

---

---

# Clio's Psyche

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

---

Volume 5, Number 4

March, 1999

---

## Academia, Psychoanalysis, and Psychohistory

17 Authors Explore the Special Relationship

---

### Special Session on Understanding the Impact of Impeachment

On Saturday, March 6, in Manhattan, the Psychohistory Forum will have a special session in which a distinguished panel will tackle such difficult questions as: "What will be the impact of impeaching William Jefferson Clinton on the politics,

### The Prospects for Psychohistory and Psychoanalysis

Paul H. Elovitz

The Psychohistory Forum and Ramapo College

It is easy to be quite optimistic or pessimistic about psychoanalysis and psychohistory and their relationship to academia. Let us first examine some of the facts and

### IN THIS ISSUE

#### Academia, Psychoanalysis, and Psychohistory

The Prospects for Psychohistory and Psychoanalysis .. 117  
*Paul H. Elovitz*

My Experiences in Academia and Psychoanalysis . 124  
*John J. Hartman*

A Freudian in Middle American Academia..... 125  
*Tod Sloan*

Psychoanalysis in the APA..... 126  
*Spyros D. Orfanos*

What It Takes to Be A Psychoanalyst ..... 127  
*Sander Breiner*

Why Was Freud So Hung-Up on Sex? ..... 128  
*Daniel Dervin*

Research as Autobiography ..... 131  
*Hilary Clark*

Why I Left Academia: Psychoanalyst as Artist.. 132  
*Jonathan Goldberg*

Impossible Knowledge: Teaching Psychoanalysis . 133  
*Susan Varney*

Biography and the Use of Psychoanalysis ..... 134  
*Linda Simon*

On the Margins of Psychohistory ..... 135  
*Peter Petschauer*

Pioneering Psychohistory in Kansas..... 136  
*George Kren*

From Erikson to Lacan in Chinese History ..... 137  
*Lung-kee Sun*

A Conversation in Praise of the Subjective ..... 138  
*Charles Fred Alford*

An Australian Psychohistory Group ..... 139  
*Lyn Baker*

A Psychohistorian in New Zealand..... 140  
*Norman Simms*

Psychoanalysis and Academia in the U.K..... 142  
*Robert Maxwell Young*

Understanding the Impact of Impeachment ..... 117

The Dual Character of a President Impeached..... 144  
*Aubrey Immelman*

An American in Amsterdam: Arthur Mitzman ..... 146  
*David D. Lee*

Showalter on Hysterical Diseases ..... 150  
*Book Review by David Lotto*

Analysts on the Couch: Part III: John Bowlby..... 152  
*Review Essay by Andrew Brink*

Roots of the Jonesboro Schoolyard Killings:  
Envy of the Feminine ..... 155  
*Garth W. Amundson*

Good Parenting in the 14th Century:  
Christine de Pisan..... 158  
*Norman Simms*

interpretations supporting optimism. Of late, psychoanalysts have been inclining to affiliate with the world of the university or to announce their presence within it. For example, the University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium has many talented colleagues who meet periodically. Lacanians have been spreading their version of psychoanalysis in the groves of academia with considerable success, especially in English departments. The *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society (JPCS)* is now being published by the University of Ohio Press. *Psycho Culture* is a newsletter which began being published in 1997 at Teachers College of Columbia University. *Applied Psychoanalysis* is a new journal announced by the Menninger Foundation. The proliferation of psychohistorical publications has been so rapid that **Clio's Psyche's** "Publishing in Psychohistory Special Issue" (June, 1996) is obsolete because of the recent creation of *Psychoanalysis and History*, *Tapestry*, *JPCS*, *Psychoanalytic Studies*, *Applied Psychoanalysis*, and other publications. There are now over ten psychohistorical publications in addition to older ones in applied psychoanalysis such as *American Imago* which is published by Johns Hopkins University Press. While psychohistory organizations and publications are not usually affiliated with academia, they are thriving and influencing the academy. There are many signs of vitality, growth, and creativity.

The pessimistic approach is that some psychoanalysts are reaching out for an academic lifeboat in desperation. Psychoanalysts are losing their practices in this age of biological determinism, managed care, and miracle drugs. Psychohistorians never had more than a toehold in the university and that will soon be lost as an older generation dies or retires. Lacanians and deMausians are talking to themselves more than anyone else, psychoanalysis is mostly a big city phenomenon, and psychohistory is mostly just a New York and West Coast phenomenon. Even *The Psychohistory Review*, the most academically respectable of the psychohistory journals, last year was debating closing down after 28 years of being published by the University of Illinois and its predecessor.

Regular readers of these pages will have no doubt that I stand with the optimists rather than the pessimists, but that I do not ignore the problems. Over a dozen scholars in **Clio Psyche's** "Dual Training in Psychoanalysis and History, Literature,

or Another Academic Discipline Special Issue" (September, 1997) demonstrated the enormous benefits to the academic in terms of insight and methodology stemming from psychoanalytic training.

This issue builds on the "Dual Training" one. In it, seventeen authors reflect on important questions related to the marriage of psychohistory/psychoanalysis to academia. Seven of them are from literary backgrounds, four from history, three from psychology, one from psychiatry, and -- with double and triple counting -- three from psychoanalysis and four from therapy. They are about equally divided between having a primary commitment to psychohistory or to psychoanalysis -- several with a strong commitment to both and only one sees herself as neither. Thirteen are men and four are women, with all but one of the women being in literature. Three of the authors are Lacanians, presenting a view which has only recently appeared in this publication, who responded to an open invitation on the Internet.

These authors have both very similar and dissimilar experiences and sometimes hold very different viewpoints on a diversity of related subjects. The first two, Hartman and Sloan, are psychologists who have been affiliated with the University of Michigan, one as a professor, the other as a graduate student. John Hartman came to Michigan from Harvard's famed Social Relations Department. He specialized in group work, but later trained as a psychoanalyst and now works primarily doing individual analysis. He reports Michigan to be less amenable to psychoanalysis than when he arrived there. Tod Sloan feels somewhat isolated teaching in a traditional, anti-psychoanalytic psychology department in Oklahoma. The Internet appears to help connect him to a larger community of Lacanians and lessened his feelings of isolation.

Spyros Orfanos, President-Elect of the 4000 member-strong Division of Psychoanalysis of the 155,000 member American Psychological Association, is a talented advocate for psychoanalysis who warns against the mutual derisiveness which leads many psychology text book writers to refer to psychoanalysis as "a failed 19th century form of treatment with a dubious scientific basis" and some analysts to call academic psychologists "rat psychologists." With such mutual disdain is it any wonder why the great majority of psychoanalytic programs are in non-academically affiliated institutes? Like so many

practicing clinicians, he loves to teach and adjuncts at several colleges.

For decades I have noted a strong interest in analysis and psychohistory in the State of Michigan and especially the Detroit area. John Hartman, Alexander Grinstein, Lloyd deMause (who long ago left his home state for Manhattan), and Sander Breiner are the first four names which come to mind when I think of Michigan's contribution to psychohistorical knowledge. Breiner is a psychiatrist/psychoanalyst of enormous energy and a broad range of interests. He is part of a psychiatric tradition which stems back to the time when American medical doctors had a near monopoly on psychoanalysis despite the admonitions of Freud himself who strongly believed in lay (non-medical) analysis. In

discussing his view of the requirements for becoming a psychoanalyst, Breiner recognizes that medical knowledge is quite secondary to other training and attributes.

Psychologists wishing to practice psychoanalysis successfully challenged the psychiatric monopoly, but usually their organizations used regulatory and legal means to pull the ladder up after themselves. Yet by the time I trained in psychoanalysis the majority of candidates (students) were from social work with a sprinkling of those from academia, nursing, the clergy, and business. And overwhelmingly they were women. A master's or doctoral degree and a suitable personality were the minimal requirements for applicants.

In late January, a reference librarian at the 42nd Street Branch of the New York Public Library asked me, "Should psychohistory be listed under history or psychology?" I responded with the pros and cons of listing either way or separately. The understandable impulse to lump psychohistory under either psychology or history is perhaps unfortunate for at least two reasons.

First, most working psychohistorians are in neither psychology nor history departments, but are rather spread throughout the academic and clinical worlds -- and beyond. At my college, the colleagues I happen to know of who trained as psychoanalysts come from counseling (two), history, philosophy (two), political science, psychology, and theater (now deceased). Like most psychoanalysts, few of them have demonstrated much interest in applying their psychological insights beyond their patient population. When all but one of them does think psychoanalytically beyond patients, it is usually to literary characters and seldom, if at all, to psychohistory.

Second, psychohistory has taken on a life of its own. It is a hybrid that is often a part of, but more than, history, psychology, politics, literature, sociology, and so forth. Trying to fit psychohistory under any one disciplinary umbrella is too limiting at best, and, at worst, the single discipline approach becomes a Procrustean bed. People write valuable psychohistory from many different perspectives.

The four historians writing for this issue are a varied lot with many things in common. Our specialties are Chinese, English, European, and German history. George Kren and Peter

## Clio's Psyche

Vol. 5, No. 4

March, 1999

ISSN 1080-2622

**Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum**

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

e-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

**Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, 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 Jeansonne, PhD** University of Wisconsin • **George Kren, PhD** Kansas State University • **Peter Loewenberg, PhD** UCLA • **Peter Petschauer, PhD** Appalachian State University • **Leon Rappoport, PhD** Kansas State University □

### Advisory Council of the Psychohistory Forum

**John Caulfield, MDiv**, 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: \$10

We welcome articles of psychohistorical interest that are 300 - 1500 words.

Copyright © 1999 The Psychohistory Forum

Petschauer were born in Austria and Germany, respectively, and Lung-kee Sun, in China. All are academics teaching in the U.S., one each in the Midwest (Kansas), the South (North Carolina), a border state (Tennessee), and the Northeast (New Jersey). Our senior member is George Kren who, together with his colleague Leon Rappoport of the Psychology Department at Kansas State University, instituted a path-breaking graduate program in psychohistory in the 1980s. Unfortunately, like most new ventures, it failed. In retrospect, its founders believe that its Achilles' heel was a lack of financial support for graduate students. In the process of attempting it, Kren and Rappoport had a stimulating collaboration which has continued down to the present time.

Peter Petschauer writes of his sense of psychohistorical marginality as a historian who lives away from the main areas where psychohistorians live, meet, talk, and research. He relates this marginality partly to being unable to teach psychohistory as a part of his normal course load. This admired psychohistorian, scholar, and leader astutely realizes that this marginality is part of the self-image of a German who was raised in Italy by people who were not his parents, a boy who attended boarding schools, a teenage "immigrant in New York, and as a Yankee in the South." In this editor's mind he has always been in the mainstream of psychohistory and I know that I was not alone in feeling disappointed that he chose to step away from the path he was on which would have taken him to the presidency of the International Psychohistorical Association. His university and the readers of his valuable books are really the beneficiaries of this decision.

My own experience as a professor at a small public liberal arts college in New Jersey may not be very different than Peter Petschauer's at a state university, but my perspective is certainly different in that I feel less marginalized in the psychohistorical community. While having to teach almost entirely out of my area of specialized research and publication, I focus on how much these, and my analytic training, enrich what I do teach as well as all of my interactions with students. But if I lived far from the land of my birth (in fact I was born a New Englander, barely 75 miles away from where I live and teach) and if I did not have a psychohistorical friend with whom I meet on a weekly basis, or if I did not run psychohistory meetings in Manhattan on a regular basis, than perhaps I would share Petschauer's sense of marginality. I do know that the two-and-

one-half decades of sustained effort I have devoted to developing a psychohistorical community at the Institute for Psychohistory, the International Psychohistorical Association, the Psychohistory Forum and around **Clio's Psyche**, have served many of my own psychic needs as well as those of the psychohistorical communities I have sought to nurture. The work of many psychohistorical scholars and organizers has created a dynamic psychosocial paradigm for many drawn from both the margins and the mainstream.

While a graduate student, Lung-kee Sun was excited by the possibilities of psychohistory by the work of Lucian Pyle and Richard Solomon. The severe criticism by other China specialists their work was subjected to discouraged him, but did not eliminate this interest. With the recent emergence of Lacanian scholarship, Professor Sun has found a new community of scholars with whom to dialogue. Could it be that, like many others before him, he will also find a second community of psychological knowledge with the Psychohistory Forum?

Political scientists have flocked to the International Society for Political Psychology and have increasingly taken leadership positions that previously were occupied by clinicians or academic psychologists. They are a large, important group of academicians who base their political psychology on many sources including psychoanalysis. I thought it important that this group have some representation in this issue, and Charles Fred Alford agreed to be interviewed. He makes the unsettling point that as academic psychoanalysis thrives, "its clinical practice is disappearing" and speculates upon the causal connection. Clearly, he values psychoanalysis for its subjective quality.

Jonathan Goldberg was a humanities teacher who reports leaving academia 28 years ago because he felt it moving away from a humanistic base towards a scientific one he deplors in the humanities. Like Alford, he focuses on the need to emphasize the subjective. He makes his living as a Jungian analyst and psychotherapist, deploring the tendency for psychotherapists to justify their existence by "a pseudo-scientific theory of what works."

Seven of our authors did their graduate training in literature and it is precisely in the field of literary studies that psychoanalysis is most openly accepted at many institutions of higher learning. Daniel Dervin, an erudite and prolific

psychohistorian, both highlights the differences -- he calls psychoanalysis and academia "natural enemies" -- and their complementary qualities. His intellectual biography and critiques of academia (with its gamesmanship) and Lacanianism are quite incisive.

Hilary Clark struggles to make a point that comes quite easily to many a psychoanalyst but quite difficultly to most academics. That is, that research interests stem from the psychic needs of the researcher. She learned this from the experiences of her own life as an academic who has been a long-term user of the mental health system and had it verified by Phyllis Grosskurth's biography of Melanie Klein. But she appears to feel quite ill at ease putting it in print, expecting colleagues will think her approach a "rather paranoid view of academic research," as if the link between the personal and professional is a secret knowledge. To my psychohistorical way of thinking, psychic investment in a subject is what gives students, professors, and all human beings the impetus to persevere and achieve something special. It enriches, rather than devalues, what we do.

Susan Varney, an editor, teacher, and graduate student in literature, makes an important point about psychoanalysis as an impossible form of knowledge. It could have been even better if she had used case studies from her own life and teaching. I know that my own lengthy and intense analysis, individual and group, and work as an analyst taught me that I could know things that were not previously knowable and therefore impossible. These experiences also taught me that I can strive for knowledge with my patients, and students for that matter, but never fully achieve it. I learned that we can only partially know ourselves, to say nothing of knowing others. As a professor, the quest for knowledge integrating powerful emotion with intellect leads me to take advantage of a *teachable moment* by sometimes deviating from my lesson plan and focusing on seemingly unrelated materials on the minds of my students.

Linda Simon is the only one of our authors who neither identifies herself as an adherent of psychoanalysis nor of psychohistory. Indeed she specifically rejects psychoanalytic theory as a guide to her research. So why have we included her in this discussion? The answer is that she is an example of a fine, sensitive biographer who approaches her subject with empathy and also uses

her own experiences, intuition, and observations. Above all else she is fearful of imposing a theoretical framework on her subject. This is my ideal for how to write good biography and psychobiography. Simon readily acknowledges that after she had formed her own view of William James, she read psychoanalytic literature on anxiety, empathy, narcissism, and panic disorder. My only disagreement with this Skidmore professor is that when she presented at the Psychohistory Forum and Ramapo College she assumed that psychohistorians necessarily lead with theory. Often this is not the case and it certainly is at odds with my ideals.

Psychohistory has many practioners throughout the world, especially in Germany and France. Our call for papers brought two from Australia, one from New Zealand, and another from Britain. The origin of this special issue is in the questions asked last year on the Psychohistory Listserve (<PH-L@Smooth.com>) by Lyn Baker of Australia who was learning psychohistory, trying to figure out if she could do a psychohistory doctoral degree, and forming a psychohistory group. Her efforts, questions, and conflicts reminded me of some of our struggles at institution building in the New York area in the 1970s. This mature graduate student in sociology and teacher appears to be making good progress in nurturing and leading her psychohistorical colleagues. **Clio's Psyche** also had a second article submitted from one of her countrymen who is an historian of Napoleon and it may yet be published at another time. I should note that Australia is a fertile ground for psychohistory and the Forum has normally had one to three members or subscribers from this southern continent.

Norman Simms is an American expatriate in New Zealand who teaches literature, edits *Mentalities*, and does archeological research. This most productive scholar portrays himself as the lone psychohistorian in the country, for which he compensates by maintaining a worldwide network of collegial associates.

Psychoanalytic links with academia appear to be thriving in the United Kingdom. The final author, Robert Maxwell Young, is an American from Texas who has played a key role in this process of psychoanalytic affiliation and as the Editor of *Free Associations*. As an American in England he is not alone. For example, Brett Kahr, a talented young American psychohistorian also went over to England to study and has stayed on in

various clinical roles. For years in London he organized psychohistorical activities despite encountering considerable skepticism and in 1996 Kahr published a biography of Winnicott which Andrew Brink recently reviewed in **Clio's Psyche** (September, 1998).

As mentioned earlier, this issue followed partly from a discussion online which was partly about how to get a psychohistory doctoral degree in traditional academic institutions. I was more pessimistic than David Lotto, who has always been a therapist primarily and an University of Massachusetts professor secondarily, while I have always been primarily a professor -- Ramapo College, Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities -- and only secondarily a psychotherapist. I pointed out that in history, sociology, political science, and psychology departments, it is usually perilous to try to get a doctoral dissertation accepted on an openly psychoanalytic or psychohistorical topic. (English departments are another issue.) A psychoanalytically or psychohistorically based dissertation usually means having an interdepartmental doctoral committee which is normally extremely dangerous for the candidate because of the inclination of academics to be defensive regarding their own field in relationship to those of other advisers. The candidate for the degree can easily be caught in the middle.

There is a very sad story illustrating the danger of openly defending a psychoanalytic or psychohistorical dissertation. Over 15 years ago, a political science graduate student jumped off the George Washington Bridge to his death not long after his doctoral committee, at an outstanding New York City university, turned him down. A leading political psychologist was on his committee which appears not to have liked his use of the concept of the psychoclass. Though the student, who had previously published a book on childhood in America, was not half as emotionally stable as he was bright, his suicide was certainly partly a result of his disappointed in not getting past his doctoral defense.

People with doctoral degrees and academic positions can also have problems. A talented political scientist who is also a psychoanalyst in academia, who is often selected as leader of her disciplinary group, after 20 years as an assistant professor no longer tries to get promoted to associate professor because of the criticism she faces. But if she did not present her

psychoanalytic publications as her sole scholarship, she would succeed just as I and others succeeded eventually. But she publishes in limited circulation psychoanalytic journals which allows the critics to keep her from promotion. By contrast, someone from a non-controversial field recently was promoted right after getting tenure on her first attempt in her sixth year. Her scholarship was no more profound than in the first case and she happened to have collegial enemies, but they did not have a common -- usually unarticulated -- prejudice against psychoanalysis to rally around. There are two important elements of the uncomfortable feelings towards psychoanalyst colleagues: the fear that they can read people's minds and an envy of the money they are imagined to be making in private practice.

Yet I think that sometime within the next five to twenty years the current academic opposition to the very concept of psychohistory will start breaking down. To the average layperson psychology and history together make perfect sense, so why not combine them? Psychohistory's problem is not so much the attitude of the average person as the intellectual few who take part of the psychoanalytic/psychohistorical message while condemning the messenger. Now let me turn to the growth of psychoanalysis in America.

In my adult lifetime I have witnessed an enormous proliferation of psychoanalytic institutes and an opening of these private organizations to candidates from various backgrounds. The number of analysts has proliferated enormously. Though the ideal career for graduates has been full-time individual analytic practice, most certified analysts have always seemed to maintain some other institutional affiliation or to see more psychotherapy rather than psychoanalytic patients. Yet the impact of the analytic experience often effected their work, whatever it happened to be. The current difficulties practitioners are having getting reimbursement from third parties has reduced the number of candidates, but I do not know if it has caused any institutes to close.

With the educated public currently interested in biological determinism and Prozac, psychoanalysis has lost some of its luster. It no longer has the prestige that led the State of Connecticut to appoint the psychoanalyst-psychiatrist Albert Solnit as Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services and the University of Chicago Psychiatry Department to offer the clinician Heinz

Kohut its chairmanship over 20 years ago. Kohut declined the position, but, the last I heard, Solnit was still holding on to his at about 80 years of age. Yet, even if the psychoanalytic pessimists are correct, and analysis is a dying form of treatment, it would still be a powerful intellectual force in and out of academia.

The theme of this special issue assumes there is a close relationship between psychoanalysis and psychohistory. This is true in the minds of most, but not all, practitioners and readers. The earliest psychohistories were an offshoot of those applying Freud's ideas to society. Though psychohistory has taken on a considerable life of its own, there is still a close relationship in my mind, but not necessarily in the minds of everyone I know or have read. For example, Alan Elms and Mac Runyan write psychohistory from a non-Freudian perspective. These scholars are worth reading. As I struggle with the misinformation regarding psychoanalysis and psychohistory present among my fellow historians, I wonder what it is like for Professor Elms in an academic psychology department? I doubt that it is completely comfortable. Just as all psychohistorians are not inspired by psychoanalysis, so all, and not even most, psychoanalysts are interested in applied psychoanalysis.

Fred Alford's statement that clinical practice is "disappearing" is an overstatement as I am sure Professor Alford readily would acknowledge. Psychoanalytic practice is clearly declining, but there remain an enormous number of people who come to analysts for one reason or another. Even in the heyday of psychoanalysis, most people came to analysts for reasons (short term marital therapy, for example) other than analysis, but a few slowly realized how valuable analysis could be and stayed. When I rented office space from a practice of three psychologists and a psychiatrist -- a behaviorist, an eclectic therapist, and two psychoanalysts -- it was the analysts who **a l w a y s h a d f u l l** practices. A colleague recently expressed considerable concern for people entering private psychoanalytic practice today, noting that managed care companies and drugs such as Prozac were cutting into the pool of potential patients. But she has a thriving practice, and she agreed that there are far more analysts and analytic institutes today than when we were psychoanalytic candidates together in 1973.

In the extraordinarily unlikely event that psychoanalysis would eventually cease to be a valued treatment modality, I am confident that as an intellectual discipline it would hold its own. Its value "as a humane 21st-century worldview," "an investigative research method," and "a mode of perceiving human interactions, data, events, and behaviors" is spelled out with great clarity in Peter Loewenberg's "Professional and Personal Insight" in our "Dual Training Special Issue" (September, 1997). Psychohistory, as mentioned above, has taken on a life of its own and, while it is enriched by clinical practice, this is not a requirement for its continued growth and success.

The many authors of this special issue illustrate the vitality of psychoanalysis and psychohistory and their complex relationships with academia. Most are, or have been, full-time professors and a minority are part-time teachers. All seem to have had to struggle to find a place. Despite the many obituaries that have been written for psychoanalysis and psychohistory, I remain optimistic about their future because of the special insight which they offer in the consulting room, classroom, and quiet time when one is struggling to understand something new.

*Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is a founding faculty member at Ramapo College and formerly a professor at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities. He is a founding member*

### Hayman Fellowships

The University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium announces two \$5,000 annual fellowships to aid psychoanalytically informed research on the literary, cultural, and humanistic expressions of genocide, racism, ethnocentrism, nationalism, inter-ethnic violence, and the Holocaust.

The Endowment supports studies in the psychodynamics of personal, group, and international crisis management, de-escalation, conflict resolution, and peace processes. The fellowships are intended to provide for dissertation research in scholarly resources, archives, libraries, academic contacts, and to provide support for the final writing for publication of a project whose major research has been completed. Applicants should be advanced to candidacy for the doctorate in their graduate studies or be in a psychiatric residency or fellowship program.

Contact: Hayman Administrator, The Director's Office, NPI&H, B8-248, Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences, UCLA, Los

of the International Psychohistorical Association as well as a past president. In 1983 he founded the Psychohistory Forum and in 1994 he became founding editor of **Clio's Psyche**. Four years after completing his doctoral degree in English and Modern European history he began a ten-year program of training as a psychoanalyst. Professor Elovitz presents papers and writes extensively on a variety of subjects including historical dream work, the history of psychohistory, the Holocaust, leadership, methodology, Presidential childhood and personality, psychobiography, and teaching. He has edited Historical and Psychological Inquiry (1990) and co-edited Immigrant Experiences (1997). He may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>. □

## My Formative Experiences in Academia and Psychoanalysis

John J. Hartman  
University of Michigan

As a psychohistorian, my most important academic influences have been the Social Relations Department at Harvard and the Psychology Department at the University of Michigan. I signed up for a freshman seminar at Harvard in 1960 entitled Racial Housing Discrimination in Large Urban Areas. It was taught by Richard D. Mann, a social psychologist. In this seminar we did some work in conjunction with the Boston chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality, identifying housing discrimination in several neighborhoods. However, our group of nine students devoted most of its time to examining our own racial attitudes, our family lives growing up, and our here-and-now feelings about each other and our seminar. This was my introduction to the self-analytic group format. Mann had been analyzed while in graduate school and so brought this perspective both to our group and to the issues of ethnic conflict we were exploring. Most of my current professional and academic interests, including psychohistory, stem from that seminar experience. It is noteworthy that, perhaps with one exception, all of the participants have become mental health professionals.

The Social Relations Department at that time was organized around combining cultural anthropology, sociology, and psychology with a psychodynamic point of view. Henry A. Murray, the founder of the Harvard Psychological Clinic

and a student of both Freud and Jung, had retired by this time but his influence was still felt. Sociologists Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales had been trained as academic associates at the Boston Psychoanalytic Institute and anthropologists like John and Beatrice Whiting studied personality cross-culturally, testing psychoanalytic hypotheses. Erik H. Erikson had recently arrived at Harvard and was teaching his undergraduate course on human development and writing his books on Luther and Gandhi. So the application of psychoanalytic notions to groups, to history, and to social issues was a common thread in this interdisciplinary department. Most of the influential professors and their students regarded psychoanalysis as a worthy and useful social science discipline, and many had been analyzed themselves.

When I came to the University of Michigan in 1964, Richard Mann came also and we eventually collaborated on two books on groups. The clinical psychology program was heavily psychoanalytic with most students going into analysis or psychoanalytic therapy. But there was also a psychoanalytic influence in social and personality psychology as well. In addition to Mann, Daniel Miller, who had been analyzed in England, taught the large personality course that many graduate students took. His research involved testing psychoanalytic concepts empirically.

The first thing I wanted to do when I came to Ann Arbor was to go into analysis. I was referred to a local analyst by another analyst in Boston, and due to my father's generosity was able to start analysis immediately and to continue it until I finished graduate school in 1969. My analysis was crucially important to me personally and led to my finishing graduate work in clinical psychology although I had begun in the social psychology program.

Mann eventually took over the teaching of the large and popular Psychology as a Social Science (101) undergraduate beginning course. The teaching fellows who taught the sections met in a self-analytic group with Mann to share personal as well as teaching experiences. Psychoanalytic group dynamics was the theoretical approach and heavily influenced the teaching of the sections. Mann also started a self-analytic group course similar to the one Bales taught at Harvard and it became popular and was taught for many years. Currently, the interest in groups on

the undergraduate level may be less than in the 1960s and 1970s. However, applications of this method to the training experience of psychiatric residents has been very positive; I have run weekend workshops for psychiatric residents for over ten years with much success. The self-analytic approach also influenced the original Saturday workshop seminars of the Institute for Psychohistory and the International Psychohistorical Association which still maintains a type of group analysis.

Those academic experiences have deeply influenced my professional, academic, and personal life. That was a time and those were places where psychoanalysis was seen as capable of making significant contributions to the vexing problems of social science as well as of society as a whole. I still believe in this goal and have tried in my own small ways to uphold this tradition of the blend of psychoanalysis and social science in my work on ethnic prejudice and propaganda. The reception I have had to this recent work on integrating individual and group perspectives to understand ethnic prejudice has been very positive since it seems not to have been taught that way before.

The current climate in the United States is certainly anti-psychoanalytic in many respects. The current influence of psychoanalysis on undergraduate education at both Harvard and Michigan is far less than that I have described from my own education. Clinical psychology is now proudly eclectic at Michigan.

However, in organized psychoanalysis the interest in group and organizational psychology is growing. I participated in a several-year workshop on anti-Semitism sponsored by the Research Fund for Psychoanalysis and presented my thoughts about anti-Semitism from a psychoanalytic group perspective. This spring I will teach the first course in our psychoanalytic institute on group and organizational psychology; I doubt that many other psychoanalytic institutes have such a course. The work of psychoanalysts like Otto Kernberg and Vamik Volkan on groups has acquired greater currency among psychoanalysts world wide.

While an ideal relationship between psychoanalysis and academia does not exist, and the current one is in many ways much impoverished over my experience in the 1960s, the effort to understand humankind's irrationality in groups continues. For many of us, we have little choice but to keep on with this quest to find out

what makes it so difficult for us just to get along with each other.

*John Jacob Hartman, PhD, is Clinical Associate Professor of Psychology in the Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, and maintains a private practice in psychoanalysis in Ann Arbor and West Bloomfield, Michigan. His publications include Analysis of Groups (with G.S. Gibbard and R.D. Mann) (1975); "The Psychoanalytic View of War," Encyclopedia of Violence, Conflict and Peace (1999); and "A Psychoanalytic View of Racial Myths in a Nazi Propaganda Film: Der ewige Jude (The Eternal Jew)," Journal of Applied psychoanalytic studies, vol. 1, no. 1 (1999). His e-mail address is <jjhart@umich.edu>. □*

## A Freudian in Middle American Academia

**Tod Sloan**  
**University of Tulsa**

I first encountered psychoanalytic thinking while I was serving as a disgruntled Mormon missionary in Paris in the early 1970s (yes, I can hardly believe it myself!). I ran across a book called something like *Les Grandes Decouvertes de la Psychanalyse* [*The Major Discoveries of Psychoanalysis*] and, being very impressed with this powerful new worldview of psychoanalysis, I decided that upon my return to college I would change my major from history to psychology. Soon after re-enrolling I was caught up in rather exciting encounters with all sorts of personality theories, from Freud and Jung to the existentialists and behaviorists.

The academic treatment of Freud and psychoanalysis at the undergraduate level did not lead me to believe that actually undergoing psychoanalysis was to be recommended, but I had the good fortune to be admitted for graduate studies in personality psychology at the University of Michigan. There it was understood by many professors and grad students that everyone had plenty of neurotic issues to work on and that if you did not enter psychoanalysis or at least some form of psychoanalytic therapy, you had not seen the light. You were even bordering on unethical behavior if you chose to do clinical work without

having worked through a lot of your own issues. So, I entered a formal psychoanalysis a couple of years before I finished my PhD in 1982, and I feel that I learned as much about the psyche from that experience as from my book reading. In short, I suppose the thing I learned most was that people who consider themselves ordinary, as I did, do all those things that neurotics are defined as doing: projection, rationalization, reaction formation -- and even experience those feelings that no one can see in themselves at first, like castration anxiety and violent unconscious impulses. What had been intellectual knowledge became understanding on the basis of experience.

I was hired as assistant professor at the University of Tulsa, a mid-sized private university in Oklahoma, as a token gesture by the psychology department toward a humanities-oriented dean. I was to teach courses on psychology and literature or psychology and social theory to keep the dean happy while the rest of the department cranked away on their empirical research programs. I suppose no one knew at the time I was hired that I had a strong interest in psychoanalysis. They probably saw me as an eclectic personality theorist with clinical training and a preference for qualitative methods. Eventually the mismatch between the department and me was expressed in a negative tenure vote, from which I was rescued by a second humanities-oriented dean whose college tenure committee overturned the department's decision. So, here I remain, a lone Freudian in middle America. (There is a psychoanalytic study group in Oklahoma City, over an hour away, but I have not been able to attend their meetings.)

Over the past decade, I have continued to teach courses to clinical students on Freud and object relations theory, and to use psychoanalytic concepts in the interpretation of interview data, and, perhaps most importantly, in my overall view of how society and the self are constituted. I wrote about this recently in my book, *Damaged Life: The Crisis of the Modern Psyche* (1996), in which I develop a synthesis of Habermas and Marcuse to discuss the psychological impact of capitalist modernization. Like much of the Frankfurt School work, I arrive at a fairly pessimistic conclusion about the possibilities for reversing the colonization, by the market and the state, of the lifeworld, that sphere of human activities in which dialogue and debate lead to intersubjective understanding and the viability of culture and

society.

Part of this pessimism is due to what I see as the failure of the majority of practicing and publishing psychoanalysts to look beyond the consulting room to address the macrosocial scene or participate in practical struggles for change. We academic psychologists tend to be guilty of the same thing, imagining that our research will be consumed in a manner that will have a significant impact on something beyond the ivory tower. So, my basic opinion on the question of relations between academia and psychoanalysis is that ties between the two must be developed in order to inform social practice. In the absence of a strong link between the two that is turned outward toward the project of social transformation, we will continue to get social programs designed by cognitive-behavioral social psychologists who do not have a clue as to what might really induce the sorts of self-reflection and intersubjective practices that a progressive psychoanalytically informed politics would suggest.

*Tod Sloan, PhD, is Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Tulsa. His areas of interest are ideology theory and social theory. He has authored Life Choices: Understanding Dilemmas and Decisions (1996) and Damaged Life: The Crisis of the Modern Psyche (1996). He may be contacted at <tod-sloan@utulsa.edu>. □*

## Psychoanalysis in the American Psychological Association

Spyros D. Orfanos  
American Psychological Association

The large conference room at the Washington Hilton was packed and I was nervous as I stood waiting to be videotaped in a mock interview for television on the topic of psychoanalysis. It was the 1998 Division Leadership Conference of the American Psychological Association (APA), and as the newly minted President-Elect of the Division of Psychoanalysis I was learning more details about my 155,000-member organization than I ever wanted to know. Media training was one of the areas that the parent organization wanted its future leaders to be savvy to, and given my strong belief that one learns by doing, I volunteered to be interviewed in front of my 52 colleagues and the

hierarchy of the APA. Other than the personal agenda of developing media skills, I had another one.

My second agenda was to put a human face on psychoanalysis for the numerous academics in the room. In an effort to make me feel more comfortable, the media trainer gave me the option to be interviewed on any topic I wished. I chose "Psychoanalysis Today," in accordance with my second agenda. I knew that my fellow psychologists, most of who were academics, really had no conception of psychoanalysis beyond its allegedly being an outmoded form of expensive therapy with all kinds of intellectual baggage.

As we began the videotaping, I realized that the trainer's plan was to put me through a hostile interview. I could sense that my audience was sympathetic to my plight. The media trainer was brutal, for reasons other than pedagogy I was sure. She attacked psychoanalysis, its premises, and its costs. After the first couple of jabs I recovered and did what I was taught earlier, that is, to not answer hostile questions, to lead the interviewer to where I wanted to go, to talk in simple sound bits, to look at the camera and not the interviewer, and to keep a positive attitude. How I managed to say anything coherent is beyond even my Homeric pride. Yet, what struck me most about the whole experience was what my peers said during the processing session after the taping. Many admitted to being ignorant of any new developments in psychoanalysis and the varied populations we work with. They were glad that Woody Allen is really not a testimonial to the efficacy of clinical psychoanalysis. Further, they were surprised that the data in support of the concept of unconscious processes generated from the laboratory alone are massive. "It's not so exotic," said one experimental psychologist.

Within the world's largest psychology organization, the APA, psychoanalysis is becoming less exotic. It not only boasts a 4,000-member division, but also has been recognized as a formal specialty, and a psychoanalyst can become "Board Certified" as an advanced clinician by the American Board of Professional Psychology. It is the practice agenda of the APA, that is, the commitment to the independent practitioner and clinician, which has supported these advances. This, despite the fact that many of the academics at the conference were quite ignorant of psychoanalysis. Perhaps their ignorance had to do with some outdated definitions of the arts and

sciences, scholarly snobbishness, and some real problems, both political and intellectual.

Higher education and psychoanalysis have had a tricky history right from the start. Freud may have liked to be called "Herr Professor," but he held no academic posts. For decades to come, psychoanalysts enjoyed respect from their informed peers for their clinical writings, but the academics, who tended to be empiricists, remained skeptical. A quick glance at current introductory psychology textbooks can lead one to think that psychoanalysis is simply a failed 19th-century form of treatment with a dubious scientific basis. True, many literature departments have an intellectual interest in psychoanalysis, but the reality is that they are few and far between. Of course, we must not forget that psychoanalysts often referred to the academics as "rat psychologists." Given this mutual derisiveness, we can begin to understand why the majority of psychoanalytic training programs are freestanding outside of university settings.

Progress is being made with the Education Directorate of the APA, some new introductions to psychology textbooks are beginning to note the advances in psychoanalysis, and researchers are starting to alter their views of psychoanalysis as voodoo. My belief is that real change in the relationship between the academy and psychoanalysis is taking place. The energy, goodwill, and resourcefulness of both houses are necessary. After all, psychology continues to be one of the most popular undergraduate majors in college.

Recently, a college senior taking a course I teach titled "Music, Culture, and the Creative Process" on the activist Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis, said that my course was about more than its title and the composer. "It's about understanding passion and revolutionary character," she asserted. She then said that passion was never directly addressed in any of her liberal arts studies. To paraphrase Auden, psychoanalysis reminds us to be enthusiastic about passion.

*Spyros D. Orfanos, PhD, is Co-Director of the Manhattan Institute for Psychoanalysis; President-Elect, Division of Psychoanalysis, American Psychological Association; and Faculty and Supervisor, Contemporary Center for Advanced psychoanalytic studies, New Jersey. He has published in the areas of clinical psychoanalysis, ethnicity, cross-cultural psychology, and music and psychoanalysis, and is*

the recipient of the "Educator of the Year" award from the Hellenic American Educators Association/United Federation of Teachers. □

## What It Takes to Be a Psychoanalyst

Sander J. Breiner, MD, F.A.P.A.  
Private Practice

What makes the most complete psychoanalyst? Is it an MD with psychiatric training, plus a PhD in clinical psychology, plus a PhD in sociology, plus a PhD in history, and the additional training and therapy of psychoanalysis, classes, and supervision? These questions pose an ideal that seems beyond realistic expectation. So, what is the proper education for a psychoanalyst and who should do the therapy? Without an understanding of the theory and data and conflicts about human psychology, how can only medical training be considered adequate for preparation to be a psychotherapist? Psychiatric training must have much more than education in the major mental illnesses (e.g., schizophrenia) and the usual modalities of psychoactive drugs and somatic therapy (e.g., ECT).

Psychoanalysis is a science, and its applications are an art. Psychoanalytic therapy requires the subtlety of artist creativity. The "ideal" psychoanalyst is a goal. We should always aspire to reach it; knowing full well that individually we will not succeed. But, as Rabbi Tarfon said in the second century C.E., "It is not your obligation to complete the work of perfecting the world; but you are not free to desist from trying."

We understand the following: 1) There is no separation of the organic brain from the dynamic mind. A purely organic approach to mind denies its potential for problem solving. A purely psychological approach to the mind of the non-neurotic patient limits the ability of the therapist to help diagnose and treat. 2) Neurotic patients have essentially intact brains with the essential problem (injuries) onset after three years of age. They are best helped by conflict resolution. 3) Providing the best environment for the brain (mind) in the first two, even three, years of life is vital for the prevention of serious mental illness (psychosis). Understanding that the early development of "mind" is based on the development and growth of the human "mind" in the "womb" of the family for

the first several years, it is seen that a comprehension of the social structure of the family is an important area of knowledge that must be appreciated in becoming a "complete" psychoanalyst. Since the "womb" of the family is essentially the mother (not caretakers), then how can this important responsible position be developed in an emotionally healthy way? The answer is in how *she* is raised from birth on; how *she* is nurtured.

What does it take to be a complete psychoanalyst? In order of importance, a psychoanalyst should have: 1) An extensive personal psychoanalysis. 2) A healthy character. This is something that is not measurable; however, we all know what it is. Its basic element is honesty and integrity, not just isolated to a job or a particular relationship; it is in every aspect of life. In therapy, it is kind curiosity. There is also the quality of warmth. You know these qualities of character when you see them. They cannot be taught or psychoanalyzed in. Even if successfully analyzed, an unkind character with a neurosis will still be an unkind character. 3) Clinical training and academic study in psychoanalysis, with extensive supervision of their analytic work. 4) Broad understanding of mankind, both past and present, particularly the culture within which therapy is done. 5) Medical training if the cases will likely require medication (e.g., psychological decompensation -- borderline ego organization) or have significant organic etiology (e.g., epilepsy, psoriatic arthritis, asthma, etc.).

What the preceding states is that medical training is valuable but it is at the bottom of the list. Psychoanalytic therapy, psychoanalytic training, and personal character along with broad human knowledge are much more significant. They are the most valuable assets to adequately function in making a diagnosis and doing psychoanalytic work.

*Sander Breiner, MD, is a psychoanalyst/psychiatrist in Birmingham, Michigan, who has published extensively on psychohistory including his book, Slaughter of the Innocents: Child Abuse Through the Ages and Today (1990). He also teaches psychiatry at Wayne State University and the University of Michigan. □*

## Why Was Freud So Hung-up On Sex?

**Daniel Derwin**  
**Mary Washington College**

Freud performs in academia about as nicely as a courtesan in a monastery -- the two are natural enemies and their worlds don't really fit together. But throwing them together can produce unforeseen, exciting results, and in the end you wonder if they might not be complementary. Having played this game -- and most of what goes on in academia is a variant on gamesmanship -- for three decades, I had best lay my cards on the table, keeping any tricks up my sleeve for later.

My academic background is mixed -- "checkered," as I recall a Columbia University professor calling it, for although I pursued graduate programs in literature, I supported myself by working for a psychiatric unit in an inmate rehabilitation program in Westchester County, New York, receiving analytic-based supervision with therapy groups. If other American writers sailed the sea or hit the road, I went to the county penitentiary for my apprenticeship. It lasted four years, and when I came to teach undergraduates in a liberal arts college in Virginia, my inclination was to integrate psychoanalytic approaches into all my courses in ideally seminar-style settings that valued process equally with product.

Gradually over the years I siphoned off my interest in psychoanalytic readings into specialized courses and taught literature more strictly within the confines of its own discipline. The relevant courses range from Psychological Dimensions of Literature (encompassing nursery rhymes, jump rope songs, fairy tales, Eskimo myths, and bona fide works of literature like *Werther*); Literature of the Self (during a period of Kohutian interest); Literature of Madness (during a period of interest in R.D. Laing and Michel Foucault); a graduate colloquium with a biologist on *Becoming Human* (in which I improvised psychoanalytic anthropology, including deMause, Weston LaBarre, Eli Sagan, along with literary works by Wordsworth and Sartre, among others); and an interdisciplinary course, *Hitler and the Holocaust: The Psychohistory of Evil*; to, most recently, a course on Freud and Feminism. All the courses drew on selections from Freud's writings, as well as from Melanie Klein, D.W. Winnicott, and many other analysts. What did I learn through all these permutations? Briefly:

1) It is axiomatic that introducing Freud (by whom I mean an evolving psychoanalytic

vision) is tantamount to reinventing the wheel in an increasingly anti-wheel culture. The dominant discourse in academia has traditionally been some variant on Cartesian mind-body dualism, rationalism, or behaviorism, which is bad enough because Freud suggests that all that sweet reason of two equals two, of guaranteed positive reinforcement for academic and worldly success, is but the barest tip of a continually submerging iceberg. But, more recently, culture wars have rendered Dead White Males not only suspect but dangerous seducers-abusers who threaten to repeat one's experiences of victimization. Thus, I can contrast a senior seminar I once taught out of the psychology department on Freud and Contemporary Psychoanalysis in which I adapted to the differences of the material by inviting students to discuss their dreams one-on-one and by sitting in a circle on the floor to consider Freud's problematic views on women. The students back then were reflective and receptive. In the recent course on Freud and Feminism, interdisciplinary but top-heavy with psychology majors, a sea change had occurred. Freud, who had once discovered his patients' inclinations to fabricate, was now being accused of fabricating his own cases and being hopelessly sexist. Having lost all credibility, he retained mere curiosity, and about the best I could do was mark where Freud went off the track on women yet was wrong in interesting and productive ways that have been correctively continued by later analysts, many of who are women.

2) Simultaneously, I was encountering disconcerting distortions outside the classroom. Students, as well as psychology faculty, would casually refer to an Electra Complex and I would make an effort to explain there is no such thing. Girls do have conflicts with their mothers, fathers, and other family members, but the notion of a complex complementary to the Oedipus, although once floated by Jung, was rejected by Freud and forgotten by Jung and later analysts. Much to my dismay, I found that a wide sampling of current psychology textbooks had grossly misinformed chapters on Freud and psychoanalysis, including the Electra Complex along with pre-emptive-strike questions such as, "Why Was Freud So Hung-up On Sex?" My attempts to engage psychology colleagues on these matters were met with initial indifference followed by a circle-the-wagons reflex. Finally, I interested one of their number, Chris Kilmartin, to co-author a whistle-blower on the textbooks where Electra had spread like a

computer virus (see *Teaching of Psychology*, 1997, and I have pursued the phenomenon more fully in *Gender and Psychoanalysis*, 3:4:1998). But the effort is like stomping on prairie fires, and Electra has been reborn in the pages of Steven Pinker's evolutionary psychology in *How the Mind Works* (1997).

3) My foray into psychohistory via Hitler and the Holocaust received a mixed reception by the history department with one colleague being supportive in material ways, others making it difficult to use films and badmouthing the course to students while putting on a friendly smile to me -- all of which I take to be par for the transgression.

4) Other colleagues are enthusiastically injecting Freud into their philosophy courses, and, while I wish them well, I cringe at the prospect of Freud being reduced to another contributor to Great Ideas of the Western World. I always ask if the instructors include his essay on negation, which proposes that consciousness and, thereby, thinking per se are defensive. These mental processes may also be adaptive, but unless the integrating of conceptual processes with more primitive ones -- both defensive and instinctual -- occurs, the classroom can easily fall prey to vapid intellectualizations and facile accommodations.

5) In English and philosophy departments to a great extent today, Lacan and other French semiotic-philosophical analysts like Julia Kristeva and Gilles Deleuze have largely replaced Freud in favor of postmodern discourses. Since POMO (postmodernism) means many things to different people, I'll use just one of its meanings, that of breaking with modernist narratives of universal rights and values. Freud's "Where Id was, there Ego shall be" situates him as a modernist; Kohut and Lacan fall into the POMO camp.

I have profited from some of Lacan's theories, especially on the interplay of desire-lack of desire and the often perverse strategies that accrue from warding off castration fears by phallic fetishizing. But Lacan's claim to return to Freud is transparently deceptive, and his unconscious is a linguistic system highly structured and readily accessible -- but at a high price -- to academics for whom language is the be-all and end-all of their professional lives. Freud allows one to move from the cooked to the raw; Lacan, who can be clever and entertaining as well as obfuscating, shifts from the cooked to the pre-cooked. The absence of affects, of empathy, of clinical-anchoring, and of scientific interest in his theories finally underscores

the pitfalls of appropriating a clinical practice to an academic discipline.

Nonetheless, because Lacan seems to bridge the gap from the private to the political, the subjective to the social, he has been in great demand as an arms supplier in the culture wars. Lacan is made to falsely reassure his disciples that they are helpless victims of their past, forced to conform to an alien social order, and lacking the resources to work through conflicts which are not so much inner as imposed. In his vocabulary, the other pre-empts the drives of the subject; the subject is constituted by the other; and the unconscious is structured like a language. Thus read, Lacan gives legitimacy to the victim ideology and conspiracy theories of the 1990s. Whereas psychoanalysis implicates us, Lacanianism conveniently implicates *them*. Jacob Arlow's admonition that there are no victims on the couch is anathema among his disciples.

While Lacan is thus the perfect prophet of postmodernism, there are signs of changing times. Terry Eagleton, who has played a major role in promulgating these discourses, has had a belated awakening. "Literary theory," he writes, "is in love with failure. It looks with distaste on whatever is integral, self-identical, smugly replete, and is fascinated by lack, belatedness, deadlock, self-undoing." (*London Review of Books*, April 16, 1998: 13) This awareness has been a long time coming, but if we can realize that our attacks on culture are returning to injure ourselves, perhaps we can move beyond the unsavory status quo.

6) In the left field of POMO's ballpark, Freud, Lacan, Deleuze, Foucault, Roland Barthes, and Jacques Derrida, among others, have been teamed together in the still evolving academic field of gay and lesbian studies, sometimes conflated as Queer Studies. The Freud who plays in this league is the exponent of narcissism and polymorphous-perverse sexuality (see Jonathan Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence*, 1991; Earl Jackson, Jr., *Strategies of Deviance*, 1995; and Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, 1996). Deleuze is best known for his *Anti-Oedipus* (1983), a surreal attack on the Oedipus complex in favor of a tongue-in-cheek schizophrenia (though the term as used trivializes the serious plight of the mentally ill).

These texts dovetail with the Author-is-Dead tack of Foucault and Barthes. In effect, the author's authority is replaced by that of theory, and the common denominator is an exclusive

cultivation of preoedipal phases as constitutive of psychic structure, as if by avoiding or denigrating the oedipal stage, one strikes a blow against hierarchy, male hegemony, and oppressive authority systems everywhere. It's all very tendentious.

Yet, while these authors' prose reads like a piano recital in which only about 12 of the 88 keys are engaged, there is no reason why Freud cannot be read selectively. (I suspect we all do to a degree; I'm sure we also read him defensively). And I suppose Freud's allegiance to the scientific *Weltanschauung* was an ideal he did not always achieve. Psychoanalysis must in any case continue to be questioned both from within and from without. But whether it can ever be enlisted as an agent for social change and still remain true to itself is at best open to question.

*Daniel Dervin, PhD, is a prolific psychohistorian who has recently written Matricentric Narratives (1997) on questions of gender and agency in women's writing. □*

## Research as Autobiography

Hilary Clark

University of Saskatchewan, Canada

I am a professor of critical theory and literary modernism whose research interests have largely been in the area of psychoanalytic theories of shame and depression, Kleinian object relations, and the psychoanalysis of 20th-century culture. I am also a long-time user of the mental health system: for over 20 years, depression and antidepressants have been a part of my life; three years ago, I was diagnosed as "bipolar II" (mixed states of depression and hypomania). There is certainly a connection between my own experiences with depression and psychotherapies (not always psychoanalytic) and the research path I have been following. There is probably also a connection between my experiences with therapy and an earlier research interest in memory and its lapses: the problem of forgetting and the

mnemonic systems erected against forgetting. What do these connections mean? Is it simply that, narcissistically, I am interested only in issues that resonate with my own experience -- that I see my life, my experiences with shame, loss, and depression, mirrored in everything I (strategically) choose to read and gather into my research? Or might there be, more generally, a connection between the story of any academic's life and the story of his or her research, a relationship that can be established? I believe that there is, and that psychoanalysis provides the ground for articulating this relationship.

Peter Brooks writes in *Psychoanalysis and Storytelling* (1994) that psychoanalysis is "a 'praxis' of narrative construction within a context of live storytelling" (p. 76); it builds its clinical narratives on the basis of life-stories told "live," on the spot, in analysis. Psychoanalysis has built up on these clinical stories, developing theoretical narratives of development and regression, conflict and integration, that in their turn shape analytic practice, the stories it interprets and tells. Guilt and repression, grief and reparation -- such concepts are best understood when embodied in analytic narratives of resistance and transference, narratives that teach us that the past never quite ceases haunting us.

An academic research path is also a narrative. In it are implicated all the stories, manifest and submerged, that have shaped the researcher's life. Research can thus be seen as a form of life-writing, however indirect. To put it another way, I would suggest that a research path has a transference aspect: it is chosen not in a disinterested manner but rather in response to deep-seated needs, enacting or repeating in the present unresolved conflicts from the earliest object relations -- the earliest and always unfinished stories of love and hate, guilt and aggression. (Melanie Klein, "The Origins of Transference" in *The Selected Melanie Klein*, 1987: 206-207) And this is the case, I would argue, not only for academic research in psychoanalysis but for any research narrative, inasmuch as it is composed by a person whose life is still haunted or shaped by unfinished business, a narrative that will write itself by whatever means come to hand.

Perhaps this seems a rather paranoid view of academic research. As a further example, however, I will briefly offer a case that is not my own: that of Klein herself. Klein's life story has

been written by Phyllis Grosskurth in her absorbing biography, *Melanie Klein: Her World and Her Work* (1986). Klein's life was divided roughly in two: the first half comprising a conventional girlhood and marriage; the second being Klein's career as a child analyst and object relations theorist. There were two turning points in this story of progress from middle-class married unhappiness to professional fulfillment: the discontented wife's first reading of Freud (*The Interpretation of Dreams*) and subsequent entering into analysis while still married; and the Kleins' divorce around ten years later. Klein suffered from depression throughout her married life and frequently beyond as she came to terms with a number of losses: besides the loss of her early aspirations, there were the deaths of a sister and a beloved brother, the loss of a lover, and the loss of a son in a mountaineering accident. Most strikingly, Klein lost her daughter, Melitta Schimberg who as an analyst turned against her mother and waged an unrelenting war against her.

In a recent graduate seminar, my students and I traced parallels between Klein's life story and her theoretical narrative, which posits the infant's development from a "paranoid-schizoid" position, in which it splits its objects into good and bad, defending itself against that which it has sadistically attacked, to a "depressive position" in which the infant experiences guilt and grief over the damage it has done and seeks to make reparation -- to make amends and to mend the broken object. Mourning is theorized by Klein, in "Mourning and Its Relation to Manic-Depressive States" in *The Selected Melanie Klein*, as involving a guilty process of reparation, a rebuilding of the inner world (p. 167); mourning brings about the ability to tolerate ambivalence and loss, and eventually love and gratitude replace the earlier rage and fears of persecution. (p. 173) In her theoretical narrative, then, which moves so strikingly from hatred and persecution to grief to the possibility of love and gratitude, Klein rewrites, however indirectly and schematically, the story of a life marked by recurring struggles with grief and depression. Importantly, she envisions at least the possibility of an end to mourning. However, Klein's final paper, "On the Sense of Loneliness" in *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works 1946-1963* (1997), was on the problem of loneliness, the yearning for an "unattainable perfect internal state" and sense of "irretrievable loss" that can disturb the difficult process of integration at any point in a life. (pp. 300-1) In old age, Klein, still

unreconciled with her daughter, felt that a number of her friends and colleagues had deserted her; as always, in "On the Sense of Loneliness" she was theorizing her own life.

I have offered Klein's case as exemplifying the tendency of a research path, a theoretical narrative, to re-enact or repeat unfinished business in the researcher's life. The research, and, perhaps more generally, the vocation, that one takes up is an analytic arena in which one works through and rewrites unfinished narratives -- attempting to compose conclusions but never entirely being able to do so. Like Klein, I am (re)writing the story of my life, my depressions that resist conclusion, in the research path I have "chosen" -- Klein's work and its reworking (or working through) of grief -- and, no doubt, I will continue to do so in a new project I am planning on mourning and the body in modernist women's writing.

*Hilary Clark, PhD in Comparative Literature, University of British Columbia, teaches English and Women's Studies at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, Canada. She has co-edited, with Joseph Adamson, a volume of essays entitled Scenes of Shame: Psychoanalysis, Shame, and Writing (1998). Professor Clark has also published most recently on James Joyce in her article, "'Legibly Depressed': Shame, Mourning, and Melancholia in Finnegans Wake," James Joyce Quarterly, Summer 1997. In addition, she has published two books of poetry with Canadian presses. Her e-mail address is <clarkh@skyway.usask.ca>. □*

## Why I Left Academia: The Psychoanalyst as Artist

Jonathan Goldberg  
Private Practice of Jungian Analysis

My personal reasons for leaving academia relatively early in my career, after only 10 years of teaching the humanities, to concentrate on building a full-time psychoanalytic practice were manifold. A prominent one had to do with how I was witnessing teaching in the humanities and social sciences becoming consumed with emulating -- if not imitating -- the model of the natural sciences. Interpretation, from whatever premise, was to be about establishing objective truth so that the

student would emerge with a body of knowledge. Instead of the anecdotal and idiosyncratic teaching which has always characterized great humanistic teaching, a false analogy began to make the whole subject stale.

However, if, for example, one takes as one's model for truth the actual working artist, one could never view learning in that way. To choose a familiar instance: the film *Rashomon* by the recently deceased director, Akira Kurasawa. In telling a story as seen through the eyes of four different characters, he is not setting us the task of determining whose version is most nearly accurate; instead, reality is understood to be reflected through the consciousness of the observer. Were I to say that I prefer the consciousness of A to that of B, I would be speaking about my own consciousness.

Psychoanalysis -- at least Jungian analysis in its pure form -- approaches the world from a perspective which is compatible with that of the artist because its focus is also on the specificity of individual experience. One of the clinical techniques that Jungians employ involves the circumambulation of the image. The idea this term attempts to convey is that when you put an image - - perhaps from a dream -- at the center and imagine yourself walking around it so that you are describing it from every possible angle, you will come to an understanding of its specific meaning in that context. This understanding is not transferable to other images in the life of the individual nor has it anything useful to say about anyone else.

Unfortunately, psychoanalysis in its diverse schools has not escaped the cultural shift away from the humanistic perspective of the artist and towards the behavioral perspective of mass psychology. (How many people even remember that Freud received not the Nobel prize for medicine but the Goethe prize for literature?) The effect of this movement is to make pathology no longer the issue of the individual soul in its life struggle to achieve a degree of wholeness but a deficit to be eradicated through treatment. Psychoanalysis becomes one of the societal tools to produce more functional individuals. I am not implying that psychoanalysis has abandoned its standpoint as a unique theory of human motivation and behavior, but that it has come increasingly to justify its existence by emphasizing its power to cure where psychopharmacology can only provide symptom relief. In my view, this descent to the

marketplace is also being taken over by a pseudo-scientific theory of what works.

I cannot exaggerate the importance of letting a thing be what it is. To draw an example from a place where the societal, cultural, and psychological meet: the psyche of Bill Clinton. What I would underline is that I know nothing about his psyche nor can I in any fruitful way speculate about it. What I do know from the history of his life is that he likes women and sex. I can also easily imagine that he and his wife long ago came to their own understanding, perhaps even are no longer sexual together, as is hardly unusual in long marriages. It also makes perfect sense to me that someone who fitted sex in between appointments -- sometimes even during appointments -- clearly subsumed his sexual appetites under more prominent ones. What I wish to demonstrate is that when you allow a thing to be what it is, nothing more, nothing less, you are freed from the compulsion to draw conclusions of any kind about it. "Bill Clinton had sex with an intern in the White House in very cramped quarters" is not a statement that leads anywhere. If we could cease thinking in humanistic discourse that we are on any road, we would have a purpose again.

It is my belief, sadly, that an interest in complexity -- moral, aesthetic, religious, cultural -- is being profoundly undermined by the rush to judgement in every part of life. I think we are well on our way to a new Dark Age, though this one will have no shortage of books, remedies, miracles, and fountains of youth. What it will not have is soul.

*Jonathan J. Goldberg, PhD, received his doctorate in English from NYU and later trained in analytical psychology at the C.G. Jung Institute of New York. Since 1971 he has been in the full-time private practice of Jungian analysis and psychotherapy. Dr. Goldberg is a past president of the New York Association for Analytical Psychology and a past vice president of the C.G. Jung Institute of New York as well as a founding member of the Board of the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis. His e-mail address is <Antenna721@aol.com>. □*

## Impossible Knowledge: On Teaching Psychoanalysis

Susan Varney  
University of Buffalo

One of the ways Freud classified psychoanalysis (in "Analysis Terminable and Interminable," 1937) was as an "'impossible' profession in which one can be sure beforehand of achieving unsatisfying results." Psychoanalysis was, he wagered, in some way comparable both to education and to government whose status as "impossible" has been known for much longer. Having spent a good deal of time over the last few years considering -- in attempting both to learn and to teach -- the theoretical overlap between psychoanalysis and politics, this insight of Freud's is never very far from my thoughts.

If each field taken on its own terms is "impossible," what are we to understand as the aim in the teaching of psychoanalysis and politics? For surely, "impossibility" is another way of recognizing a certain lack or incompleteness of knowledge inherent to the system of thought itself and, if this is the case, then the question is not simply one of pedagogy but, in fact, reflects directly back onto the theory underpinning Freud's point concerning psychoanalysis' "impossibility." For Freud, what is clearly at stake is not only the transmission of a piece of knowledge but the imparting of an impossible knowledge, the transmission of a system of thought within which the hole or rupture in knowledge can itself come to the fore. It is only in the relation -- or more precisely the impasse -- between knowledge and "impossible knowledge" that the workings of the unconscious itself come to light. The problem that Freud then faces, and we in our turn, is how to teach a "knowledge" that is, in effect, only in absentia, that is as a lack or impossibility in knowledge? It is in overcoming this disjunction between the unique "knowledge" of psychoanalysis and the limits of "understanding" that the experience of one's own analysis becomes invaluable. It is, no doubt, in the dynamic of the treatment itself that the force of "the hole in knowledge" makes itself felt most insistently and productively.

My concerns are primarily aimed at the academic side of the psychoanalytic institution, outside the realm of training analysis. In the latter field, however, I should point out that the problems involved in the institutionalization of psychoanalytic knowledge have been repeatedly broached, for example, by Balint and Winnicott. tion of non-analytic regulations. To what extent does academia -- which shares with the training institutions a relatively slavish respect for

hierarchy, dogmatism, and reverence for figureheads -- participate in this repression? And, if it does, is it not time to recognize that the biggest threat to the future of psychoanalysis might, in fact, reside in the unanalyzed acting out of its self-proclaimed followers? (A point that makes the complete absence of clinical experience in many academic theoreticians even more problematic.)

Let us note that part of what characterizes the impossible professions is that they are founded on a recognition of the necessity of dissent. Without an inherent tension, analysis, government, and pedagogy fail to thrive, fail to sustain the kind of frisson upon which they depend for their continued renewal. Without a transference-induced tension, analysis fails; without debate, liberal government becomes a farce; and without intellectual debate and disagreement, pedagogy devolves into indoctrination. We could, in other words, say that the impossible professions are those that are founded on a certain inherent rupture and thus gloss Freud's statement concerning their "impossibility" as the diagnosis of those fields whose ends cannot be conceived of as the eradication of opposition, as the erasure of friction. When the institution ceases to act as a support of a system of knowledge, and becomes instead an end in itself (in the same way that the fetishist takes his fetish), it takes itself for a truth -- indeed, *the* truth -- and demands recognition as such.

Now, it is this insistence on the truth of the institution that I fear has contributed to the continual ruptures that have been the bane of psychoanalysis since Freud's death and the "truth" of the institution has, for many psychoanalysts, taken precedence over its founding "impossible knowledge."

*Susan Varney is a graduate student in literature at SUNY Buffalo whose dissertation is on sexual difference and the liberal state. She is the founding editor of Umbra: A Journal of the Unconscious and has an article, "Sexing Community, Timing Justice," forthcoming in Clinical Studies. □*

## Biography and the Use of Psychoanalysis

Linda Simon  
Skidmore College

As a biographer, I have resisted applying

psychological or psychoanalytical theory or schema as I research a life because, for me, inviting Freud, or Erikson, or Jung, to participate in the biographical process of discovery would undermine my own sense of authority. If I came to a subject's life with a theory in my pocket, that theory would necessarily shape my selection of evidence on which I needed to base my interpretation. I would have a trove of code terms - "sibling rivalry," "oedipal struggle," even "repression" -- that would make their way, intrusively, I think, into my analysis.

Looking at William James' relationship with his father as a Freudian oedipal struggle, for example, places the responsibility for the struggle on William, who, according to Freudian assumptions, would have struggled with "any" father. Focusing on James in this way might preclude our asking about the father's experience in the struggle, or examining the repeated challenges to William's autonomy that his father posed. Someone looking at the same relationship from the perspective of a family systems analyst might see a competition between a father who perceived himself a failure and a brilliant son who would outshine him.

Although either or both of these perspectives could serve to "explain" the relationship, I found it liberating to bring to the evidence some basic human questions: What might it feel like for my subject to be a certain age, in a certain place, having a certain conversation about a certain issue with his father? What might it feel like to covet the esteem of a father beset by self-hatred? How does a child, any child, manage to get a parent's attention when that parent is self-absorbed? To answer these questions I, like other biographers, base my insights on my own experiences and observations. Despite the many texts on the psychology of adolescence, in the end, we all are left with our own memories of being 16. Despite all the texts on the psychology of family systems, we remember our own family in a way that is visceral and indelible. "Childness," "fatherness," and "motherness" are defined by our own experiences.

If this approach to biography seems unsystematic and impressionistic, nevertheless, for me, it feels more honest and creative than seeing a subject as a case to be brought to one or another psychoanalyst's "couch." Certainly, psychoanalytic methods of inquiry can serve a biographer well, and in my work on James I found

it helpful to read psychological writings about such issues as narcissism, panic disorder, anxiety, and empathy. But I have gone to these works only after I drew conclusions on my own. Using a theory as a template may limit the biographer's imagination. And it is that ranging imagination, that sense of the astounding and wonderful variety of human experience, that results in compelling and compassionate portraits.

*Linda Simon, PhD, who is Associate Professor of English at Skidmore College, earned her doctoral degree in English and American Literature from Brandeis in 1983. After teaching one year at Emory, she went to Harvard as a professor in 1983 and then served as Director of the Writing Center from 1986 to 1997. Among her publications are The Biography of Alice B. Toklas (1977); Thornton Wilder: His World (1979); Gertrude Stein Remembered (1994); and William James Remembered (1995). Professor Simon's Genuine Reality: A Life of William James (1998) received outstanding reviews. Her e-mail address is <lsimon@scott.skidmore.edu>. □*

## On the Margins of Psychohistory

**Peter W. Petschauer**  
Appalachian State University

Every psychohistorian enjoys a different perspective of psychohistory. Because some of us live and work at a distance from the core of it, that is, the New York City area, we have gained a unique point of view. Another aspect that characterizes the field stems from some of us being unable to have regular conversations with colleagues in it. In some other cases the uniqueness of the field stems from some of us being faculty members and yet rarely teaching courses in it. Thus, we choose to express ourselves in our chosen field through reading, presentations, and publications.

The dilemma of not being part of an ongoing and direct discourse is being made even more acute in recent years by the dramatic changes altering teaching such as post-tenure review and other forms of accountability, but also through the introduction of instructional technology and new perceptions about teaching. Becoming adept at the new techniques is taking so much time that one can say justly that we are being sidetracked from our fields. Simultaneous has been the rising awareness

that instruction is not so much about teaching as it is about learning. Thus, while in "the good old days" we were able to choose a pedagogy that was appropriate to us and stay with it, now we must rework our courses. I applaud this reworking and the introduction of instructional technology, particularly because they allow us to reflect and act upon what students are gaining through higher education.

I came to psychohistory because of Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson, Lloyd deMause, and David Beisel, and stayed with psychohistory because of Howard Stein, Paul Elovitz, and Vamik Volkan. Throughout most of my career, my conversation with these individuals has been at a distance. Yes, I read their work, met some of them many times, and have attended conferences with them. I have even written about some of them. Yet, the more I am engaged with instructional technology and new pedagogies, the less time there is for the field as such.

Something else creates a unique aspect of psychohistory with and for those of us who are not at or near the core territory and discussion of psychohistory. Because we continue to explore with psychohistorical methodologies into other fields, we can become absorbed into those areas and thus drift away from psychohistory. I came into psychohistory through the door of the history of childhood. It ultimately led me to explorations of human space. Initially these explorations were no more than investigations of spaces that children inhabit. But with time I wanted to understand all of human spatiality. By pushing at the borders of psychohistory in such areas as art, architecture, and geography, and by in a different dimension being mentally in such places as Chechnya and the former Yugoslavia, I increasingly noticed my isolation from fellow psychohistorians working in similar areas. I was not able to converse with them on a regular basis and obtain their feedback on my arguments. My most recent interest in ethnic issues rests squarely in my past in Afers in Northern Italy as a German-speaking child and in my career as a psychohistorian. Yet the further I move into this field, the more I feel myself standing at the margins of psychohistory. Being able to teach psychohistory, or being able to engage in steady conversation with colleagues in psychohistory, would allow me to be more firmly grounded in it and at the same time reduce the sense of an isolation as I explore the borders of it.

The most interesting part about living at

the borders of psychohistory, both territorially and intellectually, is a certain degree of healthy tension that characterizes all border experiences. It is the same sense of excitement that I experienced as a child in Northern Italy, as an immigrant in New York, and as a Yankee in the South. The border is the many cultural and experiential pasts that reside in me. They offer tension and excitement that is most different and elusive for those who live at the core. I both carry the border of psychohistory outward and I am the border of it; as such I am one other expression of psychohistory. My decriing that I am not part of the conversations at the core, or not able to teach "my subject," is matched by the realization that the tension of being at the margin of a field, an expression, or a culture allows for a set of experiences and insights that are both rewarding, exciting and unique, and thus continues to enrich psychohistory.

*Peter Petschauer, PhD, is Professor of History at Appalachian State University and the recipient of many honors and responsibilities within the North Carolina university system. His numerous publications include Human Space (1997), The Language of History (1990), The Education of Women in Eighteenth-Century Germany (1989), and Afers (1985). Currently Professor Petschauer is organizing a national conference on the history of childhood at his university for September, 1999. For more biographical information see the "Reflecting from the Periphery" interview with him in the June, 1998, issue of this publication. He may be reached by e-mail at <petschauerpw@appstate.edu>. □*

## Pioneering Psychohistory in Kansas

**George Kren  
Kansas State University**

In my opinion, academic interest in psychohistory peaked during the 1970s.

At Kansas State, Leon Rappoport in the Psychology Department and I in the History Department started working on a book on the Holocaust and found that we needed a psychohistorical dimension. We edited a book of readings, *Varieties of Psychohistory* (1976), which provided readings on a variety of aspects of psychohistory.

Since there was a general interest, we taught undergraduate courses in psychohistory and the history of childhood. We applied and received a grant for starting a degree in psychohistory. The structure for the program was simple. Students would fulfill the normal requirements for a PhD in history or psychology, but their dissertation would be on a psychohistorical subject. In addition to the regular courses they would also take courses at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, where they would do some supervised clinical work. We planned to work out the details of this once students arrived.

The grant enabled us to bring in psychohistorians who gave generally well attended public lectures on aspects of psychohistory. I recall that it was an exciting series; we had Peter Lowenberg, Rudy Binion, Lloyd deMause, John Demos, and Bruce Mazlish, among others. The grant enabled us even to pay them decently. The lectures resulted in sensitizing the history department in particular to psychohistory.

However, the program did not succeed. In retrospect the reason for its failure is very clear. The grant provided money for lecturers, but we had no money to support students and were unable to attract students to come here. The grant was not renewed after the first year, which in effect terminated the program. After a few years, interest on the part of undergraduates in psychohistory also dropped and in the 1980s we gave up teaching courses in psychohistory and the history of childhood. Psychohistory is still discussed in our graduate historiography course, but no special psychohistory courses are offered.

*George M. Kren, PhD, is a distinguished scholar of modern Europe and the Holocaust who is also a member of the Editorial Board of this publication. He may be reached at <kreng@ksu.edu>. □*

## From Erikson to Lacan in Chinese History

### Lung-kee Sun University of Memphis

When I was a student from 1971 to 1984 at the University of Minnesota and Stanford University, Erik Erikson was in vogue among a number of scholars who applied his psychobiographical approach to the study of prominent Chinese figures from Wang Yangming (1472-1529) to Liang Shuming (1893-????). But psychohistory soon fell out of favor. Some professors said that the field was discredited by the works of the political scientists Lucian Pye and Richard Solomon who, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, theorized that the Chinese were an "oral" type of people upgraded to the "anal" stage by the Maoist revolution. However, the decline seemed to have most to do with psychohistory in general going out of fashion within the American historical profession.

When I wrote "Beloved China: The Imagery of 'Mother China' in Modern Chinese Political Thinking," in Vamik D. Volkan, et al, eds., *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships*, vol. 1 (1990), it was for the field of political psychology. I sometimes adopted a different approach, such as synthesizing, within a framework of my own, the behavioral testings done on the Chinese in the last 30 years, in order to study their modal personality in my "Contemporary Chinese Culture: Structure and Emotionality," *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs* (July, 1991). For my fellow historians I simply did the conventional type of history of psychology such as in "Social Psychology in the Late Qing Period," *Modern China* (July, 1992). Lately, I have paid more attention to the semiotics, or the study of language and signs, of self and identity.

In my opinion, psychohistory has not so much gone out of fashion as it has been subsumed under the rising tide of postmodernism and poststructuralism. Today it is politically incorrect to call an entire people, especially not one's own, "oral" or "anal." In deconstructionist terms, this is called "over-determining," and it is believed that the narrator harbors a power motive -- to dominate the other. On the other hand, today's identity politics puts a premium on "self-fashioning." Postmodernism also downplays elite culture and the intellectual hero, so the Eriksonian psychobiography is definitely out of fashion. It invariably sets up the intellectual hero in a crisis

scenario as the center of a drama of tension-resolving, which he did by making rational and existential choices. This superior act presupposes an integral and free agent which postmodernism attempts to eliminate. The postmodernist assertion of the illusory nature of subjectivity needs to be further argued, but it does open up a new range of possibilities. Now we may experiment with the idea of identity as a narrative woven from a hybrid of incongruous fragments.

Ironically, with all of the hullabaloo involved in resisting and deconstructing a dominant discourse, the poststructuralist "self" is, after all, other-determined. Knowing we are inevitably embedded in a narrative -- like *Total Recall's* interplanetary hero in a mental implant -- the important thing today is that one should also have some say about one's identity and should not let other people, especially the dominant party, have the last words in the discourse. Yet, with the downplaying of the agent -- or the "death of the author," so to speak -- this "self" can only be fashioned out of the parts or fragments that are ready-made. In this spirit, the new "femininity" of America, in order to define itself -- to come into "presence," so to speak -- has to beat down traditional "masculinity" which was in its turn defined by beating down traditional "femininity."

This is my understanding of psychohistory as it should be today -- wedded to semiotics, or carried out with an emphasis on language and the study of signs -- and not exactly a description of its reception by contemporary academia. Lacan is better known in gay and lesbian studies, and not nearly so much within the historical profession, but I think he might shed some light on identity politics. Lacanian psychoanalysis is immensely useful in demonstrating the thesis of the "other-determining" of self. Unfortunately, if I try to explain this approach to some of my colleagues the response is quite often, "Who is Lacan?"

*Lung-kee Sun, PhD, is Associate Professor of History at the University of Memphis. He received his MA degree in Russian history from the University of Minnesota and his PhD in Chinese history from Stanford University. In both English and Chinese he has published numerous articles on the intellectual history of modern China and Chinese personality. Professor Sun's three books are published in Chinese, with The Deep Structure of Chinese Culture translated into German. An English work under preparation is The Chinese National Character: Nationhood, Orientalness,*

*Corporeality, and Individuality. He may be reached at <lksun@cc.memphis.edu>. □*

## A Conversation in Praise of the Subjective

Charles Fred Alford  
University of Maryland

**Paul Elovitz:** I was intrigued when you wrote the following:

One thing that concerns me is how obtuse and obscure academic psychoanalysis often, but not always, is. Yet academic psychoanalysis is flourishing -- at least in its small garden -- as its clinical practice is disappearing. I wonder if there is connection.

Please give some examples of the "obtuse and obscure" and then of why you think there might be the connection you suggest.

**Fred Alford:** Though I did call it a connection, the term is too strong. "Relationship" would be a more appropriate term, though I admit that I am using a wiggle word. Maybe "an ironic relationship" would put it best.

The practice of analysis is remarkably inefficient: it takes years and years, and thousands of dollars, and the benefits are entirely subjective. This is, of course, precisely what one would hope from analysis, that it provides subjective benefit. Or, as Bob Dylan said, "Don't worry about those dreams, boy, they're only in your head."

We live in a world that is not responsive to the subjective, the slow, the subtle, and the inward. No one will pay for it, and the result is that analysts are doing other things, including management consulting, non-analytic -- "analytically informed" is the euphemism -- therapy, and all the rest.

The academy has time. Tenured professors have all the time in the world. In this world anyway. It is easy to be sarcastic about it, but it is a great virtue, a wonderful thing. To cultivate inwardness, to imaginatively reconstruct the sources of only apparently obvious behavior, to play with the complexity of human motivation: if this does not justify academic life, nothing does. At its best, academic psychoanalysis does all these things, making the obvious new and wondrous again. Everything that Frederick Crews says

against psychoanalysis -- that it is untestable, speculative, unscientific -- is the best argument I know for it.

But all is not well in academic psychoanalysis either. Aspects of academic psychoanalysis -- and I am thinking particularly of the Lacanians, but surely there are others -- seem intentionally obscure, purposefully hermetic. A sympathetic reading would be that this is a defense against a world, including an academic world that wants to put everything to good instrumental use, to find the measure for everything. But one suspects there is more going on in it.

Above all, we live in a world in which the subjective and the inner are under attack. This includes the realm of feelings. Or at least the realm of subtle feelings, for it seems to be the goal of the entertainment industry to stimulate a very limited range of feelings as intensely as possible.

What concerns me most is not that the Lacanians, or others, are obscure and hermetic. That has its purpose and its charms. What concerns me is that academic psychoanalysis would become less like poetry, less about the cultivation and investigation of imagination and feeling. What concerns me is that the psychoanalytic study of texts is no longer about feeling, but about the suffering of the letter. But letters don't suffer. Only people do. In a world in which no one seems to have time for suffering, in which the cultivation of an inner world in which suffering is essential seems pointless, academic psychoanalysis should be exploring just how complex human suffering can be, and the strange and destructive permutations it can take.

In the end, this is the standard by which I would judge academic psychoanalysis: not whether it is obscure or recondite, but whether it is an attempt to cultivate inwardness. At least some academic psychoanalysis -- and this applies to every school -- seems to use the jargon of psychoanalysis to escape from inwardness by talking about it in ways that denude it of a meaningful connection to suffering and joy.

**Paul H. Elovitz:** When I was introduced to psychoanalysis by a colleague at Temple University in the 1960s, I thought of it as having the power of poetry and music in getting to the subjective heart of the human condition. Thanks for reminding us of psychoanalysis' subjective essence in this age of science and verbose intellectualizations cut off from emotion.

*Charles Fred Alford, PhD, is a professor of Government at the University of Maryland in College Park and a most prolific author. Included in his nine books are Narcissism (1988), Group Psychology and Political Theory (1994), and What Evil Means to Us (1998). He was his university's Distinguished Scholar-Teacher in 1992-1993 and is Co-editor of Cornell University's Psychoanalysis and Society book series. His e-mail is <falford@bss2.umd.edu>*

*Paul H. Elovitz is Editor of this publication. See full author credit on page 123. □*

## An Australian Psychohistory Group

Lyn Baker  
La Trobe University, Australia

Early last year in Melbourne, Australia, nine people met formally for the first time to create a psychohistory discussion group. I will explain how this came about and report on our experiences.

Several years ago I approached a senior lecturer at La Trobe University, where I was and remain a student, to supervise a "free-reading" course so I could probe deeply the works of Freud and other eminent psychoanalysts. The lecturer, Richard Trahair, is himself a recruit to psychohistory and a presenter at International Psychohistorical Association conferences. He subsequently introduced me to some of Lloyd deMause's theories.

In the ensuing years I have tutored and lectured in Dr. Trahair's Psychoanalytic Studies course. Together with him, I have attempted to introduce some of the more enthusiastic and sophisticated students to the work of deMause. Interestingly, these students have without exception been "mature" both in age and experience. As a mature age student myself I could identify with the frustration many of them experienced in trying to find like-minded individuals with whom to explore these ideas openly and frankly. Having come to know most of them quite well, I approached them about starting a small discussion group to meet once a month, have dinner, and talk about psychohistory. We now meet on the first Wednesday evening of each month for about four hours.

Our early decisions included setting a limit to the size of the group of no more than 10 people,

focusing on a chapter of deMause's *The Foundations of Psychohistory* (1982) each month, and having one member of the group provide current materials, such as media reports of child abuse and cartoons demonstrating unconscious collective feelings toward political leaders, that support or refute the claims made by deMause.

This arrangement worked, but not without some uneasy moments. Most of us had long since read *The Foundations of Psychohistory* and a degree of tentativeness about the case studies did not always produce vigorous discussion. About the fourth month came the usual process of sorting out personalities: We stopped being on our best behavior, figured out who knew what about psychohistory, struggled to maintain our focus on the subject, and worked on some issues of leadership and group consensus.

After several anxious weeks, I discovered the unconscious desire of the group to have and sustain a "leader," something I had been strongly resisting. My original intention in starting the group was to act as a facilitator for only a few months, providing suggestions for discussion papers and encouraging people to introduce their own research interests so that it would evolve into a more consensual group. I remain optimistic that this will happen as the group develops further. However, in response to the uncertainty and insecurity in the group that surfaced in the fourth month, I now select an article for discussion each month from the *Journal of Psychohistory* and write a short monthly newsletter. In the newsletter I remind everyone of the date of the next meeting, chat about what is happening on the Psychohistory List on the Internet, and pass on any information about new books and articles. The newsletter is posted to the members prior to the meeting.

To date we have discussed several important issues including Repressed Memory and the McMartin Tunnels; Eli Sagan's analysis of the Paranoid Position; and Adowa Cycles. The McMartin Tunnels case in the U.S. is one in which children's accounts of abuse at a preschool and the physical evidence that supported their claims were met with massive denial by those in authority. The vilification of therapists and the "scapegoating" of one concerned and vocal mother elicited much discussion. In Eli Sagan's analysis of the Paranoid Position he posits that the extent to which individuals overcome the feeling of infantile paranoia greatly affects their capacity to manage non-rational impulses and moral anxiety as adults.

Emerging from the paranoid position of infancy is dependent upon the ability to develop trust, both in the self and others. Sagan's analysis proved illuminating for our understanding of the Heaven's Gate suicides. Adowa Cycles are fifteen year cycles in which current socio-political phenomena, psychohistorically perceived as re-birth imagery, are seen to have their genesis in a traumatic event or events approximately 15 years previously.

In our discussion of recent Australian films, we concluded that a vast majority of them dealt with the theme of national identity -- *Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* is the best example. We found the events that occurred in America just prior to the 1980s to be closely connected to an emerging "group fantasy" in Australia: the uncertainty of who we are and where we belong in the world; for example, the shadow of disgrace over Nixon's resignation [1974] and the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics. This was compounded by a severe recession here in Australia. However, our winning the 1983 America's Cup in yachting had a profound effect on national pride: "little" Australia could upstage the mighty United States! While severe bush fires added to economic concern they also witnessed a resurgence of community support. It seems as if we were starting to feel capable of standing alone. At the same time, a new and charismatic prime minister was elected. Robert (Bob) Hawke exemplified the archetypal Australian, a bit of a larrikan [a rowdy], but a man with the intelligence and strength to "get the job done." As Australia attempts to deal with severing the umbilical cord with mother England (we are in the difficult process of becoming a Republic) and to prove that it is able to stand alone without the constant approval of a paternal United States, we can be seen to be in an oedipal struggle to define our identity.

The monthly discussion is very lively. The members of the group are increasingly trusting of one another and, consequently, very relaxed. Six women and three men from various backgrounds, including academia, teaching, welfare, and psychology, make up our group. We have had one person leave due to work commitments and another person join two months ago. There have been two other expressions of interest in joining, but our group is reluctant to expand further. My personal preference is to provide a format in which guests may participate occasionally with a view to establishing other, similar groups themselves. To

help new groups, as well as for our own historical record, I have maintained a file of our newsletters, discussion papers, and the reference materials that we have found profitable. There are open invitations to present to us extended to Norman Simms in New Zealand and Philip Dwyer, an Australian historian working to apply psychohistory to Napoleon and the French Revolution. Recently, Paul Elovitz and Henry Lawton in America have provided support which includes important resource materials. We have taken out a group subscription to *Mentalities*, and articles from that journal along with articles from **Clio's Psyche** will be amongst our forthcoming discussion subjects.

We will soon hold a weekend mini-conference at which each member of the group will give a paper that applies psychohistorical theory to their research interests. Besides providing valuable intellectual experience, this time together will also strengthen our ties as developing psychohistorians and bring our work to a wider audience.

*Lyn Baker of the School of Sociology, Politics, and Anthropology at La Trobe University in Victoria, Australia, is a Tutor and Occasional Lecture in Sociology and Psychoanalysis. She is researching her PhD thesis on the narratives of people who have joined charismatic religious cults. She is also a trained crisis counsellor. She may be reached at <baklyn@connexus.net.au>. □*

## A Psychohistorian in New Zealand

**Norman Simms**  
Universtty of Waikato, New Zealand

So far as I know, no one has taught any university courses in psychohistory in New Zealand. Nor has any colleague ever voluntarily expressed an interest in psychohistory. Yet, paradoxically, I became a psychohistorian precisely because of my coming to this country in 1970.

When I came from Canada 28 years ago, I had never heard of the field -- it would have seemed bizarre. Nevertheless, there is evidence of a nascent psychohistory in my thesis and first attempts at publishing. I wrote about a 14th-century Middle English romance called *William of Palerne*, and there are two aspects to the study which tell me now why I would eventually be

interested in psychohistory, sparked into an explicit enthusiasm because of my move to New Zealand.

The first is the subject matter of the poem: it is about lovers who are forced to escape from Rome to Sicily. Their flight is guided by a werewolf, a prince transformed by his step-mother to get him out of the Spanish court, and this creature, always called the "witty werewolf," raises problems of the relationship between human and animal, reason and instinct, language and communication. I had to deal with childhood in the Middle Ages, definitions of humanity and bestiality, and the problematics of language and reason. Though I did not know it then, I was already dealing in psychohistory.

Rather than a straightforward literary translation from a French original, the poem seemed to be a transformation from a literate to an oral mentality, with the text recast into formulaic phrases and into new categories of thought, perception, and feeling. I am surprised at how radical my thesis was because in the mid-1960s the field of "oral dynamics" had just opened up, and virtually none of the major literary studies were published. Today, of course, many scholars are writing about the way in which oral literatures differ from written texts, going way beyond McLuhan's notion that the medium is the message. Now it is evident that the way memory works; the reception mechanisms of traditional audiences; and the dynamic relationship between visual, tactile, and auditory perceptions largely determine what can and cannot be known, felt, and thought about. These are not absolute but significant minor distinctions, and therefore my early work on *William of Palerne* as a "translation" from a written French version strikes me as still on the cutting edge, and certainly open to further psychohistorical investigations. If I have moved on, it is less in terms of theory and methodology -- which have increasingly turned to psychohistory for insights -- than of specific content.

However, the only indication that what I had been working on was "abnormal" to "serious" scholarship came in the form of silence, the lack of response to my thesis: it was not referred to by anyone writing about *William of Palerne*, not even to dismiss it as ridiculous. The silence continued when I started to give papers in conferences or deliver guest lectures around New Zealand; and more so the silence existed among friends to whom I tried to speak of my interests. At that time I would not have used the words *denial*, *repression*,

or even *avoidance*, but I did start to feel alienation.

Because of that I turned to new fields where I hoped to find intellectual and social comfort. First, I became interested in my Romanian family background and folklore -- a discipline which seemed to pick up my previous interests in orality and to give me a perspective on group rituals, creativity, and performativeness. I took my family for a half year to Bucharest, and then spent four months at the Folklife Institute in Leeds in England.

Then, being in New Zealand gave me an opportunity to study Maori traditions and the new literatures in English starting to appear in the Pacific Islands. My interests were sparked by the interplay of oral and literary forces, the way in which pre-modern cultures were transforming into modern societies. The result was, however, more alienation -- and a realization that I could not understand these other cultures (medieval, Romanian folk, or Pacific Island), let alone myself, unless I came to grips with unconscious forces in individuals and groups. Though I was writing and lecturing in terms of the insights that Eastern Europe gave to medieval literature, the judgement of my "peers" was that I was completely eccentric, trivial, and probably crazy. Similarly, my work with Pacific traditions, again having analogies to the formation of modern personalities and secular articulation in late medieval England, was dismissed with silence or scorn.

In later years, other fields (e.g., Jewish Studies) have been integrated into my research interests, all bound together by an overriding concern for history of mentalities and psychohistory, with psychoanalytic insights providing the driving power to the developments in cultural history. Though I have received recognition overseas and try to keep in touch with colleagues in many countries, my status in New Zealand is so marginal that I can only call it "pathetic." I have suffered from a lack of promotion and being marginalized by administrators, academics, and students.

Perhaps my career could not be otherwise in New Zealand because this is a country where psychology equates to behaviorism, and psychiatry and psychoanalysis are rare. The unconscious is not a concept presumed here and the idea of a psychohistorian makes no sense to my colleagues. In attempting to deal with politicians or social workers nominally concerned with child abuse and domestic violence, there is silence or dismissive

noise. Those actually working in areas where the insights of psychohistory would be most pertinent are "too busy" to listen. Since I am not a specialist in their fields, my voice is not worth taking the time to hear.

Nevertheless, I have never been asked to desist from my psychohistorical approach in teaching, and no one has formulated an alternative viewpoint to my comments. I continue to teach what I want in the way I want by not calling them "psychohistorical" or announcing a psychohistorical view of the world. In all my teaching I am most constrained by the generally low level of student preparation, the lack of proper library resources, and the restricted range of courses. Year after year, students say thanks because these courses changed their lives. They learned how to think.

My other achievement has been the development of *Mentalities/Mentalites* as a scholarly journal with international editors, contributors, and readers. While beginning this venture with European colleagues (e.g., Alexandru Dutu, Robert Muchembled, Emmanuel Le RoiLadurie, Carlos Barrios, etc.) deep into the history of mentalities, over the past several years, especially after meeting with psychohistorians in New York, I have nudged the focus more and more towards both a psychoanalytic and psychiatric approach, with articles on the unconscious forces driving historical events and on the history of the various depth psychology movements and mental health programs of the Western world. Yet this has not been at the expense of prior interests: my other more topical, especially textual concerns, have been enhanced by the juxtaposition -- which, I might say, has become a mutual fertilizing process. I have always regarded psychohistory and the history of mentalities as at least complementary, never felt comfortable with any sorts of mutually exclusive paradigms.

*Norman Simms, who grew up in Brooklyn, New York, left the United States after earning a PhD from Washington University in St Louis. He specialized in Middle English literature while maintaining a strong interest in history and archeology. He and his family moved to New Zealand in 1970. He has since spent substantial periods living and teaching in Canada, France, and Israel. Professor Simms is the editor of Mentalities/Mentalities, and the Director of the New Zealand branch of the Institute for Psychohistory, as well as a Vice-President of the*

*French Society for Psychohistory. He has six books and hundreds of articles to his credit. He may be contacted at <nsimms@Waikato.ac.nz>.*

□

## Psychoanalysis and Academia in the United Kingdom

Robert Maxwell Young  
University of Sheffield, England

When I was an undergraduate at Yale in the 1950s, psychoanalysis had great prestige, but its presence in universities was largely confined to psychiatry departments. Nowadays you would be hard put to find many recent appointments of psychoanalytically oriented people in psychiatry departments. The more successful candidates train in psychopharmacology, behavioural work, or even research on genetics. Except for Lacanians in English literature, academic appointments for psychoanalytically trained or oriented people are still rare in any university department.

But, in spite of this and all the flak in the "Freud Wars," the subject is far from moribund in certain quarters. In Britain there have grown up in the last decade about a dozen graduate programs in psychoanalytic studies. Most are master's, but there are also a good number of places where doctoral dissertations are being supported. Among the universities with active programs are University College London, East London/Tavistock Clinic, Sheffield, Essex, Manchester Metropolitan, and West London; there are also programs in Eire [Ireland] and Northern Ireland. People come into psychoanalytic studies from all sorts of backgrounds and move on to various kinds of work. The curricula do not include any clinical work but concentrate on theory, history, and applications to other spheres, e.g., film, literature, parenting, groups, and institutions.

I think I am right in saying that I hold the only chair that has so far been established in psychoanalytic studies. I teach at the Centre for Psychotherapeutic Studies, University of Sheffield, where we have master's, doctoral research, and distance learning programs, as well as a very large and active web site, <<http://www.shef.ac.uk/~psysc/>>, with extensive archives and guides to psychoanalytic resources on the Internet. We are also affiliated with numerous e-mail forums, for example, psychoanalytic studies; Psychoanalysis & the Public Sphere; and Human Nature, Authority & Justice. The forums attract several hundred subscribers a day. The Web site where my writings are archived gets up to three thousand visitors per day, and a new one covering a wider range of issues in the study of human nature, <<http://human-nature.com>>, gets nearly three thousand per week.

There is also a resurgence of publishing in this area. I edit a quarterly journal, *Free Associations: Psychoanalysis, Groups, Politics, Culture*. In February, a new academic journal, *Psychoanalytic Studies*, began publication, and another, *PS*, with a more Lacanian emphasis, has published one issue. Several publishers have brought out books in this area, e.g., Routledge, Karnac, Rebus, Polity, Free Association Books (which I founded) and Process Press (which I now run). There has even been a book devoted exclusively to the subject: *Teaching Transference: On the Foundations of Psychoanalytic Studies* (1996). It was edited by Martin Stanton and David Reason. Stanton started the first program in psychoanalytic studies, at the University of Kent in 1988, but I am sorry to say that it has been closed down. He was also active in founding the Universities Association for psychoanalytic studies (UAPS).

I suppose several hundred people have graduated from the existing programs, and others are coming on stream all the time. It is odd but impressive for applied psychoanalysis to be flourishing at a time when psychoanalytic practice

### The History of Psychohistory

**Clio's Psyche's** interviews of outstanding psychohistorians (see "An American in Amsterdam: Arthur Mitzman," page 146) have grown into a full-fledged study of the pioneers and history of our field. Psychohistory as an organized field is less than 25 years old, so most of the innovators are available to tell their stories and give their insights. Last March, the Forum formally launched the **Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project** to systematically gather material to write the history of psychohistory. We welcome memoirs, letters, and manuscripts as well as volunteers to help with the interviewing. People interested in participating should write, call, or e-mail Paul H. Elovitz (see page

is being subjected to so much criticism.

*Robert M. Young, PhD, was born in Dallas, Texas, and studied Philosophy at Yale and Medical Sciences at Rochester. He won a fellowship to Cambridge, where he did doctoral research on the history of ideas of mind and brain and taught history and philosophy of the biomedical and human sciences. He then made television documentaries for a time, set up Free Association Books, went into analysis, and trained as a psychotherapist. He is currently Professor of Psychotherapy and psychoanalytic studies at the Centre for Psychotherapeutic Studies, University of Sheffield. His publications include Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in Victorian Culture (1985); Mind, Brain and Adaptation (1990); and Mental Space (1994). □*

### Special Session on Understanding the Impact of Impeachment

(Continued from page 117)

Constitution, and political psychology of America?" "Will it change the balance of power of the parties, and, if so, in what ways?" "Why the incredible hatred of Clinton in some quarters yet the consistent public opinion poll support of him throughout the impeachment process?" "Is it less important that Clinton was acquitted by the Senate than that he was brought to trial for lying to try to cover up an extramarital sexual liaison?" "What is the meaning and impact of the almost complete loss of privacy for public officials?" "Will there be a further loss of faith in politics by the populace and reluctance to run by many of the most promising potential candidates?"

To offer some answers to these and other related questions, the Forum has assembled a distinguished panel. Herbert Barry (University of Pittsburgh) and Betty Glad (University of South Carolina) will fly in for our session. Ted Goertzel (Rutgers), Aubrey Immelman (St. John's University in Minnesota) and I (Paul Elovitz, Ramapo College) will drive to New York to share our insights. Together we represent the disciplines of history, politics, political psychology, psychoanalysis, psychology, and sociology. All of us have written on Presidents and/or Presidential candidates. Herbert Barry and I started on Clinton in February, 1992, while I first met Betty Glad in 1976 at the first ever national psychohistorical convention when we were both on a panel discussing the psychodynamics of candidate Jimmy Carter. Professor Glad has published extensively on Presidential character, has served as

president of the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP), and is the recipient of numerous honors as are the other panelists.

Contact the Editor at <pelovitz@aol.com> for particulars, including time and place, of the session. □

## Bill Clinton: The Dual Character of a President Impeached

Aubrey Immelman  
Saint John's University

History will make little sense of the misconduct and political struggles of the 42nd President of the United States without recourse to Bill Clinton's character. Academically, the unforeseen legacy of the Clinton Presidency may well be psychohistory's place of prominence alongside more customary approaches to Presidential scholarship.

What have we learned about the President's character in the course of Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's investigation of the Lewinsky matter and the ensuing impeachment proceedings? To address this question I focus on three landmark events in the impeachment saga that illustrate the remarkable cross-situational consistency and temporal stability of President Clinton's personality pattern: his August 17, 1998, grand jury testimony, his January 19, 1999, State of the Union address, and his February 12, 1999, post-acquittal statement to the nation. To set the stage, I offer two converging commentaries on Bill Clinton's character: the media perspective and my own empirically based personality assessment.

### Media Representations of Bill Clinton's Character

In cracking the code of Clinton's character, an emerging consensus in the media is the President's duality. As journalist David Brooks has written in *The Weekly Standard*, "...there are two sides to Bill Clinton. There is the Yale and Oxford side, all policy talk and high aspiration. But then there is the Elvis-loving and Hot Springs side, "Clinton's ... appetites for fame, sex, and approval, and his willingness to trample others to serve himself." ("Hollywood Beats Harvard," Oct. 5, 1998: 19) Part of the contradiction here is between a public persona and an undisciplined, self-indulgent inner self.

*Newsweek's* Jonathan Alter, too, has

commented on Bill Clinton's dual nature: one, responsible, solid, cautious, and supersmart; the other, heedless, squalid, reckless, and superdumb. ("The Two Mr. Clintons," Aug. 24, 1998: 20-24) Former Clinton consultant Dick Morris has dubbed the two faces of the President "Saturday Night Bill" and "Sunday Morning President Clinton."

*New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd has mocked the President's duality, pointing to pop culture multiple personality icons "Eve" and "Sybil" in characterizing Bill Clinton as a President who "has raised his personality disorder to a management style." ("Sex and Balances," Jan. 20, 1999: A31) If nothing else, Dowd's caricature offers an ironic sequel to Bill Clinton's 1992 election promise to give us "two for the price of one."

### **An Empirical Assessment of Bill Clinton's Character**

My own research (*Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 9, 1998: 335-366) suggests that Bill Clinton's character is composed primarily of narcissistic (ambitious, confident) and histrionic (gregarious, outgoing) elements. Personality theorist Theodore Millon (*Disorders of Personality*, 1996) has asserted that in the realm of ego defenses, the narcissistic pattern is associated with rationalization and the histrionic pattern with dissociation.

In the case of Bill Clinton, the hidden hand of rationalization is revealed in the habitual fabrication of technically plausible explanations for less-than-admirable behaviors, and frequent recourse to alibis that put a positive spin on conduct unbecoming. It provides the psychodynamic underpinnings for President Clinton's propensity to parse his words and shade the truth.

The self-protective dynamics of dissociation are revealed in Bill Clinton's penchant for frequently altering his self-presentation to create a succession of socially attractive facades: "I did not inhale" and "I did not have sexual relations with that woman." Dissociation provides the psychological underpinnings of, in Beltway vernacular, the President's "compartmentalization" and accounts for President Clinton's ability to maintain his self-confidence and composure in the face of adversity.

The predictable expression of these personal dynamics is a recurrent theme in the past year's political crisis, permitting some reliability in

anticipating the President's moves. This is precisely what I attempted in three unpublished reports documenting my personality-based predictions of President Clinton's performance under pressure: his August, 1998, grand jury testimony, his 1999 State of the Union address delivered in the wake of his defense team's opening arguments in the impeachment trial, and his brief February, 1999, response to his acquittal.

### **The Grand Jury Testimony**

The days preceding President Bill Clinton's appearance before the grand jury in Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's investigation were marked by intense speculation about the President's likely testimony. I based my own analysis on Bill Clinton's personality, his past behavior, and compelling situational constraints.

*Personality* Narcissistic characters are ambitious, competitive, and self-assured. They are audacious and clever, display an interpersonal boldness, believe in themselves and their talents, and have sufficient charm to win others over to their causes and purposes. They have an expectation that others will recognize their special qualities and cater to them, but they lack social reciprocity, and feel entitled. Histrionic characters have a need to be popular, believe they can readily charm and influence others, and are skilled at manipulating others to meet their needs.

*Situational constraints* Bill Clinton is the consummate political animal. Given this context, I anticipated that his testimony would be guided by considerations of political expedience, including the survival of his Presidency and the protection of his legacy. It seemed likely that he would heed the advice of his lawyers on matters such as the need to avoid a perjury trap, and exploit the opportunity to bolster his public image as a buffer to the outcome of a potential impeachment inquiry.

*Past behavior* Assuming that Bill Clinton's evasiveness with reference to his marijuana experimentation, his Vietnam draft status, and the nature of his relationship with Gennifer Flowers represent the expression of an underlying disposition, it seemed safe to expect -- based on the consistency principle of personality -- that President Clinton's testimony before the grand jury would have a similar tenor.

*Formulation* Based on personality, past behavior, and situational constraints, I predicted that the President's grand jury testimony would be "evasive rather than forthright, vague rather than

precise, and ambiguous rather than explicit." I also noted that Bill Clinton has displayed a pattern of "initial denial followed, under duress, by measured honesty, carefully calibrated truth-telling, and -- ultimately -- feigned contrition."

*Resolution* As predicted, the President's grand jury testimony was evasive, though on the face of it "technically truthful," to use the President's turn of phrase. Also as expected, the President avoided legal jeopardy by acknowledging an inappropriate relationship with Monica Lewinsky, but offered no unequivocal "mea culpa" as many political analysts had predicted. Subsequent public admissions of wrongdoing and expressions of contrition were incomplete, unconvincing, and transparently dictated by political motives. In general, President Clinton's performance was consistent with a personality style that relies primarily on the regulatory mechanism of rationalization for self-protection.

#### **The State of the Union Address**

Dick Morris predicted that President Clinton would use his State of the Union address as a forum to express contrition for his conduct and to acknowledge the reality of his impeachment trial. I found these speculations by a former Clinton insider notable by virtue of their incongruence with my assessment of the President's character.

In the confluence of character and circumstance I expected nothing less than an ambitious policy agenda to lay the foundation for a rehabilitated legacy and prevent the erosion of public approval -- in other words, a calculated plan by the President to buttress his defense against charges of perjury and obstruction of justice. In short, rather than Morris's predicted Presidential bending, I anticipated an unrepentant President craftily wielding his "people power."

As reported by the *New York Times*, the President "ignored the trial," "coupled a rosy appraisal of the nation's state with an urgent appeal for action," "left it to his lawyers to attack the charges that he broke the law," and seized upon his State of the Union message "as his most potent defense." ("Unbowed, Clinton Presses Social Security Plan," Jan. 20, 1998: A1)

From a psychological perspective, the most striking aspect of the 1999 State of the Union address was its congruity with Clinton's character. More specifically, it revealed a personality style

that adaptively employs dissociation to present a pleasing public facade or, in Maureen Dowd's more disparaging view, a "tour de farce" by a "compartmentalizing" President with an unprecedented capacity "to wall himself off from himself."

#### **The Post-Acquittal Statement**

My general expectation was that President Clinton's response to his acquittal would combine the essential features of his August 17, 1998, address to the nation following his grand jury testimony and his 1999 State of the Union address: a carefully crafted expression of contrition without full acknowledgment of personal responsibility for

#### **Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting**

**Saturday, March 6, 1999**

#### **"Understanding the Impact of Impeachment"**

- **Herbert Barry (University of Pittsburgh)**
- **Paul Elovitz (Ramapo College)**
- **Betty Glad (University of South Carolina)**
- **Ted Goertzel (Rutgers)**
- **Aubrey Immelman (St. John's University)**

**Contact the Editor at <pelovitz@aol.com>.**

any wrongdoing, punctuated by an undertone of defiance and underscored with his agenda for the future.

The President's five-sentence statement was notable for its classic Clintonian ambiguity as much as for its brevity. Its key element was encrypted in the phrase, "I want to say again to the American people how profoundly sorry I am for what I said and did to trigger these events [the impeachment proceedings] and the great burden they have imposed on the Congress and the American people."

In parsing the meaning of these words, it is patently clear that the President admitted to no specific wrongdoing; there is no elaboration on what, exactly, it is that he "said and did." More striking, however, is the President's use of the word "trigger," which cleverly connotes diminished responsibility. The plausible subtext, given Bill Clinton's way with words, is that his private misconduct distally triggered an independent counsel investigation and a partisan prosecution, which in turn served as proximate causes for "the great burden" imposed on the nation.

With reference to his agenda for the future,

the President limited his remarks to a general appeal to "rededicate ourselves to the work of serving our nation and building our future together." However, in a more comprehensive contemporaneous message to his White House staff, released to the press, he said, "Now, together we have much more to do to meet our obligations to future generations. We have set our goals before the American people: from saving Social Security and Medicare, to strengthening education and health care, to advancing peace and security around the world."

### Conclusion

How did we get to this ignoble juncture in the history of the American Presidency? For the record, Bill Clinton is psychologically far removed from Richard Nixon, the only other President this century to have faced impeachment. That said, I submit that in the character of Bill Clinton the seeds of its own undoing germinate abundantly in the fertile fields of Presidential power.

The failings of the narcissistic-histrionic character extend predominately to self-indulgent excess, including sexual intemperance. More important, when these personalities land themselves in trouble, it is generally with absence of malice. Their instincts are self-serving rather than malevolent. In their benign arrogance they overlook their vulnerabilities and take unwarranted risks, including self-protective lying and duplicity. When entrusted with the high office of the Presidency, such individuals, without posing an undue risk to constitutional democracy, may nonetheless exploit their privileged position to bring disrepute to the Presidency and compromise the public trust.

*Aubrey Immelman, PhD, is an associate professor of psychology at St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict in Minnesota. He is a political psychologist specializing in the personality assessment of Presidents, Presidential candidates, and other public figures. □*

## An American in Amsterdam: Arthur Mitzman

David D. Lee

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

*Arthur Mitzmann (b. 1931) became Professor of History at the University of*

*Amsterdam in 1971 after teaching at Brooklyn and Goddard colleges and Rochester and Simon Fraser universities. He has held visiting professorships at Rutgers University and the College de France. Professor Mitzman is best known for his contributions to the history of sociology, The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber (1970), Sociology and Estrangement: Three Sociologists of Imperial Germany (1973), and Michelet, Historian: Rebirth and Romanticism in Nineteenth-Century France (1990). Forthcoming in 1999 is Michelet ou la subversion du passé. The Iron Cage has been translated into Japanese and Spanish. His psychohistorical contributions include "Comments on Peter Gay's Lectures on History and Psychoanalysis" (in Three Cultures, 1989) and the preface to the Dutch translation of Peter Gay, Freud for Historians (1987). Mitzman has published widely in various languages on Flaubert, Michelet, and historical consciousness and identity. In 1982 Professor Mitzman received the William Langer Award for Best Article in The Psychohistory Review, and he has also served as a Fellow of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study. David Lee interviewed him in Amsterdam on November 5, 1998.*

**DL:** Could you tell us about your family and personal history?

**AM:** I have two siblings, a brother nine years older and a sister four-and-a-half years older. My father (1893-1972) was a roofing materials wholesaler. My mother (1901- ) was a housewife. My father came from the Lower East Side, my mother from Brooklyn. My father was barely educated, part of the generation of children whose parents had come to the U.S. between roughly 1880 and 1900. This generation of Eastern European Jews was very largely a lost generation because of the tremendous difficulties in assimilating, although they did receive some help from the existing Jewish community, particularly the German Jewish community. In fact, there were very few economic opportunities and my grandfather was often unemployed. My grandmother was frequently ill, with the result that my father had to be sent to an orphanage to be brought up. He didn't spend very much time there; he didn't like it and ran away on more than one occasion. He became one of those New York street kids at the age of 11 or 12. He had learned enough to read and write, although not terribly well. But he had a particular aptitude with figures which came in very useful when calculating costs.

For a long time he only worked at odd jobs but he gradually worked his way to more and more responsible things. He got work at a chemical factory around the First World War. While working there he noticed that some factory refuse might make good roofing material. He bought it and went into business for himself selling it and did quite well.

**DL:** A real entrepreneur.

**AM:** Yes, that he was! He was also known for his generosity. He was extremely helpful to family, neighbors, and acquaintances during the Great Depression. My father owned the house we lived in, renting out the lower floor. His mother died in the house shortly before I was born there in 1931. When the downstairs family was unable to pay the rent, my father let them stay anyway.

**DL:** I'm hearing that he had a strong sense of responsibility for his community. Was this religious in origin?

**AM:** He was totally irreligious.

**DL:** Was there a Marxist or socialist origin?

**AM:** Not that I know of. It came from a sense of responsibility to his family. Despite the fact that his parents could not bring him up, he still felt responsibility to the family.

**DL:** What kind of relationship did you have with your siblings?

**AM:** My sister and I shared a rivalry which she felt more keenly than I. I was the youngest and I was rather spoiled. With my brother I had a good relationship, but he was, after all, nine years older than I. He was the guy who took me to the Museum of Natural History when I was about seven. Generally he was someone I looked up to a great deal. When he came back from the army in 1945 I discovered that he was relatively left wing for the time, which I suppose wasn't all that unusual for a young Jewish boy in 1945. He very quickly became a lot less left wing, fairly conservative, and went into my father's line of work. Though he didn't do as well, he did all right for himself and his family.

**DL:** Have you ever written or considered writing an autobiographical piece?

**AM:** Not really. It's curious, my wife just brought it up today.

**DL:** But you've never seriously considered

it? Because in several of your works you stress the importance of biography to understanding what you term "national mentalities."

**AM:** The people I've written biographies of were interesting because their creativity revealed something about their societies. This was true with Weber, with Flaubert, with Wittgenstein. I doubt very much that anyone could find any insight into either American or Dutch society by examining my biography.

**DL:** Who at Columbia and Brandeis influenced your thinking on history and sociology?

**AM:** Of course, Fritz Stern [ed., *Varieties of History*], from the standpoint of style. There were some teachers I recall fondly, but if I were to look for major influences I would say that the History of Ideas program at Brandeis around 1959 to 1962 was a very powerful department. It was an extraordinary place: Herbert Marcuse, Lewis Coser, and Frank Manuel, who was also a masterful stylist. Apart from that, however, the area which influenced me the most has been outside the university. Two different groups had a more powerful stimulus than my formal schooling between the ages of 16 or 17 and 25.

**DL:** Can you describe this?

**AM:** In the first place, the Socialist Zionist youth group Hashomer Hatzair, of which I was a member, was enormously educational. This was in 1947 to 1948 just before the establishment of the State of Israel. There was still a certain kind of socialist idealism one could merge with Zionism, which in the case of Hashomer Hatzair took the form of arguing for a bi-national state. This, of course, came to absolutely nothing. But it was very useful in opening up my mind, my social vision which had already been primed by a certain awareness of what had happened to the East European Jewish community during and immediately after the Second World War. I realized with shock that I had come from that community and it had now largely vanished. That was a sort of primal social-historical experience. Hashomer Hatzair was a prolongation of that. It was an interesting experience. Following Hashomer, there was an even more broadening experience in New York City with a libertarian Marxist circle that published a periodical called *Contemporary Issues*.

**DL:** Were these experiences more influential than your academic interactions?

**AM:** I would say that they preceded and

shaped my academic and intellectual interests. For example, I learned about Marcuse and the Frankfurt School from these groups. One of the reasons I went to Brandeis was that Marcuse was there.

**DL:** Along similar lines, from that period could you name five books which profoundly influenced you? Would Erikson be on that list?

**AM:** I wasn't familiar with Erikson's early work and only read it later, so it didn't influence me much. I would certainly include Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution* and *Eros and Civilization*. Horkheimer's *Eclipse of Reason* and Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* as well. I recall really enjoying Cassirer's *Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. Also, I learned from E.P. Thompson's *Making of the English Working Class* and various works of Marx. I gradually came to realize the limitations of Marx's approach, but his style is fantastic!

**DL:** How did you come to history as a discipline and a profession?

**AM:** I didn't originally begin in history, or even in the humanities. After high school in 1949 I enrolled in a pre-medical program at Rutgers which I failed miserably because I had neither knowledge of nor aptitude for chemistry. So after six months I began studying music, as I had played the violin since I was rather small and wanted to learn to compose. I studied music for four years, did not learn to compose, did not sufficiently improve my skills as a violinist, and actually discovered during the course of my musical training that my real interests were in history, philosophy, and contemporary politics.

**DL:** Tell us about the origins of your two major works, *The Iron Cage* and *Sociology and Estrangement*.

**AM:** In 1967 I was pursuing the possibility of publishing my doctoral thesis on three German sociologists, Toennies, Sombart, and Michels as *Sociology and Estrangement*. The publisher, realizing that these were not well known figures, asked if I would add a chapter on a visible figure, such as Max Weber. I consented, but as this chapter unfolded, it developed into a book of its own! Thus, *The Iron Cage* was actually written as an addition to *Sociology and Estrangement*. Reinhard Bendix, whose work I knew, approached Weber in what I considered a monolithic way -- as if one Weber existed at all times. As I read Weber's early work in particular, a steady

development within his thought became clear to me. In terms of his psychological development, a certain weaning from paternal authority along with some striking and obvious oedipal elements was evident. I found myself writing a psychobiography because it seemed to be the only intelligent thing to do at the time.

**DL:** To what extent was your decision to approach these issues psychohistorically the product of your own development and to what extent the product of larger movements within then current historiography or academia in general?

**AM:** I wasn't much aware of the psychohistorical movement. In about 1966 Peter Loewenberg and I appeared together on the same panel at an American Historical Association meeting. So I knew something of his thought, I knew his "Nazi Youth Cohort" article, which I've always admired. I had been teaching Freud as a major figure in intellectual history from 1962 on. Freud was in the air at the time. Frank Manuel was using Freud. Marcuse had published *Eros and Civilization* which sensitized many to the broader social implications of Freud's thought. But I cannot recall specifically when I first encountered psychohistory. I realized that what Erikson was doing with Freud was very important. Erikson's use of Freud was anthropologically sensitive and, because history was becoming that way, Erikson was interesting to historians. To do something intelligent with Freud it was necessary to extract him from the therapeutic framework and expand the scope of the investigation beyond childhood experiences and see the entire life course of the individual.

**DL:** What does it mean to practice psychohistory?

**AM:** Unfortunately, most of those who claim to be doing psychohistory are extremely limited as historians. It involves either an emphasis on application of psychoanalytic constructs to an individual's life or some kind of study in the history of psychoanalysis. My experience is that a great many psychohistorians in mastering psychoanalytic theory have neglected other relevant aspects of historical study. Mentalities, ideologies, and larger socio-economic frameworks of history are usually ignored by psychohistorians. Psychoanalytically sensitive historians, such as Carl Schorske and Peter Gay, cannot be accused of this. Yet they usually wouldn't call themselves psychohistorians.

**DL:** What would you say is your primary affiliation or identification?

**AM:** I'm a cultural and intellectual historian.

**DL:** What are you researching now? Any continued interest in psychohistorical work?

**AM:** What I'm involved with today is really quite different from anything I've done in the past. I have a book on the boards, *Beyond Prometheus*, on freedom and solidarity in the 21st century, which is absurdly ambitious. It does have a root in everything I've done in the past. You've noticed the strong element of social engagement in my work as a whole. The theoretical root of that social engagement is in my notion of a civilizing offensive. This is a controversial notion. The French have a somewhat more neutral term, *mission moralisatrice* of the bourgeoisie. It's a concept which is derived from Norbert Elias' book, *The Civilizing Process*. What it signifies is that what we now have as civilization is built up on the ruins of an infinite number of cultures and mentalities which from the standpoint of our notion of civilization didn't cut the mustard. They were either too lazy or too licentious. They lacked discipline, the proper sense of authority. In place of all those we have our present, quite marvelous world. This world is coming apart at the seams, partly on a short-term basis because of the lunacy of its economic constructions and its myths of pure individualism when historians know that individuals do not exist without a social nexus. On a long-term basis, the natural environment is reacting to our failures. The strange weather we're having all over the world is producing phenomena never seen before. All the pollution problems, for example, acid rain, are coming from this marvelous victory of civilization, which is leading us to a wall beyond which we cannot go without taking another course. The *Beyond Prometheus* project is a look at what the wall consists of and what resources there are for finding a way around it.

**DL:** I hear in your new project a very similar ring to what you wrote in *Sociology and Estrangement*:

It seems to me of great value for the social scientist and the humanist to return to the obscured origins of contemporary sociology where they may find not only perspectives for the delineation of new critical approaches to the analysis of society, but also examples of the courage that they will need to face their responsibilities.

A very poignant and potent point.

Could you comment on your experience as an American academic in Europe?

**AM:** I've taught at the University of Amsterdam for 25 years. Other than guest lectures here and there, I've remained here. There's obviously an enormous difference between European and American universities. Not the least of these differences is that there is no liberal arts program here. No one expects to learn that kind of knowledge at universities. The university's exclusive function is to train professionals in particular disciplines. They may be scholarly or practical disciplines, but from the first day at the university you're in training for them. But this is changing. There is more attention given here in Amsterdam to different aspects of the humanities.

**DL:** What is your impression of European academic reaction to psychohistory?

**AM:** Unnecessarily hostile. Many colleagues reject the idea that psychoanalytic constructs could be useful to the study of history in any way shape or form. Their standard criticisms are either that it is a bankrupt set of ideas, or if they're more cautious and sympathetic, they'll say, it's all right as a therapy, I suppose, and possibly all right for analyzing Freud's own background, but trying to apply it before Freud brings you into anachronism. They find psychohistory too culturally bound.

**DL:** What value do you place on childhood in your work?

**AM:** In working on Flaubert, which I did for a number of years without publishing more than a couple of articles, I came to the conclusion that there were two aspects of Flaubert that were decisive motors for his creativity. One was his adolescent relations with friends which continued throughout adulthood. The very close peer group was continually determinant for his creativity and keeping him alive. And the other, very specifically, was his relationship to his sister, which I'm convinced verged on incest. It's an aspect of the pressure-cooker, bourgeois family structure of his class, his area, and his time. I think you can see a great deal in his work in the light of these motor forces to his creativity. In the few studies of individuals I've done, I've found childhood important because it revealed something about their society. Weber, for example, illuminates the paternalistic and authoritarian aspects of German society. This is where

psychohistory can contribute to the larger project of history.

**DL:** Do you have any observations on the dynamic of contemporary political violence and terrorism? What does psychohistory have to offer discussions of this nature?

**AM:** I don't see these as psychohistorical, but as political and social, problems. These are issues whose magnitude transcends the therapeutic limitations of psychoanalysis.

**DL:** What, then, would you say, is the value of psychohistory to cultural, intellectual, even European, history?

**AM:** I often find psychohistorical works to be fundamentally misguided. Approaching political history as the larger manifestation of one individual's psychic history will never be very convincing. I have always steered clear of trying to understand a phenomenon, such as Nazism or Stalinism or any major political movement by a psychoanalytic understanding of its leading figure. When it comes to these major movements, the leaders are more symbolic than anything else. They're symbolic of a very profound feeling among those who bring them to power. It's never seemed to me that you can understand anything about either Bolshevism by understanding Stalin's paranoia or Nazism by understanding Hitler's distorted childhood experiences. In both of these cases the only recourse for the historian is a very broad social, economic, and political understanding of the entire context from which they come and the masses who support and accept them. That is crucial. And where the individual becomes significant for psychohistory is most of all where he reveals something about his society that we would otherwise not know. The use of psychoanalysis in cultural history can be highly valuable. This is why I so admire Carl Schorske's new book, *Thinking With History* (1998).

*David Lee has just completed his PhD in modern European history on the life and work of the Protestant pastor/psychoanalyst Oskar Pfister at UCLA under the direction of Peter Loewenberg. He is currently on fellowship in the Department of Psychology at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands and is writing comparatively on the standardization of methodology in psychoanalysis and behaviorism. He may be contacted at <D.D.LEE@ppsw.rug.nl>. □*

## Showalter on Hysterical Diseases

David Lotto  
University of Massachusetts

*Review of Elaine Showalter, Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Media. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997. ISBN 0231104596 (pb.), x, 244 pp., \$11.96.*

Elaine Showalter, a Professor of Humanities and English at Princeton, describes herself as a literary critic, a historian of medicine, and a feminist. In her previous book, *The Female Malady* (1986), she argued that "epidemic hysteria" is an extreme and self-destructive form of feminine protest, a body language expression of women's rebellion against patriarchal oppression.

Her present book, published in 1997, looks at certain current phenomena in a historical context using a psychoanalytic approach. Showalter's position is that hysteria and hysterical epidemics are cultural symptoms of anxiety and distress. She sees hysteria as something that has been with us for a long time, continues today, and will be with us in the future, as long as there are group fantasies and fears. Her central thesis is that hysterical epidemics involve the coming together of three factors: vulnerable people who can become patients; doctors and theorists who define the syndrome; and a supportive cultural environment. She believes that hysteria, while primarily psychogenic, is quite real and universal. Her attitude toward those suffering from the symptoms of hysteria is consistently respectful and empathic throughout the book.

The book has three sections: "Histories," reviews the history of the concept of hysteria from the 17th century until the present; "Cultures" examines the presentation of hysteria in literature, theater, and film; while the third section, "Epidemics," gets down to cases. The last is the longest section of the book and the most controversial. Showalter has a chapter each on six phenomena which she labels as hysterical epidemics: chronic fatigue syndrome, Gulf War Syndrome, recovered memory, multiple personality disorder, satanic ritual abuse, and alien abduction.

Showalter, by publishing this book, has become acutely aware of how controversial her stance is. She expresses surprise at the depth of the

hostility it has generated. As she says in her preface, "I didn't foresee that my editors at Columbia University Press would be called 'cunt sucking maggots' to let this one slither through." Or that she would receive quantities of hate mail which would "advise me to get a bodyguard, threaten to rip me apart, or warn me of assassination unless I recanted." However, even before the book was published, she was well aware that she was dealing with provocative material. She says:

I expect that defining recovered memory, chronic fatigue, and Gulf War Syndrome as contemporary hysterias, and analyzing them on a continuum with alien abduction stories and conspiracy theories will infuriate thousands of people who believe they are suffering from unidentified organic disorders or the aftereffects of trauma.

One of the most valuable contributions that Showalter makes in this book is her emphasis on historical context. She points out that hysterical epidemics seem to reach peaks as the turn of a century approaches. The Salem witch trials happened in the 1690s; the 1790s saw a flurry of interest in "mesmerism"; and interest in "classical" hysteria, stimulated by the work of Janet, Charcot, Bernheim, and the early Freud, peaked in the 1890s. The six examples of the current phenomena she calls hysterical epidemics seem to be reaching their peaks with the approach of the millennium.

Showalter also examines some of the historical evolutions "hysterias" have gone through. She reminds us of the history of what we now call post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD): from the mid-19th-century "railway spine" (the cluster of PTSD symptoms observed in survivors and witnesses to railway accidents), to "shell shock" in World War I, "battle fatigue" in World War II, and finally PTSD following the Vietnam war. She suggests that Gulf War Syndrome is the latest manifestation along this historical continuum.

Similarly, she points out the virtual identity between the symptom cluster which was labeled "neurasthenia," a very widespread diagnosis in the late 19th and early 20th centuries which has totally disappeared today, and the contemporary symptom cluster labeled "chronic fatigue syndrome" or "fibromyalgia."

Showalter sees all of these "hysterias," past

and present, as being some of the many ways that humans react to the conditions and circumstances of their lives which they find difficult. She is careful to reiterate that she does not believe that "hysterics," people who are suffering with a variety of symptoms, painful feelings, and disturbing "memories," are liars, weaklings, or "neurotics," or that the physicians, therapists, and others who believe in the literal truth of their stories are villains trying to profit or deceive. Rather, the patients are individuals who have found one of many ways to express their pain and unhappiness, and to protest. They have experienced and suffered from trauma of various sorts, but they may not be correct in their attribution of its sources.

Showalter is interested in the specific form hysterical expression takes with regard to gender differences. She points out that 80% of those diagnosed with chronic fatigue syndrome are women, as are more than 90% of those reporting recovered memories of childhood sexual abuse and those diagnosed with multiple personality disorder. Accusations of Satanic ritual abuse also come overwhelmingly from women. Among those claiming alien abduction there are three times as many women as men. Her explanation is that:

The conflicts women try to resolve with histories are ... complex. Recovered memories of sexual abuse are unreliable, but child abuse, rape, and violence against women is an everyday reality that affects every woman's sense of security and

**Call for Nominations  
Halpern Award  
for the  
Best Psychohistorical Idea  
in a  
Book, Article,  
or Computer Site**

**This Award may be granted at the level  
of Distinguished Scholar, Graduate, or  
Undergraduate.**

**Contact the Editor at**

autonomy. Women have traditionally used

hysterical disorders to compensate for the absence of adventure and challenge in their lives and to deal with real sorrows, dissatisfactions, and disappointments.

She answers the question, in regard to memories of sexual abuse, Why would anyone choose to take on the pain and turmoil of being a survivor if it were not true?, by suggesting the operation of "a combination of suggestibility and social coercion" along with "the availability of these explanations for a variety of anxieties and discontents in women's lives."

Men are the primary sufferers of Gulf War Syndrome and the PTSD diagnoses related to the trauma of warfare. They have to deal with the additional burden that developing a psychological illness in response to the trauma of war is regarded as unmanly. It is far more acceptable to be suffering from a physical illness caused by germs, poisons, or damage to the nervous system.

While Showalter does not identify herself as a psychohistorian, both her methods and conclusions are psychohistorical:

Modern forms of individual and mass hysteria have much to tell us about the anxieties and fantasies of Western culture, especially in the United States and Europe. We can use our knowledge of the past to interpret what is happening today.... And we can lead the way in making distinctions between metaphors and realities, between therapeutic narratives and destructive hystories. If hysteria is a protolanguage rather than a disease, we must pay attention to what it is telling us.

She is quite forceful about the dangers of mistaking metaphor for reality:

Whether the details of these narratives are demonstrably true may not be as important as their imaginative and spiritual resonance for the individual. But extending private psychoanalytic or artistic testimonies to the media and the courts is risky. We must exercise caution as a society when histories take on that political, judicial form, when they stop being therapeutic and cross the line into accusation and prosecution....  
...the hysterical epidemics of the 1990s have already gone on too long, and they continue to do damage: in distracting us from the real problems and crises of modern society, in undermining a respect for evidence and

truth, and in helping support an atmosphere of conspiracy and suspicion.

Her concluding chapter is entitled "The Crucible," a reference to Arthur Miller's play about the Salem witch trials. I would like to conclude this review with the author's closing exhortation, with which I am in agreement:

Men and women, therapists and patients, will need courage to face the hidden fantasies, myths, and anxieties that make up the current hysterical crucible; we must look into our own psyches rather than to invisible enemies, devils, and alien invaders for the answers.

*David Lotto, PhD, is a psychotherapist and psychoanalyst in private practice in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in the Berkshire Mountains, as well as an adjunct professor at the University of Massachusetts. He is a longtime member of the Psychohistory Forum and of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) as well as a frequent contributor to these pages and the Journal of Psychohistory. □*

## **Analysts on the Couch: Part III: John Bowlby**

**Andrew Brink**

**Psychohistory Forum Research Associate**

*[Editor's Note: In Clio's Psyche's last September and December issues, Professor Andrew Brink wrote in-depth review essays of psychobiographies of the prominent psychoanalysts Donald Winnicott, Ronald Fairbairn, and Harry Guntrip. In this issue he concludes the series with a review of a recent book on John Bowlby. Though Bowlby was more of an enigma than are most people, Brink found him to be "a dear man, generous and helpful to me over many years" with "one of his last generous acts" being to work to "get better distribution in the U.K." for Brink's "psychobiography of Bertrand Russell, which he really liked and wanted to see readily available."]*

*Review Essay of Suzan van Dijken, John Bowlby: His Early Life, A Biographical Journey into the Roots of Attachment Theory. London/New York: Free Association Books, 1998. ISBN: 1853433934 (pb.), viii, 214 pp., \$20.00.*

Is a biographical assessment of John Bowlby's contribution to psychoanalysis yet possible? Compared to the contributions of Winnicott, Fairbairn, and Guntrip, Bowlby's are of the greatest magnitude and the most scientific, the most exportable to other fields. Yet, Bowlby the man is less known, and less knowable, because he did not wish to be known. Despite psychoanalytic training and a lifetime of practicing child analysis, Bowlby seemed uninterested in the intricacies of his own personality, nor did he leave evidence of an ongoing struggle for which further analysis was sought. He achieved enough sense of personal security to become a confident, even aggressive, scientist of infant and child development -- perhaps the leading English-speaking psychological innovator this century. His *Attachment and Loss* is a classic.

Throughout much of his 83-year life, Bowlby (1907-1990) was controversial and embattled, an uncomfortable presence in his profession. He not only staunchly defended the rights of children, whom he saw often tragically separated from their parents by illness, death, divorce, and wars, he also pursued the theory of separation and loss. His acknowledged starting point was Freud's (atypical) paper, "Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety" (1926), which countered Otto Rank's theory of "birth trauma" with one of anxiety generated by the infant's fear of separation from mother. Bowlby's studies of juvenile delinquents and children separated from parents in wartime, later reinforced by primate studies, led him to postulate an instinct for attachment. This put into question Freud's drive theory and showed the importance of pre-oedipal development in the emotional well-being of children. While Bowlby had no intention of attacking Freudian fundamentals, he was seen by many analysts as doing so. Similarly, Melanie Klein and her followers were annoyed with Bowlby for questioning the primacy of "phantasy" in infants and insisting upon observed details of what went on between mothers and their infants. Bowlby, the empiricist, preferred to see emotional disorders of adults in terms of actual relational precursors in their early attachment experiences. Thus, a culturally determined mind-set of Bowlby's, reinforced by his Cambridge and London education in the biological sciences and medicine, put him at odds with the middle-European founders of psychoanalysis. When World War II brought some of them as refugees to London, the stage was set for a clash which has not yet been resolved.

Bowlby was a post-Victorian Darwinian liberal; he had strong reforming inclinations, hating war and human discord of all kinds. Yet he was a privileged product of his class, confident in his formidable power of intellect, and somewhat military in manner and bearing, reflecting his time as an army psychiatrist. Non-English people have a hard time knowing how to take such persons, even when they are internationally known analysts. Bowlby's latest and fullest biographer, Suzan van Dijken, is a researcher at the Centre for Child and Family Studies at Leiden University, the Netherlands.

Her English is exceptionally good, but she does not know England from the inside, nor did she know Bowlby himself. The advantage of being an outsider is that her biography is meticulously built up from research data gathered from family, colleagues, and archives. She has ordered and consolidated her gatherings with great skill and the narrative moves well (though her study is taken only to 1951, which is when Bowlby's famous World Health Organization report on the mental health of children was published). The disadvantage is that Ms. Van Dijken's documentary thoroughness takes her away from speculating much on the enigma of Bowlby's personality. Hers is fittingly an "intellectual biography" and she wonders why Bowlby should have chosen to study separation and loss as his life's work. Bowlby himself gives strong indications of the reasons as being in his personal development and is quoted as saying of his parenting that he had been "sufficiently hurt but not sufficiently damaged." (p. 11) What exactly did he mean by this? Instead of speculating, Van Dijken quotes analysts Eric Trist and Jock Sutherland about Bowlby's "'protective shell'" that "'John's own early experience must have included a degree, if not of actual deprivation, of some inhibition of his readiness to express affection.'" (p. 11) Her "Overview" disappointingly emphasizes Bowlby's separations from his army surgeon father and being sent away to school, though she does mention the early loss of his "much loved nursemaid, Minnie" as sensitizing him to separations. (p. 154; see also p. 26) But Bowlby's main interest was not with fathers or even nursemaids but with mothers and their infants and children. More should have been said, in terms of Bowlby's own categories of anxious attachment, about the consequences for children of mothers, especially those temperamentally distant as May Bowlby was, who give up primary care to nurses and nannies. The

concept of anxious avoidant attachment, as developed by Bowlby's followers, Mary Ainsworth and Mary Main, would have been especially apt to discuss.

Several attempts have been made by interviewers to elicit personal information from Bowlby, none of them satisfactory. Rosemary Dinnage's "Understanding Loss: The Bowlby Canon" (*Psychology Today*, May, 1980) calls him "one of the most reticent of men," likening him to "a retired military or naval gentleman of the old school." (p. 56) Dinnage obviously had a thin [lean, unrewarding] time with Bowlby, not experiencing his capacity for engagement and warmth. Similarly, Nora Newcombe and Jeffrey C. Lerner were kept at a distance when interviewing for "Britain Between the Wars: The Historical Context of Bowlby's Theory of Attachment" (*Psychiatry*, February, 1982). This astute paper focuses on Bowlby's theories' taking their rise in an era of wartime separations and losses; but Bowlby managed to elude the interviewers by not imparting how very close to home such experiences were. Christopher Fortune met with Bowlby to talk about childhood sexual abuse, publishing "Psychoanalytic Champion of 'Real-Life' Experience: An Interview with John Bowlby" (*Melanie Klein and Object Relations*, December, 1991). Fortune was somewhat more successful, beginning his taped interview while walking to a London pub. Later at the Tavistock Institute he found Bowlby's manner "unpretentious and down-to-earth," despite "his characteristic upper-class British accent." (p. 70) This is a wide-ranging and informative interview, but still not very personal as to Bowlby's motivation for being the crusader he was on behalf of children.

Robert Karen's *Becoming Attached: Unfolding the Mystery of the Infant-Mother Bond and Its Impact on Later Life* (1994), an excellent introduction to the theory, also contains the rudiments of a good biography. Karen rightly reports Bowlby as having seemed "emotionally distant," yet "very direct, admirably, almost touchingly, incapable of being devious, and ... possessed of an unshakable integrity." (p. 29) Still, the best assessment of Bowlby's inner life is Jeremy Holmes, *John Bowlby and Attachment Theory* (1993). While Holmes lacked the array of information with which Van Dijken works, his English training as a psychotherapist gave him special powers of insight. Holmes shows the real starting point for a psychobiography of Bowlby

when he writes, "Attachment Theory might be seen as a return by Bowlby to the values of his mother which he had rejected when he became a psychoanalyst. Disappointed with his mother's self-preoccupation and favoritism, he turned to the many mothers of psychoanalysis -- Klein, Rivière, and Payne. But these, too, partly through their own limitations, partly because they contained his hostile projections, disappointed in their turn. By marrying the biology of ethology with Freudian theory, he managed to reconcile the discordant elements in his personality: his country-loving mother with her respect for nature, and the intimidating urban medical father whose success and intelligence were inspirational but whose Gradgrindian [excessively practical and unimaginative] devotion to fact and duty dominated his life." (pp. 27-28) Bowlby was profoundly attuned to the natural world, a lover of trees and plants, and a skilled bird-watcher; he was a kind of nature mystic who saw no use in organized religion. Nature was maternal and nourishing, while paternal intellect was necessarily instrumental in dealing with uncomfortable emotion. He somehow managed to draw together these two aspects of being into an incomparable, unified personality which was both distant and warmly reassuring. Bowlby was a psychobiographer of Charles Darwin (1990) and he must have realized that a similar attempt would be made for himself. The task of putting such a man on the psychobiographer's couch remains, but we should be grateful for the partial efforts so far made.

*Andrew Brink, PhD, is a literary scholar and psychohistorian who taught at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, from 1961 to 1988, and from 1988 to 1993 he directed the Humanities and Psychoanalytic Thought Programme at Trinity College at the University of Toronto. From 1979 to 1988 he helped to edit the papers of Bertrand Russell and also published Bertrand Russell: The Psychobiography of a Moralist (1989). He serves as a trustee of the Holland Society of New York and of the Psychohistory Forum. His other books include Obsession and Culture: A Study of Sexual Obsession in Modern Fiction (1996), which studies writers H.G. Wells, Hermann Hesse, Vladimir Nabokov, John Fowles, and John Updike, and the forthcoming, The Creative Matrix: Anxiety and the Origin of Creativity, which will show how Freudian and Kleinian theories of creativity are giving way to an attachment model, owing to the*

*research of John Bowlby and others into how anxiety arises in human development; the study will offer a theory of creativity as adaptational for the Avoidant/Con-trolling personality organization typically found in our culture. □*

## **Roots of the Jonesboro Schoolyard Killings: Envy of the Feminine**

**Garth W. Amundson**

**Psychohistory Forum Research Associate**

Just after the Jonesboro schoolyard murders, I arrived in northeast Arkansas early last April with my wife and baby daughter. I was anxious to assume my post as clinical psychologist and director of a small but active community mental health center in Paragould, a town approximately 20 miles north of the now famous (or, if you like, infamous) town of Jonesboro. I was lured there from my position in a state-run psychiatric hospital located in Chicago, Illinois, by a federal government agency called the National Health Service Corps. This agency is a kind of white-collar Peace Corps which places health professionals in "underserved," mostly rural, areas of the nation. In return for two years of service, the National Health Service Corps pays off the individual's student loans.

The mass murder in the schoolyard at Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, in which five girls and a female teacher were shot and killed by two fellow classmates, boys a mere 11 and 13 years old, occurred in late March of last year, just prior to our arrival. This article contains some of my preliminary thoughts regarding the meaning of this tragedy. To be clear, I do not claim to have definitive answers regarding the possible social and psychological roots and meaning of this tragic incident. Rather, I wish to raise preliminary questions about the possible effects of the social and cultural climate of the American South on the psyche of people living there. I write from the perspective of a psychoanalytically oriented psychologist with an interest in anthropological and sociological theories of human nature.

Two days after moving into our condominium in Jonesboro (we settled in the largest town in the region hoping to smooth the transition from Chicago), my wife and I met some older neighbors of about 55 or 60 years of age who

were lifelong residents of this area. They shared their enthusiasm for the economically prosperous Jonesboro, and listened to our descriptions of Chicago. Eventually, the discussion turned to the Westside tragedy about which the man, in an apparent attempt to protect his community (and himself) from what he believed to be the critical scrutiny of a Northerner, commented, "Everyone talks about how violent the South is, and this will just fuel the fire."

Indeed. I would be less than honest to say that I am unaware of the South's perverse love affair with authoritarian social and political structures, the latest example of which is arguably the mania for state-sponsored executions now occurring in Texas. The South's earlier embrace of slavery and, following that, its legally instituted policy of racial segregation, go without saying. In my own job, I was often harshly criticized by both supervisors and colleagues for such things as giving clients copies of the psychological evaluation which I wrote about them and attempting to establish group supervision to facilitate discussion about work-related problems, including staff conflicts. The response of various colleagues to these and other practices and ideas was to inform me, directly and indirectly, that those at the top of the organizational hierarchy disapproved. In a discussion about this issue with one of my staff, a social worker, I once asked rhetorically, "They made me a director. Shouldn't I *direct*?" Her response was, "You mean well. But, don't forget, this is the South."

Her comment returned to my memory on various occasions. One of those times was the day I decided to find out what the office space next door to our clinic was used for. I walked there to see the words "County Department of Community Punishment" etched on the glass door. I suddenly remembered having seen a court-referred client who had commented to me that he was sent "by the guys next door," a comment which confused me at the time but which I failed to query. Now I was no longer confused. At that moment I realized that our clinic offices were located directly adjacent to what, in other parts of the country, would probably be referred to as the County Department of Adult Probation. As a clinician I never want my work to be associated with punishment.

I wondered at the roots of this authoritarianism. Over the following months, I began to identify a possible source in the widespread prevalence of Protestant

fundamentalism. For example, our baby-sitter, a woman of 19, once explained to me that her Christian church was, in her words, "pretty liberal" in comparison to other area congregations. I asked what she defined as liberal and was told, "Well, we're not allowed to dance. But singing is all right, as long as it's during church services." Further, I have regularly been asked by total strangers if I would come to their church for a visit, on the premise that this is the appropriate way to become integrated into the community. Also, I became accustomed to seeing Jonesboro residents donning T-shirts with various evangelical slogans such as "What would Jesus do?" and "Saved." Local churches have been extremely politically active in Jonesboro and throughout the area, with the result that the entire county is "dry" (that is, alcohol sales are forbidden). Finally, the realtor who showed us our condominium once noted that Jonesboro is a "family-oriented" community. When I asked her to explain the reason for this, she cited the political involvement of various ministers who, as she said, "keep the bad element out."

A defining feature of Protestantism -- particularly in its fundamentalist forms -- is its vision of God as cosmic father figure, the ultimate authority who, as the Nicene Creed says, will "come to judge both the quick and the dead." I began to wonder, Is it possible that the shadow of this heavenly Father falls over the entire region, to be expressed, albeit covertly, in even the most apparently secular activities? If so, I reasoned, then the authoritarianism I experienced in some form everyday, might be traceable to the existence of a heavily patriarchal social organization. This patriarchal social system would ultimately be derived from a Protestant *Weltanschauung*, with which the citizenry would be unconsciously identified. For example, is it possible that the two boys accused of this crime were responding, at least in part, to the psychologically suffocating effects of growing up in a social environment in which conformity, particularly of the kind rooted in an attitude of subservience, is emphasized one-sidedly?

The problem may not be so much with the South and its social structures, or with peculiarly "Southern" ways of interpreting reality. Rather, I wonder if it is possible that in the South we find expressed in unusually concentrated form a more widespread, pathognomic American social and cultural value, one rooted in the above-mentioned Protestant worldview upon which our nation is

founded. Specifically, I mean the construction of maleness along, or perhaps I should say opposite, the lines of all that is fluid and ambiguous, or "natural," including the psychological qualities of emotion, empathy, and the desire for interpersonal mutuality and attachment. This vision of masculinity is manifested in, and perpetuated by, the unconscious misogyny of our social and political structures. For example, feminist scholars such as Mary Daly (*Gynecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, 1978) and Camille Paglia (*Sexual Personae*, 1990) argue that normative American visions of the "healthy" or "well adjusted" self valorize assertiveness, self-sufficiency, and achievement. Further, they state, these idealized psychological characteristics are one-sidedly ascribed to males, with the result that females are viewed as intrinsically less healthy or less well adjusted. These writers also note that, for all the superficial bravado of this construction of masculinity, it is one built on psychological quicksand. Specifically, they state that it is a vision of selfhood formed largely on the basis of an opposition to the "feminine" values of intimacy and empathy which challenge notions of the self as a well defined, self-contained entity, rather than on the basis of an affirmation of its own unique creative potentials. These scholars also echo the psychoanalytic formulation that we secretly long for, and even identify with, the qualities which we consciously most despise or fear in others. Based on this premise, Daly, Paglia and others assert that the one-sidedness of popular American concepts of masculinity imply, not simply that socially-dominant men loathe "feminine" qualities, but also that as a group they are deeply desirous -- and even envious -- of these qualities.

I suggest that events such as the Jonesboro schoolyard murders should cause us to think more deeply about if and how we Americans instill this "normative" masculine identity in our young boys. For example, is it possible that this tenuous construction of masculine identity creates and maintains a uniquely "American" vulnerability to narcissistic injury among males? Can we infer that the one-sided investment of American males in the values of independence and assertiveness leaves them with a sense of crushing shame when confronted with their own disavowed dependent longings? Further, do interpersonal interactions which reveal the poverty of this construction of selfhood figure in incidents of explosive, retaliatory rage by our young men, as they counterphobically reassert their wish for dominance and

independence through violence?

The manner in which the Jonesboro schoolyard murders were actually carried out is, in key respects, a microcosm -- as well as a caricature -- of certain of the social values upon which rural, and particularly rural Southern, communities are founded, values which themselves are rooted in the long tradition of Western patriarchy. For example, an examination of the events both leading up to and surrounding the murders implies that the accused harbored profound contempt for "feminine" psychological qualities. First and foremost is the fact that all of the victims were female, and that the older of the two boys had proposed the murders following his having been "dumped" by a girlfriend. The boy's use of guns, particularly their reliance on so-called "long rifles" to carry out the assault, is of such phallic significance as to barely warrant mention. Second, prior to the shootings, the older boy was investigated by Minnesota police, who suspected him of having sexually molested a three-year-old girl there (as a young boy he had lived in Minnesota with his grandparents). There is also evidence suggesting that throughout their lives both boys had been force-fed a symbolic diet of exaggerated but nevertheless widely popular American cultural images of maleness by various family members. For example, the younger of the two boys had a reputation in Jonesboro of riding about the streets on his bicycle sporting army fatigues, with a hunting knife strapped to his belt. Most of us are by now probably familiar with the formal portrait of the older boy, taken when he was five or six years old. In this picture he, like the younger boy, appears clad in military garb, proudly clutching a toy rifle.

The idea that the American South is more likely than other parts of the nation to foster the unmodulated, violent expression of "male" values by troubled youngsters is supported by the fact that three of the last four public school massacres occurring in the U.S. prior to my writing took place in the states of Kentucky, Mississippi, and Arkansas. The hypothesis that these killings occur in response to authoritarian and one-sidedly moralistic social structures rooted in a specifically Protestant worldview is supported by the facts that the high school students murdered in Kentucky were attacked as they gathered in a school hallway for an impromptu prayer and the assault on Mississippi high school students was orchestrated by a group of teenagers who had formed a Satanic cult consisting of self-proclaimed social outcasts. (Psychologists who study such cults regularly

describe them as functioning to support a counter-phobic flight from intolerable, unconscious guilt.)

I pose a question. In committing these crimes, is it possible that these boys recreated, in microcosmic form, what is perhaps the key psychological flaw of a one-sidedly patriarchal organization of society and culture -- namely, that in attempting to subjugate frightening "feminine" forces, patriarchy ultimately succeeds in doing no more than revealing the brittleness, instability, and ultimately self-undermining qualities of a worldview built upon the aggressive disavowal and rejection of things "female"? Looked at from the above perspective, the tragedy at the Westside Middle School represents a tragic intersection of the public and private spheres of existence, one which acts as a mirror of key social and psychological underpinnings of the cultural milieu which spawned it. By killing females en masse, these boys were arguably acting upon some of the premises of the patriarchal worldview transmitted to them.

*Garth W. Amundson, PsyD, is a clinical psychologist who took his doctoral degree at the Illinois School of Professional Psychology in 1994. He is affiliated with the International Federation for Psychoanalytic Education (IFPE) and the Chicago Open Chapter for the Study of Psychoanalysis which is an affiliate of Division 39 of the American Psychological Association. His discomfort with the social structures he encountered in Arkansas led him to return to Chicago in less than a year rather than after the two years he had planned. Dr. Amundson is currently working in a day treatment program for adult and adolescent program operated by York Health Care in Illinois and he is also an adjunct faculty member at the Institute for Clinical Social Work. His research interests include the impact of democratic social structures on psychoanalytic theory making. □*

## **Good Parenting in the 14th Century: Christine de Pisan**

**Norman Simms  
University of Waikato, New Zealand**

It is usual to find that important women in history are known only in shadowy and dependent ways -- their fathers, husbands, or sons being the real center of attention. But in some instances,

such as that which I am going to discuss, it works the other way around: it is because of the daughter that the father enters the history books. As I hope to show, too, this is as it ought to be in the case of Tommaso da Pizzano precisely because the success of his daughter, Christine de Pizan (ca. 1364-ca. 1430), marks his success as a father. The little we can piece together of his philosophy of parenting comes together in the career of this late 14th- and early 15th-century female poet.

Tommaso today can be found only in footnotes to the biographies of other people, but Christine, even before she was rediscovered by feminist literary historians in search of women poets to rank with Chaucer, Machaut, and Boccaccio, had 19th- and early 20th-century studies devoted to her. If there are entries about Tommaso in encyclopedias, they are brief notices, while Christine gets columns, if not pages. Yet in his own time, Tommaso was a distinguished physician, astrologer, and alchemist who spent much time in official capacities at the court of Charles V in Paris. After a distinguished double career, first as professor at the University of Bologna and then as medical officer in Venice, he chose to reside in Paris rather than Hungary, where Louis XII was also urging him to come. It was the combination of medical skills and precision in what today are taken as occult sciences that made him so attractive to these great figures of the early Renaissance. Perhaps it is precisely because he was not in the vanguard of the new sciences that overwhelmed the old systems of knowledge during the course of the 15th century that made him so forgettable in the modern world, recalled only because Christine was consistently so full of praises for him in her autobiographical writings.

Yet we cannot totally dismiss him as old-fashioned thinker. His role was more transitional. The students at Europe's most prestigious medical school, Bologna, had voted him professor at an early age. The city of Venice called him to be part of one of the most advanced sanitation projects after suffering from the plague. The French court valued him as physician, as well as adviser in state affairs because of his knowledge of astrology and alchemy -- not the quack pursuits they would later become but then sciences of process and influence, unlike the safe Aristotelian natural philosophies of fixed category and contingent power. In other words, he was one of those great men who help reshape society and culture so it can move forward in radically new directions.

For all Christine's praises of her father as a great thinker, however, it is her loyalty to him rather than his actual place as a scientist or philosopher that makes him worthy of our attention as psychohistorians. If we are concerned to find out both how and why societies change in their way of caring and rearing of children, particularly females, then we should want to know more about Christine's homelife and education. Why was she able to achieve success as an independent, intellectual woman at a time when other females, if they achieved artistic recognition, had to do so either within the confines of an ecclesiastical or an aristocratic system? Aside from her public denunciation of the misogynist traditions in life and literature -- it was Christine de Pizan who initiated and sustained the controversy surrounding Jean de Meun's *Romance of the Rose* -- and this is, of course, no inconsiderable part of her female independence! -- her poetry and thinking are, like her father's, more of the previous age than of the emerging Renaissance. Nevertheless, after both her father and her husband died, she forged a

### Forthcoming in the June Issue

- Interview with a Distinguished Featured Psychohistorian
- "The Insane Author of the *Oxford English Dictionary*"
- "Jews in Europe After World War II"
- "A Psychohistorian's Mother and Her Legacy"

career for herself and raised her children by dint of her writing; it was more by what she did, than by the specific content of her poetry, that she marks the transition out of medieval categories of thought and social relationships, including, of course, gender.

My point is that Christine would not have been what she became had it not been for her father, and this must include, given the period of her childhood, the care and attention of her "tender and loving" mother. In the domestic politics of the age, the fact that she nursed Christine is credit to Tommaso as much as it is to the mother. Though there are four crucial years between Christine's birth and her journey to Paris to join her father when she was under the exclusive care of her mother in Bologna -- it took that long for Tommaso to decide that he would remain with

Charles V -- the influence of the father is not absent in her upbringing. If it were up to her mother alone, Christine recalls many times, her intellectual talents would have been put down in favor of a more conventional domestic education. Her father always, even in his letters, promoted the training of her mind and her literary talents. At the University of Bologna he had known the French canonist Jean André whose daughter Novella was allowed to lecture in his place, albeit behind a curtain, and he also was aware of -- and probably himself was the product of -- a more liberal attitude towards children in Italy than in either France or England during the 14th century.

But it was more than the example of Novella or the Italian acceptance of children's noise and playing in the household that makes Tommaso stand out as a father -- and as a figure who represents one of those parents who mark the long and often painful route into loving and respectful families. It may be something special about his character which also attracted Charles V to him and made him -- and Christine -- an intimate of the royal household; and then, almost tragically -- both for himself and his family, as well as for the smooth development of progressive childrearing practices -- why the passing of the monarchy into the hands of the mad Charles VI meant an end to Tommaso's influence at court, and from there to the rest of French society. This special quality was Tommaso's rejection of physical punishment and humiliation as disciplinary tools. Christine always referred to her father as "kind."

In her own pedagogical essays, Christine recommends that children, especially young girls, should be allowed to play often and be taught through stories rather than formal lessons. Children should be rewarded with trinkets when they are good, and when they need correction they should not be beaten or locked in closets, but spoken to gently, so as to avoid "rebellion." Without her drawing the connections, we can see that these lessons she learned from her father made it possible for her to note that the cause of war was "cruelty" and the way to prevent conflict was through "justice."

When it came time for Christine to marry at the age of 15, which was normal for the year 1379, the groom was someone she chose herself, with the backing of her father, namely, Etienne du Castel, who, though somewhat older, she had known since infancy. She was not forced to marry

for the sake of financial or social gain. It was what we would call a "love match." Christine emphasizes that his attentions were to make her feel at ease and he was so gentle with the adolescent that he did no "outrage" to her on their wedding night. I would suggest that Etienne's childhood had also been influenced by Tommaso's point of view, and the tragedy of his early death was mitigated to some extent by the way his attitude towards her had reinforced her sense of self-esteem developed in her father's care. Neither Christine nor her father, Tommaso, could change the world they lived in and both were committed to the prevailing intellectual and religious ideas that surrounded them. But because they were concerned to love and respect their children and those around them, they helped create a world that was far different from both the medieval and the early modern periods they bridge. In doing so, they help us understand how the human race has been able to survive and eventually begin to transform the nightmare of abuse and violence that psychohistory reveals to us as the unfortunate lot of most people at most times in most places.

*[See author credit on page 142.]* □

## Bulletin Board

### Call for Papers Special Theme Issues 1999 and 2000

- **Our Litigious Society**
- **PsychoGeography**
- **Meeting the Millennium**
- **Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society**
- **The Psychology of America as the World's Policeman**
- **Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa**

**600-1500 words**

#### Contact

**Paul H. Elvoitz, PhD, Editor**  
**627 Dakota Trail**  
**Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417**

The next **SATURDAY WORK-IN-PROGRESS WORKSHOPS** seminar will be **Saturday, March 6, 1999**, on "The Impact of Impeaching President Clinton on America and Its Politics." Participants include **Herbert Barry** (University of Pittsburgh), **Paul Elovitz** (Ramapo College), **Betty Glad** (University of South Carolina), **Ted Goertzel** (Rutgers), and **Aubrey Immelman** (St. John's University). On **April 24**, the Forum will have the "Judith S. Kestenberg Commemorative Meeting" with a presentation, "Generations of the Holocaust," on the intergenerational transmission of the trauma of the Holocaust, by **Flora Hogman** (Psychohistory Forum Research Associate) and commemoration by Eva Fogelman and others. **CONFERENCES AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES: "Encore: The Formation of the American Lacanian Link"** is a conference to be held at UCLA, March 5-7, 1999. For information, call (310) 825-9581, fax (310) 206-7617, or e-mail <modcon@humnet.ucla.edu>. On March 26 to 28, 1999, the 13th Annual Convention of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychohistorische Forschung will be held at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität in Frankfurt am Main. For information, write Ralph Frenken, Ginnheimer Landstr. 121, 60431 Frankfurt/Main, Germany. The American Historical Association's (AHA) Year 2000 Annual Meeting will be held in Chicago, Illinois, January 6 to 9, 2000, with the theme of "**History for the Twenty-First Century: Continuity and Change.**" The AHA Web site is <<http://www.theaha.org/>>. "**Literature, Aesthetics, and Psychoanalysis: The Legacy of British Object Relations**" is a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Summer Seminar for College Teachers which will be directed by Mary Jacobus, Anderson Professor of English, June 14 to July 24, 1999, at Cornell University. For further information, including application procedures for the NEH awards of \$3,700 each for 15 participants, contact <jacobus\_NEH@cornell.edu>. Marquette University will host a conference on the "**History of Children in 19th- and 20th-Century American Cities**" on May 5 & 6, 2000. Papers on the upper Midwest and Milwaukee are particularly welcome. Submit proposals (one page and brief vitae) for complete panels and single papers, as well as offers to comment, by July 1, 1999, to Professor Thomas Jablonsky, Institute for Urban Life, Marquette University, P. O. Box 1881, Milwaukee, WI, 53201-1881, (414) 288-5300, e-mail <jablonskyt@marquette.edu>. **Peter Petschauer**,

<petschauerpw@appstate.edu>, is organizing a September conference on childhood at Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. **PUBLICATIONS:** Congratulations to **Dan Dervin** whose book of short stories, *Home Is Another Country*, was chosen by Mary Washington College Press to launch its publishing venture in 1998. Congratulations to Charlotte Kahn and the family of the late Judith Kestenberg on the fall, 1998, publication of *Children Surviving Persecution*. **TRAVEL: Herbert Barry** (University of Pittsburgh) was in Santa Fe giving the paper, "The Choice of Spouse by Adolescent or Adult Relatives," on February 6, 1999, to the Society for Cross-Culture Research of which he is a former president. **AWARDS: Norman Doidge**, MD, won the Second Annual CORST Essay Prize presented at the Fall Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association at the Waldorf Astoria. His public lecture was "Diagnosing *The English Patient*: Contributions to Understanding the Schizoid Fantasies of Being Skinless and of Being Buried Alive." **DEATHS:** Our condolences to the family of **Judith Kestenberg**, a long-time member of the Psychohistory Forum and a distinguished child psychoanalyst and student of the Holocaust, who died in January at the age of 88. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and friends for the support which makes **Clio's Psyche** possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry and Ralph Colp; Patron Jerome Wolf; Supporting Members Mary Lambert, Peter Loewenberg, Peter Petschauer, and Hanna Turken; and Contributing Members Charles Fred Alford, Sander Breiner, Alan Elms, Roberta Rubin, and Nanette Sachs. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Charles Fred Alford, Garth Amundson, Lyn Baker, Sander Breiner, Andrew Brink, Hilary Clark, Daniel Dervin, Jonathan Goldberg, John Hartman, Aubrey Immelman, George Kren, David Lee, David Lotto, Arthur Mitzman, Spyros Orfanos, Peter Petschauer, Norman Simms, Linda Simon, Tod Sloan, Lung-kee Sun, Susan Varney, and Robert Maxwell Young. Thanks for proofreading to Jennifer Taylor. □







**Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting**  
Saturday, January 30, 1999  
**Charles Strozier**  
"Putting the Psychoanalyst on the Couch: A  
Biography of Heinz Kohut"

**Call for Papers**  
**Special Theme Issues**  
**1999 and 2000**

- The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis (March, 1999)
- The Psychology of Legalizing Life [What is this???
- Psychogeography
- Meeting the Millenium

**Forthcoming in the March Issue**  
Special Theme:  
**The Relationship of Academia,  
Psychohistory, and  
Psychoanalysis**

Additional papers are still being accepted. Contact the Editor -- see page 71.

Also:

- Interview with Arthur Mitzman, author of *The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber*
- Ralph Colp, Jr.'s Review of Vadim Z. Rogovin, *1937: Stalin's Year of Terror*

**Call for Nominations**  
**Halpern Award**  
for the  
**Best Psychohistorical Idea**  
in a  
**Book, Article, or Computer Site**

This Award may be granted at the level of Distinguished Scholar, Graduate, or Undergraduate.

**To Join the Psychohistory List**  
send e-mail with any subject and message to  
<psychohistory-subscribe-request  
@home.ease.lsoft.com>

**Letters to the Editor**

**The History of Psychohistory**

Clio's Psyche's interviews of outstanding psychohistorians (see "An American in Amsterdam: Arthur Mitzman," page 146) have grown into a full-fledged study of the pioneers and history of our field. Psychohistory as an organized field is less than 25 years old, so most of the innovators are available to tell their stories and give their insights. Last March, the Forum formally launched the **Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project** to systematically gather material to write the history of psychohistory. We welcome memoirs, letters, and manuscripts as well as volunteers to help with the interviewing. People interested in participating should write, call, or e-mail Paul H. Elovitz (see page 119).

**Awards and Honors**

Professor Janice M. Coco, Art History, University of California-Davis, American Psychoanalytic Association Committee on Research and Special Prize, will present her paper, "Exploring the Frontier from the Inside Out," at a free public lecture at 12 noon, Saturday, December 20, Jade Room, New York City.

**Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea** • The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to award Michael Hirohama of San Francisco for starting and maintaining the Forum's mailing list (see page 98).

**Student Award** • David Barry of Fair Lawn, New Jersey, has been awarded membership in the Forum, including a subscription to **Clio's Psyche**, for his part of the Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project.

**Forthcoming in the March Issue**

**Special Theme:**

**The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis**

Additional papers are still being accepted. Contact the Editor -- see page 71.

Also:

- Interview with **Arthur Mitzman**, author

**Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting**

**Psychohistory Forum Presentations**

**September 27**  
George Victor on Hitler's Masochism  
**November 15**  
Michael Flynn, "Apocalyptic Hope — Apocalyptic Thinking"

**Call for Papers**

**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.

**Call for Nominations**

**THE MAKERS OF PSYCHOHISTORY RESEARCH PROJECT**

**Independent Variable of Internal Stability – May, 1945**

Stagnant/Disintegrating Negative Trend						Stable/Creative Positive Trend				
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
Nazi Germany						USA				

year's subscription to Clio's Psyche free. Help us spread the good word about Clio.

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce

## The Young Psychohistorian 1998/99 Membership Awards

**John Fanton** recently received his medical degree and is doing his five year residency in Providence, Rhode Island. Currently, he is at the Children's Hospital, Women and Infants Hospital, and the Butler Psychiatric Hospital. His goal is to become a child maltreatment expert working in the area of Preventive Psychiatry. At the IPA in 1997 he won the Lorenz Award for his paper on improving parenting in Colorado.

**Albert Schmidt** is a doctoral candidate in modern European history at Brandeis University who plans to defend his dissertation in April when his advisor, Rudolph Binion, will return from Europe for the occasion. Rather than do a biography of SS General Reinhard Heydrich as originally intended, he is writing on the German protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under Heydrich's dominance. In the last four years this talented young scholar has been awarded nine fellowships, grants, or scholarships.

### Dreamwork Resources

The **Historical Dreamwork Method** is available to help the biographer better understand the dreams of the subject and other aspects of psychobiography. **Clio's Psyche** welcomes papers on historical dreamwork for publication and for presentation at Psychohistory Forum meetings. Contact Paul H. Elovitz (see page 43).

☆☆☆

### Forthcoming in the March Issue

Special Theme:

#### The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis

Additional papers are still being accepted. Contact Paul H. Elovitz, Editor - see p. 71.

Also:

- Interview with Arthur Mitzman, author of *The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber*

- Having previously chickened out of the

#### Letters to the Editor

military, he demoralized it by integrating

homosexuals into it. He disarmed the

### Call for Nominations

#### Halpern Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea in a Book, Article, or Computer Site

This Award may be granted at the level of Distinguished Scholar, Graduate, or Undergraduate.

American People with the Brady Bill.

### Call for Papers

#### Special Theme Issues 1999 and 2000

- The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis (March, 1999)
- Our Litigious Society
- PsychoGeography
- Meeting the Millennium
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society

Contact the Editor at

### Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, January 30, 1999

Charles Strozier

"Putting the Psychoanalyst on the Couch: A Biography of Heinz Kohut"

Letters to the Editor on  
Clinton-Lewinsky-Starr