
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 4, Number 2

September, 1997

Special Theme Issue

Dual Training in Psychoanalysis and History, Literature, or Another Academic Discipline

The Psychoanalytically- Informed Historian: Peter Gay

Paul H. Elovitz, Ramapo College
David Felix, CUNY – Emeritus, and
Bob Lentz, The Psychohistory Forum

Peter Gay was born in Berlin, Germany, in 1923 and left in 1939. He received his PhD in 1951 from Columbia University, where he taught

(Continued on page 62)

Professional and Personal Insights

Peter Loewenberg
UCLA and the
Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute

Psychoanalysis is, among other things: 1) a therapy; 2) a humane 21st-century world view which bears both the tolerance of Enlightenment secularism and the Romantic assertion of human

IN THIS ISSUE

Dual Training in Psychoanalysis and History,
Literature, or Another Academic Discipline

The Psychoanalytically-Informed Historian:
Peter Gay33
*Interview by Paul H. Elovitz,
David Felix, and Bob Lentz*

Professional and Personal Insights33
Peter Loewenberg

A Unique Dual Education.....36
Paul H. Elovitz

The Impact of Psychoanalytic Training on
My Work as a Historian.....44
Thomas A. Kohut

From History to Analysis.....46
Nellie L. Thompson

An Adlerian Historian.....48
Richard Weiss

The Psychohistorian as Business Consultant....48
John Fitzpatrick

Lacan, Literature, and Psychoanalysis.....50
Mark Bracher

From Literature to the Consultation Room 52
Jonathan J. Goldberg

Creativity Without Dual Training 54
Andrew Brink

Dual Careers and the Burden of Pain..... 56
Victor Wolfenstein

From Hitler to Historical Evolution 57
Lloyd deMause

The Sociologist as Psychoanalyst 58
Jeffrey Prager

A Psychobiographer Trained Among
Academic Psychologists..... 60
Todd Schultz

Timothy McVeigh: A Preliminary
Psychodynamic Sketch..... 66
Daniel Dervin

The Way It Was, and Wasn't, 1947-1957:
The Dodgers of Brooklyn..... 68
Essay Review by Melvin Kalfus

Bulletin Board 71

individuality; 3) an investigative research method; and 4) a mode of perceiving human interactions, data, events, and behaviors. The first category, the clinical therapeutic encounter between analyst and an analyst, is experientially necessary to understand and to make full use of the remaining three categories.

The critical difference between those who use only theory and those who have a thorough familiarity with a hands-on clinical situation is that the psychoanalyst uses his subjective self empathically to know the "other" in the emotional field they jointly occupy. This field may be the chaos of a research project or the inner pain of an analyst. The natural syncretism between the research and the interpretive tasks of the historian and psychoanalyst is that both construct complex narrative explanations with hierarchies or orders of "causes." These reach from the common-sense rational to the less understood, sometimes intuited, emotional, unconscious, even irrational, motives. Perceiving, framing, and tackling a historical problem is similar to working with a patient and that patient's life. The tool of cognition is the self — the emotional insight and sensibility of the researcher. An institutional benefit for academics of informal psychoanalytic training is the potential of creating joint psychoanalytic-academic seminars, of placing graduate students in private low-fee analyses or psychoanalytic clinic analyses, and of being able to draw on and instrumentalize their own clinical experience. Among the institutional benefits we may point to is that the Robert J. Stoller Foundation has for the past five years offered essay prizes and research funds for psychoanalytically-oriented research to both graduate students and post-doctoral scholars. Two annual Hayman Endowment Fellowships aid dissertation-level graduate students. The Committee on Research and Special Training of the American Psychoanalytic Association is this year for the first time sponsoring both a psychoanalytic essay prize and research funds.

The downside of dual training is the substantial commitment of time and energy necessary to acquire an entirely new, or even to create a unique hybrid, profession. The academic must undergo an apprenticeship and process of socialization; learn a literature, bibliography and nosology; and acquire the novel and idiosyncratic thoughtstyle and the esoteric coded language of a new discipline. A demanding program of training draws on the same intellectual and emotional

resources that go toward research and publication, so that research "productivity" is initially delayed. The demonstrated promise of psychoanalytic understanding applied to any other field becomes more and more valuable, perhaps necessary, as the scholar is willing to draw more on the subjective and make greater use of creative imagination. To the extent that the historian uses psychoanalysis, it allows him to more effectively move back and forth across the internal boundaries between conscious, preconscious, and unconscious processes. The barriers will become more permeable, easing insight to relationships between discrete, apparently incoherent, categories, data, and feelings. There is a good reason why psychoanalysis is so ubiquitous among writers, artists, actors, and those in the world of literature, film, and theater. These craftsmen of language, image, and symbol welcome the tools of psychoanalysis as they develop their internal and

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 4, No. 2

September, 1997

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

e-mail: pelovitz@juno.com

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 • **Joseph Dowling, PhD** Lehigh University • **Glen Jeanonne, 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, Apopka, 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

\$40 yearly to institutions

(Both add \$4 outside USA & Canada)

Single Issue Price: \$9

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest

most private resources. Any ambitious institution must weigh the quality and originality of work as well as its quantity. We wish to have not only publication, but discerning original publication. An institution's very integrity depends upon a willingness to acknowledge the unique value of the very recent availability of full interdisciplinary training, including clinical training in psychoanalysis, whatever the costs in time and immediate publication.

Some critics express the fear that acquiring clinical skills will seduce the scholar to give up teaching and writing and lose his academic identity. This has not been our experience in California where we have trained over 30 university social scientists and humanists in clinical psychoanalysis. Many of them are members of the University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium. The isolation of solo clinical practice and the feuding of the psychoanalytic institutional community are not that alluring! The cases which I know of where researchers became full-time clinicians are those where an academic career was not an option. An identity as a university teacher and researcher is a precious, hard-fought achievement not lightly to be thrown away. The opportunity to have and to train students, to experience that at the end of a semester they know things they would not have otherwise, is a rare satisfaction only to be compared with the experience of working with a person therapeutically and helping him to turn his life around.

The creation of discrete academic disciplines is historical, their boundaries are arbitrary. In the 17th and 18th centuries philosophy freed herself from theology. In the 19th century history as a discipline liberated herself from philosophy. Political science, sociology, and anthropology are essentially 20th-century creations. Artificial disciplinary boundaries have quickly become institutionalized and rigid, each with its discrete subculture and guild. But neither the human mind nor the real world are so compartmentalized. Knowledge, understanding, and problem-solving do not lend themselves to narrow scotomized approaches. Fields such as history and psychoanalysis must be related to each other by the researcher, not statically, but as independent variables, each with its own context and imperatives. Creativity requires open listening. It draws on the perspectives and findings of many disciplines as it

demands their integral and interpretive use.

Now it is time to turn to my personal motivation for dual training:

"In the beginning was the family...."

I was born in Hamburg, Germany, in August, 1933, the year of Hitler's seizure of power (*Machtergreifung*). My intense conviction of the value of dual training has a personal, subjective source as well as the power of its subsequent value for my own work as a historian. Mom was a public health nurse, large in heart and body, practical and efficient, a convert to Judaism from the Lutheran tradition of her north-German family, idealistic, a socialist activist on the political left in a Weimar Republic increasingly threatened by the extreme right. Dad, the son of a distinguished liberal Jewish educator, writer, and poet, was a university psychiatrist and a humanist who wrote on Kant, Lichtenberg, and Nietzsche.

Although it was the first months of Nazi rule, Father saw that it was urgent to act immediately. I treasure the soft-covered, mottled brown notebook which holds the record of his search for a place of refuge from the Nazis for his wife, his new baby, and himself. The addresses of medical boards and universities, written in his hand and checked off, speak of pride and self-esteem, a determination to maintain his identity — he was a psychiatrist, and he was not going to end up doing anything less. Penciled entries tell of his travels exploring the prospects of our new life: "Institute of Industrial Psychology, Aldwych House, London, WC 2"; "Medical Council, 44 Hallam Street, Portland Place, W1"; Scotland: "Royal College of Physicians, D.L. Eadie, Esq., 49 Lauriston Place"; "Ireland: Belfast, Queen's University; and Dublin: "Trinity College"; in May: "Holland: 15. V. 33, Prof. Cohen, van Breestraat 172"; and "France: Comité des intellectuels, Rue de Poinbiens, Bureau 330." The extent of my father's sense of futility, despair, rejection, and even desperation, in seeking a refuge may only be inferred. Yet, there was courage and toughness, a willingness to explore terra incognita — strange, inhospitable, unknown places. Behind father's fantasies was the reality of his resourceful wife, who would create a home anywhere. There were melancholy lists of lands, spelled in German, organized by the prospective ease of entering medical practice: those with "only an examination: Albanien, Bulgarien, Ägypten, Griechenland, Haiti, Jamaica, Madras, Nicaragua, Samoa, Yukon"; those "without an exam: Abessinien, Arabien, Kongo, Bengal, Bombay,

Borneo, Burma, China, Zypern, Hong Kong, Irak, Madera, Marakko, Mauritius, Palästina, Panama, Persien, Salvador, Siam, Sudan, Syrien, Tanger."

In October, 1933, my parents with their six-week-old infant left Germany forever. They traveled to the other end of the Earth — to Shanghai. Their friend, Nurse Milli, who helped them pack, wrote to her fiance: "They are traveling into the blue mist [*auf blauen Dunst*] to China." My earliest memories are smells of freshly steamed rice and the aroma of Chinese tea. I still abhor human crowding, not only in the streets, but at home — the cook, the house boy, the chauffeur, my Ama — servants with incomprehensible layers of authority and power to whom I could not make myself understood. When recently I — for the first time — returned to Shanghai en route to visiting our 22-year-old daughter, who is teaching in Beijing, I saw how hard life there still is. There is not enough of anything — except people. I imagined how difficult life must have been for refugees over sixty years ago. To my wife I said, "Only Adolf Hitler could make me move here with an infant."

Perhaps only Hitler in combination with the courage and resourcefulness of my parents could have given me the background and incentive to acquire my own psychoanalytic training in addition to pointing my intellectual life toward the study of 20th-century European cultural history, Austro-German history, and political psychology. It was above all the models of my mother's activist compassion and my father's vision and tenacity that helped me to ignore the pragmatic "wisdom" regularly preached at me by colleagues and administrators, the conventional wisdom of not deviating from the usual methods of investigation and professional advancement, and encouraged me to take the time to explore my own terra incognita. Whatever the personal sources, I have been privileged to be part of the breakthrough to a new openness among American psychoanalysts, which encourages full psychoanalytic training for those of us in scholarly fields. The opportunity which is now open to my academic colleagues is too uniquely valuable to be lost to pragmatism or safety and timidity, to a fear of short-term sacrifice for personally and professionally valuable, long-term goals.

Peter Loewenberg, PhD, is a modern European historian at UCLA and a Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst at the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute. He has had a

number of visiting professorships and a plethora of honors in the U.S. and abroad. Among his numerous publications are Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1996 [1985 copyright]) and Fantasy and Reality in History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). Dr. Loewenberg is the recipient of numerous fellowships and awards including those of the following: Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, Austrian Institute, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, American Council of Learned Societies, Social Science Research Council, and the German Fulbright Commission. □

A Unique Dual Education: Editor's Introduction and Personal Commentary

**Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the
Psychohistory Forum**

People interested in psychohistory have sometimes asked me about the proper training to effectively combine psychology with traditional academic disciplines. My answer is that there is no one way to become a good psychohistorian, but that a personal analysis is both the starting point and the most important ingredient. The Socratic dictum, "Know thyself," holds true even more today than it did over 2,300 years ago when it was first uttered. The development of modern psychoanalysis gives us a method of putting an invaluable utterance into practice.

As someone who took his doctoral degree in history in the 1960s and began ten years of training in psychoanalysis in 1973, I had long wanted to devote an issue of this publication to dual training and its impact on historians and other scholars. As a result, I was pleased by several recent occurrences: first, Peter Loewenberg's call in *Fantasy and Reality in History* for "a dual discipline and dual career"; next, the comments of Bruce Mazlish in our December issue of **Clio's Psyche**, worrying about its impact on historians; and, finally, Charles Strozier's frank discussion of his dual training in our March issue. Consequently, I asked certain scholars who have been trained in psychoanalysis or one of the psychotherapies to relate their experiences and to explain its impact on their work.

My request was for a short, personalized essay, answering, where possible, the following questions: Why did you choose to train in psychoanalysis after, or while earning, a doctoral degree? What was the training like? What parts of it (course work, case presentation, case supervision, the training/personal analysis) were most helpful and in what ways? How did the clinical elements affect your assessment of human motivation? How was it different from and/or the same as your academic training? Did the training affect your work in your discipline and, if so, how? Did you publish more or less as a result of this training? How was what you published different as a result? Was any teaching and or administration you did changed by the experience? If so, in what ways?

For those who had clinical experience, I also suggested the following questions: How were you received, given your unusual background for a clinician, by clients/patients, therapists, insurers, and the general public? How did your clinical work help or hurt an academic/professional career and in what ways? Overall, was it an asset or liability in your career? (In making this assessment, I asked the authors to include the affects of the greater insight and effectiveness they may have gotten in the course of psychoanalytic training.) What were the comparative rewards, demands, pleasures, and frustrations of your two fields?

The first step was to identify and invite potential contributors. It should be noted that virtually all psychoanalysts have dual training, since one or more graduate degrees are required for entry into psychoanalytic programs. To start with, I asked people I had met or heard of during my 20 years of psychohistorical organizing. Next, Peter Loewenberg of the UCLA History Department and the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society, was generous enough to lend his name to the enterprise, write the introduction, recommend a group of potential contributors, and answer my questions about dual training and research psychoanalysts in Los Angeles. Finally, I went through the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis' 1997 *National Registry of Psychoanalysts* so I could identify and write individuals with dual training which included history.

The response to the call for papers was both gratifying and frustrating. Gratifying that a number of people were able to take time from

extremely busy schedules to write about their thoughts and experiences regarding dual training. Frustrating that I had made the wrong assumption about how much lead time and space were needed for this type of project. Clearly, six months to a year was a more appropriate time to give our participants as opposed to the one to three months that we in fact did give. Scholars like Peter Gay have so many activities and commitments on their plate that the time allotted was simply insufficient. Nevertheless, a number of people from the busy and creative group who have had a rather unique education did find the time and wrote within the limited space that we were able to allot. Because psychohistory is such an interdisciplinary field, we also decided to open the issue to individuals whose scholarly training was in fields other than history. It is no accident that three of our papers are by individuals with training in literature since an enormous number of people in that field have profound psychodynamic interests and a number have undergone psychoanalytic training. Had we time enough, I believe that we could have had a representative with dual training from each major field represented in academia. In fact the disciplines represented in this special issue are history, literature, political science, psychology, and sociology.

A major goal of this issue is to demystify some of the elements of psychoanalytic training. This postgraduate training is available to mature individuals who are deemed to have the emotional, intellectual, and therapeutic potential. With a growing number of exceptions, such as with the relationship of the Psychoanalytic Institute of Los Angeles and the UCLA History Department, it is conducted by psychoanalytic institutes which are not directly affiliated with colleges and universities. Later, I will discuss the cooperative movement between academia and psychoanalytic institutes.

The essence of the training is a personal psychoanalysis (the "training analysis"), courses in the theory and practice of psychoanalysis, and the supervised treatment of patients over many years. Though the courses are scheduled to last a set number of years, five at many institutes, the education is open-ended: it is more a matter of minimal standards than a sum total of earned credits. It normally concludes with a lengthy paper on a psychoanalytic case that has been seen for a number of years and an oral defense of this case. This case presentation is parallel to the oral

defense stage of the dissertation in doctoral work. An examination of these two forms of education is instructive.

Both forms of education require an enormous commitment of time, money, intelligence, and energy. In analytic training, as in graduate school, first the student does the course work and then focuses on a individual project: in the one case researching and writing a dissertation and in the other treating and writing about a psychoanalytic patient. In both cases the classes are usually small and the education is personalized. In either form of education, most students do not incline to complete their education in a set number of years, with the result that many drop out, though at institutes additional seminars sometimes are added to keep the students from becoming demoralized. Both forms of education put enormous pressure on the student (called a "psychoanalytic candidate" at the institutes), especially since so much must be done on his/her own. In both forms of education the students tend to feel quite exposed to the criticism of their instructors, especially since issues of personality are so relevant to the work psychoanalytic candidates are being trained to do. However, in the final analysis, the graduate school analogy is totally inadequate.

Psychoanalytic training is closer to the model of a professional school of medicine or law than it is to that of graduate school in the liberal arts and social sciences: primarily it is the skill of helping patients which is being taught. In my view, it is most like being an artist going to work with a series of master artists who supervise your work on a weekly basis. The masters recognize that the journeymen/women need theory courses, but that these courses are quite secondary to the practical experience of honing their art. Psychoanalytic training, at least for me, involved a much greater sense of self-discovery and empowerment than did earning my doctoral degree. As a result of it, I felt I had invaluable tools for exploring the world and myself, and I felt much more in control of my life. Some of my fellow psychoanalytic candidates who were already exposed to personal psychoanalysis and patients prior to the training and who lacked my intellectual impetus to apply psychoanalysis to society and history seem to have found it to be much less stimulating. They were learning a valuable skill that helped people, usually improved their own livelihood, and typically enabled them to give up

an institutional job in favor of private practice. As a psychohistorical networker and organizer, I soon discovered that most analysts simply did not share my interests, even if they were open to the language of the unconscious. Let me now turn to my personal experience in psychoanalytic training.

Psychoanalytic education was for me a wonderful voyage of exploration and self-discovery. Yet I came to it only after working past many misconceptions. For example, in 1972 I thought I had to have an MD in psychiatry or a PhD in psychology to be psychoanalytically trained. Though I realized that there were exceptions for those who were grandfathered into the field, this did not contradict my assumption. By chance, one day I walked to class with a psychologist/psychoanalyst colleague who questioned this assumption. She indicated that there were a number of institutes in the New York area that accepted people who had advanced degrees in the humanities and that I might want to apply to one of these since I was always talking about psychoanalysis and psychohistory.

My intellectual reason for considering psychoanalytic training was that I felt it would be invaluable to me in order to think psychohistorically. I had looked up the word "transference" in every possible source and I could never understand the definitions — and I realized I never would until I had experienced transference. But an intellectual reason for going into training was insufficient. I came to realize that I both wanted and could personally benefit from psychoanalysis. At the time my first marriage was floundering and I was having to confront the glaring difference between my idealized image of academia and the real academic world. This was not an easy step to take since I came from a family which believed therapy was for the hopelessly insane or the idle rich, certainly not for the son of immigrant parents. Yet, intellectual reasons, combined with problems in love and work, were enough for me to overcome my resistances to entering analysis.

In short order, I was accepted to both the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis (NPAP) and the New Jersey Institute for Training in Psychoanalysis. I began by auditing a class and a case presentation seminar at the NPAP but soon switched to the New Jersey Institute which was more conveniently located. At the beginning of training I thought the intellectual component was what really counted, but I soon

realized that the experiential components were far more important. Thus I came to value my own psychoanalysis, case presentation seminars, and control analyses as far more valuable than my courses on abstract theory. The best theoretical constructs were taught in the context of extensive clinical examples. It totally amazed me how in a case presentation seminar, there could be a half dozen different interpretations, each shedding new light on the subject as well as on the psychoanalytic candidate making the interpretation. I found that brilliant theoretical interpretations were usually wrong and was pleased to read Thomas Kohut describe the same observation during his training in Cincinnati. In my experience, the best therapists in training tended to be the best listeners.

If therapists who relied on abstract theory were missing the point, were psychohistorians with a heavy reliance on theory often in the same situation? I would say yes, based upon my observations of numerous psychohistorians with whom I have worked closely in the development of their ideas, and in my personal experience. Though I was sometimes drawn to certain theoretical formulations, in graduate school, like most history students and faculty, I found I had a distrust of theory. In psychoanalytic training I continued to distrust theory, though, as in graduate school, I also felt I had to have an excellent theoretical and working knowledge of all the theories that my fellow candidates or instructors talked about. It is worth noting that the candidates, in their insecurity, were far more concerned about theoretical issues than were our teachers.

There were six people in my class at the New Jersey Institute and for several courses over a five-year period this class would meet with another of a similar size. My classmates were three social workers, some with enormous clinical experience; an equally experienced psychiatric nurse; and a literature professor. The other professor and I would shine when dealing with the intellectual component of our training but we initially felt bewildered and inadequate when it came to the discussion of patients.

As Victor Wolfenstein notes, it can be hard for professional teachers to sit through long classes. First, they are used to being the instructor, rather than the student. Second, the instructors at psychoanalytic institutes are usually unpaid, non-professional teachers of uneven teaching experience and quality.

When my classmates and I started asking about when we would see patients at the Psychoanalytic Clinic (aka the Low Cost Clinic), a summer placement was worked out whereby we would see both resident and outpatients at Rockland Psychiatric Hospital for the summer and an institute faculty member would supervise us. Dealing with institutionalized patients was a revelation in itself and I remain grateful to the kindness of the staff and patients. Since we were total clinical novices, I remain convinced that the patients helped us more than my colleague and I could possibly help them. After my intensive summer immersion was over, I spent one day a week for another six months at the hospital and two of the patients I had seen there chose to see me at the Institute's Clinic. Today, however, clinically inexperienced candidates at the Institute are sent to a volunteer counseling service which accepts mostly people who are college graduates and appear to be emotionally stable.

My training analysis was from one to five times a week, though primarily twice a week. Eventually there was invaluable group therapy with my analyst. Most, but not all the time, I used the couch. My course on dreams was intellectualized and therefore disappointing. However, attending and then running experiential dream group seminars was an invaluable tool in probing unconscious processes. Seeing patients as a therapist in training, helped to deepen my own analysis because I had to confront my own feelings induced by the needs of my patients (the induced countertransference). From personal referrals as well as those at the Clinic, I built up a private practice of about 30 patient hours per week. This left insufficient time for other activities and I eventually cut it down so that it would not be over ten hours per week. Until the creation of **Clio's Psyche** this allowed adequate time for teaching, research, psychohistorical organizing, and publication. My private practice also provided the funds to pay for research and scholarly publication expenses.

Psychoanalytic training textbooks such as those by Otto Fenichel, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (NY: W.W. Norton and Co., 1945); Ralph Greenson, *The Technique and Practice of Psychoanalysis* (NY: International Universities Press, 1967); and Charles Brenner, *An Elementary Textbook of Psychoanalysis* (NY: International Universities Press, 1955), are useful and even essential, but quite secondary to the following: the

ability to listen for what the patient does not realize is being communicated; knowing when, and when not, to interpret; knowing how to make the right interpretation; knowing how to use one's own feelings in treatment; and empathy. It is noteworthy that five of the six historians in this issue referred to empathy, while few historians without psychoanalytic influences use the term in print.

The training analysis is the key ingredient in psychoanalytic training. When it comes to decisions involving their analysands, in both talking and writing reports for the institute, psychoanalysts follow the rule of abstinence: they may not participate in any decisions involving their analysand because that might weaken the therapeutic alliance and therefore inhibit what the psychoanalytic candidate would express. The sense of emotional exposure can be difficult for psychoanalytical candidates who are on uncharted voyages of self-discovery. However, they are not alone because they have an ally or two in their analyst and control analyst who can help them validate their experience and think of protecting themselves from unnecessary exposure.

My recommendation is that it may be a good thing to avoid going into analysis with someone who has a leadership role in a training institute because it confuses the transference. This may be easier said than done because institutes are small organizations, and analyst and analysand may find themselves in the same class, lecture hall, committee room, or even holiday party.

Despite the invitation to write about one's "training/personal analysis," writing about one's own psychoanalysis is not something that most of our authors chose to do in the limited space provided. Victor Wolfenstein appreciatively mentions his psychoanalyst by name while Lloyd deMause refers to his unusually long analysis of 27 years. Two authors, including the one who has not been analyzed, mention their own depressive tendencies.

What constitutes psychoanalysis is a question which may arise in the minds of the reader and one with which analysts and accrediting organizations struggle. Most analysts, though not Adlerians, use the couch, though not necessarily for all patients. The frequency of treatment is often raised as a criterion and is quite variable. The standard for NPAP in New York City is three times a week and for Jungians it is once a week. The definition of psychoanalysis on page iv of the

National Registry of Psychoanalysts is quite general. It avoids specifics involving frequency and the physical position of the analysand, more appropriately focusing on the "intense verbal, therapeutic relationship between the analyst and the analysand" as well as "the resistances, defenses, transference, countertransference phenomena" and so forth.

Occasionally, I have been asked if all psychohistorians must be analyzed and get analytic training. Andrew Brink provides an excellent example of a psychohistorian who does fine research and writing on creativity and psychobiography without having had psychoanalysis or psychoanalytic training. He received on-the-job training in psychotherapy for ten years as an Associate Member of the Department of Psychiatry at McMaster University and then for a few months as a psychotherapist at the Affective Disorders Centre before leaving to head a University of Toronto program combining psychoanalysis with the humanities. These therapeutic opportunities were open to him because he was well respected by the people running the programs. Without his asking directly, they invited him in while turning away others who eagerly sought entry. Yet, as his article indicates, this modest man is painfully aware of the personal and professional limits imposed by his lack of psychoanalysis and dual training. Rudolph Binion and George Kren are two other fine scholars who have made significant contributions to our field without undergoing psychoanalysis or psychoanalytic training. The one other author without psychoanalytic training per se is Todd Schultz. He was asked to write for this issue in order to provide an example of a psychology doctoral student who had to struggle to focus on psychobiography and psychohistory in a non-clinical program which emphasized experimental research.

In the introduction of *Cultural Theory and Psychoanalytic Tradition* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1991), there is an excellent discussion of the psychoanalytic training of David James Fisher — a historian and member of the Psychohistory Forum. One of many interesting points he makes is about "psychoanalytic time, which is slow, laborious, needlessly bureaucratic, and not particularly attuned to the desires and anxieties of the novice." He also discusses, as does Thomas Kohut, the "power of transference to a school of thought or method of inquiry." For

Fisher it was the difference between Kleinians and classical psychoanalysts; at my institute it was the difference between advocates of Kernberg and Kohut.

Do psychoanalytically-trained historians publish less than their classmates in graduate school as Professor Mazlish fears? Do the demands of their practice cause them to lose interest in publishing? Do they publish very different materials than they would have without the training? The answers to these complex questions are *not usually, sometimes, and yes*. Let me explain after discussing rates of publication.

Most psychoanalytically-inclined historians I know publish only a modest amount, but most other historians of my acquaintance publish far less. Many decades ago my doctoral adviser did a study of the publication activities of historians. This distinguished scholar, who went on to edit the *American Historical Review* and become acting president of Rutgers University and president of the University of Cincinnati, discovered that only one out of four historians actually published *anything* after completing his/her doctoral dissertation.

Four of our respondents indicated that they may have published less or later in their careers as a result of their dual training. Jonathan Goldberg, a literature professor-turned-psychoanalyst, who eagerly welcomed my invitation to contribute to our issue, wrote that as a practicing analyst he simply did not have the time to publish. I, on the contrary, recount that it was psychohistory which motivated me to publish. David James Fisher is an example of a historian making his living as a psychoanalyst who publishes high quality scholarly materials, but who needs lots of lead time because of the demands of his practice. Thus, he was not able to contribute specifically to our issue in the time allotted. Everyone who touches on the point agrees that psychoanalytically-trained scholars are inclined to publish different materials than they would have without their dual training. At best their writings provide a creativity, depth and humanity not normally possible without the special insights of psychoanalysis as well as a unique integration of thought and emotion.

Ultimately, I think psychoanalytically-trained historians and other scholars have more to say as we develop the paradigm of psychohistory which leads us to write and publish quite a lot. This is certainly the case with me. After a successful, but demoralizing defense of my

doctoral dissertation on the controversy regarding the condition of the workers in the English Industrial Revolution, I thought I had to publish to be a historian. But what could I publish? I approached a publishing company about putting together a book of documents of the English Industrial Revolution and they were eager to publish it. Feeling more obligated than enthusiastic, I started work on it — but it was just plain dull compared to the psychoanalytic and psychohistorical materials I was exploring at the time. At Temple University in 1971, I perished rather than published as was the case with the overwhelming majority of the other young historians with whom I was hired to do the survey teaching in a department with 83 historians. At the time I denigrated publishing as one of the least important parts of a professor's job and searched for a small college where there was more concern for students than for publication.

At Ramapo College I became a founding faculty member and did not publish anything until a year after I was awarded tenure in 1976. At the present time, I publish far more than most full professors at the college despite a heavy annual teaching load of 24 credits, plus another 15 credits in summer and winter sessions, and very limited release time for research and writing. My publications are made possible because of my commitment to developing the psychohistorical paradigm and the realization that much of what I write is original. It is worth burning the midnight oil to help to shape a new field. I also learned in my analysis to trust my own feelings, and to not be afraid to write about them. This freed me from some writer's blocks which had periodically plagued me since the first time I recollect attempting to write as a small boy.

In 1976 I was writing my first publication, "Three Days in Plains," based on a visit to Jimmy Carter's hometown about a week before the 1976 election. The article was written, except for the conclusion, and it read well, but I began to feel insecure since it would be criticized as "mere psychohistorical journalism." I decided I needed a theoretical framework, which came to me as I sat in a course on narcissism and borderline personality. "Jimmy Carter was a narcissistic personality" was my conclusion and I went home and wrote it up. Though I received only compliments on this article, which also became a chapter of a book (*Jimmy Carter and American Fantasy*, [New York: Two Continents, 1977]), I

realized in my own psychoanalysis that the labeling was a defensive maneuver on my part. Certainly, Jimmy Carter had lots of narcissism, but so do almost all politicians. At that point I decided to work to write psychohistory with a minimum of theory and I have never regretted the decision despite the difficulty of living up to this standard.

Let me now turn from issues of publication to some more generalizations about our authors and others with dual training. The gender breakdown of our authors, twelve male and only one female, is not representative of the field or of my own experience in training. When I called Margery Quackenbush, Administrator of the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP) in New York City, she thought that among this organization of lay analysts there are about 66 percent women and 34 percent men, which was the approximate sex ratio at the New Jersey Institute when I attended it. In this respect, the gender ratio of those who wrote for this issue may be more typical of medical analysts of the American Psychoanalytic Association, who tend to be men, than it is of lay analysts who are not PhD psychologists.

College teaching can become quite arid if it is abstractly intellectualized and if there is no renewed stimulation. The absence of the "subjective factor" lead Jonathan Goldberg to give up college teaching. Others, such as Richard Weiss and Jeffery Prager, report being much more sensitized to subjective factors in their disciplines as a result of training. Most of our authors are, or have been, college teachers and all of them with psychoanalytic training who delved into issues of teaching noted that psychoanalytic training, or psychoanalysis, changed how they saw students and how they taught. For example, Thomas Kohut and Mark Bracher became more aware of transference issues among students. Both describe becoming much more sensitive teachers. Mark Bracher, a literature professor, describes helping certain students resolve "intrapsychic conflicts" which is "essential to helping them become effective writers." When Kohut describes learning how to "tolerate silence, confusion, even tension in the classroom" without holding forth, it reminds me of my own experience. Psychoanalysis both freed me from older patterns and enabled me to develop different modalities in the classroom such as historical re-enactment (the role-playing of historical figures). Psychoanalysis made me much more sensitive to the needs of individual students,

to the importance of mentorship, and to the students' need for their professors as role models. My model of education changed from what I had been taught in graduate school in history. There I saw it as my job to fill the heads of my students full of historical facts and ideas. During my training I came to want to help the individual students to each find the inquisitive five-year-old within, the curious child who loved to learn. I began to see my job as helping them to overcome their resistances to learning, just as I worked with patients to help them overcome their resistances to self-knowledge.

Scholars come to clinical work for different reasons and have different reactions to the opportunities presented. Lloyd deMause came to clinical work because he wanted to analyze Hitler and his institute wanted him to analyze patients at a time when he was also absorbed in starting a business. As a consequence, he dropped out of training, the continuance of which might have been quite valuable to him as a psychohistorian. Intensive work with individual patients might have tempered some of his psychohistorical generalizations, thereby helping his ideas to gain greater acceptance. Professor J. Lee Shneidman of Adelphi University spent four years at the Columbia University Institute for Psychoanalytic Training Post Graduate Program and two years in psychoanalytic training at Rubin Fine's institute in New York. He reports that Columbia feared he would see patients while Rubin Fine said he had to do clinical work to remain a psychoanalytic candidate. Since he was not interested in clinical work, he left training. He does not feel training had an impact on his work, though on the basis of working with him on psychohistory for over fifteen years, I rather doubt this view. But I can not say with any certainty that his psychological awareness does not come from his own analysis, psychoanalyst wife, and numerous friends and colleagues who are therapists. It is worth noting that John Demos, Lloyd deMause, and a variety of other psychohistorians are also married to psychotherapists or psychoanalysts.

Lee Shneidman's situation of being accepted as a research candidate at Columbia and being restricted from seeing patients was not unique. John Demos and Charles Strozier both had this experience as research candidates at Chicago. In speaking with them the dominant feeling was of gratitude, but I also felt there was some sense of exclusion since they were left out of the core

function of the Institute — treating patients. Sometime after Strozier came to the Center on Violence and Human Survival in New York City in 1986, he had the opportunity to teach and see patients at the Training and Research Institute for Self Psychology.

One of our authors, Jonathan J. Goldberg, is very pessimistic about the present and future of lay analysts from the liberal arts. In my opinion he overstates his case. Despite his assertion that literature professors can no longer get training in analysis, the institute at which I trained, as do many others, continues to welcome liberal arts professors as students. The career of the late Melvin Goldstein, a literature professor and psychohistorian, also serves as evidence of the wide acceptance of lay analysts. For many years Goldstein taught physicians about clinical work — a Sisyphean task in his view — and was accredited by the State of Connecticut as a medical examiner despite his lack of an MD or PhD in psychology. Though the intervention of third-party payers and managed care may hurt the economics of psychoanalysts — most especially for those who come from fields other than medicine, psychology, social work, and nursing — the gates to training seem to me to be open wider than they ever were in the past.

Let us now turn to some questions involving how psychoanalysis fits into the world of academia and health care. Recently, there has been a movement for psychoanalytic institutions to affiliate with universities. For many years there was a relatively small number of psychoanalytic programs that were affiliated with, or a part of, universities. Those at UCLA, New York University, Columbia University, and Adelphi come to mind. Margery Quackenbush of the NAAP has helped make me aware of the proliferation of psychoanalytic affiliations at a time when analytic institutes and universities find it in their self-interest to make connections. For example, Emory and Duke Universities have psychoanalytic educational programs and the Denver Institute for Psychoanalysis is affiliated with the Denver School of Medicine.

The movement for credentialing psychoanalysis takes other forms as well. Dr. Phyllis Meadows has created the free-standing Boston Graduate School which gives a master's degree in psychoanalysis. For over 20 years I have known psychoanalysts who have signed up for distance learning doctoral programs, and I sat on

the doctoral committee of one. These programs allow practicing psychoanalysts, who do not have a PhD or MD, to earn one by working independently and taking courses on site for brief periods in California, the Caribbean, Florida, or elsewhere. Though most traditional academics question the validity of external doctoral degrees earned in this manner, to much of the public, a doctorate is a doctorate. Insurance companies now, but not necessarily 15 or 25 years ago, make sharp distinctions regarding degrees and are almost always inclined to favor short-term therapies over long-term ones. However, some psychoanalysts from untypical backgrounds get around these difficulties by licensure or certification as marriage counsellors or in some other field.

A comparison of psychoanalytically-inclined scholars at and from Yale and UCLA is revealing. At Yale many excellent books have been written by outstanding psychoanalytically-inclined historians and psychiatrists. People such as John Demos, Peter Gay, Kenneth Keniston, and Robert Jay Lifton are a credit to our field. The first two are historians with psychoanalytic training who stopped short of seeing patients. The latter two were psychohistory students of Erik Homberger Erikson at Harvard and, like their classmate Robert Coles, have demonstrated an unusual ability to reach a large audience. To the best of my knowledge, neither of this group has formal psychoanalytic training. Both have moved on to other institutions, with Lifton doing admirable applied psychohistory at the Center for the Study of Violence and Human Survival at CUNY.

At UCLA excellent work has been accomplished by Robert Dallek, Robert Hill, Peter Loewenberg, Mauricio Mazón, Fredelle Spiegel, Richard Weiss, and others, and identifiable psychohistorical institutions have been created which are an integral part of the History Department and the University. An educational alliance was forged between the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute (SCPI) and the UCLA History Department with Samuel Eisenstein and Peter Loewenberg playing some of the key leadership roles. Loewenberg and others at the SCPI and the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute convinced the California legislature and Governor Jerry Brown to create the category of "research psychoanalyst." UCLA graduate students from the History Department, who work with certain professors, even have the opportunity to spend part

of their time at the Psychoanalytic Institute. Faculty from all departments may, and do, train as analysts and may even receive financial support to do this. Graduate students can win training awards. Funding has come from many sources: the Robert J. Stoller Foundation, the Hayman Endowment Fellowships, various other foundations, and a \$50 per year voluntary annual assessment of SCPI members. Peter Loewenberg plays a key role in helping to create and enlarge these opportunities as indicated by his helping to establish the University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium. A sense of psychoanalytic and psychohistorical community is an important outgrowth of these efforts.

Even UCLA graduate historians who fail to avail themselves of the opportunity for dual training, Professor Geoffrey Cocks for example, are profoundly influenced by the experience as reflected by their scholarship. Nellie Thompson, one of the authors in this issue, trained at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute after graduating from the UCLA doctoral program in history. It is not at all surprising that over half of our authors have had a direct connection to Professor Loewenberg and/or the University of California system.

When I interviewed Peter Gay (Yale–Emeritus) [see interview on page 33], who took psychoanalytic training but chose not to make the enormous commitment of time and energy to see patients, it was my feeling that even in graduate school at Columbia with his classmate Richard Hofstadter he was what I would call a proto-psychohistorian.

But at Yale, the psychohistorical and psychoanalytic climate was not nearly as fertile *within the history department* as at UCLA. This is not to say that psychoanalysis has not been a powerful force on this Ivy League campus, especially at the Yale Child Studies Center, in the Psychoanalysis and the Humanities seminars, and formerly in the Yale Department of Psychiatry. About two decades ago the Gardiner/Kanzer Seminars (now the Muriel Gardiner Program in Psychoanalysis and the Humanities) were established to encourage discourse between psychoanalysts and the Yale campus. Psychoanalysis in the region is centered at the Western New England Psychoanalytic Institute in New Haven and the Austin-Riggs Center in Stockbridge, Massachusetts — with strong

Eriksonian influence. In the 1960s several faculty received NIMH (National Institute for Mental Health) funding for psychoanalytic training, but the idea of awards or fellowships to support psychoanalytic candidates never was institutionalized, in sharp comparison to the situation at UCLA.

The less friendly attitude towards psychoanalysis in the Yale History Department, compared to the UCLA department, may be part of the reason why Gay chose to get his analytic training late in his career, when his reputation was totally secured. To do this he had to go to a Connecticut psychoanalytic institute with no affiliation with his department. Though I have been advised that he is an active participant in the Psychoanalysis and the Humanities seminars, when he thought of writing a proposal for a training program in psychoanalysis for history graduate students, he decided against it because of the cost and a climate among historians that he perceived as too hostile. He fears that it is probably too dangerous to the career of a young historian to openly be identified with psychoanalysis. He is not comfortable with the term psychohistory, which is also true of Erik Erikson, John Demos, and some others who have made great contributions. Gay commented to me that John Demos and he never really discussed psychohistory even while having amiable relations as colleagues. In the same department, David B. Davis and Jonathan Spence also have enough interest in psychoanalysis applied to society to sometimes attend the Gardiner/Kanzer Seminars, yet there seems to be no cohesive sense among the historians as a psychohistorical group.

As an emeritus professor Peter Gay is now applying his considerable talents to establishing the Cullman think tank at New York Public Library. As in the case of Lifton, whose excellent center we have brought to our readers' attention in these pages, the special insights that he brings from his psychoanalytic perspective, will not be highlighted as psychohistory. There is much to be said for an indirect approach — mainly, that there is less resistance to overcome. Yet clearly, because of the institution-building at UCLA, the prospects for the long term flowering in history departments of psychohistory in California is better than in Connecticut, from which some of the Yale innovators have dispersed. I will leave it to the reader to decide if these better prospects in Los Angeles than New Haven are more a function of

different approaches or primarily the openness of California to all sorts of innovations and the relative conservatism of the history faculty at one of the country's oldest and finest universities.

It should be noted that Yale University Press should not be confused with the departments at Yale. There, Gladys Topkis, who participates in the Psychoanalysis and the Humanities seminars, has sought out and built an outstanding psychoanalytic academic list from among mostly non-Yale authors. Albert J. Solnit, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Pediatrics and Psychiatry, is current coordinator of the seminars and Managing Editor of *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* series which is published by the Yale University Press. It should be noted that this energetic, 78-year-old practicing psychoanalyst and attending physician at Yale Hospital, is still also Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services — even if the likelihood is that his replacement will not be a psychiatrist — and certainly not an analyst. However, in listening to him discuss the need for more applied psychoanalysis at a conference in New York last April, I had no sense that he had an awareness of the work being published in most of the explicitly psychohistorical journals.

A concluding question is, do professors who are psychoanalysts have the best of two worlds or are they torn in two directions without enough time for either? Though in the end each individual must ultimately answer this question, I suspect the answer is usually that they have the best of both worlds. After all, they can regulate how much time is devoted to a psychoanalytic practice, and as college professors they have far more control over the use of their own time than do the members in most professions. Furthermore, in analysis, analysts become fully aware of just how much we shape our own lives and how we are free to make choices. And most importantly, they have a method of inquiry which offers special insights to personal, interpersonal, societal, and historical issues. They have the rewards of a truly unique education.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is Editor of this periodical. □

History and Psychoanalysis

The Impact of Psychoanalytic Training on

My Work as a Historian

Thomas A. Kohut
Williams College

It is difficult for me to define the impact of psychoanalytic training on my work as a historian because of my family background. I grew up in what can only be described as a psychoanalytic atmosphere. My father was the well-known analyst, Heinz Kohut, and my mother, Betty Kohut, was a social worker who had psychoanalytic training in Vienna during the 1930s. Most of my parents' friends were psychoanalysts, and I grew up knowing many of the leading analysts of the 1940s-1960s, some of whom were only one step removed from Freud (e.g., his daughter, Anna). As a result of this background, I came to formal training already familiar with psychoanalytic ideas and with a psychoanalytic outlook — the assumption that human beings can be understood if one adopts the appropriate empathic perspective.

Already as an undergraduate at Oberlin College I had determined to become a psychohistorian. My choice of the University of Minnesota for graduate school in history was based in part on the presence there of Otto Pflanze, whose article, "Toward a Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Bismarck," had just been published in the *American Historical Review* in 1972. From the outset I planned to have formal psychoanalytic training. I did so for two reasons. First, given the controversial status of psychohistory in the 1970s, I wanted to enrich and legitimate my psychohistorical work with an extensive and systematic psychoanalytic education. Second, given the uncertainties of the academic job market, I wanted the option of becoming a lay analyst. Having taken courses in psychology and psychiatry at the University of Minnesota, I took the opportunity provided by Pflanze's departure for Indiana University, where he assumed editorship of the *American Historical Review*, to leave Minnesota myself in order to enroll as a research candidate at the Cincinnati Psychoanalytic Institute in 1977. For the next six years, while writing my PhD dissertation in history, I was a student there and, after a few years, began doing clinical work at the V.A. Hospital and at the University of Cincinnati's Central Psychiatric Clinic. I had been made an Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Cincinnati (where I taught psychiatric residents) and established the

beginnings of a flourishing private practice as a psychotherapist when I was hired as an Assistant Professor of History at Williams College in 1984.

Although I learned a great deal of psychoanalytic theory at the Cincinnati Psychoanalytic Institute, it was my exposure to clinical material — in case conferences, my clinical practice, supervision, and my own training analysis — that, I think, proved most illuminating and influential. Indeed it was that experience which revealed to me the limits of theory or, better, its place as a tool in the psychoanalytic enterprise. Less a compendium of universal laws forming the basis for a general human psychology, psychoanalytic theory now seemed more an effective way of transmitting clinical experience. Because an analyst can have direct clinical experience only with a relative handful of people, theory exposes the analyst both to a much larger number of patients and to the knowledge and experience of colleagues, past and present, who have worked with them. By making us attentive to issues we might otherwise have missed, theory in the clinical practice of psychoanalysis facilitates empathic understanding but never should substitute for it. Indeed, I regularly observed in clinical case conferences that when an analyst employed abstract, theoretical formulations during a case presentation, she invariably did not understand the experience of her patient.

In sum, I think the single most important lesson I learned at the Institute in Cincinnati was the centrality of empathic understanding in psychoanalysis, as the therapist thinks her way inside the psychological world of the analysand and imagines why, given his experience, it makes sense that he feels, thinks, and acts as he does. And I learned that understanding must be communicated so that the analysand achieves empathy with himself, in terms not of theory but of his own life experience. As a clinical discipline, psychoanalysis thus seemed fundamentally compatible with history to me, since both attempt to achieve empathic understanding of the other — the one in the present; the other in the past — a point I tried to make in the article “Psychohistory as History” published in the *American Historical*

Review in 1986.

Obviously, my psychoanalytic training has profoundly influenced my scholarship since I left Cincinnati to become a full-time historian at Williams College. It has influenced my choice of topics, from my PhD dissertation which eventually became a book, *Wilhelm II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership* (1991), to my current effort to analyze the experience over the course of the 20th century of a group of 62 Germans born before the First World War who were all active in the youth movement. And my training has influenced the approach I take to these topics. As a result of my clinical experience, I think I am less theoretically oriented than I might otherwise have been and I try harder to immerse myself in the experience of my historical subjects. Like a good psychoanalyst, I try to listen more to the people I study than I do, say, to Freud. What theory has done is help me to be attentive to more of their voices.

My teaching has been influenced by my training every bit as much as my research. I am more attuned to the experience of my students in the classroom, to their narcissistic vulnerabilities and competitive impulses. In particular, my appreciation of the presence and power of transference has helped me to deal with numerous difficult situations inside and outside of the classroom. I think that the single greatest skill I acquired through my psychoanalytic experience is an ability to listen patiently to students and understand what they are trying to say. I can tolerate silence, confusion, even tension in the classroom and find it relatively easy to resist the impulse to hold forth. In sum, I think that my analytic experience has made me a more sensitive teacher.

Obviously these skills have also enhanced my ability to interact with colleagues. The capacity for patient listening and for understanding people, intellectually and psychologically, has made me more effective in doing administrative work. Furthermore, my clinical experience with some deeply disturbed and unhappy people has helped me put the intense and insular world of Williams College into perspective, to appreciate what separates and connects a life lived at Williams with lives lived elsewhere.

Finally, along with my increased ability to understand others, be they people of the past or students and colleagues, I have also a greater ability, acquired mainly through my training analysis, to understand myself. Needless to say,

Free Subscription

For every paid library subscription (\$40), the person donating or arranging it will receive a year's subscription to *Clio's Psyche* free. Help

this has benefited my scholarship, teaching, and interaction with colleagues. But most of all, it has enhanced the quality of my life.

It has been 13 years since I left Cincinnati to come to Williams, and over that time my identity as a psychoanalyst has steadily diminished to the point where I now feel myself to be more or less completely a historian. And yet, I remain a historian, indeed, a person, with a psychoanalytic world view. As a result of my personal background and formal training, psychoanalysis is something I have internalized. It is an essential part of who I am.

Thomas A. Kohut, PhD, Sue and Edgar Wachenheim III Professor of History at Williams College, is a graduate of the Cincinnati Psychoanalytic Institute and the doctoral program of the University of Minnesota. Professor Kohut has been the recipient of numerous awards and three visiting professorships. His publications include William II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991) and Wilhelm Busch: Die Erfindung eines literarischen Nationalheiden, 1902-1908 (Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik) which is in press. □

From History to Analysis

Nellie L. Thompson
Brill Library and Private Practice

I began my graduate studies in history with the intention of becoming a psychohistorian and my work with Peter Loewenberg at UCLA gave me an informed initial understanding of psychoanalytic theory. During my graduate training I became deeply interested in the history of the psychoanalytic movement, and was impressed by the large number of women who made creative contributions to it. The outcome was my dissertation, "Women Psychoanalysts and the Theory of Feminine Development: A Study of Karen Horney, Helene Deutsch, and Marie Bonaparte."

After moving to New York I decided to seek psychoanalytic training for two reasons. First, Peter Loewenberg had always encouraged me to do so and I found his integration of the practice of history and psychoanalysis an ideal worth emulating. Secondly, I became convinced that in order to enrich my understanding of the clinical and theoretical writings of women analysts I needed formal training in psychoanalysis. As I

thought more deeply about what it is about psychoanalysis that has facilitated the creativity of women, one factor in particular impressed me. That is that the epistemological arena of psychoanalysis, the clinical encounter between patient and therapist, seems to have been particularly congenial to many women. I felt my ability to explore this facet of women and psychoanalysis would be immeasurably enhanced through my own clinical experiences. This conviction has indeed been borne out by my training.

I was accepted for training by the New York Psychoanalytic Institute in 1983. The course work was enjoyable, demanding, and occasionally tedious. I was treated warmly by my colleagues and teachers. Keenly aware that my fellow candidates came to their training with a range of clinical experience that I could never hope to match, I was somewhat taken aback when I realized that some of them were slightly in awe of me as a historian. They explained that much of their medical school education was boring, requiring only rote learning, and I was perceived as having a more intellectual background. I quickly realized that many candidates — and teachers too, for that matter — knew little about the history of psychoanalysis and my knowledge in this area was something that I could contribute to seminar discussions.

Ultimately I learned the most from my patients and the opportunity to work with several very gifted analytic supervisors. (My own personal analysis also played a crucial role in my training.) My experience with patients has usually been that they are intrigued when they learn about my background. On occasion a patient has even been referred to me because they did not want to see an analyst with psychiatric training, preferring someone from an academic background. In general, however, I have found that patients decide to work with me because they feel I can help them; the fact that I am also a historian fades in importance. Working with patients is an absorbing emotional and intellectual experience. I understood psychoanalytic theory differently after beginning clinical work because the conscious and unconscious dynamics that analytic theory attempts to delineate are more powerfully realized, complex, and subtle when embodied in a human being than on the written page.

The therapeutic process requires patience; a solid understanding of technique; empathy; the

ability to hold a working understanding of the patient's inner life; and a willingness to amend one's thinking as the patient reveals more about her or his self. In this respect, there are obvious similarities between treating a patient and engaging in a long-term historical research project. One begins with a hypothesis and then utilizes historical methodologies in order to learn as much as possible about one's subject or topic. Like the psychoanalyst, the historian follows his or her evidence and keeps an open mind, never losing sight of the fact that reconstructions, whether historical or clinical, always remain somewhat incomplete. But I think the capacity to tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty is something that characterizes both the historian and the psychoanalyst.

Paradoxically, psychoanalytic training has made me more cautious about accepting explanations and interpretations, either clinical or historical, that appear too neat or all-encompassing. On the other hand, historical and clinical reconstructions and interpretations enriched by a sensitive use of psychoanalytic theory are more convincing to me than narrowly grounded explanations which eschew theory.

Certainly the demands of analytic training affected my productivity as a historian. When I began my training I did not have an academic position and at this point I do not anticipate that I ever will have one. I do not regret this fact. I have been able to pursue my scholarly interests in ways that I never anticipated when I began my training. Much to my delight I have been able to create a role for myself, both within the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and Society and the American Psychoanalytic Association, that draws on my historical training and thus reaffirms my identity as a historian. Several years ago I became the Curator of the Archives and Special Collections of the A.A. Brill Library at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. This wonderful collection includes rare books, oral interviews, photographs, papers of individual analysts, and the papers of the Institute and Society. My ongoing efforts to put in place conservation projects for these materials and to make them better known to researchers have been very rewarding in terms of the support I have received from the Institute and Society and the wider analytic community. I sit on both the Library and the History and Archives Committees of the American Psychoanalytic Association and am actively involved in the Oral

History Workshops that are presented each December in New York. Thus I have been able to use my historical training within the psychoanalytic community to promote an awareness of the importance of preserving papers, documents, and artifacts relating to the history of psychoanalysis.

As much as I enjoy clinical work, my commitment to research and writing on the history of psychoanalysis and the role of women analysts has not diminished. Indeed, the current proliferation of polemical works on Freud, early psychoanalytic figures, and the evolution of psychoanalytic theory and clinical practice makes it all the more imperative that scholars trained in both history and psychoanalysis remain engaged in writing and researching the origins and complex development of psychoanalysis as a theory and movement. In my case dual training has brought me personal and professional rewards and benefited both the disciplines to which I am committed.

Nellie L. Thompson, PhD, is a historian and the Curator of the Archives and Special Collections of the A.A. Brill Library of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute. She is the Associate Editor for North America for a new international journal, Psychoanalysis and History, to be published in London. She is also guest editor for a special issue of The Psychoanalytic Review on early American women psychoanalysts. Her papers include "Helene Deutsch: A Life in Theory," "Early Women Psychoanalysts," "History and Psychoanalysis," and "Schisms in the North American Psychoanalytic Movement."

□

An Adlerian Psychohistorian

Richard Weiss
UCLA History Department

I began my training in psychoanalysis late in my career as a historian, though an interest in the subject preceded, by many years, my actual decision to formally study and train in psychoanalysis. I had been introduced to some of Freud's writings when I was an undergraduate at the City University of New York and was fascinated by them. My interest deepened during graduate studies when I did work on the beginnings of the psychological profession in the United States and G. Stanley Hall's involvement in

bringing Freud to Clark University again brought me into contact with psychoanalysis, particularly its influence on the intellectual climate of the day.

More recently, in the course of studying second generation immigrants during the 1930s, I discovered that the concept of the inferiority complex was commonly used in explaining whatever ailed the children of immigrants. I became interested in the origins of the idea and that took me to Alfred Adler, but it has also influenced me much more broadly.

I began my training in 1993 and it has been a fascinating journey, both in its clinical and theoretical dimensions. It has deeply impacted on my perception of human motivation and experience, and has influenced how and what I teach. I am much more sensitized to the felt experience, and am mindful of Robert Stoller's injunction about the necessity of bringing the subjective into the social sciences.

I continue to work on Adler's influence in the United States, which was in some ways more pervasive than Freud's though far less recognized. I am also working on the impact of migration in the American experience. Psychoanalytic perspectives have been very helpful, and in this connection I have been much aided by the work of Salman Akhtar, "A Third Individuation: Immigration, Identity, and the Psychoanalytic Process," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 1995, 43:1051-1084, and of Leon and Rebeca Grinberg, *Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Migration and Exile*, trans. Festinger (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

Richard Weiss, PhD, earned his doctoral degree from Columbia University and since 1966 has taught history at UCLA. In 1993 he became a Clinical Associate of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute. Among his publications are The American Myth of Success (New York: Basic Books., 1969) and "Racism in the Era of Industrialization" in his co-edited The Great Fear: Race in the Mind of America (New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1970). Weiss' research-in-progress includes "The Adlerian Impact on American Psychotherapy." □

The Psychohistorian as Business Consultant

John Fitzpatrick

Family Business Resource Center

My dual training as a psychoanalyst and a historian began in an opportunistic fashion. As a graduate student in the History Department at UCLA I enrolled in a course taught by Peter Loewenberg. While I had read a little Freud by that time, I knew very little about psychoanalysis. Peter's course provided me with exposure to social psychology, Erik Erikson, and classical psychoanalysis as historical tools. Peter subsequently became both a personal and intellectual inspiration for me to pursue a more systematic understanding of both psychoanalysis and history. I transferred to the doctoral program at Berkeley after my first year at UCLA but Peter continued to nurture my interest, my development, and eventually my training in psychohistory and psychoanalysis.

Since there was no psychohistory track at Berkeley, Peter provided me with personal mentoring, Lawrence Levine provided me with intellectual support, and Neil Smelser provided me with tutorial support. Additionally, a few of us "academics" from "Cal" persuaded some faculty members at the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute to organize a study group loosely focused on learning more analytic theory and doing some applied psychoanalysis. We'd meet once a month. Those were very exciting times. We were doing something new, something challenging, and something very interesting. I taught a historiography course at Berkeley integrating psychoanalysis and history, and linked up with a few other historians to form the Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH). We created a newsletter, shared bibliographies and course outlines, and eventually began publishing *The Psychohistory Review*. We were excited about our work and thought we were on the cutting edge of creating a new approach to understanding individual and collective behavior.

Following the completion of my doctorate, I came to Topeka to spend a year studying at the Menninger Clinic. Initially, I had intended to return to academia but I received support to pursue full clinical psychoanalytic training at Menninger. Roy Menninger, Paul Pruyser, and Phil Woolcott wanted to bring an interdisciplinary emphasis to the training that was being provided to psychologists, psychiatrists, and analysts at Menninger, so I received a grant to support my training, taught some courses to trainees, and

received a waiver from the American Psychoanalytic Association to receive clinical training in Psychoanalysis. Since I have been moderately depressed for most of my life, the prospect of combining a personal analysis with didactic training and supervised clinical work was very appealing.

The Menninger Clinic had a tradition of providing clinical training for psychologists. Probably more non-physicians were trained as psychoanalysts at Menninger in the two decades following World War II than in all the other psychoanalytic institutes combined. Menninger had been very strongly influenced by the immigration of European analysts to the United States in the 1930s and 1940s and, as a result, it provided a very hospitable environment for therapeutic pioneers. Murray Bowen and a handful of prominent ego psychologists received their psychoanalytic training at Menninger, Arthur Mandelbaum pioneered a family therapy training program, and Harry Levinson created an educational program to educate professionals and business people about human dynamics in the workplace. Wilford Bion's work permeated the organization; all department heads were required to undergo intensive group dynamic training. John Sutherland, a renowned British analyst, was an annual consultant to the management group at Menninger.

So, the Menninger Clinic had received a grant from the Spencer Foundation to provide interdisciplinary training for psychiatric residents. The grant supported research on borderline personality disorders and the efficacy of alternative therapies, my teaching activities, and my training as a psychoanalyst. My training consisted of a personal analysis, four years of course work, case study seminars, and analysis of control cases under supervision. I also was able to receive clinical training as a psychotherapist, a group therapist, and a marriage and family therapist.

Whereas I had initially intended to use my one-year educational experience to augment my understanding of history and then to teach at the university level, my plans changed as I progressed

through the psychoanalytic training program. Both psychoanalysis and history helped to ingrain in me the value of disciplined inquiry and learning. Both taught me the value of using language as a vehicle for creating understanding and meaning. In the late 1970s I had an opportunity to become an employee at Menninger. The Center that Harry Levinson had begun in the mid-1950s needed someone to help teach human behavior and motivation and to provide consultations primarily of a personal nature to executives. I worked in this department at Menninger until 1988 and then started my own consulting business.

Since starting my own consulting business I have provided consultation services for executives, organizations, and family-owned businesses. Let me explain. The Executive Development Consultation that my partner, Anne E. Francis, and I provide consists of an intense two-day meeting with an executive and his or her spouse in Topeka. The executive participates in the consultation because of a need that has been identified by a superior, a human resource professional, or him or herself. We utilize an extensive life history questionnaire to obtain a good deal of historical data about the consultee; we use a psychological assessment created by Clyde Rousey; and we use our clinical skills, our individual abilities to be empathic, and our understanding of business issues in order to provide assistance to the executive and his or her spouse. It will probably come as no surprise to readers of this issue that the healthiest and most successful executives possess the following attributes: good reality testing, good interpersonal relations, good judgment, supportive personal relations, and an ability to work both effectively and competitively with others.

The area of my current work that is most suffused with the benefits of my historical and psychoanalytic training is the work that I do with family-owned businesses. I help families move the leadership and ownership of their business from one generation to the next in an orderly, productive way. Psychoanalysis and history, as two disciplined methods of inquiry, have enabled me to understand the multiple factors that motivate individual and collective behavior. Each discipline has helped me to not take data and verbal report as an adequate explanation but rather to probe, to ask questions, to formulate tentative hypotheses, and to continually enrich the tapestry of understanding. The methodology of history and the methodology

Psychohistory Forum Presentations

September 27

George Victor on Hitler's Masochism

November 15

**Michael Flynn, "Apocalyptic Hope —
Apocalyptic Thinking"**

Contact Paul H. Elovitz (see page 34).

of psychoanalysis have proved to be invaluable resources for my work with the families and the management of family-owned businesses.

The major task that I am usually confronted with is helping owners and the leaders of the business undertake some very demanding yet necessary changes. Understanding, empathy, a respect for what others are able to learn, the timing of this learning, and a sensitivity to important personal feelings are at the core of my work with family businesses. My work helps the entrepreneur enjoy the often bittersweet fruits of his or her labors: succession. Ambivalence is always a part of letting go of something that has been important and meaningful and turning it over to someone else. My training in history and psychoanalysis has afforded me an appreciation of the role ambivalence plays in our lives. Sons, daughters, mothers, fathers, and siblings, as well as power, ambivalence, control, love, anger, hatred, defensive routines, repression, anxiety, compromise, and accommodation, are the essential ingredients of my work with family-owned businesses. Without the disciplined methods of inquiry that I had learned as a historian and psychoanalyst, I would not be able to do the work that I currently do successfully. Without an appreciation for context, without an appreciation for the role of what is hidden to casual observation, without an appreciation for the complexity of motivation, I would not be able to be successful as a consultant helping family-owned businesses create a harmonious succession from one generation to the next.

John J. Fitzpatrick, PhD, received a master's degree in history from UCLA in 1967 and a doctorate from the University of California at Berkeley in 1975. He began his employment at the Menninger Clinic in 1975, teaching there as well as teaching courses in psychohistory at Kansas State University and the University of Kansas. He trained at the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis. While at the Menninger Clinic, Dr. Fitzpatrick consulted executives and organizations and provided seminars on human behavior and motivation to business people at a department initially started by Dr. Harry Levinson. In 1989, he started his own business, the Family Business Resource Center, providing executive and organizational development services as well as succession planning for family-owned businesses.

□

Literature and Psychoanalysis

Lacan, Literature, and Psychoanalysis

Mark Bracher
Kent State University

My opportunity to receive psychoanalytic training at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Institute materialized out of thin air in 1985-1986 when, in my first year of teaching in the English Department at Kent State University, the department chair, Robert Bamberg, received a grant from the Ohio Board of Regents for over \$500,000 to enhance the department's offerings in critical theory by, among other things, paying the lion's share of psychoanalytic training expenses for three faculty members from the department.

My interest in psychoanalysis (aside from an undergraduate infatuation with Jung) was only about four years old at the time, having originated from my participation in a psychoanalytic reading group at the University of Texas at Austin, where I was teaching at the time. One of my primary research interests concerned the effects that literature can have on subjectivity, and my participation in that reading group demonstrated to me that psychoanalytic theory offered the best conceptual tools for understanding such effects. So when the opportunity to receive psychoanalytic training presented itself, I eagerly embraced it as the ideal way to learn more about the workings of human subjectivity and thus to understand the psychological effects of literature.

In retrospect, I would say that my general expectations were largely fulfilled: the training helped me understand complexities and recognize nuances of thinking, feeling, and behavior that I had not previously been cognizant of. The way in which this new understanding came about, however, was a bit different than I had anticipated. I had expected the course work (the "didactic" part of the training) to be the most useful. I had imagined that the courses would provide me with a systematic understanding of human mental functioning, and that my personal analysis (the "training analysis") and my supervised clinical work with patients would provide the concrete experiences that exemplified and substantiated the theory. While this expectation was met to a modest degree, the relation among individual courses and between the courses and the clinical experiences was not what I had anticipated.

In the first place, this relationship was

more often one of tension and even disjunction and incoherence than of integration and coherence. There was no discernible logic or overarching aim to the sequence of courses: a course in Freud's early writings was followed by courses in Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* and a series of courses devoted to the various developmental stages from infancy to old age, along with a course on Freud's major cases, one on perversion, another on instincts, and so on. Nor was there any discernible connection between the courses and our clinical work. Above all, I felt that the therapeutic action of psychoanalysis — the processes through which psychoanalysis promotes psychological change — needed to have much greater emphasis and focus in the curriculum. It seemed to me that this process — the *raison d'être* of psychoanalysis — was largely ignored in the courses which focused primarily on psychodynamic structures and development rather than on therapeutic strategies and techniques.

This lack of coherence among courses and between courses and clinical experience was exacerbated for me by the fact that my scholarly work was grounded primarily in the theory of Jacques Lacan, who was (understandably, I suppose) viewed with great suspicion by a number of senior faculty at the Institute. It was made clear in several courses that Lacanian ideas were not acceptable topics for discussion, so I was continuously struggling to integrate three rather separate realms of experience: my clinical experiences (personal analysis and work with patients), my didactic training at the Institute, and my reading and writing in Lacanian theory. By the time my training ended in 1993, I felt that I had achieved such integration to a modest degree and that the results had been worth the effort (which continues today). But I also believed that greater results could have been achieved through considerably less effort if the course work had been more coherent, less historical and hagiographic, more connected with contemporary clinical realities, and more inclusive of other psychoanalytic theories (Lacanian, Kleinian, self psychology, object relations). This was apparently also the perception of many others at the Institute, for shortly after I finished my course work, the entire curriculum was revised to make it more inclusive, relevant, and coherent.

Also contrary to my expectations, the indispensable part of the training proved to be my personal analysis and my clinical work with

patients. My own analysis benefited me both personally and professionally, helping me recognize and work through a number of desires, fantasies, enjoyments, and defenses that I had been oblivious to and that had kept not only my personal relationships but also my teaching and my scholarship from being as productive and fulfilling as they could be. I am now much more aware of the complex of psychological needs and conflicts that I and other teachers and students bring to the classroom, and I have altered my teaching practices as a result. I am, for example, much more sensitive to the way a teacher's enthusiasm can operate on students in transference in ways that are, whatever the teacher's intentions, inevitably seductive and/or authoritarian and therefore ethically problematic. I have come to see writing problems as functions more of what I have come to call the psychopathology of everyday prose than of lack of knowledge or skill. As a result, I now see helping students to recognize and work through certain intrapsychic conflicts as being essential to helping them become effective writers. And I see a similar process as being essential to becoming a more effective teacher. By examining what was motivating me in my teaching and my scholarship, I have come both to alter my own pedagogical and scholarly aims and procedures and to question many of the fundamental practices of English studies. The result is that I now see many of the pedagogical and scholarly practices in English studies as functioning more to defend against anxiety and provide narcissistic and aggressive gratifications for English professors than to provide real human benefits for our students and for society at large. More generally, and most importantly for my own scholarship, I have become more sensitive to the complex psychological needs and conflicts that underwrite all social problems (whether by producing the problem more or less directly, as in gang violence, or by interfering with rational strategies for dealing with the problems, as in opposition to gun control or enthusiasm for incarceration and execution of criminals), and I now believe that the most valuable role that English professors and other cultural critics can play is as psychoanalysts of culture and society, illuminating the various psychological needs and conflicts that underwrite social problems, and finding ways to help people recognize these needs and work through them (or find alternative satisfactions for them).

This professional agenda, the formulation of which resulted in substantial part from my

personal analysis, has probably reduced the quantity of my publication, in two ways. First, most other English professors are not particularly eager to hear my critiques of our discipline's current scholarly and pedagogical practices, and, as a result, it has been more difficult for me to publish much of this material. Second, this agenda has motivated me to co-found a new organization, the Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society (co-founded with Marshall Alcorn of George Washington University), and to edit its journal, the *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society* [see notice on page 67], which cuts significantly into my own writing. But this reduction in quantity of publishing is more than compensated for by the conviction that my current scholarly work has the possibility of producing some real human benefits, as opposed to simply another body of articles and books that may be read by a few other scholars but would ultimately change nothing. Thus, while my psychoanalytic training has probably made my work more difficult and more frustrating in certain ways, it has also made it more meaningful and more gratifying.

Mark Bracher, PhD, is Editor of the Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society. Five years after taking his doctoral degree from Vanderbilt University, he began his psychoanalytic training at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Institute. He is a professor in the English Department at Kent State University. □

From Literature to the Consultation Room

Jonathan J. Goldberg
Private Practice, New York City

In my 28 years as a practicing Jungian psychologist and as a clinical teacher and supervisor, I have been able to confirm what Victor Frankel and many others have described, namely, that people who enter the mental health field as a first profession usually do so from an unconscious power motive and in defense against their own areas of pathology. Among this group, the worst offenders appear to be those who as young physicians become psychiatrists.

I do not mean this point as an indictment of these professionals, but as a bridge to the phenomenon which Henri Ellenberger described in *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (1970): that, as

with the founding fathers of psychoanalysis, Freud and Jung, it is the attempt to understand the origin and structure of one's own neurosis — and achieve healing — which serves as the indispensable basis for working with the unconscious material of anyone else. Hence arises the notions of the *wounded healer* and the *creative illness* which shifts the psyche's experience of itself.

Though my entry into psychoanalysis from the background of a PhD in English literature is now considered unusual (and would, in fact, in the over-regulated and bureaucratized climate of today hardly be possible), it accords precisely with the sequence of personal work first, professional development second. I sought psychoanalytic help in 1964 (Jungian, since I had a contact in that specialty) because of writer's block in attempting to finish my doctoral thesis. My road to completing the dissertation and starting an analytic journey which continues 33 years later is important to note because it introduced me to the central idea of the symptom as symbol which is at the heart of Jungian therapy and crucial to my decision to seek Jungian training.

Thirty years ago, the viability of a prospective Jungian training candidate was based on the individual's demonstrated capacity to work creatively with his or her unconscious (provided he had also demonstrated academic proficiency in achieving a terminal graduate degree). The premise was that a person could be taught over the six-year training program the principles of psychopathology; the dynamics of transference and counter-transference; aspects of the history of symbolism as contained in myths, fairy tales, and other literature; and comparative theories of neurosis and psychosis. However, the basic affinity for thinking symbolically and for translating intra-psychic dynamics into language that would allow their assimilation by an analysand was understood to be a talent, like a gift for playing the piano. An applicant without this predilection would not be accepted regardless of how many degrees he presented. In the same vein, a candidate who performed well in the program academically but whose personal analytic capacity came into question could never expect to graduate.

For me, this dominant attitude had an enormous appeal. As far as professional categories go, the modern world is organized virtually exclusively around knowledge and skill sets. I was here faced with a striking exception, with an interest in who I was rather than what I knew. I

realized then that much of what had been most arid for me in the graduate study of literature and the teaching of humanities was the absence of the subjective factor. It was as if we had all agreed to cooperate in the fiction that there was a body of knowledge to learn and pass on, that the methods of literary study (I imagine it to be no different with history) were imagined to offer a way of objectifying a canon. However, if, for example, one is going to confront *The Divine Comedy* in a living way, it can only be through those experiences of one's own that correspond to a given circle in hell or a voyage through purgatory. Literary study without that interactive dialogue with the text has no psychological life.

Psychological life is equivalent to the energy one brings to any task. I found my own energy most accessible when I could include my personal responses in a paper or presentation or when I could elicit them from others. This inclination away from content as material presented to ready students for examinations made me realize several years into my analytic training that I could not continue any form of academic career. I have never missed the academy, except for the externals it at one time offered: job security, abundant paid time off, health insurance, retirement plan, and sabbaticals. The fact that for the last twenty-six years I have never had more than two consecutive weeks off from psychoanalytic practice has left no time for writing or lecturing.

The effect of a non-traditional background on the establishing of a viable private practice was very different a generation ago than it would be now. I had the good fortune to complete my Jungian training in New York City at a time when there were fewer than 20 certified Jungian analysts in active practice here, a supply seriously inadequate in the face of demands from prospective analysands. In some cases my having a PhD was sufficient to allow patients to achieve major medical reimbursement, usually at 80%, under their fee-for-service plans.

As is generally known, with the advent over the last decade of the HMO's, the whole field of mental health private practice is in growing crisis, and the prognosis for those psychoanalysts who do not belong to licensed or certified fields is grave. Not only will the HMO's limit the number of sessions for which reimbursement is offered, but no one without a license will be accepted as a provider. Furthermore, the generation that is now

under 40 is much more likely to turn to psychopharmacology with some adjunctive short-term therapy than to commit to psychoanalysis. While my viewpoint may appear overly pessimistic, I consider it probable that psychoanalysis as a therapy will largely disappear over the next decades, absorbed by collective historical trends.

It is of course nearly impossible at this distance in time to reflect on my response to the experience of analytic training. By contrast with doctoral-level academic study with its emphasis of mastering a body of knowledge, what stands out about Jungian apprenticeship is not content, not even method, but attitude. What in essence I learned was how to approach the psyche. Borrowing an image from the Oedipus story, I assimilated the importance of his tenacious pursuit of the truth, but with humility rather than pride. Whether I am sitting with a patient listening to a narration or watching a series of images unfold on a movie screen, I know I will be led to the deeper meaning of what is being presented if I remain open and keep asking questions. I credit my analytic training with giving me the ability to hear the psyche speak.

What has felt restrictive to me in my life as a clinician has been the absence of a connection to the larger external world. Psychoanalysts with a broad humanistic and historical perspective strike me as ideally suited to be news analysts, to function as facilitators on the political or educational stage, to fill judicial and arbitrating positions — to represent a model of listening, verifying, and formulating bases for action. I keenly regret my failure to move beyond the consulting room, but, beyond that, I regret the failure of the profession as a whole to impact the wider culture. But at no point in my career have I been victimized through not having entered the psychoanalytic profession in an orthodox way.

Like Oedipus, we find the truth, but the truth makes us an exile. We rest on our island far from the city, left to talk to whoever comes our way while the world proceeds without us. Far from loathing us, the world barely recognizes our existence. A century after Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*, no one could imagine a public figure describing the effects of the unconscious on a controversial issue. I believe it would be a significant task for a future historian to make sense of this phenomenon. There has been no work of a humanistic nature comparable in

importance in this century to the mapping of the unconscious. No one with access to this map would ever dream of operating in life without it, yet everyone else uses maps as outdated as the idea of the world being flat.

Jonathan J. Goldberg, PhD, since 1969 has been in the private practice of analytical psychology and psychotherapy, treating both individuals and groups. He served as President of the New York Association of Analytical Psychology. Dr. Goldberg is a Founder, former Vice-President, and Member of the Executive Council of the NAAP as well as once being Treasurer and Board Member of the Joint Council for Mental Health Services. From 1961-1971 he was Assistant Professor of Humanities at Stevens Institute of Technology. □

Creativity Without Dual Training

Andrew Brink

Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

I am an academic who discovered the personal unconscious inadvertently when I began to doodle and invent motifs in idle moments while a PhD student at the University of London, United Kingdom. At first this drawing seemed innocent enough but it soon acquired a power of its own, then a necessity. Drawing, augmented by painting in watercolor, continued into my first teaching job with the Department of English, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. I was hired to teach 17th-century literature, along with introductory courses, which I did credibly while being preoccupied with tense, anxious, and urgent imagery from my unconscious. Fortunately, there was enough freedom to comply with the creative urgency, along with dream recording, for about 10 years until the feeling was no longer quite so importunate. Many of the drawings and small paintings still exist, but I think of them less as art than as ideograms of the unconscious by which I communicated with a realm of lost feelings, especially from early childhood.

As a result of this spontaneous imagery I had to change my view of myself from a gentle, compliant pacifist to somebody struggling with hurt, anger, and aggression — and eventually sadness. Had it not been for the ongoing exercise in creativity, I would almost certainly have become

depressed — which so far I have been spared. Depressiveness has always been a tendency of mine offset by curiosity about the origin and meaning of creativity. Having been left sadder and perhaps wiser by re-experiencing the irregularities of my birth and childhood (cesarean delivery, mother at risk for her life and debilitated for the first year before recovery to become an attentive mother) I have become profoundly curious about how children thrive or fail to thrive.

My direct experience of analysis is limited and from a long time ago. As a child from six to about twelve years of age I had some searching and helpful, though intermittent, analytic treatment with a woman therapist in Madison, Wisconsin. The family physician had given up on my constant complaints about sore feet, etc., and my parents were enlightened enough to find a child analyst. Using modified Kleinian play therapy, together with talk, the foot pains were persuaded to vanish, replaced by real feelings about the family in which I lived. Unfortunately, I never went on with analysis, being too busy with academic pursuits. There were times when I considered it — as when my father turned up to lecture at University College, London, where I was a graduate student and had skin eruptions. (A shrewd physician-psychotherapist enabled me to make the connection.) But I regret missing the chance to go into treatment with a good London analyst as I could have afforded an inexpensive student analysis then available. Conflict and anxiety have lost me time and energy but my resilience is such that I have not gone into treatment. This was probably a mistake as there are emotional limitations of which I *know* without fully feeling them or having explored their origin in analysis.

All these experiences inevitably pushed aside my conventional study of literature, replacing it with a consuming interest in psychoanalytic insights into the genesis and management of emotion — especially as seen in the products of creativity. In 1972 I originated an undergraduate course called “Motivational Criticism” in which theories of creativity were considered. I was especially impressed by Henri Ellenberger’s idea of *creative illness*, which he attributed to both Freud and Jung in *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (1970). Creative illness certainly explained what I had been going through by compulsively drawing and painting, but I never mentioned this to students. Instead, I constructed a series of psychobiographies of creative writers and

artists, from John Donne to Pablo Picasso and John Lennon, to illustrate the principles of how the creative urge arises from the "inner necessity" of certain developmental configurations.

By reading amongst post-Freudian analysts, especially in the "British School," I became aligned with those having least "metapsychology" and most empirical humility in the assertions they made about child development. Perhaps because I was brought up by a convinced Darwinian father (a well-known University of Wisconsin plant geneticist) I turned towards psychobiology. The theories of John Bowlby in particular impressed me by their soundness and, while attachment theory may not have had the imaginative reach of more speculative theories, I much preferred it and continue to build upon it. During the years I was struggling to write convincing psychobiography — especially of subjects such as the depressed 18th-century English poet William Cowper, who had lost his mother early — I introduced myself to Bowlby and we became friends. As a tribute to Bowlby, when I was Coordinator of the Humanities and Psychoanalytic Thought Programme at Trinity College, University of Toronto, I organized a conference on "John Bowlby and Attachment Theory" in October, 1993.

While at McMaster in 1979 I helped found the Bertrand Russell Editorial Project as I had written my MA thesis at Toronto on Russell the essayist and had joined his anti-nuclear weapons campaign while living in the U.K. during the late 1950s and early 1960s. Familiarity with Russell's early life through little-known family letters and documents showed me a Russell very different from the rational philosopher and even from the reforming social activist. I later published my findings as *Bertrand Russell: A Psychobiography of a Moralist*.

For ten years I was Associate Member of the Department of Psychiatry at McMaster, the only one from the Humanities Faculty. To strengthen my psychobiographical writing and teaching about creativity I had interacted with the then young and vital psychiatrists who were setting up the innovative department. I was nominated for membership by Dr. Nahum Spinner, probably the most scholarly among them and an inspiring teacher. By this time I was finding the English Department dreary and the Russell Project stifling in its phony guardianship of Russell the master logician and philosopher as it required that

Russell's thought be separated from his subjective life in the presentation of his papers for publication. My best and most interesting students were in the Social Sciences faculty, so I set up new courses in sociology on theories of psychobiography and creativity — enjoying the support of colleagues in psychiatry. (All this happened in days of openness and freedom which are unimaginable now.)

By far my most important intellectual stimulation came from an invited group in Psychiatry known as The SAD Society (*SAD* standing for the Study of Affective Disorders). Organized by Dr. Paul Grof (brother of Stanislav Grof), the group was wonderfully open and free-ranging on all topics connected with depression. Briefly in 1988 I joined the team as "psychotherapist" to help patients in a primarily lithium-monitoring clinic. But this fascinating work came to an end after a few months when Paul took an offer to become research director at the Royal Ottawa Hospital. In like manner, I was offered the job of Coordinator of the Humanities and Psychoanalytic Thought Programme at University of Toronto.

"Hum and Psy," as it was affectionately called, was a new interdisciplinary undergraduate program in need of leadership, which I gave for five years, 1988-1993. The program centered on literary, philosophical, and religious studies; it offered lectures on Freud (Charles Hanly), Jung (Donald Evans), and the British School of Object Relations (Phyllis Grosskurth [see interview in *Clio's Psyche*, September, 1996]), while I ran the general seminar for all students. There was a sizable group of other courses with some psychoanalytic content upon which students could draw. The program attracted highly talented students, some of whom were in personal analysis, intending careers as psychotherapists, social workers, and teachers. In 1990 I organized an international conference on "Freud and the History of Psychoanalysis."

Clearly, I was never "trained" to take on the sort of work in applied psychoanalysis towards which experience inclined me. I found that, while the Toronto analytic community was very kind and welcoming, having no credentials as an analyzed person or a therapist excluded me from their councils. As Coordinator of the Humanities and Psychoanalytic Thought Programme I needed to be closer to analytic organizations than it was possible to get. And I became aware that there were various

factions with ideological persuasions hard to serve by the sort of open university enquiry upon which I insisted. Up to a point I could embrace them all, but this still left the question as to why the Coordinator had no training other than his research PhD in English literature. I believe that I was highly successful in the job, but, after five years, problems of credibility with the analytic community were beginning to arise. Having "played the Bowlby card" in the second conference, it was time to get on with my own work and not become embroiled in the politics of psychoanalytic education (or lack of it) in Toronto.

Perhaps my best hope is for good reception of my books, articles, and reviews. Intrigued by the reasons I earlier had discovered for Bertrand Russell's tortured and torturing relations with women, I decided to pursue the theme further. *Obsession and Culture: A Study of Obsession in Modern Fiction* is the result. It discusses the extent to which male obsessional personality organization (with typical Don Juanism) pervades Western literary culture. [See review in **Clio's Psyche**, September, 1996.] My just-completed book draft, tentatively called *The Creative Matrix: Anxiety and the Origin of Creativity*, starts with Freud's "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety" (1926) and shows how John Bowlby's attachment theory emerges from it to stimulate rethinking about the meaning of creativity.

Andrew Brink, an American expatriate, is a literary scholar and psychohistorian who taught at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, from 1961-1988 and headed the Humanities and Psychoanalytic Thought Programme at the University of Toronto from 1988-1993. His publications include Bertrand Russell: A Psychobiography of a Moralist (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1989) and Obsession and Culture: A Study of Obsession in Modern Fiction (Cranbury, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1996) He serves as a trustee of the Holland Society of New York and of the Psychohistory Forum.

Political Science, Sociology, or Psychology and Psychoanalysis

Dual Careers and the Burden of Pain

Victor Wolfenstein

UCLA Political Science Department

I became interested in psychoanalytic theory when I was a graduate student in politics at Princeton in the early 1960s. My initial models and influences were the works of Harold D. Lasswell, Erik H. Erikson, and my aunt Martha Wolfenstein. I characterized my own work as psycho-political, but was just as comfortable thinking of myself as a student of personality and politics.

I completed my doctoral studies in 1965 and came to UCLA the same year. I made a premature attempt to apply for psychoanalytic training and was accepted by a local institute. But the attempt was half-hearted: at the practical level my interests were rapidly becoming more political than psychoanalytic, and I let the training issue drop.

The next period was devoted, intellectually speaking, to developing my own version of psychoanalytic-Marxist theory. This included the idea, common in leftist circles, that theory and practice were mutually constitutive. I was therefore in the self-contradictory position of advocating psychoanalysis without ever having practiced it — or, indeed, without ever having experienced it. Moreover, for purely personal reasons I had undertaken a self-analysis. I learned something from this venture, but the upshot was the recognition that I had something to gain from actual psychoanalysis. Finally, by the mid-1970s (as a result of the determined efforts of Peter Loewenberg and others) the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute had a program for research candidates, which included funding to help defray the costs of the training analysis. I applied for and was accepted into this program.

My reactions to the training program were varied. From the beginning my own analysis was engaging and worthwhile. It lasted just over three years and it provided the foundation for further emotional development. I am profoundly grateful to my analyst, Ruth Aaron, for that experience. Theory seminars, by contrast, were not so gratifying. I entered the program after ten years of being the teacher, not the student, and of being intensively immersed in Freudian theory. It felt like a big step back to be a student of what I was accustomed to teaching. But I liked my fellow candidates and the teachers were a decent bunch, so that part of the program was tolerable. And the continuous case conferences were genuinely

exciting.

The decisive part of the experience was treating patients under supervision. Along with my personal analysis, this is where the real learning took place. Also the real time-management problems: the combination of the various things analytic eventually took over 20 hours a week, while the university continued, appropriately, to demand a full-time commitment. Hence, it was my research (other than psychoanalysis as research) that suffered. Over time, however, I developed ways of balancing the three parts of my professional life: teaching, research, and analytic practice. So, while I maintain a substantial part-time clinical practice, I don't feel that my productivity has suffered too much as a consequence.

During my training and after, my academic colleagues have been tolerant of psychoanalytic concerns. As noted above, no special allowance was made for the demands of training, but neither have I encountered hostility to research that is psychoanalytically-informed. (The fact that I am in the history of political theory is a buffer in this regard.)

The matter is more complex when it comes to my psychoanalytic colleagues. Psychoanalysis was overwhelmingly medical when I entered training. Consequently, research people, who lacked psychiatric training, were viewed with a certain skepticism. But there was also a kind of odd deference to academic sophistication. So, we lacked legitimacy in the one regard and were given too much of it in another. This evened out over time, however, as we proved to be adequate clinically and as personal relationships eventually eroded the distinctions of professional categories. Further, psychoanalysis in Los Angeles is no longer a male-dominated medical specialty. Perhaps it's going a little too far to put it this way, but for the most part, psychoanalysts are just psychoanalysts. A core psychoanalytic identity places in the background the various professional pathways leading up to it.

This brings me to the central issue. There are those who pass through psychoanalytic training and come away from it fundamentally untouched. Perhaps they use psychoanalytic ideas in their research or, if they are therapists, in their clinical practice; but they do not become psychoanalysts. For others psychoanalysis really becomes an identity, or a vital component of one's identity. One then is a psychoanalyst, which is quite a

different thing from entertaining psychoanalytic ideas.

This sounds a bit like a psychoanalytic essentialism, so let me take a step back from it. Prior not only to my training, I was a convinced adherent of Freud's metapsychology. I took the Oedipal situation as the core of analytic theory and adopted the canonical approach to the interpretation of dreams. Libido theory dropped away rapidly during training, as it became clear that affects and, especially, the capacity to tolerate unpleasurable affects, was the heart of the matter. In parallel fashion, I was drawn by my patients into the depths of pre-Oedipal issues. Klein, Winnicott, and Bion (along with feminist psychoanalytic writers like Dorothy Dinnerstein) proved to be of greater value than more orthodox theorists. And, technically, with respect to both dreams and clinical interaction generally, tracking details was displaced by a concern to identify and be able to stick with the central affects and essential intra-subjective and inter-subjective dramas.

These changes — to return to my prior point — were not, with respect to my own personal development, external. They were something more than ways of thinking about things — although they did give me new things to think about. Coupled with prolonged efforts to practice what Bion terms the "disciplined denial of memory and desire," as well as to tolerate the maximum of anxiety with the minimum of defense, I find myself reacting to people and situations from a different and, I'd like to believe, deeper psychical location.

I'd also like to believe that my students have been the beneficiaries of these developments. I think I'm better able to listen, not just cognitively, but also to half-articulated emotional concerns. I've worked hard to try to understand group processes, and this spills over into seminar management. And being able to speak to developmental issues, especially as these are permeated by the problematics of race and gender, is often very helpful to undergraduates in particular.

This list of benefits could be extended, but it's best to end on a cautionary note. Quite apart from time, psychoanalysis exacts a price from its practitioners. One has to be able to tolerate the presence of other people's pain in oneself, not just during sessions but when they are over as well. Sometimes it is hard to tell who is who. And too often, one's loved ones are forced to help carry this burden. Hence, even if it is but one half of a dual

identity, I believe one must take psychoanalysis as a vocation (in Max Weber's sense) — or else one is better off leaving it alone.

Eugene Victor Wolfenstein, PhD, received his doctoral degree in politics from Princeton University. Nineteen years later he earned his doctoral degree in psychoanalysis from the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute where he is currently a member of the faculty. He is also Professor of Political Science at UCLA. Among his many books is The Revolutionary Personality (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967). He is also the author of "Black Liberation and the Jewish Question" in Marcus & Helmreich, eds., Blacks and Jews on the Couch (Praeger-Greenwood, forthcoming). □

From Hitler to Historical Evolution

Lloyd deMause
The Journal of Psychohistory

My formal training in psychoanalysis was confined to taking courses at Theodore Reik's National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis in New York City (NPAP). When I got to the level of taking on clinical patients for control analysis I said I wanted to take on people like Adolf Hitler and the institute's representatives asked me to leave. After that, I learned psychoanalysis from extensive reading on my own, from attending hundreds of scientific lectures at New York psychoanalytic institutes, and — most importantly — from my own personal psychoanalytic treatment. Despite my failure to continue in formal training, I was asked to be an honorary member of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training. My own experience is that one way to be a psychohistorian — a way I wouldn't think of condemning anyone else to — is to be 27 years in intensive psychoanalysis, read every psychoanalytic book and journal published, and sit 40 years in a library that has 14 million volumes [the New York Public Library].

Lloyd deMause is Director of The Institute for Psychohistory, Editor of The Journal of Psychohistory, President of the International Psychohistorical Association, and Chairman of Psychogenesis, Inc.. He did his postgraduate training in political science at Columbia University and in psychoanalysis at the National

Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis and has taught psychohistory at the City University of New York and the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training. Lloyd deMause has published over 80 scholarly articles and his books include Foundations of Psychohistory (New York: Creative Roots, 1982) and Reagan's America (New York: Creative Roots, 1984). He is currently writing Psychohistorical Evolution. □

The Sociologist as Psychoanalyst

Jeffrey Prager
UCLA Sociology Department

I completed my psychoanalytic training in 1993, receiving my PhD in psychoanalysis from the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute. The training program afforded me a whole host of new challenges, including studying with individuals with different academic and professional backgrounds (in my case, mostly MDs) and establishing a private practice that introduced me, through my patients, to many different worlds of experience that I otherwise would not have encountered. In this article I'll detail the particular challenges of psychoanalytic training while functioning, on a day-to-day basis, as a member of the faculty in the Department of Sociology at UCLA.

Sociology over the years has had more than a casual flirtation with psychoanalysis. Horkheimer, Adorno, and, more recently, Habermas came to define a particular theoretical tradition within sociology characterized by an aspiration to integrate Marx and Freud into a comprehensive understanding of contemporary society. Talcott Parsons, too, developed a theory of personality that borrowed heavily from Freud by working out an alternative theoretical tradition within the field and seeking to integrate Durkheim within a systematic sociology. These contributions to sociology, while powerful and vital in the 1930s-1950s, have substantially lost both their luster and their interest among today's sociologists. With a few notable exceptions, such as the work of Neil Smelser and Nancy Chodorow, psychoanalysis' place in today's established sociology is almost non-existent, or at least no stronger than that of critical theory and structural-functionalism.

As a result, my own engagement with psychoanalysis during the last decade was met by colleagues with considerable skepticism. The uncertain fit between the two disciplines made it difficult to easily explain the reasons for my divided attention between the fields: Wasn't I simply seeking a second career? The ways in which psychoanalysis might contribute to sociological research, either my own or others', were not immediately apparent. It was difficult for me to easily account for my own interest in the field. *I knew* that I was not after a new career. I could not present myself as being motivated by purely research concerns. There was nothing particular in my previous research that made analytic training an obvious next step for me. My research was always focused on macro sociological concerns — big questions about society *writ large* — and not on interpersonal processes or even social psychology where psychoanalysis might have more obvious and direct application.

But ever since my earliest research on Irish nationalism and on American racism, I had long been convinced that these sociological concerns could benefit from a more robust and developed theory of the self, of the individual personality, of subjectivity, and of the role of the irrational in social life. A Freudian-inspired psychoanalysis offered the possibility of such a sustained encounter with these dimensions of personal and social life. Yet at the same time, my decision to seek analytic training certainly was not contained by a definite set of research questions. I was, in part, seeking a different intellectual community because of my disenchantment with sociology — both locally and globally.

Nonetheless, in the end, the intellectual payoff to my sociology proved to be among the most profound benefits of my analytic training. My greatest reservation about the training at the time I began was that I feared that the seminars would be organized around Freudian orthodoxy and that the kinds of controversies which I had come to take for granted within the university would not be tolerated or welcomed. These worries were exacerbated when I realized that the training programs in psychoanalytic institutes tend to be built around a professional model of education (not a graduate school model), structured to teach a skill — like doctoring or lawyering — and not to engage a set of intellectual questions and controversies. Fortunately, I found no such rigidity. Despite the many pictures of Freud that

hung prominently on the walls of the seminar rooms, it was soon clear that Freud represented only a starting point by which alternative perspectives and developments, though derived from Freudian formulations, were introduced and debated.

It was both surprising and exciting to discover that the same methodological and epistemological questions that were dominating sociology were having parallel expression within the field of psychoanalysis. At the time, within sociology I had allied strongly with the hermeneutic and linguistic turn (all part of a culturalist approach to society) that was challenging both sociological positivism and certain forms of empiricism. I discovered that the same debates were center stage within psychoanalysis as well. Donald Spence's book *Narrative Truth and Historical Truth* (1982), for example, was interesting to me not only for what it captured about the ambiguities of the psychoanalytic dyad and its discussion of the relationship of the present to a reconstructed past, but, as importantly, also for how it provided a different vantage point by which I could think about critical sociological controversies about narrative and truth, about reflexivity and sociological observation, and about social constructivism and objectivity.

Now I was able to approach these same sets of questions that I had engaged as a sociologist from within a distinctively different discourse relating to a particular set of issues that were not sociological. It enabled me to see how disciplinary debates only express concretely — in controversy over appropriate sociological or psychoanalytic practice — issues that have much more fundamental cultural resonance. My first insight that derived from my dual training was that scientists — whether sociologists or psychoanalysts — employ the discourse of their field to express themselves creatively, to situate themselves culturally by carving out a "scientific" position on the questions of the moment, and attempt to influence the ways others similarly experience a common cultural world. Interdisciplinarity demonstrated sciences' link to cultural expression; it freed me to think that good sociology, like good psychoanalysis, rests not solely on technical practices but also on the capacity of individual sociologists and psychoanalysts to articulate their moral, ethical, and cultural commitments. The sociologist and the

psychoanalyst as practitioners of a craft are not so different from one another as might be first imagined. To the extent that they are intellectually engaged, both are humanistically involved with current cultural questions or concerns.

The fact I was able to experience, participate in, and to comment on sociological controversy more confidently as a result of my exposure to similar controversies appearing in different contexts speaks to the benefits that derived from my training in two fields. It describes the advantages of interdisciplinarity more than the particular advantage to my sociology of my having trained as a psychoanalyst. But, in the end, my sociology itself, while focused still on these questions of the self, subjectivity, and the irrational, became substantively different in orientation and focus, specifically as a result of my analytic training.

Ironically, the original impetus for the change emerged from my clinical work. In different ways than I had anticipated, I began to see the ways in which the individual and social interpenetrate. In my analytic practice, I was confronting individual patients who came to treatment because of different kinds of life crises and who, through the therapeutic process, were attempting to understand their current states of unhappiness, indecision, feeling of being unfulfilled, and other unpleasant states of being. Their purpose was to understand how both past experiences and feelings, and current self-understandings, contribute to their dissatisfaction. But what became striking was the process by which — slowly, methodically, but inevitably — patients use the available “categories of experience,” what might be described as frames of meaning or narratives of self, to understand in a deep way the sources of their troubles.

For example, the patient who found himself unhappily married raised for himself the question of his sexual orientation as a possible source of his distress: Could it be, he wondered, that he was homosexual? Or, the African-American patient who, only through the course of her analysis, came to appreciate the consequentialness of her early experiences as an African-American in her feelings about herself and in her relations to others. Or, the patient who wondered as to the possibilities of her having been abused as a child interfering with her capacity to develop meaningful and satisfying relationships today. These categories — homosexual, African-

American, and abused — are invoked to capture profound and significant dimensions of themselves, elements of being that are outside volition or choice. The categories are often accompanied by more elaborated narratives of experience, in which are personal history and *socially produced* tales of suffering that include interwoven themes of estrangement, discrimination, recognition, and redemption. In short, in appropriating a category as one's own, one often situates oneself in a whole story of one's past, and understands the relation of these past experiences to the present day forms of distress that one endures. These categories are called upon to capture a certain constellation of inner feelings and beliefs, and are typically invested with the possibility for personal transcendence. But while they are employed for eminently personal aims, they are fundamentally socially-located cultural categories: frames of experience that are presented to the patient from the outside, organized by the society as meaningful, consequential, and relevant features of a member of a collectivity's life.

This permeability between the self and the social world, the interpenetration between inside and outside, and the difficulty between the two, became crystallized for me in one case in particular. This case was of a woman who, in the course of her psychoanalysis, came to believe that she had been sexually abused as a very young girl by her father. But while she “recovered” memories of abuse, I was skeptical of her accounts and could not corroborate her desire to identify as a victim of childhood abuse. Interestingly, as the analysis progressed, she came to no longer believe in these memories and, by the end of the treatment, had largely abandoned this particular form of “identity work.” Based upon this case, I researched the question of memory, looking particularly at the intersection between the socially generated narratives of abuse that were dominating the cultural landscape at the time of our work together and the very intimate process of self-discovery and self-constitution that was occurring within the analytic setting. My research for the last several years has been on this question of memory and, in Spring, 1998, my book *Presenting the Past: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Mis-Remembering* will be published by Harvard University Press.

Jeffrey Prager, PhD, both received his doctoral degree from UCLA and is a professor of sociology there. In like fashion, he is a member of

the faculty of the Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute at which he earned his PhD in psychoanalysis. He has published widely in the fields of political sociology, race relations, psychoanalysis, and social theory. His publications include *Building Democracy in Ireland* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); the co-edited *Psychoanalytic Sociology, Volumes I and II* (Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar 1993); and "Politics and Illusion: A Psychoanalytic Exploration of Nationalism" in *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 1993. □

A Psychobiographer Trained Among Academic Psychologists

Todd Schultz
Pacific University

In the middle 1980s, while training to be a research psychologist in a mostly methods-centered department (where the focus is on learning specific experimental methods and the means are more important than the ends), I discovered myself to be something of an outlier, *ipso facto* an iconoclast, working in a disciplinary no-man's land. My chief concerns, then as now — psychobiography, psychohistory, the individual life, psychoanalysis, and the history of insanity — received from orthodox psychologists at best a kind of irritated blessing, at worst dismissive eye-rolling. And, though I had no special urge to trumpet my intellectual homelessness or to make myself into some sort of martyred revolutionary, it seemed that simply doing the kind of work that interested me most got me into trouble. Was I really a psychologist, people wanted to know? According to most criteria — the use of complex statistics, random sampling of subjects, and the cultivation of a semblance of scientism — No, I was not. Then, Was I a philosopher, a historian, a Freudian (God forbid!), a dilettante *litterateur*? I didn't really care what I was. I only hoped to be permitted to pursue the questions that intrigued me.

Fortunately, in the department there were also a handful of broader-minded multi-disciplinarians into whose orbit I gratefully drifted. Because I kept on and, with the encouragement of Alan Elms, my mentor, proposed a psychobiographical dissertation, the department at

last needed to take a formal stand on the issue. Would my enterprise receive provisional approval, or would I be asked to relent, to abandon my misspent efforts? In his *Uncovering Lives: The Uneasy Alliance of Biography and Psychology* (1994), Elms describes the opponents' position:

Departmental rules, from the early days of our PhD program, had stipulated one primary methodological requirement: that a doctoral dissertation must be based on empirical research.... Those argumentative faculty members suddenly announced they'd always taken the word "empirical" ... to mean only "quantifiable" or "nomothetic" research.... The rules are clear, these earnestly nomothetic professors said, "No PhDs granted for psychobiographical dissertations in our department."

Fortunately for me, and for Alan Elms, too, who increasingly perceived his own professional identity to be under attack, when the votes were counted most of the department proved tolerant enough to allow the formation of my dissertation committee and that of one of my peers, Eva Schepeler, who went on to write a psychobiographical analysis of Jean Piaget. From that day forward, I wrote only what I wanted to write, and rarely looked back. The accidental revolution had been a success, and set a precedent about which I continue to be proud.

But did I find a home? Not so fast. As most everybody knows, psychology — generally unhistorical, method-infatuated, atheoretical, mechanistic, reductionistic, concerned more with hiccups of mind than with real lived lives — remains to this day generally inhospitable to psychobiography and psychohistory. And that is odd, especially in light of the fact that psychology's superheroes — Freud, James, Jung, Erikson, Piaget, Skinner, Allport, Maslow, Murray, and others — all championed the study of the individual life, the single case. When today's academic psychologists turn their back on the person, and focus instead on large groups of randomly-chosen, anonymous undergraduate subjects, they repress their roots, and worship method at the expense of true illumination. They seek tiny, tidy facts, and risk boring themselves to death.

So psychologists resist, and psychobiographers/psychohistorians persist. Why? Because the complexity of the lived life inspires discovery. It disarms, provokes, and dislocates, demands

inventiveness, requires intuition and counter-intuition. The individual "limit-case" poses an extreme challenge, throwing psychology against itself, fomenting fresh starts and novel approaches. Anybody who has tried to explain a complex personality — Picasso, Elvis, the Unabomber — or the interaction between personality and history, understands all too clearly how little the science of psychology has to offer by way of advice. Entire theories sometimes result — Murray's work on Melville comes to mind, or Maslow's prototypes of self-actualization, or Louis Sass' examination of schizophrenia and modernism — the effects of ecstatic efforts merely to understand. We grope, largely unarmed but hopefully undaunted, and out of that groping emerges the prospect of progress — qualified truth, but truth nonetheless, the best we are capable of. At the same time, by investigating the link between creator and creation, theorist and theory, politician and politics, scientist and science, the psychobiographer/ psychohistorian demystifies art, theory, politics, and science, and situates each in its proper orbit (not that we thrill to each any less). In certain cases — e.g., the psychology of science — tracking the subjective gives rise to a kind of liberatory de-naturalization or contextualization; the ideological smoke screen of fact recedes, and what remains is 1) a person, one brilliant soul creating something out of what he or she has inside and 2) a culture, a time and place, beckoning that brilliant soul towards specific culture-generated problems.

Because of the excesses of the current orthodoxy, work on the person can't help but be antidotal — it measures the statistically significant against the psychologically relevant, as Alan Elms has put it, reminding psychologists in particular, but others as well, that research results don't mean much unless they tell us something about this life here or that one over there. Unless they can be used, that is, and not merely reported. My work may not land me a plum job, it may not get me grants, it may not place me in a popular textbook, and it may not even facilitate my tenure, but it absorbs me, and gives me, most importantly perhaps, a sense of mission.

As for clinical work, I can't imagine any better training than psychobiography. Three or four days per month I work for an inpatient psychiatric unit, a crisis unit. I am constantly confronted with the most bizarre, sad, puzzling, and ridiculous kinds of behaviors and situations. I need to size people up as quickly as possible, to

prevent violent or self-destructive actions. That often reduces to two things: figuring out what people are really trying to express and identifying motives that usually are anything but obvious. In other words, I act as a psychobiographer, with the single difference being that my subject happens to be sitting right across from me. It seems to me that clinicians, just by virtue of being clinicians, are psychobiographers, and psychohistorians, too. I like to tell my clinical psychology students that if they want to hone their skills, they ought to start reading poetry; I even read poems in front of the class sometimes (they always grumble a little bit). But people are poems, I say. And just like poems, understanding people requires an act of interpretation, unremitting interpretation, in fact. Analysis is interminable; so is the interpretation of a single poem. The best clinicians observe empathically, respect the complexity of the individual case, gather data assiduously, and construct interpretations carefully and mindfully — just like the best psychobiographers. Psychobiographers are people experts, something clinicians ought to aspire to, as well.

William James once said of psychology, "The mathematician with the poet, fervor with measure, passion with correctness; that surely is the ideal." I couldn't agree more. In psychology, psychobiography and psychohistory deliver the poetry, the fervor, and the passion. They balance an unbalanced discipline, chasten the orthodoxy, remind the mainstream of its purpose: the illumination of the actualizing personality. If and when psychology gets the point — and I think it's beginning to — the field will begin to right itself. In that sense, psychobiography and psychohistory might represent psychology's "return of the repressed."

Todd Schultz is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Pacific University in Forest Grove, Oregon (<schultz@pacificu.edu>), where he teaches, among other classes, psychobiography. He has written on James Agee, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Jack Kerouac, Truman Capote, and Roald Dahl. □

The Psychoanalytically-Informed Historian: Peter Gay

(Continued from page 33)

history from 1962-1969. From 1969 until his retirement in 1993, Gay taught Comparative and

Intellectual European History at Yale University, first as Duffie and then Sterling Professor. Throughout his distinguished career he has received many awards and fellowships, including six honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degrees.

Gay's numerous books include *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*, 2 vols. (New York: Knopf, 1966-1969); *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984-1986) and 3 vols. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993-1997); *Freud for Historians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); and *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988). Gay resides in Hamden, Connecticut.

Clio's Psyche (CP): Please tell us about your family, siblings and birth order, and age at parental loss.

Peter Gay (PG): I was the first and the last child. My father was a manufacturer's representative, which is not the same thing as a traveling salesman. He ran a firm in Berlin, which represented a number of manufacturers of china, glass, and crystal. He would deal with the large department stores. My mother was a housewife. My father died in January, 1955, when I was 32, and my mother died in 1977, when I was 54.

CP: Are there experiences from your early years in Germany that profoundly affected your life?

PG: I'm writing a memoir just about that. It's actually very largely done and should be out next year. I'm trying to deal with my life at home, and how my parents managed the advent of the Nazis. I was roughly nine-and-a-half when the Nazis came to power. That clearly made a big difference — it was very isolating and difficult to deal with because I was constantly being called names. It was also complicated by the fact that I continued in a school, or *gymnasium*, and stayed there for five years during that period, and on the whole had a pretty easy time of it.

My main positive experience was that my father was very active in providing all kinds of alternatives to brooding about what was happening in the newspapers or in the streets. He was a very impassioned soccer fan and so was I, and this meant that we had a lot to talk about and a lot of games to go to every Sunday. I'm going to devote a whole chapter to what I call survival strategies —

obviously things that I didn't know then but which I unconsciously dropped into to keep myself more or less sane by a number of preoccupations of which sports was the most important.

The other thing to be said about my father is that once he became particularly active in getting us out of the country, he did all kinds of illegal things to make it possible, taking big chances, all of which I very much appreciated and all of which worked. So, I think he looms very large in my mind, much larger than my mother who was more passive than he. He took the initiative. That was psychologically of great importance. I never rebelled against him in any particular way. Just one example: He was a village atheist of the most extreme kind, and so am I and have always been. Unlike so many people I know who as adolescents or grownups turned away in some way from their parents, this did not happen to me at all.

CP: You've completed your series, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud*?

PG: The fifth and final volume, *Pleasure War*, is ready — I've just sent back page proofs. It is shorter and some of the old material is very much cut down. To ask anyone to read all five volumes may be too much, so this final one repeats a number of the themes and restates them using examples the way Freud did on dreams — he took his *The Interpretations of Dreams* and cut the material way down. Also, I have much new material on cultural tastes; I am trying to reinterpret the notion many hold against the bourgeoisie. In the 19th century, the bourgeoisie participated in important cultural interchange. Many of them had excellent taste and were progressive in their taste. They supported not just the academic painters or composers, but were very alert to new developments. I call it a progress report.

CP: You're going to be working with the New York Public Library?

PG: I'll be starting officially September 1 as the director of a small think tank, a place that will give houseroom to about 15 people each year to work on either some particular topics or perhaps branch out from a general theme to be announced. It will be a common center for scholars and writers. I imagine anyone but a severe natural scientist could fit. I'm certainly not going to confine it to historians.

CP: How do you define *psychohistory*? Are you a *psychohistorian*?

PG: I haven't used that word for myself because, although it's very convenient, on the whole I've always thought that psychohistory has been excessively reductionist, giving too much weight, or causal importance, to certain inner experiences of whatever sort. So I've used this clumsy phrase of being a historian who is "oriented towards," or "influenced by," psychoanalysis.

I am a historian. I feel a little bit like Erikson who did not like the word *psychohistorian* and I can see why. I am a historian who uses psychoanalysis without forgetting that I am a historian. I have been very much interested in the outside world — the world of the ego. There is nothing unorthodox about that as far as Freud is concerned. Freud talked about history a great deal, though he never did any real history. He did, however, make it possible to do history from his point of view. One of the real problems is that analysts are not doing enough about the outside world. When I wrote my little book, *Freud for Historians*, there were two interesting reactions. One was that analysts had *no* reactions to my work and, second, that historians, on the whole, had none either! With the historians I understood this, because as a profession they are very ignorant about and hostile to psychoanalysis. In *Freud for Historians*, I tried to mobilize the objections to psychoanalytic history I could think of, and suggest that they could all be overcome. But, again and again historians have said, it's too much trouble, or the material is too rare or too difficult to come by, or the leaps that you make are too large. On the other hand, I would have thought that analysts might have picked it up as "applied analysis."

My argument over the years has been that Freud left us a much more general view of how things happen, so that presumably the external influences the ego has to deal with are of great importance. For example, he believed that the history of the Oedipus complex in each individual depends on schooling and reading and people around him, all of which are absorbed by the inner world so that there's a kind of steady exchange. In history, if you want to do a psychohistorical study of the French Revolution you can't just talk about parricide and rage boiling over and so on. All of these would be true but would not take account of such things as the bankruptcy of the French state, the loss of prestige of the French Crown, and the highly conflicted view of the various estates toward one another — all of which fed into the

French Revolution. I see the inner life as a rich amalgam of external influences and internal responses, or, rather, internal causal agents like the drives. So, although I'm very happy with psychoanalysis as an auxiliary science or discipline, it seems to me the historian has much more to do than just that.

I think of myself as a historian who has learnt a lot from psychoanalysis and who has not given up on what most of my colleagues were not at all interested in calling real history. I do not do a great deal of analysis, although I have done some dreamwork and have used, but only very rarely, psychoanalytic language. When I went into my psychoanalytic training, I never had any intention of becoming an analyst. I just thought that what analysis had to offer was the way people played their parts.

CP: Did you practice at all?

PG: No, but I did some interviewing. I went through the entire course as a research candidate and at the end I decided not to take the analytic route [to clinical practice]. I could have gotten a waiver, a "PhD" or an "MD," because I have some connections with the American Psychoanalytic. But I finally decided against it because it would have meant staying in New Haven eleven months of the year for years until I had my two or three patients done and I did not want to do that. It had been a lot of commitment just to do the six or seven years of the training and classes.

CP: What brought you to psychohistory? Your *Freud for Historians* was published fairly recently, in 1985.

PG: The interest goes back to 1950/1951 when I was just beginning to teach at Columbia in the Government Department, as I was working in the history of political ideas there. History was the discipline to which I moved. The first impetus came from an older colleague, Franz Neumann, who was a left-wing Marxist but open to other fields. Having been tied to the Frankfurt School he had some interest in Freud, but in 1950/1951 he, his wife, who was as smart as he was, and their best friend, Herbert Marcuse, who came from Washington, DC, to do this, started this serious course of reading on Freud. This aroused my interest. Neumann was very influential among his younger colleagues. So, from the very beginning I had an interest in psychoanalysis and as an amateur would try to think about how to deal with it and

how to use it. It certainly appears in a number of things I wrote, though it's not very prominent. Even my book on Weimar Germany, *Weimar Culture* (1968), has a number of psychoanalytic categories which are more or less invisible although they were in my mind. But it wasn't until the mid-1970s that I took professional training. So, it wasn't really until later than that that I really felt comfortable enough to write about it.

CP: Please tell us about your experience with collegial collaboration.

PG: One of the courses that I taught for several years was the famous Contemporary Civilization course, called "CC." It was a freshman course; each instructor had his own section. We would meet on Thursdays for lunch. We battled over our syllabus, or over what the final should look like. We spent a lot of time like that even though the departmental rewards were very limited. Then there came prosperity, conferences, and enormous emphasis on producing. Now, I do not think that I produced because I had to — I enjoyed it, I felt at home. But, more and more people would do their own work and not talk business at lunch anymore — just eat, maybe gossip, and then go back to work. Look at my situation with the Early American historian John Demos at Yale. I like him and I think he likes me. I once invited him to a graduate seminar where we were reading his *Entertaining Satan*. He made the students very familiar with the work and it was a very enjoyable evening. But did he and I otherwise sit down and talk about psychohistory? Virtually not at all. But I do not regard that as unusual. There is such an emphasis on rushing things out and protecting yourself that the old, more leisurely way of getting together has become pretty rare.

I have felt that the two fields, history and psychoanalysis, really fit together, but most of the time there is very little patience on either side. When analysts used to say, "Why don't you write something?", I would say, "Why don't *you* write something!" But I have done enough fighting. In the late 1960s there was a panel at a meeting of the American Psychoanalytic that dealt with group processes. The reporter said that this was the first panel on group processes that we had had in 28 years and he thought we should do this more often.

Another difficulty is the question of how you can structure a graduate program that would include psychohistory and that would be practical. I once actually wrote a lecture of how one might

even have a graduate program in which young historians interested in this would have dual training in history and in psychoanalysis right at the beginning in their mid- or late-twenties. But I never published it because it seemed to be not practicable. In part, not only because the training is so expensive, but also because the profession is so suspicious of it that you're not going to impress your colleagues. I always said to my students that if they wanted to be trained in psychoanalysis, I thought it would be a very good idea, but not to announce it at the beginning — their careers might very well be hampered. Rather, they should emphasize that they are historians of modern Germany or the Reformation or whatever, and then when they have tenure they can come out of the closet. This is unfortunate, but this is how the historical profession is.

CP: Why is dual training valuable?

PG: It seems to me fairly obvious that the psychoanalytic view of the human animal is the most fruitful psychology we've got. To have psychoanalysis as one of your instruments to search with or as one of your fundamental orientations towards individuals and collective experiences makes dual training very valuable. But psychoanalytic training is also very expensive and very difficult. Therefore, it's going to

Timothy McVeigh: A Preliminary Psychodynamic Sketch

Daniel Dervin
Mary Washington College (Emeritus)

"...a child any mother could be proud of"

Mrs. McVeigh's anguished courtroom plea to spare her son's life only added to the media's "unfathomable mystery" of the supposedly normal American boy and Army veteran who gravitated to anti-government militias until, in his words, he was transformed from "intellectual to animal" and to a monster according to Brandon Stickney, *All-American Monster: A Biography of Tim McVeigh* (1996). Around the poles of Mystery and Monster, public discourse and group fantasy promise to oscillate long after the "animal" has been put to sleep or the "monster" exterminated, as he is scheduled to be.

What has most painfully perplexed the country is not so much the magnitude of Timothy

McVeigh's crime (168 deaths, 21 of whom were small children) as its disproportionality. But if there is a rule of proportionality in political behavior, it is more often evident in its breach than in its observance. Alice Miller's study of Hitler's battered childhood demonstrates how closely it dovetails with his punitive policies toward the Jews as delegate victims, but we are still dumbfounded by the enormity of Hitler's crimes. In Friedrich Durrenmatt's *The Visit* (1953), the seduced and abandoned Claire returns to her native village and demands the life of her abuser, now the leading citizen. If not, she will ruin the community. Why? he asks. You turned me into a whore, she explains, so I will turn the world into a brothel. Once emotional terrain is entered, rational proportions fall by the wayside.

Yet there is no evidence that Timothy McVeigh was an abused child or was designated his mother's delegate, although a member of the defense team has suggested a dissociated personality disorder: "I'm convinced that he's two people. He has no idea what he's done." But McVeigh knew precisely *what* he was doing. He was quoted about timing the explosion for maximum body count and viewing the victims like storm troopers being mowed down in *Star Wars*: "They may be individually innocent," runs his friend Michael Fortier's paraphrase, "but because they are part of the evil empire, they are guilty by association." "Is a civil war imminent?" McVeigh wrote in 1992 to his hometown paper. "Do we have to shed blood to reform the current system? I hope it doesn't come to that! But it might." In addition, by linking his bombing to the anniversary of the FBI assault on Waco, McVeigh showed how clearly he had thought through his actions.

Nonetheless, the disproportions originate in his peculiar mental system; and, despite his nice-guy deportment around his attorneys, there is no reason to doubt that he conceived himself consciously as a moral avenger and, though driven by hate, found satisfaction in the pain he inflicted. Of course, he could be in touch with certain feelings but not others, and not with any of their sources. Nor would he have had to have been physically abused to suffer emotional trauma demanding redress.

In fact, a provisional psychodynamic profile may be attempted from the meager biographical data. The McVeighs, William and Mildred ("Mickill"), were married in 1965 and had two daughters with Tim in the middle, before

divorcing in 1986. William worked six-day weeks at the local auto plant, never took vacations, and, in Mildred's eyes, was a workaholic. His performance at the death sentence hearing was remarkably laconic. Instead of reading a heartfelt plea, as did Mildred, or speaking spontaneously, he avoided eye contact and showed family photos along with home movies. He answered the lawyer's questions: Does he still love Tim? "Yes, I do." Does he want him to stay alive? "Yes, I do." Asked about a photo, he replied, "It's a happy Tim ... always good-natured, fun, always fun to be with, always in a pretty good mood." This concern with mood management and with having his own needs met rather than (or at the expense of) his son's needs suggests William's detachment stemmed from chronic depression; his work dependency perhaps maintained him on a borderline level.

Before this central family dynamic provoked Mildred's flight from the family to Florida and her eventual remarriage, it set in motion some short-term acting-out. Mildred began hanging out in the local bowling alley and picking up men for one-night stands. Acquiring a reputation in town as a tramp, she may have been sending William a message, but he apparently never got it. When she cleared out, she took her younger daughter Jenny, leaving Pat and ten-year-old Tim behind. Mildred now assists on a bus that transports disturbed and disabled children.

The emotional devastation from the mother's departure and the family's breakup can only be inferred. Very likely, Tim's fascination with firearms began around this time and it, along with neighbors' recalling him as a nice boy, suggest splitting, fantasies of revenge, and an armory of defenses against helplessness. The fact that he never formed libidinal ties outside the family, but gravitated toward reconfigured families structured along lines of hierarchical power — the Army, militias — further point to a twofold trauma, in both the areas of self and of object-relations. His washing-out from Special Forces training after having acquitted himself well in the 1991 Persian Gulf War may have re-enacted the family trauma of rejection and loss and elicited more extreme measures in the militia fringe.

In his family's complex sequence of action and reaction, an emotional cause and effect process may be reconstructed. Extrapolating from her high-visibility flings, his mother's departure would have registered as more than emotional

abandonment: her serial lovers played out as repeated Oedipal betrayals in which the father's inadequacies disallowed Tim an emotional support system for empathy and identification. Instead, more regressive, grandiose fantasies revolving around magical weaponry were entertained. Presenting himself as a good hometown boy had little impact in bringing back the lost mom, who may also have been too absorbed in her unmet needs to attend to her son's distress. Consequently, Tim's sufferings of multiple Oedipal defeats were compounded by narcissistic mortifications — a lethal mix which in his case apparently fueled schemes of grandiose anti-government sabotage and paranoid revenge. When the need to send a message became overwhelming, he would have his mother's antisocial acting-out for a model.

Of course, factoring in McVeigh's personal history with his violent behavior severely qualifies notions that he knew what he was doing. To probe further into the dynamics of his quasi-delusional system, one would need to plumb the basis for his affiliation with the Waco "wacko," David Koresh, whose sacrifice he would both avenge and replicate.

Two other features of this psychodynamic sketch can only be roughed in until more information is available. One is the disparity between McVeigh's carefully planned and executed bombing and his expeditious arrest for driving without license plates. His lack of remorse and failure to display any emotional concern during the trial is certainly significant, but does it imply absence of guilt? Or does his getting himself arrested indicate an acted-out level of guilt-feelings with a need for punishment? His single emotional display during his brief span of public exposure occurred when his mother spoke on the stand. Then "he pressed his hands tightly against his cheeks and wiped the corner of his eye" (*Washington Post*, June 12, 1997). This venting/suppressing of tears is also significant, but highly ambiguous. Did Tim's parents and sisters visit him during his confinement? I have come across no such account; in fact his younger sister and confidant had testified against him. Assuming there were no visits, then the death penalty hearing would have been the first time the family was reunited since its breakup eleven years ago.

Could this reunion have been cathartic for the stoic trooper-turned-terrorist because it was a bizarre fulfillment of his childhood wishes aroused

in the traumatic aftermath of the parents' divorce? If there were reparative wishes, there were also hostile ones to bring the parents in and make them see what they had done to him and how powerful he had proved himself to be? His family's performance on his behalf that day was most likely, on some profound level, an enactment. As more of their troubled lives come to light we will be in a better position to fit together the grotesquely refracted images from Tim McVeigh's childhood and inner world reassembled and played out on the courtroom stage.

Daniel Dervin, PhD, Professor Emeritus at Mary Washington College, is the author of numerous publications including Enactments: Modes and Psychohistorical Models (1996) and Matricentric Narratives: Recent British Women's Fiction in a Postmodern Mode (1997). □

The Way It Was, and Wasn't, 1947-1957: The Dodgers of Brooklyn

**Melvin Kalfus
Florida Atlantic University
Lifelong Learning Program**

Essay review of Carl E. Prince, Brooklyn's Dodgers: the Bums, the Borough, and the Best of Baseball. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. ISBN 0-19-509927-3, i-xiv, 202 pages, \$23.00 (\$12.95, softcover).

Carl Prince is both a fan and a historian of considerable distinction. As a result, he has produced a remarkable book which offers great insight into a number of important subjects related to the sport and the business of baseball, a book that is always fun and often provocative. Do not, however, anticipate yet another nostalgic re-telling of "The Boys of Summer" saga. Prince offers us pretty much the same cast of characters, but he looks past the afterglow and the myths and lays bare the reality of this great Dodger team in the context of its social, gender, and political milieu.

The decade Prince has selected to write about began, of course, with Jackie Robinson's first year with the Dodgers, when the team — under the ownership of and with the will of Branch Rickey — broke the "color line" and brought about the integration of major league baseball. In a book that is chock-a-block with colorful, fascinating, and controversial characters, Jackie Robinson

stands out as the most formidable and complex individual in baseball during that historic era. Indeed, Robinson himself is the perfect nexus for three of the topics that most concern Prince: major league baseball as a part of the male culture of the fifties; baseball as a vehicle for the militant anti-Communist culture of those years; and the relationship between owners and the ballplayers whose careers they totally controlled during the era of the monopolistic reserve clause.

Prince reminds us that the decade of the Dodgers' greatness — 1947-1957 — was also the era of the Cold War, the Korean War, and McCarthyism. It was an era that believed “nice guys finish last” and imposed macho masculinity both on and off the ballfield — when “playing hardball” was a way of life. To “stick it in his ear” meant that you not only wanted to defeat your opponent but you also wanted to destroy him. To win, you attacked your opponent's manhood: physically, with your spikes high as you slid into second; and verbally, for trash talk wasn't invented on the basketball courts but by baseball's “bench jockeys.”

It is Prince's thesis that a major reason Robinson succeeded both in the role of Branch Rickey's integrationist point man and the Dodgers' premier money player was because Robinson epitomized *both* the macho male social culture and the militant anti-Communist political culture of the era. A recent biographical article on Robinson took note of Jackie's “hyperactive, aggressive, full-throttle approach to the game.” (Kenneth Shouler, “Here's To You, Mr. Robinson,” *A&E Biography*, July 1991, pp. 54-60.) As Prince observes, Robinson regularly “challenged the manhood” of players on the other team, especially the New York Giants and most especially team manager Leo Durocher (himself a master of the art). Interestingly, both Shouler and Prince employ the same incident as an example of Robinson's approach to the game (Shouler, pp. 59-60, and Prince, pp. 50-51).

During the 1955 season, Giants pitcher Sal “the Barber” Maglie was regularly “sticking it” in the ear of the Dodger stars with beanball pitches. Robinson, a burly, former college football star, tried to retaliate by bunting down the first base line, planning to crush Maglie with a body block as he covered first. Instead, he nailed the smallish second baseman, Davey Williams, who suffered a serious spine injury that nearly ended his career. Prince asserts that Robinson, running head down,

didn't know it was Williams he was leveling until after the play is over. Shouler is less sure. He cites Giants' star Monte Irvin, another great player from the Negro League. Irvin called Robinson's play “a cheap shot,” adding that many of the problems Jackie suffered were those he created for himself because of “his aggressive, abrasive nature.” But Shouler also cites Jackie's former teammate Ben Wade who asserted that the problems Robinson experienced were “for no other reason than he was black.” Prince ultimately embraces both these points of view, making clear that Robinson would have been a target no matter what his attitude, but that his natural acceptance and embodiment of baseball's macho male culture added to his problems even while making it possible for him to triumph in the end. In psychohistorical terms, Robinson was a delegate — for his teammates, for the Brooklyn fans, for African-Americans throughout the country, and for the macho American male culture of his time.

Another way Robinson served as a delegate, Prince's argument makes clear, was through his militant anti-Communist beliefs. Later a Nixon Republican, Robinson (at Branch Rickey's behest) appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1949. He was invited there to respond to Paul Robeson's allegation that “African-Americans would never fight for, or shed their blood in, a war against the Soviet Union.” But, anti-Communist though he was, Robinson had larger purposes than merely serving as a foil against Robeson. Prince writes: “strip away his tepid criticism of Robeson, and what remains is an impassioned demand for social justice that was pure Robinson (p. 37).” Prince adds that Jackie later came to regret even his mild denunciation of Robeson and to feel that his own belief in the inevitability of social justice for the African-American from the dominant white political culture had been betrayed. Again, psychohistorians will see in Prince's painstaking and empathetic treatment of Robinson's “double bind” the ways in which one can be bound as delegate. Psychohistorians know the personal price that can be paid when a one is caught between the conflicting group fantasies of the various societal segments for whom one is serving as a delegate. Robinson died at the very young age of 53 from a diabetes-induced heart attack after becoming blind and barely able to walk.

There is so much else to recommend Prince's book. For one thing, the fascinating

character of Branch Rickey, in some ways a Neanderthal conservative, in other ways a moral man of conscience and conviction, and always a miser who exploited his ballplayers. Rickey traded away established Dodger stars like Dixie Walker, racists who would not accept Robinson as a teammate, but he could do so because he could replace them out of farm system well-stocked with players kept in the penurious slave system called the reserve clause (a clause in each player's contract that gave the club exclusive rights to his services for the entire life of his playing career.) Prince demonstrates that Rickey, like the justifiably-despised Walter O'Malley after him, was not above using a willing sports press to destroy the reputations of Dodger stars like Duke Snider, Billy Loes, and Don Newcombe in order to help keep their salaries in line.

Prince has shrewd observations to offer also on the role of women in the macho male-dominated baseball culture. There were the "baseball annies" of the sort that shot Phillies star Eddie Waitkus in a hotel room (if you don't remember the incident, rent *The Natural* again). There were the madly-devoted female fans such as

the one-of-a-kind, poverty-stricken Hilda Chester, who became the media symbol of the wacky, abrasive Brooklyn fans. (Chester deserves immortality for her exquisite ridicule of the racist Eddie Stanky, as fondly recalled by Prince.) And there were the players' wives, who had to endure being patronized by management, press, and fans alike.

Prince also offers insights into the special role played by the Dodgers in binding together the self-segregated neighborhoods of the various ethnic groups that populated post-War Brooklyn (Irish, Italian, Jewish, African-American, etc.), often serving as the vehicle for the "Americanization" of second-generation youngsters. Indeed, Prince feels that the club's move from Brooklyn to Los Angeles (master-minded by O'Malley) was one of several factors that contributed to the explosive, divisive Brooklyn of the sixties and seventies.

Prince correctly points out that for all of its evils, the reserve clause helped to make major league teams such psychically-binding forces within the local communities, since it kept teams intact for a decade or more at a time — the

PSICOLOGÍA POLÍTICA

An International Journal of Political Psychology

Psicología Política is a new, semi-annual journal dedicated to the psychological analysis of political phenomena with special attention to the problems of political culture, collective action, and the environment. Major objectives of the journal are to disseminate knowledge about political psychology and to facilitate scientific exchange among scientists in related disciplines. Above all, the journal presents a forum for theoretical debate among scientists from a variety of disciplines and from different geographic regions who are interested in furthering an understanding of the relationship between psychology and political phenomena. **Psicología Política** uses a flexible format to present social scientific scholarship in a variety of forms. As an outlet for political psychology from different countries, **Psicología Política is published in Spanish with English abstracts.** Manuscripts are invited; send inquiries or manuscripts to an editor. Manuscripts are accepted in Spanish, English, Italian, French, or German. Advisory Board members are **M. Garrido** - University of C. Madrid, **K. Gergen** - Swarthmore College, **J. Giner** - University of Sevilla, **E. Ibáñez** - University of Valencia, and **M. Brewster Smith** - University of California at Santa Cruz.

Adela Garzón, Editor
University of Valencia, Spain
e-mail: garzon@uv.es

Julio Seoane, Associate Editor
University of Valencia, Spain
e-mail: seoane@uv.es

Ronald Dillehay, Associate Editor
University of Nevada
e-mail: Dillehay@unssun.nevada.edu
Grant Sawyer Center, 313
University of Nevada, Reno, NV
89557 USA
Fax: 1-702-784-6271

Psicología Política

C/ Bachiller, 27. 46010-Valencia, Spain

Fax: 34-96-3731011 or 34-96-3726383

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

Foreign One Year - 3,500 pesetas (about \$23) Foreign Single Issue - 1,800 pesetas (about \$12)

Foreign subscription is easy: Send to the Spanish address above a check in Spanish currency or a bank transfer made out to No. 0093-0130-85-0000073934, Banco Valencia, Agencia 30, name "**Psicología Política**".

Yankees of the thirties, forties, and fifties, for example. One recognizes, then, the irony that arises from the Rickey-Robinson integration of baseball. For Prince accurately reports that some of the opposition to Robinson was not racist, but economic. White ballplayers feared the competition from black players for the relatively few major league berths. But, we can now see, it was the influx of a huge pool of talented black players that enabled the leagues to expand and made inevitable the death of the reserve clause, thus making millionaires of journeyman .250 hitters and billionaires of the endlessly greedy owners whose morality is far more dubious than that of the protean Branch Rickey.

A terrific, and wonderfully provocative, book!

Melvin Kalfus, PhD, currently teaches in the Lifelong Learning Program of Florida Atlantic University and serves as president of his synagogue in Boca Raton, FL. His research interests include American and Jewish history, Theodore Herzl and Richard Wagner. Professor Kalfus' book on Frederick Law Olmstead was published by New York University Press in 1990. He is a past president of the International

Psychohistorical Association and a member of the Advisory Council of the Psychohistory Forum. As a Giants fan in his youth he gloried in the pennant victory in 1951 and respected Jackie Robinson for his integrationist achievements, but despised him as a player. It has taken time and perspective for him to shed the adolescent rivalries and come to admire Robinson and the great Brooklyn teams of the post-World War II era. □

Bulletin Board

FORTHCOMING PSYCHOHISTORY FORUM PRESENTATIONS: On **September 27** (Saturday) **George Victor** (private practice) will present on Hitler's masochism and on **November 15** (Saturday) **Michael Flynn** (Center on Violence and Human Survival) will present "Apocalyptic Hope — Apocalyptic Thinking." The tentative Saturday schedule for 1998 is **Nellie Thompson** (Brill Library and psychoanalytic practice), "Women Psychoanalysts: Bonaparte and Horney," on **January 31**; **Vivian Rosenberg** (Drexel University), **Paul Elovitz**, et al, "Empathy and Its Limits" on **March 7**; **John Hartman** (University of Michigan and private practice), "A

Psychoanalytic Theory of Propaganda: Hitler and the Jews" on **April 11**; and **Eva Fogelman** (CUNY Graduate Center and private practice), "The Rescuer Self" in September. **CONFERENCES:** **David Lee** of UCLA presented a paper, "Oskar Pfister's (1873-1956) Transatlantic Psychoanalytic Connection," at the 29th Annual Conference of the International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences held in June at the University of Richmond in Virginia. He also presented on Pfister in August in Budapest. The **Association for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society** is holding a conference on Aggressivity and Violence in Washington, DC, on November 6-8. (See the notice of the APCS's journal at the bottom of this page.) On December 14 (Sunday) the Training Institute for Mental Health is sponsoring at Mount Sinai Hospital the **Milton Kestenberg Holocaust Memorial Conference** on "Reparations and the Holocaust: Political, Monetary and Psychological Dynamics." It is in the Stern Auditorium and the entrance fee is \$25. **CONDOLENCES:** To David Beisel on the death of his mother. **BIRTHS:** Congratulations to **Mustafa Ziyalan** and his wife, also a psychiatrist, on the recent birth of their daughter, Elvan Su. Dr. Ziyalan is an attending psychiatrist at the outpatient clinic of the Department of Psychiatry of the Staten Island University as well as on the faculty of New York University. **TRAVEL:** **Eva Fogelman, John**

Hartman, and Peter Loewenberg were some of the members of the Forum community who attended the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP) July conference in Poland. Recently **Mel and Alma Kalfus** took a Caribbean cruise. This summer, **Ted Cox** spent two weeks in Paris and four in Ireland. **NEW**

Immigrant Experiences

The book, *Immigrant Experiences: Personal Narrative and Psychological Analysis*, ISBN 0838636918, 289 pages, \$43.50, was published in August by Fairleigh Dickinson Press, Cranbury, NJ. The book, edited by Paul H. Elovitz and Charlotte Kahn, is the outgrowth of the Psychohistory Forum's Immigration Psychodynamics Research and Publication Project begun in 1990. Rudolph Binion of Brandeis University writes about the book:

Ours is a nation of immigrants increasingly ambivalent toward new immigrants. We cannot properly deal with the resultant issues in our public life or private lives without understanding the immigrant experience itself. This simple fact makes indispensable reading of *Immigrant Experiences*, which is

Awards in Psychohistory

Bauer, Bernabei, Elovitz, Kalbache, Lorenz, and Schmidt Prizes. Awarded at the IPA's annual convention for the best presentations in designated categories. Contact Henry Lawton, <hwlipa@aol.com>.

CORST Essay Prize • The deadline is September 15, 1997, for this annual \$1,000 award for essays on psychoanalytically-informed research in the bio-behavioral sciences, arts, or humanities, sponsored by the American Psychoanalytic Association's Committee on Research and Special Training (CORST). The publishable-quality essays should be 30 pages in length. Contact Dr. Deanna Holtzman, Chair, CORST, American Psychoanalytic Association, 309 East 49th St., New York, NY 10017.

Sidney Halpern Awards • The Psychohistory Forum offers prizes to students and mature scholars for the "Best Psychohistorical Idea in a Research Paper or a Published Article or Book." Contact Professor Paul H. Elovitz c/o The Psychohistory Forum (see page 34).

Langer Prize • The Group for the Use of Psychology in History (GUPH) annually awards this prize of \$400 for the best article in *The Psychohistory Review*. Contact Professor Larry Shiner, University of Illinois at Springfield, Springfield, IL 62794-9243.

Robert Stoller Foundation Essay Prizes • The Foundation will announce on September 15, 1997, the winners of two \$1,000 essay prizes, one pre-doctoral, the other post-doctoral, for publishable-

PUBLICATIONS: *Immigrant Experiences*, the Psychohistory Forum-sponsored book, was published in August (see notice, this page). **Rudolph Binion's** newest book, *Sounding the Classics: From Sophocles to Thomas Mann* also appeared in August (hardback by Greenwood, paperback by Praeger). **Nellie Thompson** will be the North American Editor of the new publication, *Psychoanalysis and History*, published in London. **Jerrold Atlas** has announced the forthcoming publication of the *Psychohistorical Quarterly*. **WELCOME** to new members **Garth W. Amundson, Eva Fogelman, and John J. Hartman.** **OUR THANKS** to our members and friends for the support which makes **Clio's Psyche** possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, Ralph Colp, and Anonymous; Sustaining Members Alberto Fergusson, William K. Joseph, and Peter Petschauer; Supporting Members Rudolph Binion, Florian Galler, Robert Pois, H. John Rogers; and Contributing Members, Suzanne Adrion, Garth W. Amundson, Joyce Berkman, Geoffrey Cocks, David Felix, Eva Fogelman, John J. Hartman, Harry Keyishian, Bob Lentz, Peggy McLaughlin, Richard Morrock, H. John Rogers, Vivian Rosenberg, Johan Schioldann-Nielsen, J. Lee Shneidman, and Richard Weiss. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Mark Bracher, Andrew Brink, Lloyd deMause, Daniel Dervin, David Felix, John Fitzpatrick, Peter Gay, Jonathan Goldberg, Mel Kalfus, Thomas Kohut, Peter Loewenberg, Jeffrey Prager, Todd Schultz, Nellie Thompson, Richard Weiss, and Victor Wolfenstein. Appreciation to Michele O'Donnell for proofreading and to Anna Lentz and Gary Schmidt for their assistance in producing this periodical. □

This brings up some issues of the business of psychoanalysis, psychoanalysts as business people, and the business person as psychoanalyst.

Liberal arts professors are disinclined to see themselves as business people. Yet, the reality of becoming a private practice psychoanalyst is that one is in business for one's self. This business becomes increasingly complex as therapists confront the increasing intrusiveness of health insurance programs and managed care. (A number of psychoanalysts refuse to fill out forms or reports for insurance companies.) The individual who introduced me to psychoanalysis made his mark in business before earning his PhD in history and undertaking psychoanalytic training. Sidney Halpern enjoyed helping others and aspired to be a psychoanalyst. He soon discovered that he could not maintain a proper psychoanalytic distance from his patients since he wanted to help them immediately. The demands on his time from the large company he had started were enormous and it was hard for him to take time from his own business for the analytic practice. As is the case for a number of other psychoanalytic candidates that I have known from all fields, but especially from business, he dropped out of training. But Halpern's business experience also served the development of psychoanalysis since I once noted that he was listed as "Business Manager" for *American Imago*, a psychoanalytic publication.

People coming from a business background sometimes put a premium on action, decisiveness, and time management which can be the wrong mindset for long-term psychotherapeutic endeavors. I'm reminded of a psychoanalytic candidate with whom I worked in the Clinic. This capable man, who was a vice president of a New York bond company, lacked patience with poorly motivated clients. Though he had already invested over four years in training, it was clear to me that this was not the field for him. His need to help others was better expressed by mentoring younger business colleagues and by volunteering at his local ambulance core. Both of these endeavors were much more emotionally rewarding to him than working through the initial resistances of poorly motivated clients at the Low Cost Clinic.

For others, a business background can be useful, as Peter Balo found when he went into psychological counselling after a career in business and engineering. (Balo's autobio-graphical article is scheduled to appear in our next issue.) Also, one of my teachers in psychoanalytic training came

from business, something which was always apparent to me because his personal style was so different than the styles of my other teachers who came from psychology, social work, literature, and nursing. He was a salesman with a habit of mind of a salesman. This was partly why he became a popular instructor, because he seemed always to be selling himself as an effective analyst, teacher, and "control analyst" who could help psychoanalytic candidates build up their practices. Fortunately, the rules of most institutes limit how many candidates can be in control analysis with one supervisor, though these are not always effectively enforced.

-

•

But at Yale, the psychoanalytic and psychohistorical climate was not nearly as fertile within the history department as at UCLA. This may be part of the reason why he chose to get his analytic training late in his career, when his reputation was totally secured. To do this he had to go to a Connecticut psychoanalytic institute with no affiliation with Yale. **[Paul, the following through the end of the paragraph repeats from the Gay interview — would delete and refer readers to the interview.]** When he thought of writing a proposal for a training program in psychoanalysis for history graduate students, he decided against it because of the cost and a climate among historians that he perceived as too hostile. He feels it is probably too dangerous to the career of a young historian to openly be identified with psychoanalysis. He is not comfortable with the term *psychohistory*, which is also true of Erik Erikson, John Demos, and some others who have made great contributions. Gay commented to me that John Demos and he never really discussed psychohistory though as colleagues in the same department they had amiable relations.

As an emeritus professor Peter Gay is now applying his considerable talents to establishing a think tank at New York Public Library. As in the case of Lifton, whose excellent center we have brought to our readers attention in these pages, the special insights which Gay brings from his psychoanalytic perspective will not be highlighted as psychohistory. There is much to be said for an indirect approach — mainly, that there is less resistance to overcome. Yet clearly, because of the institution-building at UCLA, the prospects for the long-term flowering of psychohistory in California are better than in Connecticut, from which the Yale innovators have dispersed. I will leave it to the reader to decide if these better prospects in Los Angeles than New Haven are more a function of different approaches or primarily the openness of California to all sorts of innovations and the relative conservatism of the faculty at one of the country's oldest and finest universities.

•

**THE MAKERS OF PSYCHOHISTORY
RESEARCH PROJECT**

To write the history of psychohistory, the Forum is interviewing the founders of our field to create a record of their challenges and accomplishments. It welcomes participants who will help identify, interview, and publish accounts of the founding of psychohistory.