarchy. The three gunmen — all "poor white trash," like the character Penn plays — received a total of something less than \$5,000 for their night's work.

That night, I stammered out a reply to the effect that I hoped my position would not change. "Just you wait," he said, "until it happens to you."

My friend was making what I think is probably the only valid argument for the death penalty: the desire of the next-of-kin for revenge. One could argue, I suppose, that this is part of the "natural law." It has an early codification in the Torah's concept of "the avenger of the blood." (See, for example, Numbers 35:11-34 and Deuteronomy 19: 6, 11-13.) In Capote's book, when they bring Dick Hickock out to hang him, he asks, "Where are the members of the Clutter family?"

The trouble with this rationale is that in our society it is not the courts or the legislature that decides who is actually subjected to the death penalty. Rather, it is the local prosecuting attorney, who is usually an elected official.

Death penalty cases bring headlines and headlines mean re-election. The prosecutor's discretion is largely unreviewable. Witness the fact that the prosecutor in Philadelphia has sent 80 or so people to death row in recent years, while her counterpart in Pittsburgh less than five. Also, other than invoking the local mores, it would seem to be difficult to advance a rationale as to why Susan Smith was deserving of death for her crimes and O.J. Simpson was not.

In both the book and the movie, Sister Prejean gets involved with the families of the victims, and this causes her to embark on the hardest task of all: to get Poncelet to share some of the sorrow that she now feels for the grieving parents of his victims. This approach is part and parcel of her Roman Catholicism, but it overlooks the fact that while Poncelet was committing these crimes he was very much the predator. However, at this juncture, he is the clear victim. Her tact seems to be like asking the man on the end of the rope to empathize with the lynch mob. At this point it doesn't seem to make much difference if he has been rightly or wrongly singled-out.

It is generally cold-blooded, premeditated murder that our society punishes with death. However, I can think of nothing more cold-blooded and premeditated than to lock someone away in a cell not much larger than a closet for five, ten, twenty years, and say to them everyday, "We will do our best to kill you just as soon as we can." It's not an easy thing to kill a rat or a dog, but we expect 10 or 12 civilian guards (paid only a little more than minimum wage) to superintend this ghastly project — murdering another human being. One of their unofficial last minute tasks is to stuff the prisoner's anus with cotton so there's not so much of a mess to clean up afterwards. No one wants to do that!

In his seminal essay "Reflections on the Guillotine" (and later in *The First Man*), Albert Camus tells how his father went out very early one morning to witness the execution of a particularly vile criminal. The young Camus waited for his father to return and tell the family of the spectacle. When his father came back, he went directly to the bathroom and vomited for several minutes. When he came out, he never,

ever said a word about the execution.

Thinking back, I suppose I made my decision about capital punishment when I was 10 or 12. We lived a few miles from the state prison, and a guard was a friend of my father's. The guard had gone through one or two executions, and told us how all the lights dimmed when the prisoner was electrocuted. (This is part of the lore of the old electric chair. Other people deny that it happens.) I thought then that I could not bear to see those lights dim. And this is several removes from watching a man die in the chair, or cleaning up afterwards.

H. John Rogers is a graduate of Harvard Law School and has practiced in West Virginia and federal courts for over 25 years. □

Reflections On Rogers' "Doing Time" and "Dead Man Walking"

Jennefer V. Mazza
Ramapo College

H. John Rogers' two-part article on the death penalty underscore the basic problem with capital punishment as an "instrument" of justice: the effect it has on individuals in a civilized society. Vengeance and revenge may "feel good," but the purpose of civilization, according to Freud, is to help humankind come to terms with the problem of human aggression. It is to teach self-restraint through sublimation which, in part, involves taking "drives" like the desire for revenge and channeling them into more constructive pursuits. As Rogers elegantly points out, capital punishment affects not only the condemned but, and this is of equal importance, it affects the executioners as well. While we can — and should — emotionally empathize with the victims of crime, for individuals like Mr. Rogers' friend who "used to be a liberal," is not life imprisonment without parole a rational response to their need for vengeance given society's need to protect us and mete out justice without inflaming popular passions and putting some citizens in the dangerous position of being murderers for the

whole? Freud, I think, would argue that to put any individual in the position of having to cross that line by acting out our deepest drives for aggression ("the death instinct") makes it difficult if not impossible for us to maintain any kind of civilized order that places limits on all of our aggression.

Rogers' youthful experience as a prison guard illuminates the problem poignantly because it highlights the dangerous effects that prisons have on the guardians. They too become dehumanized (uncivilized) by the job and that is why prisons are horrible places for both the inmates and the keepers. "Tough" talk feels good but the reality of it is ugly; just being with killers tests the most civilized of us. So, how does making "executioners" out of some of us improve the quality of "civilized" life? This argument is particularly difficult to make in our culture because of how "comfortable" we are, as a culture, with aggression and "tough" talk — witness the public outcry over the firing of Bob Grant [New York City radio talk show host] and the enormous popularity of "hate" radio and "liberal bashing." A group of my students visited the Holocaust Museum in Washington, DC, recently and a most-talented student had a very interesting and uniquely American reaction to it. He said that his experience at the museum reinforced his belief in the right to bear arms: "If they were armed they would not have been such easy victims."

Freud did not think that psychoanalysis would have a significant impact in America. While all of us who read and write for this publication defy his expectations, I do think that we face enormous resistance to raising questions that challenge the popularity of such issues like the death penalty. The movie *Dead Man Walking* enjoyed enormous popularity, in part, because its "message" was so ambiguous.

Jennefer V. Mazza, PhD, is a political scientist who has taught for 20 years at Ramapo College of New Jersey. She maintains a private psychoanalytic practice. □

On Teaching Psychohistory: A Precarious Enterprise

Mel Goldstein, PhD
University of Hartford (Emeritus)
and
Margot Goldstein, MA
West Hartford Public School System
(Retired)

Learning takes place on an affective screen. The learning of which we speak is not to be found in courses which share with people methods and skills, information and knowledge. It is the kind that reaches to an understanding of the internal self and the self in the world. Such learning expands a student's perceptual system in such a way that his or her inner being is stirred into a sense of what it is to have some insights and ideas about what makes the world go round the way it does. The goal in a course in psychohistory is achieved through a respect and perhaps love for the teacher whose introduction to the materials and methods of the discipline develops in the student a respect and love for some of the basic concepts which strike his fancy. Whatever the books selected to be read, the core text becomes the teacher who from the start is evaluated as genuine and authentic or not. Our observations in this missive are based on some not such successful teaching excursions. We share what we have learned about teaching psychohistory over a period of more than 20 years, having made all of the errors to which we alert the reader.

Though for the initiated of psychohistory, and especially for those who become votaries and then priests, the discipline may become a religion, it is not such. It is essentially a way of thinking about a body of literature — speculative, exciting, stimulating, imaginative, and creative — that the student is asked to master. He or she doesn't have to believe in the theories and their applications as they are expounded. They are simply to be learned. To impose beliefs is to lose one's audience almost immediately.

When we introduce students to some of the concepts of psychohistory we take them on a strange and fascinating journey filled with disquieting and perilous episodes. Affecting mutual indifference to material that students regard as weird to outrageous and defend against

with a fierce kind of stubbornness, we respond by allowing them to keep a merciful distance from those materials which ignite them. The meal we offer up is capable of poisoning them at the very moment we introduce the image of the poison container of the family. "That's me, in my family!" comes the cry from a student. Startled that she shouted out this secret, she falls back into her chair, stunned into silence as is the class.

As teachers we learn insufficiently soon not to undermine students' beliefs at a frenetic pace, if at all. Wild analysis, as Freud warns in his essay by that title, is capable of eliciting violent responses which injure beyond amelioration. The under-appreciated father, Polonius, teaches that we can find direction by indirection. This is why film and fiction help buffer messages that are capable of causing minor disruptions in the nervous system. Sometimes to bring to the surface the unconscious messages in these media can result in earthquake-like responses that leave faults dangerously open. For example, remembering Oedipus, Paris, and Hamlet, as well as the protagonists in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Maxwell Anderson's *Winterset*, and Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, we are reformed that too sudden an eruption of one's stability-of-beliefs is liable to destroy the optic system and cause deformities of personality, blindness, suicide and other death in its various guises. Numerous psychology majors have read repeatedly about the Oedipus Complex. Some have read Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. But a positive and gutsy response comes semester after semester from a showing of Howard Hawks' *Red River*, in which John Wayne and taken-under-his-wing son Montgomery Clift (who is an orphan) vie for the same woman. To a student they declare, "For the first time I understand what the Oedipus Complex is all about." We have now softened up the class sufficiently to take them through the expanses of the myth that psychohistory urges on us.

Student interest is easily grabbed with the following, but the responses are not similar. When they read that Stanislav Grof, the Czech psychiatrist, conducted over 3,000 LSD-therapy sessions since 1956, they are ready to flee the

classroom for a trip to their travel agent. But when they find that the purpose of the therapy is to relive birth experiences, they become a bit leery of both the theory and the practice. Interest is there in Lloyd deMause's theories on leadership, especially as a leader relates to a group. The predictable progress that moves the group from the honeymoon stage of idealizing the leader through to the phase of collapse, despite the accomplishments of the leader, piques their curiosity about a host of political events in the world. However, the ideas regarding group-fantasy as it is examined in numerous cartoons, on covers of magazines, and in radio and television talks does not convince them that there is much validity to the conclusions derived from the material. We believe that as important as these topics are they do not engage the students because the material remains on the level of the intellect — there is not much affect in their responses.

Sharing with a class deMause's brilliant schema of the six psychogenic modes of parenting of the infant-child brings with it a desire for a more enlightened understanding of the six stages: infanticidal, abandoning, ambivalent, intrusive, socializing, and helping. This is not only because all of us have experienced "Mother." The schema catches the students because it resonates to the demotic [popular] and enchorial [domestic] experiences of the entire group. We move from advanced to primitive: we begin with a discussion of the helping mode. By the time we have gotten to the intrusive mode, we are laughing and sharing our experiences with the stereotypical Jewish mother (even though she need not be Jewish), noting that 80% of American comedians are Jewish and that much of their material centers about Mother.

As we move further down the list a certain air of discomfort blankets us all. Numerous examples come from the class; the sources are from literature, film, and history. The abandoning parent, surprisingly at first, gets the most play — there appear to be an infinite number of ways in which mothers and fathers are capable of abandoning their children. And, finally, the infanticidal parent. The quandaries after viewing Pier Paolo Pasolini's stunning film, *Medea* (and, if possible, his *Iphigenia*), is: Is it

necessary in a matriarchal society for young, virgin men to be sacrificed? Is it necessary in a patriarchal society for young, virgin women to be sacrificed? And what of the 500 burial urns found in Carthage just a few years ago by a Harvard anthropologist? All 500 urns contained the bodies of infant children similarly roasted on a grill like Cornish hens.

A final caveat: There is implicit, and sometimes explicit, in too many essays and in larger works of psychohistory a pejorative view of the world and of human beings in general. Harsh judgments are made of leaders of goodwill and good faith for reminding us how little control we have over our unconscious needs which sometimes lead to compulsive acts of destruction. As teachers, we repeat in our presentations throughout the semester that psychohistory is an optimistic science as well as an art. We conclude that though not all of the world has ascended to *the* highest psychogenic level of parenting, many have evolved into other relatively higher levels allowing for more advanced — more benign and nurturing — parenting.

Growth comes about through the dual process of regression-progression. We cheerfully remind ourselves that once a certain level is achieved, the return to that level after slippage is less difficult than the initial ascent. Cynicism is an all too rampant virus among all too many discouraged students. Psychohistory views humans as capable of becoming *menschen* and closer to the realm of the angels than we had previously thought and hoped as children.

Mel Goldstein has taught and/or been a student in 16 different colleges and universities over the past 45 years. He has applied psychohistorical principles in his courses in psychoanalysis and literature, and in psychoanalytic studies in film.

Margot Goldstein has taught for 25 years and specialized in learning theory. □

Review of the First Special Student Edition of

Clio's Psyche

David D. Lee
UCLA History Department

The 1995-1996 Special Student Edition (SSE) of **Clio's Psyche** is a supplementary pedagogic tool which those who teach psychohistory and methods courses will find most useful. For me it worked most effectively in conjunction with collected essay works such as Geoffrey Cocks & Travis L. Crosby (eds.), *Psycho/History* (1987); Paul H. Elovitz (ed.), *Historical and Psychological Inquiry* (1990); Dan P. McAdams & Richard L. Ochberg (eds.), *Psychobiography and Life Narratives* (1988); and William McKinley Runyan (ed.), *Psychology and Historical Interpretation* (1988). These collections demonstrate the importance of the intrapsychic, emotional, and psychosocial contexts of historical actors. They do so, in part, by calling to the reader's attention the essential value of close and careful inspection of a subject's life and thought. As many of the contributors to these oft-assigned volumes appear in the SSE, it facilitates discussion on mainstream historiographic themes. The 48-page SSE engenders discussion on the determinative role of the historian and the personal nature of history writing, historicism, historical relativism, and additional topics of historiographic import with interviews and stimulating short pieces. It is an invaluable catalyst in the pedagogical quest to make history relevant and bring home the unique insights of psychohistory.

The SSE contains a series of informal, non-technical interviews with some of today's leading psychohistorians such as David Beisel (SUNY-Rockland), Rudolph Binion (Brandeis), John Demos (Yale), George Kren (Kansas State), Peter Loewenberg (UCLA), Lloyd deMause (Institute for Psychohistory), and Vamik Volkan (University of Virginia School of Medicine), which have appeared over the last two years in **Clio's Psyche**. They synopsise each individual's life and professional history, highlight his psychohistorical contribution, and enter into a relaxed, informative interview. These varied conversations explore various definitions of psychohistory, relate current

teaching and research projects, and permit each of these eminent scholars to reveal aspects of his style and background which shape his professional work. Additional material such as book reviews, think-pieces on psychohistory's content and purpose, and short articles on Marxism, nationalism, ethnic conflict, and terrorism as well as on personalities such as Erik Erikson and Karen Horney make the SSE an essential supplement to any psychohistory or methods course.

David Lee, a teaching fellow, is currently finishing his doctorate in history on the Protestant pastor-analyst Oskar Pfister and his remarkable thirty-year friendship with Sigmund Freud.

Editor's Note: We will be offering an enlarged 1996-1997 Special Student Edition for classroom use beginning September, 1996. Please contact me for details. □

Wish List

Psychohistory Forum Advisory Council member John Caulfield has recommended that we let our readers know our needs to improve our effectiveness in promoting psychohistory.

- Volunteers for a Membership/Subscription Program.
- Twice-a-year reports in **Clio's Psyche** by members of all Forum research groups.
- Co-ordinators for the "Introduce a Younger Colleague to Psychohistory" and "Introduce Psychohistory to Scholars in the Former Communist Countries" Programs.
- Computer and e-mail training (cost of \$200).
- Funds (\$1,000) for secretarial assistance.
- Sponsorship of printing this issue's "Publishing in Psychohistory" section as a separate pamphlet. □

Bulletin Board

FORTHCOMING PSYCHOHISTORY FORUM PRESENTATIONS: On September 28, "The Childhoods, Personalities, and Political

Motivations of the Republican, Democratic, and Independent Candidates for President” by **Herbert Barry** (University of Pittsburgh) and **Paul H. Elovitz**; on November 3 (Sunday), “Creativity” by **Marvin Eisenstadt** (Fair Oaks Hospital); and on January 26, 1997, “A Cross-Cultural, Work-in-Progress Study of Men’s Subordination of and Fear of Women” by Rita Ransohoff (private psychoanalytic practice). **PUBLICATIONS:** The University of Chicago Press had a March 29th reception honoring **Glen Jeanson** (University of Wisconsin-Madison) on the publication of *Women of The Right*. We are pleased to learn that **Brett Kahr**, Senior Lecturer in Psychotherapy at the Regent’s College School of Psychotherapy in London, has just completed a biography of Donald Winnicott which is being published by International Universities Press. **CONFER-ENCES:** Plans are going well for the International Psychohistorical Association’s June 5-7, 1996, conference in New York City where the Forum will sponsor a session on Presidential candidates. For conference details contact Henry Lawton at (201) 891-4980. The ISPP’s Summer Institute in Political Psychology will be held at Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio, from July 15-August 9, 1996. For information on the new *Bulletin of the International Network for Projective Drawing and Pictorial Symbolism* call Stephen Safran, (914) 353-0207. The six **Sidney Halpern Memorial Presentations** at the Mid-Atlantic Environmental Conference were attended by 60 people. **Paul Elovitz** gave a brief biography of Sidney Halpern and, in Halpern’s spirit, challenged environmentalists to be good historians and scientific in their approach. **NEWS OF MEMBERS:** Welcome to new member, David Redles of San Antonio, Texas. **TRAVEL:** Jacqueline S. Paulson has been traveling quite a lot lately — most recently to Israel and last fall to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, to deliver a paper. George and Margot Kren (Kansas State University) are in Greece and Turkey on a two-week cruise. **OUR THANKS** to our members and friends for their support which makes **Clio’s Psyche** possible. To Patrons Herbert Barry, Ralph Colp, and Anonymous as well as Mena and Dominic Potts (who hold a joint membership); Supporting Members Timothy J. Mitchell and Jacqueline

Paulson; and Contributing Members Melvin Goldstein and Mary Lambert. Welcome to Gary Schmidt, a recent Ramapo College Honors graduate, who is working part-time for the Forum prior to going to graduate school in 1997 to study disarmament. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Herbert Barry, David Beisel, Lloyd deMause, Bruce Edwards, Mel and Margot Goldstein, Melvin Kalfus, David Lee, Jennefer Mazza, Stanley Renshon, H. John Rogers, Larry Shiner, Norman Simms, and Pauline Staines. Also to Anna Lentz and Pauline Staines for their assistance in producing this newsletter. □

Resistances to Learning: Psychoanalysis and Pedagogy

Jennefer V. Mazza, PhD, NCPsyA
Ramapo College

Editor’s Note: The author has kindly granted permission for us to print the following excerpts from her paper presented at the Meeting of Political Scientists from COPLAC Institutions, at the College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, November 17-18, 1995.

I have been teaching political science for over 20 years and I have found that I have had to alter my style and approach in the classroom because of changes in the student population and because of changes in my own life work. Students have changed quite dramatically over the years, in addition to variations in skills and background one can observe some significant changes in interest and perspective. My colleagues and I have spent many hours in recent

years pondering the phenomena of student disinterest and even hostility to the subject of politics. Observing in the student population currents that are evident in the culture at large: a distrust of government, and indifference to civic matters, a disinclination to even "tune in" a little bit to the larger political environment and a comfort with a certain level of social withdrawal.

The change in student audience has forced me to change my tactics in the classroom. As a trained psychoanalyst, I have found myself relying more and more on concepts and techniques I have learned as an analyst; in particular, the psychoanalytic notion of resistance has been useful in helping me develop ways to "reach" and motivate students today. In this paper I will define the concept and explain its genesis and describe ways it has been useful in developing strategies for the classroom.

The concept of resistance appears early on in Freud's writings (see his "Paper on Technique," [1912],) but its meaning changes over time. Initially Freud conceived resistance as a defense against instinct and he equated it with the repression of anxiety; later he envisioned it in broader terms to refer to the various ways the mind tricks itself into "not knowing": regression, undoing, isolation, displacement. Anna Freud further elaborates upon her father's theory in the seminal text *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense* (1966) where she expands upon the list of the ways the mind tricks itself: projection, denial, intellectualization, isolation, etc. As psychoanalysis has developed, since Freud, the term resistance has come to mean simply the ways in which the patient is prevented from free associating in therapy (Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* [1945], page 27). Resistances are both conscious and unconscious, depending upon the origin of the internal conflict that the mind is avoiding, for example, whether it involves the ego or superego. In therapy, the analyst must address the resistances first in order for the treatment to progress and this may entail something as obvious as looking at lateness to sessions to things less obvious, like "going blank" when certain issues arise. The contemporary view in psychoanalysis is that resistances are not

"weaknesses" but rather, they reflect various modes of adaptation to survival and, as such they reflect "older" ways of doing things (see, for example, Thompson, *Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development* [1950], chapter 12).

In terms of pedagogy, the concept of resistance is useful if we conceive it in terms of resistances to learning, keeping in mind that we are addressing issues that students may not be aware of or are only remotely aware of and which have to be addressed in order for them to progress in class. In this context, resistances are defined as whatever prevents or inhibits the student from attending class, doing the reading for class, participating in class and taking exams and writing papers. Now, we can distinguish between less serious or more obvious resistances and more serious or deeper resistances to learning, the former referring to issues like lateness, not reading, not participating in class and the latter, referring to issues that inhibit comprehension of the course material, "mental blocks" to incorporating the material, whatever inhibits "interest" in the material. Given these two dimensions to resistances, I will refer to the more surface issues as initial resistances and to the deeper issues as defensive resistances to learning in order to describe the various techniques I've developed over time to address these roadblocks to learning.

Many of the initial resistances to learning involve "older ways of doing things", that is, students bring expectations to my class that they have developed subconsciously as well as consciously from previous classes and from their educational "histories". I use the syllabus to carefully lay out *my expectations* for students and I reinforce those expectations in class. Through trial and error I have found that a short syllabus, which clearly describes my expectations regarding attendance, class participation and the readings works best; I also include the dates for exams and papers and "class debates" and I try to get all this on one page. I use the syllabus as a guide and I consistently refer to it in class, noting when we are on schedule or behind or whatever. I also take attendance and I will refer to coming events like exams, weeks in advance. Students know that I take attendance at the beginning of class