
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 7, Number 1

June, 2000

IN THIS ISSUE

The Future of Psychoanalysis

Millennium Man.....	2
<i>Dan Dervin</i>	
The Promise and the Challenges	4
<i>Daniel G. Dupertuis</i>	
Toward a New Paradigm.....	5
<i>Patrick B. Kavanaugh</i>	
The Relational Model.....	7
<i>Spyros D. Orfanos</i>	
Humanism and Human Extensions.....	9
<i>Richard Booth</i>	
Psychoanalysis Needs Marital and Family Therapy.....	11
<i>Fred M. Sander</i>	
Acceptance of the Unknown.....	11
<i>Angelina M. Baydala</i>	
Doing Therapy in Our Electronic Age	13
<i>Irene Javors</i>	
Reflections on the Impossible Profession.....	14
<i>David Lotto</i>	
Political Engagement of Analysts	15
<i>Daniel Burston</i>	
Responsible for the Future.....	17
<i>Robert Hinshelwood</i>	
Diversity and Pluralism in California.....	18
<i>Charles Webel and Sarton Weinraub</i>	
A Latina Analyst's Perspective.....	20
<i>Norma I. Cofresí</i>	
French Psychoanalytic Feminism.....	22
<i>C. Fred Alford</i>	
Barbra Streisand, Analyst and Patient	23
<i>Robert Bruce Marchesani</i>	
The Harbinger of Truth.....	25
<i>William Daryl Spidaliere</i>	

The Elián González Obsession

Introduction.....	2
<i>Paul H. Elovitz</i>	
Identifying with Elián González	26
<i>Suzanne Schambach LaMar</i>	
Elián González as the Moses of the Third Millennium.....	27
<i>Suzanne M. Gassner</i>	
The Subjectivity of Freedom.....	28
<i>Penny D. Caldwell</i>	
Future Psychological Issues Elián González May Face	30
<i>Hanna Turken</i>	
"Elián González"	31
<i>Boghos L. Artinian</i>	
The Biblical and Mythic Elián.....	31
<i>E. Mark Stern</i>	
Mel Kalfus: Psychobiographer, Institution Builder, and Survivor	32
<i>Paul H. Elovitz</i>	
Eugene O'Neill's Psychodynamics.....	41
<i>Book Review by Andrew Brink</i>	
Adaptation and Healing of Child Holocaust Survivors.....	43
<i>Book Review by Ellen Mendel</i>	
Dreams of Infanticide II: Flayed for a Wineskin.....	45
<i>Robert Rousselle</i>	
Editorial Policies.....	46
Exchange on Pearl Harbor	47
<i>Richard Morrock, George Victor</i>	
Bulletin Board.....	48

The Elián González Obsession

Introduction

Paul H. Elovitz

Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

The eight-month long focus on Elián González has included incredibly little in-depth analysis. The constant spotlight on the plight of a six-year-old raises many questions. We need to have some analysis that takes us beyond the photojournalism, news headlines, talk show rantings, and general hyperbole that dominate the issue.

As I drove to a psychohistorical meeting on April 25, I listened to "All Things Considered" discuss the issue on National Public Radio (NPR). I had a moment of optimism when I heard the Elián affair referred to as "a collective bi-polar disorder" and a societal "psychotic incident." I waited to hear if the next step would be taken: a call for an explicit psychohistorical exploration of society's passion for one little boy. Not surprisingly, none was forthcoming.

That day's psychohistorical meeting was on men's envy of women's ability to have babies and male efforts to subjugate women. Our societal focus was on a custody fight for a child whose mother drowned escaping from a Communist country. The tone of our New York City meeting was introspective, thoughtful, and cooperative. Participants struggled for understanding. The tenor of our societal debate was threatening, "in your face," and rhetorical. One exchange brought people together, the other separated them.

As David Beisel is fond of saying, prime psychohistorical questions are: Why now? Why here? What are the unconscious reasons for the Elián fixation? In a world of millions of "throw away" children, child soldiers, child labor, child slavery, child prostitution, etc., why select one little boy to care about? Does society see him as a symbolic savior in this new millennium as some have speculated on the two psychohistory electronic discussion groups?

A question I always ask is, What isn't the country paying attention to when it becomes fixated on a subject like Elián González, Princess Diana's death, Presidential impeachment, or the

(Continued on page 26)

The Future of Psychoanalysis

Millennium Man

Dan Dervin

Mary Washington University, Emeritus

Perhaps more dramatically than anyone else, Freud inaugurated the 20th century with his dream book, which he carefully postdated to 1900. It has been overall a terrible century, terrible not the least in its contradictions. Freud's role in helping us to understand the irrationalism and horror of the end of the second millennium has been inadequately recognized. He does not seem to have made the final cut in the person-of-the-century choices of the various self-appointed culture custodians.

For his promising to disturb the sleep of humanity we have never quite forgiven him, even though he offered a revolutionary means for grappling with the destructive forces of anarchy without and rages within. At bottom, he was merely suggesting that patients let the craziness talk itself out while he offered interpretations, and proposed reconstructions of a troubled past, while carefully monitoring the transferences of feelings along with the countertransference responses thereby evoked. But the messenger's message has so often raised such intense anxieties that we prefer warding off his words rather than working with them in ways that a dialogue can be continued. Freud was not always right, though he was almost always provocative, profound, and engaging. His wide-ranging writings were never meant to be the last word -- more likely the first -- and he explicitly disavowed aspiring to fill in all the gaps in the universe.

I would hazard the proposition that today Freud cannot be adequately understood outside of the continuing psychoanalytic tradition. The history of psychoanalysis is still being written, with major recent contributions by John Kerr (on the Jung period), Elisabeth Roudinesco (on France), and Alexander Etkind (on Russia). Freud is continually stimulating new biographical studies as well as attacks. In this essay, I will confine my interest to the last quarter century of the American Psychoanalytic Association, which meets in New York City when annually the Waldorf-Astoria hotel is virtually taken over for several days in De-

cember.

These meetings I began attending as a sort of non-matriculating student of psychoanalysis. Despite all the cultural turmoil and psychoanalytic politics surrounding them, I was consistently impressed by the internal dynamics that prevailed. There were incursions from the street fights of history, and other moments when I felt conflicts unresolved within psychoanalysis were enacted within its panels. The faces of psychoanalysis also changed. In the early years, I was impressed by elderly men and women reuniting and embracing in lobbies and among the bookstalls; these were a surviving generation of European Jewry who had fled to New York during the World War II years and colonized Freud in the New World City. There were also years when all the panels seemed

filled with a younger generation of men wearing worsted wool suits and ties of discreet shades. There was a protracted brouhaha over the ostensible heresy of Heinz Kohut's self psychology, a pause for timely reflection before the brink, and finally belated expressions of a new spirit of tolerance.

But by the early 1980s psychoanalysis was losing some of its cultural hegemony. The long hours of free association were being viewed as indulgence, scientific bases were slipping away, neuroscience was offering a psychopharmacology that more effectively managed symptoms, and more women analysts began appearing on panels. Panelists began referring to one another by their first names -- Libby, Marty, etc. The feminists had definitely rocked the boat, but the result was that some of the most prominent voices -- Nancy Chodorow, Juliet Mitchell, and more recently, Elisabeth Bruehl-Young -- undertook analytic training.

In December, 1999, New York seemed especially hospitable to Freud. A major exhibition of his life and work, that had generated controversy long before it opened, drew public attention. While supposedly hyping the show, a free-for-all on Charlie Rose re-enacted perennial disputes. Almost drowned out among the guests was Louise Kaplan's insistence that women were now in the forefront in keeping psychoanalysis thriving despite the efforts of curators to embalm its founder. The Equitable Gallery in Midtown Manhattan had also organized an exhibit exploring the interplay of dreams and art, including the Wolf Man's own haunting painting of white wolves surrealistically decorating a dead tree. And a new translation by Joyce Crick of *The Interpretation of Dreams* is being brought out by Oxford University Press. I recall the eminent English analyst, Joseph Sandler, once remarking, not entirely in jest, that one should not attempt reading Chapter Seven of that book until one had practiced analysis for 20 years.

The psychoanalytic sessions again proved a blend of internal, evolving dynamics, and attunement to cultural influences. There was a panel on attention deficit disorder and a paper advocating rewriting Freud's views on mourning that evoked Freud's thought so eloquently that I concluded that the present effort -- to allow for an ongoing healthy tie to a lost object -- as a mere addendum. There was a paper by an out-front gay analyst that rather boldly explored hostility toward mothers (and other women) among gay men. As the discussion

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 7, No. 1

June, 2000

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

Internet Co-ordinator: Stan Pope

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 © 2000 The Psychohistory Forum

spread to the floor, a reliance on terms like "narcissism," "pre-oedipal," and "gay boys" raised issues of gender etiquette and residual homophobia that evoked images of actors' stumbling through the first rehearsal of a promising new work -- and thus an enactment of sorts.

A major all-day panel tackled the issue of the goals in analysis. According to Glen Gabbard's opening comments, Freud advocated practical recovery -- the ability to return to living a normal life. The patient might focus on the outcome (relief of distress), the analyst on the process of intrapsychic change. Each may have conscious goals at odds with unconscious ones. Along with goals, one should factor in aims and motives. Aims suggest direction; goals, specifics. Goals in therapy differed from those in analysis. Should the analyst ever impose his/her own goals? No, of course not. Should the analyst be swayed by cultural models or stereotypes? No, again. But I would insert that we are more sensitive today to normative cultural ideals that subtly disguise conformity. Should the psychoanalytic process then be goal-less? That this Buddhaesque question could be raised and then explored at length was reassuring to me, as Freud's people and the rest of us enter the third millennium.

Dan Dervin, PhD, is a prolific psychohistorian whose recent books are Enactments: American Modes and Psychohistorical Models (1996), and Matricentric Narratives (1997) on questions of gender and agency in women's writing. He may be contacted at <ddervin@mwc.edu>. □

The Promise and the Challenges

Daniel G. Dupertuis

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

In the little more than a century since Freud gave formal birth to psychoanalysis, the field is as strong and creative as ever, despite the endless attacks on it and the time that has elapsed. In this essay, I will examine the attacks, the relationship of psychoanalysis to science, Freud's contributions and false step with the libido theory, and the challenges of the new century.

First, I will discuss a specific attack on the field. There is the periodical recycling of the outdated argument that the physical sciences are

"more scientific" than the social sciences -- including psychoanalysis. Yet we should already have accepted that social science is the science of the subjective, and therefore its epistemology differs from that of physical science.

The influence of physical science over social science rightfully belongs to the past. We should no longer speak about "psychometrics," but about "psychological assessment," and here is where we should analyze the testability of psychoanalysis. I think that whether we like it or not, there is something in the patient that is subjective and not objective, and I believe we can think of tests as existing outside of positivist, objectivist science, and yet still being tests.

We are already far from Freud's Vienna Circle and the adepts of logical positivism, with their indictments that social science must follow the physical science model. Now we know that in social science, in psychology and psychoanalysis, it is impossible to measure. We can only assess. Yes, the social sciences do have a different epistemology, and, yes, we can do a science of the subjective.

It is very difficult for me to imagine a time -- little over a hundred years ago -- when a doctor had to make a justification to his colleagues if he claimed to have cured a patient. In those days doctors did not expect their patients to get better, and were surprised when it happened. Medical statistics of the time stated that only 5% of patients got over their illnesses. Freud put the idea of recovery into words in his conference of December 12, 1904, at the Viennese Academy of Medicine. A cure was possible, and it depended on the physician's attitude rather than on medication. (In fact, medication was almost non-existent, and bloodletting was still a major medical procedure.) I can only be amazed at his audacity. I am glad that Freud persisted where others desisted. Freud's success was an exceptional accomplishment. In those days hope was frail, almost non-existent. This change from hopelessness to hope is what makes me think that today we cannot conceive of any kind of psychology without Freud.

Many years were to go by before Freud's discoveries achieved a common ground with psychiatry. This only happened when specialists had to deal with the recovery of soldiers who came back from the battlefield after World War II. Those discoveries promised neither miracles nor instant healing, but did justify hope. When Jean Delay, on September 19, 1950, inaugurated the 1st

International Congress of Psychiatry in Paris, he said in his opening speech, "For the first time we are permitted to speak of a cure, that word which is to be uttered so cautiously because of the hopes it raises." Fifty years had passed since Freud had spoken of recovery as a real possibility. He had been a pioneer.

I believe Freud's other great contribution was that, thanks to his work, we were given the possibility of understanding human behavior from viewpoints until then entirely unknown. These are through:

- Human motivations
- Man's internal resources
- The intensity of conflicts that appear to be partially buried
- The remarkable power each of us has to determine if s/he is going to live or die
- The realization that we, the therapists, must encourage each individual to be his/her own life's real protagonist, and not merely a privileged spectator; to consider one's self a person, and not just an incident in the universe.

As amazing as this may appear to us, these ideas did not exist before Freud. This was the light of hope that Freud kindled 100 years ago in the fields of psychology and medicine. This is why it is impossible to conceive of psychology without Freud.

I further assert that if Freud did not develop a theory of personality based upon human free will, it was not by choice. It was because he found his way blocked by the specific problems posed by the natural science of his time, which rejected any theoretical development that involved or permitted the use of a final cause. Freud's dilemma was how to state that the human mind acted for the sake of intentional ends, without contradicting Newtonian discourse. Freud was forced to compromise and draw up his theory of the libido, which is doubtless the less sound aspect of his theorization, because he had to translate much of his final cause terminology to an energetic formulation of material and efficient cause. Freud had really no choice if he was to be regarded as a scientist, and we know this was of vital importance to him.

Today we face similar problems. Psychology is so often circumscribed to an extraspective description of behavior called "responsivity," that if we attempt a teleological description of behavior, we are left without a technical terminology to do so. I know of no other way to understand the

sage comment, "in social science we have learned to hide ignorance under the sophistication of the quantitative." Persuading psychologists to accept this possibility of a final cause is often the most difficult obstacle, because they are still entrenched in the Newtonian traditions of the far origins of psychology.

At the new millennium, I am persuaded that psychoanalysis still applies to our times and that its ideas point us to the course we should follow to work in this globalized world. In a world of increasing anonymity, we must insist on the importance of individual self-worth, of motivation, and of the interests that push our lives forward. We must also dispel, through our work on the unconscious, any hurdles there may be as a result of parental mistakes in childrearing, or of unknown traces of traumatic events that may still prevent a vital, personal growth. It is here that I see the greatest challenge for our new century. It is helping our patients, and our communities, grow up, through the knowledge provided by psychoanalysis.

These are also the prospects I see for psychoanalysis in my country, Argentina. For cultural reasons, such as our fondness for European culture, psychoanalysis has developed to an extent it has not in other South American countries. It is precisely the vitality of its past that I see in the current developments of Argentinean psychoanalysis, and I am certain they will carry on through the next century.

Daniel G. Dupertuis, PhD, is Assistant Professor at the Facultad de Psicología in the Universidad de Buenos Aires, which he describes as being most significant in the development of psychoanalysis in South America. He is also in charge of the experimental psychology courses at the Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Professor Dupertuis may be reached at <dgomezdu@psi.uba.ar>. □

Toward a New Paradigm

**Patrick B. Kavanaugh
Academy for the Study of the
Psychoanalytic Arts and
Private Practice**

Grounded in a 19th century worldview, psychoanalysis developed from within a paradigm of biology, medicine, and the natural sciences. In

the United States, evolutionary biology provided an organized method of thinking about people, while constructing psychoanalytic theories. American psychoanalysis in particular is wedded to notions of sequential stage theories and developmental paradigms in which a progressive and hierarchical development of mental functions is determined by the development and hierarchical arrangement of the central nervous system. Disruptions during particular phases of development in childhood have deleterious effects on particular systems of motives, character traits, object relations, and ego or self-structures. Infused with a medical ideology, thinking and behaviors falling outside of an empirically established normative are understood as symptomatic of underlying psychopathology; the causal factors are understood in much the same way as those of biology.

For the greater part of the past century, psychoanalysis has drawn upon the empirical methods and assumptions of the natural sciences and developed as a science of the mind. Organized psychoanalysis continues to pursue the status and respectability of a causal-empirical science of the mind. It continues to search for a new and biologically sound meta-theory in which the findings of psychoanalysis and neurophysiology intersect. With its assumptions rooted in biology, medicine, and the natural sciences, psychoanalytic pedagogy and the bodies of knowledge of the 20th century spoke of the psychoanalyst as a health care professional, a social scientist, and a social engineer.

In recent years there has been an epistemological awakening in the analytic community, a creative awakening prompted in large measure by the growing recognition that the intellectual foundations of our discipline have remained stagnant in a 19th century epistemology, science, and moral theory. During the past quarter of a century, we have witnessed a rethinking of the very concept and meaning of psychoanalysis as discourse and discipline. The ABCs of knowledge production are changing as pluralistic understandings of people, life, and psychoanalysis develop outside of the pathology- and science-driven medical model. Currently, many different versions of psychoanalysis exist in the analytic community, each having a distinct premise, a different set of theoretical assumptions, and different objectives in the analytic discourse. This pluralism includes those more contemporary bodies of knowledge that speak to the analyst of the 21st century from the perspective of philosophy, the humanities, and the arts, in contrast

to biology, medicine, and the natural sciences. These bodies of knowledge provide insights to the 21st century analyst as a philosopher, a historian, and an artist.

Turning to changing times and a philosophy of differences, some 95 to 100 years ago, a conceptual revolution took place in philosophy. Philosophy took a linguistic turn and language itself was to become the privileged object of thought. A problem arose with those bodies of knowledge premised on classical epistemology. Namely, our modes of understanding the world, others, and self depend on language. Language itself is a mode of representation, understood as an organized system of signs.

This linguistic turn in philosophy reflected a ruptured break with modern philosophers, their problems and questions, and their search for universal truths in philosophic inquiry. Saussure in Europe and Charles Sanders Peirce in the U.S. introduced the discipline of semiotics. It is concerned with the study and analysis of language, systems of signification, and the structures of thought and experiences. As a mode of knowledge, it understood the world as a system of interconnections and interrelations. Contemporary semiotics studies the nature of representation and provides a perspective by which we might conceive of human reality as a construction, as a product of signifying activities which are both culturally specific and generally unconscious. Indeed, from this perspective, the subject of current times is understood as a historical subject spoken by language, history, and the specific discourses of the culture. In addition, semiotics is understood in its interrelations and interconnections between all of these.

Human reality as a construction and product of signifying activities speaks to a worldview premised on the philosophy of differences of Nietzsche and Heidegger, wherein there is an appreciation of an infinite interpretability of reality among people. The world is a world of interpretations of the world. Reality and the nature of that reality are to be found in the eye of the beholder. Differences among people in their construction of reality are considered to be the stuff of life, in contrast to evidences of psychopathology as understood in the medical model. The days of a monolithic medicalized psychoanalysis have been receding into the foggy mist of a different historical context, time, and perspective as the empiricist's doctrine and thesis have been drawn into question.

Correspondence between a value-free science and objectivity, and reason and a unitary truth has become an interesting historical fiction. The concepts and meaning of causality, identity, the subject, and truth have been changing.

That which constitutes bodies of knowledge and our relationship to that knowledge has been radically changing in the analytic culture, changing the role of the analyst in the 21st century. These changes occur as different ways of thinking, as suggested by theoretical physics, chaos theory, and the Asian and Eastern philosophies enter the analytic community. Re-situated in philosophy, the humanities, and the arts, psychoanalysis rests on a different way of thinking about people, and develops from the study of the psychoanalytic arts. The psychoanalytic arts refer to the arts of communication such as language, literature, prose, poetry, music, and semiotics. They also refer to the arts of continuity such as history, mythology, religion, science, theatre, film, dance, folklore, and those traditions of the culture that link a phenomenal past with an anticipated future. The arts of critical thinking such as philosophy and philosophic inquiry are also referred to.

The psychoanalytic arts consist of bodies of knowledge produced from a different philosophical premise. They are from a radicalized subjectivism, and appreciate that there are no facts except as construed within the mind of each person; there is no perception independent of one's perception. Truth as to the question of essence is to be found in the values of the subject. It is the subject who has the privileged relationship to truth; it is the privilege of the action of the analysis to attempt to understand that truth. The conceptual premise and understandings of psychoanalysis are to be found in the realm of human experiences.

As the analyst has been speaking of these bodies of knowledge in the analytic discourse, how might these bodies of knowledge speak of the analyst in the 21st century? From this perspective, these bodies of knowledge speak of the analyst as a philosopher-semiotician venturing into the subject's very personal, private, and unique construction of the world. It shows a historian to be of historiographic meta-fictions, listening to the enduring and fixed traditions of the subject's phenomenal past as coexistent, co-occurring, and co-determinant with present wishes, desires, and longings, and future purposes and goals; as an artist, translating the ideographic symbolizations of "bodymindspeak," speaking with the voices of the

dead in this, the present.

A major question remains to be addressed: How might this image of the analyst speak to the analytic educator of the 21st century? As a community, we must bring into question the underlying assumptions of our educational traditions lest we unquestioningly speak of today's analyst as one from the pages of a 19th century historical text. The project of rethinking psychoanalysis and its bodies of knowledge includes rethinking the conditions of acquisition of those knowledges. This includes bringing into question our traditional educational structures and institutions, the underlying assumptions of our educational philosophy and tripartite model of education, and the image of the analyst around which analytic education has been organized during the 20th century. As the presumed theoretical authority of the medical model has been brought into question in the analytic community, new and different theoretical possibilities of understanding ourselves and others have been emerging. The medical model and its institutionalized wisdom has become but one of many varied perspectives regarding the human condition. As these multiple perspectives continue to develop, I believe that there will be many different educational models in the 21st century, reflecting a world of differences in philosophies and models, and educational practices and objectives. A philosophy of differences puts within context a world of differences for psychoanalysis as discourse and education in the 21st century.

Patrick B. Kavanaugh, PhD, is president of the Academy for the Study of the Psychoanalytic Arts, past president of the International Federation for Psychoanalytic Education, and a former president of the Michigan Society for Psychoanalytic Psychology. He is in the private practice of psychoanalysis in Farmington Hills, Michigan and may be contacted at <Camsufism@aol.com>. □

The Relational Model

Spyros D. Orfanos
American Psychological Association and
Private Practice

Psychoanalysis straddles at least two domains: the clinical and the applied. This essay will focus on the clinical domain with specific examination of the rejection of the old classical paradigm and the creation of the current relational model.

This shift has been one of the most creative developments in the field for some time. It is simplistic to think of these two paradigms in either-or terms, but due to space limitations what follows is a sketch of the issues.

The trend in clinical psychoanalysis away from the drive model of a one-person psychology studying intra-psychic processes to the relational model of a two-person psychology studying interactions and inter-subjectivity is a revolutionary development. It is extraordinary because the relational model rejects the classical and steers the field of psychoanalysis in a new direction. This approach is a fundamentally different way of thinking about and working with conscious and unconscious processes. For example, in relational thinking, transference is a reaction to the patient's life history as well as a reaction to the personality and actions of the analyst. The analyst can never fully become a neutral, blank screen with "objective" intent. Similarly, counter-transference in relational thinking is inevitably linked to the psychic reality of the analyst and aspects that are responsive to the specific analysand. The patient and the analyst are simultaneously subject and object, and the transference-countertransference matrix has no delineated beginning.

Jay Greenberg and Stephen Mitchell used the term "relational" in their 1983 landmark book, *Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory*, to link the psychoanalytic traditions of interpersonal relations and object relations. Since that time, the relational model has come to also include aspects of contemporary self psychology, feminist thinking, constructivist views, and intersubjectivity theory. This movement seems to be parallel to related developments in other fields that can be loosely labeled "postmodern" but which are not heterogeneous. Relational psychoanalysts are not of one type. What appeals to my personal sensibilities is that relational psychoanalysis is an amalgam both as theory and as practice. It allows me some choice in what I may actively and systematically note as figure and ground in clinical work. This should not be interpreted as an entirely open field of options. It means that the fundamental ambiguity of clinical process is respected and dealt with openly.

The relational approach is revolutionary in ways similar to Chomsky's impact on the surface structures of language, Einstein's impact on Newtonian physics, Picasso's strikingly bold directions in art, and Harry Stack Sullivan's thorough revision of Freud's metapsychology. Books, conferences,

and journals attest to the emerging institutionalization of the movement towards the relational in psychoanalysis.

Moreover, perhaps the most important change has occurred in the consulting room. Day-to-day clinical work has partly encouraged this shift because it is a more complex way of working and thus captures the analytic experience more appropriately. Psychoanalytic ritual now includes the expressive participation of the analyst. Psychoanalysis, like all creative human enterprises, expands to greater and greater complexity. This "sea change" as Mitchell calls it is not without its controversies and critics. The most notable criticism first appeared from contemporary Freudians who claimed that it was erroneous. As it drew more adherents, they then asserted that their views already included all the relational innovations anyway.

The transformation brought on by the relational perspective has so far been limited mostly to the clinical domain. The one exception is Neil Altman's 1995 book, *The Analyst In the Inner City: Race, Class, and Culture Through a Psychoanalytic Lens*. My prediction is that in the near future we will begin to witness more relational literature in the applied domain. While there are many approaches to psychohistory such as the Freudian, the Kleinian, the Lacanian, and the self psychological, the relational approach with its unique amalgam and creative understanding on how subject and object activate and mold each other will soon be enriching and transforming clinical psychoanalysis.

Spyros D. Orfanos, PhD, is a psychoanalyst and psychologist in private practice in metropolitan New York and Co-Director of the Manhattan Institute for Psychoanalysis. He is Past President of the American Psychological Association's Division of Psychoanalysis (39) and currently President-elect of the Academy of Psychoanalysis of the American Board of Professional Psychology. Dr. Orfanos is affiliated with the Contemporary Center for Advanced Psychoanalytic Studies, Long Island University, and Queens College of the City University of New York. He may be reached at

The Best of Clio's Psyche

This 93-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the September, 1999, issue is available for \$20 a copy.

It will be distributed free to Members renewing at the Supporting level and above as well as Subscribers upon their next two-year renewal.

<Sdorfanos@aol.com>. □

Humanism and Human Extensions

Richard Booth
Black Hawk College

Psychoanalysis is predicated on the ancient dictum that we need to know ourselves, while humanism emerged to counterbalance behavioristic and psychoanalytic reductionism. Psychoanalysis gave birth to depth psychology and humanism, moving beyond seeing a patient as an objectification of symptoms, created methods through which we could understand the phenomenal world of the experiencing person, as Carl Rogers has said. Both orientations, however disparate in some respects, do, nonetheless, converge in important ways. Both admonish that an unexamined life is, indeed, an empty life and, as the philosopher said, not worth living. Valuable living is conscious living, that is, living in the light of awareness.

Self-knowledge delivers us from the sometimes tyrannical forces beyond our conscious awareness, enabling us to more fully, freely, and with intentionality direct our lives. Knowing who we are renders us more mindful, that is, better able to comprehend what we are experiencing, thus increasing the likelihood of our making informed judgments about life's challenges. Moreover, this understanding predisposes us toward self-reflection, which leads to what Ernest Becker has called "a progressive freedom of reactivity." This self-reflection makes us uniquely human and, if engaged properly, positions us to consciously choose what we react to and how we will frame those reactions.

When people avoid this inner work, they foreclose their potential for happiness and love, as Erich Fromm reminds us. And, when we love insufficiently, we begin to substitute in sometimes inappropriate, extreme, and self-destructive ways. A common substitution style is creating artificial self-extensions, with which we overidentify, and sometimes exchange for aspects of our own identity. The more anxious we are, Becker says, the more we invest in self-extensions, until our lives become organizations of tools and machines and collections of things that define who we are.

It is easy to overidentify with almost any self-extension, obviating the inward journey. Children can be narcissistic self-extensions, for example, as can property, money, collectibles, clothing,

causes, automobiles, or any other artifact. Granting some cross-cultural variations, televisions, computers, and telephones are now virtually universal self-extensions. But, if people fail to sufficiently self-reflect by focusing on their tools, will our species fall victim to what we have decided not to know? Might we ultimately relinquish the authorship of our personal and collective lives until we reach the point at which the car begins to drive the driver?

In his 1973 seminal work, Ivan Illich warned us about these very problems. He cautioned against relying too much on our tools rather than on each other, and said that any tool not "convivial" with human nature will become destructive. Illich is as accurate today as he was three decades ago, since our technologies far outstrip most people's ability to manage them. Examples of the price we pay are all around us. Do physicians value patient input as much as their machines and pharmaceuticals? Is the nurse, watching a dying patient's vital signs on a remote computer, engaged in behavior just as important as being with that dying person? Do we trust the cashier's ability to deduce the correct change without checking the computer? Have we not wondered why, when a television show is virtually meaningless by any objective standard of personal growth, some people become irrational when interrupted during their viewing? In these situations, is the driver really driving the car?

Perhaps I overstate my case that people are moving toward internal desiccation. Consider, before deciding, that people can order virtually anything from a computer, have it delivered by a stranger, and never leave the house. When "Y2K" survival plans were discussed recently, the issue was clear: if the computers fail, perhaps nothing will work, life as we know it will stop. We realize from daily experience that when the computers are down, students cannot register for courses, online research stops, business transactions halt, and e-mail communication is interrupted. Machine-intensive lifestyles are replacing person-centered reality.

I am concerned about the numerous seductive alternatives to the quiet solitude Anthony Storr writes about. I am concerned about many other things as well: that it is easier to write an e-mail than talk with someone because an e-mail does not require "wasting time" on human factors; that some of my students mentally create "love relationships" with cyber partners who may or may not be who

they say they are; that "computer addiction," "television addiction," "telephone addiction," and other diversionary strategies testify to empty lives; that we are putting computers in every classroom when our students cannot read when they graduate from high school; that online time may be correlated with underdeveloped social skills, loneliness, anxiety, and depression; that academics are computerizing courses so sensitive that they require classroom processing for balanced interpretation; that we will suffer a greater void than before we created our tools, begin to see each other as expendable cogs in a wheel that has assumed a life of its own and, in the process, lose what it means to be most deeply human.

Can psychoanalysis and humanism be helpful with these problems? At a minimum, they urge us to connect deeply with ourselves, to learn to be with ourselves and understand who we are, without distraction or substitution. This internal connection constitutes the foundation for personal unfolding and relatedness with others. This is the wisdom of the ages and is verified by modern psychological research. Our tools cannot fulfill this need, and the need is unequivocal. It is in this self-searching that we find our center of values, as Rollo May tells us, without which we wander through life in a state of meaninglessness. Without values, we move by whim, and whimsical living is impulsive living, escapist living. We must decide what we care about. But, where shall we look for guidance? Psychoanalysis and humanism will, as the future unfolds, certainly continue to cry out for a return to the inner search, but they also offer a perceptual framework that helps us remain focused on what is important, since the future most assuredly challenges us in fundamental ways.

Perhaps Alfred Adler sets the stage best when he says, "The supreme law [of life] is this: the sense of worth of the self shall not be allowed to be diminished." In the face of all our exciting new tools, then, in the future we cannot forget who the autonomous agent of life actually is: the human person, individually and in concert with other persons. Excessive preoccupation with self-extensions is a defense against knowing who we are because it diverts us from pondering the deepest elements of life and death.

As we consider what truly satisfies, we come to understand that creatively expressing who we are generates a deep fulfillment that speaks to our need for increasingly greater potentiation, as Maslow and May both argue. As we reach inside

and unlock the parts of ourselves that tell us, honestly, who we are, we are emboldened in our attempts to recall the split-off aspects of ourselves, feeling much more complete for having done so. Then, feeling more complete, we are free to decide which tools to use and which to reject. We have gained perspective.

We would benefit from anxiety-reduction in the future. Early analysts conceptualized the "false self" as a primitive survival strategy, but we know it can become a lifestyle. If we create destructive fictions, to use Adler's term, we essentially live a lie. We lose track of who we are. We pretend too much, substitute honesty for comfort, tools for authorship, and remove ourselves from ourselves. Creating a chasm between our real self and our fictional self can lead to neuroses and otherwise fractured lifestyles. Pretending that an easier life is a better one, or that it is acceptable for machines to determine our destiny, or that we love someone on the other side of an invisible monitor is, in short, neurotic. To build our lives on such self-deception cannot lead to happiness, and we will not know peace.

In conclusion, we are living in a time when knowing ourselves -- and, indeed, caring about knowing ourselves -- may well be in peril. Hence, psychoanalytic and humanistic understandings of who we are may be rendered secondary to the titillation our most novel self-extensions afford. In light of this, psychoanalysis and humanism are far from unnecessary expendables with nothing to offer; rather, they may well be among the few remaining signs that caution us not to lose ourselves, and not to forget who we are. After all, if, in the end, we confer on our machines the power to control our lives, while failing to attend to what it means to be complete, self-directed, and fully conscious persons, what kind of world are we saying we wish to create? If, finally, we do not know who we are, who (or what) shall we then become?

Richard Booth, PhD, is Professor of Psychology at Black Hawk College, Quad-Cities Campus, Moline, Illinois. He is also a licensed psychotherapist who has published numerous professional articles in psychological journals. Booth may be contacted at

Clio's Psyche

**Now on the World Wide Web at
www.cliospsyche.com**

<dickbooth1@aol.com>. □

Psychoanalysis Needs Marital and Family Therapy

Fred M. Sander
Mt. Sinai Hospital and Private Practice

Psychoanalysis began 100 years ago as a revolutionary movement that challenged the two-dimensional pre-Freudian psychiatric world. In light of managed care and the psychopharmacologic revolution, it seems that we are returning full circle to that earlier era. In the first half of this century, psychoanalysis changed the very landscape of how the nature of man is viewed. While external historical factors play a significant role in the current decline of psychoanalysis, there are also internal reasons. I shall mention only one of them here.

The exclusive focus on the one-to-one analytic situation is a major factor. The shift to a "two person" psychology notwithstanding, analytic institutes, wary of alloying the pure gold of analysis, have failed to adapt to changing historical circumstances. How is it that the most comprehensive general theory of the mind is applicable to so few patients? The number of analyzable patients, realistically, is quite small. Yet, transference and unconscious conflicts are ubiquitous.

In 1917 Freud compared psychoanalysis to a surgical procedure and asked how such operations could succeed "in the presence of all the members of the patient's family, who would stick their noses into the field of operation and exclaim aloud at every incision" (Standard Edition of *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* 16:459). Such boundary violations are part of the family's transference-countertransference repetitive pattern of interaction usually involving shared unconscious fantasies. (See my chapter, "Marital Conflict and Psychoanalytic Therapy," in R. Liebert and J. Oldham, eds., *The Middle Years: New Psychoanalytic Perspectives*, 1989.)

Such externalizing behavior can be interpreted in the context of conjoint treatment. Though Freud was skeptical about involving family members, a year later he observed that "unhappy marriage and physical infirmity are the two things that most often supercede a neurosis. They satisfy, in particular, the sense of guilt and the resultant need for punishment which makes so

many patients cling so fast to their neuroses. By a foolish choice in marriage they punish themselves" (Standard Edition 17:163). During the past half century our society has responded to the epidemic of marital instability through the emergence of tens of thousands of couple and marital therapists with no training in analytic theory. Meanwhile, psychoanalysts wonder where all the patients are!

Over 20 years ago I explored the potential of integrating psychoanalysis with family treatment through the study of five classical plays and a review of analytic contributions to understanding family dynamics (*Individual and Family Therapy: Toward an Integration*, 1979). Recently, I developed a fuller integration of theory and practice in my chapter, "Psychoanalytic Couple Theory," in Frank M. Dattilio, ed., *Case Studies in Couple and Family Therapy* (1998).

Instead of building on our finely honed classical psychoanalytic technique by applying it more generally to marriage and the family, we have been as fixated on the past as our individual patients often are. We may need to apply our theory to our own group behavior to help deal adequately with current sociohistorical realities.

Fred Sander, MD, who is affiliated with Mt. Sinai Hospital, is in the private practice of psychoanalysis and family therapy in New York City. He also teaches the only course on psychoanalytic couples therapy given in a psychoanalytic institute (The Association of Psychoanalytic Medicine at Columbia University) within the American Psychoanalytic Association. Anyone wishing a copy of the course curriculum can reach him at 200 East 89th Street, New York, NY 10128 or at <73002.3656@compuserve.com>. □

Acceptance of the Unknown

Angelina M. Baydala
University of Calgary, Canada

As a therapy and method of understanding, contemporary psychoanalysis generally replaces prescription with patience. Instead of prescribing what must be for mental health, psychoanalysis focuses on understanding and what relations demand. The significance of psychoanalysis is in its ability to explain the production of meaning, the debt of expression to desire, and the processes that break down the production of meaning. Instead of

making definite claims about the truth and certainty of treatment, psychoanalysis indicates an art and systematic methodology for understanding the process of understanding. In so doing psychoanalysis dispossesses us of the conviction that we simply know what we know.

A central insight of psychoanalysis is that there is no certainty, no final word, and no definite knowledge because the unconscious is always at play. Knowledge becomes a static caricature except for the force of the unconscious. Whereas psychoanalytic understanding ensures that we cannot be the expert on or the originator of life, the use of manualized treatment avoids truth, in the attempt to maintain the belief that the truth is certain. Certainty is the enemy of creativity and processes of understanding. Authoritative techniques become significant cover-ups for moments of fear and insecurity. Instead of responding with expert advice, the psychoanalyst is expert at breaking the promise of being an expert. The difference between psychoanalysis and financially acceptable forms of assessment and practice is that psychoanalysis is a critique of the need for authority and in this respect psychoanalysis revises our notion of the expert or the professional. Analysis of transference is the analysis of a person's need for and belief in authority. The analyst knows that no one knows the answers although they also know the patient thinks that they are supposed to know.

Embedded within the practice of psychoanalysis is the insight that there is more to medicine and therapy than fixing pipes, adjusting levels, and altering lifestyle patterns. There are within the field of sickness and health deep philosophical and spiritual concerns. Illness brings on a contemplative, reflective state of being. Teleological questions come to the fore. Why am I sick? Why is there pain and suffering? What does this disorder indicate? What does the pain mean? What is my body's intention? The patient, the one who must suffer to wait, is held in suspension. Desirous of something other than what is; mostly desirous of the absence of what is, but acutely in need and asking for help. Psychoanalysis recognizes value in inquiring into the meaning of symptoms, not in terms of controlling the symptoms, but rather in terms of understanding the signs. When the unknown compels us to act and know, opportunities for insight may be lost.

The future prospects of psychoanalysis in the 21st century are presaged by a growing climate of distrust in authority. In general, people are will-

ing and able to question authority, to fearlessly think for themselves. Dispossessed of absolute certainty there is appreciation of multiple meaning, acceptance of symbolism in dreams, jokes, and slips. In even the simplest claims to truth there is recognition of hidden motivations. Although short-term, problem focused therapy in the face of time limited health care coverage seems to leave little space for the principles of psychoanalysis in the practice of therapy, people seem to be more interested in understanding their health in a more holistic and comprehensive manner.

Opting for combinations of yoga, acupuncture, massage, and meditation, people seem less willing to subscribe to the authority of a single discipline. Costs may be prohibitive in some cases, however, in others insurance companies and employers may support health care for people on long-term disability in the hope of bringing employees back to work. Such long-term convalescence invites a non-confrontational, inquiring approach to understanding psychological difficulties, perhaps creating a space for emerging psychoanalytic principles of practice.

Furthermore, even if third party HMOs and insurance companies are unwilling to pay for traditional psychoanalysis, it is not the therapy that is financially supported but the individual therapists. Correspondence between therapists' schools of training and therapists' practice is notoriously inconsistent. People practice what they are and not what they claim to know. In descriptive statistical analyses, magnitude of benefit is shown to be more closely associated with the identity of the therapist than with the type of psychotherapy that the therapist practices. It is also found that very different interventions are used by therapists who have the same theoretical allegiances. Although psychoanalysis is currently excluded from managed health care, this may be irrelevant to the question of the impact of psychoanalysis in 21st century mental health care. If psychoanalytic concepts continue to capture the popular imagination, perhaps authoritative technique may come to be replaced with a spirit of inquiry and desire for understanding. Therapists may come to practice according to tacit psychoanalytic principles by virtue of their existence in a psychoanalytically influenced culture. In this case, explicit exclusion from managed care would be irrelevant.

As a hermeneutics, it seems that psychoanalysis has a secure place regardless of its explicit exclusion from mainstream psychology. In a soci-

ety ruled by values of equality, the death of the expert is a welcome harbinger of a new era in understanding and relating to difficulties of mental health. We have yet to see if psychoanalysis can withstand the temptation to become an expert on not being an expert. To accept the radical uncertainty it implies is a difficult task in the face of invitations to take power, but as a general cultural phenomenon perhaps acceptance of the unknown and fluid inquiry will be inevitable.

Angelina M. Baydala is a doctoral candidate in clinical psychology at the University of Calgary in Canada. She is trained in the disciplines of neuropsychology, cognitive science, clinical psychology, and philosophy. Baydala is interested in the creative interface of material and postmaterial hermeneutics as applied in the practices of mental health care. Yoga is an important part of her life; she teaches it and has lived in yoga communities in Nepal, Malaysia, Canada, and the U.S. You may contact her at <anbaydal@ucalgary.ca>. □

Doing Therapy in Our Electronic Age

Irene Javors
Private Practice

We live in the age of bottom lines. How much does it cost? How long will it take? Who is going to pay for it? Cut, snip, and trim. No time, talk is a waste. Just do it. Don't stand still. Keep moving. Action is life; thinking is death. Forget meaning, just make money -- that's all that matters.

Daily, in session after session, these phrases are uttered by my patients who have come to talk about their lives in the "information age." Like dialogue out of an absurdist Kafka tale, I am made privy to the prevailing anxieties of our times. More often than not, I find myself wincing in pain each time another contemporary cliché is offered up for analysis by my oft-confused patients who seem to be swimming around in an ocean of half-digested sound bites. "Help me feel something, anything," he implores. "I don't want to think, just feel," she whimpers.

We live in a time when information is more important than wisdom. We cannot tolerate multiplicity of meaning -- we yearn for simplicity, for answers, for fast spelling checks done in megabytes. We e-mail frantically, seeking connections,

yet far too frequently end up bounced offline and floating into cyberspace. How do you practice psychotherapy in a time such as ours? How do you explore subjectivities? How do you talk of passion, commitment, and *existenz* to people who have no understanding of metaphor, and who in their quest for conformity spout post-modern rhetoric about their socially constructed "selves?"

Our managed care age of brief therapy, short insight, and the wonders of modern chemistry offers us training in how to be "pod people" in the next version of a body-snatcher movie. In 20 sessions or fewer, we are asked to help our clients (indeed, we are all consumers) probe the depths of their psyches, and explore their existential angst. We are asked to come up with a treatment plan to get them up and running before their HMO decides that the whole business is cost ineffective.

This isn't the half of it. After years of training and supervision wherein I learned about setting limits, the importance of boundaries, and the sacrosanct nature of the therapeutic encounter, I am now confronted by the presence of cell phones, beepers, palmcorders, and all manner of electronic gadgetry being brought into "sessions." Like the house manager at the opera, I am required to remind my client to turn off their telephonic devices during our time together. Often, this is greeted by an uncomprehending expression and a response such as, "But what if I am needed?" Carefully, I explain that we must "talk about" this.

Despite my Luddite sympathies, I realize that the hip, 21st-century psychotherapist must learn to use all that the client presents, digital or otherwise, as part of the therapeutic process. Like some ancient Tantric master, I need to put "everything on the path" for analysis and consideration. Another millennial headache involves e-mail. One after another of my "Twenty-Something" clients asks for my Internet address. For hours, I have agonized over whether or not to give out these cyberspace coordinates. Whenever a client asks, "Can you e-mail?," I find myself plunged into severe counter-transference anxiety. "What about calling me instead?" I ask. "Oh, I thought I could send you some of my thoughts between sessions," he cheerfully points out to me. After what seems like an eternity, I connect the dots and realize that this is just another way of challenging boundaries. With renewed confidence, I respond, "No e-mail. Let's talk at our next meeting."

I am a confirmed product of the 20th cen-

ture -- a being shaped by the concerns of the post-war existentialist humanist project. I question whether I will be able to adapt my ways of knowing to help clients in this "brave new world" of ours. I often ask myself, "In cyberspace, do we still sing the blues?"

Irene Javors, a Diplomate of the American Psychotherapy Association, is in private practice in New York City where she specializes in bereavement counseling. She may be contacted at <Kelpiel@aol.com>. □

Reflections on the Impossible Profession

David Lotto
University of Massachusetts and
Private Practice

An Australian academic psychoanalyst, Douglas Kirsner, recently wrote in the *New Yorker Magazine*, "the Impossible Profession is on the ropes [and] Freud's reputation has never been so battered." Furthermore, "the art-science he founded, once a kind of secular religion in America ... is now a national afterthought, a discipline in financial peril and internal tumult."

Although for its entire hundred-year history psychoanalysis has been vigorously and at times viciously attacked from both without and within, the last 20 or so years has seen an escalation in vigor and viciousness. From Jeffrey Masson's portrait of Freud as a craven careerist denying the reality of child abuse to get more referrals to Peter Swales' allegations that Freud had an affair with his sister-in-law, a chorus of critics contend that he, and the movement he founded, are morally and intellectually dishonest. A whole new growth industry has been created, which the media has even dignified with a label -- "Freud bashing."

Yet this is only one side of a deeper attack on psychoanalysis along with any other form of depth psychotherapy that takes seriously the examination of the inner life. This aspect of the onslaught is driven by the world of corporate health care and their skills. These "skills" are the brief solution-focused psychotherapy crew allied with the unlikely coalition of biological psychiatry and the latest incarnation of behaviorism, cognitive-behavioral therapy. All of them share the belief that the practice of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy is at best useless, and at worst,

fraudulent.

From the perspective of the practitioner the situation has become quite grim. For the majority of those who want to continue working with patients in the traditional psychodynamic modes there are several unpleasant alternatives. One can accept managed care insurance money at the cost of putting up with the full gamut of managed care horrors which include, but are not limited to, spending large amounts of unpaid time filling out long application and credentialing forms, filling out treatment reports, wading through lengthy telephone and voice mail menus, and having inane conversations with intellectually challenged case manager bureaucrats -- all for having, at most, 20 to 30 sessions a year paid for by insurance at substantially reduced fees. Alternately, one can practice managed care free and be faced with the choice of living on a very reduced income or limiting one's practice to a carriage trade clientele.

But perhaps things are not quite as grim as they seem. Although I have been a practicing clinician for 30 years, my primary interest in psychoanalysis has always been as a way of understanding contemporary political realities and historical trends and events. My introduction to psychoanalysis was in the mid-1960s at the start of the anti-Vietnam War movement and the emergence of the radical politics of the New Left. I felt that psychoanalytic concepts were the most powerful, sophisticated, and satisfying tools for understanding the behavior and motivations of entities larger than the individual: groups, organizations, governments, and nations.

I have always strongly identified with Freud's claim that he was more interested in understanding than in therapeutic change. In particular, I have always wanted to be able to understand what motivates people, and the groups with which they are affiliated, to do things like drop atomic bombs on cities full of people and commit the atrocities of the Holocaust. I have always been drawn to those psychoanalytic thinkers who have emphasized the importance of the outer world -- the stage of history, politics, and current events -- in determining who we are and what we do. This, of course, is the essence of psychohistory.

So, perhaps the promise of psychoanalysis lies more in the direction of psychohistory than of psychotherapy: to make use of the discoveries, insights, and theoretical constructions of the discipline and way of thinking developed by Freud, and elaborated by the many branches and schools of

psychoanalysis which have proliferated over the course of the last 100 years, to help us understand the *why* of history.

There are several hopeful signs that within psychoanalysis itself there has been some change of focus, shifting from the exclusively clinical to broader concerns about groups and culture. The popularity of Lacanian analysis, with its emphasis on understanding the behavior of groups, the significance of the products of our culture, and the workings of the institutions of our society -- rather than on strictly clinical matters -- is one sign of this.

Speaking as a psychoanalyst and again looking for silver linings in dark clouds, I would say that we should remember that for most of our hundred-year history, psychoanalysts' incomes were closer to the bottom than to the top within their profession. The strength of psychoanalysis and Freud's genius was always to look deeper, behind, around, and underneath what is apparent on the surface; to understand as fully and truthfully as we can about the whys, whether it is about our patients, our selves, or our world and its history. The value of psychoanalysis lies in its ideas, methods, and applications -- not in its popularity as a commodity which commands a high price or grants its practitioners an elite status.

David Lotto, PhD, is a psychoanalyst/psychologist in private practice in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, as well as an adjunct professor at the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Lotto is an active member of the Psychohistory Forum and the International Psychohistorical Association, who often writes about issues of war and peace, and health care. He may be reached at <Lotto8@juno.com>. □

Political Engagement of Analysts

Daniel Burston
Duquesne University

American psychoanalysis faces formidable threats to its survival in the 21st century. Most analysts' energies and attention are occupied with the most obvious and direct challenges to the legitimacy and viability of the profession, such as the hegemony of managed care, pressures to mandate the complete manualization and standardization of psychotherapy, and increased skepticism about the

effectiveness of psychotherapy and of psychoanalysis in particular. Psychoanalysis is also being threatened by more diffuse economic and cultural processes that ignite and sustain the more organized and overt threats, and features of its own forgotten history that are seldom satisfactorily addressed.

Efforts to address these challenges are necessary. To confront and contain the indirect economic and cultural trends that threaten psychoanalysis' future, psychoanalysts must engage in some collective soul searching, and discard or revise Freud's attitudes toward politics and technology. It is because Freud's theories did not make provision for the social changes we are witnessing today that current attitudes must change.

Leaving the doctrine of adaptation aside, another significant factor in the rapid rise (and recent decline) of psychoanalysis in the U.S. is the adoption of a purely professional ethos, rather than the stance of the committed and engaged intellectual. This was also a concession to middle-class sensibilities, albeit one that began in Europe, not in the U.S. At the risk of oversimplifying, the analyst *qua* professional, be s/he a lawyer, doctor, etc., offers their expert skills and services to individual clients for a fee, but declines to get involved in social and political issues on the grounds that it would compromise their professional credibility or competence. The analyst *qua* intellectual, by contrast, will also write, teach, or create art for a living, and is actively involved in the public sphere, while often maintaining a discrete distance from party politics by virtue of their disciplinary engagement in the arts and sciences.

Obviously, there are some noteworthy exceptions to both of these stereotypes, and there is no reason why -- ideally, anyway -- analysts cannot be both professionals and intellectuals. In the past, however, any deviation from the professional ethos was openly discouraged by the majority of institutes and subtly discouraged in most others as well. Significantly, this process did not commence with the exigencies of adaptation to America. Indeed, Freud himself set the tone for these developments. In response to Otto Gross, who advanced a Marxist and pro-feminist interpretation of his work in 1909, Freud disclaimed any political agenda for psychoanalysis, saying; "We are just physicians." He was implying that remedial interventions which analysts undertake ought to be tailored strictly to the welfare of the individual, not to social change. However, later that year in a letter to Jung, Freud

noted that the future survival of psychoanalysis was contingent on the success of various "progressive" (i.e., liberal) political forces that protect science from bullying by church and state. Later, in *The Future of An Illusion*, Freud even commended Mussolini to his readers, mistaking Il Duce for a courageous conservative who would presumably contain Hitler's rabid anti-Semitism.

Experience suggests that this professionalizing process, though European in origin, became more pervasive in the U.S. than in Europe, where more analysts remain engaged intellectuals, and/or are actively involved in social and political affairs. In any case, in the process of disclaiming the intellectual role, analysts across the board embraced the misbegotten notion that clinical neutrality -- and by implication professional competence -- presupposes political neutrality. However, clinical and political neutrality are not at all the same thing, and the linkage between the two is highly questionable. In fact, just as psychoanalysis cannot prescribe a particular attitude or approach to politics -- as Freud rightly insisted against Gross and Reich, for example -- so it ought not to proscribe any particular approach to politics, including neutrality.

To thrive, much less survive in the 21st century, psychoanalysts must re-examine their own collective history and recognize the necessity of proactive political engagement, something many are reluctant to do. This is not merely a matter of doing battle with managed care, and the manualization movement, but of experiencing and interpreting the growing power and perceived legitimacy of these hostile forces as symptoms of a deeper cultural malaise that needs to be addressed. This is not merely for the benefit of the analytic profession, but for society as a whole. To tackle these problems insightfully, analysts must acknowledge that the rise of psychoanalysis in America created unprecedented inroads with the (then) growing American middle class, and that psychoanalysis became more respectable, less avant-garde and less oppositional, and inevitably, more conformist as a result.

Judging from recent experience, however, the middle class that furnished the bulk of analytic patients in days gone by is in decline. Economists report that the 60 percent of the population wedged between the bottom and the top twenty has been steadily losing financial ground from the late 1970s until very recently. Even if the recent stabilization of the middle class lasts, which is doubtful, present social trends ensure that only a steadily dwindling

fraction of the population will be able to afford analytic therapy -- never mind a traditional psychoanalysis -- in the future. The availability of money (and/or insurance coverage), while crucial, is not the only factor. Time and literacy are also critical.

Furthermore, let us remember that in Freud's hands, for better or worse, psychoanalysis slowly changed from being primarily a method for the alleviation of symptoms into an instrument for deepening self-knowledge. Admittedly, it was not to be pressed in the service of revolution. That much is crystal clear. What is less clear, but evidently implied -- at least by the later Freud -- is that even in the absence of robust benefits, psychoanalysis can and should be practiced for the sake of self-knowledge alone. The hedonic and utilitarian goals of "successful adaptation", i.e., material prosperity and personal happiness, didn't rate highly on Freud's list of priorities, and with the passage of time, Freud seemed less and less certain that self-knowledge necessarily results in self-mastery in any case (e.g., *Analysis Terminable and Interminable*, p. 193).

In the present climate, however, Freud's attitude obviously is untenable. Insurance companies want something tangible in return for their money, and if you cannot demonstrate rapid improvements in return for services rendered according to prevailing criteria -- which are often trite, narrow, or misleading -- you are likely to lose credibility and, hence, your "market share." As a result, analytically oriented practitioners have met the emerging *Zeitgeist* half way already by devising manualized, short-term therapy protocols for anxiety and depression, which are just as (or more) effective than their cognitive-behavioral counterparts. Efforts like these should continue to prevent the cognitive and behavioral schools from gaining a monopoly of the short-term psychotherapy market, and the political leverage that goes with it. However, they are clearly insufficient to stem the rising tide of anti-analytic ideology in the mental health field, and do nothing to avert the threats to more traditional (i.e., long-term) approaches.

As their economic prospects become more precarious, perhaps, some American analysts will become more politically engaged, and attempt to address the more diffuse cultural threats to their profession. In view of the disparate political traditions that claim the allegiance of individual analysts, however, anything resembling a universal consensus on overall strategy is unlikely.

Fortunately, one issue on which all analysts

can agree is that pressures for the standardization and manualization of psychotherapy practice, and for the de-legitimation of non-manualized approaches, should be resisted. It is not enough to compete with them on their own terms, or to match their efforts with modifications to traditional formats. To be effective in this regard, analytically oriented clinicians may soon have to join forces with outsiders and some traditional adversaries, i.e., Jungians, existential and humanistic psychotherapists, as well as pastoral counselors, to challenge the manualization movement. This will help create an effective counter-lobby, and call attention to the scientific tendencies to quantify, reify, and (inadvertently) debase human beings and human relationships in the name of efficiency and accountability.

To oppose manualization and managed care vigorously means to confront these deeper cultural problems only in their most overt and manifest form. In the long run, analysts must do more. They must realize that the cultural and economic changes that bode ill for the analytic profession are all linked to the headlong advance of technology, unchecked by other social and cultural forces that are capable of containing and diffusing its deleterious effects. Accordingly, they must ask themselves whether Freud's attitude toward technology, or that of the average American, is really adequate or appropriate to circumstances. I think not. The average American -- including the average analyst -- is indoctrinated from early childhood to think of technology as a good thing, by and large, and to merely question occasional abuses and excesses of this process, not to view its systemic effects on society as a whole.

Freud was more ambivalent about technology, and therefore, closer to the truth, in my view. He realized that technology transforms us into "prosthetic gods" on the one hand, and enables us to destroy ourselves completely on the other. Even he lacked the foresight to discern the cultural problems it creates in peacetime. Despite all the talk of technology as a laborsaving device, the headlong advance of technology in the last two decades has created far too much work for those who are fortunate enough to have it and little or no work for many others. More to the point, netheads [avid Internet users] don't read Sophocles, Shakespeare or Proust, as a rule. As Jane Healey reports in *Endangered Minds* (1990), and as educators all over the continent know, America's educational system is producing successive generations of students

who are illiterate, or allergic to reading: who can read, but prefer not to, and who seldom extract much meaning from what they do read. As current trends intensify, those who can afford analysis from a purely monetary standpoint, because of their successful adaptation to the emerging technosocial order, are less and less likely to have the time or inclination to pursue it, or the ability to benefit from it if they do.

What is the solution? There is no single or simple solution to our current cultural malaise. Unless analysts see the nature of the problem clearly, they have no hope of addressing it effectively. Let us hope they see the bigger picture soon, before it is too late.

Daniel Burston, PhD is Associate Professor of Psychology at Duquesne University and the author of The Legacy of Erich Fromm (1991), The Wing of Madness: The Life and Work of R.D. Laing (1996), and The Crucible of Experience: R.D. Laing and the Crisis of Psychotherapy (2000). He is a former (and future) Erik Erikson Scholar in residence at Austen Riggs, where he is working on an intellectual biography entitled Situating Erikson. He may be reached at <burston+@pitt.edu>. □

Responsible for the Future

Robert Hinshelwood
University of Essex, England

Psychoanalysis, being an introspective and inward-looking practice, is replete with introspective and inward-looking practitioners. It is likely that this inward gaze was prompted and enhanced by the development of training analyses. These became compulsory in the 1920s and then changed, perhaps in the 1930s, from control analyses, which looked merely at trainees' blocks in relation to training cases, to become analyses of transference, much like any other analysis.

Another defining moment was the introduction of the importance of countertransference, in the 1950s, and the transformation of the trainee analyst's inward gaze into a permanent self-analysis as the core of psychoanalytic practice. The benefit of countertransference in grasping the full depth of the intrapsychic inter-relatedness of analyst and analysand is now inestimable. Yet it encourages us professionals in navel-gazing activity which is helpful in the consulting room, but disadvantageous for political awareness within the

world around.

Stressed by the high cost of psychoanalysis, an excess of the supply of psychoanalysts over the demand for their services, and pervasive Freud-bashing, analysts tend to club together in institutes, often separating them from the rest of the world, sometimes encouraging a degree of group paranoia.

Let us turn now to psychoanalytic remedies to our problems. As a reflex reaction, analysts search for the origins of current problems in past history. Ours is a historical science. We spend time, and are prepared to spend endless time, on reconstructions of our patients' pasts, and in perfecting our reconstruction of their past -- of the constellation of figures, imagoes, and families from childhood, or of constellations of unconscious fantasies and primitive defenses proper to the past rather than the present. Trouble, we surmise and theorize, is inherited from a previous time, and an earlier stage in development. Therefore, is it not natural enough to be captured by that same reflex when it comes to worrying about the problems we perceive in our profession? Tempting and natural enough, such a developmental approach to the history of a group is not realistic.

If there is a tendency, when we are collectively together, to conceive our problems in a somewhat paranoid mode, it is because we experience the threats primitively -- "someone is trying to do something nasty to us!" Above all, this strips from us any feeling of responsibility for our own situation -- and thereby renders us incapable of considering what responsible actions we might plan and execute in the future. We are paralyzed by both the historical emphasis and the paranoid aversion to responsibility.

The blindness that the collective institutions of psychoanalysis have towards their own future in the outside world is a handicap. It curtails the efforts of those individual psychoanalysts who can and do actually work in our society, health services, charitable institutions, and universities, to achieve a new understanding of psychoanalysis. It hinders us in the understanding of others, and in inviting them into the important ways of using our ideas.

The future can be ours, it can be psychoanalytic. At the very least, a psychoanalytic future must be made for human science, as opposed to the material sciences which have displayed the wonders of human ingenuity for several centuries. The

future of psychoanalysis will, in the end, be the future of our society. Whatever the paranoia in us, and whatever the Freud-bashing in others, all our futures stand to be better with the use of psychoanalysis and its principles. We owe it to our species to claim that future.

Robert (Bob) D. Hinshelwood is a professor in the Centre for Psychoanalytic Studies of the University of Essex as well as a Member of the British Psychoanalytical Society. He may be reached at <bobhinshelwood@compuserve.com>.

□

Diversity and Pluralism In California

**Charles Webel and Sarton Weinraub
Saybrook Graduate School**

Psychoanalysis clearly has become a pluralistic theoretical enterprise. However, it is less clear if the clinical work of analysts is as diverse as their stated theoretical orientations. It is also uncertain if psychoanalysis will continue to diverge from its Freudian roots, whether it will converge towards a central paradigm, or even if it will survive in any distinct fashion during this century.

If the future state of psychoanalysis in the English-speaking world should fulfill the optimistic expectations of psychoanalysts currently practicing in California, then psychoanalysis will flourish, perhaps in a more diverse form. If, however, psychoanalysis does not adapt itself to changing conditions, and if it does not improve its administrative infrastructure, its days may be numbered. California is often considered to be rather heterogeneous and experimental, encouraging pluralism and diversity. Even psychoanalysis, sometimes misperceived as the most rigid form of psychotherapy, has become a diverse and truly pluralistic enterprise in California. In an attempt to understand "the present state of psychoanalysis in California," Sarton Weinraub, the co-author of this paper employed a qualitative interview-based survey of trained and currently working Southern California psychoanalysts. This study forms the basis for his master's thesis project.

In order to obtain a comprehensive picture of Southern California psychoanalysts, Weinraub interviewed three analysts from each of the seven psychoanalytic training centers in Southern California, including five institutes in Los Angeles, one

in Newport Beach, and one in San Diego. Additionally, he interviewed three Southern California psychoanalysts who are not currently members of any psychoanalytic institute, making for a final total of 24 interviews. There are an estimated 1,000 psychoanalysts in Southern California; therefore, the interview ratio was one for every 42 psychoanalysts. The interview questions were broken down into five categories: background questions, theoretical questions, clinical questions, individual questions, and geographical questions.

The results of this study suggest that the theoretical and clinical orientations of the interviewees are diverse. The theoretical orientations of the Southern California psychoanalysts can be placed in four "camps": drive and ego psychology; object relations; self psychology/inter-subjectivist; and Kleinian. It is noteworthy that drive and ego psychology, as well as self-psychology and inter-subjectivist theory, are not usually grouped together. These theoretical and clinical orientations have different origins, and sometimes, different perspectives on particular issues. However, in this study these theories were grouped together because they seemed to be linked in the minds and clinical practices of many of the interviewed analysts. Other, but less prevalent, theoretical orientations include classical Freudian psychoanalysis; structural theory; relational theory; and neuropsychology. Most significantly, the vast majority of interviewed analysts state that they incorporate varying degrees of other theoretical perspectives within their own overall framework, thereby justifying the designation of the terms "eclectic" and "pluralistic" to their theoretical inclinations. For example, many of the analysts who stated that they hold to classical Freudian theory call themselves "Freudian eclectic." Consequently, it seems likely that very few Southern California psychoanalysts are "orthodox" followers of any theoretical orientation. Additionally, no interviewed analyst stated that they followed or even used any form of Jung's analytic psychology.

Interviewed analysts were asked the question, "What major evolutions has psychoanalysis undergone since Freud's death?" They mostly gave three answers: first, the advent of ego psychology; second, the rise of Kleinian theory; and, third, the more recent developments in self psychology and/or inter-subjectivist theory. The majority of these analysts stated that ego psychology saved Freudian psychoanalysis, because the ego exists on its own, somewhat independently from the id. Next, the

interviewees stated that Melanie Klein brought Freudian theory to a much deeper level, especially because of her argument that infants have an extremely rich inner life. Finally, interviewees stated that self-psychologists and/or inter-subjectivists have made psychoanalysis more "user friendly," by breaking down the conventional image of the analyst as a blank screen.

Regarding what could be done to improve the current condition of psychoanalysis, all analysts who were interviewed suggested that in order to safeguard their profession, they and their psychoanalytic institutes need to work much harder to increase the popularity of psychoanalysis in Southern California. Many analysts advocate initiating varying levels of community outreach, including designing programs where volunteer members of analytic institutes create relationships with local high schools and colleges, offering counseling, psychology and philosophy courses, and setting up discussion groups where the psychoanalytic relevance of great literature and art, as well as famous psychoanalytic literature, is discussed and debated, encouraging young students to recognize the relevance of psychoanalysis within many different disciplines. Another common recommendation is that analytic institutes should start offering parenting and child development classes. A final suggestion is that analysts should initiate dialogues focused on combining techniques and finding the usefulness for psychoanalysis within other professions such as medicine, law, and government.

When considering the future of psychoanalysis, most of the interviewed analysts state that 30 years from now psychoanalysis will have grown significantly larger than it is today, because analysts will expand their notions of what "proper therapy" entails. Analysts stated that they would be forced, in order to keep their profession alive, to become flexible and to adapt their techniques to current social and individual needs. According to them, if it does so, the psychoanalytic profession might become a useful tool for many fields. Ultimately, their hope is that if psychoanalysis can promote itself within a wide range of areas, many people will be motivated to return to looking inward instead of hoping for some external and fast "cure" for their emotional problems. Most of the interviewed analysts hope that, if analysis sufficiently diversifies itself and thereby gains greater public acceptance, it will enjoy a renaissance.

The most interesting result of Sarton Weinraub's research was his discovery that the majority

of the analysts he interviewed had apparently not already asked themselves the questions he asked. For example, he thought they would be just waiting for the opportunity to reveal their opinions to a receptive audience when he asked, "What can psychoanalysis do to improve its current state?" To his surprise, however, this was not the case. Most of the analysts had to think for a while about the questions. Many simply stated, "I do not know."

After the interview process was over, Weinraub thought long and hard about why most analysts had apparently only rarely concerned themselves with such seemingly important questions as how can they improve the state of their profession. Later, it occurred to him that he had designed these questions as an outsider to the profession, as someone who is going through his own analysis, but has never been an analyst. He came to understand that if he were an analyst, he probably would also not be concerned with these questions. When the researcher put himself in the place of the analysts he interviewed, he imagined that his principal concern as an analyst would be working with and helping patients, not with attending to the social appearance of his profession. Therefore, Weinraub came to understand why analysts are not as concerned with the organization of their profession as they are with their daily clinical work. The many organizational problems that analytic institutions in Southern California and around the country are now experiencing make sense if one keeps the following generalization in mind. Psychoanalysts are often wonderful clinicians, but they are just as frequently inept administrators who devote little thought to the role of psychoanalysts in society.

The preliminary results of Sarton Weinraub's study of psychoanalysis in Southern California are consistent with more impressionistic indicators of theoretical pluralism and clinical convergence, noted often by Robert Wallerstein from the University of California at San Francisco and the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute, and by Charles Weibel during his period of psychoanalytic training at the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California.

In the English-speaking world, it seems clear that the relative theoretical uniformity of psychoanalysis during its domination by ego psychology in the immediate post-World War II period has been succeeded by several decades of theoretical diversity and pluralism. It is less clear if the clinical work of analysts is as heterogeneous as their avowed theoretical orientations. At the dawn of

this new century there are many uncertainties facing psychoanalysis. Will it continue to diverge from its Freudian roots? Will it converge within a single theoretical paradigm? Will it survive, given its organizational difficulties and the changing therapeutic marketplace, in a distinct theoretical and clinical form? Our choices over time will help determine the answers to these questions.

Charles P. Weibel, PD, is a member of the Executive Faculty of Saybrook Graduate School in San Francisco and is a Lecturer in the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley, where he teaches social theory, psychology, and gerontology. He has published articles in the International Encyclopedia of Psychiatry and Psychoanalysis and in New Ideas in Psychology. He is the general editor of the scholarly series, Conflict and Consciousness: Studies in War, Peace, and Social Thought, in which will soon appear his co-authored book (with David Barash), Peace and Conflict Studies. Dr. Weibel is completing his final year as a research candidate at the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California and may be reached at <cweibel@aol.com>.

Sarton Weinraub, currently a graduate student at Saybrook Graduate School, is writing his master's thesis on psychoanalysis in California. He has worked in several psychoanalytic institutes in Southern California, including the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Institute and Society. After earning his doctoral degree in clinical psychology, Weinraub plans to enter psychoanalytic training. He may be reached at <sarton@pacbell.net>. □

A Latina Analyst's Perspective

Norma I. Cofresí
Cleveland State University

My family often moved in the search for ever elusive economic stability. Consequently, I grew up surrounded by the asphalt and brick structures of New York City and was also raised in the mountains of rural Puerto Rico. The simultaneous experience of living within two different cultures with different values and speaking two distinct languages left indelible marks on my own psyche. My sense of self was further disjointed by the difficulties engendered by the exposure to the traumas and losses implicit in repeated uprooting. Typical for Puerto Rican women of my generation, I was expected by my family to put their needs before my own. However, I learned to value my auton-

omy because I was educated in the midst of the feminist revolution, away from my familial and cultural milieu. In response to these discrepant demands, I often felt and sometimes still feel divided. Psychoanalysis has been for me the medium to integrate the many opposites coexisting in my mind.

In more than one area of my life, I inhabit contrasting worlds. In my personal life, I struggle to integrate my Puerto Rican heritage with the mainstream, middle-class, Anglo-American world to which a graduate education has made me privy. In my professional life, I work to meet the challenges of academic psychology, while becoming versed in psychoanalysis, a discipline dismissed as not empirical by many academicians. In my endeavors, I am grounded and guided by knowledge gained through years of psychoanalytic treatment and training. Though not always named or acknowledged, psychoanalysis quietly resonates in my discourse with students, colleagues, and friends, many of who are strangers to psychoanalysis. Whether they know it or not, my psychoanalytic perspective enriches our discussions.

On a more discordant note, colleagues and students ask, How can I, a Latina woman, espouse Freud's theory? Implied in the question is the notion that psychoanalysis is sexist, racist, and ill suited to treat someone of my background. In my answers, I talk about the ongoing integration of feminist and cultural critiques with the theory. I describe the efforts by many psychoanalytic societies across the nation to provide outreach and services to the culturally and racially different and to the economically deprived. Sometimes, I even reveal the impact in my own life of a psychoanalytic experience. I tell of my own work with inner-city Latino and Appalachian patients. I describe the integration made possible by a method and a process that allows inner stories to unfold.

For instance, a Latina woman came to me, seeking a way to understand and put together the discordant strands of her life. She claimed that only a Latina woman could understand her experiences. I, too, wondered what it would be like to conduct an analysis with a woman whom I perceived to share my background. In retrospect, there are more differences than similarities between us.

What brings us together, two Latina women from different countries of origin, raised in different parts of the nation, with different histories? We are conjoined by her need to tell, and by

my willingness to listen, informed by psychoanalytic theories. As she searches and finds words to express the inexpressible, we examine the many conflicts created in her by her experiences in two cultures, one dominant, one, until now, oppressed. We examine how her early experiences continue to reverberate in her present relationships and in the way she construes her perceptions. From her telling, we unravel the past. In the attempts at understanding, we weave her future. In this manner, we slowly reconstruct a life narrative that may be less restrictive in its possible outcomes.

Psychoanalysis as a therapeutic modality provides a space for individual storytelling and meaning-making, a time and place to transform the ideograms of the mind into coherent life narratives. Through this method, a capacity for unencumbered appreciation of the juxtaposition of blessings and tragedies can be discovered. Latinos and persons of color may have lives disrupted by uprootedness and unfortunate life circumstances. For them, as it has been for others, psychoanalysis is a unique vehicle to bridge what was then and what is now. The psychoanalytic relationship makes possible an all too rare opportunity to engage in a reflexive interplay of the past and the present with an objective but caring significant other. Persons of color and immigrants can certainly benefit greatly from taking the time to creatively connect to, examine, and possibly reframe neurotic feelings about their circumstances, themselves, and others. Unfortunately, the exigencies of life of persons of color in the United States does not often permit these individuals to make use of what psychoanalysis has to offer. Hopefully, this may change more rapidly in the second century of psychoanalysis.

This is not to say that all Latinos and immigrants react to their life trajectories in the way that I have described for my patient and for myself. However, for those similarly situated, psychoanalysis may help consolidate hard-won intrapsychic achievements over very oppressive and restrictive past and present circumstances. The widening extension of psychoanalytic practice to such non-traditional patients is one more reason to be optimistic about the future of psychoanalysis.

Norma I. Cofresí, PhD, is an assistant professor of psychology at Cleveland State

**Call for Papers on
Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
Contact the Editor (see page 3)**

University and was a 1998-1999 Fellow of the American Psychoanalytic Association. She is a candidate-in-training at the Cleveland Psychoanalytic Institute and has a psychoanalytic practice in the inner-city. Professor Cofresi may be reached at <n.cofresi@csuohio.edu>. □

French Psychoanalytic Feminism

C. Fred Alford
University of Maryland

If one just read the popular press, one would worry that psychoanalysis was on its deathbed. Frederick Crews argues in *The New York Review of Books* (not exactly the popular press, but popular compared to the French psychoanalytic feminists) and elsewhere that not a single one of Freud's distinctive claims has been corroborated by scientific study. To Crews, whatever is of value in Freud, is merely a turgid rehash of the literary tradition that runs from Plato to Proust.

In response, the psychoanalyst Jonathan Lear argues in *The New Republic* that psychoanalysis is not so much a science as an extension and deepening of ordinary ways of understanding. Psychoanalysis should be judged in terms more akin to how we would judge a narrative. (Jonathan Lear, "The Shrink is In," *New Republic*, December 25, 1995) Crews responds that under such a standard almost any teaching would count as knowledge. (Frederick Crews. *Memory Wars: Freud's Legacy in Dispute*. New York Review of Books Press, 1997). The debate goes on, as it has for almost a century now. All the while, managed care, as it is called, under which medical decisions are made by clerks, is making psychoanalytic therapy a quaint episode in modern history.

Fortunately, the world is not all of one piece. In one corner of the academy at least, psychoanalysis is alive and well. Institutionally, that corner is more often than not in departments of English, cultural studies, and critical studies as they are called. Rarely, if ever, is that corner in departments of psychology or philosophy. Intellectually, this corner is French, a reaction by French feminists to the work of Jacques Lacan, a French psychoanalyst and psychiatrist influenced as much by structural linguists as by Freud (Jacques Lacan, *Ecrits: A Selection*, trans. Alan Sheridan, 1977).

Here is no place to explore the teachings of Julia Kristeva, Luce Irigaray, and Helene Cixous.

Nor is it the place to explore the teachings of American academic analysts similarly influenced by Lacan, such as Jessica Benjamin and Juliet Mitchell. I intend only to share the good news, that in this corner of the world, psychoanalysis is not only being debated; it is being cultivated. There is no place where psychoanalysis is more alive. Thousands of graduate students on the Continent, and in the United States, are learning a feminist version of Lacanian psychoanalysis (what should be a contradiction in terms, but isn't), and applying it, mostly to cultural studies and literary criticism.

In all fairness, I have to say that French psychoanalytic feminism is not my cup of tea. For me, the British School of object-relations theory has always been more accessible. The British School, along with its American cousins, such as Heinz Kohut's self-psychology, is one that lends itself more readily to social and political analysis: that is, the study of social problems, not cultural critique. One can readily imagine a psychobiography informed by the work of Heinz Kohut. It is harder to imagine one informed by the work of Lacan. Instead, both Kristeva and Cixous have written novels. (Julia Kristeva, *Black Sun*, trans. Leon Roudiez, Columbia University Press, 1992) However, the topic is not my intellectual taste. It is in fact, surprising at least to some analysts and analytically-oriented academics with whom I have spoken, that in one corner of academia a thousand psychoanalytic flowers are blooming.

How to describe this efflorescence? For Lacan, the central category is the Law-of-the-Father, his linguistic version of the Oedipus conflict. The Law refers not just to patriarchy, but the regulation of desire by law. Unlike Freud, Lacan argues that desire is first created by the law that forbids. The world is divided in two, the difference defined by the desire to transgress boundaries.

For Cixous and Irigaray, Lacan has confused the way men experience and write the world with the way everyone does. They call this way of experiencing the world phallogocentric (as in the logic, or logos, of the phallus), based upon the primacy of an array of binary oppositions, such as male/female, presence/absence, inside/outside, good/evil. If, however, one experiences the world from a female body (if, that is, the female body is a living metaphor for the entire world), then the basic categories of experience are more slippery, fluid, and less fixed than for men.

In writing in this way, I am allowing words

such as slippery and fluid to perform linguistic double duty, referring to aspects of women's bodies as well as to words, such as slippery terms and slippery signifiers. It is this linguistic play, originating in the body, that marks French psychoanalytic feminism, in which bodies frame words, and words are virtual bodies. This, the psychoanalytic feminists take from Lacan, even as the body becomes female.

You must forgive me for summarizing French psychoanalytic feminism in three paragraphs. Surely everything I have said is simplistic. This may be a greater sin than usual when writing about authors who make complexity and convolution their leitmotif. My goal is simply to share with you my excitement at discovering a group of authors for whom psychoanalysis is a living body, even if an unfamiliar one.

If the body of work is unfamiliar in many respects, it should be familiar in at least one. Like so many analysts before them, the French psychoanalytic feminists have taken the work of their teacher Lacan and turned it upside down, or perhaps inside out would be a better term in this case. There seems to be something about psychoanalysis, the way it gets inside, that requires its possessor to transform it in order to make it his or her own. Of course, this transformative tendency is not unique to psychoanalysts. Marx had to turn Hegel upside down before he could appropriate him. Perhaps we have to do this with all knowledge that we really care about, twisting and torturing it before we can call it our own.

If the style of the French psychoanalytic feminists is arcane, the substance is not: an investigation (a phallogocentric term?) of pre-Oedipal experience. In fact, a number of Anglo-American analysts have dealt with many of these same issues. D. W. Winnicott had a few words to say about the experience of women (though generally in their role as mothers), and Thomas Ogden's account of the autistic-contiguous position has much in common with the experiences that Cixous describes in terms of fluidity and slipperiness. Unfortunately, the Anglo-American and French analytic traditions don't talk with each other very much. Talking with other traditions might render French psychoanalytic feminism less obscure. Or is obscurity in the eye of the beholder? In any case, its insularity has served to protect French psychoanalytic feminism from having to justify itself to others, and this seems to have fostered its creativity. All interested in the future of psychoanalysis will wonder at this

secret garden.

C. Fred Alford, PhD, is Professor of Government at the University of Maryland, College Park. He is author of nine books on psychoanalysis and social theory, including *Melanie Klein and Critical Social Theory* (1989), *Group Psychology and Political Theory* (1994), and *What Evil Means to Us* (1997). Author of dozens of professional articles on psychoanalysis and society, he is co-editor of the *Psychoanalysis and Society Series* at Cornell University Press. Professor Alford may be contacted at <falford@gvpt.umd>. □

Barbra Streisand, Analyst and Patient

Robert Bruce Marchesani
New School for Social Research

While watching *Barbra: The Concert* at Madison Square Garden in 1994, I was struck by the role psychoanalysis had played in the performer's life and career. It was popular knowledge that Barbra Streisand had struggled with an intense fear of the stage, although the audience would never have known it by the way she performed -- confident and assured, even loving of her memories of Marlon Brando and her own son, Jason Gould, an actor who appeared with his mother in *The Prince of Tides*. Of seeing Brando for the first time, Streisand remarked as she reminisced about an old film, "It was truly a life-altering experience." (Brando himself was at the top of *The People's Almanac's* (1975 edition) list of "20 Celebrities Who've Been Psychoanalyzed.")

But, when in Act One, Streisand took a seat on the onstage couch, I wondered what she was up to. Was she about to depict an analysis or would this be one more parody on the work that I was being trained to conduct? Although she never uses the word "psychoanalysis" throughout any of the three vignettes that depict her in therapy, in the very first one Streisand sits on the classical couch that has stood as an icon of the unconscious since Freud's day. In the first vignette, Streisand begins talking anxiously about the present-day problems of dating. The audience then hears a disembodied voice from an empty wingback chair just behind the head of the couch. And a distinctly older, male voice says, "Why don't you just let your mind vander?"

"Vander?" Barbra gives the voice a slight double take, mimicking its unmistakable Viennese accent.

"Vander," the voice maintains.

She pauses and then relaxes into the corner of the couch closest to the chair.

"All right," she gives in willingly, even happily, wandering back to the memory of a blind date she'd had in high school.

It's hard to miss the obvious references to psychoanalysis: the couch, the voice, and the implicit reference to free association by "letting your mind wander" (Viennese style), and not add Streisand to the list of celebrities who have courageously embraced the couch and, as courageously, let go of it to live and work as Streisand did on that closing night of her tour.

From the couch Streisand breaks into song, marking a tribute to the creative potential that can be released in an individual who takes the journey on the couch. She sings, "Will he like me ... will he know enough to know that there's more to me than I may always show...." She ends the song and takes her seat on another analyst's couch.

This time, we hear the sound of a mature woman's voice. And once again, Barbra is there to work on relationships, as the therapist reminds her. Her story continues to unfold with the therapist simply adding, when she hesitates, "And..." the way the Viennese voice had urged in the first vignette, "Ya, go on" The therapist's voice and chair fade as Streisand and her voice once again emerge from the couch.

She finishes the song about love and ends up on a chair behind the wingback from which another therapist's voice asks her, "Have you ever been in therapy before?"

Streisand responds, "Have I ever been in therapy before?" and looks to the audience which is laughing. She continues, "Now I'm really fascinated by Jung. You know, the collective unconscious, the archetypal triangle: father-mother-child. It all comes down to that, doesn't it?"

"Yes, it does," the therapist says. "I would think all the different types of therapy must have been very confusing."

"Yeah, with all the transference and countertransference, sometimes I don't know whether I'm the patient or the doctor," Streisand says and then proceeds to show a series of clips from her own films in which she plays analyst and patient in

alternating roles. She concludes, "I don't care if you're the patient or the doctor, relationships are difficult to have. I guess the only good thing about unrequited love is that it's been the inspiration for some of the greatest songs ever written," like the one by Gershwin she proceeds to sing.

"One of the nice things about growing older is realizing that you can survive life's disappointments," she says. "And you also realize that you cannot look to someone else for your happiness. Of course, that screws up the songs you can sing. You know, you can't sing those dependent victim songs anymore with the same conviction.... But there are songs that you can sing and really mean, after many hours of therapy." And she breaks into, "On a clear day, rise and look around you, and you see who you are."

No doubt, she had come into the best of a good analysis where love and work are united. One might wish she would have used the word *psychoanalysis*. But, besides the props and the many inferences, "transference and countertransference" were words enough. It looked like analysis, it sounded like analysis, and, in fact, it was analysis. So, I'll place my faith in what Bettelheim and Rosenfeld called "The Art of the Obvious" (1993), something that any apprentice analyst needs to learn -- to trust the seen as well as the unseen.

That Streisand both wrote and directed *Barbra: The Concert* warrants further applause for the behind-the-scenes work of analysis, where the patient conceives herself anew and directs that self in a new way, with the voice of the analyst behind her, who says that it's okay to speak up, to sing out, and to be heard.

Barbra is a celebration of the triumph of the couch. And for Streisand, that means more than being "truly, the greatest vocalist around," as Marvin Hamlisch, musical director for the concert, said of her. It's also her presence, which is to say, her personality. Maybe Streisand's is the story of the creative possibilities of the couch. As many of the best stories on stage, in film, and on the page are told through what seems to be dramatic expressions of ordinary life, Streisand's story may represent the extreme of the many fears that bring one to the couch and also keep one away from the couch with the complaint, "It takes too long." What sent her to the couch? Fear for her life after being threatened in 1967 when she was politically outspoken. And for those who still believe analysis "takes too long" to be helpful, ask yourself, after

you see her performance (rent the video), was it worth the 27 years she took to make it back to the stage?

Psychoanalysis has been so aptly referred to as "the talking cure," from its very first patient, Anna O., who first spoke the phrase. It has become a process that strives to free up the will and the voice to speak and even to sing again -- to trust that life will not be taken away when patient rises again, but rather will be shared as it was first shared on the couch. At the end of the concert, Streisand reveals, "I've learned a lot. I've conquered some of my fears even....," giving witness that patient remains as analyst, still human and still afraid at times, but no longer paralyzed, and able to act.

Robert Bruce Marchesani, who holds a master's degree from the New School's Psychoanalytic Studies Program, is co-editor of the Psychotherapy Patient journal and book series for Haworth Press. He teaches The Internet and the New Self at the New School for Social Research in Greenwich Village, New York, and is a senior candidate with the Philadelphia School of Psychoanalysis where he began his training in psychoanalysis. □

The Harbinger of Truth

**William Daryl Spidaliere
New Hampshire Psychoanalytic Society**

As I sat down to explore my thoughts about psychoanalysis and its place as a therapy and a philosophy in this new century, the instrumental by Vangelis, "To the Unknown Man," played itself through my mind. The song is not well known, carrying with it little of the apparent power of Vangelis' work in *Chariots of Fire*. Yet there is an attraction there, something that draws some listeners into it. As for myself, as the song proceeds, it lures me, pulling me farther and farther into it until I am left with no place to go and no desire to fight where it may lead. As the tempo increases and the darker rhythms overtake me, I feel myself drawing peace from the release that it allows until it possesses all of me and I abandon myself to the music. As with all songs, the music comes to an end. But, as with all things that are truly moving, it is not forgotten and its effects remain long after, inspiring and directing my thoughts.

These free associations remind me of what Reik said in his *Thirty Years with Freud* (1940).

Reik discussed the effects that psychoanalysis can have upon one. If one is true to the cause and the study of psychoanalysis, then one can not help but be grasped by it. It takes hold of all who are willing to allow it, all that allow themselves to be possessed and indeed overcome by it. It is a thing that affects, a thing that, once the music has stopped, continues to pervade and work within one's psyche. It is a path that one has the grand opportunity of taking if one is willing to do so.

As so aptly stated by Shakespeare, "There's the rub." With the opportunity to take such a path, are we, as a civilization, willing to embrace it, to risk taking the journey that psychoanalysis offers us, with all of its trials and tribulations as well as all of its insights? I fear not, and this fear leads me to give little reason for optimism for our civilization.

There are few things that we fear, we brave souls of the 21st century. Much that had once plagued our world, that had caused us fear, has been removed or played down for our sanity's sake. Yet there remains one fear, one primary fear: that of knowing something about ourselves that we cannot look past.

We talk about sex and aggressive behavior and pretend that we are wise regarding these things. Yet we turn a blind eye to what these things mean, what they do to us and to our world. We see these things as acting upon us alone, as if we lived in an illusion where we believe that what we do and the way that we live does not effect others in our shadows, in our lives. A psychiatrist colleague of mine is a prime example of this fallacy of thought. Given the opportunity to explore with a patient the effect on her psyche of her husband's choices, he preferred to keep up the illusion that her husband's behavior had no effect upon her or their children but was an act separate, in a world all of his own. Why did the psychiatrist tell such a fallacy? Was it perhaps to protect himself and his client from the discomfort it might cause? Was it possible that he was trying to protect her from the effects of psychological insight? Whatever his goal might have been, he deceived her and allowed her to live under the illusion that her husband's behavior was, honestly, none of her business and none of her concern. Does this not pose the greatest of threats?

This does not mean that psychoanalysis is a failure, a poor vision by a poor visionary. No, psychoanalysis has not failed. Instead it is man and civilization that have failed. We as parents, teach-

ers, mentors and guides, as citizens all, have failed to bring up a culture where honesty and self-exploration are prized. Instead we adhere to the mystical, the unknown driving force, running from something that we believe haunts us instead of allowing ourselves the chance to realize that it sets us free. Never do we look toward honesty, the honesty that Freud espoused and worked so hard to attain through his science. Through it man is offered the opportunity to combat and overcome this greatest of all fears. Indeed, psychoanalysis is the one harbinger of truth. It is only through this search, this journey into truth, the truth of oneself, that man can come to develop understanding.

This course of free associations brings my mind back to "To the Unknown Man." Is it not a paradox, this song and its title? On the one hand it guides one to a place of self-exploring abandon, while on the other it emphasizes through its very name the failure of people to know or want to know themselves. Perhaps this is why the song is so unknown. We hasten from anything that threatens us with self-knowledge -- be it Vangelis' haunting song or the science and art of self-exploration, psychoanalysis. I prefer to stay with self-exploring abandon. Letting its melody again fill my mind's ear I wonder why more are not willing to be drawn into the music and the journey on which it can take us?

William Daryl Spidalieri, MS, LCMHC (Licensed Clinical Mental Health Counselor), is a private psychotherapist practicing in Nashua, New Hampshire. Studying Freud since adolescence, Mr. Spidalieri employs psychoanalysis to treat his patients. His areas of research interest include religion, death, and separation issues, all from a psychoanalytic perspective. He is the president and founder of the New Hampshire Psychoanalytic Society. Mr. Spidalieri can be reached by e-mail at <sigmundfreud@juno.com>. □

The Elián González Obsession: Introduction

(Continued from page 2)

O.J. Simpson trial? At a time when everyone knows Elián González, when asked who the current Vice President of the United States is, only about half the population names Al Gore. The country was bored by the primary elections, except when Senator John McCain briefly had Governor George W. Bush on the political ropes, but it did

not let go of one little boy so long as the picture of the six-year-old appeared before us. The country's attention to the normalization of trade relations with China and the increase in the interest rate by the Federal Reserve Bank has been slight compared to its focus on Elián González.

The fantasies about Elián were intense as the country delighted in seeing him at McDonald's and playing with our latest made-in-China American toys. It watched with excitement and trepidation as a human wall of Cuban-Americans formed around Elián's great uncle's home in Miami.

We called for papers which would cast some light on the national obsession, asking questions such as: Why this incredible focus on one little boy here at this time? In what ways is Elián seen as a child savior? How does Elián embody survivorship? How does this custody fight correspond to Castro's successful custody fight for his son? What do psychobiographical explorations (but not assassination) reveal about the main individuals involved in the struggle? To what extent is this a continuation of the Cold War after the collapse of European Communism? What is the psychology of the unspoken alliance of Castro, the Republican rightwing, and the Miami Cubans? How does the narcissism of groups impact on this situation? What are the real emotional needs of a six-year-old and how are these affected by Elián's last eight months?

We received little of what we requested and our referees also rejected some articles that were submitted. The papers below have not come from well-known psychohistorians. In the middle of a feeding frenzy of national interest there is much interest but little psychological insight. Yet it is precisely during such national obsessions that we most need such analysis. We see the following papers as beginning the process.

Paul Elovitz is Editor of this publication. □

Identifying with Elián González

Suzanne Schambach LaMar
University of Virginia Women's Center

As I offer an explanation for the incredible focus upon Elián González, it is Sunday, April 23, 2000. It has been 24 hours since the federal intervention occurred, removing Elián from his Miami relatives and re-uniting him with his father. Clearly, the collective reaction to Elián has been

neither casual nor cynically aloof. Tensions are high; passions surge.

When Elián was rescued at sea on Thanksgiving Day, he was not the first child to seek refuge in this country. Nor was he historically unique in experiencing the traumatic event of motherloss. Custodial disputes similar to Elián's are daily realities in American domestic relations courts. How is it that Elián's experience has so riveted our attentions? Why has one child so captured and provoked the passions, convictions, and indignations of Americans, Cubans, and international onlookers?

While issues of post-traumatic stress disorder, custodial rights, motherloss, attachment, and Cuban-American cultural/political issues are intellectual concepts and academic fodder, this child has emerged as the "real" as opposed to the "intellectual" and "conceptual." Daily we learn of his past and present. We polemically debate what is in Elián's best interest. As his saga is revealed, multiple challenges and tragedies unfold; we should remember that it is one child who is experiencing very real multiple crises.

In his story we identify with residual artifacts of our own experience: the early loss of a parent, attachment and separation, family conflict, issues of acculturation, and the process of repatriation. The more frail our personal resolution is in these areas, the more furious may be our reaction to Elián's plight. It is in identifying ourselves with this child that we align our collectively old or ongoing psychological vulnerabilities. As we re-experience our life events through Elián, I suggest that we impose our idealized outcomes onto his experience. Our ancient unmet needs are projected onto Elián; his travail is the reenactment of our own sorrows. Our former idealized solutions for our losses become the longed-for resolutions for Elián.

Admittedly, I am not penning this reaction piece from an emotionally remote stance. In my valuable 10-minute intervals between client sessions, I scurry to an available personal computer to catch the latest Internet news update. I ruminate alone, pontificate loudly, and downright weep at the photographic image of this "most wonderful little boy" as he is face-to-face with an armed and masked Immigration and Naturalization Service agent. The media coverage has enlivened what has become more than a case study; we identify with the intimately developed reality of a small child whose sufferings are real.

The image of Elián adrift, cradled in the hollow of an inner tube, is not unlike the images of the baby Moses or the infant Christ child. As his archetypal predecessors, Elián has also emerged as the catalyst for our passions, ranging from parental sovereignty to political agendas. This very real child ignites our compassion. This very real Elián carries a piece of our own unfinished business.

Suzanne Schambach LaMar, MEd, is Counselor in Residence at the University of Virginia Women's Center in Charlottesville. Her clinical focuses include the alcoholic family system, grief and bereavement, the human-companion animal bond, and psychological issues of the gifted and talented child. The author may be contacted at <pslssl@peoplepc.com>. □

Elián González as the Moses of the Third Millennium

Suzanne M. Gassner
University of California, Berkeley

The Elián González drama has commanded America's attention. Various segments of our population have reached differing conclusions about what resolution would best meet the emotional needs of a severely traumatized six-year-old boy. In the absence of significant and relevant details about Elián, his family relationships and the life that would await him were he to return to Cuba, we all can project our fantasies.

One can find reasons to view all of the major characters in a sympathetic light. These include Elián; his father, Juan Miguel González; the great uncle, Lázaro González; Elián's cousin and self-appointed surrogate mother, Marisleysis; and the Cuban Miami residents. Elián González's great uncle has two brothers who Castro imprisoned as dissidents. Elián's father describes himself as a devoted father who is agonized by the endless delays and obstacles that interfere with his resumption of his more normal life with his son. Elián has been characterized as having bonded intensely with Marisleysis, and the bilingual psychoanalyst who spent two days with the boy, Dr. Perdigo, formed the impression, despite his preconceptions, that Elián would be further traumatized by losing a second "mother" should the child be cut off from his cousin, Marisleysis.

All of this allows us to identify with or disassociate ourselves from the competing and con-

flicting claims that the father and the surrogate mother's family are making. One's perspective is shaped by one's membership in various groups. These include fathers whose crucial parental roles are underestimated; mothers who care deeply about nurturing the unprotected motherless child; the poor and disenfranchised and their spokespersons who dislike the upper middle-class Cuban community's receiving special attention and exercising their political clout. Also included are people who have struggled through custody battles, single parents, surrogate parents, adoptive parents, adults who have survived serious childhood trauma, religious groups identified with either the Catholicism of the Miami Cubans or Protestant groups that are making in-roads in Cuba, and all of us who have suffered the inevitable losses that parental death brings to the survivors. My own nine-year-old son projects onto Elián the picture of a child who has relevant opinions and is capable of using a mind of his own. He also projects his own wish not to be constrained by either parental or governmental authorities.

Another reason that Elián has commanded such attention is that he is viewed as a hero, a child who has endured in a way that is hard to imagine. His mother apparently dressed him in orange, which probably saved his life, because the color orange reportedly repels sharks. The idea of a small boy staying afloat in a tube that a mother ties her son into, while knowing that she will surely drown, is the stuff of mythology. Such a mythic figure is supposed to survive and flourish. The story of Moses begins with a mother placing her precious baby in a basket of reeds with an under-cover made of tar, hoping that he will stay afloat and be rescued from tyranny. In Elián's case, however, we witness a situation where every possible outcome is dire, and where he and many of the major characters are now destined to suffer additional losses.

Finally, there is something compelling about a drama where the needs for love and for freedom are at odds with one another. I recall the movie *Born Free* where the baby lion, Elsa, is raised by a game warden and his wife. They adopt her after circumstances force the game warden to shoot and kill her mother. This moving film dramatizes the couple's struggle to help the lion regain its freedom, while neither endangering it by releasing it prematurely into the wild nor protecting it by sending it to live in a zoo. What makes the Elsa and Elián stories so engaging? In the

Elián situation, political values determine what outcome one considers to be the equivalent of sending Elián to the wild or to the zoo. Regardless of political considerations, the dilemma touches something core in our nature, something that makes us care to see that a child's loving bonds are not severed while also wanting that child to have the freedom to live fully.

And what of the psychology that leads to competing assumptions about what the applicable legal principles are that should govern in cases such as Elián's? It is not that long ago that women were considered the property of men, and children, the property of their fathers. These attitudes still prevail in some parts of the world. Perhaps we are not as free of these beliefs as we would like to think. The Elián situation implies a larger question: At what age and to what degree do we consider a child competent and entitled to determine its destiny? The Elián saga provides us with an opportunity to evaluate how we regard children within our society.

Suzanne M. Gassner, PhD, is a training and supervising psychoanalyst at the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute and an Associate Clinical Professor of Psychology at the University of California at Berkeley. She may be reached at <Smgassner@aol.com>. □

The Subjectivity of Freedom

Penny D. Caldwell
Kent State University

Soft brown chestnut eyes dramatically described the helplessness and vulnerability of the little survivor as he gazed silently at the strangers surrounding him. Except for the subtle movement of innocent eyes, he remained motionless and mute. This was Elián González's first taste of freedom. His mother and nine other companions would not be as fortunate. The tragic loss of these and countless other human lives remains a cold, somber monument to a vague, illusive abstraction known universally as *freedom*.

Throughout history the human species has willingly endured hardships, sacrifices, and death to achieve and retain this precious ideal. Proudly, America portrays her founding fathers as courageous, altruistic pioneers struggling to build a new humanitarian society based on autonomous sovereignty. These immigrant visionaries were among the first to bear witness to the concrete manifesta-

tions of the sacred abstraction. As it spread beyond the boundaries of its infancy, expansion enabled individual subjectivity to dilute and distort original meaning. Now, each subsequent generation inherits a definition proclaiming hedonistic entitlement without accountability. The freedom of the past is now just an antiquity. As pilgrims of the modern world continue to risk all for the opportunity to live in this utopian ideal, more branches of subjectivity and intolerance reach out from its diverse, multi-layered foundation.

It was an unwavering belief in this awaiting paradise that prompted a desperate mother to ignore dangerous conditions, and, with her son in her arms, flee to this, the land of freedom. On the other side, relatives were waiting to embrace these newest members of emancipation. But now, her frightened child trembled and sobbed alone in a frigid, sterile healing facility. As he rubbed his swollen eyes, an "angel" appeared offering him comfort and protection. He pressed himself tightly against her beating heart as she cradled him lovingly in her arms. As dawn's first light broke through the darkness, it revealed not one, but two, wounded "children" still clinging tightly to each other.

This traumatized innocent would soon find himself at the center of a bitter custody battle. As it unfolded before a global audience, each participant would actively employ the abstract concept of freedom as their weapon of choice. Subjective definitions were narrow, self-serving, and powerfully resistant to change, as each player reflected an inner reality while shaping a personal meaning of *freedom*.

Quickly, battle lines were drawn as individuals, cultures, and countries gravitated to one of two sides in what would prove to be a highly emotional drama unfolding daily before the critical, probing eyes of the world. This simple concept called *freedom* would be pushed, pulled, crushed, and attacked as multiple authors attempted to force compliance to multiple definitions.

On one side of this equation are relatives who had previously fled Communist Cuba to seek sanctuary in this, the land of freedom. Among them was Elián's "angel" of mercy, Marisleysis González. Instantly, this distant cousin became the vulnerable lad's surrogate mother and primary supporter. With honest intentions, this outspoken advocate cried "freedom" for the traumatized youngster, although unable to see the blurring of boundaries that separated his needs from her own. In the

flurry of activity and passion of the cause, she remained blinded to the simplicity of his basic needs. She failed to realize that Elián's only need was to hide in the warmth and the safety of loving female arms. She appears oblivious to the fierce, dramatic reactions erupting within her, as old wounds reopen and begin to bleed. This frightened young woman displays very little trust in the outside world. Lacking a sense of safety, she attacks first, before she is attacked. As all attention focuses on her and Elián, she thrives as they perform in the center ring of the media circus. As she begs for the boy's freedom, the familiar echo of a utopian paradise is again present and standing the way of reason. Like the self-absorbed adolescent, she demands her rights and freedoms. The limelight is hers, and the rights and freedoms of others do not matter because they are trying to take them from her. She wants, and most of all, she needs to keep Elián with her. Unfortunately, the void that this small victim fills for his female lifeline is at best, only a bandage to provide some temporary relief. Because the environment is an unhealthy one, although genuine, Marisleysis' heartfelt emotional bonds cannot compensate for the unhealthy environment that requires much more than her motherless child can provide.

The Miami relatives and the population of Little Havana bring specific, political motivations to the playing table. They are united in one shared obsession; the hatred of Fidel Castro and of Communist Cuba. As rational thought is lost to emotion, Elián becomes a pawn used to strike a blow against the ruthless dictator. Freedom is regressed to a cheap tool used to gain advantage over the enemy. As the game escalates into one of winning at all costs by annihilating the enemy, desperation and frustration increases and the potential for violence runs dangerously high.

The American government and media are located on the other side of this controversial battle. Janet Reno, one of this administration's most powerful people, finds herself thrown into the eye of the hurricane. Unfortunately, the Attorney General remains a hostage of her freedom of choice from her own past. She is still haunted by memories of the bloody events of Waco, Texas. Her fears and regrets have compiled, and now, stubbornly retard her ability for swift and decisive movement. The resulting loss of control manifested itself as avoidance, as she repeatedly failed to enforce the firm deadlines and demands issued by her department. Elián's trauma increased daily,

as confusion and stress heavily weighted the atmosphere of the Little Havana home. Now, like a defiant child and indifferent parent, Marisleysis and her community quickly learned that government threats were empty and would not be enforced. Reno's credibility was now damaged and all future words would fall on deaf ears. Increasing trauma for the child survivor and prolonged agony for all involved, is a direct result of Reno's self-imposed prison.

Enjoying what appears to be the most unrestricted freedom of all is that of the media. Insatiably they devoured this traumatized child by exploiting him while he still held the interest of the public. There seem to be no boundary lines forcing an end to their freedom and a beginning to their responsibility. Elián became an overnight sensation, cleverly labeled and sold as a desperate refugee seeking sanctuary from a life of oppression. This seeker of freedom was instead just a commodity used in the name of capitalism and free enterprise. When the blood from this victim begins to wane, it will be on to new hunting fields and fresh prey. Unfortunately, because the pile of flesh will no longer bring profits, they are free to abandon him without looking back.

In this fruitless quest to make freedom an individual panacea, the rights and freedoms of Juan González, father of Elián, are ignored due to lack of sensationalism. Although he has joint custody and appears to be a competent and loving father, he has committed the unforgivable sin of living in a Communist country and of being unremarkable.

These many definitions of our simple concept called *freedom* effectively confuse and complicate its historical origins. The color of freedom reflects conflict and war, pain and suffering, sacrifice and blood. It is an unending merry-go-round of hope and despair. Safety is only a temporary lull in the storm. Was the intention to give freedom to all? The freedom to speak and be heard? Freedom to have a fair, objective trial? Freedom to raise children? Freedom to be protected from crime and slander? Freedom to live where one chooses? Extravagant displays can temporarily distract, but to remain blinded is to walk a path of apathetic compliance and complacency. "Give us your tired, your poor, and your hungry" and we will exploit you. "Come to these shores and taste freedom" -- well, freedom for some. Welcome to America.

Penny D. Caldwell is a senior at Kent State University with an AA and is working on her BA in

psychology/sociology. She also provides crisis intervention for rape/incest survivors and their families. She may be contacted at <caldwellpe@tusc.kent.edu>. □

Future Psychological Issues Elián González May Face

Hanna Turken

Forum Research Associate and Private Practice

Some relatives of Elián González believe it best for him to remain in the United States, while others believe that he should grow up in Cuba. These two factors, with or without the publicity he has received, will forever be imprinted on his mind.

This case is not only a matter of where the boy belongs after his parents' divorce, but one of divergent ideologies. His mother died in a risky effort to get away from Cuba to the U.S., hoping for Elián to grow up in what she believed to be a better place. His father, on the other hand, does not share her views, at least that is how it appears.

Since his mother is dead and his father is alive, the choice as to where he should live is obvious. While the choice may seem clear, the psychological task ahead for Elián will be to integrate both parents' beliefs, while not getting trapped in a never-ending web of ambivalence. The trauma of a dead mother and other events in the past year will be an unconscious influence on him for the rest of his life.

Because of the media attention, a custody fight between relatives became a political and ideological clash. Fidel Castro found a cause for himself and the Cuban people. Cuban-Americans saw an opportunity to validate their opposing political beliefs. The United States became involved in this game with Elián as the pawn, further compromising Elián's future psychological development.

The media has played an enormous role in the development of this story. Gabriel Garcia Marquez, in an article published by *The New York Times* last month, voiced his opinion that Elián belongs in Cuba and not in the United States. He further stated that Fidel Castro's son experienced a similar experience when his mother brought him to the United States. This earlier custody fight, which Castro eventually won, contributed to his rousing the Cuban people to fight for Elián's return to Cuba.

A cartoon in *New York Newsday* showed Elián, looking very American, saying, "Like, what's up?"; Castro is looking at him and gesturing; the caption says: "Send him back". A *New York Times* letter to the editor offered a possible solution: let Elián go back to Cuba but grant him U.S. citizenship so he could return when old enough to choose.

After resolving the Oedipal conflicts, there are many developmental tasks for a six-year-old. These include the latency six-year period of growth. Elián thus far displays a well-adjusted six-year-old attitude. Beginning at this level of development and throughout latency he needs both parents: a mother for a home base and a father to help him adjust to the outside world of neighborhood and school.

Some outcomes might include a possible resentment towards a stepmother and his father's Cuban home. A lack of progress in school and a rigidity of personality are also possible. Other outcomes may include an idealization of American culture and of his cousin Marisleydis in whom he seems to have found a loving mother substitute.

As much as we would like to believe that when Elián is back in Cuba living with his father all will be well, in my clinical experience this is not a likely outcome. I wonder, will it be possible for Elián to erase the experiences of his mother's having absconded with him, her subsequent death, his incredible survival, the men who rescued him, and all the publicity he received? The only hope is that in his Cuban home and school he will be given the opportunity to achieve an emotional balance incorporating all his experiences.

While living in Cuba, will American culture influence Elián somewhere in his psychological future? I think so, for it is one way of preserving the maternal love and connection to the dead mother. He might not be able to identify it as such, but the unconscious meaning of his American experience will symbolically be represented in one form or another.

In adolescence all prior experiences rework themselves. Will the maternal or paternal influence be stronger? Or will Elián be able to integrate the two apparently opposite ideological beliefs into

his own personal recipe? These questions will remain unanswered for many years to come.

Hanna Turken, PhD, is a psychologist and psychoanalyst in private practice in New York City and a Psychohistory Forum Research Associate. □

"Elián González"

Boghos L. Artinian
Private Practice, Beirut, Lebanon

Millions of children are bought and sold,
"Elián González,
Elián González."

Millions of children die of famine,
"Elián González,
Elián González."

Millions of children die of disease,
"Elián González,
Elián González."

He is nearing sainthood,
"Elián González,
Elián González."

Give him back to his Cuban father
And stop singing, "Elián González."

The mother drowned in the Atlantic Ocean,
Let not the child drown in undue emotion!

Boghos L. Artinian, MD, is an internist in private practice in Beirut, Lebanon. He has several published poems in medical journals and several editorials of a philosophical nature. The author may be contacted at <bogart@inco.com.lb>. □

The Biblical and Mythic Elián

E. Mark Stern
Iona College, Emeritus

And Elián was watched over by his mother as the seas enveloped her. Her sacred trust that God would preserve her to keep this watch was not to be God's pleasure. And the seas carried Elián to the arms of rescue.

This was the sign -- the miracle had occurred. At once Elián was no longer to be the freed dove. The child, wings and all, became chattel, a pawn of those who would be heard claiming the dove. "Give him to us. He has landed on our shores. Surely the Almighty meant for us to have him."

**Psychohistorians probe the "Why" of
culture, current events, history, and
society.**

The dove smiled and began to thirst for those things that all child avatars crave: hugs, tricycles, oblong footballs, and a home that was awaiting a one seasick from the salty mist.

"He is our sign, our boy Jesus, come this tortuous path so that our fates be one with his." Aghast, some of the humble in faith pause. Moments go by as Elián is led through the streets in triumphal capture. The wars have been won. The boy deity has fulfilled the prophesy. "A child is born this day in the House of David. A virgin's child. All glory and hope belong to the wistful-eyed boy. To him we wave banners in idyllic devotion."

And Joseph lamented in the bleeding land of silence. His treasured offspring, fostered and redeemed by the multitude, is no longer to be called his child.

Mary, fearful of the tides in Bethlehem, had abandoned herself and the child to the seas in the night. Rather her son have no father than he be at unease in the bleeding land. She feared so for her life that it was a life and lives worth risking. Joseph was her estranged. The man who perished at her side was willing to take by necessity that role which can rarely be reached in flight. He would henceforth be called "Abba," "Father." But the seas relinquished that claim. With brutal force they buried mother and consort.

Under the influence of the gift of fear, the mouthpiece of the gods held the crowds at bay. No simple task to deter the wild voices who "knew" the signs. "Give us this boy and we too shall become gods." Here tumultuous crowds confused between public and private matters, between the need to make sacred and the profanity of claiming the sacred right.

Joseph crossed the seas. He might have gazed in momentary contemplation to study the triangle of mother, consort, and child. He made a holy gesture. "Please," he said, "my son. Allow me a prodigal's reunion, and if he be the son of the Spirit greater than I, in time will be told. But, for now, allow my son the belly of his father."

Perhaps, little Elián, they loved a different person? A person that could never be? A person who never was or no longer is? Years will intervene till you are ready to decide whether they do love you. Is it for you to conjure up the true from the sea breezes? Bewildered child, for now mourn your mother; be led in slow grief by your father. In time it shall be your son whose hand you grasp,

but for now grip vigorously.

E. Mark Stern, EdD, is Professor Emeritus, Graduate Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Iona College, New Rochelle, New York; Fellow of the American Psychological Society and the Academy of Clinical Psychology, and Past President of the American Psychological Association's (APA) Division of the Psychology of Religion and Division of Humanistic Psychology. He is currently in practice as a psychotherapist in New York City and may be contacted at <Dremstern@aol.com>. □

Mel Kalfus: Psychobiographer, Institution Builder, and Survivor

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

Melvin Kalfus was born in New York City in 1931. He grew up on Long Island and in Miami and Tucson. After a 30-year career in advertising (1959-1989), rising to senior vice president of a major New York City ad agency, Kalfus received his PhD in history from New York University in 1988. He served as International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) President from 1982 to 1984 and Treasurer from 1982-1984 and 1984-1995. After retiring from advertising, he moved to Boca Raton, Florida, and taught history and psychohistory 1990-1997 at Florida Atlantic University (FAU) and Lynn University, and since 1996 has taught seniors through the Jewish Federation's Elderhostel program and FAU's Lifelong Learning program. He has been active in the leadership of Congregation B'Nai Israel, Boca Raton, since 1991 and served as President 1995-1999, directing the building of a new three-story school and a chapel.

Kalfus' major publications include his dissertation rewritten as Frederick Law Olmsted: Passion of a Public Artist (1990) and the article, "Richard Wagner as Cult Hero: The Tannhauser Who Would Be Siegfried" in the Journal of Psychohistory (1984), for which he received the IPA's Glenn Davis Award.

Paul Elovitz interviewed our featured psychohistorian in the fall of 1999. Kalfus may be contacted by e-mail at <kalrose@aol.com>.

Paul H. Elovitz (PHE): Please tell us

about your family background.

Melvin Kalfus (MK): My family was Jewish. Both parents were born in New York City. Mother's parents were of Hungarian descent. Father's parents were from Silesia, Austro-Hungarian Empire, of Polish-Jewish lineage. My parents were born and grew up in immigrant poverty on the Lower East Side. Mother married my father when she was 16, in part she later said, to get away from home and to not have to get a job. My brother, six years older, and I were born when our parents resided in Brooklyn. Mother was a homemaker until she was 50, when she fulfilled a girlhood ambition of becoming a nurse, a licensed practical nurse. Father was a very successful plumbing and heating contractor, specializing in restaurant and hotel work in Manhattan. Father died when I was 43. (I did not learn of his death until 3 months afterward; we had been estranged since I was 22.) Mother died when I was 63.

PHE: What has been the effect of all the moving around your family did -- Long Island, Miami, Long Island, Tucson, Long Island, Rosedale?

MK: Actually, my wife Alma and I moved even more often in the first dozen years of our marriage than my family did when I was a kid -- mostly in response to my rapid career changes, which suggests a reluctance or inability to "put down roots" as a result of childhood instability and insecurity. But such moving around can also help some individuals to become flexible, adaptable, and able to deal with change, and possibly less insular.

All the moving around as a child was complicated by illness. I was born with the whooping cough, which turned into bronchiectasis -- a chronic lifelong respiratory condition that today requires I use oxygen equipment around the clock. A terrible and unnecessary operation when I was five just made it worse. Put them all together and you have the formula for a good deal of inner rage and pain as well as insecurity. On the flip side, you also have the evolution of a survivor: what Bowlby says about trauma as healed-over scar tissue. You can function well enough most of the time, but the scars throb on rainy days.

PHE: You've said elsewhere that you hated school when young, yet you went on to get a doctorate and become a teacher. How do you explain that?

MK: In high school and then undergraduate university at Purdue, I did well at the subjects I

liked (English, history, and some math), but my mind and imagination went on "walkabouts" everywhere else (the sciences and engineering mechanics). But I almost never missed a class or a day of work in later years. When I went back to school the first time, to Boston University, for an MBA program I didn't complete, it was for a career advantage. When I went to NYU for the doctorate in history, it was to pursue something I loved. Focus and self-discipline were things that came late to me: perhaps after I moved to Hartford at age 24 to start work as a reporter for the *Courant*, maybe not even until I came to the ad agency at age 36. After holding seven different jobs in the 12 intervening years, I stayed at the agency for 22 years.

One reason I later identified so strongly with Frederick Law Olmsted was coming across this statement of his, early on, that he wrote when he was 68 (my age now!): "I never before had the question so clearly before me, how such a loitering, self-indulgent, dilettante sort of man as I was when you knew me and for ten years afterward could, at middle age, have turned into such a hard worker and *doer* as I then suddenly became and have been ever since." Of course, I know now that it wasn't so "suddenly" with him, or with me. I said in my book that Olmsted's experience perfectly illustrated Erik Erikson's concept of a "psychosocial moratorium" -- "a period, sometimes lasting many years, during which a young person seeks to find 'a niche in some section of society'" which will allow him to consolidate and to live in harmony with his sense of identity. Obviously, I believed that also about myself.

PHE: What psychoanalytic/psychotherapeutic training and experience have you had?

MK: No formal training. As part of the doctoral program at New York University (NYU), I was permitted to take courses in the Psychology Department in place of a foreign language requirement. Took three or four. But, as an autodidact, I heavily read Sigmund Freud, Melanie Klein, Eric Erickson, Donald Winnicott, and Margaret Mahler, plus subscribed to several journals. I also purchased second-hand at the Strand Bookstore many copies of that wonderful series, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* (1945).

I went into therapy in the mid-1970s, in large part to deal with the tremendous stress of the advertising business, but I quickly found I was dealing with issues far beyond that immediate problem. I believe it was essential to being able to

be effective as a psychobiographer and a psychohistorian. You simply have to have dealt with your own issues to diminish the tendency to impose them on your subjects and end up making your work just another link in your defenses. Plus, there is nothing like the experience of psychotherapy to enable you to truly grasp the theoretical stuff you have been studying. What did I really know about the powerful defenses of splitting and transference and projection and denial until I had grappled with them and their effects in therapy?

I also believe that the intense psychotherapy I engaged in between 1985 and 1988 made it possible for me to get myself together after chemotherapy and go on to complete my dissertation, get my doctorate, and publish a book. And probably also being able to resign from the ad agency, move to Florida, and launch a late-life career change to teaching.

PHE: How do you define *psychohistory*?

MK: I like your early phrase at the head of *Clio's Psyche*: *Understanding the "Why" of Culture, Current Events, History, and Society*. That helps to explain what I think is one of the most valuable traits of a good psychohistorian -- an insatiable curiosity.

PHE: What brought you to psychohistory?

MK: I didn't start out doing psychohistory or psychobiography at NYU. I started out thinking of a political/intellectual study of John Adams and Edmund Burke, and did a seminar paper on the subject. While taking another course, I got involved with Frederick Law Olmsted and, for this course, read Laura Wood Roper's biography, *FLO: A Biography of Frederick Law Olmsted* (1973). He fascinated me, clearly because I identified with him in so many ways, not the least of which was his self-proclaimed "dilettantish nature" noted above. At any rate, the Roper biography just whizzed by so many things in his life that raised so many profound psychological questions that I felt a compelling interest in answering and understood I could only answer psychobiographically. It was while building the background to do it that I discovered the *Journal of Psychohistory* (recently renamed from the *History of Childhood Quarterly*, which is what I was looking up in the NYU library) and, through it, the brand-new IPA, and through them both, an absorbing interest in doing psychohistory.

PHE: What books were important to your development?

MK: I'll answer for my development as a psychobiographer:

- Erik Erickson: *Childhood and Society* and *Identity, Youth, and Crisis*.
- Donald Winnicott: *The Maturational Process and the Facilitating Environment*.
- Margaret Mahler (et al): *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant*.
- Alice Miller: *Prisoners of Childhood*.
- Melanie Klein: *Love, Guilt and Reparation*.
- Anthony Storr: *The Dynamics of Creation*.
- Harry Guntrip: *Schizoid Phenomena, Object Relations and the Self*.
- And that wonderful series: *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*.

To answer this question in its largest sense, I have to return to my childhood as a "sick kid" who spent an inordinate amount of time bedridden. Books such as *Robin Hood*, *The Hardy Boys*, *Baseball Joe*, and *The Saga of Billy the Kid* developed, deepened, and enriched my imagination. Then, in the high school and university years, I was blown away by Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*; Fitzgerald's *Tender Is the Night* and *The Great Gatsby*; Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*; Dickens' *David Copperfield*; Bronte's *Wuthering Heights*; Maugham's *Of Human Bondage* and *The Moon and Sixpence*; Bellow's, *The Adventures of Augie March*; and Farrell's *A World I Never Made*.

What all of this created in me was the consuming passion about mythmaking and storytelling, for the richness and variety of the human experience, that is at the heart of both the historical and the psychohistorical imagination. I don't know how widely-read today's would-be psychohistorians are, but it is useful to remember that our discipline is one -- and just one -- of the humanities.

PHE: Who was important to your development as a student of psychosocial phenomena? What impact did Erikson have on you?

MK: Of the writers mentioned previously, Winnicott and Erickson had the most influence. Winnicott's True Self/False Self, in dynamic interrelationship with "the environment," has been at the center of a lot of my work. And I should add the work of Robert Stoller, related to gender development and identity, which I have found so useful to the study of creative people and which has significant psychosocial implications.

Erickson's influence has been profound in

leading me (as he had led so many others) to doing psychobiography and psychohistory. I doubt that I would have turned to psychobiography to answer the questions I had about Olmsted (after reading Laura Wood Roper's biography) if I had not first read Erickson. That, by the way, happened only because my mentor in history, Carl Prince of NYU, assigned Erickson as a part of a class on historiography in 1974. And reading Erickson first also made me a lot more open to Lloyd deMause's *Foundations of Psychohistory* (1982) than I would have been.

PHE: Did you have any mentors in psychohistory? What special training was most helpful in your doing psychohistorical work?

MK: I had none of a formal nature. What I had were role models, and through them, places to turn to acquire ad hoc training. When I began to be interested in psychohistory, David Beisel was both president of the IPA and editor-in-chief of the *Journal*. I learned more about doing psychohistory from David than from any other single individual. He was my editor on two articles important to me [on Olmsted and Wagner], and my encourager in so many ways large and small. Through my growing friendships with David, you, Henry Lawton, Bernard Flicker, Mel Goldstein, and Lloyd deMause, I became very active in the IPA, the Institute for Psychohistory, and the Psychohistory Forum.

The "special training" I most benefited from was the Saturday morning sessions of the Institute for Psychohistory and the Psychohistory Forum. In each case, someone would present an excerpt from a work-in-progress. The work would be critiqued and a gazillion suggestions made by those attending. These were superb vehicles for learning psychohistory through other people's projects -- but especially for learning by doing (by presenting one's own projects). These workshops successfully did what universities try to do with mixed success in their seminars.

PHE: Of which psychohistorical work are you the most proud?

MK: My book on Frederick Law Olmsted. It has something new and important to say about Olmsted, the sources of his creativity, and the role of his gentry class in 19th century America. It reflects more than a decade of very careful, very thorough research and writing, and it carefully sets forth solid and ample evidence upon which my findings were based. Since I was working at the ad

agency full-time, I purchased a second-hand microfilm reader on which to go through the 60 reels of Olmsted papers purchased from the Library of Congress, usually from 8 p.m. to 1 or 2 in the morning.

Let me give one small example of how this research paid off. The previously printed version of a letter Olmsted wrote late in his life has him saying that he felt "giddy" when he thought of the many honors that had been heaped upon him. When I read the same letter in microfilm, I found that he had written in "giddy" after striking out the word he originally wrote. He had first written that when contemplating these honors, he felt "guilty." Not only is this a very different response, but it is one of the keys to understanding the reparative nature of his work. And there were many other instances such as this. Primary research should be as primary as you can make it.

PHE: Your Olmsted book and article on Wagner really impressed me and I think others would like to know more about them.

MK: My work on Olmsted was first published in an article for the *Journal of Psychohistory* in 1978 and, after my doctoral dissertation was concluded in 1988, as a book from New York University Press in 1990. The Wagner article appeared in the *Journal* in 1984.

Both of them proceed from the same point of inquiry: the inner sources that a creative person draws upon in his work. For Olmsted, the work was, primarily, his role in creating the great urban parks -- Central Park in New York, Prospect Park in Brooklyn, and Franklin Park in Boston. For Wagner, the work was, clearly, his operas, with special emphasis upon *Tannhäuser* and the *Der Ring des Nibelungen* tetralogy (*Das Rheingold*, *Die Walküre*, *Siegfried*, and *Götterdämmerung*).

I was also interested in the process of identity formation -- its sources and vicissitudes. Interestingly, both of these men suffered devastating parental losses and also had been sent away from home during their formative years. Olmsted, a first-born child, lost his mother when he was not quite four, ten months after the birth of his brother. From ages 7 to 17, he was sent away from home to rural boarding schools, often under repressive clergymen. Wagner lost his supposed father during infancy, but gained a wonderful, caring, creative step-father within a year -- the man that he and everyone else believed to be his real father (through his mother's adultery) and which he and

many current scholars believed to have been a Jew. Until age 14, Wagner was known as Richard Geyer.

I suggested that Olmsted's life was dominated by a need to make reparation to his lost mother -- recast as nature -- and a need to assimilate the feminine and masculine identities that he had taken into himself and which were apparent in his self-representations. Wagner's life, I argued, was dominated by splitting and by a much stronger pull toward feminine identification. Wagner's splitting, ominously, was often focused upon the conflict between his German self (Richard Wagner) and his Jewish self (Richard Geyer).

PHE: What are you researching now?

MK: I had been working in three fields: the Civil War; the modern Presidency, especially as related to Jewish issues (mostly FDR but also JFK, Nixon, and Clinton); and Hollywood and the Jews. But I do hope to continue to publish articles on FDR and on Hollywood (such as "How Hollywood Hid the Holocaust" that I wrote for the December, 1999, issue of **Clio's Psyche**).

One of the courses I teach, "The Truth about FDR," deals with FDR, the Holocaust, Palestine, and the Jews. The Jewish community at one time worshipped FDR, and now a great many condemn him mightily for American inaction either on Jewish refugees or in reaction to the Holocaust itself: "He knew and he did *nothing*!!!" I think this offers a most important example of the psychohistorical role of the leader. My interest is in seeing the leader whole, and in the context of his times -- un-split, neither idealized nor demonized. And in seeing the leader as a delegate: shaped by, and shaping, the dominant group fantasies of his time.

PHE: What is it like being a scholar at a distance from the main centers of learning?

MK: It was very tough, even at a time when I could, and did, travel back to New York very frequently. Being quite limited in my travel now, it is extremely hard. But this mostly relates to being able to be among my friends and fellow psychohistorians such as Ralph Colp, Dan Dervin, and Howard Stein on a regular basis. It is so very easy to feel isolated and out of touch down here in Florida. But there's the Internet -- a life preserver for disabled scholars, and those who live far from the center of the action. Norman Simms, in your September Cyberspace issue, whetted my appetite for doing far more by way of research and historical/psychohistorical communication via the Net.

PHE: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

MK: It's fundamental. How can you do psychohistory without reference to childhood, individually and societally? Whenever I lecture, I use Alice Miller's phrase in discussing psychohistorical causality, noting that all of us, including our leaders, are "prisoners of childhood." And I give everyday examples of splitting, denial, projection, return of the repressed, etc. How we learn to operate in the world and deal with people is built upon the matrix constructed in childhood, out of the family circle and all those attached to it, or impacting upon it, for good or ill. We are burdened with all the unfinished business of childhood, roiling in the unconscious awaiting release through re-enactment, when crisis or emotion pushes us to the wall.

When lecturing on leadership, one of the models I have adopted is that of charismatic leadership, paranoid or reparative. In this model, a fundamental issue is the Eriksonian psychosocial focus upon the development of basic trust vs. mistrust. The former makes possible reparative leadership; the latter is the fundamental basis of paranoid leadership. It is a paradigm that has to be applied to the whole society, not just the leaders themselves. You can see that this provides a useful way of comparing the leaderships of FDR and Hitler, both of whom came to power in 1933. This series of lectures, "The Democrat and the Dictator," begins with their childhoods and with the kinds of childhood that dominated the societies for which they became leader/delegate. None of this is a novelty to psychohistorians, most of whom are well aware of the pattern of paternal authoritarianism and abuse that pervaded German society.

PHE: How do you view parental influence, identification, separation, and loss?

MK: My work has included both political leadership and creativity, sometimes both in the same individual. Olmsted, Wagner, Theodor Herzl, FDR, Hitler, Nixon, Clinton, William Tecumseh Sherman, Herbert Graf ("Little Hans"), and Hemingway. In every case, there are issues with both parents. But overwhelmingly, separation from the mother is a major issue, and an inner feminine identification is an issue -- it must be true of every male who received a smothering love from his mother, or at least an extreme closeness. In every case I've studied, the father was either remote or frequently absent. What occurred among most, if not all, of these men was an over-

valuation, idealization, of masculinity, with a fear that one is not masculine enough combined with a need to suppress one's inner feminine identifications. If the individual finds a way to integrate these paternal/maternal, masculine/feminine identifications, the result can be quite positive. This is where reparative political leadership and reparative creativity comes from as with Olmsted, Herzl, and FDR.

Olmsted always thought of *nurturing* as feminine, *doing* as masculine. His great work (with Calvert Vaux) of Central Park was feminine - - pastoral parks are nurturing -- but his role was masculine, doing, making it happen as Superintendent and Architect-in-Chief. When he directed the Sanitary Commission during the Civil War, the work of the Commission was nurturing; his role was doing, making it happen. One could say the same thing about Herzl, a would-be author and playwright, and Zionist. "The Jewish State" was his greatest play, and he spent his life trying to make it happen. His banker father was remote; his mother (to whom Judaism was important) was very close and both emotionally domineering of and worshipful of her only son (and only child, after a sister died young). FDR's inspiration for his socialistic, welfare-state, "New Deal"-response to the Depression was also feminine. His austere and remote father died when he was young; his domineering, smothering mother controlled his finances until she died in 1941.

Where the individual is moved to repress all signs of femininity in himself and around himself, including the repression (or abuse) of the women he knows and identifies with, then the outcome can be an obsession with masculinity or stereotypical masculine endeavors and attitudes: aggressive, dominating, even ruthless. The impact on himself, or his work, or the society around him can be devastating: Hitler, Nixon, and Hemingway offer very different examples of this. Sometimes there is some integration, but still a lot of problems as with Clinton.

Most of these men were also hit hard by parental loss, some quite early. There is always an impact, but the nature of the impact varies greatly - - idealization of the lost parent with need to make reparation; feelings of abandonment and rage; or a perpetuation of mourning with depressive feelings. Olmsted, for example, lost his mother when he was almost four, and re-created her in the idealized form of Nature. When he was eight, Wagner lost the person he believed was his father (and who

probably was), a very kind and nurturing man, whom many still believe was Jewish. Wagner re-created him in a split image: the idealized German father (Wotan in the *Ring*) and the feared and despised Jewish father (Alberich in the *Ring*).

PHE: Are high achievers more identified with their fathers?

MK: In my own work and experience, I haven't seen a pattern that suggests that. It may simply be a case of either parent, or both, thinking the child is something special, has a great destiny. I would think that this is more often the mother, but, as in Wagner's case, it can be the father. I think the high achiever, especially the creative achiever, identifies with both parents. But, it's always the father who offers the target to be surpassed.

In my own case, I was a child with a severe, chronic illness. As such, I was quite dependent upon my mother. She probably had a vested interest in having a sick child (it got her away from my father twice). She was very encouraging and believed in me and made me believe in myself, always preaching that I could do anything I wanted to strongly enough, and that everything was open to me. And she was adventurous and independent, and very, very smart.

My father was an interesting man. In his lectures to us -- and he always lectured, never spanked or hit -- he always sold the macho male line. He had it in his mind that his role should be authoritarian, a disciplinarian. He urged us to be tough, and he hated it when I cried (and I cried often and easily -- "Oh God, here come the tear ducts again," he'd say). But, in fact, my father was kind, generous, gentle, and comradely. I never saw him acting belligerent or coming anywhere close to a physical confrontation.

When I was in my early teens and my parents were headed for a break-up and then finally separated for good, I was the intermediary, carrying the messages (usually about money) back and forth, or trying, when they were together, to prevent the explosions that were going to come anyway. Those three or four years, 13-17, certainly stood in the way of idealizing either one of them, and helped me to see them as all too human. (And, it was pretty good training for dealing with clients in my ad agency days -- it undoubtedly played a role in my tendency to take the mediator's role, to be a consensus-builder.)

Of course, my parents were both, in their

own ways, enormous influences on me. The funny thing is that I still take delight in all the ways, large and small, that I "take after" my father. He used to take great pleasure in his large success in the small community of New York City construction trades. And he urged that on me as an example of what I should aim for in life: "It's better to be a big fish in a small pond, than a little fish in a big pond." After I was elected president of Congregation B'Nai Israel, standing alone in the sanctuary in front of his *yahrzeit* [memorial] plaque, I said: "Look at me, Dad -- just like you said, a big fish in a very small pond."

PHE: As someone who has attended every International Psychohistorical Association meeting and served in almost every office, I know as an insider that you did a first rate job as its president, vice president, and treasurer. Please comment on your contributions to IPA organization-building, especially the issue of fiscal soundness.

MK: We certainly pursued a rather single-minded policy of achieving fiscal soundness as well as organizational stability and continuity during my years as president from 1980-1982 and the decade or more afterwards that I was treasurer. But I was following and elaborating upon a direction first set by Bernard Flicker, the third IPA president (1978-1980); the Executive Board; and myself as treasurer.

When I became president, we established short- and long-range goals for the organization itself. We concluded that we had two fundamental activities to finance in the pursuit of maintaining a community of psychohistorians. The first of these was the annual three-day convention -- the only opportunity then in existence for large numbers of psychohistorians to come together, to present their work, to critique and encourage the work of others, and to bond with one another. The second crucial activity was to provide a first-rate newsletter, published at least twice a year, which would allow all those members who could not make it to the convention to keep up with what was happening in the organization. We also wanted to create programs that would encourage people, especially students and women, to do psychohistory.

To make all this possible, we needed to build a solid and enduring financial base. And this meant, above all, following Bernard's basic strategy of strengthening the annual convention as our principal source of income. We increased the membership and convention fees modestly to be more nearly in line with the fees of other organiza-

tions and we staged our conventions in academic settings to hold costs to a minimum. These strategies proved to be quite successful over time. Later on, we were able to invest our reserve funds and generate some additional income. To further advance the goal of achieving financing stability, I spent a great deal of time getting the IRS to grant us tax-free status.

I certainly believe that my own approach to "managing" various IPA activities was heavily influenced by my prior business experience.

PHE: Your background in business interests me because you are one of a number of talented psychohistorians -- Lloyd deMause, Sid Halpern, and Eli Sagan, for example -- who came from business rather than academia or the consultation room. How did the business background effect your acceptance in the field, your thinking, and your work?

MK: I suspect it had positive effect insofar as being so quickly accepted into the leadership of the IPA, certainly insofar as what others felt I had to offer organizationally. Both my engineering education as an undergraduate and my business experience were of some value in developing an approach to problem-solving. The nature of my business experience -- both marketing-oriented and client-oriented -- also sharpened my attention to human behaviors and attitudes. The pragmatic approach to decision-making fostered by business needs is also probably a useful form of reality-testing that has to benefit any psychohistorian. Some blue-sky is great for creativity; too much blue-sky can lead to disaster. Also, if you have had a business career, you are less likely to either demonize or idealize the businessman, especially the *successful* businessman (a particular hazard for this academic psychohistorian whose own father was a successful businessman).

PHE: Tell us about your career as teacher.

MK: Taken as a whole, it has been great. I taught undergraduates for a few semesters at Florida Atlantic University and for more than six years at Lynn University, both in Boca Raton. My last year, I taught on a very reduced schedule before retiring in 1997. The head of the department did ask if I would be interested in joining the faculty full time in 1994 or 1995, but I had to decline because it was becoming clear that my physical problems were increasing.

Even though the income situation was exploitative, I enjoyed teaching at Lynn as long as

they gave me the chance to teach advanced courses -- seminar courses. These were usually history students that I'd had already in two or three classes, and they were usually my best students. These were the students I introduced psychohistory to in seminars such as "Totalitarianism and the Holocaust" and "Comparative Political Systems." These were the motivated, highly responsive kids and it was a joy to teach them.

In 1996, a friend of mine asked me to do a couple of Elderhostel sessions, and I loved it. A highly motivated, highly involved group of 50-60 seniors, very responsive. They actually *wanted* to be there. And no tests or term papers! And I got to teach only subjects that interested me! And, cumulatively, the pay was actually a little better! Heaven! The next year I also taught in FAU's Lifelong Learning Program.

Seniors in both Elderhostel and LLP have been very open to psychohistorical ideas and concepts. In fact, most are anxious to be exposed to new ideas, new ways of looking at things, especially familiar things. And they love to study the events and leaders and culture of their own lifetimes. There are, of course, a few seniors who are quarrelsome or negative, or who make speeches instead of asking questions -- but I have found them to be very few and easy to deal with. The courses have to be lively and entertaining, as well as informative -- we laugh a lot in my classes. I will miss Elderhostel very much when I have to give it up entirely as my physical limitations increase. But maybe I'll then begin doing more writing!

PHE: Your reference to your physical limitations reminds me that at the wonderful party in 1988 where you celebrated earning your doctoral degree, I had the pleasure of sitting at a table with members of your cancer support group who were a terrific bunch of people. This had special meaning to me since I had greatly admired your courage in facing this disease and in accomplishing so much since first having to confront it. Would you be willing to talk about your health and what you learned psychohistorically in the course of your struggles to restore or maintain it?

MK: My bronchial illness had proved to be only a minor handicap during my working career, up to 1984 (when I was 53). I had great energy and was able to work the long hours that advertising agency work demanded, as well as pursue other interests. But clearly I was greatly overdoing it. My immune system likely suffered from stress and

from fatigue and I developed cancer (lymphoma), detected reasonably early. The oncologist said that the next year would be the worst of my life, and he was right. I have always viewed myself as a survivor (bronchiectasis and my dysfunctional family), and I was fortunate enough to survive this bout with cancer. But there was a price. The very aggressive chemotherapy we pursued severely worsened my respiratory problems.

The greatest impact of this experience upon my life has been a progressively greater inner pressure to use my remaining years, and my talents, in ways that truly mattered to me. My Judaism was one of the driving forces in reassessing where I wanted to go with my life. But -- and this was important to my doing of psychohistory -- I also drew great inspiration from Donald Winnicott's writings on the True Self and False Self and the danger of allowing the demands of the False Self to take over one's life. "Only the True Self can be creative and only the True Self can feel real," Winnicott wrote. And, after cancer (and renewed psychotherapy), I put a "full-court press" on completing my doctorate and bringing my ad agency career to an end. If I'm a survivor, I want to be a survivor with a worthwhile purpose in life, pursuing goals that I truly value.

Confronting the reality of one's mortality certainly throws into clear focus all that one regrets in one's life, the misuse of time, the hurts and bruises inflicted, etc. And that, for me, underlined the sense of making reparation. In Reform Judaism, great emphasis is placed upon the concept of *tikkun olam*, of being G_d's surrogate's in "repairing the world." I would like to believe that my psychohistorical work after surviving cancer was deeper, richer, and more focused than it was, or could have been, beforehand, and that this was true of all the other aspects of my life.

PHE: Has psychohistory helped in understanding your strong Jewish identity?

MK: Therapy, perhaps; psychohistory, not much that wasn't there to begin with. My Jewish identity was always strong. How could it not be? The two years in Tucson, followed by eight in Rosedale, were immersions in very palpable anti-Semitism. And I was always a G_d-centered kid. I had somehow learned the *Shema* very young, the only "prayer" I knew -- but somehow it was sufficient (*dayenu!*). I began to become a serious Jew at 24, after reading Ludwig Lewisohn's wonderful books, *The Island Within* (1928) and *The American Jew* (1950). I followed his road map in the latter:

learning Hebrew; giving up the *tref* [unclean] foods -- pork and shellfish; affiliating with a synagogue; and reading books. My name is on the charter for the first Jewish congregation to be formed in the more than 300 years of history of Sudbury, Massachusetts.

If anything, I think my understanding of Judaism helps me to be a better psychohistorian. The sages taught that every human being possesses a *yetzer ha-tov* and a *yetzer ha-rah*, an impulse to do good and an impulse to do evil -- and that we spend our lives in choosing between the two, actively and passively. Further, Judaism understands doing good to be life-affirming and doing evil to be life-destroying ("See, I have set before you this day life and good, or death and evil.... Therefore, choose life"). I think this is a pretty good context for doing psychohistory.

PHE: What are your thoughts on fundamentalism, terrorism, and violence?

MK: There probably isn't a psychohistorian who doesn't believe that you cannot eliminate violence and terrorism until you eliminate poverty and massive abuse of children by parents and society. If you raise children who are loaded with rage, have nothing to lose, and can easily acquire devastating destructive technology, what else can you expect? How much of the world today, of our own American society today, is locked into the paranoid-schizoid position, feeding on hatred of the other -- that split-off part of the self that needs to be annihilated? Are these youngsters not candidates ripe for recruiting to gangs, militia groups, and terrorist organizations?

I set great store by the Kleinian/Winnicottian concepts of the development of the child (and, for me, society) through the paranoid-schizoid position to the depressive position (achieved slowly and painfully). In the depressive position, the child (and society) has achieved a better grip on object relations, splitting is greatly reduced (but certainly not eliminated), and cooperation, consensus, and reparation become possible. This is akin to Erikson's concept of maturing enough to form "basic trust." It is my belief that democracy, compromise, tolerance, and peacemaking only become possible in a society dominated by individuals who have matured at least to the depressive position.

PHE: What training should a person entering psychohistory today pursue?

MK: Training in the historical method

should come first. Then, if affordable, psychoanalytic education/training later has got to be extraordinarily helpful. It is imperative that psychohistorians have experienced psychotherapy themselves. They should read the psychohistory publications, back issues, too, and stop trying to reinvent the wheel. It always drove me nuts at IPA conventions to have papers read on a particular subject that never cited any of the work already done on that subject by our leading IPA scholars.

PHE: What do we as psychohistorians need to do to strengthen our work?

MK: Be rigorous in our standards of what is and is not psychohistory, and in the quality of psychohistorical work, the integrity of psychohistorical argument. It is hard to build a profession upon work that is based upon wild speculation and unsupported "findings." It is also hard to respect work that seems to be in the service of a political agenda. Good psychohistory, as with any other discipline, is hard work and we have every right to expect that the hard work be done.

PHE: How do you see psychohistory developing in the next decade?

MK: The answer has got to be the Internet, which alone can make our work truly international. We need all the Web pages and online publications we can get, of course. But even more, we have to be online ourselves, posting our message to mailing lists and newsgroups, with invitations to visit our Web sites. What a great way to bring new people into the orbit of psychohistory, especially considering how much into the Web college students are.

PHE: What are your recommendations concerning the problem of new leadership for the IPA and psychohistory in general?

MK: I remember it was a problem that confronted us when I was IPA president, and that was more than 15 years ago -- we always seemed to be drawing upon the same small group of people and failed to persuade some other very talented people to become more actively involved. I'd like to see a sort of mentoring system. I remember David Beisel, Jerry Atlas, and you as being very good at this, back when I was heavily involved in the IPA. Each one of the existing leaders could identify and nurture potential leadership recruits. We could also hold "leadership training" seminars and meetings, which people are nominated to attend.

The Internet offers a great opportunity to

the IPA and the Forum for recruitment and for involvement. Members and officers can now easily be from anywhere in the U.S., or the world! Why can't Board meetings take place online? Why can't there be discussions and referenda on issues that concern all members online? Convention and work-in-progress papers should be available online. I just can't imagine a more exciting way to recruit members and develop leaders than to permit interested people to dialogue with leading psychohistorians from all over the world. If Erik Erikson were alive today, he'd be online.

PHE: How can we psychohistorians have more impact in academia and on society in general?

MK: What is there to do but keep on writing, preaching to the converted, and jumping at every opportunity for a wider audience, even if it's only a letter to the editor? As psychohistorians, do we not believe that we will not influence people until they are ready to be influenced? But when they are ready, we still have to be there: writing, teaching, lecturing, debating, or whatever.

PHE: What has been the influence of psychotherapy, psychohistory, and psychobiography on you as a man and on your world-view?

MK: I am not sure that my world-view has changed at all since my 20s. I am now, as I always have been, an unreconstructed New Deal/Fair Deal Democrat and serious about Judaism. But maybe my commitment to these concepts has also been deepened along the way.

Therapy helped me to confront the power of the repressed, the irrational in my own life -- and the destructive and self-defeating behaviors stemming from it -- and, empathetically, in others, in society. To understand the sources of your own creativity, ambition, needs for love and affection and acceptance, enables you to understand them, empathetically, in the lives of others.

I think that I am far more tolerant and accepting now than I was before therapy began all those years ago (in 1976), more willing to let rage and resentment pass quickly and harmlessly, and move on. I have burnt many bridges in my time, and helped to build many walls. In recent years I have tried to rebuild some bridges and tear down some walls. I lay much of that to therapy, as well as to aging, to surviving -- it all goes together. I think I am a much better husband, father, and friend now than before -- though there is still much room for improvement.

The demons still stalk the corridors of the unconscious, but they have names now and they can even be taken out into the sunlight every now and then for an airing. When I do act on my anger, I hope that it is because more often than not the anger is directed at the right things -- at meanness and indecency and hatefulness and exploitation. My wife says I'm a lot more patient -- even when driving -- but, again, there's room for improvement -- especially when driving!

I must say that doing psychohistory and psychobiography -- especially in my later years, after all I've experienced and survived -- has deepened my respect for those who have struggled for

Book Reviews

decency and kindness and cooperation and compromise in life, and has deepened also my own wish to be remembered as one of them.

Paul H. Elovitz is Editor of this publication. □

Eugene O'Neill's Psychodynamics

Andrew Brink

Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

Review of Stephen A. Black, Eugene O'Neill: Beyond Mourning and Tragedy. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999. ISBN 0300076762, pp. xxi + 524, \$29.95.

Stephen A. Black's biography of the playwright Eugene O'Neill sets a new standard for psychobiography, calling literary criticism back to the experiential origin of art. As America's leading dramatist, O'Neill (1888-1953) received the Pulitzer Prize and won international recognition with the Nobel Prize for Literature. His theme was family dynamics, with plays typically examining persons in close relationships who are denied fulfillment by the limiting influences of parents and siblings. Black shows decisively how such powerful and enduring dramas as *Long Day's Journey Into Night* (1941) arose from O'Neill's fractured childhood which he tried to understand and heal. The Tyrone family of the play is a reworked version of O'Neill's, although, as Black shows, the "autobiographical themes were usually so well disguised that they were seldom suspected to be that, even by close friends" (p. 258). It was O'Neill's

genius to give audiences seemingly universal meanings about families from the particular pathology of his own. O'Neill was steeped in the psychoanalysis of his day, to which Black brings the biography new psychoanalytic sophistication.

Stephen Black is a professor of English literature trained in psychoanalysis, the right credentials to make a striking contribution to O'Neill studies. O'Neill has other skilled biographers, and psychoanalytic critics such as Albert Rothenberg and Bennett Simon (both psychiatrists) have written insightfully about the plays as they deal with unconscious conflicts. Black seldom considers such work, preferring to pursue a different psychobiographical line: that of the loss-repair theory of creativity.

I was startled to find that Black had drawn upon my *Loss and Symbolic Repair: A Psychological Study of Some English Poets* (1977) to orient his thinking about O'Neill. (My book could not find an academic publisher. It was published in typescript, limiting circulation, but had favorable reviews and citations in other books.) Black also draws upon its sequel, *Creativity as Repair: Bipolarity and its Closure* (1982). The loss-repair theory of creativity is fully stated on pp. 212-213 of *Eugene O'Neill* and developed throughout the book. Black writes, "Whether or not he understood it as a general psychoanalytic idea, O'Neill intuitively grasped that people who themselves are still dependent cannot complete the process of mourning" (p. 344) and "For decades a loss or change had driven him inside, where he would spin out of himself something he could put into the world to restore what was damaged or missing" (p. 479).

Up to a point the loss-as-repair theory of creativity is helpful in understanding O'Neill's motivation, but Black sees its limitation for a full account of his creativity. O'Neill did not suffer early loss of parent(s), as did the poet subjects of *Loss and Symbolic Repair*. Indeed, Marvin Eisenstadt *et al* see O'Neill as more affected by chronic illness than by parental loss (*Parental Loss and Achievement*, pp. 62, 304). Yet Black contends that "O'Neill spent most of his writing life in mourning" (p. xvi). Temperamentally he was unusually susceptible to the ordinary losses and setbacks of persons around him, of which there were many. However, the most fateful loss affecting O'Neill was his mother's or her father, leaving her developmentally impaired -- she simply could not give consistent care as a mother (see p. 130). After

Eugene's birth she became addicted to morphine (for which he blamed himself) and she was either narcissistically remote or intrusive with her growing sons. In a sense, O'Neill "lost" his mother to the drug, but there is more to the story. Their affectionate father, an actor, could not compensate for disorganized mothering. This leads Black to introduce "Oedipal" theory to assist with reconstructing the troubled family.

But isn't it "Jocasta Mothering" he needs? The psychoanalyst Mathew Besdine's "The Jocasta Complex, Mothering and Genius" (Parts I and II, *Psychoanalytic Review* 55, 1968) brilliantly reconsiders Freud to show the prevalence of intrusive, domineering, and controlling mothering in males who become both obsessively conflicted and creative. These boys fear emotional overloading in later relations with women, much as they experienced it with their mothers. They may be confused as to gender and are typically anxious with women, defensively exerting counter-control. It was this model I tested with five modern novelists in *Obsession and Culture: A Study of Sexual Obsession in Modern Fiction* (1996). I believe that the "Jocasta Mothering" model, incorporating the loss-repair theory, would have served Black's reconstruction of O'Neill, whose depression was complicated by suicidal impulses, heavy drinking, violent outbreaks wrecking things, and inconstant relations with many women, including divorces.

Was Eugene O'Neill traumatically seduced by his mother, or at least sexually overstimulated? Black is well aware of the possibility, as he points out the theme of maternal seduction turning up forcefully in the plays (pp. 307-308). O'Neill feared maternal engulfment, sometimes hated his mother, and came to believe that she was incapable of selfless love. But as often happens in psychobiography, evidence of early attachment experience is not enough for certainty. It is, however, made clear that Eugene's early childhood care was partially by a nursemaid, whereas his elder brother, unrelieved of his mother's moods, was unable to marry and died tragically. We are left wondering why, after his mother's death, "her image remained in Eugene's mind as an object of obsessive reflection and compulsive writing..." (p. 280). Writing *Long Day's Journey into Night* allowed O'Neill to end obsessive mourning for his mother, and this masterpiece was made possible by writing *More Stately Mansions*.

Eugene O'Neill is an immensely rewarding book for those looking for an explanation of a great

writer's motivation. Psychoanalysis is used consistently, with unflinching aptness and feeling for its subject. Also expert in the history of drama, Black places O'Neill's achievement in the context of tragedy. Producers of O'Neill's plays will be well served by this psychobiography. Readers may end up exhausted by O'Neill's struggles to overcome false adaptations to childhood traumas, but there is a growing sense of art as healing which raises this account above the dour conclusions of Bennett Simon, for instance. O'Neill was a truth-seeker who sooner or later welcomed whatever brief analyses, and life-long self-analysis, brought him. He said that he had been "born without a skin," for which there is no repair, no rebirth. Black never suggests that creativity changes past defects of attachments, but he shows movingly how O'Neill's anxiety themes aggregated, organized themselves as art, and brought coherence to a life of otherwise unintelligible suffering.

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 Moralizer (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/Controlling personality organization typically found in our culture. □

Adaptation and Healing of Child Holocaust Survivors

Ellen Mendel

Alfred Adler Institute and Private Practice

Review of Judith S. Kestenberg and Charlotte

Kahn (eds.), Children Surviving Persecution: An International Study of Trauma and Healing. Westport, Connecticut, and London: Praeger Publishers, 1998. ISBN 027596261x, pp. 253, \$65.

What happened to the children, the children who suffered in the Holocaust? What happened to those who will soon be the last survivors of the survivors? Does country of origin, age, or even uniqueness of situation play a role in the subsequent aftereffects on the survivors, either child or adult? Can this kind of persecution, unique in its inhumane level of sadism and degree of organization, as noted by Albert Einstein, be seen within a larger context of cruelty and violence in general? What about the experiences of other victimized children who were not Jewish, the children of the perpetrators, how were they affected? What about all children (Jews and non-Jews alike) behind the Iron Curtain, and those in the world at large?

These and many other questions are explored and analyzed in this book. Part I concerns itself with the traumas of the Holocaust from a psychohistorical perspective. Part II concentrates on the individual. It deals with personal and autobiographical accounts from surviving children on a country to country basis. The second part also contains pieces from victims who are not Jewish, children of the perpetrators, for example. Part II also explores the processes of confrontation, mourning, and integration, and the subsequent possibility of a certain degree of healing.

In Part I, "Psychohistorical Perspectives," the editors have woven together the ideas of eight authors, including themselves. Each author's chapter is complete and could stand on its own; but when seen within the totality of this book each contributes to the richness and depth of the whole. It gives the reader a comprehensive picture from psychological, sociological, economic, and historical points of view. It begins to answer the leading question that so many people have asked: "How was it possible?"

Each author seems to be wrestling with the question of how brutality of such magnitude could have occurred in the 20th century, committed by a supposedly civilized country. As each chapter unfolds, the reader begins to come increasingly closer to answering this immense question. The authors also seem concerned with the possible implications for the future.

Part I delves into the role of physical and emotional survival during and after the Holocaust.

Kestenbergs, one of the editors and a psychoanalyst/psychologist who pioneered the study of child trauma, provides important information in this section. She addresses the need for the child survivor to acknowledge what happened, and the need to mourn all that was lost. She notes that, frequently, self-healing in child survivors occurs through creativity: poetry and painting. She makes it clear that for survival, the child needs an adult. This may result in altruism later in life, originating from the identification with a rescuer.

The theme of overcoming is continued by Eva Fogelman. She discusses the various stages of confrontation, expression, and mourning leading to some kind of acceptance, and a search for meaning on the part of child survivors. The channeling of feelings into meaningful activities such as art, film, writing, music, and dance are examples. She also notes the expression of feelings in discussion groups, which often assume the role of a kind of extended family that was lost. In this process, she states, "knowing the details of family losses and persecution facilitates the mourning process. It helps in coming to terms with the past, and integrating the painful legacy."

We learn from another author that in Communist countries, this knowledge had to be repressed. In exchange for getting a sense of belonging, the survivor had to give up his or her Jewish identity, and not express feelings. This resulted in many decades of silence and the loss of opportunity to work through the trauma. The theme of persecution and working through of trauma is traced in the specific experiences in the second part of the book.

"Children's Responses to Persecution," Part II, documents experiences of children from Sweden, England, Poland, Germany, Australia, Yugoslavia, and Holland. It documents the passing from persecution to overcoming by the child survivors. What is commendable about this part of the book is that it does not minimize the depth of the horrendous experiences. It does, however, highlight the tremendous courage it took the child survivors to live with and overcome all the negative experiences of their lives, and to build effective and viable lives.

I found Charlotte Kahn's essay on German-Jewish identity particularly compelling. I could identify with it. I began my own life in Germany under Nazi rule. In this section I saw reflections of my family's experiences. It is what the author describes as the "symbiosis between Germans and

Jews with cultural cross-fertilization of the Jewish tradition and culture and German philosophy dating back to the Enlightenment." This period came to a shattering halt on *Kristallnacht* in November, 1938. The option of being a German who practiced Judaism as a religion was over. So was the life that accompanied it. The unique way of life was lost in the fires of the burning synagogues on that fateful night.

Paul Valant, a psychiatrist and child Holocaust survivor, describes the development of the group in Melbourne, Australia, of which he is a member. He explains that the children who survived had become professionally successful, were devoted parents, and had become contributing and often altruistic members of society. They only began to reconnect with their traumatic experiences after 25 years.

As delineated in various chapters in this book, there are many levels of healing: 1) ability to function, 2) leading a productive life, 3) confronting the traumas of the past, 4) the expression of feelings, 5) the process of mourning, 6) acceptance and working through, 7) integration, and 8) finding a sense of meaning. These levels of healing are illustrated in the numerous heart-warming examples of how child survivors have been able to overcome their pasts and live with their experiences. They have progressed through life, and have worked through their trauma at an individual pace.

What I found particularly interesting about this book is its comprehensive nature. It goes from the factual to the personal, from the general to the specific, and from persecution to overcoming and healing. There are many books that document the trauma and horrors of the Holocaust, but few like this one. What sets this book apart is its uplifting treatment of integration and healing, and its description of how they occur. By the end of the book, the reader has a full picture of the history and horrors of the Holocaust but is left with a sense of hope. There is also a reaffirmation of the resilience of the human mind, and the strength of the human spirit, as it is reflected in the lives of the child survivors.

I feel this book should be required reading for everyone who is interested in the Holocaust. It

**Call for Papers on
The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime
Contact the Editor (see page 3)**

is a solid resource, and it carries implications for the overcoming of other kinds of persecution and trauma.

Ellen Mendel, a psychoanalytic therapist in private practice, is a staff member and a training analyst at the Alfred Adler Institute of New York where she is on the governing board. She may be contacted at <LNM97@webtv.net>. □

Dreams of Infanticide II: Flayed for a Wineskin

Robert Rousselle
Independent Scholar

The *Oneirocritica* of Artemidorus contains hundreds of dreams and their interpretations, as well as discussions of the various dream symbols and their meanings in different contexts. Though prediction is the ultimate goal of the ancient dream interpreter, Artemidorus at times seems aware of the dreamer's unconscious fantasies, though he will rarely, if ever, explicitly mention them, because they were considered unimportant. One infanticidal dream in which he seems to grasp the dreamer's unconscious wishes is the following:

A man dreamt he flayed his own child and made him into a bag made out of skin. On the next day his child fell into the river and drowned. For out of dead bodies is the bag made out of skin fashioned and it is capable of receiving liquids (5.22; my translation).

As with most dreams reported by Artemidorus, we only know what little he chooses to tell us. The dream appears to be contemporary with Artemidorus since he tells us in the Introduction to Book Five that he collected these dreams at festivals in Greece, Italy, and Asia. His aim was to give only a brief narrative of each dream and an indication how it came true. Hence, Artemidorus begins with the dream and, in the second sentence, shows how its prediction was fulfilled. The third sentence explains the symbolism by which the dream predicted the child's drowning.

The act of flaying his child would involve cutting the skin of the youth with a flaying knife. Flaying alive had many associations for an ancient Greek. It was known as a Persian punishment, by which the Great King would punish corrupt judges, stretching their skin across the seats upon which their successors would sit (Herodotus 5.25.1; Dio-

dorus Siculus 15.10.1).

The expression "to flay into a bag made out of skin," usually translated "to flay into a wineskin," is frequently used to describe a terrible punishment to which a Greek man will conditionally resign himself. The punishment was proverbial, and goes back to a poem of Solon in which he describes his critics as ridiculing him for refusing to become tyrant of Athens. The hypothetical critic goes on to say that, in return for the power and wealth as tyrant of Athens for one day, he would be gladly flayed into an *askos* (wineskin) and have his lineage utterly destroyed (Plutarch, *Solon* 14.6).

The common denominator among these examples is that the person flayed, or threatened with this punishment, is in a position subordinate to a father figure. The Greeks likened the relationship of man to the gods to that between a child and his parents (Plutarch F 46 and 86; Sandbach, *Loeb Classical Library*). A teacher was often a father-substitute. Nor should we forget that one of the prominent accusations against Socrates was that he turned young men against their natural fathers. Though the executioner of the tyrant in Solon's poem is unstated, it would presumably be the leader of the *demos* he had recently ruled. Solon related being flayed into an *askos* with the extirpation of his line, suggesting that the cutting of his skin into strips by the flaying knife would also include his emasculation.

Animals, not humans, were the targets of most of the flayings in Greece. A large animal would be dispatched by a *pelekus*, after which its throat would be cut by a sharp knife. (*Pelekus* refers to a double-edged axe used to cut trees and for sacrifices and executions.) The animal would be cut up and its skin flayed. The meat was divided up: some set aside for the gods as a burnt offering, the rest eaten by the celebrants (among many descriptions, see Homer, *Odyssey* 3.430-474 and 12.352-370, and Euripides, *Electra* 774-843). Concerning the skin, not essential for the sacrifice, nothing else is said. However, in a culture in which consumption of meat was a luxury, it must be assumed that the skin flayed during the sacrifice was used to make *askoi*, among other things.

The father's dream seems to reflect part of an animal sacrifice, the flaying of the victim's skin and its subsequent manufacture into an *askos*. Here his child plays the role of the sacrificial animal. As malevolent as this part of the dream is, it censored an even more savage fantasy, the cutting up, roasting, and eating of his own child. Only the

secondary part of the sacrifice, the relatively unimportant use made of the skin, could escape past the "dream-censor," while the primary part, the cannibalistic fantasy, could not.

The dream expresses the father's desire to murder and eat his child in terms of the sacrificial ritual of his day, replacing the animal victim with his child. It need not conform to the manner in which the child died, which may have occurred when the opportunity arrived, either by the intent or negligence of the father, or may have been accidental with the father far away. Nor does Artemidorus implicate the father in his child's death, but seems to imply that the child accidentally fell into the river and drowned. The nuances of the Greek, however, suggest otherwise.

Just as I have previously examined the words *askos*, and *pelekus*, I will now probe *pipto* and *pnigo* to illustrate this point. Though *pipto* means fall or fall down, and is used by Artemidorus to describe the child's fall into the river, in other contexts it often has a violent connotation. These include to cast down, to fall upon something violently, as if in attack; to fall in a fight; to fall short, or to fail; to be overthrown or overcome by another. More graphic is Artemidorus' use of *pnigo*, translated in this context as drown. The variety of meanings of *pnigo* suggest the true horror of drowning, since its primary meanings are to choke, strangle, throttle, and seize by the throat. It evokes the sensation of what drowning must feel like to the victim. One must wonder whether Artemidorus intuitively grasped, by his use of this word, the cannibalistic fantasy of the father's dream, since *pnigo* could also be used in the context of baking or cooking in a closed vessel.

Though Artemidorus cites this dream as an example for his son of a dream of prediction, a modern psychoanalytical interpretation illustrates the dreamer's unconscious infanticidal and cannibalistic fantasies. Though Greek culture and religious rituals, and even the forms of their dreams,

Editorial Policies

are very different than those of the 21st century, the dream processes have changed little over the millennia since Artemidorus recorded this dream, making its analysis possible.

Robert Rousselle, PhD, is an ancient historian with an intense interest in the dreams of the classical world. In the last issue of Clio's

Psyche he published, "Dreams of Infanticide I: Dancing with Dionysus." □

Editorial Board Says "Yes" to Poetry

The Editorial Board has agreed to support the publication of poetry on the condition that it is psychohistorical and/or relevant to a subject we are covering. In an effort to raise the standard of the poetry we publish, the Board agreed unanimously that it should be sent to referees. Several volunteered to serve as referees, while others said they would be submitting poetry. None of those strongly opposed to including poetry indicated they would stop reading and supporting *Clio's Psyche* as a consequence of its inclusion.

Policy on Possible Ad Hominem Attacks

For the first time since our founding in 1994, we have had to face the issue of a possible ad hominem attack within our pages. Richard Morrock, Vice President of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) and a regular contributor to IPA psychohistorical panels and the *Journal of Psychohistory*, recently responded to George Victor's "Playing God" which appeared in our last issue. (March, 2000, Vol. 6, No. 4). Upon receiving a copy of Morrock's letter, Victor called, stating that he interpreted Morrock's letter as an ad hominem attack on Toland and himself. We decided to temporarily put aside the merits of the particular letter, and ask our Editorial Board if we should publish possible ad hominem attacks. Six different policy options were raised, ranging from publishing everything to outright rejection of any possible ad hominem attack.

The Editorial Board responded quickly and enthusiastically. Though there were great variations in viewpoint, publication was favored, and all concluded that Morrock's letter was not really an ad hominem attack. The latter concurred with the views of the Editor and Associate Editor. The Board of Editors was less concerned than were either the Editor or Associate Editor about the issue of the Morrock/Victor exchange not being psychohistorical in content.

Since both editors and the Editorial Board concluded that Morrock's critique of Victor was not an ad hominem attack, and because it does not really assault or assassinate Victor's character, we asked Dr. Victor what he considered to be such an attack. He wrote as follows:

To me, ad hominem means personal criticism of an author as an indirect means of

questioning or rejecting the author's data. The author is labeled as a fool, or worse, implying that his/her data are not worth considering. Current ad hominem labels are "conspiracy theorist" and "revisionist."

Victor's definition clarified his position. Furthermore, he indicated that he favors responding to the author's data, but not the author himself.

Letters to the Editor: Exchange on Pearl Har-

This is not a position with which we can agree. We are very much interested in the motivation of authors, and conclude that we must treat every case of references to an author on its merits or lack thereof.

Morrock's letter and Victor's response to it, which Morrock chose not to answer, appear below. The letters have been edited to save space and eliminate materials that are not completely relevant. □

Reply to George Victor's "Playing God" (March, 2000)

It is astounding that nearly 60 years after the event, scholars are still being taken in by the fable that President Franklin Roosevelt knew in advance that the Japanese were planning an attack on Pearl Harbor in December, 1941. This myth has been fostered by such dubious experts as John Toland, a self-trained historian who has endorsed the Holocaust-denying publication, *The Barnes Review*.

The leading experts on the subject of Pearl Harbor, Gordon Prange and his associates, Donald Goldstein and Katherine Dillon, have long since demolished every single argument raised by FDR's critics that he knew that the Pearl Harbor attack was coming and deliberately kept his Hawaiian commanders, General Walter Short and Admiral Husband Kimmel, in the dark. They spell this out in detail in the definitive work on Pearl Harbor, *At Dawn We Slept* (1981).

Undeniably, Roosevelt and his advisors anticipated a Japanese attack on the United States, but they believed that the attack would come in the Philippines, where about 170,000 military personnel -- American and Filipino -- were prepared to defend the islands under General Douglas MacArthur. Unless Japan could take out the long-range B-17 bombers in a surprise attack on America's

Philippine bases, it was heading for a humiliating defeat.

In addition to the fact that Victor overlooks the surprise attack on the Philippines, he undermines his own case when he compares FDR's alleged Machiavellianism at Pearl Harbor with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill's painful choice over Coventry. Churchill, as Victor admits, did indeed warn Coventry's fire department and ambulance corps of the impending German air raid, but declined to warn the city's population for fear of revealing to the enemy that Britain had broken their codes. Roosevelt had no need to warn the people of Honolulu, even if he knew that Japan was going to attack Pearl Harbor, since the attack would be directed exclusively against the naval base, which was outside the city.

**Richard Morrock
Bay Terrace, New York**

Richard Morrock, Vice President of the International Psychohistorical Association, has recently completed a book on the career of General Douglas MacArthur's chief of intelligence in the Philippines and is now working on a book on psychohistory.

A Response to Richard Morrock

My article made no mention of John Toland; nonetheless, in objecting to what I wrote, Morrock attacked Toland more than me. Morrock discredited the data in Toland's book *Infamy* (1982) by dismissing him as a "dubious expert" and a "self-trained historian." His main impeachment of Toland was that he "has endorsed the Holocaust-denying publication, *The Barnes Review*." Without saying Toland denied the Holocaust, Morrock smeared him by alleging that he supported Nazis. If it were true that Toland endorsed *The Barnes Review*, the relevance of that to the lively historical question of Roosevelt's advance knowledge about the Pearl Harbor attack escapes me. Knowing and admiring Toland, and without seeing Morrock's evidence, I reserve comment on the surprising statement that Toland endorsed *The Barnes Review*. A Pulitzer Prize winner, Toland probably needs no defense from me. Nonetheless, continuing attacks on him illuminate the rancor in defenses of Roosevelt -- defenses often made in the absence of attacks. For, unlike Toland, I am a strong admirer of Roosevelt (and Churchill), and had no criticism of his leadership in my article.

Government officials have tried to suppress intelligence and documents on whether Roosevelt

knew in advance of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In testifying before the Joint Congressional Committee and other tribunals investigating Pearl Harbor, top officials said that not a single piece of intelligence had identified Pearl Harbor as a target of Japan's coming attack. But the Committee rejected their statements and published a dozen intercepted Japanese diplomatic messages that identified Pearl Harbor as a likely target -- messages known to have been brought to Roosevelt's attention. The most dramatic one contained, "... there is considerable opportunity left to take advantage for a surprise attack against..." and listed Pearl Harbor and other military installations -- all in Hawaii. Those messages have been discounted in defending Roosevelt, but they speak for themselves. In 1945 and 1946 -- while the Congressional investigation was in progress -- the Truman administration suppressed other intelligence of the coming attack -- evidence in the files of Naval Intelligence, Army Intelligence, the State Department, and the FBI -- which has been slowly released since. To sketch it, a coming attack on Pearl Harbor was reported to Washington by a secret agent of the Army, by a Soviet agent via Moscow, by a British agent, by various offices of Naval intelligence, and by General Frederick Thorpe who said his source was Dutch intelligence.

The most recent and sensational evidence came from the partial breaking of Japan's naval codes. Many messages involving the Japanese fleet moving to attack Pearl Harbor were intercepted during the 10 days preceding the attack. The Roosevelt administration and its successors hid the existence of the messages until 1979, when Jimmy Carter ordered their release. Since then, the government position has been that the codes were not broken until the spring of 1942 -- that none of the intercepted naval messages were decrypted before the Pearl Harbor attack. That position is demonstrably false; government records contain messages decrypted before the attack. Robert Stinnett reported much of that evidence in his 1999 book, *Day of Deceit*. More than a million documents -- the great majority unrelated to Pearl Harbor, but bearing on the breaking of Japan's naval codes in 1941 -- had been hidden. With censorship and delays, their release is still incomplete, but more have become available since Stinnett completed his research. As of today, the bearing of the most recently released documents on Roosevelt's advance knowledge remains to be determined. Whatever the intercepted Japanese naval messages eventually may show, without them there is still much evidence that officials, including Roosevelt, had ad-

vance warning of the Pearl Harbor attack.

George Victor
West Orange, New Jersey

George Victor, PhD, is a Psychohistory Forum Research Associate who retired from the full-time practice of psychology to devote himself to scholarly research and writing. After completing Hitler: The Pathology of Evil (1998) he began his book on the war in the Pacific. □

Bulletin Board

The next **WORK-IN-PROGRESS SATURDAY SEMINAR** is scheduled for **September 23, 2000**, when **Michael Britton** will present on his countertransference feelings in conducting interviews of American nuclear warriors. On **October 28**, **Herbert Barry** (University of Pittsburgh) and **Paul Elovitz** will present on the psychobiographies of George W. Bush and Albert Gore. On **January 27, 2001**, **Jay Gonen**, **Mary Coleman**, *et al.*, will present on the use of law in society starting with the Ancient Sumerians. **CONFERENCES:** The International Psychohistorical Association (**IPA**) will meet on June 7-9, 2000, at Fordham University Law School in New York City, while the International Society for Political Psychology (**ISPP**) meetings are in Seattle on July 1-4, 2000. **TRAVEL:** **Andrew and Helen Brink** recently spent a month in France. **CONGRATULATIONS:** To **Jerry Piven** on his May wedding in Japan. **IN MEMORIAM:** **Faris R. Kirkland**, PhD, a retired Army Lt. Colonel and scholar of war, died on February 22 of colon cancer at his home in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. **CORRECTION:** The biographical statement for **Juhani Ihanus** in the March issue should have read "Adjunct Professor of Cultural Psychology" at the University of Helsinki rather than "Adjunct Professor of Culture." **NEW MEMBERS (Research Associates):** Welcome to **Irene Javors** and **Isaac Zieman**. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To Benefactors **Herbert Barry** and **Ralph Colp**; Patrons **Andrew Brink**, **Peter Petschauer**, **H. John Rogers**, and **Jacques Szaluta**; Sustaining Members **Mel Kalfus** and **Mary Lambert**; Supporting Members: **Anonymous** and **Hanna Turken**; and Members **Fred Alford**, **Michael Block**, **Ted Goertzel**, **Maria Milora**, and **Francois Rochet**. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to **Fred Alford**, **Boghos Artinian**, **Angelina Baydala**, **Richard Booth**, **Andrew Brink**, **Daniel Burston**, **Penny Caldwell**, **Norma Cofresí**, **Dan Dervin**, **Daniel Dupertuis**, **Suzanne Gassner**, **Robert Hinshelwood**,

Irene Javors, Mel Kalfus, Patrick Kavanaugh, George Kren, Suzanne LaMar, David Lotto, Robert Bruce Marchesani, Ellen Mendel, Richard Morrock, Spyros D. Orfanos, Robert Rousselle, Fred Sander, William Daryl Spidaliere, Mark Stern, Hanna Turken, George Victor, Charles Webel, and Sarton Weinraub. Thanks to Brett Lobbato and Marnet Mersky Kelly for editorial assistance and proofreading, and to Anna Lentz for proofreading. Thanks also to Jon Battaglia for computer assistance. ◻

George Kren's Retirement

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Colleagues will be interested to know that a founding member of *Clio's Psyche's* Editorial Board, one of our very first Featured Psychohistorians (March, 1995, Vol. 1 No. 4:7-12), "and a distinguished scholar of the Holocaust," is retiring from teaching after 35 years at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kansas. We hope George Kren will not be retiring from his contributions to *Clio* and we know he will never retire from the life of the mind. Below we will quote liberally from comments of colleagues and students of Professor Kren and conclude with his own words at his retirement ceremony. The reader should note that not every thought at this sad and joyful ceremony was meant to be literally true.

One Kansas colleague lovingly said she "found George Kren to be the most exotic creature I had ever met." She thought this "strict Freudian" (according to her) "looked just like Fritz Perls, the guru of gestalt psychology." (This puzzled me since when I last saw him, I thought he was a Trotsky look-alike.) He was the first person she met "who had apparently read everything ... could quote from everything, and ... footnote it at the same time." She recollected comments consisting of 28 points each introduced by the words, "That is to say...."

The professor recollected a Thanksgiving dinner in 1975 where six or seven colleagues (George and his wife Margo included) "drank four or five gallons of wine" and "smoked approximately 3,000 cigarettes" amidst exhilarating intellectual discussions and George's "highly individual sense of humor." She wondered if that wonderful dinner really happened in Kansas or if it might have been in some other location, such as the "other Manhattan" -- the one on the Hudson River.

Students from Kansas were fascinated by Kren, as were many of his colleagues. To them, knowing George was an altogether unprecedented event, and "an experience not to be missed." Kren's "very being," his "respect for the life of the mind, make the world large in a way" they "would not have known without" him. To these students, it was a "privilege of knowing an authentic European intellectual." (George was born in Austria.) That this European intellectual is such a sweet man and gifted artist with a motorcycle was all to the better. What is most appreciated by colleagues and students alike, is exposure to George's "version of the life of the mind." This vision includes a "ferocious comprehension of the starkness and the absurdity as well as the dignity and even the glory of the human condition." This "has always been at the center of what" Kren does, will "continue to do, and will always continue to do." All felt privileged to be one of his friends.

George Kren's Comments at His Retirement Ceremony, May 4

I am deeply touched and moved by the ceremony and thank you for it individually and collectively. In language of the current generation, to see so many friends here is "awesome." The next line should be "I really don't know what to say" but that is a phrase that has never yet been part of my vocabulary. I am particularly pleased that the traditional gold watch has been replaced with the arrangement of my photographs for the Beach Museum. I could not have wished for anything more. The glass piece is stunning, and I even know the artist.

In reviewing the 35 years that I have been a member of this history department, what stands out most is that I am and have been part of a community, using that term in Ferdinand Tönnies's sense. What Tönnies means by the term *community* is a group where relations are personal, and where people care for each other as individuals. When I was in the hospital at Christmas in 1993, I had the most dramatic demonstration of this sense of belonging by the concern shown to me by members of the department and other members of the university. On Christmas Eve and afterwards, nearly every member of the department visited me. One colleague stayed in Manhattan over the holidays to stay near me rather than go home for the holidays. At that time, expectations of others, which I disappointed, were that I would not be available for future New Years' celebrations. I have had not only good colleagues in the department, but it has been the source for the founding of important friendships -- some going back to the 1970s, and some of more recent vintage.

I have been able to establish friendships with a number of individuals outside the department. Leon Rappoport from psychology and I, in a true collaboration, have been able to produce work together, most notably our book on the Holocaust, which neither one of us could have done as well alone.

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- Violence in American Life and Mass Murder as Disguised Suicide
- Assessing Apocalypticism and Millennialism Around the Year 2000
- PsychoGeography
- Election 2000: Psychobiographies of Bradley, Bush, Gore, McCain, Buchanan, et al
- The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime
- Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
- Psychobiography
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model for Healing
- The Processes of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
- The Psychology of America as the World's Policeman
- Entertainment News
- Television, Radio, and Media as Object Relations in a Lonely World
- Kevorkian's Fascination with Assisted Suicide, Death, Dying, and Martyrdom
- The Psychobiography and Myth of Alan Greenspan: The Atlas Who Has Not Yet Shrugged

Many of these subjects will become special issues. Articles should be from 600-1500 words with a biography of the author. Electronic submissions are welcome on these and other topics. **For details, contact Paul H. Elvoitz, PhD, at <pelovitz@aol.com> or (201) 891-7486.**

Clio's Psyche

Now on the World Wide Web at
www.cliospsyche.com

The Best of Clio's Psyche

This 93-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the September, 1999, issue is available for \$20 a copy.

It will be distributed free to Members renewing at the Supporting level and above as well as Subscribers upon their next two-year renewal.

Contact the Editor (see page three).

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- Violence in American Life and Mass Murder as Disguised Suicide
- The Future of Psychoanalysis in the Third Millennium (June, 2000)
- Assessing Apocalypticism and Millennialism Around the Year 2000
- PsychoGeography
- Election 2000: Psychobiographies of Bradley, Bush, Gore, McCain, Buchanan, et al
- The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime
- Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
- Psychobiography
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society
- The Role of the Participant Observer in Psychohistory
- Psychohistorical Perspectives on Loneliness
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model for Healing
- The Processes of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
- The Psychology of America as the World's Policeman
- Entertainment News
- Elian Gonzales Between Two Worlds
- Television, Radio, and Media as Object Relations in a Lonely World
- Kevorkian's Fascination with Assisted Suicide, Death, Dying, and Martyrdom
- The Psychobiography and Myth of Alan Greenspan: The Atlas Who Has Not Yet Shrugged

Many of these subjects will become special issues. Articles should be from 600-1500 words with a biography of the author. Electronic submissions are welcome on these and other topics. **For details, contact Paul H. Elvoitz, PhD, at <pelovitz@aol.com> or (201) 891-7486.**

Call for CORST Grant Applications

The Committee on Research and Special Training (CORST) of the American Psychoanalytic Association announces an American Psychoanalytic Foundation research training grant of \$10,000 for CORST candidates (academic scholars) who have been accepted or are currently in training in an American Psychoanalytic Association institute. The purpose of the grant is to help defray the costs of psychoanalytic training. The grant is to be administered by the local institute to be paid over three years of training at \$3,500, \$3,500, and \$3,000 per year, or as needed.

The application is: a.) A brief statement of 1000 words of the research proposed, b.) A letter from a scholar in the field (e.g., department chair, colleague, or dissertation advisor) attesting to the validity and significance of the research, c.) A letter of endorsement by the Education Director of the institute certifying the candidate is in, or has been accepted for, full clinical psychoanalytic training at an institute of the American Psychoanalytic Association, and d.) An up-to-date Curriculum Vitae.

Applications are to be submitted in three copies by May 1, 2000, to Professor Paul Schwaber, 258 Bradley Street, New Haven, CT 06511.



Howard F. Stein

(Editor's Note: We welcome scanned pictures of past Featured Scholars to be published in future issues.)

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

CORST Essay Prize • Professor Janice M. Coco, Art History, University of California-Davis, winner of the First Annual American Psychoanalytic Association Committee on Research and Special Training (CORST) \$1,000 essay prize, will present her paper, "Exploring the Frontier from the Inside Out in John Sloan's Nude Studies," at a free public lecture at 12 noon, Saturday, December 20, Jade Room, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

Sidney Halpern Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea • The Psychohistory Forum is granting an award of \$200 to Michael Hirohama of San Francisco for starting and maintaining the Psychohistory electronic mailing list (see page 98).

Psychohistory Forum Student Award • David Barry of Fair Lawn, New Jersey, has been awarded a year's Student Membership in the Forum, including a subscription to Clio's Psyche, for his contribution of a fine paper as part of the Makers of the Psychohistorical Paradigm Research Project last June.

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

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

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 Papers Special Theme Issues 1999 and 2000

- The Relationship of Academia, Psychohistory, and Psychoanalysis (March, 1999)
The Psychology of Legalizing Life

Free Subscription

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

P
S
Y
C
H
O

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).

☆☆☆

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.

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

Letters to the Editor

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, October 2, 1999

Charles Strozier

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

Letters to the Editor on
Clinton-Lewinsky-Starr

Book Review Essay

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, January 30, 1999

Charles Strozier

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

Call for Nominations for the

Best of Clio's Psyche

By July 1 please list your favorite articles, interviews, and Special Issues (no

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- Violence in American Life and Mass Murder as Disguised Suicide
- Assessing Apocalypticism and Millennialism around the Year 2000
- PsychoGeography
- Election 2000
- Psychobiography
- Manias and Depressions in Economics and Society
- The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime

Call for Nominations for the

Best of Clio's Psyche

By July 1, please list your favorite articles, interviews, and Special Issues (no more than three in each category) and send the information to the Editor (see page 3) for the August publication.

- Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society
- The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model for Healing
- The Processes of Peacemaking and Peacekeeping
- The Psychology of America as the World's

Clio's Psyche of the Psychohistory Forum

Call for Papers

- Future of Psychohistory and Psychoanalysis in the Light of the Demise of the Psychohistory

The Best of Clio's Psyche

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce the creation of The Best of Clio's Psyche.

This 94-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the current issue is available for \$20 a copy and to students using it in a course for \$12.

It will be distributed free to Members at the Supporting level and above as well as Two-Year Subscribers upon their next renewal.

To Join 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.

Hayman Fellowships

The University of California Interdisciplinary Psychoanalytic Consortium announces

The Best of Clio's Psyche

The Psychohistory Forum is pleased to announce the creation of *The Best of Clio's Psyche*.

This 93-page collection of many of the best and most popular articles from 1994 to the September, 1999, issue is available for \$20 a copy and to students using it in a course for \$12.

It will be distributed free to Members renewing at the Supporting level and above as well as Subscribers upon their next two-year renewal.

The