Clio's Psyche

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

The Nazi Genocidal and Apocalyptic Mind

George Victor
Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

After World War II, social scientists, some of whom had fled the Third Reich, sought to explain the genocidal mind. They identified an "Authoritarian Personality" -- a type of person likely to obey authority generally and follow orders to harm innocent people particularly. This work, and experiments by Solomon Asch on how perception can be manipulated, undercut the complacent belief in the United States that genocidal obedience was a German aberration -- that a holocaust "can't happen here." (In fact it had already happened here, when President Ulysses Grant sent an army to exterminate Native Americans. United States soldiers carried out their mission obediently, and their command-

Election 2000

Presidential Historian and Research Psychologist: Herbert Barry, III

Paul H. Elovitz and Bob Lentz
Clio's Psyche

Clio's Psyche (CP): Let's begin with some questions on Presidential candidates and Presidents. What are your impressions of Al Gore and George W. Bush?

Herbert Barry, III (HB): Al Gore has many attributes in common with Jimmy Carter. Gore will be an energetic, effective campaigner for President. If elected, he will probably continue the centrist Democratic policies of the Clinton administration. George W. Bush is similar to Reagan.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

George W. will inspire affection and trust from many voters as the Republican nominee. If elected, he will probably reproduce Reagan's policies of tax cuts, federal government deficits, and cautious assertiveness in foreign policy.

CP: Of their running mates?

HB: The Vice Presidential nominee needs to differ conspicuously from the Presidential nominee in a way that will attract additional votes. The "observant" rather than "Orthodox" Jewish faith of Democratic Vice Presidential candidate Joseph I. Lieberman will attract populists, members of minority groups, and politically correct liberals. The main benefit might be to take votes away from Ralph Nader, Presidential nominee of the Green party. Because of Lieberman's centrist ideology, Gore's campaign will probably concentrate on the core Democratic constituency of liberals, labor union members, and poor people.

Dick Cheney, Republican Vice Presidential candidate, will help to maintain the allegiance of conservatives because of his ideology and links with former Presidents Ford, Reagan, and Bush. George W. Bush will probably continue to emphasize that he is a "compassionate" conservative who desires to "leave no child behind."

CP: Writing a year ago in **Clio's Psyche** you predicted that Gore will be elected. Do you stand by that forecast?

HB: I continue to predict a victory by Gore. George W. Bush has great social skills and will be a strong opponent. Gore has strong competitive drive and a habit of winning. I believe the polls underestimate Gore's support and will overestimate the support for the Green party nominee, Nader, who would draw most of his votes from Gore.

CP: Earlier in Bill Clinton's Presidency you wrote very positively of his promise, of his style of consensus, conciliation, and compromise. How do you evaluate him and his Presidency now?

HB: I expect that in the future Clinton will increasingly be evaluated on the basis of his performance as President. He has broadened the support of the Democratic Party and helped to strengthen the United States as a global economic leader and peacemaker. His personal sexual misconduct was greatly exceeded by some predecessors, notably Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. The principal difference is that the sexual misconduct of the prior Presidents was not publicized.

CP: Again, writing a year ago in **Clio's Psyche**, you speculated on an impending drastic change in American national life, based on an observed approximate 72-year cycle connecting the government's inception, the Civil War, Roosevelt's New Deal, and the year 2005. What should we look for in our future Presidents?

HB: Major changes are impending in the United States political scene, in the world, and in the environment. Examples include political realignments in the United States, global warming, the threatened use of nuclear bombs, and the spread of AIDS and other infectious diseases. Another problem is a severe, chronic, and worldwide defect in taxation policy. Governments obtain most revenue from taxing products of human enterprise and labor. These taxes detract from productive activity. Governments should obtain more revenue from user fees and taxation on unimproved land. In 1861-1865, Lincoln successfully combated the threat to the Union. In 1933-1945, Franklin D. Roosevelt led national responses to an economic crisis and foreign military invasion. The next President is likely to face major new crises. I believe that Gore is more likely than George W. Bush to provide the needed leadership. It is possible that the necessary economic and political changes can only be advocated and accomplished by a subsequent President.

CP: Why and when did you first get interested in the psychobiography of Presidents?

HB: In 1976 I bought a paperback book, *Facts About the Presidents* (1976) by Joseph Nathan Kane. I felt thrilled because the facts on each President included the name and dates of birth and death of each of his siblings. I was preparing a brief article, "Birth Positions of Alcoholics," for a special issue of an Adlerian journal, *Journal of Individual Psychology*. I was able to tabulate rapidly the birth orders of the Presidents and also submitted a report on that study. The paper was rejected because the editor had previously received and accepted a paper on the same topic.

I then found evidence that Presidents who were the father's namesake and the first son were more likely to be politically allied with than opposed to the preceding President. Among eight Presidents who had the same first name as their father and were the first son, all except Carter were members of the same political party as the preceding President. In contrast, eight out of nine Presidents who were later sons with a brother named

after the father replaced a President of the opposing party. The exception was William Howard Taft. I presented a paper, "Birth Order and Paternal Namesake As Predictors of Affiliation With Predecessor By Presidents of The United States," at the initial meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology in 1978. The finding was published in an article in the second issue of the ISPP's journal, *Political Psychology*, 1979, vol. 1, pp. 61-67.

CP: What is the impact of psychohistory on Presidential studies?

HB: I have repeatedly noticed that most of the Presidents have highly complex characters. The Presidents therefore are suitable subjects for psychobiographies, which study origins of seemingly contradictory traits. There are excellent psy-

---

Clio's Psyche

---

chobiographies of some Presidents, notably Jefferson, Wilson, and Nixon. For example, Fawn M. Brodie, *Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History* (1974). The author documented and argued persuasively that Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave, Sally Hemmings. Most historians have respected Alexander L. and Juliette L. George, *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study* (1956). There are several good psychobiographies of Nixon. I recommend especially David Abrahamsen, *Nixon vs. Nixon: An Emotional Tragedy* (1976). Insightful comments on the relationship of Reagan with his older brother are in a book by historian Garry Wills, *Reagan's America: Innocents at Home* (1987). I believe that psychobiographies have induced recent conventional biographers to pay more attention to the complex, contradictory characteristics of the Presidents.

CP: Which Presidents do you find most interesting?

HB: Lincoln, Jefferson, and FDR. Abraham Lincoln succeeded in preserving the Union under circumstances that would have defeated almost anyone else. His intellect and social skills are generally underestimated. Jefferson is interesting because of his contradictory role as an eloquent spokesman for individual freedom, while still being a slave owner. Franklin D. Roosevelt combined lofty idealism with political deceptiveness. *Roosevelt: The Lion and the Fox* was an accurate metaphor as the title of a book by James MacGregor Burns (1956).

CP: Historians frequently rate or rank the Presidents. Often the bases are issues of leadership during a crisis period, war or peace, economic expansion or contraction, territorial expansion, etc. How do you rate and rank a top five and a bottom three Presidents *psychologically*?

HB: In a newspaper column (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, September 13, 1987, p. 19) I listed my opinion of the 10 psychologically most mature Presidents. Following is my present opinion of the top five, starting with the psychologically most mature.

- William McKinley. He was stable, rational, kind, and a more active and intelligent President than is recognized.
- Gerald Ford. He was highly genial and conscientious. He effectively helped to heal the nation after Nixon.
- James Monroe. He combined extraordinary

achievements with a very sociable, concilia-tory personality.

- Martin Van Buren. He was serene and gen-erally contented in spite of a highly political career.
- Harry Truman. He was devoted to his fam-ily and a diligent, wise leader in spite of great difficulties and his own limitations.

Following are the bottom three, starting with the psychologically least mature.

- Theodore Roosevelt. He displayed the tem-perament and often the actions of an egotisti-cal, impulsive young boy in spite of his bril-liant intellect.
- Lyndon B. Johnson. He was a domineering, conniving bully in spite of his great political accomplishments.
- Richard Nixon. He suffered from intense, disabling anger and feelings of insecurity in spite of his extraordinary self-control and achievements.

CP: Are there any childhoods of Presidents that you find illustrative/exemplary of the impor-tance of childhood to psychohistory/psychobiogra-phy?

HB: Presidential leadership may have been developed as a result of unusual relationships with the father. When Franklin D. Roosevelt was born, his father was 53 years old. The father was an amiable companion rather than authoritarian fig-ure. The son developed responsible, protective behavior as a teenager due to his father's failing health. Washington and Jefferson were both less than 15 years old when their fathers died. Each of these Presidents were the oldest son of their wid-owed mother. Their responses to this status con-tributed to their subsequent leadership skills. Three Presidents were born after the death of their father: Jackson, Hayes, and Clinton. I believe they have in common an often successful effort to emu-late an idealized father combined with difficulty of self control because they lacked a satisfactory pa-ternal figure.

CP: Are there any birth orders of Presi-dents that you find illustrative/exemplary of the importance of birth order to psychohistory/ psychobiography?

HB: Twelve Presidents were in the first half of large families of six or more children. They are Washington, the first of six; Jefferson, third of 10; Madison, first of 12; Polk, first of 10; Taylor, third of nine; Fillmore, second of nine; Buchanan,

second of 11; Grant, first of six; Benjamin Harri-son, second of 10; Harding, first of eight; Eisen-hower, third of seven boys; and Kennedy, second of nine children. Only five Presidents from fami-lies of six or more children were not in the first half. They are William H. Harrison, last of seven; Pierce, sixth of seven; Arthur, fifth of nine; Cleve-land, fifth of nine; and McKinley, seventh of nine.

CP: What psychodynamics are there to Presidential candidates' selections of running mates?

HB: Most Vice Presidents have been cho-sen to broaden public support by representing a faction of the party that differs from the Presiden-tial nominee. The election of Kennedy was proba-bly made possible by the Southern electoral votes won because of Vice Presidential nominee Lyndon B. Johnson. This policy sometimes produced problems. William Henry Harrison, a Northern Whig, died and was replaced by Tyler, a Southern Democrat. Taylor, a Southern Whig slave owner, died and was replaced by Fillmore, a Northern Whig opponent of slavery. Lincoln, a Northern Republican, was replaced by Andrew Johnson, a Southern Democrat. A contrast to this policy was Clinton's choice of Gore. Both were young cen-trist Democrats from adjacent Southern states.

CP: What is your assessment of third par-ties?

HB: Third parties have succeeded by *re-placing* one of the prior two major parties, rather than by differing from both major parties. The Whig Party replaced the Federalist Party in 1832. The Republican Party replaced the Whig Party in 1856. The Democratic Party has survived because it adopted some proposals of its minor party rivals, such as the Greenback and Socialist parties. The Progressive "Bull Moose" Party in 1912 and the Reform Party in 1992 and 1996 were mainly the agents for an individual who sought to compete against both major parties instead of replace one of them. In the future, the Green or Libertarian or Reform party might replace the Democratic Party. An America First or Constitutional or Christian party might replace the Republican Party.

CP: Are there any psychological studies of the Presidency?

HB: Good information on each President prior to Clinton is by William A. DeGregorio, *The Complete Book of U. S. Presidents* (1991). It is primarily a reference book but contains good, brief information on personality and early experiences.

I do not know of psychohistorical studies of the Presidency as a unique role or status. I speculate that the extraordinarily high degree of achieved status has a psychologically beneficial effect on most Presidents. Some Presidents have been characterized as growing into the job, such as Polk and Truman. Sometimes the status inspires them to outstanding performance after their Presidencies, such as John Quincy Adams and Carter.

Atypical People Pursue the Power of the Presidency

Richard Booth
Black Hawk College

We will soon elect this century's first President and, whenever I think of Presidential politics, I think of power. Since the President's decisions affect millions of people, it is useful to consider the candidates' relationship to power because the effect of that power devolves from the President's own core values and personal history, including unresolved issues. My central question is, What kind of person will exercise power over the nation?

This year's two major candidates, Albert Gore and George W. Bush, are dissimilar personalities in many ways, but both share at least three features: (1) both are men, (2) both are sons of politically successful fathers, and (3) both possess a clear desire for executive power. As Presidential candidates they are atypical people, since only a few seriously pursue this office. What differentiates those who want extraordinary power from the majority who do not? What motivates them to want to be set apart from, and perhaps above, the rest? Is it a sense of entitlement? Is it the grandiose notion that no one else can do what they can do? Is it, in this particular election, a need to supercede paternal accomplishments? Or, might it be a sincere desire to serve people, emanating from a psychologically healthy personality?

The depth psychologies provide various frameworks for examining such questions. For example, Alfred Adler maintains that when individuals experience certain inferiorities, a pathological superiority complex may result through overcompensation. Karen Horney, agreeing, discusses the neurotic need for power as one manifestation of neurosis. Personal experience tells us that people who are "power-hungry" may connive until they achieve their goal, as if only power can vitalize them or make them feel important and different. Notice that the language employs an oral metaphor relative to those pursuing extraordinary power, implying that achieving it will "fill them up" in some incorporative, survival-related way.

Numerous psychologists suggest that excessive power pursuits demonstrate a lack of centeredness, that is, an imbalance of needs and drives within the ego system. This would, of course, be true if primary incorporation needs were unfulfilled or if oedipal conflicts were being acted out through power pursuits. These issues and conflicts can be acted out on the world stage or in personal relationships. In *The Art of Loving*, Erich Fromm says that overpowering another (i.e., pathological power) is the opposite of love, and this comports with theologian Paul Tillich's view that controlling organisms in a manner inconsistent with their nature renders them objects of coercion. If manipulation is used to buttress this goal, a false sense of strength results. In general, then, we should be wary of those who need excessive power over others. The Taoist sage Lao-tzu many centuries ago said, "He who loves his body more than dominion over the empire can be given the custody of the empire." In other words, he should rule who does not need to rule. Perhaps Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., are models of Lao-tzu's wise counsel.

Balancing one's internal reality is difficult but vital for psychological health. When certain drives or forces overwhelm the personality, other dimensions suffer underdevelopment. True strength derives from seeing clearly and honestly, something one cannot do when being pulled and pushed by intractable, unresolved and, perhaps unconscious needs. The internally strong person is a reflective self-knower, whose fears and issues have been largely worked through. An illustrative case may be Socrates, who, refusing to compromise his personal, internal truth, moved beyond his fear and, on principle, drank the hemlock. Real strength eschews a facsimile of power, since real strength comes from within the personality structure. Substituting power for internal strength is false strength.

Compensating for insufficient internal strength does not, per se, disallow a powerful person's doing good things, nor am I implying that healthy people never attain extraordinary positions of power. Perhaps Richard Nixon, lacking self-confidence, being deceptive, and manifesting pos-

sible paranoia at times, exemplifies the former, while Jimmy Carter, to the best of my knowledge, exemplifies the latter. Abraham Lincoln, now a mythical hero, is not as clear a case. Nonetheless, plagued with unbalancing, depressive episodes and suicidal ideas, he appears to have transcended those challenges to keep the Union intact. But, although good behaviors often suggest a "goodness of person," we know that what appears to be true may not be. We must certainly apprehend the pattern of a leader's acts, but we must also explore what fuels that pattern. Is the apparent goodness of behavior the natural outgrowth of a fundamentally healthy personality or is it actually an approval-seeking dependency or oedipal process unraveling in a socially beneficial form? To understand this, one must understand the person.

I consider many pursuers of any type of excessive power as people working through oedipal and pre-oedipal issues. I think that, for them, there is still someone to please, someone to feel above, someone to defeat. Life is a battle in which there are winners and losers, as in children's games. Appearing vulnerable or dependent is forbidden, although these are shared dimensions of the human condition. Having once attained power, retention is vital since its loss constitutes a return to peerage, where dependency and narcissistic threats are no longer shrouded by the visage of power. Losing means not being "good enough" to win (to be loved?). But, win for whom? Win for what? One can only hope that, if oedipal or pre-oedipal issues are unconscious motivators for the two major candidates, the future President can resist unnecessary conflicts with father-images and avoid succumbing to the need for excessive approval by maternal symbols.

Given our brief discussion, are there any guidelines for selecting the best integrated person for the Presidency? This is an exacting question, but the indicators below may provide some general direction.

First, in everyday life we evaluate others by observing them -- their facial and verbal reactions, and their behavioral patterns. Watching candidates' areas of blockage, tension, and impulsive reactions is important. How is the head held? Is there an appearance of arrogance or entitlement? How does the candidate diminish an opponent? Does the candidate manifest an easy flow or a pressured force? When under pressure, is the candidate straightforward without defensiveness or overly intense and abrasively reactive?

Second, is winning everything? The healthy candidate's life will be broader than winning an office. Resorting to pathological manipulation, distorting the other's record, and creating false impressions through half-truths indicate the candidate's lack of internal power. In this case, the loss of the office suggests an overidentification with the office that may be tantamount to a loss of the self.

Third, what is and has been the candidate's typical lifestyle? Assuming that lifestyles of power-seeking engender self-sustaining strategies (e.g., ambition, pandering), we may conclude that what gives meaning to the power seeker's life is, in fact, not merely the pursuit of power itself, but the systematic maintenance of those qualities that sustain it. Healthy people use few defenses and those are typically adaptive rather than destructive. Moreover, the research shows a strong positive correlation between the number of defenses employed and a person's degree of psychological dysfunction.

Fourth, I find it helpful to distinguish between authority and power. To possess authority means to author, to invent, to create, so I conceptualize directive authority as a type of creative "authoring" of policies, programs, and ethical compromises. Power means unidirectional force. Will the candidate likely rule creatively and cooperatively or through intimidation? Can he command respect for who he is rather than fear for punishments he might bestow?

Finally, is the political aspirant oriented toward using power for unifying rather than divisive ends, even though this may be unpopular? Without this ability, Tillich argues, power will likely become coercive.

In conclusion, let us not become unduly cynical when selecting our President, even though we may have a sense that chicanery is required for achieving political goals. Our task is to elect the candidate who will use political power well. He will be fundamentally balanced, internally strong, humbled by serving, and self-reflective. His decisions will reveal his considered values and others' reasoned input rather than popular opinion or whim. To better ensure this kind of leader, we should carefully attend to the candidates' styles, watch for indicators of centeredness and integrity, as well as his ability to govern cooperatively and well. We should also note defensive patterns, arrogant and impatient styles, and the intensity of the desire for power itself. Then, after careful observation and information-gathering, we can assess

who might enter the White House with more efficacy than transference issues, and who has the stronger core of values -- one that, in our best judgment, has been tested against the exigencies of life.

Richard Booth, PhD, is Professor of Psychology at Black Hawk College, Quad-Cities Campus, Moline, Illinois, and a licensed psychotherapist. He has published numerous articles in professional journals. He can be reached at <BoothR@bhc1.bhc.edu>. q

Portrait of George W. Bush As a "Late Bloomer"

Aubrey Immelman
St. John's University

Speaking with reporters yesterday as she visited the Austin campaign headquarters of her son, George W. Bush, Barbara Bush said: "George is no dummy … maybe he was a tad of a late bloomer."

Washington Post, December 3,1999

It's a hot simmering day in August, 1989. The new part-owner of the Texas Rangers is sitting behind the batting cage watching baseball practice. The $2,500 black eel-skin boots of the Lone Star state's future governor are clearly visible, as is the emblazoned Texas flag, which seems as vibrant as "Dubya" himself.

To those who know him best, Presidential candidate George W. Bush is a likeable, gregarious personality, charming and congenial. If ever proof was needed that character endures, Dubya would be it: college classmates characterize Bush as "personable," "outgoing," and "funny," while childhood friends describe "the Bombastic Bushkin" in similar terms.

The words commonly used to characterize Bush capture the essence of what contemporary personality theorist Theodore Millon calls the "outgoing personality pattern." Bush clearly recognizes his central personal quality, as affirmed in his own words in a 1994 interview with Tom Fiedler of the *Miami Herald*: "When your name is George Bush, with the kind of personality I have, which is a very engaging personality, at least outgoing, in which my job is to sell tickets to baseball games, you're a public person."

Millon notes, however, that few people exhibit personality patterns in "pure" or prototypal form. Most personalities represent a blend of two or more prevailing orientations, and Bush is no exception. Beyond his trademark gregariousness, Bush's college cronies remember him as "mischievous" and a "prankster." These words evoke images of Millon's "dissenting pattern" -- a dauntless, adventurous, unruly personality type.

Bush's colorful life story bears witness to an indelible outgoing streak, tinged with an unruly, dauntless element. At age 20, frat boy George was questioned, arrested, and charged with disorderly conduct following the disappearance of a wreath from a New Haven storefront. (The charges were later dropped.) The errant scion of the Bush clan had another run-in with the law at Princeton when, with fellow frolicking Yale fans, he flattened the goal posts following a football game. This time, Bush was detained, questioned, and told to leave town. For a future governor who would later invoke education as an election incantation, the budding young Bush's college years at Yale were remarkably rooted in the less cerebral components of a college education.

Following graduation from Yale and a Vietnam-era stint in the Texas Air National Guard, and armed with his natural exuberance, his daddy's connections, and an MBA from Harvard Business School, the 29-year-old Bush returned to Texas in the summer of 1975, "drawn by the entrepreneurial spirit of the energy business," to forge a career for himself in the risky oil exploration and development business. Risky, perhaps, but undaunting for someone propelled by an adventurous personality with its love of high-risk challenges, gift of the gab, and talent for thriving on sheer wits and ingenuity.

Throughout his time in the oil business, Bush, by his own admission, was "drinking and carousing and fumbling around." But the "so-called wild, exotic days" of his youth ended abruptly just after his 40th birthday in 1986 when Bush unceremoniously jumped on the wagon, reigned in his unruliness, and turned his life in a direction that would ultimately take him to the pinnacle of power in politics.

This turning point in the life of George W. Bush marks a juncture where psychological inference diverges from direct biographical interpretation. The conventional wisdom concerning Bush's midlife course correction is that Laura Bush's exhortations played a pivotal role, as did personal faith and the healing power of heart-to-heart talks with family friend Billy Graham and other pastoral

advisers.

But consideration of Bush's character in broader context raises another possibility. The adventurous, dauntless personality style is a normal, adaptive variant of a personality pattern that in extreme cases may emerge as an antisocial personality disorder. Perhaps by dint of more favorable childhood socialization experiences the more adaptive styles express themselves, as Millon puts it, "in behaviors that are minimally obtrusive, especially when manifested in sublimated forms, such as independence strivings, ambition, competition, risk-taking, and adventuresomeness."

In *The New Personality Self-Portrait* (1995), John M. Oldham and Lois B. Morris characterize individuals with this kind of adventurous personality style as bold, tough, persuasive, "silver-tongued" charmers talented in the art of winning friends and influencing people, who like to keep moving and are adept at getting by on wits and ingenuity, with a history of childhood and adolescent mischief and hell-raising. Bush biographer Bill Minutaglio writes in *First Son* (1999) that Bush "loved it" when Richard Ben Cramer, in his chronicle of the 1988 Presidential campaign, *What It Takes* (1993), called him "an ass-kicking foot soldier, a quick-witted spy, the 'Roman candle' in the family."

Oldham and Morris' portrayal of this pattern provides the theoretical underpinnings for what Bush himself has referred to as his "nomadic" period and the "so-called wild, exotic days" of his youth. The American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders'* (*DSM-IV*) description of people with antisocial personalities as "excessively opinionated, self-assured, or cocky" individuals having "a glib, superficial charm," does not seem too far removed from accounts of the -- to borrow his own phrase -- "young and irresponsible" Bush in his 20s and 30s.

But the clincher is this: According to the *DSM-IV*, antisocial personality disorder "may become less evident or remit as the individual grows older, particularly in the fourth decade of life." Ultimately, we have no way of corroborating the root cause of Bush's dramatic midlife change at age 40; human behavior, after all, is determined by multiple causes, none of which can be experimentally controlled in the psychobiographical study of lives. Thus, attributing diagnostic meaning to Bush's midlife metamorphosis must of necessity remain highly speculative.

Psychobiographically, the operative question is whether Bush's developmental history reveals compelling evidence of socialization experiences consistent with the hypothesized underlying dynamics of dauntless, antisocial character traits. In *Disorders of Personality* (1996), Millon asserts that the experiential history of "socially sublimated antisocials" is often imbued with secondary status in the family: "It is not only in socially underprivileged families or underclass communities that we see the emergence of antisocial individuals. The key problem for all has been their failure to experience the feeling of being treated fairly and having been viewed as a person/child of value in the family context. Such situations occur in many middle- and upper-middle class families. Here, parents may have given special attention to another sibling who was admired and highly esteemed, at least in the eyes of the 'deprived' youngster."

The circumstances surrounding the death of his three-year-old sister Robin when George was seven, younger brother Jeb's early achievements, and the unspoken burden of being the standard bearer of the Bush legacy may all have played a part in the emergence of these speculative dynamics. Pamela Colloff, in the 1999 "Who is George W. Bush" special issue of *Texas Monthly*, chronicles how, during the seven months that his sister battled leukemia in a New York hospital with mother Barbara Bush at her bedside and father George Bush shuttling back and forth between Midland and New York, George W. and his baby brother Jeb were often left in the care of family friends. And in a 1998 *New York Times Magazine* profile, Sam Howe Verhovek paints the young George Bush as "a mischievous boy with a passion for sports, especially baseball, and a penchant for wisecracks that may well have its origins in a family tragedy.... [B]oth of his parents told friends that George seemed to develop a joking, bantering style in a determined bid to lift them from their grief."

Concerning Jeb's favored status in the Bush family and George W.'s burden of first-born status, Paul Burka, also in the *Texas Monthly* special issue, writes: "[George W. Bush] will inevitably be compared to his father.... They spent quality time together ... but well into George W.'s adulthood, their relationship was marked by the competitive issues that often arise between fathers and firstborn sons.... Perhaps the source of the tension lies in the status within the family of brother Jeb, seven years his junior, ... who was regarded as the smart one, while George was the smart-alecky

one."

There can be little doubt, however, that the life course that George W.'s parents charted for him -- following in his father's footsteps to Andover, Yale, and the oil fields of Texas, and his prominent role in his father's political campaigns -- also bestowed special privileges on the "First Son," scion of the Bush political dynasty. It would be a mistake to venture too far out on a limb with the speculative "socially sublimated antisocial" hypothesis in describing the character of George W. Bush.

Nonetheless, what *can* be stated unequivocally is that Bush is not a highly conscientious character type, and this can have important political implications. Perhaps most pertinently, Bush is unlikely to exhibit what psychologist Dean Keith Simonton calls a "deliberative" leadership style. Thus, a President Bush may neglect to keep himself as thoroughly informed as he should (for example, by diligently reading briefings and background reports), place political success over effective policy, fail to exhibit depth of comprehension or understand the broader implications of his decisions, and force decisions to be made prematurely.

As the 2000 Presidential campaign unfolds, Bush's task will be to convince voters that he's a serious candidate, not just a charmer who wants to be taken seriously -- a task for which, ironically, he has the requisite personality skills. And voters, for their part, will have to weigh the evidence and decide what premium to place on the past and whether the mellowed George W. Bush has the mettle to lead the United States into the new millennium.

Aubrey Immelman, PhD, is an associate professor of psychology at St. John's University in Minnesota, where he also directs the Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics <www.csbsju.edu/uspp>, a faculty-student collaborative research project with the mission of studying the impact of personality on political leadership and disseminating the findings to the public. Immelman specializes in the personality assessment of Presidents, Presidential candidates, and other public figures. The personality data in this paper are drawn from Immelman's contribution, "The Political Personality of U.S. Presidential Candidate George W. Bush," which will appear in the forthcoming Greenwood Press volume, Political Leadership for the New Century: Lessons from the Study of Personality and Behavior among American Leaders *by Ofer Feldman and Linda O.*

Valenty (eds.). Dale Fredrickson, an undergraduate political science major at St. John's University, contributed to this paper. q

George W. Bush's Anger and Impulsivity

Eileen Reda
Ramapo College

While watching Governor George W. Bush during his acceptance speech at the Republic National Convention 2000, my six-year-old son asked, "Is he angry, Mom?" "Why do you think he is angry?" I queried. "I don't know, he just looks angry," he replied with a shrug. My son's comment summed up what I discovered while researching Bush's personality in the previous two months.

George W. Bush's anger had occupied my thoughts this summer while researching the Republican governor for my seminar paper in Professor Paul Elovitz's senior seminar on political candidates. This essay will examine George W. Bush's personality and his emotional responses to experiences in life. He is inclined to respond impulsively and sometimes with anger. While my findings are based upon an examination of the Texas governor's childhood and youth, I think there are clear implications regarding his mature personality.

The relationship between grandmothers and grandchildren is one of the most special bonds one may experience in life. This is why I was struck by Barbara Bush's recollection of a comment of her mother (George W. Bush's maternal grandmother). The grandmother said that "she hated to be in the same room with the baby, for if she took her eyes off him, George looked hurt" (Barbara Bush, *A Memoir*, 1994, p. 29). This early description of the behavior of the eldest son of Barbara Pierce and George Herbert Walker Bush seems to contain an element of anger as well as the lifelong desire for attention so common in politicians.

It is important to search for signs of impulsiveness and anger in the life of the person most likely to be the next President of the United States (according to current public opinion polls). Anger is a natural human emotion that can help energize us when we face threats. In modern society, where we seldom must literally fight, the problem becomes how to manage anger without damaging our relationship with others.

Clio's Psyche

Behaviors in Bush's early years portray anger and a lack of self-control, leading to impulsivity. In his third-grade class taught by Miss Austine Crosby, "Georgie" "threw a football through a window at Sam Houston Elementary School one rainy afternoon when all the students had been ordered to stay indoors at lunchtime." The following year a teacher sent him to the principal's office for creating a disturbance by using a ballpoint pen to painstakingly mark his face with a goatee, mustache, and sideburns in imitation of Elvis Presley.

George W. had his mother's outspoken manner. Always the family lightning rod, as a 12-year-old he would get into fights with his five-year-old brother Jeb. This prompted their mother Barbara, according to a paternal uncle, "to get in the middle of those fights … bust them up and slap them [the kids] around" (Bill Minutaglio, *First Son: George W. Bush and the Bush Family Dynasty*, 1999, p. 49).

Childhood friend Randall Roden described Bush while at Andover as being somewhat impulsive: "Being stickball commissioner revealed Bush's personality. He was a figurehead, well suited to deal with a diverse group," bringing people together. But "Bush was slightly impulsive, it was hard for him to bite his tongue and keep from saying something that would get him in trouble…. GWB was a prankster, mischievous" (*First Son*, p. 73).

Nor did the eldest Bush child outgrow this rashness while an Ivy Leaguer at Yale. Seven days before completing a well-paid summer job (obtained by his father) on an inland oil barge in Louisiana, Bush, nicknamed the "Bombastic One," simply walked off the barge and never came back. This was an incident that George W. Bush always regretted because his father expressed disappointment in him because of it (*First Son*, p. 90). Such dropping out often reflects anger.

Another impulsive incident portraying rebelliousness occurred while George W. was in university. As a 20-year-old, along with some of his equally loud Yale fraternity brothers, he "descended on the Christmas-bedecked streets of New Haven. Patrolling downtown, Bush spied a wreath on a storefront and reached out to take it." The police happened to see him and he was "questioned, arrested and charged with disorderly conduct" (*First Son*, p. 99). Eventually, the charges were dismissed.

Shortly after the wreath incident, young George returned home to Texas where he impulsively bought a "monster ring" at Neiman Marcus for Cathryn Wolfman, his first fiancé. The family was none too happy with the match and it did not result in marriage (*First Son*, p.100).

In 1968 Bush had enlisted in the Texas Air National Guard, which protected him from being sent to Vietnam. With his obligation scheduled to end on May 26, 1974, he wrote a letter expressing his desire for early discharge: "I respectfully request my discharge from the Texas Air National Guard.… I am moving to Boston, Massachusetts, to attend Harvard Business School as a full-time student" (*First Son*, p. 153). Once again, George W. decided to not complete an obligation. One could conclude that because of the "Bush" name he was able to receive an honorable discharge easily, which the average citizen would have to fight for.

After graduating from Yale, Bush was in the "nomadic period of his life" with intervals of unemployment interspersed with stints as a management trainee and a political campaigner. In 1972, George and his 15-year-old brother Marvin drank too much at a friend's house and then noisily crashed into a neighbor's metal garbage can on their way home. Facing his father (then ambassador to the U. N.), George W. challenged him to a fistfight, offering to go "*mano a mano* right here." Their brother Jeb stepped in to defuse the situation. This incident seemed prompted by a defiant pride over being accepted into the Harvard School of Business MBA program as well as anxiety over his decision to attend (*First Son*, pp. 147-148).

An important turning point in Bush's life was his meeting, courting, and marrying Laura Welch. He became obsessed with her, called her constantly to the point where her mother declared that she "was afraid George was going to ruin the whole thing because he was rushing it" (*First Son*, p. 184). Fortunately, his impulsivity did not drive Laura away. Marriage and parenthood eventually helped lessen his erratic conduct. His considerable alcohol consumption ended when he gave up beer at age 40, after Laura threatened to take their twin daughters and leave him if he did not moderate his behavior.

A politician must carefully select each and every word, since any utterances can come back to haunt him or her. The Republican governor knows the names of the media people and readily talks about his personal passions or whatever is on his mind. The press is generally very comfortable

with him. Yet, George W. has also expressed his anger, impulsivity, and lack of self-control to the media when he dislikes their questions or their tone. At a scheduled stop in Salt Lake City, Bush abruptly ripped the microphone from his coat, declaring, "That's it buddy!" and storming away from the cameras at the beginning of the interview. He declared, "Listen -- you know, if you want to try to do this to me then I'm not going to talk to you." With that he stabbed his finger at the reporter (*First Son*, p. 262-264).

Bush is prone to rationalizing his angry and impulsive behavior. In the fourth grade when he was sent to the principal's office for drawing on his face, he stated that he "was imitating Elvis Presley," who had done concerts nearby. Bush justified the wreath-stealing incident as a college prank. By 1976, well aware that his peers were accomplishing much more than he, George W. acknowledged that he was "drinking and carousing and fumbling around" (*First Son*, pp. 49, 99, and 173).

In conclusion, from infancy to adulthood George W. Bush's behaviors demonstrate impulsive and angry personality traits. Throughout his life he has rationalized poor self-control. Although I began my study of the Texas Governor inclined to support and vote for him on November 7, I eventually felt that he was too impulsive and angry to be President.

Eileen Reda is a senior psychology major at Ramapo College of New Jersey. After graduation in December, she will prepare to teach in public education and then attend graduate school in psychology on a part-time basis. She may be reached at <blckbear@warwick.net>. q

Psychohistorical Notes on Al Gore and President Clinton

Herbert Barry, III
University of Pittsburgh

Review of

James MacGregor Burns and Georgia J. Sorenson (with Robin Gerber and Scott W. Webster), <u>Dead Center: Clinton-Gore Leadership and the Perils of Moderation</u>. New York: Scribner, 1999. ISBN 0684837781, pp. 416, $27.50.

Bill Turque, <u>Inventing Al Gore</u>. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000. ISBN 0395883237, pp. xiv + 448, $25.00.

Bob Zelnick, <u>Gore: A Political Life</u>. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing Inc., 1999. ISBN 0895263262, pp. xiii + 384, $29.95.

Democratic Presidential nominee Al Gore has significantly influenced the policies of the United States during his past eight years as Vice President. If elected President, he will wield even more influence for the next four or eight years. Future psychohistorians will attempt to identify his socially acquired motivations and attitudes that result from early experiences.

Useful information for inferring Al Gore's distinctive motivations and attitudes is contained in two recent biographies. Bob Zelnick expresses a predominantly hostile evaluation of his public actions and policies. Bill Turque evaluates him more favorably but includes embarrassing revelations. The books are not psychohistories, but they contribute useful information for the psychological interpretation of Al Gore's early experiences and behavior. They also include valid inferences about his motivations. The psychological perspective of this essay may provide useful background for more thorough psychohistorical analyses in the future.

Zelnick and Turque both characterize Al Gore as a generally ethical and diligent Congressman, Senator, and Vice President. He is a conscientious, loyal subordinate of President Clinton; a loving, faithful husband; and an attentive father. His social motivations and attitudes include a desire to serve his country; the determination to warn the public about the dangers of global warming and cigarette smoking; and sympathy for poor and exploited people. Both authors also describe contradictory behavior by Al Gore. Although he is highly intelligent and introspective, his scholastic performance was inconsistent. Before he went to college, he fell in love with and subsequently married a woman of whom his parents disapproved because her family had inferior social status. Although Gore eventually chose a political career in accordance with the desires of his parents, he initially attended a theological seminary and then was a journalist for several years.

Turque and Zelnick both report several occasions when Al Gore exaggerated his achievements. The most widely known is his claim that he invented the Internet. On many occasions, Gore has been deceitful in trying to gain public approval. Turque emphasizes that Gore is complex and conflicted. With friends and family he is genial and affable, but in public contexts he inclines to be stiff and inhibited. Personally he is kind and gentle, but

a nasty, aggressive political contestant. Turque declares the Vice President to be "...protective of his family's privacy yet willing to exploit personal tragedies for political gain. His carefully tended Dudley Do-Right image obscures a keen and sometimes ruthlessly competitive nature." The most spectacular revelation by Turque is evidence that Gore's characterization of his youthful marijuana consumption as "extremely rare, extremely rare" was a gross understatement. He tried to prevent a former friend from revealing the frequency of their marijuana smoking together while he was a journalist.

Both biographies report several childhood experiences that are probably the origins of Al Gore's distinctive motivations and attitudes. Although he was given the same name as his father, Albert Arnold Gore, the son was given the choice of whether to use the identifier, "Jr." The father was called "Albert" and the son, "Al," although Zelnick repeatedly identifies the son as "Al Gore, Jr." Both parents were ambitious for his future political success. His sister Nancy, 10 years older than Al, undoubtedly resented the greater aspirations of the parents for their son than for her. Albert Gore, the father, was a member of the United States Congress (House and Senate), which necessitated that the family divide its time between the family farm in Tennessee and an apartment in Washington, DC. Their mother, Pauline, devoted more attention to her husband's political career than to her children. Both parents were frequently absent. Al's father was an admirable and loving parent but also severely demanding. He required young Al to do hard, prolonged labor on the family farm.

Older sister Nancy sister was overtly rebellious as well as a heavy drinker and smoker. Al partially emulated her by covert rebellion against parental demands and expectations. In common with many sons who are the father's namesake, Al developed a strong but ambivalent identification with his father. The influence of his older sister and frequent parental absences helped him to develop social skills and a high degree of independence.

Senator Gore's opposition to the Vietnam War was unpopular in Tennessee. In fact, it was the main reason for his defeat for re-election to the Senate in 1970. Upon graduation from Harvard, Al Gore tried to rescue his father's political career by enlisting in the Army, volunteering for duty in Vietnam that same year. Afterward, he expressed his most conspicuous rebellion against parental wishes as he briefly attended divinity school followed by several years as a newspaper reporter.

In 1976, Al Gore competed for and won election to the U. S. House of Representatives. In 1984 he was elected to the U.S. Senate. During his legislative career, Al was enthusiastically supported by his father, but adamantly refused paternal help. In Al's candidacy for President, he is enthusiastically supported by President Clinton, but will probably refuse most of Clinton's efforts to help his campaign.

It is evident that President Clinton and Vice President Gore have a mutual relationship of cooperation and respect. Both books state that Gore has had a more prominent and active role in the Presidential administration than any previous Vice President. Nevertheless, there are also tensions between two different personalities and Gore has publicly expressed disapproval of Clinton's sexual misbehavior.

Dead Center by James MacGregor Burns and Georgia J. Sorenson describes Clinton's Presidency as a triumvirate with Hillary Rodham Clinton and Al Gore. Clinton is characterized as a weak and excessively cautious President. The title for the book refers to President Clinton's strategy of occupying the center of the political spectrum, avoiding the stigma of being a liberal. The book repeatedly distinguishes between "tranformational" and "transactional" leadership. Transformational leadership is described as setting lofty goals and fighting to achieve them. Transactional leadership is described as brokerage and compromise, producing incremental changes. Clinton is characterized and disparaged as a transactional leader.

The book describes and evaluates the first five-and-a-half years of Bill Clinton's Presidency from January, 1993, until autumn, 1998. The disapproval of Clinton's policies seems unfair. His victory in two Presidential elections might be attributable to his centrist political ideology and to his preference for compromise and accommodation instead of confrontation and combat. Clinton's principal transformational effort was the unsuccessful proposal for health care reform in the first two years of his term.

The prologue of *Dead Center* contains a brief conversation of the authors with Bill Clinton less than two months before the 1992 Presidential election. Clinton promised to become a "transforming leader." The authors describe but do not

fully appreciate the political realities imposed on Clinton. Transformational leadership might have caused him to lose the Presidential election in 1996.

Inferences about Bill Clinton's motives in this book are simplistic and derogatory rather than psychohistorical. Clinton's disappointing actions are usually attributed to excessive caution or craving for approval rather than to prudence or realism. Chapter 2 contains brief information on the personality development of Bill Clinton, Hillary Rodham Clinton, and Al Gore. In contrast to Clinton's early life, Al Gore's was "a study in strong community and powerful concentration on values." Burns and Sorenson comment that the Gore father and son occasionally sparred with one another. The book quotes a friend of "Al junior" as observing, "A powerful father and a strong-willed son is not always an easy relationship."

There are a few brief references to the encounters of Bill Clinton with Monica Lewinsky, including the impeachment proceedings against the President by the House of Representatives. Since the book describes in detail other events in 1998, the authors choose to minimize their analyses of Clinton's personal, erotic behavior. Psychohistorians can probably contribute satisfactory explanations for the concurrence of Clinton's risky personal behavior with his cautious political decisions.

The book focuses on President Clinton, with brief and superficial comments about Vice President Al Gore. The Vice President is described as a close comrade and consistently loyal subordinate of President Clinton. The authors state that an important purpose of Clinton is to help Gore to be elected as the next President. There is no hint of discord or rivalry. Gore is portrayed as giving usually good advice and Clinton as always highly valuing the Vice President's judgment. There is no mention of Gore's publicized disapproval of Bill Clinton's relationship with Monica Lewinsky.

The books by Zelnick, Turque, and Burns and Sorenson have several attributes in common. They all describe and discuss political leaders whose actions are in progress rather than completed. Modern technology makes it possible for a book to be published almost as fast as a monthly magazine. The biographers had limited or no contact with their subjects, but all the books include useful information obtained from interviews with other people. None of the books is psychohistorical. The interpretations offered by the authors may

reveal more about themselves than about their biographical subjects. Future biographies and psycho-biographies will supersede these books but will benefit from some of their facts and comments.

The most conspicuous difference among the three books is the political ideology of the authors. Zelnick is a conservative. He disparages Gore's efforts to protect the world environment and to counteract the effects of racial prejudice. The preparation of the book was hurried and superficial. There is no scholarly documentation of the information. Careless errors include "Harrison" instead of "Harris Wofford" (Senator from Pennsylvania) and "Betsy" instead of "Betsey Wright" (Assistant to President Clinton). Turque does not display political bias. He describes but does not try to explain Gore's contradictory characteristics. His book contains numerous endnotes and a collection of photographs. Burns and Sorenson repeatedly express disappointment with the centrist rather than liberal policies of Clinton and Gore. Their book is primarily a description and adverse evaluation of the Clinton Presidency.

Patrick Buchanan and the Politics of Denial

Michael A. Milburn and Sheree D. Conrad
University of Massachusetts, Boston

The year 2000 marks the third consecutive Presidential election in which Patrick Buchanan has run for President. In the 1996 election, he ran as a "populist," confusing many political pundits who thought that his themes were typically those of liberal Democrats. If one is aware, however, of the influence that childhood experiences exert on political beliefs and behavior, and the power of denial, his political positions become manifestly clear and understandable.

First, one needs to identify the emotions that Buchanan uses and attempts to evoke in his supporters: anger, fear, and insecurity. These emotions are at the heart of his appeal. While some analysts suggest that his economic message has been liberal in nature, it depends on scapegoating and fear for its attraction. In his view of the world, affirmative action, illegal immigrants, and unfair competition from Japan are responsible for stealing

jobs (from white Americans). Fear of outsiders, such as gays and blacks -- these are essential parts of his message. Buchanan's recent choice of a black conservative running mate named Ezola Foster may deflect some charges of racism, but it does not change his essential message.

Where do these emotions in Buchanan originate? Much is now known of his authoritarian upbringing. He grew up in Washington, DC, with a father who stressed toughness and violence. His father, "Pop" Buchanan, was proud of his Confederate Mississippi heritage, and was himself the son of an alcoholic, abusive father. He was given to angry outbursts and did not hesitate to use his belt on Pat and his brothers. Pop Buchanan also wanted his sons to be able to use their fists. If Buchanan or his brothers missed their required daily practice on the punching bag, their father would beat them. This training in violence had negative consequences in Buchanan's adult life. In college, he lost his scholarship and was expelled from Georgetown University after he assaulted two police officers who had stopped him for speeding. As Buchanan reported, he kicked one of the officers where he "thought it might do some good" (C. Lane, "Daddy's Boy," *New Republic*, January 22, 1996, pp. 15-25).

It is also clear from Buchanan's memoir, *Right from the Beginning* (1988), that the denial of emotion was a central element of his childhood: "To show emotion and feeling was considered an unmanly thing to do; we were to be stoic about pain. Take your punishment. Don't let anyone see you cry" (p. 75). This childhood restriction of emotion shaped Buchanan's adult attitudes. He writes, "Whenever I read in today's press about some individual, especially some man, 'revealing himself,' (e.g., bleeding and bleating in print about his 'feeling' and 'hurt') I always feel a profound sense of embarrassment" (p. 75).

An additional story from his childhood, reported in a sympathetic article in the *Charlotte Observer* ("Running on Religion," March 3, 1996, p. 1C), did not receive any national press attention, but it is most revealing. Buchanan's father, a Roman Catholic who prided himself on being very religious, used to hold his children's hands over a lighted match "to impress them with the pain of eternal damnation." Very few people today would fail to identify the sum of Buchanan's father's actions as abusive. We would also argue that it is quite clear where Patrick Buchanan's anger, his political opinions, and his political support originate.

Our research (with S.D. Conrad and F. Sala, "Childhood Punishment, Denial, and Political Attitudes," *Political Psychology*, 1995, vol. 16, pp. 447-478, and *The Politics of Denial*, 1996) has empirically demonstrated that experiences of harsh punishment in childhood, particularly for males with no experience with psychotherapy, are significant predictors of individuals' support in adulthood for punitive public policies ,such as the death penalty, the use of military force to protect U.S. interests, and opposition to abortion. Buchanan's experiences and opinions reflect the process for which we have found empirical evidence: that negative emotions from childhood can be displaced onto punitive political attitudes in adulthood.

Our argument that Buchanan's appeal results from punitive emotions rather than economic concerns (the issue that confused many political analysts in the 1996 election) is confirmed by Gallup poll results. A national poll in February, 1996, reported that 59 percent of Buchanan supporters believed "moral" problems were the most important issues, with only 38 percent seeing economic issues as most important. Buchanan supporters were dramatically different from both Bob Dole supporters (57 percent economic versus 39 percent moral) and Lamar Alexander supporters (54 percent economic versus 41 percent moral).

To the extent that political attitudes are based on unidentified and unresolved issues from childhood experiences, they make a poor basis for public policy. For example, Buchanan argued during one of the Republican primary debates in Iowa in 1996, without any evidence, that violence in the U.S. results from the killing of unborn (aborted) children. Political candidates who display such a high level of denial can exert a very destructive influence on U.S. political culture.

Michael A. Milburn is Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, where he has taught for over 20 years. He is the author of two books and dozens of articles. Sheree D. Conrad is Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts, Boston. She has published research in a variety of journals. Milburn and Conrad are the co-authors of The Politics of Denial (1996) and of a new book due out in the spring of 2001. q

> **There are no negatives in the unconscious.**

The Eagleton-for-Vice President Affair

Scott W. Webster
Harvard University

Love may make the world go 'round, but politics makes it interesting. In no other arena of human activity is the confluence of altruism, avarice, facts, figures, good intentions, ideology, insolence, personality, and revenge so evident -- and so downright combustible -- as in electoral politics.

Bringing his powers of perception to bear on politics, Ralph Waldo Emerson scribbled in the mid-19th century that "A party is perpetually corrupted by personality." If pressed, political junkies of Emerson's era and our own might concede that the reverse also holds: a personality is, from time to time, corrupted by a party -- or at least by the duties and pressures of public office.

No politician in recent American history has paid a higher professional price than Thomas F. Eagleton for falling victim to this twist on Emerson's aphorism. When it was revealed in the summer of 1972 that Eagleton had been hospitalized -- and undergone electroshock therapy -- for depression, the embattled U.S. Senator from Missouri abandoned his post as the Democratic Party's Vice Presidential nominee. A brief review of the Eagleton affair reminds us of the singular and salutary contributions that psychology makes to the study of politics and political leaders.

Tom Eagleton won election to the U.S. Senate in 1968. He was a rising star in his first term, but hardly a heavyweight. George McGovern, the 1972 Democratic Presidential nominee, plucked Eagleton as his running mate for several reasons -- not the least of which was that party stalwarts like Ted Kennedy and Walter Mondale had declined McGovern's offer. For his part, Eagleton was young, bright, Catholic, chummy with organized labor, and perceived as tough on law-and-order. And he said "Yes."

Compared to the violent protests that convulsed the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, the summer 1972 quadrennial affair in Miami was as calm as, well, summer in Miami. The real fireworks shot off after the convention. Within days of the Democrats' formal endorsement of the McGovern-Eagleton ticket, newspaper reports surfaced that Eagleton had undergone psychiatric treatment, including electroshock therapy.

After some foot-dragging, Eagleton came clean. On July 25, 1972, he disclosed that over the past dozen years he was hospitalized on three separate occasions (1960, 1964, and 1966) for bouts of nervous exhaustion and depression.

The story, predicted R.W. Apple, Jr. of *The New York Times* ("The Question Raised by Eagleton") on July 27, 1972, "may be a political event of the first magnitude or it may not." Such journalistic self-restraint did not linger for long. The Eagleton drama dominated the headlines and airwaves for an entire week until its fateful denouement. First the *New York Post*, then the *Washington Post* and the *Baltimore Sun*, and finally *The New York Times* called for Eagleton to step down. Navigating a course between sensitivity and cold political calculus, the *Times* editorialized that the Missourian should "unquestionably" continue his work in the U.S. Senate, but the Vice Presidency, with its peculiar demands, was a different kettle of fish: "The regrettable fact is that the state of scientific knowledge in the field of mental illness is not such that anyone can speak with certainty on [whether], as Senator McGovern has said, 'there is no one sounder in body, mind, and spirit' than his running mate." Eagleton suffered a few bruises to his character, too. Many sided with the *Times'* position that "Senator Eagleton was himself grievously at fault in not revealing his medical history to Mr. McGovern when the nomination was first offered" ("Candidate Eagleton," July 28).

Privately, George McGovern was incensed and bewildered. Incensed, because Eagleton had put him in a nasty predicament. Bewildered, because the issue of his running mate's suitability for office emerged like a bolt from the blue. Democrats expected to be battling Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew in the fall of 1972 -- not dueling with the skeletons in Tom Eagleton's closet.

Eagleton defended his non-disclosure on the grounds that he viewed it as part of the past -- as no more relevant to his qualifications for the Vice Presidency than a broken arm. This may be true. But it revealed, at a minimum, a gross political miscalculation by someone who had been around politics long enough to know how damaging such information could be if suddenly discovered, as opposed to willingly disclosed.

Even more harmful was how -- and how quickly -- the episode eroded McGovern's Presidential credibility. Critics lambasted him and his staff for failing to sniff out the Eagleton baggage in the first place. McGovern initially declared his

support for Eagleton "1,000 percent" (Theodore White, *The Making of the President*, 1972, p. 203) and then backpedaled when pressure mounted to replace the Missourian. Complicating matters further was Eagleton's insistence on plodding ahead, and the not-so-incidental fact that, legally, only Eagleton could remove himself from the ticket. Fairly or not, it all had become a litmus test as to how McGovern might respond to a crisis as President.

"It was," McGovern wrote in his 1977 autobiography, "the worst political week of the campaign or, indeed, of my political life" (*Grassroots: The Autobiography of George McGovern*, p. 205). Eagleton had surely arrived at the same conclusion. On July 31, 1972, he quit the ticket on the grounds that the brouhaha over his mental health imperiled the Democrats' chances for victory against Nixon-Agnew in November. But the genie could not be put back in the bottle. When, in the midst of the fray, McGovern phoned Dr. Karl Menninger for advice, the psychiatrist spelled out the awful dilemma. "Millions of Americans," he said, "are so frightened by mental illness that they will not support you for the Presidency in the knowledge that your Vice President has had a history of mental problems. On the other hand, if you now ask Senator Eagleton to resign from the ticket, millions of other Americans will turn against you for persecuting a man who has suffered mental instability" (*Grassroots*, p. 210). It was not only the most unforgivable, but the most unforeseeable, of political hiccups.

McGovern and his new running mate, Sargent Shriver, went through the motions of campaigning in the fall of 1972, but history's mold had been cast. The Democrats suffered a drubbing at the polls, as Nixon-Agnew coasted to a second term. "Either through a failure on my part to handle these developments with sufficient skill or through a failure of the press to discern the issue fairly," wrote McGovern years later, "the Eagleton affair destroyed any chance I had of being elected President in 1972" (*Grassroots*, p. 191).

Franklin Delano Roosevelt once famously noted that the Presidency was pre-eminently a place of moral leadership. The emergence of the Eagleton matter served as a necessary corrective: the Presidency was, first and foremost, pre-eminently a place of human leadership. A human being, subject to the frailties and ineptitudes of all human beings, sits in the Oval Office. And though Eagleton was not being elected President, he was asking voters to place him close enough to the position that his psychological health mattered enormously. 1972 might have been an election year when policy issues would have dominated: the economy, civil rights, Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union. Indeed, Eagleton hoped his resignation would bring such matters to the fore. But, even after his departure, news of the Missourian's mental health history lingered and irreversibly altered the political landscape.

Of course, questions as to the mental health and suitability of Presidential candidates was not new in 1972; indeed, Richard Nixon had faced such charges in 1968 and Barry Goldwater had endured them in 1964. What was new was that they stuck this time, forcing Americans to consider whether and at what cost persons with a history of mental health disorders should serve as President. George McGovern took pains in his July 31, 1972, news conference to convey that Eagleton's removal from the Democratic ticket was no indication "that anyone who has ever seen a psychiatrist is a second-class citizen" ("McGovern, Eagleton Statements and News Parley," *The New York Times*, August 1, 1972). But even at a time when most Americans conceded they would seek professional help for a mentally ill relative ("The Question") and when, by some estimates, 25 percent of Americans "suffered gusts of mental depression, instability, or incapability," retaining Eagleton as the Vice Presidential nominee was too much of a wager (*Making*, p. 198).

Presidential power has waxed and waned over the course of American history. Seldom had it reached greater heights than in the post-1945 decades. Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon all bestrode the world stage with enormous resources at their disposal. They could dip their ladle into what is sometimes called the Imperial Presidency -- a reservoir of immense Presidential power that eroded in the wake of the Vietnam and Watergate experiences. The Eagleton affair is often eclipsed in our collective memory by these larger tragedies, but it is no less instructive. To scholars toiling to understand the contours of American politics, the Eagleton affair is a powerful reminder of the limits of structural, systemic explanations and of the importance of psychological considerations. Any portrait of the past or prediction as to our future that ignores the centrality of individuals -- their uniqueness, their *Weltanschauung*, and even their psychoses -- does so at its peril.

Scott W. Webster, MA, Assistant Director

of the Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, is completing his doctoral dissertation on Spiro Agnew's Vice Presidency. He is a former James A. Finnegan Foundation Fellow, Pew Charitable Trusts Teaching Fellow, and Fellow of the Society for Values in Higher Education. Most recently, he is a co-author with James MacGregor Burns, Georgia J. Sorensen, and Robin Gerber, of <u>Dead Center: Clinton-Gore Leadership and the Perils of Moderation</u> (1999). He may be contacted at <Scott_Webster/FS/KSG%KSG@harvard.edu>. q

The Character of Hillary Clinton

Aubrey Immelman
St. John's University, Minn.

As Hillary Rodham Clinton runs for the Unites States Senate from New York State, issue**s** about her character abound. In this essay I will document some of the enduring personal characteristics that provide the empirical basis for my assessment of Hillary Clinton's dominant, ambitious personality pattern.

"Can you be a misanthrope and still love and enjoy some individuals? How about a compassionate misanthrope?" That enigmatic thought, expressed in the spring of 1967 by Wellesley sophomore Hillary Rodham in a letter to a friend, provides a valuable clue to the character of Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Last fall, my student Aví Bahadoor and I conducted a study of the political personality of Hillary Clinton. We collected personal data from published biographical materials and political reports, and synthesized these public records into a personality profile using the second edition of the Millon Inventory of Diagnostic Criteria (MIDC), which I adapted from the work of contemporary personality theorist Theodore Millon.

The evidence I have collected supports the hypothesis that Hillary Clinton fits what *Millon (Index of Personality Styles,* 1994) labels the ambitious and controlling type of political leader. His scale finds ambitious personalities to be self-assured, competitive, and bold people who readily assume leadership, while expecting others to acknowledge their unique qualities. It is common for them to feel entitled. Controlling or dominant personalities enjoy directing others from whom they expect respect and obedience. They often are ef-fective leaders, characterized by unsentimental, tough competitiveness. This amalgam of adaptive narcissism and dominance in Hillary Clinton's personality profile parallels the recollection of high school classmate Art Curtis, as quoted in Gail Sheehy, *Hillary's Choice (1999)*: "Hillary was very competitive at everything. Even pugnacious. She was very ambitious."

After interviewing many of Clinton's associates for a *New Yorker* article ("Hillary the pol," May 30, 1994), Connie Bruck concluded, "In the end, the sureness about her own judgment -- at its extreme, a sense that she alone is wise -- is probably Hillary's cardinal trait." Evident in Bruck's assessment is the dogmatic inflexibility characteristic of the cognitive style of highly conscientious, dominant personalities, tinged with the hubris of high ambition.

Commenting on the leadership implications of these traits, Stanley Renshon, in his 1996 book, *High Hopes* (winner of the American Political Science Association's Richard E. Neustadt Award in 1997 for the best book on the Presidency, and 1998 recipient of the Gradiva Award, presented by the National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis for the best biography that advances psychoanalysis), had this to say: "The view that one knows better than others -- period -- can lead to imperiousness and cause trouble in one's relations with others. It has done so in Hillary's case."

Renshon's contention seems to be borne out by Elizabeth Drew. In her book, *On the Edge* (1994), she wrote that Hillary Clinton's presence at health care meetings early in the Clinton Presidency was a "source of discomfort," with some attendees finding her "intimidating -- hard to argue with and uninterested in the points they made. Mrs. Clinton's style was very direct. She told people straight out what she thought.... Mrs. Clinton displayed a certain impatience. And her humor was biting."

Drew's reporting provides evidence of dominant behavior, but what evidence do we have that this is indicative of an enduring, consistent personality pattern rather than a situationally determined response simply reflecting Hillary Clinton's seriousness of purpose concerning comprehensive health care?

Childhood nicknames sometimes provide a useful index of an individual's ingrained, central personality traits. Among their mock predictions for seniors, Hillary Rodham's high school newspa-

per proclaimed that Hillary's destiny was to become a nun named "Sister Frigidaire." "Obviously," wrote celebrity biographer Norman King in *The Woman in the White House* (1996), "she was known for her ability to freeze anyone with a glare from her blue eyes."

Just how tough is Hillary? James Carville, in *All's Fair: Love, War, and Running for President* (1994), co-authored with Mary Matalin, put it like this: "Hillary won't run you down for fun, and she won't run into a ditch to avoid scratching your fender, but if you are blocking something we need to get done you'll get run over in a hurry."

Less folksy, if more gravely, Bob Woodward reported in *The Choice* (1996) that Hillary occasionally "snapped at people, even blew up, providing a momentary glimpse of inner rage. She seemed angry, bottled up. Hillary was smart and determined, knew what she wanted to happen. When she was focused and directed, she often seemed not to recognize when she was hurting people." As Gail Sheehy wrote, "Empathy was not characteristic of Hillary."

Lani Guinier, who once considered herself close to the Clintons, has written poignantly about this hurt. In "Who's afraid of Lani Guinier?" (*New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 27, 1994), she related how, when her nomination for attorney general began to founder, she received neither emotional nor logistical support from her "friends in the White House." She writes that Hillary Clinton first "breezed by" her in the West Wing "with a casual 'Hi, Kiddo'" and then, when someone tried to tell the First Lady that she was there to strategize on her nomination, Hillary "turned slightly and said, 'Oh'," and "to no one in particular, announced, 'I'm thirty minutes late for lunch'."

Millon proposes that the primary psychological precursor of an aggressive, controlling personality orientation is parental hostility. Sheehy describes Hillary's father, Hugh Rodham, as an "authoritarian drillmaster" who "neither offered nor asked for nurturing." "He was gruff and intolerant and also famously tightfisted: he shut off the heat in the house every night and turned a deaf ear to his children's complaints that they woke up freezing in the morning. *Toughen up* was the message." Sheehy writes that Hillary "tried hard ... to please her father." In *It Takes a Village* (1995), Hillary Clinton wrote, "When I brought home straight A's from junior high, my father's only comment was, 'Well Hillary, that must be an easy school you go to.'" Sheehy suggests that Hillary's

"drive toward perfection, her severe self-discipline and overwhelming need for control" are rooted in the tyranny of her father's "demand for perfection and his readiness to demean his daughter."

The foregoing touches primarily on Hillary Clinton's dominant traits. What do we know about her ambitiousness? In this regard, Renshon writes that "one aspect of Hillary Rodham's character" that stands out is her confidence in herself, her positions, and her work. Noting that both Bill and Hillary Clinton "are very ambitious and confident," but that Hillary's ambition "trumps her husband's," Renshon speculates that Hillary "appears to have developed ... boundary problems" stemming from "her strong self-confidence in the correctness of whatever she does," in contrast to her husband's "failure to develop strong internal boundaries." For both Clintons, the end result is a sense of entitlement -- "a tendency to not want to be bound by limits that apply to others."

It seems difficult to reconcile Hillary Clinton's personality profile with her "It takes a village" persona. Part of the problem may be that character can be difficult to discern beneath a polished political persona. In one sense, Clinton has learned to soften publicly, as Bruck puts it, what others have viewed as the "hard edges" of her nature. But more importantly, clear perception of Hillary's character can be easily confounded by her embrace of humanitarian political issues as a vehicle for political expression. Had she remained a Goldwater Republican and subscribed to the agenda of, say, a Margaret Thatcher, the character traits that drive her political ambitions might well have been more transparent. The point is that character largely remains a constant, even as ideological values change.

Aví Bahadoor, a biology/premed major at the College of St. Benedict, assisted with the data collection for this paper. r

Gender Stereotypes and Elizabeth Dole's 1999 Candidacy

Karen Callaghan
University of Massachusetts
and
Frauke Schnell
West Chester University

Although women are playing a much more significant role in politics than in the past, no woman has yet become President, or even Vice President, of the United States. Geraldine Ferraro's nomination for Vice President in 1984 was the closest a woman has ever come to the Presidency. We find this surprising because women have been elected to lead in much more conservative and traditional societies. Those who come to mind are: India's Indira Ghandi, Israel's Golda Meir, the Philippines' Corazon Aquino, and Sri Lanka's Sirimavo Bandaranaike. As Texas Republican U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison remarked, "If Pakistan's Benazir Bhutto can get elected to prime minister [of], Good Heavens, a Muslim country!, I really think we are big enough to handle [a woman President]."

The U.S. Presidency remains a "bastion of maleness," in which female candidates are interpreted through the lens of gender. Barriers arising from gender stereotypes -- the unique way female candidates are viewed and evaluated by the electorate -- are probably the most important obstacles to electing a woman as President. In this essay we will discuss the way in which gender stereotypes of women contributed to the failure of Elizabeth Dole's candidacy for President, prevented her from breaking the political glass ceiling of the American Presidency.

Long-standing public perceptions of women as best in domestic roles restrains female motivation to run and intensifies society's reluctance to see female politicians as suitable for highest national office. Estimates of how *a* woman candidate will perform in office are based on our attitudes and feelings about women as a *group*, rather than on individuating information, such as the candidate's actual policy positions and personal characteristics. In the 1950s and 1960s, popular belief was that a woman's place was in the home, not in the Oval Office. Today, women are still more likely than men to be perceived in terms of their domestic roles such as caring for family. Women are seen as cooperative, kind, passive, gentle, warm, compassionate, and emotional. They are not seen as decisive leaders who are strong, competent, analytical, or determined -- all criteria the electorate seek in a Presidential candidate. It is the latter characteristics which are associated with handling fiscal responsibilities and matters of national security and defense -- foreign policy, trade, defense, taxes, the budget, and farm and high-tech issues. Instead, female candidates are seen as better at dealing with "women's issues": health care, day care, poverty, civil rights, and education.

Thus, voters appear to have been predisposed to view Elizabeth Dole's candidacy through the lens of gender. Stereotypes are readily activated under "low information" conditions notoriously true of elections. Knowing relatively little about Dole, the public could not counteract stereotypical information. Further, she was unable to maintain a public perception independently of her husband, former Presidential candidate Bob Dole. (This point was made about Hillary Rodham Clinton in Paul Elovitz's comparison of the family histories of Bill Clinton and Bob Dole, "Work, Laughter, and Tears," *Journal of Psychohistory*, September, 1996.)

Poll data from the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (March and July, 1999) supports our contention that voters simply derived Dole's policy positions from gender stereotypes rather than paying attention to her actual statements about policy positions. When Americans were asked to describe their impressions of Elizabeth Dole, few respondents mentioned the most crucial Presidential qualities: leadership and competence. Instead, the top five characteristics Americans used to describe Dole were "intelligent," "strong," "good," "smart," and "all right." This is not a very good profile for a woman positioning herself to compete for the American Presidency. Even the "intelligence" descriptors were more of the "good-head-on-her-shoulders" variety. Dole was seen as "unique," because she graduated from Harvard Law School -- although all her male competitors were also Ivy Leaguers. Despite the equivalency of all her qualifications to those of her male rivals, it was her educational background that stood out in people's minds.

Public perceptions of Dole's policy statements centered on "compassion issues," such as: education, social welfare, family values, and women's rights. Few respondents referred to Dole's foreign policy positions. Some made reference to "Viagra" which her husband was associ-

ated with taking and being a spokesman for. (As Paul Elovitz notes, "Negatives are often split off and projected onto the spouse.") Others highlighted the fact that Dole was President of the American Red Cross, a "sharp dresser" and "better looking than any other candidate," as well as Bob Dole's wife. Gender even played an overt role as some asserted that America was "not ready for a female President" while others made even more derogatory comments like "it's tea time." Her significant political experience as the executive director of the President's Commission for Consumer Interests (1968-1971), member of the Federal Trade Commission (1973-1980), Secretary of Transportation (1983-1987), and Secretary of Labor (1989-1991) was ignored. Despite her actual qualifications and impressive résumé, she was seen as a political neophyte.

Dole waged a combative election campaign with a clear policy agenda. She supported tough gun control policies, told conservative Republicans that abortion should not dominate the Presidential campaign, and while in Kosovo argued that NATO should use strong military force to win the war in Yugoslavia. Her campaign literature was decisive. On China, she proposed a "two-track policy" to "push for open markets" and develop "innovative political reforms." She favored a strong "post-Cold War buildup of military weapons" and "quick deployment of an SDI missile defense system." In short, while Dole took stands on salient national policy issues with broad electoral appeal, a woman who expresses such issue positions usually invites disbelief.

Her husband, Bob Dole, did little to dispel traditional gender-biased myths about her candidacy, taking an almost paternal approach to her campaign. In an interview with *The New York Times* he noted that she might need help sorting out the issues, and he would be willing to "direct her" if asked. Though he may have said this in a joking manner, it still undercut his wife.

Negative bias in press coverage of female candidates for the U.S. Senate is well documented. In *Women as Candidates in American Politics* (1994), Susan J. Carroll notes that press coverage of women in Congress is "lacking any sense that women are important players on legislation other than women's health, abortion, and a handful of other social issue concerns." Female candidates are not given the opportunity to demonstrate their expertise on issues where the public needs to see it. To the public's mind, leadership positions on so-

cial issues don't count. Even incumbent women are portrayed as less viable political contenders than their male counterparts. They are often asked fewer substantive and more gender-based questions.

Media portrayal of Elizabeth Dole's candidacy also reinforced gender typecasting. For example, reporters repeatedly asked what her husband thought about her running -- a question they did not often ask male candidates about their spouses. A *Buffalo News* headline read, "A Question of Leadership is on the Table." Political cartoons depicted her as "pretty." An article in *The New York Times*, "In Straw Poll, Dole Got Help from Her Sisters," neglected her policy positions, focusing on her affiliation with a women's sorority, Delta Delta Delta. Meanwhile, a *U.S. News and World Report* article, "Psst, Bob Dole Beats his Wife," highlighted the problems the "rookie campaigner" was having with husband Bob. Finally, a *Daily News* editorial read, "Libby Without Tears -- Money was part of it, but the real reason her campaign tanked was that Dole was a candidate without substance."

Like most women candidates in the U.S., Elizabeth Hanford Dole was perceived through the lens of gender, by both the electorate and the news media. Even though pervasive gender stereotypes result in biased perceptions of all the Presidential candidates, these perceptions often work to men's advantage. Although Elizabeth Dole stressed toughness and aggressiveness -- a strategy that should have helped overcome negative voter stereotypes -- her opponents clamored to make her appear warm, gentle, sympathetic, passive, and flighty: "typically female." She could not minimize her "female" qualities and convince voters and the media that she could handle traditionally "male" issues, such as defense, the economy, and Big Business. Partly because society needs to stereotype by thinking in rigid, oversimplified categories, or unambiguous terms where everything is black and white, Dole was judged ill-suited as an equal player in the political arena so long dominated by men. She was seen as deviating most from an "ideal" politician, particularly one wishing to hold the highest national office.

Electoral trends in the U.S. seem to be moving in a favorable direction for women. But even if institutional barriers to education, employment, and income are eliminated, female candidates seeking office, especially at the national level, must still contend with voter stereotypes.

We are confident, however, that women will eventually break the ultimate glass ceiling, that of the American Presidency.

Karen Callaghan, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, specializing in political psychology/behavior, methodology, and media politics. She has published in various venues including the Journal of Politics and Public Integrity. She may be reached at <kjmcallaghan@yahoo.com>.

Frauke Schnell, PhD, is Associate Professor of Political Science at West Chester State University of Pennsylvania, specializing in media politics, political psychology, and women in politics. Her publications have appeared in Polit-ical Communication, Political Research Quarterly, Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, and Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior. She may be reached at <fschnell@wcupa.edu>. q

Elizabeth Dole and America's Second Woman President

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

The early failure of Elizabeth Hanford Dole's Presidential campaign disappointed but did not surprise me. Despite Libby Dole's impressive résumé, she did not fit the profile of the candidate about to break the gender barrier. She did not present herself as a woman who was tougher than the men (Margaret Thatcher and Golda Meir are the prototypes), nor was she the wife, daughter, or widow of a revered or martyred leader (such as India's Indira Ghandi, Sri Lanka's Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Pakistan's Benazir Bhutto, and the Philippines' Corazon Aquino). Although being wounded in World War II may have helped Dole's husband, Bob, obtain the Republican Vice Presidential nomination in 1976 and the Presidential nomination in 1996, it neither got him elected nor rubbed off on her Presidential bid.

Elizabeth Dole's sugary North Carolina accent reflects another time and place, but does not help her break down stereotypes about female politicians. Her sweet manner of speech made her more acceptable to Presidents Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush who appointed her to important political posts. It fit their stereotypes, which included a belief that bright, hard-driving, powerful, and ambitious women should hide these traits behind a feminine veneer. Thus, what helped strengthen her résumé also weakened her in the eyes of voters looking for the first woman President. Heading the American Red Cross and being married to a partially disabled man also put her in a "caring role" associated with women.

Pioneering women who have achieved presidential power in a democracy without being stand-ins for men have done so by being stronger and tougher than the men. In Israel, they liked to joke that Golda Meir was the only one in the cabinet with "balls" and David Ben-Gurion used to say that Meir was "the best man" in his cabinet. Margaret Thatcher was unquestionably Britain's most combative Prime Minister since the younger Churchill. Both women were tested by war and assassination attempts, as were Bandaranaike and Gandhi. Bhutto was forced from office.

The testing of women in administrative and political positions is not something that I have observed only from afar as a scholar and a citizen. Early in my academic career, I worked alongside the first woman administrator in my educational institution. The administrative "boys club" never found her acceptable, with the result that her department suffered a lack of resources and ultimate extinction.

The first woman academic vice president under whose auspices I worked was a Harvard-trained European historian of some distinction. (She had also been an attendee at Erik Erikson's Well Fleet Seminars and joined the psychohistory group I was leading at the time.) In the midst of a financial crisis, she was ordered to eliminate a department and detenure faculty. Though she proved how "tough" she was by carrying out her assignment, the stressful situation she was forced into brought on a recurrence of her cancer. Shortly afterwards she died. (This dying woman hardly missed any time from work as she showed "the guys" that she could take the pressure.) In retrospect I felt strongly that the detenuring was unnecessary from an economic standpoint because, when all was said and done, those who were detenured were given other jobs at the university.

It is noteworthy that the second generation of female academic administrators has not had to face unusual testing for their offices. At the present time, virtually all of the major administrative officers at my college are women.

All recent American Presidents from Franklin Roosevelt through George Bush have listed military experience on their resume as a way of establishing that they were tough enough to do the job. Much of the abuse that Bill Clinton endured in the early years of his Presidency stems from distrust of a man who did not prove his toughness by serving in the military. After a string of Presidents with military experience, his draft evasion and anti-war activities added insult to injury in the eyes of many, especially male, voters. Elizabeth Dole has no such military experience, which greatly weakened her candidacy.

Norway, Ireland, and other smaller European countries not likely to engage in war, do not have to worry about having a military leader as president. This makes the decision to elect female presidents much easier for voters. However, the U.S. President-as-war-leader is still part of the job description in the country that remains the world's only superpower. No one should underestimate the need for American Presidential candidates to appear tough to be elected. This makes it likely that the first woman President will be someone who does not appear to be a sweet-talking Southern woman, but rather a politician tougher than her male counterparts, modeled on Thatcher or Meir.

Though Elizabeth Dole did not have the right public persona to come close to victory in the Presidential sweepstakes, other women may not be far from achieving the Presidency. Recent American Presidents have often overcome traditional political wisdom to gain the highest office in the land. In the last 40 years, conventional political wisdom said that a Catholic, a Southerner, a divorced man, or someone who had not served in the military could not be elected to the highest office. In 1960 John Kennedy overcame the barrier against a Catholic as President, in 1976 Jimmy Carter demonstrated that a Southerner could be elected, in 1980 Ronald Reagan proved that divorce was no barrier, and in 1992 Bill Clinton showed that one need not have served in the military to occupy the White House.

A pool of women is forming who are developing the drive and résumés for one of them to become the highest leader in the land. I am encouraged by watching some high school girls look at their leaders with the same look of awe that 15-year-old Billy Clinton gave President Kennedy when they met in a public ceremony in 1963. Viewing women governors and senators at the political conventions this summer leads me to think

that some of these individuals may be ready to succeed in the Presidential sweepstakes in my lifetime. Some like Christine Whitman and Dianne Feinstein are developing strong résumés, but it remains to be seen if they have the fire in the belly for the job.

In fact, I most enthusiastically await the second American woman President, while worrying about the pressures put upon the first woman President. While the first woman President will be pressured to prove that she is tougher than the men, subsequent women Presidents will be able to bring the special attributes of their gender to the job and, if we are fortunate, disinclined to play the traditional male war games. I wish them all well in the complex and difficult business of leadership.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is Co-Director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidents and Presidential Candidates. q

Political Dreaming: Correlations Between Dream Content and Political Beliefs

Kelly Bulkeley
Santa Clara University

The correlations between dream content and political beliefs has fascinated me to the point where I began researching the subject in 1992. My approach to political psychology has been strongly influenced by D. W. Winnicott's notion of "transitional phenomena" and his suggestion in an intriguing essay, "Some Thoughts on the Meaning of the Word *Democracy*," that politics is a type of transitional space in which people literally "play out" their deepest hopes, fears, desires, and concerns. Winnicott suggests in other writings that dreaming is also a kind of transitional space (see Chapter 6 of my work, *Visions of the Night: Dreams, Religion, and Psychology*, 1999), so my effort to correlate dreaming and politics has the Winnicottian justification that because they are both realms of transitional experience, findings from one realm can cast light on features of the other.

My study of people's dreams during the 1992 U.S. Presidential election (see Chapter 10 of *Among All These Dreamers: Essays on Dreams*

and Modern Society) found that people from many different backgrounds and political orientations had dreams directly relating to that year's election campaign. I asked a group of 12 people to keep a dream journal from October 25 to November 8, which happened to be the two weeks straddling the 1992 election. Six of the 12 people had dreams relating to the election; of the 113 total reported dreams, nine made some reference to the election. In addition to these 12 journal keepers, I gathered politically-related dreams from a number of others during the 1992 and 1996 election campaigns. These were sorted by theme and content into three broad groups: *political cartoons of the mind*, *personal symbols*, and *new political perspectives*.

 Political cartoons of the mind are dreams expressing in succinct and sometimes very humorous ways the dreamer's waking life political perspective. Here's an example from a 36-year-old man from Florida: "I'm playing golf with Bill Clinton. I've heard people say he cheats and I understand what they mean because he frequently improves the lie of his ball. But he encourages the people he's playing with to do the same. He says, 'It's just a game, and just for fun!'" This dreamer enthusiastically voted for Clinton in 1992, but in 1996, when he had this dream, he wasn't sure if he would vote for Clinton in the upcoming election. The dreamer saw the golf imagery as an expression of his concern that President Clinton is a "cheater" who frequently "improves his lies" and then tries to smooth talk other people into letting him get away with it.

 The next category is of dreams using political figures of politicians as *personal symbols* to express strong emotions that the dreamer is feeling toward some matter in his or her waking life. For example, a 55-year-old woman from New Mexico dreamt: "I'm back in college, in one of the classrooms, and Bill Clinton is one of the students. Then he's the teacher, and he asks me how alcohol manufacturers get us to drink so much. I say I haven't given the question much thought." This dreamer had long struggled with alcoholism, and in her dream she sees the President as voice of "executive authority" within her, a voice that is prompting her to think more carefully about why she drinks.

 New political perspectives dreams directly call into question the dreamer's waking life political attitudes, leading the dreamer to think anew about his or her accustomed beliefs about a politician or a political issue. A 44-year-old man from

New York stated: "I'm on a camping trip with the President and his party in a heavily wooded area. Suddenly, Clinton darts up a hill into the woods. He sees a bear approaching the camping area. None of us moves, as the President confronts the bear; Clinton is very expert and competent as he does this, not wild or frightened. He manages to drive the huge bear, the size of a grizzly, into a snare set for him. The FBI in the entourage are angry at the close call, but the President seems unperturbed." This dreamer said that he had always been skeptical of Bill Clinton's leadership qualities, but he awoke from this dream surprised by Clinton's swift, assertive, and fearless response to the threat of the huge bear. As a result of his dream, this man reconsidered his generally dim view of Clinton's executive abilities, wondering if he had been overlooking the President's skills as a fighter.

 Using content analysis of 1996-1997 dreams, in my present research I am trying to build on those earlier findings by taking a different approach to the general question of dreaming and politics. Beginning in the fall of 1996 (immediately after the Presidential campaign between Bill Clinton, Bob Dole, and Ross Perot), I began gathering the most recent dream reports from college undergraduates of varying political persuasions. In addition to writing down their most recent dreams, I asked the students a series of questions about their political beliefs and activities: Were they registered to vote? If so, in which party? Did they vote in the election? If so, for whom? How would they describe their political views: as conservative, liberal, moderate, or other? How did they feel toward each of the three main candidates?

 I then analyzed the content of those dreams using the Calvin Hall and Robert Van de Castle scales for characters, social interactions, emotions, and misfortunes, along with a revised good fortunes scale. ["Good fortunes" is when something good, beneficial, or miraculous happens through no deliberate action of the dreamer or another character.] I separately analyzed the answers to the political questions, and divided the students into four ideological groups: *Right* (generally conservative, Republican, voted for Dole), *Left* (generally liberal, Democrat, voted for Clinton), *disenchanted* (belonging to third party and/or disgusted with all mainstream politicians), and *center* (generally moderates, Independents, didn't vote). Because "*center*" was a kind of definitional grab bag, I did not further analyze these dreams. The findings

thus far are sufficient to suggest that certain correlations between dream content and political beliefs do exist and are worth further investigation.

Men with political views on the Right (generally Republican, conservative, voted for Dole) had dreams with a high percentage of negative emotions (fear, sadness, and anger), an unusually low percentage of friendly social interactions, and no family members as characters.

Men with political views on the Left (generally Democratic, liberal, voted for Clinton) had dreams with a high percentage of happy fantasies and wish-fulfilling scenarios (evidenced by emotions in the low negative, low aggressor, high befriender range), often involving female characters in romantic and sexual situations. Many of the dreams portrayed the dreamer in an explicitly moral struggle, as a "good guy" fighting against "bad guys."

Men who are disenchanted with conventional politics (either belonging to a third party, indifferent to politics generally, or scornful of all politicians) had dreams characterized by remarkable power, ability, and self-confidence (partly indicated by their high good fortunes and aggressor percentages), involving a relatively high percentage of female characters. Even in potentially frightening dream scenarios (a fistfight, a police interrogation) these men maintained strong control over their experiences.

Women on the political Right had many dreams in which they were trying to help a friend or family member deal with some kind of threat. There were no positive romantic themes in their dreams (the one sexual interaction involved kissing an ex-boyfriend, which left the dreamer feeling disgusted upon awakening), and many of the dreams involved something that was disturbing or upsetting.

Women on the political Left also had many dreams with themes of helping and caring and of fair treatment generally. They had a high male characters percentage, and a high percentage of good fortunes involving unusual intuitions and extrasensory perceptions.

Women who are disenchanted with conventional politics had dreams with unusually bizarre content (distorted settings, magical happenings, or animal characters). They were often alone or socially distinct in some way, and their dreams commonly involved the ability to see or know things other characters could not perceive.

These findings raise several questions. First and foremost, what do such correlations mean? What exactly is the link between dream content and political beliefs? A measure of understanding is achieved by bringing Winnicott's notion of "transitional phenomena" back into the discussion. Both dream content and political beliefs are types of transitional phenomena involving the creative interaction of a person's inner psychic reality with his or her outer public reality. Dreaming and politics lie at opposite ends of the spectrum: dreaming is a developmentally early transitional phenomenon that is more oriented toward inner reality while politics is a developmentally later transitional phenomenon that is more oriented toward outer reality. The fundamental link between them is their giving symbolic expression to a person's deepest hopes, fears, concerns, and conflicts. They are both realms in which people are able to freely voice their strongest feelings, greatest worries, and most cherished ideals.

Seen in this light, the findings I have just outlined can be interpreted as follows:

People on the political Right have dreams expressing a much darker, more danger-filled portrait of human nature and society. This reflects their inclination to right-of-center political views, which emphasize a "traditional" approach to morality and a "realistic" attitude toward law, economics, and international relations.

People on the political Left tend to have dreams that portray remarkably hopeful and optimistic views of themselves and the world. This reflects the attraction they feel to left-of-center politics, which offer "progressive" visions of possibility, progress, and social harmony.

People who are disenchanted with conventional politics tend to have dreams involving remarkable power, strength, and independence. This reflects their forceful rejection of ordinary political ideas and their interest in alternative ideologies and different ways of looking at society.

In each case the dream content and the political beliefs share the same basic emotional and cognitive patterns. In Winnicott's terms, they share the same distinctive dynamics of the individual's experiences in transitional space.

To end on a provocative note, let me suggest what these research findings on the dreams of people on the Left and Right imply in my mind for the two major Presidential candidates, Al Gore and George W. Bush, as they try to connect more

deeply with the concerns, ideals, desires, and "dreams" of American voters.

Al Gore needs to arouse and inspire the idealistic optimism of people on the Left while acknowledging and responding to the anxieties of people on the Right.

George W. Bush needs to demonstrate the moral strength and forcefulness that people on the Right wish for in their leaders at the same time as he shows respect for the deeply progressive yearnings of people on the Left.

We will see on November 7 who has been the more effective "dream campaigner."

Kelly Bulkeley, PhD, teaches at Santa Clara University and the Graduate Theological Union. He is author most recently of Transforming Dreams (2000) and Visions of the Night: Dreams, Religion, and Psychology (1999). Bulkeley is actively pursuing his ongoing research project to expand his collection of dreams in which political figures appear as characters and his data base of recent dream reports and political beliefs questionnaires. Any suggestions or contributions from other scholars would be greatly appreciated. He can be contacted at <kellybulkeley@earthlink.net>. q

---

Gamwell's Dream Book

J. Donald Hughes
University of Denver

Review of Lynn Gamwell, ed., Dreams 1900-2000: Science, Art, and the Unconscious Mind (Cornell Studies in the History of Psychiatry). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000. ISBN: 080143730X, pp. 304, illus. 100 color and 500 black and white, $50.00.

This book, and the exhibition it accompanied, are commemorations of the one-hundredth anniversary of Sigmund Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*. It is an unusual exhibit catalog, however, indeed it may not be an exhibit catalog at all, but a dream in its own way. It is itself an exhibit containing carefully selected images inspired by dreams in the plastic, performing, and cinematic arts of the 20th century. It contains three major sections. The first consists of essays of very different length, purpose, and tone, illustrated by photographs of the art forms discussed; the more scientific essays are accompanied by diagrams. The

second is the sumptuous "Gallery" of more than 150 works of art in color and black and white relating to dreams and dreaming. The third is an alphabetical "Dream Archive" containing some 500 small black and white photographs, with references to those included elsewhere in the text.

The foreword, by August Ruhs, M.D., of the Universitätsklinik für Tiefenpsychologie und Psychotherapie, Vienna, defines the vast importance of the insights contained in Freud's book. "It was precisely on the basis of dream interpretation that Freud was able to develop, for the first time, an aesthetic and rhetoric of the unconscious" (p. 9). Several of the following essays also remark upon the "language of dreams."

Lucy Daniels, of the Lucy Daniels Foundation, Raleigh, NC, provides a preface, "Dreams in Pursuit of Art," which includes a personal memoir of the way in which a dream freed her of writer's block and provided energy for a period of creative activity.

The keystone essay is "The Muse Is Within: The Psyche in the Century of Science," by Lynn Gamwell, director of the Art Museum at the State University of New York, Binghamton, who organized the exhibit and edited the volume. Her article combines dream-related aspects of the history of art and the history of psychology in the 20th century in a remarkable tour de force. She approaches art in the widest sense, including literature, painting, sculpture, dance, drama, film, and video. (Her choice of selections for the gallery section of the book is similarly eclectic, with the exception of literature.)

Beginning with the state of psychology and neurology in 1900, which she attempts to show was under the major influence of Darwin's thought, she proceeds to trace the braiding of psychoanalysis and art through the century, with balanced attention to the theories of Freud, Carl Jung, Jacques Lacan, and others. Schools of art such as the symbolists and surrealists receive due attention.

Other intellectual currents, such as the philosophy of phenomenology and James George Frazer's study of mythology, receive attention, if all too brief. This reviewer was particularly interested in her analysis of Jung's influence on the dancer-choreographer Martha Graham. The author concludes with the impact of scientific discoveries in the second half of the century: REM sleep, DNA, neuroscience, and the computer.

But all that is a lot for an essay which is

only 43 pages long, with space, albeit well-deserved, devoted to many illustrations, so that throughout, Gamwell can only summarize and indicate fruitful fields of possible further study of the relationship of dreams to art and psychoanalysis.

Ernest Hartmann, M.D., of the Tufts University School of Medicine, follows with "The Psychology and Physiology of Dreaming: A New Synthesis." He reviews the work of recent sleep researchers, concluding that while the biology of REM sleep is important, it does not provide a complete explanation of dreaming, since dreaming occurs in several states outside REM sleep. Hartmann's synthesis is based on his perception that dreams picture emotions, and are very good at making connections between images and emotional states. He maintains that more focused activities, such as reading, writing, and computation (the "Three R's"), almost never occur in dreams. This reviewer, who has a recurring dream of visiting a library and consulting old tomes there, must conclude that he is one of Hartmann's exceptions.

The last essay, by Donald Kuspit of the State University of New York, Stony Brook, is entitled "From Vision to Dream: The Secularization of the Imagination." He sees the 20th century as a period of the debunking of both religion and dreams, and of the connection between them. In the 19th century, romanticism affected the art derived from dreams, and William Blake could portray religion as a sun that illuminated life, even in dreams. Freud, as Kuspit quotes him, was happy to live in the basement or at most the mundane first floor of human life, from which that sun was rarely visible. Dreams, in our day, take place mainly in the dark. "'DREAM,'" says Kuspit, "is the name of another backstreet of art."

The 122-page Gallery of art related to dreams that follows is, however, no backstreet. In fact, it argues well for recognizing the art of dreams as a major 20th-century theme. The reproductions are of fine size, color, and quality, and the selection is for the most part excellent. There are many full-page photographs, reproduced paintings, and engravings. Films are represented by a series of selections of stills. These dream images are a delight to the eye and stimulation to the mind. This reviewer caught himself about to say that it would make a wonderful coffee-table book (it is of the appropriate size), but given the subject, it should probably be recommended as a night-table book.

The Dream Archive at the back of the book is a reference work of considerable value, although it is not exhaustive, as the editor admits. There is also a fine listing of films with dream themes, each with thumbnail summaries appended. This will be an aspect of the book useful to teachers of courses on film, or who use film in the study of psychohistory.

Anyone interested in the aesthetics of dreams in the 20th century would be well advised to invest in this attractive and thought-provoking book.

J. Donald Hughes is John Evans Professor and Chair of the Department of History at the University of Denver. He has a research interest in the history of dreams and has written several articles on dreams in the ancient world for the Journal of Psychohistory *and* **Clio's Psyche***. His most recent article, "Dream Interpretation in Ancient Civilizations," was published in the March, 2000, issue of* Dreaming*. He is a past president of the C.G. Jung Society of Colorado. Another of his interests is environmental history; he is the author of* Pan's Travail: Environmental Problems of the Ancient Greeks and Romans *(1996) and is editor of* The Face of the Earth: Environment and World History *(2000), along with other books and articles. He and his wife, Pam, live and teach in Denver when they are not traveling to distant climes. He may be reached at* <dhughes@du.edu>. q

Applying Ullman's Dream Methodology

Robert Rousselle
Independent Scholar

Review of Montague Ullman and Claire Limmer, The Variety of Dream Experience: Expanding our Ways of Working with Dreams, *Second Edition. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1999. Paperback, ISBN 079144256X, pp. xiv & 280, $20.95.*

Rare is the book that appeals both intellectually and emotionally to the reader, that generates reflection and excitement on successive pages. Most academic books (the kind I love to read and review) often stimulate the mind with new insights or approaches to a specific field, but they never emotionally grab the reader. Any thoughts or ideas applicable to the life or research of the reader are tangential to the book, and often one will become

so lost in those thoughts that it will be several minutes before one realizes that he/she has read the last few pages uncomprehendingly. With Ullman and Limmer the "read" is different. The tone is conversational in many of the pieces; there is an almost total absence of jargon and a lucidity with which the process of dream work is explained. The book generates an intellectual interest in a useful technique for understanding dreams and the emotional response of considering participation in it. This is a revised, second edition of the 1987 book. The new edition includes some revised or expanded chapters, along with three new ones. Regrettably, a couple were dropped, about which I will write more below.

The basis of the book is the experiential dream group process, which is a group approach to dream work, devised by Ullman that enables people to better understand their dreams. Ullman recognizes the vulnerability of the dreamer sharing his/her dream with the group, and a *Safety Factor* is built into the process, which ensures that the dreamer maintains control of the dream. Also built into the process is *the Discovery Factor*, by which the group helps the dreamer learn about the dream and his/her self. The process begins with a person volunteering a dream, which members of the group then make their own and upon which they project their own moods and emotions. The group then relates the imagery of the dream to possible life concerns. The *Safety Factor* comes into play as the dreamer is free to accept or disregard any interpretation. The dreamer is then free to show the extent to which his/her understanding of the dream has been increased by the group's suggestions. Further discussion elucidates recent events and emotions that underlie the dream, after which the dream is read back. Aspects of the dream that the dreamer does not understand can be the subject of further discussion.

Throughout this usually fascinating process, stress is on the *Safety Factor*. Feeling in control of the process frees the energies of the dreamer to probe more deeply into the dream. The process is not only intellectually intriguing, but also appears to be emotionally satisfying. Those who have never participated in any dream group, and who might be reluctant to relate much of a personal nature, would find this technique appealing.

The next two chapters of this part of the book relate other examples of how the group dream work helps the dreamer, illustrating further applications of the method. The chapter by Nan Zimmerman was especially moving. She dealt with issues such as the loss of a child by suicide and the dreams of an elderly woman as death approached. Most striking was Zimmerman's own dream enabling her to face up to the sexual abuse perpetrated years before by a trusted minister, confiding the story to her husband and a few close friends, and eventually confronting the minister. Her narration of the dream and her struggle with it, and her courage in writing about it, exemplify her beautiful metaphor, that "(d)reams are seedpods in which the seeds of the past and the plantings of the future are encased. When we crack them open, reseeding of life can begin again."

The third chapter, by Jenny Dodd, deals with a dream group of mothers, many with young children and all but one new to America. Dodd shows how the experiential dream group refreshed and healed, enabling them to face themselves and the world in which they lived.

The second and largest part of the book shows how the procedure has been successfully used in other disciplines. Its use in academia is explored by Deborah Jay Hillman for anthropology, Richard Jones for creative writing, Edward Storm in computer and information science, and John Wiske in political science. All demonstrate to varying degrees how talking about dreams in conjunction with their course work can help students better comprehend the subject, thereby enriching their understanding of it and themselves. Two chapters, by John Walsh and Sven Hedenrud, show the viability of the experiential dream group process in ministerial and pastoral duties. Especially touching is Walsh's dream, which when explicated in its religious context reveals the sum of a lifetime of faith and his struggle with his own darkness.

It is here that I must register a major disappointment. Two chapters from the first edition, dealing with historical dreams, one by Don Hughes on ancient dreams and the other by Paul Elovitz on more modern material, were deleted from the second edition by the publisher. As a historian I regret the decision, and considering the popularity of psychohistory one might have hoped that at least one of the chapters would have been retained.

The third part of the book discusses the application of the experiential dream group in psychology and psychiatry. Inge Widlund, trained in both traditional psychoanalytic group therapy as well as the experiential dream group, addresses the contrasting techniques and goals of each field. The

author concludes that the appreciation of dreams and the way members of the experiential dream group "play" with dream images, symbols, and metaphors, could be usefully appropriated by the therapist leading a psychoanalytic group therapy session. It is followed by a very poignant account by Claire Limmer, relating feelings of youthful isolation and adult loss, plus the subsequent onset of cancer, and the healing properties of the dream work. It left her "stronger in the years that followed, more peaceful than I have ever been, and well."

Ullman and Limmer join in a chapter concerning dreams and clinical work, how the group process can be applied to one-on-one psychotherapy. The seven premises of dream work which are applicable to the practice of psychotherapy are discussed by Ullman, after which Limmer documents their effectiveness with examples from her own practice. The final chapter by Ullman argues that although dreams are personal, they also have a social component. They comment not only on individual problems and concerns, but the societal area as well. At this point Dr. Ullman suggests the need for a sociology of dreams, which complements and expands on his remarks in a recent article in this journal, "A Sociology of Dreams?" (**Clio's Psyche**, September, 1998, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 41-43).

The observant reader will quickly note the difference between Freud's and Ullman's methods of dream work. For Freud, the dream was the road to reach the unconscious, to understand one's neuroses. Through free association, Freud and his patient would go beyond the manifest content to the latent, no matter how harrowing or painful, even potentially alienating, to the dreamer. Ullman restored to importance the feelings and emotions of the manifest content of the dream, which reveals much of our fears and desires, relationships and animosities. Furthermore, it is done in a manner that ensures feelings of safety on the part of the dreamer. Rather than the doctor/patient relationship of one-on-one psychotherapy or the often confrontational nature of group therapy, the experiential dream group acts as a support system and focuses on helping the dreamer understand his dream in a safe, nurturing manner.

The authors and the dreamers whose dreams they relate resemble Freud in their courage, as they unreservedly share their dreams (some of a very personal and revealing nature) with the reader. Through this method, they document the beneficial and healing aspect of the experiential dream group. As the various chapters demonstrate, this technique is applicable to a wide variety of situations: pedagogical, ministerial, and therapeutic, as well as for anyone interested in understanding his or her dreams.

Robert Rousselle, PhD, an ancient historian and independent scholar, frequently writes about dreams in these pages. q

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 51).

Presidential Historian and Research Psychologist: Herbert Barry, III

Herbert Barry, III, was born in New York City in 1930 and grew up in Cambridge and then Brookline, Mass. After receiving a BA in social relations from Harvard College, he was awarded MS (1953) and PhD (1957) degrees in psychology by Yale University. He continued in psychology at Yale as a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow 1957-1959 and research faculty member 1959-1961. He was an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Connecticut at Storrs in 1961-1963 and a Research Associate Professor in the Department of Pharmacology, University of Pittsburgh School of Pharmacy 1963-1970. In 1970 he was promoted to full professor.

Beginning in 1952 Barry carried out cross-cultural research on child training and other social customs based on a world sample of more than 100 diverse human societies. He also published several articles on the birth order of schizophrenics and alcoholics. His principal research from 1957 until 1987 was on pre-clinical psychopharmacology, testing effects of various psychoactive drugs on behavior of laboratory animals. He received a Research Scientist Development Award 1967-1977 from the National Institute of Mental Health and a Distinguished

Scientist Award from the Society for the Stimulus Properties of Drugs in 1986. Professor Barry has published quite extensively in many areas. Since 1979 he has been active in psychohistory research. In 1990-1992 he served as vice president and president of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA). His publications on the Presidents of the United States since 1979 include their birth order, longevity, first names that induce special affiliation with their father or mother, and slogans associated with their Presidencies. Since 1986, he has contributed a psychobiographical essay on each President of the United States for the monthly newsletter of Western Pennsylvania Mensa. Barry serves as Co-Director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidents and Presidential Candidates.

Paul Elovitz and Bob Lentz interviewed our featured scholar over the Internet in July and August. Dr. Barry may be contacted at <barryh+@pitt.edu>.

Clio's Psyche (CP): Please tell us about your family background.

Herbert Barry, III (HB): During my early childhood, my father was an Assistant Professor of Psychology at Tufts College. He then enrolled in Tufts Medical School and received the M.D. degree when I was 11 years old. He became a psychiatrist, affiliated with the Massachusetts General Hospital, and was an active psychotherapist until he retired in 1985 at age 86. Group therapy became his specialty. He was founder and first president of the New England Society for Group Psychotherapy. My mother never had a paid job, although she had some training as an artist and a thoroughly artistic temperament. Income from a trust fund, established by her grandfather, exceeded my father's salary at Tufts College and made his medical education possible.

One of my memorable educational experiences as an undergraduate was learning that according to the classification of W. Lloyd Warner, my parents were lower level upper class. In childhood, a repeated experience was hearing my mother sometimes declare approvingly that the United States is a classless society, and at other times scornfully deride an action or custom as "so middle class."

My ethnic background is English, Irish, Dutch, and French. At some point in the future I might investigate and I hope to verify a family legend that I may also have American Indian ancestry. My religious affiliation was originally Episcopalian. In 2000 I joined the Unitarian Universalist church.

I was the first child, born nine months and two days after the wedding of my parents. My siblings include two sisters and a brother. For several days each year I am the same age in years as my "Irish twin" sister, born May 27, 1931. My other sister was born when I was three-and-a-half years old. My brother, born when I was 13 years old, is severely autistic. He has never talked, and since the age of 10 years has lived with a foster family.

My father died in 1986 at the age of 87 years. He was an important influence beginning early in my childhood. I had many discussions with him on a wide variety of topics. My mother died early this year at the age of 94 years. A significant experience for my sisters and me was when I was 21 and a senior at college. My father told my mother on Christmas Eve that he was in love with another woman and wanted a divorce. Seven years later, my mother finally agreed to an uncontested divorce. My father immediately married his secretary, with whom he lived happily for the rest of his life. My mother did not remarry but had an active social life. Her many trips to various foreign lands provided most of the subject matter for her paintings.

CP: What is your psychoanalytic/psychotherapeutic experience and its influence on you?

HB: I had Freudian psychoanalysis for four years, beginning shortly after I started graduate school. It was a therapeutic rather than didactic psychoanalysis. My psychotherapy was not precipitated by a crisis, and I cannot identify specific benefits, but I believe that it greatly increased my self-knowledge. I became consciously aware of the vast complexity of human thoughts and emotions. My father paid 80% of the fees but was very ambivalent about my psychoanalysis. He told me that he had declined the opportunity for Freudian psychoanalysis because he did not want to find out that much about himself.

CP: How do you define *psychohistory*?

HB: Psychohistory is when the behavior of individuals is analyzed with the aid of information about their early life and social environment. The unit of analysis may be a nation or other aggregation of people, as in studies of group fantasy. Inferences are made about persistent effects of early experiences on reactions to social situations.

CP: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

HB: Childhood experiences are sources of irrational group and individual behavior. Inferences from childhood experiences distinguish a psychobiography from a conventional biography.

CP: How are psychohistory and political psychology similar and different?

HB: Psychohistory focuses on the irrational emotions that influence overt behavior of individuals or groups. Political psychology is more interested in the governmental structures and processes than in the psychological motivations. For example, popular topics in political psychology are techniques for negotiating peace agreements and analysis of political communication.

CP: What brought you to psychohistory?

HB: In my first two years as an undergraduate, I majored in history. At that time, I became aware of the book *A Study of History* by Arnold J. Toynbee. I liked his identification and interpretation of general trends in the development and decline of civilizations. I changed my major to social relations in my junior year because it seemed consistent with my search for general principles of behavior. Many years later, I read an announcement of and attended the first meeting of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) in 1978. I felt especially interested in the paper by Jacques Szaluta, "Apotheosis to Ignominy: The Martyrdom of Marshal Pétain," published in the *Journal of Psychohistory*, 1980, vol. 7, pp. 415-453. Several years later, in response to a letter from Paul Elovitz, I began attending the IPA meetings regularly.

CP: What special training was most helpful in your doing psychohistorical work?

HB: I believe that the most useful experiences were my psychoanalysis and readings about psychoanalytic theory. Experiments in which I controlled the independent variables contributed to an appreciation of the limitations of observational studies, and thereby cautious inferences from the observations. The use of laboratory animals in most of my experiments encouraged an objective view of behavior and its antecedents. My extensive training and experience in statistical analysis revealed that the credibility of psychohistorical inferences depends on the number of independent individuals or events, and on the consistency of the findings.

CP: Please tell us about your education at Yale and Harvard.

HB: I believe that my most educational experience at Harvard was my senior honors thesis. My advisor, John W. M. Whiting, was an anthropologist. I made ratings on styles of pictorial art in 30 diverse, mostly preliterate societies. I found that art styles were more complex in societies where independent ratings indicated more severe child training. I had a difficult decision between the PhD program in social relations at Harvard and in psychology at Yale. I chose Yale because it emphasized scientific experiments on laboratory animals and it was a psychology rather than a social relations department. Although my major was experimental psychology, soon after my arrival Professor Irvin L. Child hired me, 25 percent of the time as a research assistant for a study of a world sample of more than 100 societies. Child was co-author with John W. M. Whiting of a book published in 1953, *Child Training and Personality*, which reported a cross-cultural study. Dr. Margaret K. Bacon and I made quantitative ratings on child training in dependence and related behaviors as well as on a wide variety of measures of adult culture. Our purpose was to explain variations in adult culture on the basis of differences in child training.

CP: During your attendance at them, how receptive were these Ivy League institutions to psychoanalysis and psychohistory?

HB: I do not remember any interest in psychohistory at Harvard or Yale, but at that time I had very little knowledge about the topic. The leading professors in the Social Relations Department at Harvard, such as Gordon W. Allport and Henry A. Murray, were ambivalent toward Freudian psychoanalysis. At Yale, the Psychology and Psychiatry Departments were receptive to Freudian psychoanalysis. Many graduate students were psychoanalyzed. My psychoanalyst was affiliated with the Psychiatry Department.

CP: Do you think Yale and Harvard left their mark on Bill Clinton, Albert Gore, and George W. Bush? How?

HB: I believe that the social contacts and prestige were more important than the academic advantages of Harvard Business School for Bush, Yale Law School for Clinton, and Harvard College for Gore. Yale was George W. Bush's father's college, and the son was elected to his father's elite Skull & Bones.

CP: Are there any mentors who come to mind?

HB: In my last two years at boarding school, I took a course on Public Affairs. The highly intellectual and articulate teacher, Mr. Charles C. Buell, contributed to my interest in national and world events. It was during an interesting time, from shortly before the Republicans won the majority in Congress in 1946, until shortly before President Truman was nominated for his generally predicted unsuccessful candidacy in 1948. In my last two years as an undergraduate, I had many thoughtful discussions with a graduate student teaching fellow, Norman Birnbaum. He became a Sociology Professor at Amherst College. In graduate school, Professor Irvin L. Child was my principal mentor on psychosocial topics. He taught a course on personality. He encouraged and helped me to prepare my undergraduate senior honors thesis for publication, in 1957, in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 54, pp. 380-383.

CP: Please list the five people who you think have made the greatest contribution to psychohistory, in order of their contribution.

HB: Sigmund Freud. He originated the framework for most psychohistory and contributed psychobiographies of Moses, Leonardo da Vinci, and Woodrow Wilson.

Erik Erikson. He wrote insightful psychobiographies of Martin Luther and Mahatma Gandhi. He was a mentor and inspiration for several psychohistorians.

Lloyd deMause. He has published prolifically; he founded and guides the International Psychohistorical Association; and he founded and edits the *Journal of Psychohistory*.

Frank J. Sulloway. He does not regard himself as a psychohistorian but one of the most important contributions to the field is his book *Born to Rebel: Birth Order, Family Dynamics, and Creative Lives* (1996). He reported convincing evidence from a large number of people that birth order is an effective predictor of opinions on various scientific and political controversies. The analysis includes other childhood conditions, such as conflict with a parent and the father's ideology.

Paul H. Elovitz. He has done psychobiographies of several Presidents of the United States and psychohistorical studies of group responses, such as of refugees from the World War II Holocaust. He has also founded and directs the

Psychohistory Forum, and has founded and edits the periodical **Clio's Psyche**.

CP: What impact did Erik Erikson have on you?

HB: I read his book, *Childhood and Society,* while an undergraduate. It contained some anthropological information relevant to my cross-cultural interests. I especially admired the chapter on Adolf Hitler. Erikson vividly explained that the beginning of *Mein Kampf* was a fairy tale rather than an accurate autobiographical account.

CP: What books were important to your development?

HB: While an undergraduate, I read Freud's *New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis*. In my senior year, there was *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* by Sigmund Freud. This book described many examples of how repression and denial affect normal behavior by emotionally healthy people, in addition to psychiatric patients.

My cross-cultural research was influenced by Ruth Benedict's book, *Patterns of Culture*, classifying societies as Apollonian or Dionysian, and by Margaret Mead's vivid accounts of different cultural customs. Books and articles by George P. Murdock, whom I met when we were both at Yale, reported many interesting variations in social customs in several hundred societies. His work was an important basis for my cross-cultural research with Irvin L. Child and Margaret K. Bacon. When Murdock and I were both at the University of Pittsburgh, I directed the production of new ratings on infancy and childhood, published in *Ethnology*, a journal founded and edited by Murdock. The research was supported by a grant to Murdock from the National Science Foundation. A subsequent consequence was a project with Alice Schlegel on adolescence, resulting in a book *Adolescence: An Anthropological Inquiry* (1991).

An important influence on my study of birth order was a book *The Promised Seed* (1964) by Irving D. Harris. In a study of famous men in various occupations, first sons were predominantly conformists and theorists, later sons were predominantly revolutionaries and empiricists. The sample of men included several Presidents of the United States.

CP: What brought you to the study of birth order?

HB: I was very conscious of my status as

the oldest and only male child when growing up with my two sisters. It was not an entirely privileged status because I felt that my mother favored my sisters, especially my younger sister, Lucy, who was her namesake. I believe that my interest in birth order as a psychological variable began after my PhD degree, when my father and I began to tabulate data on birth position of several hundred psychiatric patients at Greystone Hospital, in New Jersey. He had obtained this information in a study of the effects of early childhood bereavement.

CP: Of which of your psychohistorical ideas and works are you most proud?

HB: I became aware that beginning with Thomas Woodrow Wilson, most Presidents of the United States who were not given their father's first name had a middle name that reproduced their mother's maiden name. I found biographical evidence that they displayed strong early childhood identification with the mother, resulting in feminine characteristics combined with exaggerated adult assertiveness. I reported this finding in a paper presented at an IPA meeting. The paper was included as pages 26-40 in Paul H. Elovitz, ed., *Historical and Psychological Inquiry* (1990).

CP: More than that of most professors, your life is organized around scholarship and attending scholarly conventions. Do you have any thoughts on this you would like to share with our readers?

HB: From 1963 until 1977, my salary was entirely paid first by a research grant and then by a Research Scientist Development Award. My teaching duties since then have continued to be slight. I have been able to devote most of my time to data analysis and writing. I have thereby been able to divide my research among the topics of psychopharmacology, cross-cultural studies, and names, in addition to psychohistory.

CP: What are you working on now?

HB: I have prepared a proposal for a book, *Personal Perspectives of the Presidents*. The subtitle will be *Washington to Gore* or *George W. Bush*, whichever is elected." I plan to complete the book in time for it to be published in 2003, during the next President's four-year term.

CP: What training should a person entering the field of psychohistory pursue?

HB: The most important training is in psychology. Psychohistory requires appreciation of the complexity of human nature, including reactions to irrational and unrecognized emotions and the effects of conflicting desires. It is less important to know history, which is a chronicle rather than a set of general principles. People who are capable of contributing to psychohistory are also capable of obtaining the needed historical information.

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

HB: We need to obtain more detailed information to support our inferences. Future studies should be applied to a larger number of individuals and should obtain more psychobiographical information on each individual.

CP: How can psychohistory have more influence in academia and on society in general?

HB: Psychohistory should become a recognized specialty both in psychology and in history. An urgent need is a book that will be widely accepted as a text for a general course on psychohistory. Courses on psychohistory will lead to books written for the general public. The field may divide into two main branches, psychobiography (the study of individuals) and psychohistory (the study of shared sentiments, such as group fantasy or public consensus). Academic courses and academic respectability are the most important inducements for psychohistory as a career choice.

CP: As a frequent presenter at the IPA and the International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP), how are these organizations similar and dissimilar?

HB: Both are small, specialized, multidisciplinary societies in the social sciences. I believe that both were founded in 1978. The IPA is more focused, with a dominant leader and an emphasis on severely pathological experiences in early childhood as causes of maladaptive adult behavior. The ISPP includes a broader range of leaders and participants. The annual meeting is in a different city each year, often outside the United States. More people are members and attend the meetings of the ISPP.

CP: As a member of Mensa perhaps you could tell us something about that organization.

HB: The criterion for membership is the top 2 percent on standard intellectual tests. This is not a highly restrictive requirement for academic achievers. I believe that the majority of IPA members are eligible for Mensa membership. The

50,000 Mensa members in the United States are less than 2 percent of the eligible population. Several social gatherings each month constitute the principal activities of the local Mensa groups. The conversations at Mensa gatherings are primarily social and situational, rather than introspective or theoretical. The members who attend are extremely diverse. Some are highly achieving academically or vocationally, but a larger number are underachievers. Some people join Mensa briefly to prove that they are highly intelligent.

CP: How do you explain the growth and psychology of fundamentalism?

HB: I regard psychohistory and fundamentalism as opposite responses to the uncertainties of existence and the complexity of human motives. Psychohistory recognizes these stressful conditions and tries to understand them. Fundamentalism denies these stressful conditions and claims certainty based on religious faith. In the movie, *Inherit the Wind*, on the Scopes trial in Tennessee in 1925, the fundamentalist prosecuting attorney declares "I am more interested in the rock of ages than in the age of rocks." I doubt that anyone could be both a psychohistorian and a fundamentalist.

I question the premise that fundamentalism is growing. The increasing publicity about fundamentalists reminds me of the increasing publicity several decades ago about youths who got stoned on psychedelic drugs and rejected academic aspirations. They were a noisy minority. Some commentators incorrectly perceived them as manifesting the prevalent behavior of the new generation of youths.

I regard terrorism as an extreme expression of fundamentalism. Denial of the stressful uncertainties of life can induce a psychopathological compulsion to destroy one's enemies as brutally and indiscriminately as possible. Another incentive for terrorism is based on paranoid grandiosity, to be the agent for a notoriously infamous event.

CP: What are your thoughts on the psychodynamics of violence in our world?

HB: Violence is an expression of anger, which is a prominent component of human nature. Lynchings and "ethnic cleansing" express anger displaced onto an outgroup. Violence is controlled by a combination of love for other humans and social prohibitions against expression of anger. Punitive child training expresses strong social prohibition but weakens love and tolerance. More permissive child training in recent years has generally

strengthened love but also weakened social controls. Love and tolerance prevail over hate and bigotry for most people who have experienced permissive child training. I believe that violent behavior in recent years might appear to be more frequent and extreme only because more of the incidents are reported.

Paul H. Elovitz is Editor of this publication and, with Barry, Co-Director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidents and Presidential Candidates. Bob Lentz is Associate Editor of this publication. q

Psychoanalysis Needs Group Analysis to Survive

Lauren E. Storck
Harvard Medical School and Private Practice

As a group analyst, I suggest that for our new millennium psychoanalysis as a discipline, art, perspective, philosophy, and original theory must develop to include group analysis, group dynamics, and authentic interpersonal perspectives. No man is an island, no woman a separate sea.

Psychoanalysis is often slow to be inclusive as a consequence of having been excluded from various groups from its early beginnings. I interpret this as due, in part, to its need to protect vulnerable inner, personal spaces while yearning to connect with the vast outer reaches of the Other.

Psychoanalysis has used what some see as its counterproductive (counter-projective) defense of its "truths" to prove its value and validity. Accused of being beyond its heyday as a respectable individualistic and intra-psychic model for understanding human behaviors and relations, it struggles to find its relevance for a world that encompasses more than the legitimate yet lonely *individual* who suffers, stagnates, survives, but does not live to the fullest.

Group analysis recognizes the essential interpersonal, social, cultural, and political nature of human life. Provocatively, both the individual and the internal world of any individual are understood as a matrix of interrelations or a ring of circles that necessarily include the totality of one's connections to others throughout life. Little sense of self exists without other people, not only parental and fraternal figures, not only family and friends, but very influential societies, cultures, na-

tion states and global structures that are real and intimately influence our development, for better or worse. Some of these important group psychodynamics are cohesive, some coherent, some compassionate, and others are not.

No one system of thought can survive without integration with other systems of thought and other cultural patterns. Permeable and inclusive systems of human understanding are *processural,* i.e., continuously growing, open to change, flexible and thoughtful, seeking unified threads, while at the same time *welcoming differences.* This is not to argue that all things are relative, but to recognize that we are global citizens and there are multiple ways of understanding.

Group analysis more easily allows the communication of similarities and differences, as there are always three or more people in the room together. The goals are communication and relationship, expanding the necessary dyad to significant social and cultural connections. Empowering each individual, via the group experience, is a process that is non-hierarchical, relational, and collaborative. The process, managed by the group conductor with special expertise, but mostly leading "from behind" as S.H. Foulkes said, involves exploring ways to share different needs and truths [see *Group Analytic Psychotherapy: Methods and Principles*, 1990]. Striving in significant conscious and unconscious ways to learn and to change if required, each individual and the group together need each other, at least temporarily, to carry on and then to carry out. Each is able, hopefully, to apply the process to one's personal life and social experiences, even if it includes seeking social justice through controversial and difficult means. We are one human race, striving in significant conscious and unconscious ways to communicate and grow.

Group analysis, defined by Foulkes, is a treatment or philosophy, "of the group, by the group, including the conductor." His genius was to recognize psychoanalytic values, theories, and methods, and insist that the social, cultural, and political groups we all belong to are *as intrinsically important* to our health and growth as any individual, internal, systems of wellness and illness. From my perspective, two major psychoanalytic discoveries most inform group analysis: the unconscious or less aware processes and the many forms of transference and projection.

Group analysis does not ignore the individual. Neither does group analysis attend only to the group (Tavistock or "group as a whole" theories). Group analysis focuses, much like interpersonal psychology, on the substantial and varied social realities we form and are formed by as humans together. Therapy, experience, or learning groups that we participate in as "conductors," patients, clients, and students are also related and interactive with *other* groups, other social and cultural realities, be they small groups, median groups, or large groups. Each individual contributes to the social matrix and is affected by the same social group, and that group itself is influenced by many other groups. Group analysis is therefore concerned with the individual, the group, and all groups. Behaviors among many local groups is constrained by resources, but liberated by numerous possibilities for exchange.

Group analysis recognizes the downside of relationships, the anger, hate, envy and destructiveness of relations gone awry, people under pressure, private and individual or public and group confusions. Group analysis may have been inattentive to the power of these difficult emotions during its formative years. It focuses on the healing and positive dynamics of groups properly studied and organized. In more recent years, senior group analysts and their mature students have brought these darker dynamics into prominent light, suggesting new theory and direction for all to think about.

This brief article is a statement about the need for group analysis rather than an explanation of it. I refer all readers to S.H. Foulkes' own writings and a significant literature to which I have contributed. (See also the journal *Group-Analysis* published by Sage.) I recommend learning more about group analysis in order to include it more often within psychoanalytic training and practice. It is not secondary, superficial, or diluted analysis. It is primary, significant, and social in the most humanly necessary way, in order to learn, love, work, and create, not alone.

Lauren E. Storck, PhD, CGP, is a clinical psychologist and group therapist/group analyst. Born in the Bronx, she trained in New York and lived internationally for 12 years. Since 1987, she has been on the Clinical Faculty of the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School where she is currently Clinical Instructor. Her research interests include group analysis and group dynamics, socioeconomic and class issues, women's health, and intercultural dialogue. Dr. Storck is also in private practice in Belmont, MA. She may be reached at

<lstorck@hms.harvard.edu>. q

Psychoanalysis Around the World

Andrew Brook
Carleton University, Canada

There are many challenges facing psychoanalysis around the world today, varying from country to country. In countries where psychoanalysis is booming, the challenge is to find a way to educate all those who wish to be trained. In other countries, the challenge is to find a way to provide analysis to those who desire it.

In countries where analysis is growing quickly, the problem is to provide competent training without allowing standards to spiral downward. This is the challenge facing psychoanalysis in various countries in South America, such as Brazil and Argentina, and it promises to be a problem for many years to come. Japan faces a similar problem. While it may be a good problem to have, it is a problem none the less.

The challenges are similar throughout much of Europe. In France, where the internecine wars of the Lacan era appear to have subsided, analysis is doing well. The same can also be said of Great Britain, especially in London. While I am less informed of the details of both Germany and Italy, it appears that a wealth of analytic work is being done there as well. Finally, after decades of discrimination, analysis is again gaining a toehold in Eastern Europe.

In Canada and the U.S., the challenges are different. They are mostly related to general problems of health care. In the Canadian provinces where government health plans cover analysis, it is doing well. In the provinces where analysis is not covered, obviously it is struggling.

In the U.S., the problems facing psychoanalysis are also related to general issues of health care, but they are different from the ones in Canada. The U.S. is unique among the industrialized countries in not having universal, free health care. One result is that 20 percent of the population does not have even the most basic health coverage. In such a situation, it is not surprising that a sophisticated and expensive service such as psychoanalysis is not flourishing. In most cases, it is available only to the well-off.

In addition, the U.S. is still dealing with the legacy of medically trained analysts, excluding all other analysts from the American Psychoanalytic Association and therefore the International Psycho-Analytic Association. This situation has changed in the past few years. Non-M.D.s are being admitted to the American Psychoanalytic Association and a few non-medical psychoanalytic societies have been allowed to affiliate with the International directly. Nevertheless, psychoanalysis remains unavailable to the vast majority of people and will probably continue to do so for years to come.

The challenges facing analysis are not only relative to areas of the world. There are intellectual challenges as well. For example, more work is needed to establish the soundness and effectiveness of analysis as a therapy. Here the new alliances between analysts and neuroscientists in the U.S. and England are a good start.

In short, there are a number of challenges facing psychoanalysis currently. Some of them are relative to the area in which analysis is being practiced. Others arise from the health care systems in place in an area. Analysis is also being challenged as a discipline. It must meet these challenges, but there does not seem to be any reason why it cannot do so, indeed why it cannot thrive in all countries the way it is in some.

Andrew Brook, PhD, is Professor of philosophy and Director of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa. He may be contacted at <abrook@ccs.carleton.ca>. q

Psychoanalysis and Education

Vitor Franco
University of Évora, Portugal

In November, 1926, Freud wrote to his Swiss psychoanalyst friend Oskar Pfister that the most flourishing of all uses of psychoanalysis was in pedagogy. The relationship between psychoanalysis and education was a challenging and fruitful subject for the 20th century.

Enthusiasm concerning the expansion of new psychoanalytic ideas and knowledge to education was coupled with criticism towards the existing pedagogic system and methods. Early psychoanalysts, such as Ferenczi, harshly criticized education by exposing its repressive nature, accusing pedagogy of neglecting the real education of man. Viewing themselves as defenders of children, they

strove to protect the young from evils then considered harmless and inevitable. Freud shared this perspective, believing that psychoanalytically inspired and oriented teaching could function as a source of balanced education, healthy development, and neurosis prophylaxis.

The great expectations for the future of psychoanalysis in education, shared by Freud and his disciples, included analytically trained teachers who would influence education in three different ways. These were to evaluate children's inborn conditions that could lead to undesirable development; exercise a prophylactic influence through educational action; and finally, detect the first signs of neurosis. Freud emphasized the importance of early childhood years of child sexuality -- the way precocious impressions influence the ego. Assuming that education allows some sort of quick intervention in development, he recognized that implementing psychoanalysis could be a kind of vaccine used as a prophylactic method against neurosis.

In keeping with his general post-World War I turn to pessimism, Freud later rejected this optimistic vision of education. He stopped raising expectations about a pedagogical reform based upon avoiding the pathogenic effects of drive repression, by limiting the role of interdiction on educational practice. He denied the value of permissive education that became associated in the popular mind with psychoanalysis.

The non-conscious aspects in the adult-child relationship have been recognized since the 1920s. The focus of psychoanalysis shifted to understanding and enlarging the capacity of both teachers and parents. Indeed, teachers' analytical training is still considered important. Freud recognized that due to the many difficult problems teachers must face, their education should include a strong analytical experience, enabling them to provide children with the proper measure of love, while maintaining effective authority. The analysis of teachers and educators has been considered more far-reaching and effective of a prophylactic measure than the analysis of the children themselves.

As psychoanalytic theory and practice were developed in Europe, some teachers who had undergone psychoanalytical training, were interested in subjects relating to the unconscious. They wanted to assume a different attitude towards their pupils and began to develop a new concept of psychoanalytic pedagogy. Those instructors realized that some of Freud's ideas contained relevant elements in understanding children and the act of educating, which they subsequently tried to include in their curriculum.

One of the pioneer contributors was Freud's faithful friend Pfister. They corresponded for many years, discussing ideas and opening the path of psychoanalysis' educational value. *The Psychoanalytic Pedagogy Revue* (1926-1937) became the great debating arena for contributions of psychoanalysis to education and psychoanalytic discoveries. Despite controversy, both inside and outside the psychoanalytic field, analysis was increasingly making its mark on education. Prior to World War I, there were several attempts in different parts of Europe to create schools and institutions based on psychoanalytical ideas. Among those involved were Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham, who together with other psychoanalysts created a school in Vienna and later, in 1937, the Jackson Nursery for children from humble social backgrounds. It was shut down by Nazi forces, but re-emerged in a second version called the Hampstead War Nursery in England. Another example appeared in Moscow, where Vera Schmidt created a kindergarten and orphanage that maintained its activities until 1930.

The construction of a theory of human development, based upon how the psychic system works, was perhaps psychoanalysis' most important contribution to pedagogy. Some particularly relevant aspects include the unconscious emotional aspects in relationships; the importance of projective identification mechanisms related to apprenticeship and educational relationship; and the identification of anguish and fears visible in that relationship.

In Europe, the relationship between psychoanalysis and education followed three main lines of influence: psycho-pedagogical, psychotherapeutic, and institutional. In the late 1940s, the Claude Barnard Psycho-Pedagogical Center in France established a new level historically, hoping their psychoanalytical oriented therapy and pedagogical work would then spread to other European countries. The popularization of other psychological perspectives, mainly behaviorist and cognitive, repositioned the contribution of psychoanalysis to education to a secondary level.

At the present time, psychoanalysis has opened a new field of understanding and investigation by playing an essential role in student development. It focuses on how students learn and difficulties they experience. Additionally, it sheds light

on how schools operate and work to develop teachers. Since the 1970s, this is reflected in psychoanalytic texts encouraging a deeper reflection of teacher-student relationships, the pedagogical institution, and what it means to be a teacher. There is a realization that everything occurring in the educational domain can be enriched by psychoanalytic knowledge.

Teacher development is a vital field of investigation. It is a formidable challenge for the new millennium, especially because the expanding classroom use of technology will certainly raise new questions about the role of teachers in the learning process. Today's teacher is understood as an individual in relation to students, family, colleagues, and the school community.

In conclusion, psychoanalysis has greatly contributed to the comprehension of the teaching and learning of the educator as a person, as well as a professional, in methods and practice, motives, emotions, and life story. Teachers are continually involved in a development process, including pedagogical means used in classes that reflect their individuality and personal growth. Therefore, a psychoanalytic perspective is a relevant contribution for teachers' progress, because it emphasizes the intra- and inter-psychic affective processes in the educational situation. The challenge of education to psychoanalysis, as Freud acknowledged in a letter to Pfister, is that psychoanalysis finds one of its best applications dealing with healthy people.

Vitor Daniel F. Franco, PhD, is a professor at the University of Évora in Portugal who focuses on education, handicapped children, and teacher training. A psychoanalytical approach to education is present in his thesis, "Teacher's Development and Personality -- A Psychodynamic Perspective of the Transitional Value of the Pedagogical Methods." Professor Franco is also a child psychotherapist. He may be reached at <vfranco@uevora.pt>. q

A Literary Psychohistorian: Dan Dervin

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

Dan Dervin was born in Omaha, Nebraska, in 1935. He earned his MA (1963) and PhD (1970) degrees in English drama and comparative literature from Columbia University. He taught on the English faculty at Mary Washington College from 1967 until recently retiring as Professor. He is an expert in creativity, psychohistory, and psychoanalysis as applied to cultural fields such as film, literature, and art. A member of the International Psychohistorical Association (IPA), Dervin has been attending meetings since 1981 and has published numerous articles and reviews in the Journal of Psychohistory.

Dervin is the author of seven books: Bernard Shaw: A Psychological Study (1975); A Strange Sapience: Psychoanalytic Study of Creativity in D. H. Lawrence (1984); Through a Freudian Lens Deeply: A Psychoanalysis of the Cinema (1985); Creativity and Culture (1990); Enactments: American Modes and Psychohistorical Models (1996); Matricentric Narratives: Recent British Women's Fiction in a Postmodern Mode (1997); and Home Is Another Country (1998). Matricentric Narratives received the Adele Mellon Award for Distinguished Scholarship. Dervin is currently working on a compilation of studies on childhood and parenting from a global perspective. He has also authored numerous articles, short stories, and poems, and serves on the editorial boards of the Journal of Psychohistory and American Imago.

Paul Elovitz interviewed this distinguished scholar over the Internet in July. Professor Dervin may be contacted at <ddervin@mwc.edu>

Paul H. Elovitz (PHE): Please tell us about your family background.

Dan Dervin (DD): My parents were blue-collar, working-class Irish Catholic. My dad repaired gas stoves and appliances. My mother was a housewife. I had a brother, five-and-a-half years older, and a sister, three years older. She was born retarded, raised in a home run by an order of Catholic nuns, and is now deceased. My father died in 1984 when I was 49 and my mother, in 1993 when I was 58.

PHE: What was your childhood like?

DD: Mixed but pretty good. When I was four, our family moved into a new parish in the west part of town, into a modest brick home with lots of young families bringing up kids, and so it was a neighborhood of peers. Adjoining our property was a wooded gully with a stream which was used for bottling soda pop founded by a German immigrant. Beyond, were railroad tracks leading out of town. In the other direction was a parish school run by nuns who were long-sufferingly pi-

ous, often strict, and seldom tuned into the pupils' reality or needs. At 13 I first attended a youth camp in Colorado and have never since gotten over the mountains. These worlds became the source for a collection of stories written over many years and published in 1998 as *Home Is Another Country*.

Within the family, among other benefits and perplexities, I was a replacement child for my sister whose retardation and attachment deficiency inflicted traumas on everyone but me, who knew nothing of her, nothing was ever said, until I returned from the Service at age 23. Though done with the best of intentions, this act of benevolent deceit was not possible to bring off. Otherwise, I enjoyed reading and rough physical play, ran pretty wild, and was an ill-blended, studious, and hell-raising teenager.

PHE: How did your childhood cultivate your thirst for knowledge?

DD: As a preschooler, I walked with my mother to our branch library to bring home books which she read to me during nap times.

PHE: Why did you become a literature professor?

DD: I loved the study of literature, enjoyed discussing it, and also wanted a dependable income while I pursued my own unprofitable writing projects.

PHE: What books were important to your development?

DD: Greek tragedians. Major works of Shakespeare. Oxbridge classicists -- Harrison, Murray, and Cornford. Ibsen, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, Joyce, and Iris Murdoch. Sartre and Camus. Freud, Jung, Klein, Winnicott, Philip Slater, and Norman O. Brown. And countless others.

PHE: What has been your psychoanalytic/ psychotherapeutic experience and its influence on you?

DD: From 1960 to 1964 I was employed as a social worker in the inmate rehab unit of Westchester County, Pennsylvania. As I trained in group therapy, read Freud, and talked continually with a staff psychologist and friend, I began to glimpse the psyche's underworld. My master's thesis was a psychoanalytic study of Tennessee Williams. My doctoral dissertation was a psychoanalytic study of George Bernard Shaw, under Professor Steven Marcus and Dr. Arnold Cooper. In 1977, through correspondence with William Nied-

erland, whose views on narcissistic injury I was using for a study of creativity, he suggested we meet for analytic dialogues in his home, which we did.

PHE: What brought you to psychohistory?

DD: Traveling in western Europe with my wife and young children in 1978, I would read brief histories of the countries we were visiting (notably France and Spain) and repeatedly I would come across an account that read in summary like "After achieving peace and prosperity, the province or nation decided to wage war against its neighbors, which caused untold suffering and hardship." Economic or political motives failed to account for these irrational endeavors, so I sought psychological motives. I contacted David Beisel, then Editor of the *Journal of Psychohistory*, did an essay review, and began attending IPA meetings in 1981.

PHE: How do you define *psychohistory*?

DD: Psychohistory is a multi-disciplinary approach to the ways in which history and historical figures are shaped by the dynamic and hence non-rational forces of the unconscious, as stemming from early childhood experiences and manifested in the group as well as in the individual.

PHE: Have you taught psychohistory?

DD: I ran a course three times called Hitler and the Holocaust: The Psychohistory of Evil, with very mixed results. An approach that prized ambiguity, that raised questions rather than provided answers, stirred some deep-seated anxieties and even resentments.

PHE: What is your psychohistorical vision?

DD: In my book, *Enactments*: *American Modes and Psychohistorical Models*, I devised six models for deep research into historical material. Three were derived from Lloyd deMause, et al, most notably the equations of group-fantasy and the delegate; one came from Michel Foucault's theories of repression; the remaining two were a blend of psychodynamics and drama which I termed Enactments. At this point, a single psychohistorical vision would be too reductive.

PHE: What special training was most helpful to your doing psychohistorical work?

DD: Learning to listen empathetically and non-intrusively in the group work mentioned above, and more recently recognizing that all our psychohistorical observations and interpretations

are cued to models of which we may or may not be aware, and which may be relatively functional and appropriate -- or the opposite.

PHE: Did Erik Erikson have an impact on you? Did you have any mentors?

DD: Erikson's applied analysis to other cultures is interesting, but his concept of Identity lends itself to a psychology of consciousness and idealizations. Peter Blos on the ego ideal and adolescence is more profound. If you take Erikson's Identity as a compromise formation, for example, you could then probe it for latent and manifest content levels. My key mentor would probably be the classical Freudian Donald Kaplan (also his wife, now his widow, Louise), whom I knew for over 30 years, and visited and corresponded with until his death in 1994.

PHE: As is the case with a number of distinctive psychohistorians, you taught literature before coming to our field. How has this journey affected your psychohistorical work?

DD: Well, fantasy analysis is really literary criticism with a dose of psychoanalytic theory. Any good scholar should have acquired the discipline of sticking to the text, which in our field enters areas of even-hovering attention and countertransference.

PHE: Has psychohistory helped you to understand literature in ways you would not have had you not known it?

DD: One way the former has impacted on the latter is to see how deeply the author is anchored in history, and is often a delegate for the prevailing group-fantasy, as well as how a few writers have been able to break new ground and overcome the dominant cultural mode as well as the group's fantasy system.

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

DD: First, mastery of a discipline, in the humanities or the social sciences, helps to impart a sense of boundary and integrity within a field. Next, some analytic experience in which issues of competitiveness and one-upmanship in personal and professional endeavors have been worked through. Then, close study of the major works in applied psychoanalysis and psychohistory, and a fairly deep familiarity with Freud, would be ideal.

PHE: What do we as psychohistorians need to do to strengthen our work and to win greater acceptance?

DD: We spend much of our time re-inventing the wheel and not devoting sufficient energies to self-critical feedback and then to a synthesis, which should be our goal, though not my realistic expectation. Our tendency is toward hyper-individuality, hence fragmentation and lip service to colleagues' ideas, and, therefore, a deficiency in both objectivity and rigor.

PHE: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

DD: Childhood in its multifaceted dimensions is the core of psychohistory, which began in a key sense as the history of childhood. One could go on and inquire how childhood is constructed in psychohistory and consider deMause's valuable contribution to childhood's historical evolution via parenting modes. I have drawn on this model and also been inclined to tinker with it a bit, positing an intermediate Corrective mode between deMause's Socializing and Helping modes.

PHE: Some Forum researchers have been struggling with the issue of identification with a particular parent and achievement.

DD: My study of abandonment in the lives of creative persons points to a Uses-of-adversity model.

PHE: In your experience and life, are high achievers more identified with their fathers?

DD: No -- that's an awfully pat formulation, isn't it? A strong oedipal revolt is probably required for originality. Or are you implying that high achievement is a kind of conformity, that is, identification with the aggressor?

PHE: Of which of your many scholarly works are you the most proud?

DD: *Creativity and Culture* probably hangs together best. *Creativity and Culture* is a psycho-dynamic-based study of the roots of creativity as they culminate in works of the arts, but also in cultural works, and the inner processes which produce that natural work of creativity, the self. It is psychodialectical study between versions of origins, which form subjective and objective poles of the psyche; the former being epitomized by a family romance version of origins, the latter by the primal scene, which is also subject to distorted perceptions.

PHE: What are you working on now? What is its importance and when do you expect to have it published?

DD: I'm preparing a collection of psycho-

historical pieces on childhood and parenting from a global perspective, in which my role will be primarily editorial. I believe this area is psychohistorians' strongest suit, partly because the material is grounded in observations and not so prone to being over-interpreted. It is still in its very early stages.

I'm also writing on a larger project centered on the psychoanalytic concept of negation as a way into a study of mental operations generally (e.g., Why is there nothing instead of something?) It's a position I'm comfortable with, but it bothers some psychohistorians to no end. Psychohistorians by and large want to locate the bad stuff that warps human development and functioning in a real, and usually traumatic, intervention, typically resulting in some form of child abuse. This is true as far as it goes, but it leads to a kind of simplistic parity of psychic dysfunction, which is echoed by the media. Leonard Shengold, the psychoanalyst, for example, distinguishes among his patients -- between real abuse and pseudoabuse, the latter being about that "nothing" which is nonetheless real ever since Freud designated it "psychic reality." Another example is that we don't know why Clinton screwed up so awfully, but labeling him a "sex-addict" doesn't get us very far.

PHE: Do you plan to publish any autobiographical writings?

DD: Probably not. I've cannibalized my life and others' as well in creative work. When writing, I prefer masks and personae to the naked self.

PHE: These days I hear little reference to *American Imago* in which you publish. Would you speak about its contribution to applied psychoanalysis and psychohistory?

DD: It is largely given over to guest editors, and so the issues and quality vary accordingly, but recently there's been a trend toward the postmodern cultural model, which I part company from. It refers to the tendency to explain all kinds of diverse actions and mental phenomena in terms of cultural forces. It leads to discourses on oppression, conspiracy, and the kinds of splitting that produce victims and victimizers.

PHE: What has your second career as a full-time author been like? Do you miss the stimulation of teaching?

DD: Writing is freer than teaching. There is a tendency among academics to dovetail their thinking with student interest, to court superstars in the field, and to kowtow to prevailing trends -- all of which contribute to trite orthodoxy and arrest individual development.

PHE: How do you explain the growth and psychology of fundamentalism?

DD: In a word, splitting; but there is no short answer.

PHE: What are your thoughts on the psychology and psychodynamics of violence in our world?

DD: I feel we should be very tentative in any hypotheses we put forward, and so I hesitate to do so.

PHE: What are your thoughts about the Y2K emphasis and other reactions to the coming of the third millennium?

DD: I read a passing reference in the *London Times* that suggested that end-of-the-world fantasies are fueled by revenge, of the powerless against the powerful -- not a bad starting point.

PHE: How has your psychohistorical experience changed your vision of the world?

DD: My sense is that individuals continue to struggle with early conflicts, which they displace, repeat, flee from, and glimpse but find too painful or unrewarding to hold in attention for long or to work through. Yet they often do form adaptations, or live in the conflict-free chambers of their psychic mansion, or form loving ties, or find sublimated/symbolic release in quasi-creative activities, or transcend their self-concerns to act altruistically and with kindness -- for some, consistently, for others, erratically. But, in fact, we all put these ingredients together idiosyncratically and ad-hocly, adding in a portion of free will and the contingencies of circumstances and temperament. So we need to keep alive the capacities for surprise, wonder, insight, pleasure, paradox, suspending judgment, and changing our mind at whatsoever the cost.

Paul H. Elovitz is Editor of this publication. q

Grief That Dares Not Speak Its Name

Irene Javors
Private Practice and New Jersey City University

I am a psychotherapist who specializes in bereavement and loss. For over a decade, my work

has involved accompanying the bereaved on their grief journeys. Grief work has taught me a great deal about our society's attitudes towards loss and bereavement. We are socially pressured to "get over" our losses quickly and without any fuss. We are told to "pull it together" regardless of our pain and suffering. We have devised categories of inclusion regarding what we identify as legitimate or illegitimate grief. Certain losses command formal recognition by all of us, while other grievings are relegated to the sub-basement of our collective psyches.

Our emotional stinginess when faced with the very urgent neediness of the bereaved has been addressed by innumerable contemporary writers from Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, *On Death and Dying* (1969) to Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death* (1975). Americans take offense at the mere mention of the word *death*. We rail at life's incomprehensible messiness. Like Melville's ill-fated Ahab, we shake our fists at the heavens and challenge the sun, the moon, and the stars.

Perhaps, we should call this our manic defense against life's inevitabilities. If we cannot beat death and its attendant feelings of loss and grief, at least we can narrow our frames of reference -- make sure that we don't have to deal with too many unwanted losses, too much inconsolable grief. We divide our losses into those that are true and worthy of our attention and those that happen to "other people." We view those "others" as experiencing insignificant losses, losses not worthy of wider public concern. Kenneth Doka in his groundbreaking work, *Disenfranchised Grief* (1989), defined *disenfranchised grief* "as the grief that persons experience when they incur a loss that is not or cannot be openly acknowledged, publicly mourned, or socially supported" (p. 4). He goes on to say that this concept "recognizes that societies have sets of norms -- in effect, grieving rules -- that attempt to specify who, when, where, how long, and for whom people should grieve" (p. 4).

So many of our losses and so much of our grief falls outside the acceptable norms. Our society angrily declares, "No, we will not join you in publicly acknowledging your losses if your grief involves pets, jobs, status, friends, divorce, chronic illness and disability, childlessness, abortion, miscarriages, suicide, the death of a same-sex lover, the death of a lover with whom you are having an extra marital affair, aging, and the losses incurred as a result of sexism, homoprejudice, racism, and ageism." Surely, all of us can add many other forms of societally invalidated grief to this list.

Losses take on a surreal quality when there is no acknowledgment by others. All of us need to tell the story of our lives without having to repress or edit out vast sections because these aspects do not fit into acceptable social categories. When your grief receives public recognition, you are given the space to engage in much needed mourning rituals. Grief that is unacknowledged and illegitimatized has no prescribed ritual. As a therapist I have found that helping clients create their own rituals helps to facilitate grief resolution.

Loss that goes unacknowledged by either the individual or society must be looked at as a response rooted in denial. The message is "No, I am not recognizing 'this' as someone or something to which I am attached." Society recognizes only certain forms of attachment as worthy of support. Hence, when your lesbian lover dies, society does not know how to respond to such a relationship. To this way of thinking a lesbian relationship is itself an oxymoron -- it is not a relationship because it is not heterosexual. Therefore, there really has been no loss since there has been no legitimate attachment. Or, if your animal companion of 15 years dies, society once again dismisses your bonds of attachment by callously advising, "Just get another one."

The subject of unacknowledged and disenfranchised grief is worthy of further investigation and research. Whenever we study loss we inevitably study attachment as well. By focusing on the interplay between the two, we will work toward broadening our concepts of attachment, loss, and grief. As a society, our traditional ideas about the nature of family are changing. We are being challenged to expand our definitions and consider new and different familial attachments and arrangements. As we progress with this so, too, must we become more legitimating and responsive to new categories of loss and grief.

Irene Javors, MA, MEd, MPhil, DAPA [Diplomate of the American Psychotherapy Association], is a psychotherapist in private practice in New York City, who specializes in grief work. She is also an adjunct instructor at New Jersey City University. She may be reached at <raffles20@hotmail.com>. q

Teaching Death and Dying

Kenneth Adams

Jacksonville State University

I often begin my classes on death and dying -- which are attended by upper-level sociology, social work, and nursing majors -- by asking the students how they would like to die. There is unanimity. Like the rest of us, they all want to die in their sleep, a variation on an old Woody Allen joke: "I'm not afraid of dying. I just don't want to be there when it happens." Defensiveness is pervasive.

Next I ask the students to imagine what death would look like if death were a person. I tell them to draw a picture of death and then describe what they have drawn. Although the images they draw are varied, five metaphors are discernable.

The first, and one of the least common images, is death as an Automaton -- a dispassionate killing machine. This sort of death seems cold, heartless. It is an anonymous, asexual, death by android -- a "terminator" sans the malice.

The second, and also an infrequent image of mortality, is death as the Gay Deceiver, a jovial person who attracts through physical and social magnetism. Urbane, witty, wearing a fedora, carrying a cane and calling card, a frequenter of expensive establishments, an intelligent and sophisticated gentleman -- this manifestation of death is polite, courteous and deadly. This is Ted Bundy in real life; James Mason in *Heaven Can Wait*; Robert Redford as Mr. Death on the "Twilight Zone;" and Brad Pitt in *Meet Joe Black* -- each an engaging, enticing sophisticate come to claim his victim.

The third, easily the most benevolent conception, is that of the Gentle Comforter. Generally, this image is manifest as the Angel of Death -- a beautiful blonde with wings and halo who will usher the deceased out of this life and into an unearthly existence. She is feminine, kind, and gentle; or, alternatively, the meek and mild Jesus waits with a loving heart and open arms to receive and succor the dying. Death is beautiful, peaceful, pure, soft, loving, warm, caring, saintly, wise, compassionate, and welcome.

At the other end of the emotional spectrum is the fourth image. The Macabre is a horrific image of macho death as fiendishly cruel, merciless, grotesque, and diabolical. In this personification, death is fantasized as evil incarnate, a ferocious death monster, such as the Devil, a hideous skeleton or bloodsucking vampire, or even a real person,

such as Hitler. Macabre death is hideous and bloodthirsty, with agonizing pain and suffering as key components of the image. It is cold, black evil that is vulgar, haunting, harsh, merciless, and mocking. In this nightmare incarnation, death is the Grim Reaper, an equal opportunity destroyer, whose scythe cuts down all, whoever they may be.

Finally, there is the view of death as Janus, the keeper of the doorway, a being looking in two directions simultaneously. In this ambivalent metaphor, the oxymoronic quality of death, its contradictory nature, is dominant. Death is viewed through bifocal lenses as a wall and/or door, a devil and/or angel, Heaven and/or Hell, good and/or evil, comfort and/or torment, a friend and/or foe, beautiful and/or horrifying, the end and/or beginning, loss and/or gain. Such ambivalent imagery pervades virtually every metaphor that my students concoct.

In Alabama during a typical day in college, students -- like so many everywhere -- want to avoid death. They want to evade the reality captured in one of my student's drawings: a grotesque Uncle Sam-death monster, finger pointing toward the viewer, saying, "I want you -- for my very best friend!" They see death as horrific and comforting, and they hope for Heaven, while seeking to avoid Hell. They yearn for the good death, a peaceful end to an earthly life and eternal happiness. They are young and, in the words of *Fame*, "gonna live forever!" They try to avoid the bad death -- the hell of pain and suffering, and in avoiding their own personal awareness of this reality principle, they inevitably avoid knowing about the horrors of the ethnic cleansings and genocides that are in the newspapers and the history books. The Nanking Massacre in China, the Holocaust, Cambodia, and Rwanda -- the bad death is the horrific reality so common in history, so easy to push out of consciousness in our uneasiness with our own mortality.

My students want to function in terms of the pleasure principle. They want what they want when they want it -- an "A" without effort, a death without loss. They want to continue to row their boats "gently down the stream," blissfully unaware, believing that "life is but a dream." They do not want to embrace all the negatives that death entails.

However, as one of my teachers, Philip E. Slater, wrote, "Teaching is an erotic irritant" whose function it is to break through the basic defensive postures of group life, and further rationality and

consciousness. In important ways that is at least part of what a class in death and dying is about. It is also what I try to accomplish in my class.

Bertrand Russell once observed, "Many people would rather die than think. In fact, they do." Part of my job in class is to get students to reverse that scenario, and to feel, and feeling involves pain where death is involved. Stalin may have put things brutally, but his message was similar: "A single death is a tragedy, a million deaths is a statistic."

To fathom the emotional reality of contemporary life, my students and I must face our own mortality. We must grapple with its pain and significance to have even a hope of unraveling the realities of Nanking, Dachau, or nuclear war, and insure that those who have passed away are more than just statistics.

Toward that end, we talk, share, and try to defuse anxiety. I utilize my own experiences with death. I tell the students about my fears at night when my ego defenses are permeable. I talk about my friends who have died and my feelings of loss. I describe putting my dog to sleep. Mostly, however, I discuss the deaths of my parents.

My mother died while I was a grad student at Brandeis. In 1972, 10 years after a bout with lung cancer, she was stricken with pancreatic cancer. I made it home to see her before her death, but was not there when she died. She had seemed stable on my first night home, and so, since my wife and I had a six-week-old son, I chose to stay with them during the night instead of being with my mother. She died that night, and I have always felt guilty about that decision. I felt I should have been there, and I determined that I would never feel that sort of pain again.

Twenty-two years later, in 1994, my father was dying of colon cancer, and I was teaching Death and Dying. After my classes, four or five times a week, I made the 45-minute drive over to spend some time with him. He had entered a hospice program and was reasonably comfortable until the last week of his life. I had never seen my father behave so magnificently. In young adulthood, he had a blazing temper and could be tyrannical. oedipal issues were a family trademark. Yet, in his seventies, dying of cancer, he was a genuine hero -- a strong, loving man, meeting death with equanimity. He died in my arms, and I was there because I had *not* been there for my mother. I use these experiences with my parents as cautionary

tales for my students. "Take care of unfinished business," I tell them, "while there is time. Get your priorities in order."

Studying death and dying is a Janus-like endeavor. On the one hand, death is natural, the boundary of life. To appreciate how miraculous our existence is, we must focus on what it is not. Mozart's advice is exemplary: "Death is the key that unlocks the door to our true happiness." On the other hand, such a perspective may lead to Pollyannaism and the derogation of human suffering as merely the prerequisite to beatitude. Death can be unspeakably brutal, as evidenced by the gruesome pictures from the Nanking Massacre and the Holocaust. An emotional appreciation of the agony endured while dying is a prerequisite for humanity. Finding a means of helping students in Alabama become less anxious about their own deaths, while developing an awareness and sympathy for the anguish of anonymous others, is no more, nor less, than the goal of thanatology. It is why I teach my classes the way that I do.

Ken Adams, PhD, is Professor of Sociology at Jacksonville State University, where he teaches courses on ethnic and minority relations, contemporary sociological theory, the sociology of religion, and death and dying. Presently an Associate Editor of the Journal of Psychohistory and a Member of the Advisory Board of H-Psychohistory [electronic discussion network], he previously served as the Editor of Psychohistory News and an Assistant Editor for the Journal, and has published a variety of articles on Japan and America. He can be reached online at <KAAPSYSY@aol.com>. q

The Nazi Genocidal and Apocalyptic Mind

er, General William Tecumseh Sherman, perhaps a reader of Martin Luther, wrote home that he was proud to participate in "the final solution of the Indian problem.") Most shocking were Stanley Milgram's experiments (*Obedience to Authority*, 1974), showing that ordinary citizens in Connecticut obeyed orders to harm innocent people, even to a lethal extent. His experiments so disturbed the psychological community that Milgram was condemned and his findings only poorly integrated into social science.

Outbreaks of "ethnic cleansing" contrib-

uted to the growing realization that civilization had a long way to go before holocausts might stop happening. In recent years, explaining Nazi genocide passed from social psychologists to psychohistorians. Jay Gonen opens his book, *The Roots of Nazi Psychology: Hitler's Utopian Barbarism* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2000, ISBN 081312154X, pp. 224, $25.00), with Karl Mannheim's words, suggesting that psychohistory "is the tearing off of disguises -- the unmasking of those unconscious motives which bind the group existence to its cultural aspirations" -- to its ideology. In ideology and its mythical sources, Gonen finds the mental mechanisms on which messianism and particularly genocide are based. For genocide to end, destructive messianic figures need to be unmasked so well that they lose the mantle of legitimacy to which they lay claim. In the search to understand the genocidal mind, Gonen's book is a major step, and a vital part is his analysis of messianic leadership and the role followers play.

In times of despair, the ancient yearning for a messiah wells up, opening the door to a charismatic figure with an apocalyptic vision -- the most destructive of leaders. Messianic leaders ask sacrifice of their followers, offering them redemption and a new world. The destructive ones ask followers to give their lives -- the most redemptive sacrifice, insuring them a place in the pantheon of national heroes -- in fighting a fiendish enemy who must not only be beaten, but also exterminated. Gonen's probing of unconscious mechanisms in such thinking by Hitler and his followers is impressive.

Mutual needs combine into an intense love-faith relationship -- a transcendental relationship -- between messianic leader and followers, which empowers both. The leader becomes godlike; the followers, transfigured. Gonen brilliantly paints the process: the ideology in Hitler's offer of deliverance and the acceptance by Nazis of his offer of a new world, which was a return to the Eden of individuals' infancy and of the mythical Germany of the ancient, sacred past. It was to be a world in which their desires would be gratified, in which the nation's afflictions would be made to disappear, and in which prostrate Germany would rise to destroy her enemies and rule the world. As such movements do, Hitler's embraced scapegoating, became genocidal.

Explaining the process requires blending individual and group psychology, and that is where Gonen excels, enriching his analysis with Freudian insights. He provides a masterful picture of the mythical and mystical in Hitler's ideology. In my judgment, *The Roots of Nazi Psychology* is by far the best book on the irrational, regressive, magical thinking by which Nazis overcame self-hatred and despair and set aside individual and social restraints, moving toward genocide and apocalyptic war. For example, the sense of justice which carried Nazis along -- obviously grotesque, yet typical of messianic movements -- was essentially restorative and retributive. That which has been stolen from us must be restored; that which has been inflicted on us must be undone; the pollution we have suffered must be cleansed; and the perpetrators must be made to pay. The restoration, undoing, purification, and punishment were seen as absolutely necessary, constituting primordial justice, which by regressive thinking is the highest justice. I would add that on this basis, Nazis' stealing, beating, and mutilating (notably by involuntary sterilization) of innocent people were justified not only by the perpetrators but also by German courts. These courts became agents of primordial justice and exempted Nazis from punishment.

Gonen follows Erikson and Binion in explaining the most destructive messianic movements as a match between the leader's pathology and the people's, resulting in mutual reinforcement. When that happens, the leader and the people tend to repeat earlier traumas, with resultant catastrophe. Germany's recent trauma -- the destructive terms imposed at Versailles, ruining her economy and fostering widespread despair -- was analogous to Hitler's childhood trauma. The match facilitated acceptance of Hitler's delusion that Germany was being destroyed by disguised Jews, who were directing the nations oppressing Germany, and other disguised Jews in the German government, cooperating with them in the destruction. To many -- especially those who were paranoid or phobic and felt most vulnerable -- Hitler's promise of power and immortality provided their only hope. In Gonen's words, "the fate of the folk and its blood is linked.… Either both decline ... or surge together toward glorious omnipotence for all eternity…."

In exploring Hitler's messianism, Gonen often links Nazi ideology with Jewish ideology. This may trouble some readers, but is crucial in understanding Nazi anti-Semitism and apocalyptic thinking. For in both ideologies he finds "An eternal historical cycle of sin, punishment, repentance, forgiveness" to be broken by the advent of a mes-

siah and an apocalyptic war. While identifying Jews as their principal enemy, Nazis took on quasi-Jewish identity, claiming to be "the chosen people" (as do United States Nazis today). In particular, Hitler perceived Jews as Germany's conscience and -- paradoxically -- as the hated personifications of German evil. In getting rid of Jews, Nazis sought to free themselves of conscience and evil -- to elevate themselves to a state above good and evil in becoming supermen -- a Nietzschean ideal -- by replacing ethics, morality, custom, and law with pseudobiology.

(Linking Nazi and Jewish ideologies is also useful in going beyond particulars of the Third Reich to messianic and apocalyptic movements across the world -- a project beyond Gonen's book. Japan -- the other main contributor to apocalyptic war in the 20th century -- was similar to Germany in having a strong cult of death, in its obsession with being victimized and polluted, and in trying to cleanse its own nation as well as to save the world. Both nations were ridden with self-hatred -- the source of messianism -- and in their rampages killed their own people as well as outsiders. Their ally Italy seems to have lacked self-hatred and a cult of death, to have engaged in relatively little scapegoating except when under Nazi domination, and to have had little enthusiasm for apocalyptic war.)

Charismatic leaders, especially destructive ones, have wielded a power since ancient times which is undiminished in our scientific era. (It is probably enhanced by the modern media.) Hitler was one who included a sexual-procreative message. Rape was a feature of his breeding program. Women were confined in *Lebensborn* (Spring of Life) centers, guarded by SS men, to engage in sex with other SS men. Insofar as they were confined and required to submit by the authority of the state, they were coerced -- raped. He offered his select male followers (especially the SS) unlimited access to desirable women (notably blonde, virginal adolescents) -- giving permission to rape them without punishment -- and the glory thereby of becoming the progenitors of a race of supermen. He offered women the glory of bringing forth the supermen by submitting impersonally to these lords, even to the extent of rape, but with sanctification instead of degradation. Since ancient times, rape has mystically ennobled and enhanced the power of the perpetrators and -- in special circumstances -- of the victims, too. In Nazi Germany, they became symbolic brides of their savior, Hitler, and sacred

mothers of the supermen.

Gonen's analysis of the powerful "blood and soil" theme in the ideology of Nazism and of its precursor, the *Volkish* movement, is original. Nazis perceived "Aryan" Germans as growing weak when separated from their own magic soil. Consequently they believed "Aryans" needed for their survival to return to their soil, and to regain soil that had been "stolen" from them -- land in the east. This obscure and obviously regressive element in Nazi thinking contributed to the *Lebensraum* movement. Gonen's analysis of *Lebensraum* thinking is most impressive. It includes elements of birth strangulation and its remedy, a bursting-birthing expansion in the east. Hitler said, "There comes a time when this desire for expansion can no longer be contained and must burst into action." His words also suggest violent sexual action as a remedy to confinement, as if territorial limitation were related to sexual restraint. (Hitler was sexually severely inhibited, impotent, and inactive most of his life, but also obsessed with sex. His breeding program seems a transparent vicarious expression of his desires.)

Vampirism figured predominantly in Nazi ideology about Jews -- their alter egos and scapegoats. Jews, they said, sucked the blood of peoples they victimized -- metaphorically and literally. In sucking blood and in sexual contact with "Aryan" women, Jews also polluted them, turning the victims and their progeny into permanently evil creatures -- semi-Jews, the equivalent of vampires -- who must also be eradicated.

That Hitler claimed Jews were parasitic vampires, taking the blood of their hosts, is long known. But, as far as I know, Gonen is the first to identify vampirism in Nazi ideas about "Aryans." Nazis acted metaphorically as vampires by taking the "Aryan blood" of peoples they conquered -- notably Norwegians and Poles. They kidnapped blond children to raise them as Germans, thereby absorbing into the Reich their "blood" -- their genetic substance. Similarly, they kidnapped blonde Norwegian and Polish women to serve as breeders, thereby obtaining their "blood" for Germany.

Insofar as these programs linked "Aryans" with Jews in Nazi thinking, and insofar as vampire myths were powerful in central and eastern Europe, a study of vampirism and its role in the Third Reich would seem valuable. The myths include an erotic theme of death and rebirth. The male vampire seduces or rapes women, and the result is a biological exchange by which his es-

sence enters their bodies, turning them into vampires. By this kiss of death, perpetrators and victims gain eternal life. The exchange suggests a connection between blood and semen -- a connection which ran through the sexual obsessions of Hitler and Julius Streicher, who was his main propagandist, along with Goebbels. Streicher wrote over and over in his Nazi newspaper *Der Stürmer* about how Jewish semen enters a woman's blood, changing her and her progeny into monsters. The same theme was the basis of a *Volkish* novel, *The Sin Against the Blood*, which was a best-seller in Germany and particularly impressed Nazis.

A dominant idea in Nazi portrayal of Jews' role was, in Gonen's words, that "an ideal state of health (utopia), which prevailed once upon a time, has been lost because of a lethal intruder." The intruder was the Jew who, with his unbridled sexual cravings, seduced and raped "Aryan" girls and women, bringing disease to Germany. This historical notion involved two regressive fantasies: one, of the phallic, semen-carrying serpent tempting the primordial mother, ruining the Garden of Eden; the other, of individuals' fathers intruding into the blissful intimacy of children with their mothers, ruining their infantile paradise. In Nazis' version of history, by his intrusion, the Jew-serpent-father brought enfeebling afflictions -- both mental (national impotence, shame, and guilt) and physical (notably syphilis, but also other plagues). I would add that Hitler suffered with a delusion of having inherited syphilis from his father, whom he thought to be secretly Jewish. The father had a reputation for unbridled sexuality, for seducing young women and adolescents. Hitler believed that his imaginary syphilis ruined him forever, preventing him from having normal sexual relations or fathering normal children. He turned his delusion into an explanation for all that was wrong with Germany. In the nation's desperate situation, his delusion caught on, not because it had any connection with syphilis or other afflictions, but because many German males shared Hitler's experience of being harmed by a harsh father. For some of them, a bearded Jew was a symbol of severe paternal authority, because the Biblical story of the fall from grace was part of their heritage.

Hitler insisted his anti-Semitism and the rest of his worldview were based not on emotion or personal experience, but on the more solid ground of scientific observation. The authority on whom he and other Nazis relied most was Darwin. They fastened on a crude distortion of natural selection

theory, using it as a basis for racial policy. Since racial policy dominated other Nazi policy, their version of Darwinism became the basis for science in general, philosophy, education, domestic affairs, foreign affairs, and war. Policy, knowledge, art, and state institutions were to be organized around one goal -- advancing ruthlessly the natural selection of the best people, the pure "Aryans." For example, art that ennobled "Aryans" was to be fostered; other art was degenerate, to be eliminated. The same standard applied to medicine, with physicians giving up healing to aid "natural selection" as instruments of genocide. This biologization of knowledge, and its application, was to provide a sure foundation for a state which Hitler promised would endure for a thousand years if not forever. Under its pseudoscientific veneer, the racial policy meant that the chosen people were to get what they desired, while the rest were either to serve them or be eliminated.

This sketch only suggests the richness of Gonen's tapestry. I have highlighted and extended some obscure parts of *The Roots of Nazi Psychology*. The book also explores lodes that have already been mined by many scholars -- notably anti-Semitism and Darwinism along with blood-and-soil myths and *Lebensraum*. When analyzing familiar as well as obscure aspects of Nazism, the book is highly original and deeply psychological. Because of its complexity, subtlety, and psychological depth, his book is somewhat difficult to read -- certainly by the general reader. The interested scholar for whom it is intended -- especially the psychohistorian -- will find in it a wealth of seminal ideas, hopefully stimulating new research.

George Victor, PhD, the author of <u>Hitler:</u>

Call for Papers

- **Group Psychohistory (December, 2000)**
- **Conspiracy Theories (December, 2000) (See page 100)**
- **PsychoGeography (March, 2001)**
- **Legalizing Life: Our Litigious Society (2001)**
- **The Psychology of Incarceration and Crime (2001)**
- **Television as Object Relations**

Contact Paul Elovitz, Editor

See page 51

The Pathology of Evil (1998), which addresses many of Gonen's topics, is at work on *The Myth of Pearl Harbor*. q

In *Memoriam*:
George M. Kren
(1926-2000)

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

George Michael Kren, historian, psychohistorian, Holocaust researcher, photographer, and Professor of History (Retired) at Kansas State University (KSU) in Manhattan, died July 24, 2000, at the age of 74 of heart failure after many years of suffering from emphysema. He had a fascinating life, leaving a rich legacy of scholarship, art, and personal friendships in its wake.

Birth and scholarship linked Kren's life to central Europe. Linz, Austria, is well known as the town where Hitler was raised and from which some other prominent Nazis came. It was also where George was born to a professional family on June 3, 1926. When Hitler's mother developed breast cancer, it was Kren's maternal grandfather, Edmund Blcoh, who cared for her, prompting Hitler to declare that he would be ever grateful to the doctor. Rudolph Binion, in his brilliant and controversial book, *Hitler Among the Germans* (1976), argued that Hitler's hatred for Jews stemmed mainly from the blame he unconsciously placed on the doctor for his mother's failed medical treatment. Though some of Kren's relatives were outraged by the association of the family with Hitler's anti-Semitism in any way, George did not speak publicly to the issue.

The lives of the Krens and the other Jews in Austria were disrupted by Hitler's annexation of Austria. Fearful for the lives of their children, the parents of 12-year-old George and his nine-year-old sister sent them to England where they became separated. After a year, they discovered that their parents were alive and had made it to the United States, where the children joined them in New York City

In 1944 Kren was drafted into the United States Army and served in Europe. Though he joked about being a poor soldier, he landed just days after D-Day, fighting until the end of the war. After his discharge in 1946, he attended Colby College on the GI Bill before moving on to the

University of Wisconsin where he earned his master's and doctoral degrees working under the tutelage of George Mosse. Prior to joining the faculty at Kansas State University in the "other Manhattan" (as George liked to call it), Kren taught at Oberlin, Elmira, and Lake Forest colleges as well as Roosevelt University. After 35 years he retired from Kansas State University in June of this year.

Knowledge and scholarship were central to the life of George Kren. To undergraduate students he taught a variety of courses, including The Rise and Fall of Nazi Germany; Holocaust: The Destruction of the European Jews; and European Thought in the Twentieth Century. All KSU history graduate students took his Historiography class. He lectured at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas, throughout North America, and at Oxford University in England. Kren's 12-page résumé contains numerous articles and a variety of books. He enjoyed collaborating with others. With Leon Rappoport he edited *Varieties of Psychohistory* (1976), *The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior* (1980 and 1994), and chapters on the Holocaust included in the recently published *Encyclopedia of Genocide*. With his former student, George Christakes, he wrote *Scholars and Personal Computers* (1988).

Death will not cease the dissemination of Professor Kren's scholarship. His completed manuscript on a comprehensive history of the Holocaust is under consideration for the European History Series of Harlan, Davidson, Inc., with Professors George Christakes and Don Mrozek committed to seeing the book through to publication. In retirement, George planned to translate and write an introduction to his grandfather's diaries, a task now in the hands of his colleague, Helmut Schmeller of KSU.

Photography was a passion with George and his wife, the artist and KSU professor Margo Kren. In 1994 he published *Touching the Sky*, containing essays and photography. When he retired, a collection of his photographs was donated to the Beach Museum of Art at Kansas State University.

The etiology of George's emphysema was his habit of smoking three packs of Camel unfiltered cigarettes a day. He started smoking heavily in the Army and continued until about 15 years ago. At several points in the last six or seven years, he was so close to death that friends and colleagues gathered at his bedside. The last three weeks of his life were extremely difficult and painful for George and his loved ones. His wife and

about ten friends were present at his death. Among his survivors are a son from a prior marriage, a granddaughter, and his sister. On October 1 there will be a memorial service at KSU.

***

George Kren Remembered

Leon Rappoport is Professor of Psychology at Kansas State University and the author of numerous research articles in the field of personality development including a textbook on development across the life span. He may be reached at <rappo@ksu.edu>.

It may have been a harbinger of our future collaboration that George Kren and I first met over the Vietnam War in 1966. A handful of faculty had gathered at his home to discuss ways of organizing opposition to the war. At the time he was divorced, living alone in a small tract house, and what could not fail to impress anyone visiting for the first time was the overflowing floor-to-ceiling metal book racks that filled all but a small area of his living room. At the close of our relatively vague meeting -- it was only much later that an effective faculty protest group emerged -- I stayed behind to ask him if I could borrow one of the several books I had noticed concerning the Spanish Civil War.

This was the point on which we first clicked. It turned out that even more so than I, a devotee of the struggle against Franco by virtue of having read Hemingway and Orwell, George was a true aficionado. He proceeded to give me a 45-minute lecture on the International Brigades and why it was that this was the only "good war" that he would have been glad to fight in as a soldier. Following my enthusiastic agreement, our further conversation soon led to the realization that whereas my "hobby" was history and my work involved a heavy focus on Freudian theory, George's hobby was Freudian theory and his work was intellectual history. This discovery of our unusual complementarity made a strong impression on both of us. For my part, I recall telling my wife afterwards that I had met this remarkable man, a real scholar and thinker who had impressed the daylights out of me.

George and I began to meet regularly. Soon we began planning to teach a class together on the applications of psychology to history. This was before the term *psychohistory* had emerged, although George subscribed to a newsletter called *GUPH: Group for the Use of Psychology in His-*

tory, and it would be fair to say that George was a psychohistorian before there was psychohistory. At any rate, our class went well; students seemed to enjoy it almost as much as we did. More significantly, two ideas that were to shape both of our futures grew out of that class: the "easy" one followed from the collection of papers we had assembled to serve as text, which became the basis for our anthology called *Varieties of Psychohistory*. The more difficult one was the Holocaust.

It was hard not only because available source materials in psychology and history were scattered and disparate, but also, especially for George, because of the emotions it evoked. His courageous determination to work through his emotions during our efforts to write an accessible, psychohistorical/philosophical analysis of the Holocaust, is what sustained both of us throughout the several years it took us to complete *The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior*.

***

Sue Zschoche, the Department of History at Kansas State University, is completing The Industrial Hearth: Home Economics and the Reconstruction of the Woman's Sphere, 1880-1911, and may be reached at <suez@ksu.edu>.

As I write this, I find myself thinking about calling George so that I can tease him a bit about what I am going to say about him. Even now, I can almost hear his droll commentary, his eyes twinkling as he explains in mock horror how I have misjudged him. In his adopted Kansas, he truly was an exotic, the authentic European intellectual among us. But as we discovered, George could be the most playful of intellectuals, possessed of an insatiable curiosity and a witty appreciation for human foibles, not excepting his own. I used to tell him that I was going to nominate him for the position of departmental shrink -- to hear him psychoanalyze a particularly loony department meeting was an experience not to be missed. The Austrian accent, of course, was icing on the cake.

In his sudden absence, I think that I am struck most of all with the triumph that his gentle heart represented. He carried his haunted and haunting personal history with an astonishing lightness of spirit. In his work, in his life, all those left behind in his native land were his constant companions, and he bore testimony to them with unparalleled constancy and dignity. George Kren taught us to look at the human condition without sentimentality and to see not only its absurdity but its

exquisite beauty as well. It was our amazing privilege to have him with us in this place so very far from where he began. I will miss him more than I can possibly explain.

***

Don Mrozek is Professor of History at Kansas State University and colleague of George Kren. He may be reached at <mrozek@ksu.edu>.

In his 35 years at Kansas State University, George Kren made a remarkably large number of good friends, had relatively few adversaries, and collected even fewer, if any, enemies. Even in moments of disagreement, one could always trust in George Kren's sincerity of purpose and honesty in debate. Even though he loved to examine theory, he would never sacrifice an individual or the truth to it. So he was taken as a reliable colleague by individuals whose own beliefs ranged across a very wide spectrum.

George Kren was as well read as anyone I've ever known, and he had a capacity to draw on a wide range of ideas and subjects in any conversation. Analytical though he was, his mind craved synthesis and relationship -- seeing connection and affinity among music, art, literature, and other fields as well as accustomed written documentary sources. In answer to any question, he was sure to add, "There's a book you should read on this subject." If asked whether the book was good, he was almost certain to say "It's interesting." The realm of ideas was, indeed, "interesting" to George Kren -- but in the way that life itself can be interesting and not in an antiquarian manner.

In the end, there was an underlying unity to most of his published historical work. To be sure, he was specifically interested in the Holocaust -- his own life history including his escape from Nazi-controlled Austria helps to explain this. George Kren is the only person I have ever known who was actually stoned -- an unforgettable part of his childhood experience. But he was especially concerned with human values and their state in the 20th century. A frequent essayist -- and, although he had books to his credit, articles and extended review essays often seemed his preferred form -- Kren found particular appeal in the focus of periodicals such as the *Journal of Value Inquiry*. His commitment to psychohistory stemmed from this same concern.

Although he could be brave in his devotion to intellectual and academic principle, George Kren found conflict terribly disagreeable. Positioning for advantage in argument gave him the greatest discomfort, especially because its purposes seemed so much at odds with the pursuit of understanding. To his work as a teacher, George Kren brought these sentiments and others which made him genuinely beloved among undergraduate students, for whom he was surely something of an exotic beast. He was also famously popular among graduate students, for whom he was all the more exotic because his origins were better understood. That some students showed little grasp of their own culture and its product caused him hurt rather than disdain, and he was guided by a line from Bertolt Brecht to the effect that "the house will be built with the bricks that are there." For some students, then, Kren became the most memorable of teachers.

Although his analytical and critical skills were unusually keen, George Kren's ability to turn quickly to the practical and pragmatic was among his most remarkable characteristics. He played critically important roles in strengthening graduate studies in history at Kansas State University, and, for decades, he coordinated each semester's general slate of course offerings. Not only analytical but often quite theoretical, he could turn to the practical in an instant. With an ironic twinkle in his eye, he might say "So, then, what is to be done?"

An excellent photographer, a gourmet cook, a lover of fine music, and much else, George Kren was committed to living life well. Joking seriously, he would sometimes say that, with all transcendent systems of value challenged, there was nothing left to govern human life beyond good manners. And so it was that "good manners" and "behaving well" took on meaning and value, not as affectation but as a warm and personable realization of an existentialist impulse.

***

George Christakes, Harold Washington College in Chicago, authored Albion W. Small and may be reached at <71066.1207@compuserve.com>.

Several weeks ago I flew out to Manhattan, Kansas, to see George Kren in the hospital. The next day I was there when he died. I have known this remarkable man since 1965 when I was his teaching assistant. Later I did my PhD under his co-direction. Our friendship was formed early and lasted through the years, and included writing a book together, *Scholars and Personal Computers*. Many who knew him as a Holocaust scholar or a

student of cultural history may find his writing of that book surprising. He was a student of George Mosse who had said, "A historian, if he is to get history right, cannot be bigoted or narrow minded." George Kren took that dictum to heart and always utilized a broad encompassing approach to history and to life. He used psychohistory as a tool to broaden his understanding of the Nazis and the Holocaust. From his early interest in popular German anti-Semitic novels to later sociological and psychological methodology, he would use a broad range of methods "to get history right."

The wideness of his interests was not simply in his historical approach. His lecturing at Menninger on Freud demonstrated his knowledge of another discipline, which he then applied to historical research. In non-scholarly areas he also excelled. George Kren was an excellent photographer who published his photographs and had exhibits of his photography. The Marianna Kistler Beach Museum of Art in Manhattan, Kansas will present an exhibition of his photographs while George's friends gather for his memorial service October 1. His culinary skill was something that many of us had the opportunity to enjoy over the years when he and Margo entertained.

Though I valued George as a scholar and admired his ability to excel in such wide areas, I most valued him as a friend. He was a warm, sensitive, and really caring person. I think back to his constant encouragement when I was struggling with illness in my family. I, and all those who knew him well, could always count on him when we had need. The image of him that I will always cherish is of his bobbing his head while peering up with his intense but gentle eyes.

***

Rudolph Binion, is Leff Families Professor of European History at Brandeis University and may be reached at <binion@brandeis.edu>.

It could not be truer that, with the death of George Kren, psychohistory has lost one of its very ablest theorists and practitioners. But the whole truth is immeasurably greater. George was also, for starters, a surpassing expert in German thought and culture, an ongoing pioneer in the historian's use of the computer, and a splendid photographer with a poetic yet earthbound vision of the everyday rural beauties of his adoptive state of Kansas. But above all, with the strict scientific objectivity of his historical research went a tender sympathy for human failings. His understanding of the Holocaust

is a model of wisdom: that it was an unfathomably horrendous *human* crime. I who have loved George as a friend for some 30 years feel with his dear wife, Margo, a mix of deepest sorrow and, given his increasing physical suffering, relief at his passing.

***

Paul Elovitz, Ramapo College, the Psychohistory Forum, and **Clio's Psyche**.

George's twinkling eyes captivated me as we chatted at a cocktail party in a West Side highrise overlooking the Hudson River in New York during an International Psychohistorical Association (IPA) convention. They glistened like the sun on the water below. This man in a leather jacket seemed to me to be a Trotsky look-alike. It was both educational and fun to chat with him. Kren's articles and books on psychohistory and the Holocaust encouraged me in my own work. He spoke with excitement about the graduate program in psychohistory which Kansas State University started in cooperation with the Karl Menninger Foundation. Subsequently there was the sadness that it did not attract enough graduate students to be continued. I found myself looking for him at other IPA meetings and was disappointed that other commitments and emphysema made his appearances less and less frequent.

Communication was maintained in other ways. There were George and Margo's lovely postcards, mostly displaying their own artwork, that arrived during the Holidays and when the doctors let him travel. After a near death experience, George spoke at length on the telephone about the power granted to the dying and threatened to write an article on the subject. He readily agreed to serve on the Editorial Board of **Clio's Psyche** when we started this publication in 1994 and periodically wrote for us. We were proud that his fine critique of Goldhagen's book, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, in **Clio** scooped the review he wrote for the *American Historical Review*. George sent encouraging notes on many subjects, including on how to use computers to further psychohistory. In recent years e-mail kept us connected.

When Leon Rappoport sent a printed copy of Kren's retirement comments to me in May, I collected other materials and prepared a lengthy, somewhat humorous article on it for these pages with the hope of putting a smile on his tired face and the faces of his many friends and admirers. Regrettably, space consideration forced its post-

Letter to the Editor

ponement and now cancellation, but I will send a copy to anyone who cares to make an e-mail request to me at <pelovitz@aol.com>.

George Michael Kren was loved and respected by many. He will be missed. q

Ad Hominem Criticism and Editorial Policy

The June issue of **Clio's Psyche** carried an ambiguous, somewhat tolerant policy statement on ad hominem criticism without defining it. Such criticism is directed at the identity or personality of an author. It serves to discredit an author's work, and may be done without analyzing the work's data or logic. Often it is more effective in discrediting a work than is painstaking analysis. A derivative meaning of ad hominem criticism is that it appeals to passion and prejudice rather than to fact or reason. To argue against an ad hominem criticism in ad hominem fashion, one might say that it is "a Nazi technique."

Put simply, such criticism says the author is a fool or rogue, implying that the work merits no consideration. It is name-calling, devoid of scholarly value, and most destructive when it carries a punch, while passing as scholarly comment. If strong in our righteousness, we may find it appealing, take satisfaction in seeing writing dismissed out of hand, and ignore the destructiveness to scholarship that such dismissal promotes.

In historical writing, two terms have become particularly effective in ad hominem criticism -- *conspiracy theory* (implying lunacy) and *revisionism* (implying evil). Until fairly recently, *revisionist* was a neutral term, often used to describe an improved historical account. Now it implies that a work should be rejected because it is wicked.

Both terms mark criticism of writers who find Franklin D. Roosevelt responsible for the disaster of Pearl Harbor. Before his 1948 book, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War*, Charles Beard had achieved the highest distinction among United States historians. Cleverly characterized as "history through a beard," his book was dismissed. I think people were happy to dismiss it because it was offensive to the memory of a beloved President and to the highly valued, popular righteousness over the United States entry into World War II. Written before release of most of the evidence on Roosevelt's far-sighted determination to get his reluctant nation into the war against Hitler and before release of most of the intelligence on Japan's plan to attack Pearl Harbor, Beard's book was condemned as "conspiracy theory." Subsequent release of the evidence supported Beard's findings. But his reputation remains contaminated; his book is still dismissed as "revisionist."

As psychohistorians, we emphasize historical figures' personalities. Hopefully, we do so not to condemn or discredit them but to develop better explanations of events. We also bring to bear social psychology, sociology, and anthropology, finding them useful in explaining trends and historical writings that represent a time or a movement. Doing so brings us close to using such material in commenting on writings of colleagues, especially those whose views are contrary to ours. I think we should resist crossing that line.

As psychohistorians we are particularly vulnerable to being the objects of two widely used terms of dismissal -- *psychobabble* and *psychobiography* -- and I am concerned that *psychohistory* is becoming a third. This can serve as a reminder that ad hominem criticism seriously undermines acceptance of historical creativity. I suggest that scholarly publications restrict criticism to what is scholarly -- that they have a policy of zero tolerance for ad hominem criticism.

George Victor
West Orange, NJ

[**Editor's Note:** As much as I welcome the free exchange of ideas, on behalf of the Editorial Board I feel compelled to take issue with Dr. Victor's statement that **Clio's Psyche** has an "ambiguous, somewhat tolerant policy statement on ad hominem criticism." The Editors and the Board were unanimous in agreeing that Morrock's letter was not an ad hominem attack on Victor. We agreed that we would examine possible ad hominem attacks on a case-by-case basis. This is not an ambiguous policy. While not condoning character assassination, we refuse to close the door on examining the motivation of authors. However, our preference is that authors examine their own motivation. We have tried to set an example for others to follow in discussing the motivation of psychohistorians.] q

Bulletin Board

This issue is published in commemoration of **George M. Kren**, a member of our Editorial Board, who died on July 24, 2000. The next **WORK-IN-PROGRESS SATURDAY SEMINAR** is scheduled for **September 23**, **2000**, when **Michael Britton** will present "Countertransference: Royal Road Into the Psychology of the Cold War" based upon his 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 13-15, 2001, at Fordham University Law School in New York City while the **International Society of Political Psychology** (ISPP) annual meeting, "Cultures of Violence, Cultures of Peace," will be in Cuernavaca, Mexico, July 15-18, 2001. A psychohistory conference is scheduled in Nuremberg, Germany, on July 5-7, 2001. An **Ullman** experiential Leadership Training Program in group dream work will be given in Ardsley, New York, on October 27-29, 2000. For details call (914) 693-0156. **RESEARCH: Ralph Colp** recently spent an extended period in Down, England, transcribing Darwin's diary of health. **Vivian**

Rosenberg is spending part of September in Holland, researching empathy. **TRAVEL:** This summer, **Flora Hogman** presented a paper at a conference at Oxford, England, and than traveled in France while **David Beisel** with his wife Sheila Jardine traveled in Greece and Turkey. **Dan Dervin** vacationed in the Colorado Rockies, **Avner Falk** in Slovenia, **Peter Loewenberg** in the Sierras, and **Rudy Binion** on the West Coast and in Alaska. **NOTICES: Charles B. Strozier** announced the opening of his new Park Slope Brooklyn psychotherapy office at One Plaza Street. He continues to practice in his Manhattan office in Greenwich Village. **GET WELL WISHES:** To **Mel Kalfus**. **CONGRATULATIONS**: To **Peter Jüngst** on the publication of *Territorialität und Psychodynamik -- Eine Einführung in die Psychogeographie*. (*Territoriality and Psychodynamics -- An Introduction to Psychogeography*). **CORRECTION:** In Hanna Turken, "Future Psychological Issues Elián González May Face" (Vol. 7 No.1: 30-31), the Marquez article cited was from the Associated Press rather than *The New York Times* as stated. **NEW MEMBERS (Research Associates**): Welcome to Patrick Kavanaugh and Sarton Weinraub. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes **Clio's Psyche** possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, III, and Ralph Colp; Patrons Andrew Brink, Peter Petschauer, H. John Rogers, and Jacques Szaluta; Sustaining Members Mel Kalfus and Mary Lambert; Supporting Members Anonymous, Rudolph Binion, and David Felix; and Members Sue Adrion, Michael Britton, David Lotto, Margaret McLaughlin, Geraldine Pauling, and Lee Shneidman. Our appreciation for thought-provoking materials to Ken Adams, Herb Barry, Rudolph Binion, Richard Booth, Andrew Brook, Kelly Bulkeley, Karen Callaghan, George Christakes, Sheree Conrad, Dan Dervin, Vitor Franco, Don Hughes, Aubrey Immel-

---

Clio's Psyche

The Persistance of Popular Prejudices and Hatreds

J. Lee Shneidman
Adelphi University

In our "politically correct" society, it is easy to forget just how persistent are human prejudices, denigration of the other, and hatred. The pervasiveness and persistence of popular hatreds is striking and troubling to those who are interested in having a world less torn by strife and warfare. Examples will be presented from popular culture, history, and my experiences as a professor teaching a wide variety of students from around the world. I will be stressing that change does not come about because of codes of conduct and new constitutions, but as a result of one human at a time renouncing the hatreds that abound in society. My essay will not probe how to eliminate the hatreds, but rather focus on their persistence in the U.S. and among international students representing future leaders of the world.

Hatreds are not inborn, but learned. This is evident from popular culture. In the musical, *South Pacific*, Lt. Cabel, a very proper upper-class white Anglo-Saxon American, has fallen in love with a young Polynesian woman. He is conflicted. In anger and frustration he sings:

> You got to be taught
> Before it's too late
> Before you are six, or seven or eight
> To hate all the people your relatives
>   hate.
> You got to be carefully taught.

While children are not born as a tabula rasa, attitudes and values are not part of their inheritance. The teaching of prejudice is not necessarily articulated. It comes by example and subliminally in phrases and games. I have heard the following in my life as I suspect have most of my readers:

> "Eenie, meenie, mine, moe --
>   Catch a nigger by the toe...."

The little baby-shaped fudge candy in a box are called "nigger babies."

"*Shiker vei a goy.*" (Alcoholics are non-Jews.)

"Don't Jew me down." (*Jew* as a verb is still in most dictionaries.)

"Oats are eaten by men in Scotland, and horses, in England."

"Leeks make the Welsh stink." (Used by Shakespeare.)

"Sicilians can't speak Italian."

"Perfidious Albion [Britain]"

The list of phrases and rhymes that belittle people are endless. As a historian, almost where ever I turn in the past I find additional evidence of the human tendency to denigrate "the other." For example, in one of my freshman history course reading books, there is a section from a Russian General Staff meeting in 1916 reporting a discussion by the generals regarding the pros and cons of recruiting Jews for the Imperial Army. Lest the prejudices of the students keep them from seeing the point of including the selection, the editors added a footnote asking the readers to notice the accepted anti-Semitism.

In my class, I recently had an American-Serbian freshman who supported the Serbian ethnic cleansings in Bosnia and Kosovo. I asked from where he obtained his information about the Balkans. From his father and uncle, he replied. With indignation, he told of an important monastery that was ravaged by the Muslims. I inquired when it happened and why the monastery was so important. He was not sure when it happened, but stressed its holiness, again citing his father and uncle as sources. Yet, he could not answer my question as to why it was holy. Because the student was unsure of the facts behind his family's sense of outrage at the alleged actions of the Muslims, I suggested that he write a term paper on the monastery's history. He could find no information as to its significance beyond his relative's assertions.

A Ghanaian student in my course on nationalism demonstrated similar prejudices. His grandfather was the "king" of one of the local ethnic groups, but since the student's father was the son of the king's fourth wife, he would never inherit the throne. The class was discussing the problem of nation building in West Africa, when he suddenly remarked that you could always spot a Senegalese. This is, he asserted, because the Senegalese were the blackest people in Africa and because they lived on the Equator. When I double-checked the map, I found that the most northern part of Ghana is closer to the Equator than the most southern part of Senegal. Both are *north* of the Equator. His facts represented his group's prejudices rather than the reality.

The Communist leaders of Russia liked to

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.

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.**

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 Tönnes's sense. What Tönnes 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.

Howard F. Stein

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

Book Reviews

Life: Our Litigious Society
Contact the Editor (see page 3)

Letters to the Editor

Editorial Policies

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

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

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.

• **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
Saturday, January 30, 1999
Charles Strozier

P
s
y
c
h
o

Call for Papers
Special Theme Issues
1999 and 2000

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

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. Contact Paul H. Elovitz (see information, p. 2).

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.

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

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.

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

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

To Join the

The

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.