

---

---

# Clio's Psyche

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

---

---

Volume 11 Number 3

December 2004

---

---

## The Scholarly Value of Dreams Special Feature

### A Dream of a Concentration Camp

Peter Petschauer  
Appalachian State University

If anyone had told me a few months ago that a colonoscopy might have anything at all to do with psychohistory, I would have laughed; I have learned otherwise. Those who have experienced this intrusive procedure know that the day and night before it are uncomfortable as one drinks a vile liquid that purges one's bowels so that the doctor may have a clear view of any growths or obstruction in them. I experienced no exception. But the discomfort had the unique consequence in that for the second time in my life, I had a terrifying dream about a specific aspect of the past that interwove my conscious and my unconscious. Below I will describe my dream of January 14, 2004, and then give my associations and analysis.

**The Dream:** In the first scene of the dream, I was running to the latrine in a concentration camp; I was wearing poorly fitting and dirty prison garb. I desperately had to visit the latrine but an SS guard stopped me in the muddy area in front of the latrine. It was horrible to be stopped and the area itself was disgusting. He had me do push-ups until the pressure in my bowels exploded, soiling my pants further. I was disgusted with myself and ran on as the guard laughed. All this was truly upsetting because on the inside I felt like a lieutenant in the regular German army (*die Wehrmacht*). In the next scene I realized that I was half German and half Jewish, and that I was kneeling at the edge of a ravine. I was about to be shot by someone whom I could only see as a shadow from the corners of my eyes. Half turned, I told the man that I was a lieutenant in the army. "Ja, ja, me too," he said sarcastically. All  
(Continued on Page 87)

## IPA Group Process Symposium

### Attempting Group Analysis

Henry Lawton  
International Psychohistorical Association

"Why We Attempt Group Process Analysis at the International Psychohistorical Association Convention" is the full title of this paper, which was distributed at the 2004 convention. Psychohistorians seek to understand why humans act as they do in history, primarily utilizing psychoanalytic theory. This involves understanding historical motivation on both individual and group levels. Toward this end, it is important to understand the reciprocal effect of individual on group and vice versa.  
(Continued on next page)

---

## Sigmund Freud's Medical Ego Ideals

Jacques Szaluta  
United States Merchant Marine Academy

Sigmund Freud was a man of many professions. In addition to becoming a physician and, ultimately, a psychoanalyst, he wrote on art and artists, did translations, and studied philosophy and history. Freud admired and wrote about many different kinds of people, who can be categorized as medical, biblical, and philosophical personages. The men Freud admired, who may be designated as his "ego ideals," played a key role in his life and career. On the one hand, because of his interest in the study of the past, Freud sought historical figures for inspiration, and on the other, because of his revolutionary discoveries,  
(Continued on page 94)

Turn to the next page for  
**IN THIS ISSUE**

## IN THIS ISSUE

### Group Process Symposium

- Attempting Group Process Analysis.....77  
*Henry Lawton*
- Thoughts on IPA Group Process.....79  
*David Beisel*
- Group Process is a Success.....80  
*Lloyd deMause*
- The Costly Group Process Experiment.....81  
*Paul Elovitz*
- Reflections by the First Analyst.....83  
*John Hartman*
- Lawton's Response.....84

### Scholarly Value of Dreams

- A Dream of a Concentration Camp.....77  
*Peter Petschauer*
- Questions Come Before Answers..... 90  
*Montague Ullman*
- Petschauer's Dream..... 91  
*Kelley Bulkeley*

- The Historian's Mindset.....92  
*Paul Elovitz*
- 
- Freud's Medical Ego Ideals.....77  
*Jacques Szaluta*
- 
- Freud's Wolf Man.....100  
*Review by Dan Dervin*
- Appreciating Freud.....102  
*Review by David Felix*
- Fr. Bosetti as Culture Bearer to the Rockies.....103  
*Review by Dereck Daschke*
- Milgram's Legacy.....105  
*Review by Eva Fogelman*
- Saint Rose of Lima.....108  
*Review by Paula Straile-Costa*
- Leaders of Large Groups.....110  
*Review by Peter Petschauer*
- 
- Bulletin Board.....112

A fair amount of a person's life takes place in the context of various groups (culture, town, religion, family, work, professional groups, etc.). Groups cannot exist without the individuals who belong to them; groups are made by their members, and members are made by their group experiences. There can be no "group mind" apart from those that constitute the group. More properly, "group mind" is an illusion, for how can there be a mind apart from those that make up the group? Whatever groups do—for better or worse—on the stage of history is the product of shared feeling, emotion and fantasy by the members of the group. Shared emotion/fantasy is crucial for understanding how and why groups work as they do rather than as the result of any sort of group mind. But such shared emotion and fantasy tends to be quite complex and intense, as well as anxiety provoking to try and understand. So perhaps it is not surprising that many scholars try to pretend such issues do not exist or resort to intellectualizations of varying degree in order to keep what can be quite terrifying

emotion/fantasy under control. One can make a case that much of traditional scholarship is to some degree a defense against the anxiety of facing the full emotional magnitude of groups, most especially the large group. Group psychohistory strives to avoid such defensiveness with varying degrees of success.

The key question remains—what does it take to understand groups and how they work? First of all, we read the writings of people such as W.R. Bion, John Hartman, Graham Gibbard, Richard Mann, Philip Slater, A.K. Rice, Didier Anzieu, Pierre Turquet, W. Gordon Lawrence, Lloyd deMause, and Helm Stierlin. We learn about small group and large group theory, leaderless self-analytic groups, group relations work, and approaches pioneered by the Tavistock Clinic. We learn about group fantasy, shared emotions and how group process works. This is not so simple because these things are essentially unconscious phenomena. One thing that can help is experiential learning, and indeed many of the workers in

this area have come up with various schemes of experiential learning to facilitate comprehension of group process. The approach we use in IPA is taken from the work of W.R. Bion, John Hartman and workers in small, leaderless self-analytic groups. The IPA is a large group (30-50+); hence, we generally have one or more persons who serve, with varying degrees of expertise, as facilitators of the group's effort to examine its process. Without attempting to impose any structure, we try to understand what is going on in the group as it happens. Such an approach is hardly perfect; while some of us see what happens as a chaotic theater for personal acting out by some members in service of their own pathology, some of us see it as a living laboratory for understanding how the group works and the often scary shared emotions and fantasies that constitute much of any group's life and history. If we wish to under-

stand group processes in historical groups how can we shrink from seeking to look at them among ourselves? Because this sort of effort is not for everyone, at the IPA, participation is strictly voluntary.

We continue our efforts to understand. How well we do varies from year to year, but we keep trying because understanding group process in history is important. Psychohistory is not some sterile exercise in intellectualization—we put ourselves on the line emotionally, because the better we understand ourselves in the life of the group, the better we can understand the “why” in history. Even though such effort can provoke anxiety and stimulate ambivalence among some of us, I continue to believe that as psychohistorians this is what we are supposed to be about.

*Henry Lawton is a retired child welfare worker and has been a productive independent scholar in psychohistory for the last 30 years. Included among his many publications is The Psychohistorian's Handbook (1988). He has been group process analyst more than any other colleague at the IPA and may be reached at: <[hwlipa@aol.com](mailto:hwlipa@aol.com)>. □*

## Clio's Psyche

Vol. 11 No. 3

December 2004

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

e-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD

### Editorial Board

**C. Fred Alford, PhD** University of Maryland • **James W. Anderson, PhD** Northwestern University • **David Beisel, PhD** RCC-SUNY • **Rudolph Binion, PhD** Brandeis University • **Andrew Brink, PhD** Formerly of McMaster University and The University of Toronto • **Ralph Colp, MD** Columbia University • **Joseph Dowling, PhD** Lehigh University • **Glen Jeansonne, PhD** University of Wisconsin • **Peter Loewenberg, PhD** UCLA • **Peter Petschauer, PhD** Appalachian State University • **Leon Rappoport, PhD** Kansas State University

### Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum

\$25 yearly to non-members

\$40 yearly to institutions

(Both add \$10 outside U.S.A. & Canada)

Single Issue Price: \$15

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

Copyright © 2004 The Psychohistory Forum

## Some Thoughts on Group Process at IPA Conventions

David Beisel  
SUNY-Rockland

Enthusiasts who argue for group process analysis as a regular part of the IPA conventions do seem to have a point. Mandating group process analysts at every IPA convention, with a formal group meeting at the end of every day's work, was established as a requirement at the very first IPA Convention, and was written into the IPA Constitution. It seemed to many of us a good idea at the time.

Theoretically, the notion makes very good sense—theoretically. The practice should ideally help members understand the unconscious motives and impulses, fantasies and fears, envy, angers, and insults at work in group members (they are, of course, at work in all groups), allowing time to express those feelings, and even provide an opportunity to interpret them based on the symbolic behaviors and preoccupations of group members. This is, after all, what we do, sometimes successfully, as psycho-

logical historians for historical groups, as well as for public political processes outside the IPA. The notion of the macrocosm in the microcosm is familiar in the social sciences, and even if it was not, experiencing group process analysis is at least a way of being reminded again of how all groups carry hidden emotional material, sometimes acting it out in self-defeating ways.

As a founding member of the IPA, and its first Convention Chair, I well remember the enthusiasm for our first group process, so ably handled by our first group process analysts, John Hartman and Alice Eichholz. Since then, I've seen many outstanding scholars—competent, caring, hard working people—have a go at it. It's been a testament to their courage and commitment, since what I've seen at virtually every IPA convention—I've been to 26 of the last 27 annual meetings—is not the intended outcome, but its exact opposite, no matter how hard those group process analysts worked to do the right thing.

Instead of the group pretty much staying together year after year, and going on with good work because people have been allowed to vent or at least hear an interpretation of the group's unconscious fantasies and, hence, becoming less inclined to act out, I've found, as many have, the opposite: group process serving as an *excuse* for acting out, allowing people to say insulting things, or, in the name of therapy, behaving in the most hurtful ways.

There have been on average 100 attendees at every IPA convention, about 2700 bodies overall. Accounting for repeat attendees (there are at my count three who've never missed a conference) as well as for death and the infirmities of old age, both of which have thinned the ranks of our founding members, the fact remains that hundreds of good psychological historians have never returned because of the hurtful things that have been said to them at the group process analysis. It is, of course, not only group process which has driven some away; people find many rationalizations, as well as real reasons, for never coming back. Nevertheless, each of us knows scores of fine scholars—and there must be many more we don't know about—who should still be with us but who refuse to be part of the IPA because of what was said to them, or because of what they've seen regularly at the annual conventions.

It is simply false, and wrong, to pretend that no harm has been done, that only a few people have been affected, that the absence of many is irrelevant. That contemptuous, self-defeating attitude is one of the reasons IPA membership has remained relatively small all these years. I've never been one to air our dirty little secrets in public; it's unprofessional and counter-productive. And while I know full well that critical observations run the risk of being dismissed as "defensive," the fact remains that, in practice, on either the giving or receiving end, narcissistic self-indulgence and the hurtful acting-out of some group members have been for many the core experience of IPA group process, despite all its theoretical good intentions. Psychological history is the worse for it.

*David Beisel, PhD, is a founding member of the IPA who has twice served as its president. He is a distinguished scholar, an award winning teacher of psychohistory, editor of the Journal of Psychohistory for almost a decade, and on the editorial board of this journal. Professor Beisel may be contacted at <dbeisel@sunyrockland.edu>. □*

## Group Process is a Success

**Lloyd deMause**  
International Psychohistorical Association

Sharing our emotional reactions to the day's events at the IPA Convention has worked very well over the past 27 years. True, some attendees complain (and don't come back), but they don't really believe in studying emotions of groups so nothing is lost. True, sometimes (not often) some people feel insulted briefly, but they say so, and the issue is handled in the group and doesn't fester. Discussing emotional matters makes a big difference in the group. During all this time, we haven't split into several groups, we don't complain in the hallways, and we bring up our differences in the group and usually resolve them there, without the usual group difficulties. Since we discuss lots of upsetting matters in our conventions, that's an astonishingly successful outcome of our daily group process sessions.

*Lloyd deMause is current and founding president of the IPA. His most recent book is The Emotional Life of Nations (2003) and he may be reached at <psychhst@tiac.net>. □*

## The Costly Group Process Experiment

Paul H. Elovitz

### Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

Scholars and therapists benefit from understanding the power and dynamics of groups and this knowledge is best gained experientially as well as intellectually. The issues are how to do this most effectively and in what venues. The IPA vision of becoming a self-analytic group was brilliant and courageous. The reality is more destructive than constructive. After over a dozen years of working extremely hard to make group process a success, I withdrew from active participation in this pursuit. Below I will describe my group process model and goals and then survey the reality of group process leading to my pessimistic conclusions and recommendation that it be improved significantly or discontinued.

My paradigm of group process involved a group eager to be self-analytic and skilled, highly empathetic facilitators creating a safe environment, enabling people to freely express their feelings and thoughts about their experiences at our conference. All participants would have an equal opportunity to speak, rather than mainly the leaders. The primary focus would be on getting at the emotions and fantasies of attendees. Thoughts and feelings expressed would be kept in confidence, much as it is in group therapy. At our first convention, under the able guidance of John Hartman and Alice Eichholz, group process was a resounding success and I was inspired to become one of its most vocal advocates.

When I was group process analyst in the 1980s, my goals were to create a safe environment for people to gather at the end of every day to learn about themselves and our common group process. I discovered that the varied expectations and prior experiences of participants are some of the reasons making it problematic. Newcomers who had traveled across the continent, an ocean, or the street, had all sorts of reactions, emotions, and anxieties they wanted to talk about. Often they feel unheard. Furthermore, some have told me that they have felt like they have walked in on conversations and sometimes arguments that had been going on for years or even decades. An IPA shortcoming has been its failure to adequately deal with the needs of those who come

from a distance to our meetings, all but one of which have been in New York City. The metropolitan New York area attendees, usually a majority, have had far less openness to the problems of traveling to a conference at a great distance than if we were doing the traveling on a regular basis. These travelers find the group process sessions far less attentive to their needs and feelings than they would be if the meetings moved around the country and world, as do most international professional organizations.

The role of the group process analyst is quite important: I have usually been impressed by the qualifications and dedication of those assuming this position. The late Melvin Goldstein (1926-97) comes to mind as having brought exemplary qualification and dedication to the task. This psychoanalyst and University of Hartford professor of English brought group therapy know-how and decades of experience teaching medical doctors about feelings during their internships. For three years he worked hard to raise the level of the group process as he listened carefully to what people said verbally and nonverbally. One incident comes to mind. I brought a young psychology professor to the IPA and he was quite impressed by what he observed until he got to our group process session. At this session, Mel tried to get him to recognize the hostility in an off hand comment he made. Mel was totally correct about the disclaimed feeling, but the psychologist had no idea of what he was talking about and never returned to our organization.

One of the least successful examples of group process involved two leaders seeing themselves not so much as facilitators, but as experts telling the participants what they were feeling and where they fit in the analysts' group schema. Not surprisingly various members loudly protested against this approach. A very disruptive conference involved a group of Modern Analysts eager to bring feelings of anger to the surface during the sessions at the end of each day. The expression of the feelings was far more destructive than constructive to both individuals and the group. My recollection is that several valued colleagues never came back to the IPA.

Conference attendees often come to group process sessions for many reasons other than to better understand themselves and the nature of groups. These include curiosity, the desire to vent their frustrations, the fact that they are looking for an audi-

ence, and the desire to learn more about the leadership of the organization. I remember a South African who came to sessions to fight with people and threatened to sue the officers of the IPA. Though he never seemed to have developed any sense of what psychohistory is, he got the attention he craved and he carried on a lengthy, threatening correspondence with officers.

A major problem has been that there has never been any general agreement as to the rules of group process. Some approached it as if it were group therapy with confidentiality being the standard, only to find that specific accounts were then published in our newsletter. (Fortunately, because of the loud complaints of people like me, this practice was soon discontinued.) Attendees often had agendas other than self-knowledge when they came to group process meeting. I recollect the late Bernard Flicker, a fine IPA president and human being who believed passionately in the rights of children and preventing war, using a group process session to organize a march from the IPA meeting to a large anti-war rally in Central Park. Some used it as a platform for less admirable causes and others to ride roughshod over and bully vulnerable individuals. Many colleagues have appeared oblivious to the feelings of colleagues, sometimes even telling them what they were allegedly feeling. On one occasion a past IPA president came to group process outraged about a failure of academic standards. He felt so unheard that, together with a close associate, he walked out of the group process session, never to return to our organization despite the efforts of several colleagues to get them to reconsider. This is but one of many instances of the group being hurt by our unique institution.

In inviting colleagues with knowledge of group process to comment on Henry Lawton's paper, some felt strongly that it hurt the organization but would not publicly comment for a variety of reasons. Jerry Piven, a professor, psychologist, IPA vice president for two terms (until last June), and an active IPAer for the last eight years who attended the group process sessions, does want his views to be known. He believes it "has failed almost entirely, except in venting rage or misery and injuring others." He reports having observed "individuals insult, demean, accuse, humiliate, assault, and manipulate others" and make inappropriate requests. Clearly, Piven is disillusioned by the experience.

My own sense is that group process suffers from being "neither fish nor fowl." It does not offer the clear boundaries and professional expertise of group therapy. Participants with years of experience in analysis and group therapy have very different expectations and behave differently than those without any therapeutic experience. My own experience with groups has led me to believe that the essential issue is how to create a safe and secure environment in which people can freely express their fears, feelings, and hopes. In our first year group process honeymoon period this was achieved, however, after the *bar mitzvah* (to use Hartman's analogy cited below) the motorcycle jacket was taken out of the closet and the emotional tone has often been anything but conducive to an open and easy exchange.

Though group process is the brainchild of Lloyd deMause, it is my impression that Henry Lawton, our longtime secretary and past president, does the most to maintain it. Indeed, he has served as facilitator on at least seven or eight occasions and has been the force behind it when it has had no designated leader. This is all the more reason why it is astounding that after so many years he is writing a justification for it with little regard to what has actually been happening at group process sessions. Furthermore, through the years I have seen little evidence that group process sessions have directly inspired individuals to work on group psychohistory.

As one of three colleagues who have attended all 27 conferences, my conclusion is that while some people have learned things about the function of groups at the IPA, it has been at a great price to the organization. Many colleagues have come away feeling that the group allows wild analysis, and more than a few have decided to avoid the whole process or leave the IPA altogether. In the interest of our organization and field it is time to consider concluding a unique experiment.

*Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, editor of this publication, is a historian and psychoanalyst who has led different types of groups. He may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>. □*

The next IPA Convention will be at Fordham University in New York on June 8-10, 2005

## Reflections by One of the First Group Process Analysts

**John J. Hartman**  
University of South Florida

Reading Henry Lawton's explanation of the utility of group process analysis at the conventions of the International Psychohistorical Association brought back poignant memories for me. I recall that in his initial planning for the founding of the IPA, Lloyd deMause wanted this to be a part of every convention in order to try to reduce the irrationality of groups, to bring it under more reasonable control, and to serve as an experiential learning experience in the same way that classes Graham Gibbard, Dick Mann, Phil Slater, and I had taught at Harvard and Michigan had done. I thought this was an excellent idea, even an inspired one.

Alice Eichholz and I were the facilitators of the group process sessions at the first IPA convention. I recall that, as facilitators, we tried very hard to summarize as much of the underlying fantasy material as we could discern over the period of the convention. The thing that I remember best is an interpretation I made about the group being like a bar mitzvah boy hiding his motorcycle jacket in the closet. This was a somewhat arcane attempt to address the resistance we saw operating in this first group against revealing too much, particularly negative feelings. The interpretation generated a great deal of questions, feelings, and reactions. People came up to me afterwards as well, some asking what I meant and others asking how dare I say such a thing. I do remember, however, that Howard Stein was quite interested in what I had to say and seemed appreciative of our efforts to bring understanding to the group. In any case, Alice and I felt we had done a reasonable job in making the group process palpable and useful to the group.

I have not been a regular attendee at the conventions, and so cannot document first-hand the success or failure of subsequent group process sessions. I firmly believe that the idea remains a useful and perhaps necessary one for the effective functioning of any group. However, like individual exploration of unconscious processes, it is difficult, problematic, and uneven. It is also not for everyone.

I attended a large conference on the application of psychoanalysis to the humanities and social sciences held in Ann Arbor in the early nineties, which attracted some very notable contributors. The meeting was in the usual paper-giving format with different moderators introducing speakers and keeping time. None of the mostly male speakers kept to their time allotment, ignoring the moderators, some of whom were women. Midway through the second day, in a discussion period, a prominent female analyst made note of the fact that male speakers were ignoring the time limits of the female moderators, stressing the gender inequity in the conference as a whole. This was a bombshell which first elicited strong emotions and then went underground as the time constraints of the conference led to the next male speaker. That evening a dinner was held for all of the participants. I sat with a prominent psychoanalyst with whom I had a nice chat about Bion, who had been his analyst. The table conversation then turned to what had happened during the day with the observation about gender inequity in the conference. Various people offered their perceptions and views about it but none offered any group observations. I contributed my own understanding of this from a group process standpoint, having to do with anxieties about the large group focusing on splitting and projective mechanisms. Bion's patient and my new acquaintance, himself an established expert on splitting and projective mechanisms, had an untoward reaction to my comments. He declared that he had been analyzed once and was not prepared to be analyzed again, and abruptly left the dinner for his room! However, the others at our table were intrigued with the idea that one could apply such notions to an academic conference and the discussion about this lasted well past dessert. Most agreed that some kind of group process explanation was the only way to explain the widespread group reaction both to the time limit issue and its gender implications as well as to the female analyst's outburst in the middle of the conference. This experience is meant to convey my conviction that group process understanding is potentially powerful but risky if not conveyed tactfully, sensitively, and with some kind of informed consent of the participants. And, again, it is clearly not for everyone.

However, for those who do participate and are able to gain from these group experiences a greater understanding of group organization and

group process, this kind of experiential learning is unique and powerful. Further, I believe that the systematic empirical studies of small groups like those I conducted with Gibbard and Mann form an important evidential base for psychohistory itself. Psychohistory began as psychobiography, utilizing concepts from individual psychoanalysis. Conceptually the field took two big steps forward with the studies of the history of childhood itself and with the addition of a psychoanalytic group psychology approach to historical events. The empirical nature of the Mann, Gibbard, Hartman studies can be compared and contrasted with one's own emotional experiences in groups like the IPA groups.

I would like to close with a word about the role of facilitator in groups such as these. Ideally, the facilitators should be outside of the social system they are seeking to facilitate in order to be able to make useful comments about the process without being seen as involved in the organizational structure of the group. This is to prevent bias or the perception of bias and to try to ensure some emotional distance from the powerful currents of the group. This kind of neutrality is not the same as indifference or arrogance, simply a vantage point to facilitate an analytic attitude. Therefore, it is hard for me to envision a meaningful group process in which leaders of the organization serve as facilitators. That is, it seems to me as if it is hard for people to open up about organizational tensions when leaders of the organization upon whom advancement or publication decisions may depend are themselves the facilitators of the group process. It would be best, then, to have facilitators from outside the group or at least marginal to the organizational structure of the group. Practical considerations may mitigate such a choice. It is also best to have continuity over time with the same facilitators. However, "leaderless" groups tend toward trouble. Groups abhor a leadership vacuum, and so leaders appear who may or may not have the self-analytic values for which the groups were intended. The facilitator should serve functions we think of as involving the ego in individual personality organization. That is, the facilitator focuses for the group the values of growth, integration, self-understanding, empathy, and problem solving.

*John Jacob Hartman, PhD, is a training and supervising analyst at the Tampa Psychoanalytic Institute and President-Elect of the Tampa Bay Psycho-*

*analytic Society. He is Clinical Associate Professor in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of South Florida. At both Harvard and the University of Michigan, he led leaderless groups for many years. Hartman is co-editor (with Gibbard and Mann) of the book Analysis of Groups (1988) and has written (with Gibbard) a number of papers on the systematic study of small groups. His recent interests concern the emotional significance of mass propaganda and ethnic conflict. He maintains a private practice in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. Dr. Hartman may be reached at <[jjhart@umich.edu](mailto:jjhart@umich.edu)>. □*

## Lawton Responds to the Commentators

Although I do not completely agree with the position of Paul Elovitz on attempting group process analysis at IPA Conventions, he deserves our thanks for facilitating this opportunity to more openly discuss the issues involved.

My statement, "Attempting Group Analysis," printed above, was distributed as a hand out to those attending the conference who might be curious about the rationale for such an effort. Similar handouts have been distributed in the past from time to time. After the 2004 Conference, Paul Elovitz asked me if I would agree to have my handout published in *Clio's Psyche* with comments, as a way to stimulate debate on a part of IPA that for some remains quite controversial. I readily agreed and here we are.

People come to group process at IPA with widely varying expectations and fantasies about what will occur, e.g. some hope they might experientially learn more about how groups work and do not work emotionally; some desire free therapy or to be able to verbalize personal traumas; others use the group as a kind of theater to act out their own neurotic pathologies; some actually try to work with friends and colleagues in the service of understanding, and to work though, with varying degrees of success, feelings positive and negative about what they have learned and experienced at the conference; and on and on it goes. Some come away from the experience feeling they have gained valuable insights into how groups function; others tend toward the opposite view and believe the whole effort is counterproductive and injurious to IPA; if they have a viewpoint at all, most



are probably somewhere in between these two poles of opinion.

For anyone interested in the subject of group process, John Hartman's work is basic, along with that of Bion, Anzieu and a few others. I find myself in total agreement with what he says. He states that the idea of group process work "remains a useful and perhaps necessary one for the effective functioning of any group. However, like individual exploration of unconscious processes, it is difficult, problematic, and uneven. *It is also not for everyone*" (Emphasis mine). This is why we began, a number of years ago, to stress the voluntary nature of participation in the sessions. That the facilitator should be relatively outside the group and not one of the leaders (as has too often been the case) is totally correct. Sadly, this principle has to some degree gotten lost in IPA. Finding people on the periphery of the group to handle facilitation duties has always been very hard. Getting co-leaders or a team has been even harder, but on the occasions when this has proven possible our process work has tended to be a more positive experience.

Lloyd deMause is emphatic in his belief that group process has been successful. I am not sure he is correct to claim that those who do not return, really do not "believe in studying the emotions of groups so nothing is lost." Even though he has a point, I would not be quite so absolute on this issue. I was surprised that he does not mention that Group Process is supposed to be an experiential learning process, rather he seems to see it as a sort of therapy (verbalizing and working through difficult feelings, *etc.*). While this can be a part of what goes on, I have always viewed what we seek to do as more of a learning process than a therapeutic one.

David Beisel gives a lucid statement of the rationale for group process in the first two paragraphs of his comment that I agree with. He is adamant that the effort has not lived up to its promise. He believes that group process too often "serves an *excuse* for acting out," and is responsible for having driven many, who might otherwise stay, away because they are appalled at the level of acting out that the group can be capable of. But he admits that people leave the group for many reasons. This is quite correct. In my capacity as IPA Secretary I have done intermittent survey of members who did not renew to

find out why they left with an eye to ascertaining what we might be doing wrong. Reasons given varied quite a bit – excessive dues, inability to afford travel costs to the conference, retirement, changed interests, and even upset about group process. But to claim that "hundreds" have not returned because of upset about group process analysis is, in my experience, an overstatement. He goes on to remind us that it is false to claim, "no harm has been done, that only a few people have been affected, that the absence of many is irrelevant." Quite simply, while David Beisel does have a point, the reasons for lost members are more varied and complex than he may realize or wish to believe. Yes, we have people in the group who engage in hurtful acting out behavior, and we know who they are. Some leave but there are also some that try to understand why this goes on and fight such conduct as best they can.

Paul Elovitz's position is much the same as that of David Beisel. Like Beisel, Elovitz seems to feel that group process was a great idea that, for a variety of reasons, has not lived up to its promise. I would be the last to deny that there isn't *some* truth to this assertion. He next expresses concern about newcomers feeling unheard or not welcomed. Despite some progress (the Wednesday evening party), this remains a problem. I would agree with his belief that the role of the group process Analyst is important. Certainly the quality of our analysts over the years has been variable. As John Hartman noted, ideally the analyst should be on the periphery of the group rather than part of the leadership. But getting a decent, experienced person has often been harder than Paul Elovitz seems to realize. People "come to group process sessions for many reasons" aside from wishes "to better understand themselves and the nature of groups." This is true and quite beyond our ability to control. There is always going to be an edge of uncertainty about the character of the group that will excite some and be anxiety provoking for others. Like David Beisel, Elovitz points out that group process can be alienating and hurtful. Even though I would differ with them about the degree to which this goes on, the concern is a valid one. "My own experience ... has led me to believe that the essential issue is how to create a safe and secure environment" in the group. Fair enough, but groups, despite our best intentions, are not always safe, nor can we expect a group to be all sweetness and light. Where do you draw the line? Do we want to help

people to understand groups as they are, warts and all, or as we would like them to be? I have to say here that there was one year when we did not list group process on the program but left time for it. If the group process had been so hurtful one might have expected that it would have silently died. But that was not the case. When they saw that nothing had been set up, a number of attendees (outside the leadership) spontaneously took matters in their own hands and set the sessions up on their own each day. It was quite amazing.

When Paul Elovitz notes that some of those "with knowledge of group process" whom he invited to respond "felt strongly that it hurt the organization but would not publicly comment for a variety of reasons," what am I to say to this? While these people are certainly entitled to their reticence I must wonder what they expected had they chosen to reveal themselves? I feel some disappointment at being denied an opportunity to respond to them. Sadly, Jerry Piven's disillusionment with "the experience" is valid, but it is more complex than what is stated. Paul Elovitz goes on to suggest that even though group process is "the brainchild of Lloyd deMause," I have been a major force keeping it alive. He seems to believe that my handout was intended as a justification when, in point of fact, it was intended as a statement of rationale rather than a justification. To suggest that I have "little regard" for what has "actually been happening" in the group process, when he admits that he has not been there on a regular basis for a number of years, seems to me a bit much. I have been the recipient of attacks and acting out behavior over the years, and, yes it is unpleasant, but rather than packing it in I have always *tried* to understand what was going on and why. More properly, the comments by Elovitz, Beisel and others clearly show that we see the issues involved differently.

In conclusion, I want to offer some personal observations and make some suggestions about the conduct of our group process work. Our group is too large to be a leaderless group. Even a single leader is questionable; we need co-leaders or, better yet, a team of at least four people who could work together. A team would help defuse much of the acting out that can occur in a single leader or leaderless group. In those rare years when we were able to have co-leaders or a team the quality of the work tended to be

much more positive. What are the reasons for the limited success of such efforts at improvement? A lot of it had to do with ignorance of the issues involved. Large groups by their very nature can also be quite anxiety provoking. It is simply not easy to find people emotionally suited or with necessary experience to lead. Should we stop trying? The answer seems obvious to me.

Group process as we attempt to practice it is a radical enterprise. Other organizations do not attempt to do this, despite the fact, as John Hartman shows, that it could be beneficial. Why is this? It could be do to anxiety, intellectual conservatism, concern about how others might see us, etc. Does attempting group process make IPA look like a group of crazy people? In the eyes of Elovitz, Beisel, and, possibly, many others, the answer would seem to be yes. Does this mean that IPA is crazy? In my view it does not! One of many reasons that psychohistory remains something of a marginal field is because of resistance to facing and accepting the importance of emotion and fantasy as basic features in the mix of reasons for any historical motivation. If we shrink from trying to look at the force of emotion and fantasy in our own group and ourselves, how can we look at such issues in historical groups with the honesty that is necessary? The IPA has to attempt group process. If we shrink from doing so because of anxiety, concern about how others may see us, or whatever, we stand revealed as hypocrites!

But group process still can be hurtful, intimidating, and drive some, maybe many, away. Why have we largely failed to make it safer? As I have tried to suggest, there are ways that the experience can be made better, safer, and less hurtful without creating something that is artificial. Are those who like to use the group for acting out their own destructive pathologies perceived as too strong? The answer seems obvious. Has the group felt powerless against such types? Sadly, this too seems obvious. Why is this? It is not always easy for people of good will to confront such types. Maybe members have not seen these issues with enough clarity. Even when members try to speak out on the problems of acting out, nothing much seems to happen. Things may calm down for a while, only to newly erupt in subsequent years. All of this involves questions of group process that are seldom voiced. An obvious answer would be to more aggressively verbalize concerns about acting

out and attacking when they emerge. But the offenders would counter that they also have a right to be heard without censorship. So where do we draw the line? Should we stop trying to understand? Does this mean we should give it up, as Paul Elovitz suggests, because in the eyes of some group process damages the reputation of IPA and reflects poorly on our field? How important is the question of how others see IPA and our field? How correct are their perceptions? Do some of those who feel this way express resistance or anxiety to what psychohistorians try to do? Is their concern—well-meaning though it may be—misplaced? I think we could agree that psychohistory tries to ask hard questions, which is a scary proposition. It asks us to face irrationality in our institutions and ourselves without shrinking and/or trying to hide. I am the first to agree that our group process is hardly perfect and that it can be hurtful to at least some (myself included), but I must respectfully disagree with my academic colleagues. If we are worth the name psychohistorian we cannot shrink from trying to understand the full range of historical motivation, rational or irrational. In the case of group process there are ways we can and should be trying to make it better. Whether we will succeed or fail only the future can tell. But you would certainly be mistaken to think that such uncertainty is grounds to absolve us from continuing to try. □

## A Dream of a Concentration Camp

(Continued from front page)

the same, he shot the pistol next to my ear, simultaneously kicking me into the ravine. Oddly, I did not hear the shot go off. In the next scene, I was buried under several bodies. I felt tremendous weight on me; blood and filth were everywhere and the stench was unbelievable. I recall trying to crawl from underneath the bodies and out of the ravine. People were moaning and some of them were also attempting to escape. As the scene progressed, I crouched at the top of the ravine, bloody and filthy; all was quiet between the nearest barracks and me. I realized immediately that I had to find water and clean myself up so I did not end up at the edge of the ravine again, this time with a bullet in the back of my head. In the next scene, I had found water because I was now clean and looking for my uniform inside the infamous warehouse in Auschwitz. It was between the walls at the place I had hung it. I put it on, being sure

to place the iron cross first class, the wound badge, and the tank medal in the correct positions. In the final scene, I walked out of the camp, saluting smartly and being saluted smartly.

**My Associations and Analysis:** Dreams have intrigued human beings since the ancient world and it is not uncommon for a dream to allow access to a world of thoughts we sometimes avoid consciously. Freud taught us this.

The scenes in my dream stem from my imagination because I do not have any experience with a concentration camp nor with service in the German military. But the dream brought to the fore my longstanding concern with German history, the role of the Holocaust in it, and my personal relationship with both. The dream became so specific because of other relevant experiences, many conversations, much reading, and considerable reflection on all; they moderated the progression of the dream. Naturally, the colonoscopy put a lot of pressure on my bowels and that given showed up in my dream in having to run to a latrine and in scenes of filth. In some ways, the filth reminded me of the open outdoor toilets of my childhood. The one that was particularly offensive was attached to our elementary school; it literally stank up the entire three-storied building. The filth also reminded me of the smelly chicken coop on our farm where I collected eggs as a child. This recollection in turn evoked aspects of the thoughtful Alan Dundes and Gerald Dumas, *Life Is Like a Chicken Coop Ladder: A Study of German National Character Through Folklore* (1984). It likens life to a chicken coop ladder with people on different places in the pecking order. Those at the bottom are forced to spend most of their time in chicken shit. While I doubt that Germans are more scatologically oriented than most other Europeans, this background allowed concentration camp officials to design amazingly effective ways to dehumanize and depersonalize camp inhabitants by sticking them into poorly fitting and filthy uniforms, and exposing them to all sorts of other abuses, one of them being the open latrines. I understood in the dream that being filthy and becoming depersonalized would be my end, and I was not about to let that happen.

The source for the idea that I would be half Jewish and half German stems from Bryan Mark Rigg, *Hitler's German Soldiers: The Untold Story of*

*Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military* (2002) and several pictures in it. On picture that has intrigued me in particular is of the subsequent German Prime Minister, Helmut Schmidt, who is a quarter Jew by Nazi racial doctrine (insert following p. 247). Another is of two half-Jewish generals, Johannes and Karl Zukertort. As I read this book last spring, I felt profound empathy for the 150,000 or so quarter-, half-, three quarter- and small number of full Jews who served in the *Wehrmacht* during WWII and who faced increasing difficulty toward the end of it. With time, I became even angrier with the Nazi Regime, which on the one hand accepted these soldiers for years and on the other created the devaluation of the long-standing tradition of Jews serving in the German and Austro-Hungarian armies. The more I thought about it, the more my anger grew at the destruction of the patriotism and the murder of most of the soldiers' relatives—and with them, German-Jewish culture. This anger has peaked over the last few years when my good colleague Professor Zohara Boyd and I, she a hidden child and I the son of a German officer, presented our stories to students and teachers in western North Carolina. The more we dug into our pasts, the more we realized that while we needed to tell the story of the National Socialist (NS) regime, the more difficult it had become for us to bear the anguish that we feel because of it and some of the policies of our own present government.

The image of being rescued stems in part from Marcel Reich-Ranicki's autobiography, entitled *Mein Leben (My Life)*, (2000). In it he describes two pertinent scenes from Warsaw. In the first, he had just arrived on a transport from Berlin and was to help with clearing a pool; as he stood and waited for his assignment, he began to talk with a young soldier guarding him and others. Their conversation quickly turned to Berlin, their common home city, and their favorite soccer team. The soldier then told him to leave the area, thus most likely saving him from considerable hardship; Ranicki did not hesitate. In the second scene, several months later and as the remaining Jews were taken from Warsaw east to Treblinka, Ranicki and his wife ran away from their column and for some reason none of the soldiers shot at them. These rescues and several others allowed Ranicki to survive and become Germany's most famous literary critic.

The third point deals with having available a clean uniform and walking out of Auschwitz. This scene is described similarly in Thilo Thielke's *Eine Liebe in Auschwitz [A Love in Auschwitz]* (2000) in which a Polish Catholic and a Polish Jew fell in love in the infamous warehouse, and he carefully planned their escape. To do so, Jerzy Bielecki gradually assembled an SS officer's uniform in the warehouse where he served as a prisoner supervisor and hid it in a wall between some boards. When he had all the parts of the uniform assembled, and placed other details, he posed as an SS officer and led his Jewish love, Cyla Cybulska, out of the camp, with a pistol trained on her back. They escaped to freedom, unlike most others who attempted to escape.

The medals are important to me as symbols of high honor and good work. More importantly, they are symbolic of the heroic Jewish contribution to the Austro-Hungarian and German military and my disdain for the NS regime because they threw away the awesome gift to those countries. The medals were (and are) to me symbolic of cultural and other contributions to those Central European areas and the disdain with which the NS regime treated them.

Dealing with parts of the dream will hopefully now also allow getting closer to the center of the mission of the psychohistorian. But before I elaborate about this aspect, I must admit that Professor Jay Wentworth, one of my dearest colleagues at Appalachian State University, told me years ago that one can rescue oneself from a bad dream by taking an active part in it, to go on the offensive, so to speak. Thus, in this dream, too, I probably assumed a more active part than I would have without this advice and was able to rescue myself. I am grateful to Jay, Zoe Boyd, and Professor Paul Elovitz of Ramapo College for assisting in the following interpretation.

Quite obviously, the pressure in my intestines during the night that preceded the colonoscopy brought forth the first image, but the others need further elaboration. Because I am German by birth and descent, have had many family members in the German military since the 18th century, and am a historian, World War II and the Holocaust chose me long ago. For example, I endeavored to understand my father's role during that time ("Father, Son and Uncertain Solutions: Conversations and Reflections about National Socialist Germany," *Biography: An*

*Interdisciplinary Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No.3 (Summer, 1984): pp. 189-205). Additionally, I listened, often carefully, to many stories of relatives and friends regarding the horrors and traumas for everyone who remained alive during this time. But the Holocaust gained renewed immediacy recently through my colleague Zoe Boyd; her telling of her experiences give further coherence to all of these tales of woe and my reflections on them.

Uniforms are one of the underlying themes of the dream—those of the *Wehrmacht*, the SS, and the camp detainees. My most appreciated images are associated with the first, and thus I wore it in the dream. It was the uniform of Field Marshall Erwin Rommel, my favorite German officer; most of the men I have known since the war; and the German-Jewish soldiers. This uniform, in addition, is an affirmation of my heritage and its implicit courage, in this case the family of my mother, and some of my conflicts with that part of the family. Simultaneously, it represents a way to stand my ground against authority, both that of my mother's family and also my father, and father figures since then.

Importantly, the *Wehrmacht* uniform was not my father's uniform; as a diplomat in Italy, he wore that of the SS. It was also the uniform of the death camps and the *Waffen-SS* (weapons storm troopers): despised, disdained, and maligned. Nevertheless, it was the uniform of the man in the dream who did not shoot me, thus allowing me to gain my freedom. For me this uniform stands for doubt, hesitation, and complete and utter disappointment with the NS regime. The NS administration not only threw away the loyalty of the Jewish-German soldiers, it threw away the loyalty of all Germans by dragging them into a disastrous behavior toward their fellow human beings and a terrible war.

Finally, a word, too, about the "uniforms" of the camp inhabitants; they were the antithesis of the other uniforms. They were the miserable garb of the men and women who were assigned as laborers to keep alive the machinery of death.

The uniforms thus carry tremendous symbolic weight. Because my father did not wear the uniform of the regular army, I may have been able to show a distance to his uniform and at the same time an affinity to him. Because my parents were di-

vorced while my father was in one of 14 American prison camps, we were distant by the very fact that he and I lived in different places and worlds until we met once more when I was about 10; but even after that, we rarely saw each other. The man behind me at the edge of the ravine may indeed have stood for my father; he was, after all, the man who rescued me at a critical point in my life when he encouraged my emigration to the U.S.

Unlike "regular" historians, as psychohistorians we are to gain empathy for our subject so that we may, to paraphrase Peter Gay in *Freud for Historians* (1985), recreate/relive the events of the past and thus understand them more fully. Thus, the way to gain insight is not to create distance from our subject but rather to embrace it, to enter it. The Jewish-German soldier I imagined myself to be in the dream is one example of how one can enter the context of these men. Imagine being a career soldier who discovers one day, when his family recreates its family tree, as everyone was required to do in those days in Germany, that he is not of pure German blood but rather a *Mischling* (of mixed blood). A whole world must have collapsed around the young man. Having heard, read about, and seen enacted the anti-Jewish policies of the NS Regime, and knowing some of his relatives to be Jewish, he had two principal options. He could stay in the military or he could leave the military. In the first case, he had a genuine chance to survive and hopefully protect his family; in the second, he endangered himself and his family. Most soldiers chose to stay, some saved themselves and, in some more cases, their families. In my dream, I was one of the ones who stayed, but because of some infraction, I ended up in a camp, as did some of my would-be comrades, only to be saved, so to speak, by a man in SS uniform.

The escape from the imaginary camp is a function of having learned to deal with negative dreams, but it is also a function of having enough spunk left after a few weeks in the camp to attempt an escape. The issue of cleanliness is directly connected to it. Aside from being a person who does not thrive on dirt, I would like to offer two other explanations. First is the obvious need to clean myself up in order not to appear as a prisoner because anyone who looked like a prisoner was a prisoner. Second, I associated the dirt of the camp with the filth of the regime and, if I was to walk out "clean," that is, untainted by

it, I had to be rid of its dirt. Of course, I am aware that I wore a uniform that fought with the regime.

The father figures I referred to earlier, and whose opinions and behaviors I often admire and sometimes wonder about, include colleagues in psychohistory who would have us believe that our understanding of the past and our behaviors in the present rests principally, if not exclusively, on our childhoods. No doubt our personal essences rest on our relationship with our parents and our other experiences in our childhoods, however good, indifferent, or bad they may have been. But they also rest on later life's experiences and insights. As this dream illustrates, hopefully clearly, with time these later experiences, and our reflection on them, may tend to dominate our very psyche, understanding, and action.

In conclusion, this dream is about several issues important to me and possibly to psychohistorians. Triggered by the preparation for the colonoscopy, it revealed undercurrents in my understanding of the Holocaust and World War II, and my connection to both. I had gained these understandings through conversation, reading, and writing, but some insights remained hidden below the surface. Thus, the placement of the dream in a concentration camp allowed insights to surface that had not emerged during waking hours. I gained a better understanding of the dehumanization of the concentration camps through filth, arbitrary rules, starvation, overwork, and murder. Yet in this very misery was also the hope for resolution by walking out of it. I was able to get closer at sorting out my admiration for the regular German army and the contribution to it by German-Jews. I was able to address further the difficulty with my father's SS uniform and the general implications of it and having to live with him as my rescuer. The broader implication of the dream for me as a psychohistorian is that one needs to embrace one's childhood and later life experiences as an integrating part of any analysis of our chosen topics, or the topics that choose us. Without getting at the underlying currents that shape our conscious thoughts, genuine honesty and caring generosity with our topics will elude us.

*Peter Petschauer, PhD, is a historian at Appalachian State University and the director of its Hubbard Center for Faculty and Staff Development. He is an editor of this journal and has published four*

*books and several dozen articles and chapters of books. He may be contacted at <Petschauerpw@appstate.edu>. □*

## Questions Come Before Answers

**Montague Ullman**

**Albert Einstein College of Medicine**

Given the background of the dream it is not a surprise that he had this particular dream in connection with the preparation for the colonoscopy. Although he did not personally endure the misery of the concentration camp, he had a dream that was apparently experienced as what might be called a vicarious "flashback," one that ranged from terror to hope.

Dreams have an immediacy in the sense that they are triggered by recent feeling residues. Asleep and dreaming they are worked over in a way that reaches into their past origins. The dreamer on awakening is faced with the challenge of discovering how the dream speaks to current feelings that had not yet been fully acknowledged. The detailed historical associations are important data but the larger question remains:

What aspect of his current life predicament are they addressing? What are the personal issues at the time of the dream that created so poignant a narrative? The alternative is to settle for the dream simply as a deeply felt empathic response.

What are the personal issues beyond the potentially factual depiction of the concentration camp experience? If he had actually been in a camp, the dream as a flashback experience would be understandable as an indelible replay. The account as given seems to go beyond that and hint at issues from childhood, his relationship to both parents and his current feelings about life here in the United States. Without the more personal data elicited by exploratory questioning, there is no way of knowing what else the dream might be saying.

This is a powerful dream. Despite the dreamer's elaborate discussion of the imagery and the sources cited as a help to his deeply felt interest in the Holocaust, I came away feeling that he dealt with it in a scholarly fashion rather than in a more personal way. To get to it as a dreamer and with a

dream as deep-seated as this one, much more personal information would have had to be exposed. To be more precise the only way I could be of help would be to raise a number of simple questions that might have paved the way for how the current issue in the life of the dreamer was touched off by the colonoscopy. Their goal is to reconstruct what I refer to as the recent emotional content of the dreamer. Without that information I hesitate to say what that was. As the dream recedes in time it may be difficult to answer some of these questions.

*Question:* What concerns, preoccupations or feelings can you recall going through your mind just before you fell asleep the night of the dream?

When dealing with a recent dream further, more specific questions would follow.

*Question:* Look over your experiences the evening and the day before the dream. Are there any other residual feelings you can bring back?

*Question:* Take a bigger bite. Look over your life during the two weeks before the dream. Were there any other feelings or concerns that surfaced during that time that stayed with you?

*Question:* You alluded to anguish about some of the policies of our own government. Is there anything more you want to say about that?

*Question:* You mentioned that this was the second time you had such a terrifying dream. As you think back to the first dream, do you recall any analogous life experiences at the time relating to that dream? Anything suggestive of the "flashback" quality of the current dream?

Then in a series of open-ended questions there would be an attempt to explore further associations to the specific imagery of the dream, e.g. dirtiness and cleanliness, the life saving aspect of the uniform, the anger at the German military, the degrees of Jewishness, the childhood memory of the pecking order, etc. The questions are geared to eliciting more of the personal issues underlying his dedication to holocaust studies. Getting that information is the task of the dreamer himself, working alone or with a helper, or better still, a group of helpers.

For what it is worth, a passing conjecture is

that one sometimes has to identify with the aggressor as a life-saving maneuver. He identifies with the punishing authority to avoid punishment. Balint describes this as a form of dependent identification.

*Montague Ullman, MD, Clinical Professor of Psychiatry Emeritus at Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, has had a career spanning a formative era in the practice of neurology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis prior to his moving into community psychiatry before becoming director of the Department of Psychiatry of the Maimonides Medical Center. He later opened a sleep laboratory devoted to the experimental study of dreams and telepathy. In recent years Dr. Ullman has been in the forefront of the movement to stimulate public interest in dreams and to encourage the development of dream sharing groups. He has published extensively. His books, some co-authored or co-edited, include [Appreciating Dreams - A Group Approach](#), (1996); [Dream Telepathy: Experiments in Nocturnal Extrasensory Perception](#), (1973, 2003); [Handbook of Dreams](#) (1979); [Handbook of States of Consciousness](#) (1986); [The Variety of Dream Experience, 2nd edition](#) (1999); and [Working with Dreams](#) (1979). Though Ullman does not e-mail, colleagues in Sweden maintain a website for him at <http://siivola.org/monte/index.html> and provide contact information. □*

## Petschauer's Dream

**Kelly Bulkeley**

**The Graduate Theological Union  
and John F. Kennedy University**

I appreciate Professor Petschauer's willingness to share this remarkable dream and his personal associations to it. Since I believe the dreamer is always in the best position to understand the meanings of his or her dream, I don't want to take anything away from Petschauer's detailed discussion of his dream's psychohistorical roots. My only contribution to his reflections is to continue exploring the question: Why did this dream come *now*? The immediate answer seems to be, because of the impending colonoscopy. The anxieties surrounding that invasive medical procedure expressed themselves symbolically in the fantasy of the concentration camp. The interpretation of the dream leads Petschauer back to troubling childhood memories and unresolved

emotional difficulties with his father.

I wonder, however, about the dream's orientation towards the *future*, and specifically toward Petschauer's relationship with the health care system. To make it clear that I'm offering my own projections rather than a detached, authoritative pronouncement about the dream, let me put it this way: if I had this dream, I would wonder about its anticipation of my future, as I get older, my body becomes more prone to illness and injury, and I become increasingly subjected to the power of medical professionals. I can easily imagine that future as one that feels like being a prisoner in a concentration camp: a powerless individual in a depersonalizing environment, surrounded by strangers in uniforms, enmeshed in a faceless bureaucracy, plagued by concerns about cleanliness and pollution, with the conditions of my life and death determined by ideological forces that are out of control. If I were about to have a colonoscopy, I suspect these anticipatory fears of the health care system would be activated and would express themselves in my dreams. The fact that the dream draws upon concentration camp imagery would, for me, be an invitation not only to look *back* to early family history, but also *forward* to what awaits me in the final stages of my life cycle.

Ultimately, I share Petschauer's feeling that the dream provides some hope for the resolution of these fears (another of my dreamwork axioms: dreams never come simply to tell us we're stuck with a problem; dreams almost always provide images of possibility, change, and hope). The facts that the dreamer finds water to clean himself and is able to walk out of the camp on his own power indicate a potential to overcome the oppressive forces threatening to destroy him. One last question, though—is the dream suggesting that escape from oppression is only possible by becoming an oppressor oneself? Or at least a collaborator with oppression? That's a question I would carry with me and reflect on in connection with future dreams.

*Kelley Bulkeley, PhD, is a Visiting Scholar at the Graduate Theological Union and also teaches in the Dream Studies Program at John F. Kennedy University. Professor Bulkeley is the author of several books on dreams, religion, psychology, and culture, including The Wondering Brain (2005), Dreams of Healing (2003), and Visions of the Night (1999). He*

*may be reached at <[kellybulkeley@earthlink.net](mailto:kellybulkeley@earthlink.net)>. □*

## Dreams and the Historian's Mindset

**Paul H. Elovitz**

**Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum**

Professor Peter Petschauer is a fine academic, colleague, and historian. He is a good human being who is generous, open minded, and courageous. To an unusual extent he is also giving to his colleagues. Yet his thorough historical training and the resulting mindset, keep him from maximizing his ability to understand his fascinating dream. Let me start by describing his accomplishments and attributes, relating them to his history, and then showing how they paradoxically limit his work with the dream in question.

Petschauer's accomplishments are manifest. He has achieved excellence as a colleague and historian at Appalachian State University (ASU) in the beautiful mountains of North Carolina. When he arrived there in 1968 it was a backwater, undistinguished educational institution which he and his colleagues have continuously worked to improve (Peter Petschauer, "Rediscovering the European in America: From the German Boy in Italy to the Man in North Carolina," in Paul Elovitz and Charlotte Kahn, eds., *Immigrant Experiences: Personal Narrative and Psychological Analysis* [Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1997], pp. 25-46). He has held the History Department's I.G. Greer Distinguished Professorship, served as chair of the university's Faculty Senate, as well as chair of the Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina State University system, co-founded his university's interdisciplinary studies program, has mentored many colleagues, and presently serves as a director of a center that mentors faculty and staff at ASU.

Professor Petschauer's considerable accomplishments may also be measured in the variety and quality of his publications on subjects such as childhood, the education of German women in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, women artists of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, human space, human rights in a threatening world, and psychohistory. He has published in the *Journal of Psychohistory* and elsewhere enough about his own life story to give us great insight into his thinking and formative experiences. Peter was born in Germany but spent World War II mostly in a German-speaking



rural area of Northern Italy where he was separated from his parents and overcame the death from diphtheria of his only sibling, a brother. He established warm relations in the matriarchal society of the farm. After the war his father was incarcerated in 14 American prison camps and his self-involved mother was reduced to near poverty while he was sent off to various monastic boarding schools. He came to the United States alone as a 17-year old where he worked first in a factory in New Jersey, then in various offices in New York City. He jumped at the opportunity to get an education at New York University where he took a doctoral degree in modern European history at night and then began his teaching career in North Carolina. Clearly Peter is a survivor. It is my sense that wherever he has lived he has established constructive and warm human relationships and felt a strong connection to the people he has left behind, he visits and feels a sense of responsibility for them.

Peter is also quite open to new experiences as reflected in his willingness to publish on his powerful and fascinating dream. Last January he was just back from an exhausting trip to Europe and commented that he had a dream as we exchanged colonoscopy stories. Since the dream was so vivid and powerful, he wrote me about it and I encouraged him to write more, eventually suggesting that he might make it the subject of a pioneering piece on how scholars can use dreams to better understand their lives, interests, and work. For six months we discussed his dream as several of us sought to help him delve into its meanings. However, in the process of it becoming the subject of an intellectual exercise, the tendency was for the main ingredient (emotion) of understanding being overshadowed.

As a finely trained historian and academic, Peter's response to my request for the precise feelings, associations and additional details of the associations he had given, was to the intellectual work of others. Thus Bryan Mark Rigg's book on German-Jewish soldiers, Marcel Reich-Ranicki's autobiography, and Thilo Thielke's description of love in and escape from Auschwitz. As historians we were trained to give bibliographies, not emotions. Indeed, as David Beisel has often pointed out, historians of our generation were specifically trained to reject emotion. As is the case with many intellectuals, in the analyzing the dream it seemed easier for him to recognize and accept the emotions of others rather

than his own. Peter reached some associations of the dream that touched his feelings and life, but as time went on I felt that despite his intellectual courage in probing, my queries were as often moving him away from his real feelings about the dream as toward them. I just wished we could have been communicating face to face, rather than via e-mail and occasionally on the telephone, so that signs of emotional valence could more easily have been noted and picked up upon. Or better still, that we were in a Montague Ullman style dream group that does a superior job of helping the dreamer to get at the dream's underlying emotions, associations, and fantasies. In my experience, such groups are more successful than psychoanalysis in uncovering the unconscious content of dreams and that such dream analysis works best with the ordinary population. Though intellectuals tend to cloud the issues this method is still quite effective in helping them understand their dreams.

I also felt that if the dream were mine, I probably would *not* have been able to delve as deeply as Peter did into its emotional content *prior* to my having had a long psychoanalysis, group therapy, and Ullman dream group experience as both a member and a leader. These experiences changed my consciousness and taught me to approach dreams in a radically different manner.

Professor Peter Petschauer does scholarship, history, and psychohistory a valuable service by sharing his "terrifying" dream of being in a concentration camp, associating to it, and analyzing it for our (and his) benefit. He has even encouraged others with expertise in the field to comment on it. He finds the responses to be meaningful and fascinating and recognizes that they "say as much about the dreamer as they do about the analysts; a very normal situation." Peter chooses to not comment on them "because that would detract from their thoughtful insights," preferring to let them stand on their own." Nevertheless, he reports that the books he mentioned awoke his soul, in a way that my questions did not (personal communication). He is a man who is both open to experience and honest about his feelings, but who also thinks, following Elie Wiesel's advice, it wise to not delve too deeply into some areas of his life.

*Paul Elovitz, PhD, is a historian, professor, psychotherapist, and dream group leader who applied the Ullman method to the dreams of historical*

personages to better help the biographer to understand his/her feelings about the subject. He has published several articles and chapters of books on dreams and dream methodology. Elovitz may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>. □

## Freud's Medical Ego Ideals

(Continued from front page)

he sought those with whom he could identify. Freud identified with men of great accomplishment, stimulating his own creativity and minimizing his intellectual isolation. Moreover, Freud's ego ideals contributed to the very foundation of his own discoveries.

In recognition of the importance that ego ideals played, Freud wrote a pioneering work devoted to the subject, *On Narcissism: An Introduction* (1914). In this pivotal work, Freud introduced, developed, and defined the concept of the ego ideal. In a key sentence, which has a bearing on the theme of this paper, he explained that "Idealization is a process that concerns the *object*; by it, that object, without any alteration in its nature, is aggrandized and exalted in the subject's mind" (p.94). He elaborated on this concept in the *Ego and the Id* (1923), in which he called the ego ideal the heir of the Oedipus complex.

The subject of narcissism has received much attention, and the psychoanalytic literature on this topic is extensive and complex, as it deals so extensively with pathology. Narcissism, however, also applies to issues of self-esteem, ego-syntonic objects, and what is considered as reality based and normal narcissism, which led, as in the case of Freud, to positive and socially responsible aspirations and identifications with positive ego ideals.

This paper will focus on Freud's medical ego ideals, namely Wilhelm Fliess (1858-1928), Joseph Breuer (1842-1894), Ernst Brücke (1819-1892), and Jean Charcot (1825-1893). Before presenting the theoretical significance of idealization, the leading personages to be discussed in this paper will be briefly introduced. Initially, Fliess played a major role as Freud was groping toward the development of psychoanalysis.

Fliess, a nose and throat specialist, impressed Freud because he was a researcher whose interests

ranged beyond his medical specialty. Breuer, a physician of wide learning, shared many intellectual interests with Freud, and treated Fräulein Anna O., the first psychoanalytic patient. Brücke, one of Freud's professors at the University of Vienna Medical School, was called a "model" by Freud. He also said that Brücke "was the greatest authority who affected me more than any other in my whole life." Charcot did pioneering work on hysteria, and Freud went to Paris to study with him. Of Charcot, Freud said that he was "one of the greatest of physicians and a man touched by genius" (Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 1953, Vol. 1, pp. 28-29).

The literature on Freud is enormous, and there are many biographies of him as well as numerous works that specialize on some aspect of his life, career, and background. However, I depart from the traditional approach to Freud by trying to understand him from the perspective of the men he admired, or tried in some way to emulate, employing his concept of "ego ideals." Fundamentally, because Freud was going to eventually radically alter mankind's thinking about itself, he needed powerful "father images" to identify with, hence his need for ego ideals. My approach adds a new dimension to this extraordinary man.

The concept of ego ideal needs clarification and explanation, especially as it is employed in the context of this paper. Essentially, the representation of the ego ideal stems from an early identification with idealized parents. The ego ideal, however, may also have a pathological or antagonistic identity. Joseph Sandler in "The Ego Ideal and the Ideal Self" examines the many shadings of the definition of this concept. Although there are similarities between the concept of ego ideal and superego, there are also some aspects of the ego ideal that are distinct from the superego (Sandler *et al*, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1963, Vol. XVIII, pp. 139-141).

The term ego ideal is an omnibus one, and denotes moral conscience, self-observation, and ego functions. Quoting Freud's *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921), Sandler says that the ego ideal "is the heir to the original narcissism in which the ego enjoyed self sufficiency; it gradually gathers up from the influences of the environment the demands which that environment makes on the ego and which the ego cannot always rise to; so that a

man, when he cannot be satisfied with his ego itself, may nevertheless be able to find satisfaction in his ego ideal which has differentiated out of the ego" (p.142). In a general formulation, which is pertinent to Freud, Sandler says: "In normal development parental ideals, which have previously been taken over, will be modified and displaced in a reality-syntonic fashion and will be integrated with the ideals taken over from other figures throughout life—such figures as friends, teachers, and colleagues; indeed from any admired object. Ideals may also be derived from feared objects, through a mechanism similar to identification with the aggressor" (p. 155).

Sandler points out that in the *New Introductory Lectures* (1932) Freud used a different meaning than in the *Ego and the Id* (1932). The significance of the revision implies a distinction between the superego and the ego ideal and shows how Freud "measured" himself. Freud's conceptualization is pertinent to the choice of his own models and of inspirational figures such as Fliess, Breuer, Brücke, and Charcot. Freud wrote: "We have now to mention another important activity which is ascribed to the superego. It is also the vehicle of the ego ideal, by which the ego measures itself, towards which it strives and whose demands for ever increasing affection it is always striving to fulfill. No doubt this ego ideal is a precipitation of the old idea of the parents, an expression of the admiration which the child felt for the perfection which it at times ascribed to them" (Quoted in Sandler, p. 143).

In a paper written some twenty five years after the one by Sandler, David Milrod, in "The Ego Ideal," recognized that the ego ideal is an important concept, but he says it is "poorly defined and often in contradictory ways." Paraphrasing Freud, Milrod notes that as a person matures, "the individuals growing critical judgment as well as the criticism of others shatters the child's sense of narcissistic perfection, and tries to recover it in the form of an ego ideal" (*The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1990, Vol. 45, p. 46). Milrod distinguishes between "idols" and "ideals." It is one thing to admire and to emulate an idol, but ideals are "depersonalized, abstract, and decontretized"; there can be a shift, however, from idols to ideals. After the superego is developed, and with it the ego ideal, "praise or disapproval of important love objects becomes secondary" (p.46). The values that constitute the contents of the ego ideal

"follow the phase development of the drive and include gratification, strength, power, possessions, and phallic attributes. All are highly personified and often connected with personal idols" (p. 49).

In an apposite observation, bearing on Freud's interest in his personal ego ideals, Jones, who knew him personally, is of the opinion that "A profound self-confidence had been masked by strange feelings of inferiority, even in the intellectual sphere, and he tried to cope with these by projecting his innate sense of capacity and superiority onto a series of mentors on some of whom he then became curiously dependent for reassurance" (Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 1961, p. 191). Freud at times felt that he was not well endowed intellectually, but he sensed that he was going to revolutionize mankind's thinking, as Darwin had done, plunging him into heated controversy. Jones recognizes that this led Freud to "idealize" Brücke, Meinert, Fleischl, Charcot, Breuer, and Fliess in his early career (Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, 1955, Vol. 2, p. 3). The four most significant of these are discussed in this paper.

Idealization is related to the concept of ego ideals. To give another example, idealization can be compared to a patient having a positive transference, as in psychoanalysis, when the analysand aggrandizes and admires the psychoanalyst, a dependence necessary in treatment. With regard to these concepts, Freud serves to demonstrate in another communication, as in "Some Reflections on Schoolboy Psychology" (1914), the role that teachers play in this development. His ego ideals can be seen as derivations of admired teachers. This essay, written for a *Festschrift* on the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the "Sperlgymnasium," which he had attended from ages nine to seventeen, may be read as an introspective on the significance of ego ideals. He writes as follows: "It is hard to decide whether what affected us more and was of greater importance to us was our concern with the sciences that we were taught or with the personalities of our teachers" (p. 242). He recounts that some students were stimulated by them, while others were impeded by them. The students, he says, studied and observed them closely and the teachers evoked ambivalent feelings in their students: "...we studied their characters and on theirs we formed or misformed our own" (p. 242). He adds: "At bottom we felt great affection for them if they

gave us any ground for it, though I cannot tell how many of them were aware of this" (p. 242). Following a discussion of the role of the father, whom Freud points out "becomes a model not only to imitate but also to get rid of" (p. 243), he relates this attitude to the role school teachers play for young students. The notion of models who are discarded has special bearing on Freud himself, because he had at one time paid close attention to philosophers, for example Schopenhauer, Brentano, and Feuerbach. In time, he got "rid" of these philosophical ego ideals (see Jacques Szaluta, "Sigmund Freud's Philosophical Ego Ideals," in Laurie Adams and Jacques Szaluta, eds., *Psychoanalysis and the Humanities*, 1996).

Freud accords teachers an enormous importance, stating "These men, not all of whom were in fact fathers themselves, became our substitute fathers. That was why, even though they were still quite young, they struck us as so mature and so unattainably adult" (p. 244). Although Freud wrote this essay in his mature years, the feelings he describes here are the feelings he transferred to university professors and later to his intellectual mentors.

Freud's search for creative intellectual models must also be considered in a historical context. Until the 1880s, Jews living in Germany had opportunities for becoming acculturated into German society. The fortunes of Freud and his family reflected these historical conditions, but after 1880, anti-Semitism escalated in Austria, leading to the election of the notorious Karl Lueger as Mayor of Vienna. Lueger had campaigned on a distinctly anti-Semitic platform. Freud took the growing anti-Semitism personally and sought to distance himself from Gentiles in the early 1900s. As Peter Homan says in "Disappointment and the Ability to Mourn: Deidealization as a Psychological Theme in Freud's Life, Thought and Social Circumstances, 1906-1914," Freud's disappointment led him to "search out other Jews for emotional support, pride, energy, and self-defense" (*Freud's Appraisals and Reappraisals*, ed. Paul E. Stepanky, Vol. 2, p. 59). In effect, anti-Semitism stimulated Freud to excel, to be creative, to respond to its challenges, to fight back in the only way he could. This climate accentuated Freud's motivation to collaborate with Breuer, who was Jewish. As Homan notes, "Freud sought advice from Breuer on personal and Jewish matters and depended on him 'like a son'" (p.59). In the context of Freud's ego

ideals, the relationship with Breuer was like a replacement of his earlier relations with his father and Dr. Samuel Hammerschlag, Freud's esteemed teacher of Jewish religion and Hebrew at the Sperlgymsium. Fliess, who was Jewish, belonged to his circle of friends and idealized figures.

The first question to consider is what kinds of qualities Freud's ego ideals possessed. In general, they were intellectual innovators, who had risen to preeminence in their fields, and who demonstrated independence of thought and courage. For example, Freud preferred the leading fiction writers in their respective national languages who were insightful about the human condition: Goethe in German, Shakespeare in English, Cervantes in Spanish. Sometimes he admired men who were aggressive. Freud also sought inspiration from political figures who had confronted great odds, namely, Bismarck, Garibaldi, and Cromwell (Jacques Szaluta, "Freud's Ego Ideals: A Study of Admired Modern Historical and Political Personages," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 1983, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 157-186). In order to qualify as ego ideals for Freud, political leaders had to be progressive-minded men or be supportive of liberating politics. In some sense, he appreciated men who were mavericks.

Bismarck, who fascinated Freud, was the dominant statesman in Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century. Bismarck eventually came to be regarded as a man of peace, once he had achieved his goal of unifying Germany. However, he had accomplished this feat by aggressively and defiantly pursuing wars and overcoming perilous obstacles. Nevertheless, Freud paid close attention to Bismarck, and when the "Iron Chancellor" came to Vienna on a state visit, Freud waited in the street two and a half hours to see him! In this instance Freud's great appreciation of Bismarck may be regarded as an identification with the aggressor (see Jacques Szaluta, "Freud on Bismarck: Hanns Sachs' *Interpretation of a Dream*," *American Imago*, 1980, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 215-244).

In the broadest ideological sense, Freud stood in the tradition of the Enlightenment, which had its roots in the Renaissance. Before the French Revolution of 1789, the *philosophes* had thought critically about society, and as such were a beleaguered minority. By Freud's time, their ideas had become better

established, certainly in Western Europe. Eighteenth-century rationalism, which stemmed from the scientific revolution of the previous century, generated liberalism in the nineteenth century. This background promoted individualism, secularism, hedonism, and materialism, and laid the basis for modern thought. As these movements coalesced, they led to the emancipation of the Jews, and Freud in his youth benefited from them, as reflected in his *Weltanschauung* (world view). Accordingly, Freud did not accept the status of the human condition on the basis of faith. He wished to contribute to solving the "riddles of mankind."

While a young man, Freud had many career interests, but he made the decision to go to medical school after being inspired by a reading aloud of Goethe's essay on "Nature" at a public lecture. Actually, Freud had not been attracted to medicine as such, but Goethe's essay, which dealt with comparative anatomy, presented a "romantic picture of nature as a beautiful and bountiful mother who allows her favorite children the privilege of exploring her secrets." This prospect which attracted Freud was fortuitous, and as he himself was to write, "After forty-one years of medical activity, my self-knowledge tells me that I have never been a doctor in the proper sense. I became a doctor through being compelled to deviate from my original purpose; and the triumph of my life lies in my having, after a long and roundabout journey, found my way back to my earliest path." (Jones, 1953, Vol. 1, p. 28).

Freud's self-appraisal is instructive because it is indicative of his feelings, his intentions, and is decisive for the creation of psychoanalysis. Again, in his own words,

In my youth I felt an overpowering need to understand something of the riddles of the world in which we live and perhaps even to contribute to their solution. The most hopeful means of achieving this end seemed to me to enroll myself in the medical faculty; but even then I experimented—unsuccessfully—with zoology and chemistry, till at last under the influence of Brücke, the greatest authority who affected me more than any other in my whole life, I settled down to physiology (Jones, 1961, p.22).

The conjunction of Freud's ambition, societal changes, his educational background, and the sequences of relationships with talented men at critical

moments in his life became the stimulus for Freud's creativity. Ultimately, it enabled him to develop psychoanalysis.

Ernst Brücke, whom Freud credits for having influenced him so much, and after whom he named one of his sons, was the Director of the Physiology Institute at the University of Vienna, and one of the leading physiologists of his time. Freud's association with Brücke lasted six years, which corresponds to the period that he spent in medical school. Brücke advocated the radical scientific concept of dynamic physiology, meaning that the principles of physics and chemistry could be applied to living organisms. Freud became so imbued with Brücke's instruction that he later assiduously tried to apply his theories to the study of psychological disorders in people. In this particular respect, Freud's initial attempts were not productive, but he succeeded when he was "able to apply them empirically to mental phenomena while dispensing with any anatomical basis" (Jones, 1961, p. 32). Ultimately, Freud created a dynamic psychology, demonstrating that scientific laws could be applied to man's personal development. Clearly, Brücke was an inspiring and respected mentor for Freud.

Exceptional in Freud's search for mentors, Fliess was two years younger than Freud. Fliess, who practiced in Berlin, which at the time was more liberal than Vienna, was a cultured man, with wide interests in the humanities, especially literature. Fliess and Freud were close friends from 1887 to 1902. They had a similar educational background and engaged in a lively and regular correspondence, meeting frequently to discuss professional and intellectual matters. They had first met when Fliess did postgraduate work in Vienna, and it was Breuer who had recommended to him that he attend a lecture by Freud. Fliess had also been to Paris to study with Charcot. Freud developed a marked emotional dependence on Fliess, which was rooted in an idealization of him. Although Fliess was successful professionally, he was not considered to be Freud's intellectual equal.

Nevertheless, Fliess' friendship reduced Freud's intellectual isolation, and also contributed to the development of psychoanalysis. They frequently exchanged information about their health and physical ailments. Both suffered from migraines, and

Freud feared heart problems and had gastrointestinal ailments. They both expressed their enthusiasm about their work to each other, which were followed by bouts of depression. Based upon their letters, Didier Anzieu considers them to have been hypochondriacs. Anzieu writes: "They exhibited, described, and entrusted to one another their sick bodies, just as a child whose masochism has been keenly fostered believes that his mother can love him only when he is ill" (*Freud's Self-Analysis*, 1986, p. 164). And, Anzieu, citing Octave Mannoni's work on Freud, feels that Freud's relationship with Fliess was narcissistic.

Freud as a young man was particularly ambitious, consciously so, but seeking to be a scientific pioneer needed such a friend as Fliess. Freud's appreciation of Fliess is amply demonstrated in his correspondence with him. Fliess had many interests, and he was quite imaginative, for example, in his theories of numbers and rhythms and bisexuality. Later, Freud was to incorporate Fliess' notion of bisexuality, but was to go beyond Fliess in his work.

Jones notes a paradox in their curious emotional relationship. Jones says Freud's self-depreciation in letters to Fliess "sprang not from an inner weakness, but from a terrifying strength, one he felt unable to cope with alone. So, he had to endow Fliess with all sorts of imaginary qualities, keen judgment and restraint, overpowering intellectual vigor, which were essential to a protective mentor" (1953, Vol. 1, p. 295).

In so many of his letters Freud's tone is exuberant and reverential, as when he refers to Fliess as the "other," and says "you are the only other, the *alter*." In a letter dated July 14, 1894, he writes, "Your praise is nectar and ambrosia for me, because I know full well how difficult it is for you to bestow it – no more correctly, how seriously you mean it when you bestow it" (*The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess*, trans. and ed. by J. M. Masson, 1985, p. 87). In a letter of January 1, 1896, Freud writes exultingly: "How much I owe you: solace, understanding, stimulation in my loneliness, meaning to my life that I gained through you, and finally even health that no one else could have given back to me. It is primarily through your example that intellectually I gained the strength to trust my judgment, even when I am left alone—though not by you—and like

you, to face with lofty humility all the difficulties that my future may bring. For all that, accept my humble thanks! I know that you do not need me as much as I need you, but I also know that I have a secure place in your affection" (*The Complete Letters*, 1985, p. 158). Clearly, such sentiments aggrandize Fliess and, in line with the thesis of this paper, express that he was an ego ideal for Freud.

A most fortunate occurrence for Freud was when he received a fellowship in 1885 to study diseases of the nervous system with Charcot in France. Charcot's influence was to be decisive at this juncture in Freud's life, for Freud had also become interested in the phenomenon of hysteria. Charcot had established a large medical complex for neurological disorders in Paris—a treatment, research, and teaching center. So prominent was Charcot that his stature in French medicine was compared with that of Louis Pasteur. In addition to studying the "hysterical crisis" (*grande hystérie*), Charcot concerned himself with the manifestation of epileptic convulsions, the uses of hypnosis, and traumatic paralysis. Charcot further demonstrated that paralysis varied in etiology, and those stemming from mental trauma were symptomatically different from organic ones. Indeed, Charcot was a pioneer and bold researcher in the causes of mental disorders, achieving world wide recognition in his own lifetime. Nevertheless, Charcot's work was controversial, departing from orthodox medical practice, as he defiantly put forward the diagnosis that hysteria also occurred in males. However, Charcot being an innovator—and a maverick—only served to enhance his standing with Freud.

Profoundly impressed by Charcot, Freud wrote to his fiancée that "Sometimes I come out of his lectures as from Notre Dame, with an entirely new idea about perfection....Whether the seed will ever bear fruit I don't know, but what I do know is that no other human being has ever affected me in the same way" (Jones, 1953, Vol. 1, p. 185). Because of such a tribute Jones says that it is justified to conclude that he decisively influenced Freud to change from being "a neurologist into a psychopathologist" (Jones, 1961, p. 123). Furthermore, the significance of Charcot's medical discoveries for Freud, which advanced his professional thinking, is the demonstration that hysteria was psychogenic in nature, that it was governed by a hidden mechanism, and that it was not unique to women.

During the many months that Freud was in Paris he established a personal relationship with Charcot, which profited both men professionally. Freud's interest in Charcot's work was so marked that, with Charcot's approval, Freud translated his book *Leçon sur les maladies du système nerveux* into German. The German title was *Neue Vorlesung über die Krankheiten des Nervensystems insbesondere über Hysterie* (New Lectures on the Diseases of Nervous System, Particularly on Hysteria). Some years after he had left Paris, reflecting on the profound impression that Charcot's experiments had made on him, Freud noted that he came to recognize "the possibility that there could be powerful mental processes, which nevertheless remained hidden from the consciousness of men." At another time, when Charcot came by to shake hands with Freud, he remarked that "Despite my feelings for independence I was very proud of this mark of attention, since he is not only a man to whom I have to be subordinate, but a man to whom I am gladly so" (Jones, 1961, p. 123). In honor of Charcot, Freud named his first born son Jean Martin after him.

When Charcot died in 1893, Freud wrote a moving obituary: "In him, all too soon, the young science of neurology has lost its greatest leader, neurologists of every country have lost their master teacher and France has lost one of her foremost men" (1900, Vol. 3, p. 11). Of Charcot as a teacher, Freud said that he was "positively fascinating," adding that: "Each of his lectures was a little work of art in construction and composition; it was perfect in form and made such an impression that for the rest of the day one could not get the sound of what he said out of one's ears or the thought of what he had demonstrated out of one's mind" (Freud, 1900, p. 17). All of these observations show a high respect for Charcot, that he was emulated and idealized in positive identification.

The last person to be considered as being of special significance to Freud is Joseph Breuer, a Viennese physician, an internist of considerable standing, who was fourteen years his senior. Unlike the other figures cited so far, he was Freud's colleague. They met in Brücke's Physiology Institute and became close friends and collaborators. Breuer was an exceptional physician, respected for his clinical abilities; in recognition of his medical acumen, he was a physician to other physicians and notable persons in

Vienna, among them Brücke and Brentano. Breuer was not only an exceptionally good friend and mentor to Freud, but he was also very generous toward him, loaning him money for a period of years when Freud was an impecunious student. After Freud became financially successful, and he wanted to repay him, Breuer refused to accept his money.

What is pertinent here is that Freud always expressed a high opinion of Breuer. Albrecht Hirschmüller, in his exhaustive *The Life and Work of Joseph Breuer: Physiology and Psychoanalysis*, (1978), includes a detailed examination of Breuer's and Freud's collaboration and has many illustrative letters of their close relationship. Hirschmüller notes that Breuer sent many patients to Freud, and the two discussed patients continuously, and that at first "Freud's methods of treatment were wholly conventional" (p. 141). However, eventually Freud departed from this approach, and with regard to patients with mental illness, became more audacious by pioneering free association. Yet, despite their mutual interests and the benefits they derived from them, Breuer and Freud became estranged over Freud's increasing stress of the importance of sexuality as a cause of neurotic disturbances. Breuer had a high opinion of Freud, as expressed in a letter to Fliess in 1895, in which he wrote to him: "Freud's intellect is soaring at its highest. I gaze after him as a hen at a hawk" (Hirschmüller, p. 315). Again, Freud recognized the enormous impact Breuer had had on him in a moving letter to Breuer's son Robert on the death of his father in 1925, and expressed his deep feelings of appreciation for him. He wrote:

I was deeply moved by the news of the death of your father. You are well aware of the importance of his personal influence on my own life, and the vital role his teaching and stimulation played in respect of my work.

Please convey to your dear mother the deepest sympathy felt by each member of my own family, and allow my circumstances to serve as a valid excuse if I am unable to be present at the funeral.

The next issue of the *Inter. Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* will attempt to do justice to the magnificent part played by your late father in the creation of our new science.

Yours,  
Freud

The work that Freud and Breuer pioneered was decisive to the development of psychoanalysis.

The key figure in their collaboration was a gifted young woman twenty-one years of age, known in the psychoanalytic literature as "Anna O." In effect, she was the first psychoanalytic patient. Anna O suffered from hysteria, paralysis, loss of speech and sight, as well as other disturbances. In 1880, Breuer began attending to Anna O using hypnosis with some success, and in 1882 began to discuss this case with Freud. Freud then developed a strong interest in Anna O's condition, to the extent that he became Breuer's collaborator in writing the case. In time, many of Anna O's symptoms were relieved, and although there is some question about the complete attainment of her physical coordination and speech she regained her ability to work.

Breuer's and Freud's consultations resulted in the publication of a joint paper in 1893, "The Psychological Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena," which was followed by their book *Studies on Hysteria* in 1895. This book reflected a father-son dyad and marked the beginning of psychoanalysis, providing case histories and a theory of neurosis. As was noted above about the persons he admired, Freud named one son after Brücke, and another after Charcot. When one of his daughters was born, he named her Mathilde, after Breuer's wife.

Many other men influenced Freud, but they are beyond the scope of this study. Regarding Freud's idealization of many persons, as discussed in this paper, there are varied opinions of Freud, with some seeing him as appearing to be needy and others seeing him as courageous. In fact, Freud was psychologically strong, often standing alone even when he was severely disparaged for his theories. The medical personages who are presented here were important and decisive for Freud in being leading authorities in their field, in his respect and admiration for them, and in their professional intellectual stimulation of him. Ultimately, he transcended their contributions. This consequential formative period of engagement with them was marked by Freud's increasing focus on the etiology and treatment of neurosis, culminating in his *magnum opus* in 1900, *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

*Jacques Szaluta, PhD is Professor Emeritus of History at the United States Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point in New York where he continues to do some teaching. As a European historian*

*and psychohistorian, his extensive publications include Psychohistory: Theory and Practice (1999). Szaluta works hard to bring psychohistory to the attention of his fellow academics. He may be reached at <Szalutaj@usmma.edu>. □*

## Freud's Wolf Man

Dan Dervin  
Mary Washington College

*Review of Lawrence Johnson, The Wolf Man's Burden. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001. Hardcover ISBN 0-8014-3875-6, x, 188 pages, \$41.95.*

Who is the Wolf Man, and why should we be concerned about his burden? Lon Chaney sprouting fangs and facial hair under a full moon? It is not this one, but rather the other one: Sergei Pankeev (1887-1979). A promising painter of landscapes and student of literature, he was a "typical Russian intellectual" at the beginning of the last century, according to Alexander Etkind's history of psychoanalysis in Russia (*Eros of the Impossible*, p. 81). As a youth, Sergei developed symptoms, which he later called "unconscious grief," which were viewed at the time as depression. According to Etkind, Pankeev felt his life hollow and his experiences unreal, and others seemed like wax figures or marionettes (p. 84). After a foray into hypnosis, he traveled to Munich to consult with the renowned Kraepelin, who diagnosed him as manic-depressive, as was his father. By 1910 Pankeev ended up on Freud's couch. Early in his treatment, he recalled a dream of waking to the sight of several wolves perched on the walnut tree outside his bedroom window and staring in at him. Terrified of being eaten, the four-year-old screamed and awakened. In analysis he made a sketch of the dream-vision for Freud.

Thus was born the Wolf Man, whose terrors form the core of one of psychoanalysis' most famous case histories. "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis" was written by Freud in 1914 and published in 1918 when World War I ended. Freud famously interpreted the dream as a primal scene derivative, that is, of Sergei's early exposure to parental lovemaking in the mode of mating beasts. The case material was tailored to Freud's urgent needs to confirm his theor-



ies of infantile sexuality and counter the skepticism of Jung and Adler. But what was intended to be a decisive victory proved to be the opening salvo in battles that still flare up today. Not only did the issues not get resolved—the Wolf Man did not get cured. He returned from time to time to Freud but was also passed on to other analysts. By the time he expressed his own misgivings in memoirs and conversations, there were casebooks within the analytic community and extensive second-guessing outside it (see Muriel Gardiner, ed., *The Wolf Man by the Wolf Man*, 1971, and Karin Obholzer, *The Wolf Man Sixty Years Later: Conversations with Freud's Controversial Patient*, 1982).

Lawrence Johnson's title captures the paradox of the Wolf Man: burdened to be both the exemplar of psychoanalysis and its failed patient—its "greatest prize and [Freud's] archnemesis" (p. 2). While the nature of his conflicts may have rendered him a pawn in psychoanalytic politics, Johnson supports those who see a strong personal level of interest on Freud's part. Not only did he see Sergei daily six times a week for four years, but he also offered occasional free analysis, took up a collection for him when he emerged penniless after WWI, and exercised a certain veto power over his wedding plans. Noting that the key image for the West is Oedipus but that that of the East is the Sphinx, Etkind proposes that "Freud was drawn to Dostoevsky and Pankeev because ... their conscious minds had more direct access to the universal mechanisms of the unconscious" (pp. 96-97). On the other hand, Johnson quotes sources who maintain that Pankeev's linguistic dexterity (he had a polyglot mix of English, German, and Russian) fostered a tendency to speak in a sort of "crypt," which in the analytic situation worked as resistance and rendered him an "enigma" (p. 64; Johnson also uses *crypt* more idiosyncratically to address a sort of preserved and protected intrapsychic burial chamber, or "monument of a lost object preserve within the split ego" (p. 15), the meaning of which is far from clear to me). That Freud in any case did not deeply hear his patient or penetrate these barriers raises issues of countertransference. His technical papers around this time were exploring psychoanalysis as the love-cure, that is, drawing on the ways the patient transfers feelings and fantasies from prior libidinal ties to the analytic situation; but Freud lagged somewhat in exploring how analysts bring their own baggage into analytic work. He tended to interpret manifest events,

such as the dream, in terms of latent layers revealing an archaic past. This is what happened when the Wolf Man's dream was interpreted as a primal scene fantasy, which both reinforced and threatened the foundation stones of the psychoanalytic edifice being constructed during the 1914-1918 period.

So it is not difficult to appreciate how generations of scholars continue to be intrigued by this material. Johnson's contribution issues from a careful reconstruction of the two men's lives, and how their personal histories, unresolved conflicts, and current preoccupations could likely have become interwoven. Pankeev's "personal history" seems "to have echoed Freud's own internal drama" (p. 23). In this scenario, the "institution of psychoanalysis had reached an impasse as a result of Freud's attempt to work through particular repressed material of his own," and then "found its reflection (its mirror image and exact opposite) in the Wolf Man's crypt, leading Freud to posit the Wolf Man within his own internal drama as a rival for the control of psychoanalysis...." (p. 18). This is a large, extremely ambitious enterprise. It is given some support through careful and often ingenious readings but must remain speculative insofar as the intensely private exchanges of a protracted analysis can never be fully reproduced and are inevitably prone to selective recollections, distortions, and overdetermined revisions. Instead of encoding a primal scene, the Wolf Man's dream for Johnson encodes other infantile material that reverberates cryptically between the two parties. Revisiting previous analytic speculations from Ernest Jones that the death of baby Julius when Freud was 18 months constituted his primary trauma, and that baby sister Anna, arriving soon after, inherited this complex, according to Max Schur, Johnson proposes an alternative. "Let us consider that if Sigmund had wished away his sister like he claims to have done with Julius, he will have seen his wishes realized in an unthinkable event: he wishes Anna away, but it is the other Anna (his Amme-Nana [the family nanny] who disappears." She was fired by his mother, allegedly for stealing (which Johnson questions). Thus through the "medium of a homonymic confusion," he loses his "surrogate mother-object" (p. 61). The Wolf Man also had a nanny, one given to cautionary folktales of werewolves and prone to restraining male children by grabbing their genitals, and he had a rivalrous-libidinal tie to his sister Anna, which entailed fantasies (or instances) of genital-fondling. The number

of wolves in the dream as six (which also was given as seven, and was five in the drawing) lends itself to a provocative chain of associations linking *sister – sex – siesta* (the afternoon nap the parents would take which involved lovemaking) in part through the Russian *siestorka* (sister) and *shiestorka* (pack of six) (p. 137).

All of which is intriguing, but Johnson's argument is weakened by what strikes this reviewer as gratuitous diversions into current academic trends. For a short, extremely concentrated study, it is dismaying not to have the principals stage-center for the first 55 pages. Instead there are excursions into the writings of Lacan, to Derrida's problematics, to a cameo appearance of Nietzsche, to extensive treatment of Stephen Greenblatt's theories of improvisational writing as self-fashioning (which Freud supposedly practiced), and on to invoking something called "heterothanatology" (p. 19). In concluding, Johnson injects the question of his own transference only to embark on a "general understanding of the transference relation" (p. 175). Regrettably, all these flights of ideas succeed only in distracting and diluting from Johnson's main points.

*Daniel Dervin, PhD, emeritus professor at Mary Washington College in Fredericksburg, Virginia, is a prolific author and frequent contributor to psychohistory. His book, Father Bosetti in America: A Biographical Study, was released in August from Cache Glade Publications and is reviewed on page 103 of this issue. Professor Dervin may be contacted at <ddervin@mwc.edu>. □*

## Appreciating Freud

David Felix  
City University of New York

*Review of Lydia Flem, Freud the Man: An Intellectual Biography, Translated by Susan Fairfield. New York: Other Press, 2003. ISBN 1-59051-037-2, x1, 213 pages., \$28.00.*

Oddly, idiosyncratically intelligent, this book is not what it tells us it is. Indeed, it goes on to provoke repeated objections in its smaller statements as well. Yet it also defeats pedantic concern by its sensitive response to various facets of Freud's grand and various being.

Making no effort to support its claims, *Freud the Man* is not an intellectual biography. I wonder if an editor imposed such a subtitle on a manuscript defying definition, which, furthermore, consorts oddly with the broad *the Man* before the specification. In any case the text makes no effort to establish and pursue the structure of intellectual biography, with its identification of ideas, their origins, development, and conclusions. *The Man*, moreover, is just barely a son, spouse, father, and world historical personality. He is the subject of a succession of pictorial slides, individually acute, exquisite, wrongheaded, and repetitive.

Consider the first three of the ten chapters teasingly headed "Creation Day by Day," "Through the Train Window," and "The Archeologist." The first, sounding a number of themes, shows us Freud greeting one of his cherished *objets d'art*, pursuing "archaic history, link[ing] his archeological collection and his psychoanalytic approach," receiving his patients transformed into the "tragic hero[es] Hamlet, Lady Macbeth, Dr. Faustus or the Witch," lunching at one o'clock with wife and six children, writing to friends, and "dream[ing] of going to Italy at the end of summer." This fine condensation sounds a number of themes which will be repeated throughout the book. The train window chapter travels through his Moravian past, his railway phobia, his dreaming of journeys, his "structural theory of the geography of ego, superego, and id," and, again, archeology, which "presents us with a metaphor for the unconscious." The third chapter, "The Archeologist," develops the subject subtly, if repetitively, with notes on the "layers and stratifications in psychic material." The other chapters operate similarly.

Rendered in English by a translator of comparable taste, these are expressions of an appreciation by a psychic and literary gourmet of the highest order. Yet too many statements are elliptical even to a knowledgeable person, claim too much, contradict themselves, or substitute sensibility for sense. Thus, "In his own eyes, Freud is not a therapist but a conqueror, an archaeologist, a detective of the human soul." But is it not the essence of his works that he is at the same time therapist, conqueror, and all the rest? And why does Ms. Flem speculate on a time "when psychoanalytic treatment will have long disappeared?" She should, at least, argue the point. And why must she see an opposition between "scientific

discourse" and psychoanalysis as "based on the particular, on language and emotion"? Surely the *raison d'être* of psychoanalysis is that though it is scientific it still must be *felt*. Contrariwise, Ms. Flem insists on seeing a profound similarity between Freud the archeologist (permit the repetition!) of private souls and the journalist and public man Theodor Herzl.

This is not the life of Freud "the Man." It reads like an analysis, passing by vast areas not pressingly relevant to the cure, concentrating obsessively on others, quickly skirting others, or breaking off trains of thought when the hour is up. It is, however, a collection of fine insights, an appreciation to be appreciated.

*David Felix, PhD, is an emeritus professor of modern European history at the City University of New York. He has published books on Karl Marx, John Maynard Keynes, and a variety of other subjects. Professor Felix may be contacted at <[DFlixx@msn.com](mailto:DFlixx@msn.com)>. □*

## The Catholic Culture Bearer to the Rockies

Dereck Daschke  
Truman State University

*Review of Dan Dervin, Father Bosetti in America: A Biographical Study. Denver: Cache Glades, 2004, paperback. ISBN 0-9724792-2-8, vii-xi + 226 pp., \$15.95.*

Given the current and decidedly cloudy image of Catholic priests who work with adolescent boys, Father (Fr.) Joseph J. Bosetti, the subject of Dan Dervin's biography, seems too good to be true. An Italian immigrant, this priest drew on the rich cultural heritage of his native Milan to compose sacred music as well as direct operas like "La Traviata" and "La Boheme" for the Denver Grand Opera Company. He provided the "proper auspices" for seminarians to drink alcohol under his supervision at his camp in the Rocky Mountains. He embraced some aspects of Freudian psychoanalysis while teaching a University of Colorado Extension Course in the 1920's. As extraordinary as Fr. Bosetti was, Dervin, a former camper and counselor at the priest's Camp St. Malo for Catholic seminarians and altar boys, never resorts to hagiography or myth-making. In fact, in various

places throughout the book, Dervin attempts to unlock some of the significance of Fr. Bosetti's life through psychoanalytic readings of certain memories, creative acts, and interpersonal incidents.

In the end, though, the book's ability to render a deep and incisive picture of what appears to be simply a remarkable human being is undermined by some structural problems in the presentation of the narrative and a certain unevenness in the writing (including several typos). Fr. Bosetti's life is presented in roughly chronological order, but is also structured around his great loves, apart from his priestly vocation: music, mountaineering, and, related to both, his camp. Part I is devoted the origins and impact of the priest's mission to Denver (chapter one), his music in and out of the church (chapters two and three), and his love of the mountains (chapter four), which he shares not only with Catholic boys but also the Pope at the time, Pius XI. Yet the next three chapters in this section, while related, are somewhat incongruous with what has preceded them. There is a brief account of the history of St. Catherine's Chapel on the Rock on the grounds of Camp St. Malo; an estimation of the intellectual significance of Fr. Bosetti's Extension Course on psychology; and an excursus on the campers' ascents up nearby Mount of the Holy Cross. Dervin then interrupts his chronology with Part II, a selection of Fr. Bosetti's writings on mountaineering and music. Part III follows with two chapters on the final years of the priest's life and his impact on others and concludes with an appendix on his seminary years in Rome and Switzerland, which includes a prescient report of sexual abuses by one of the seminary priests.

One should recognize that Dervin has not set out to write a psychobiography of this priest, who clearly meant much to the author. But such an acknowledgment only serves to accentuate the excursions into psychoanalytic interpretation. Some of these are tentative, at best (such as his reading of screen memories of the composer Giuseppe Verdi, pp. 37-39), but others suggest perceptive ways to tie the significant parts of the priest's life together. One occasion where Dervin successfully achieves such an insight into the whole of Fr. Bosetti's life comes (probably not coincidentally) in the chapter on the psychology course (chapter six), "Such Sublimity of Mind." The title here refers to Dervin's exploration of the dual significance of the word "sublime." On

the one hand there is the religious, ecstatic, even mystical meaning that in many ways lies at the spiritual core of the priestly vocation. On the other is the Freudian concept of sublimation, highly pertinent for a celibate who was also celebrated in religious and secular society for his role as a "culture bearer" to the remote western outpost of early twentieth century Colorado. Dervin writes, "the sublime forms a unifying thread in the total Bosetti tapestry," encompassing not only the priest's love of religion and music but also the mountains (p. 145). For Fr. Bosetti, Dervin argues, mountains represented not only the literal peaks of natural beauty but also the peaks of the human encounter with God, as seen in the numerous sacred heights consecrated in the Bible. Even mountaineering, so central to the priest's life and the lives of his campers, can be easily understood as a metaphor for transcending our limitations in both the religious and psychological senses (pp. 146-47).

The play of the sublime and sublimation Dervin discusses neatly illustrates Fr. Bosetti's remarkable ability to stay grounded in the world while reaching out to its transcendent aspects. However, after using the word "sublime" on the first page of the introduction and briefly alluding to sublimation in the second chapter ("Though their collaboration was long-lasting and fruitful, celibacy makes strange bed-fellows with art," p. 38), Dervin does not develop this theme until well into the second half of the book – and subsequently abandons it. Consequently it is difficult, overall, to understand what is so compelling or illustrative about this particular man of God. Fr. Bosetti arrived in America at 25, Dervin writes, "to all intents and purposes a fully formed adult, a priest committed to his vocation, well equipped to engage the many unforeseen challenges of the New World" (p. 41), a point he reiterates near the end of the book, adding that he "suffered little doubt or uncertainty" (p. 200). Perhaps part of the problem Dervin faces in revealing an absorbing portrait of this subject stems from the fact that he appears so well-balanced and well-suited to his chosen role that little of the internal conflict or outward struggle that one might anticipate from a cultured, non-English speaking missionary to one of the rough edges of American civilization is apparent.

Even when confronting injustices brought about by others' immoral behavior or unreasonable stances, the priest is unfailingly portrayed as taking

an unequivocally upright and sensible position. While he does not back down, he often accedes to withdraw from a situation, as when the "censorious" Bishop of Denver objects to the mixed acting company and romantic situations of the opera "Romeo et Juliette" (p. 34) or when one of Camp St. Malo's benefactors threatens to cut off funding (pp. 98-104). Dervin introduces an Oedipal theme of obedience regarding Fr. Bosetti's reaction to his superior in Denver and expands on it through the screen memory of Verdi, who "became a source of both idealization and identification," providing "the missing role as an idealized, sponsoring parent" (pp. 35-39). As an adult, the priest misremembers Verdi's relationship to Catholicism, seeing him as he no doubt saw himself: "obedient" (i.e., Orthodox) but creative within its constraints. Throughout his life Fr. Bosetti is never portrayed as chafing under these constraints or surreptitiously subverting them; this culture bearer voices no discontent with the repressive forces of his civilization. Though Dervin asserts that Fr. Bosetti, like Freud, was "deeply ambivalent toward civilization," he is content to accept at face value the priest's devotion to religion—and mountaineering—as "solutions" to its "hypocrisy of conventionalities and 'ennui'" (p. 197). The story of Bosetti's life would be more fascinating and still more richly human if Dervin had been able to not only depict the priest's great strengths but the inner struggles and constant sacrifices they most certainly required.

Still, the priest's sense of fairness and justice was acute, at least when injustice threatened to impact the welfare of the young men in his world who had devoted their lives to God. We see true moral indignation when his benefactor jeopardizes his camp, resigning for two years in protest. More striking still is the letter he writes, at age 19, to make known the sexual improprieties conducted by one of the priests at the Bethlehem Mission in Immensee, Switzerland, where he had begun his training (pp. 220-23). Appealing to the issues of trust, morality, and justice upon which such a scandal, left unaddressed, would inflict immeasurable damage for the young seminarians and the Church itself, this letter demonstrates just what a force this man was in all his reasonableness and measured passion. It is unfortunate then that this episode from the beginning of his career is relegated to an appendix at the end of a book on his life. Had Dervin integrated all the aspects of Fr. Bosetti's life as well as the man himself

had, he could have produced an extraordinary biography, rather than an uneven biography of a model priest that only offers glimpses of what made him that way.

*Dereck Daschke, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Truman State University and Chair of the Psychology and Biblical Studies Section of the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting. His areas of specialization include psychology and religion, religion and healing, and apocalypticism. He is co-editor of New Religious Movements: A Documentary Reader, due in July 2005. Professor Daschke can be contacted at <ddaschke@truman.edu>. □*

## Milgram's Legacy

**Eva Fogelman  
Private Practice**

*Review of Thomas Blass, The Man Who Shocked the World: The Life and Legacy of Stanley Milgram. New York: Basic Books, 2004. Hardcover ISBN 0738203998, 360 pages, \$26.00.*

After World War II, Holocaust survivors who were liberated from concentration camps were often accused of committing devious acts in order to survive. At that time *The Saturday Evening Post* and the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* reported: "The few that remain to us in Europe are not necessarily Judaism's best. The nation's jewels were destroyed first, and many of the survivors are suspected of low morality." How ironic that the victims were blamed for their survival! The perpetrators, many of whom managed to escape, were not subjected to such denigration.

Perhaps it should not have surprised us that the man who tried to discover what was behind such barbaric inhumanity is a person who has been accused of immorality. Stanley Milgram, the world-renowned social psychologist, is best known for his studies of "obedience to authority," even though his other research findings, such as "six degrees of separation," have become part of everyday popular culture. Thomas Blass in his exquisite portrayal *The Man Who Shocked the World: The Life and Legacy of Stanley Milgram*, removes Milgram's anonymity and restores for us the panoply of Milgram's contributions to our own understanding of human behavior.

Blass sheds insight into the question of why the man who legitimized the field of social psychology is only mentioned in passing in the writings of the history of psychology.

One explanation proposed by Blass for Milgram's lack of recognition is that Milgram did not have a school of thought that followed him. Yet, Milgram had more graduate students than most members of the faculty at the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. I am a case in point. I was one of Stanley Milgram's students, one whose work would not be identifiable in a "Stanley Milgram school of social psychology." Or would it?

Being interested in moral capacity in human beings, I was intrigued by the minority in Milgram's study who disobeyed authority when asked to shock a person who gets a wrong answer to a word-association test in an experimental laboratory. What enabled certain individuals to maintain their moral integrity? I did not avail myself of Stanley Milgram's simulated shock generator. Rather, I did a case study of non-Jews who risked their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust. I also attempted to develop a "Tendency to Help" personality measurement. Although my methodology was different from Milgram's approach to uncovering human behavior in different situations, he applauded my qualitative methodology. He helped me draft a letter to *Psychology Today*; and indeed, my preliminary findings were published in that popular magazine. Milgram died at the age of 51, shortly after he approved my dissertation proposal.

In 1981, when I began to voice interest in moral issues during the Holocaust, and more specifically in altruistic behavior, I discovered that most people were suspicious of altruistic behavior. They would declare that psychoanalysts say that altruism does not exist; unconscious motivation—narcissistic gratification—is at the core of helping others. People would say, "The rescuers must have had ulterior motives." Holocaust survivors would say, "Don't make such a big deal about the rescuers; there were so few." Although I was not accused of being immoral, the idea that non-Jews risked their lives to save Jews without financial or other rewards is not accepted by all, no matter what my interviews with rescuers and those they helped show. I empathized with Mil

gram's encounter with criticism of his findings that a majority of people will comply when told to harm another person by an authority figure.

My first encounter with Stanley Milgram was in 1978 in Jerusalem, where he was an invited speaker at an international conference on psychological stress. He took a particular interest in my producing a film. From Milgram I learned about film as a medium to communicate knowledge, and how it is different from the written format. He lived long enough to see my documentary, *Breaking the Silence: The Generation After the Holocaust*, air on national PBS and the ZDF in Germany.

I was one of many of Milgram's students who Blass tracked down and interviewed. Blass's portrait of Milgram as a teacher is not a glorification of the dead. He depicts Milgram with all his wounds and strengths. Indeed, Blass reports on the students' diverse research interests and on their reactions to Milgram. Professor Milgram was imaginative and possessed an insatiable curiosity. It is that quality that he passed on to his students. If there is a "Stanley Milgram school of social psychology" it is that each student should pursue a question that most intrigues him or her about the social world and human behavior, and find interesting ways to answer the question. The dependent variable has to be attention-grabbing.

Milgram's curiosity about the world around him and invention of experiments to prove one thing or another was a part of his core self from childhood. He was curious about how "everything worked." Blass's informative psychohistorical biography is enriched by interviews with Milgram's brother, sister, wife, children, childhood friends, and by previous interviews.

In recounting Milgram's childhood, Blass highlights two incidents that in hindsight serve as a harbinger to Milgram's professional interests. In the first incident, a child was knocked down by a car in Milgram's neighborhood in the Bronx. Milgram watched as a crowd of protesters gathered on the sidewalk to chant, "Sit down strike! Sit down strike!" They built a barricade from milk crates across the width of the street and sat on the crates. Shortly after, a one-way street was established. The power of groups did not bypass the keen observer Milgram.

The second critical incident occurred when Stanley Milgram was four or five years old, and playing with his cousin in his room. Milgram wanted to measure the distance between two beds with a belt that stretched. According to Milgram, "The belt slipped, and the buckle, with its sharp spindle, fell on Stanley's [his cousin] head causing a small flow of blood. Even though it was an accident, Milgram was scolded by his mother. Years later, Milgram contemplates this encounter: "Still, to be blamed for such things was a burden. But whether I learned my lesson remains unclear. For many years later, was I not again to become an object of criticism for my efforts to measure something without due regard to the risks it entailed for others?"

What is most striking to me is that Milgram's immigrant parents, who valued their children as "treasures," were role-models for never giving up in the face of hardship. They overcame financial limitations with dignity and perseverance. It is those qualities that one also observes in Milgram. When he was not admitted to Harvard graduate school in psychology, because he had not majored in psychology as an undergraduate, he did not take "No" for an answer. Milgram figured out how to get accepted, and worked very hard to get himself ready for the challenge.

When Milgram's father, a baker and cake decorator, died at fifty-five years of age of a coronary thrombosis, Milgram was in college and living at home. The father's bad investments left them poverty-stricken, but his "resourceful and resilient" mother found a job. The father's death brought on a premonition in Milgram that he would die when he was fifty-five years old. Milgram also resolved to protect his own future family from financial disaster should he die young. Family was a high priority in Milgram's life. His drive and ambition academically did not undermine his valuing of family life, and the close knit-family of his childhood was replicated in his adult life.

Thomas Blass's detailed sequential narrative of Stanley Milgram's life and work probably would not have been possible without the meticulous archive Milgram left behind. The attention to specifics is what made Milgram the scientist *par excellence*. This certainly comes through in the engaging, readable, page turning biography, whose readers are ea-

ger to know: "what is Stanley Milgram up to next?"

Milgram's inquisitive nature led to many questions about observable social behavior. A lost letter addressed to what kind of an organization is more likely to be mailed? Who would succeed in getting passengers on a New York subway to give up their seat? Are New Yorkers more or less helpful than people in various European cities? Are Americans more or less obedient to authority than are Norwegians or French? Milgram explained that he was an "experimentalist" because "only in action can you fully realize the forces operative in social behavior. Picking up a "lost letter," or giving up one's seat on the subway, or observing familiar strangers at a train station, behavior in crowds are a few of the concrete dependent variables.

Milgram did have some studies that did not fit this paradigm, such as the study of cognitive maps of different cities. His study on television's effects on antisocial behavior is a landmark contribution as well. Milgram's appetite for filmmaking was whetted when he was in Hollywood during the filming of *Medical Center*. He prolificacy in low budget films such as *The City and the Self* was astounding. Blass captures the excitement that Milgram experienced in using this medium.

In reading *The Man Who Shocked the World*, several of Milgram's personality traits come alive and in essence shape the format of Blass's book. Milgram is portrayed as having been very organized. He was meticulous in recording conversations, correspondences, procedures, and day-to-day events, and his letters reveal much about relationships with colleagues, family members and friends. Milgram documented each research project or film project from its beginning, through its middle, and to the end. He was a great believer in the finished product: What would it look like? Would it be interesting? To be able to have so many details, almost as if Milgram wrote it himself, must have been a biographer's delight.

Despite Milgram's prominence, his proposals were not always accepted for funding. Blass illustrates how critics of Milgram limited his ability to get funds for certain projects. Throughout Milgram's life, criticism of the obedience studies continued to pop up here and there and needed constant attention. The American Psychological Association's ethics

committee and IRBs (Institutional Review Board) became very stringent as a result of the criticism. It is highly unlikely that such experiments would pass a review board today.

Blass does not focus only on Milgram's research. *The Man Who Shocked the World* is full of tidbits about Milgram's social life, early dating, and the courtship of his wife Sasha, as well as the social life they enjoyed together, and his role as a father. Milgram loved pranks and had a sense of humor. He was an experimenter and his experimentation included, unapologetically, drugs.

Stanley Milgram died almost twenty years ago. His ideas have become part of our vernacular: "What a small world"—a Milgramism—is what we say when someone tells us he met someone we know. When I read in the press about soldiers who are obeying or disobeying orders, workers who are conforming to group pressures, the familiar strangers we noticed on September 11, 2001 when we were stuck on subway stations in New York City or walked miles to reach our homes with thousands of others, I think about Stanley Milgram. Thomas Blass's *The Man Who Shocked the World: The Life and Legacy of Stanley Milgram* is a "must read" for those who want to see the world through an inspiring, uncommon lens.

*Eva Fogelman, PhD, is a social psychologist and a psychotherapist in private practice in New York City who was a student of the late Professor Stanley Milgram at the Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York (CUNY). She is the author of Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust (1994), writer and co-producer of Breaking the Silence: The Generation After the Holocaust. Dr. Fogelman is the co-director of Psychotherapy with Generations of the Holocaust and Related Traumas and Child Development Research, Training Institute for Mental Health. She is an advisor to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum who may be contacted at <[EvaFogelman@aol.com](mailto:EvaFogelman@aol.com)>. □*

**Historical amnesia is a grave danger  
of our age**

## Psychological Insights into the Life of Saint Rose of Lima

Paula Straile-Costa  
Ramapo College

*Review of Frank Graziano, Wounds of Love: The Mystical Marriage of Saint Rose of Lima. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. Hardcover ISBN 0195136403, 338 pages, \$49.95.*

Frank Graziano, John D. MacArthur Professor of Hispanic Studies at Connecticut College, adeptly elucidates the life of Isabel Flores y Oliva (1586-1617) and her transformation into Rose of Lima, the first saint in the Americas. Approaching the saint's life through the fields of history, psychoanalysis, clinical psychology, and cultural studies, he delivers a remarkable account of the social and individual motivations inherent in penitent mysticism in the New World during the Counter Reformation. He begins by addressing the scholarly attacks mounted against psychology and psychoanalysis when used to examine historical figures, particularly female mystics. He affirms that: "our fullest understanding of Rose of Lima's mysticism, sainthood, religious culture, and textual representation is afforded when history, cultural theory, and psychological analysis can negotiate a methodological compromise" (p. 20). Graziano's purpose is to highlight what scholars have brought to light in recent years "while at once recuperating the erotic and psychological aspects of mysticism that have been devalued" (p. 15). The scholar's analysis avoids reductionist labeling of religious behavior as simply pathological, deviant, or hysterical. He sees the saint as a product of her culture, her behaviors conditioned by it. He examines the many factors involved in Lima's creation as a saint, including her childhood trauma, pervasive religious fervor, political milieu, and desire to sacrifice herself for Christ. In *Wounds of Love: The Mystical Marriage of Saint Rose of Lima*, Graziano offers a multifaceted, complex reading of the saint's life, one that permits multiple meanings.

The scholar uses the image of the palimpsest to describe the complex textual world he enters in order to extract the truth about Rose's psychological condition. The palimpsest is a tablet that, having been written upon several times, the texts imperfectly

erased, leaves the previous texts still visible. Included in this image are the obviously biased canonization documents in the Vatican's archives as well as the many layers of complicity that support Rose's sainthood from her cult of followers and patrons to her confessors and inquisition interrogators. He explains how saints are created "from the bottom up." Popular oral tradition is read, recorded, edited, sanitized and repeatedly revised by the Church, providing the official narrative with "canonical definitiveness and sacrosanct closure" (p. 36). Rose's hagiography, then, is invested in proving that she was not only sane but saintly in order to affirm the church's claim to represent the one true faith. As a saint, Rose's symbolic uses are multiple and, furthermore, extend beyond the theological to the political realm. As a New World saint she provides an economy of sanctity that spans the continents justifying the colonial project and further legitimizing the Church, the Dominican Order, and the Spanish Crown, along with all its institutions in the Americas. Interestingly enough, despite possessing no indigenous blood, she becomes a symbol of syncretic faith, the way the Virgin of Guadalupe does for Mexicans. She was invoked in Creole independence uprisings as well as in indigenous rebellions, even as the Spanish continued to read her as an atonement for the sin of native paganism and idolatry. Graziano engaged in considerable speculation to understand Rose of Lima's psychological health and mysticism, which is perhaps inevitable due to the lapse of time and her prominence as a Saint.

From the age of five and increasingly as she grew, Rose practiced fasting and celibacy, and mortified her flesh with scourging, wearing a crown of thorns and a metal chain wrapped tightly about her waist. She deprived herself of sleep, slept on a torturous bed, vomited if she tried to eat something other than the Eucharist, and constantly and with apparent self-loathing inflicted many other creative forms of suffering on herself. At least 15 years of mortification and self-starvation resulted in Rose's death: a death eagerly awaited, since in her mind it meant that she would wed Christ as a martyr. Of course, as a faithful Catholic, she could not directly kill herself. Graziano indicates that Rose displayed a number of modern disorders including anorexia nervosa, delusion, masochism, narcissism and paranoia. The scholar explains that these illnesses were made possible and perhaps inescapable by her culture, in



which “aspects of Catholicism, particularly, penitent mysticism provided self-abuse a precedent, forum, method, legitimacy, purpose and meaning” (p. 168). At this time, when New World colonies were pervaded with religious zeal, Lima was like “a huge convent” (p. 7). Furthermore, the mindset of the Counter-Reformation, focusing on Christ’s passion and penitence, held the notion of life on earth as martyrdom and a human being as a “bag of excrement,” or “food for worms” (p. 165). The author also points out that manifestations and behaviors that are viewed as pathological or dysfunctional today ought to be understood as not only essential to an individual’s saintliness but also as having been positive and effective in his or her society. On the other hand, despite cultural incentive of sainthood in colonial Lima, very few women exhibited these behaviors. Thus, while cultural factors enabled her behavior patterns, it was clearly something unique in Rose that allowed her to follow her agonizing path.

As is the case with other penitent mystics and modern neurotics, Roses’ early childhood and family life were formative factors. Her father, an elderly, distant, and inconsequential man, left the care of Rose to her mother, whose parenting reinforced many of her behaviors. Rose’s mother often resorted to harsh physical punishments to halt her mortifications but succeeded only in fueling her daughter’s passion for self abuse. The young girl suffered countless childhood illnesses and injuries, with many cures so painful as to be considered child abuse today, which she bore stoically as if they were happening to another’s body. When it came time for courting, Rose attempted to separate from her abusive mother and her own powerlessness. Mirroring modern masochists, Rose identified with the source of her pain and began inflicting it on herself. The only way for Rose to cope with the double bind of her aversion to her mother’s demands that she marry and her desire to be one with God was through mystical marriage with Christ. Rose experienced Christ as often having such utterly worldly characteristics as jealousy, pettiness, impatience, lack of charity, and even hedonism. In her mind, he took on significant elements of her mother’s personality, becoming: “domineering, demanding, totalitarian, controlling, pain—and guilt—inducing” (p. 154). From this point on, in seeking to become the “bride of Christ,” Rose systematically worked to destroy her previous sense of self in order to be one with “Him.” In doing this she displayed the

modern masochist’s “slavish devotion, mediating her love through [...] guilt and unworthiness” (p. 155). Graziano explains that biochemical and psychological elements may have created an addiction to starvation and, likewise, pain dependency could have resulted from endorphin release and a predisposition caused by sleep deprivation and isolation. Rose interpreted her suffering (the self inflicted and that which she saw as induced by God) as an effort to purify herself so that she might unite with Christ as His bride.

Rose associated her love of Christ with suffering, and she gleaned periods of erotic pleasure and ecstasy from union with her image of him. Graziano treats mystical eroticism seriously, rather than simply devaluing the behaviors as bizarre or titillating. He explains that Rose’s erotic devotion is in line with a tradition of mystic penitents. Simply put, she had several role models. He identifies the biblical *Song of Songs*, combined with centuries of exegetic writings derived from it, as the main source for erotic imagery representing love and union with God. He explains that this body of literature provides an outlet for repressed sexual urges that are rechanneled in the idea of mystical marriage and acted out in penitents’ behaviors (kissing, fondling, copulation, sucking at Christ’s “breast” or wound).

Graziano explains that many of the ecstatic, or visionary, experiences of penitent mystics like Saint Rose are common with those of schizophrenics, for instance, a sense of omniscience, union with God, a loss of one’s own boundaries. Rose’s visions and locutions were consistent with her Christian beliefs and affirmed by her society. For instance, she stated that several saints, including Catherine of Siena, the saint whose life she imitated, visited her. She also reported that she communicated with statues of the Virgin of the Rosary and the Christ child, who spoke in muted voices or in her thoughts or with signs and facial expressions. Implying that some of Rose’s experiences could have been normal meditative states, Graziano notes that subjects of meditation experiments have also reported such sensations. For instance, they have perceived “visions of light and the dissolution of their psychic boundaries. One woman felt as though everything, herself included, dissolved into an amorphous, enveloping bundle of energy” (pp. 177-8).

As one who seriously practices yoga meditation, mysticism plays an important role in my own life. Thankfully, my culture doesn't require agony in exchange for ecstasy, and my mystical philosophy views suffering as part of the human condition but certainly not its nature or deserved punishment. Meditation can lead to altered states of consciousness not commonly experienced in the normal waking state where dualities break down and peace and stillness reign. These well-documented experiences can be interpreted absolutely, as transcendental reality or the presence of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, being a member of a subculture of academics informed by Western empiricism, I share Graziano's apparent skepticism regarding claims made in the name of the transcendental. While we don't need to look back in time to find fearsome examples of suffering caused by religion, recalling the lives of penitents and the Inquisition urges questioning of religious postures. This book encouraged me to contemplate the relationship between my culture and intellectual milieu and my mystical experiences in meditation. I find that while my belief in a transcendental reality is problematic, there is space for a kind of faith and wonder that urges seeking, study, a desire for deeper understanding and meaning in life.

The great strength of Graziano's inquiry is this spirit of wonder, its openness to simultaneous meanings and its resistance to definitive diagnoses. His interdisciplinary perspective rightfully brings into question single disciplinary, reductive approaches to this complex case. Resisting the expert's arrogance at having fully understood his subject, he indicates that neither the cosmos nor the human psyche can be captured under a microscope or explained through facile naming. The author's ethos, his humility, consideration of how much is at stake for his readers and great respect for his subject make this work special. Even while relating behaviors that appear horrifying or even laughable to modern readers, he treats Saint Rose of Lima and the various complicit groups involved in her creation with serious attention and studied sensitivity. Graziano's text illuminates history of Saint Rose of Lima, offering an illustration of the incredibly rich interaction of culture and the individual psyche that, if we can apply it to our own life and times, may lead us to become freer individuals.

*Paula Straile-Costa, PhD, an assistant pro-*

*fessor of Spanish at Ramapo College of New Jersey in the suburbs of New York City, has a strong interest in the psychology of religion. She earned her doctorate in comparative literature from Pennsylvania State University where she specialized in Inter-American literatures. Previously she was chair of the foreign language department at Hampton College in Virginia. Professor Straile-Costa may be reached at <pstraile@ramapo.edu>. □*

## Creative and Destructive Leaders of Large Groups

Peter Petschauer  
Appalachian State University

*Review of Vamik Volkan, Blind Trust: Large Groups and Their Leaders in Times of Crisis and Terror. Charlottesville, VA: Pitchstone Publishing, 2004. Hardcover ISBN 0-9728875-2-0, \$29.95, Paperback ISBN 0-9728875-3-9; 368 pages, \$19.95.*

Once more, Vamik Volkan has given us an exceptionally stimulating analysis; this time he has written specifically about large groups, how they function, and how their leaders "use" them for good or ill. Particularly refreshing about Volkan's work is the breath of his insights. He applies psychology, history, political science, and his own experiences with international negotiations in addition to his many interviews.

Especially convincing are Volkan's comparisons between leaders who repair their societies for societal benefit as opposed to those who undermine and even destroy their people for their own personal benefit. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, Julius Kambarage Nyerere, and Nelson Mandela are men whom Volkan sees as positive influences for their societies. Not surprisingly, Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Slobodan Milosevic, and Enver Hoxha of Albania are his examples of destructive leaders. Between these extremes, Richard Nixon stands as an example in the balance. The discussion on how each of the repairers integrated traumatic childhood and adulthood experiences into a positive construction of his personality and how destroyers attained the opposite result is totally absorbing. The repairers, who are often teachers, turned truly horrid events of their lives, as Mandela did with his extensive prison stays, to insights

that uplifted both their societies and themselves. By contrast, the destroyers were unable to integrate their traumatic experiences or the disliked parts of their personalities to this degree, externalizing them instead as abuse and hatred of those whom they learned to despise.

Interesting, too, is how each of these men dealt with enemies. Mandela pinpointed the abusive system of apartheid, and Atatürk, the illiteracy and ignorance of the population as a whole and the traditional leadership. By contrast, Hitler saw the enemies as persons, that is, Jews, Gypsies, and other undesirables, and Milosevic saw them in the Muslim descendants of the men who defeated Prince Lazar in the Battle of Kosovo in 1389.

These discussions about healing or poisoning leaders, largely based on insights regarding narcissism, are matched by equally insightful analyses of Islamic fundamentalism. Very helpful here is Volkan's ability to separate deeply held religious faith, like that of a befriended Russian Orthodox priest in Estonia who tolerates other believers, from fundamentalists of various sorts, including Muslims, Christians, and Jews who react negatively toward "outsiders." The elaborations on Islam, from the earliest days of the Prophet Muhammad, through the Ottoman Empire's defeat in front of Vienna on September 11 (actually 12), 1683, to bin Laden are "a must read" for understanding today's confrontations in the Middle East. Although Volkan warns us to hold off judgment as to evaluations of President George W. Bush's approach to "terrorism," many who have studied ethnic/religious violence, warfare, and recent military occupations are ready to argue that the U.S. was ill advised in its recent approach to the Islamic world in Iraq.

Volkan's approach is similar to the school of psychohistorians that emphasizes the experiences of childhood and group fantasies as determiners of the course of history. Somewhat in contrast, Volkan very carefully analyzes the childhoods of numerous individuals and the experiences of very specific groups. In doing so, he describes the influences of traumas on personality development and leaders' positive and negative manipulations of children, young people, and adults, including the constructive and destructive energies to which they are able to harness such experiences. I suspect that this talented

psychiatrist and founder of the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction (CSMHI) might have used to his advantage the insights of this group of psychohistorians.

No doubt, Hitler and his minions endeavored to create a *Volkgemeinschaft* (Community of the *Volk*) in ways that Volkan describes. The National Socialist regime tried to make families serve its needs and to pull children away from their families for the greater good of Germany, a point well illustrated in the film *Europa, Europa*. However, the author overlooks the great variety of Germans and Germanies that existed in the 12 years of National Socialist rule. For example, while he is correct that the number of youths who attended Youth Film Hour increased into the millions by 1943, most of us also attended church on Sundays and were offered *Religionsunterricht* (catechism) in *Volksschule* (elementary school) by a priest or a minister. In reality, only one of my friends and acquaintances who grew up in various parts of Germany in the 1930s and 1940s felt that her family's authority was undermined. Especially in cities, children were glad to get out into "mother nature" and equally glad to be back home for a decent meal.

I am troubled by the consistent misspelling of German words. For example, in the sentence "*Mutter, erzähl von Adolf Hitler! ... Ein Buch zum ... Nacherzahlen und Selbstlesen für kleinere und grössere Kinder*" (pp. 75-76) [Mother, tell us of Adolf Hitler!...A book to ... retell and read oneself for smaller and larger children], the use of *nacherzahlen* instead of *nacherzählen* is problematic as this could easily be mistaken for *nachherzahlen*, that is, to pay later.

Misspellings sometimes warn us of problems with large group analyses. But none of the above critiques imply more than that in a vast survey—with many different fields, geographic areas, and persons involved—an author will not be in control of every detail. They also do not imply other flaws. *Blind Trust* is a brilliant book that should be read by everyone who is at all concerned with leadership and large groups, and how leaders' childhoods and adulthoods create the positive and destructive ways with which they lead their own and other societies.

*Peter Petschauer's biography may be found on page 90. □*

## Bulletin Board

One of the forthcoming **Psychohistory Forum WORK-IN-PROGRESS SATURDAY SEMINARS** will be on **April 2, 2005** when **Anna Geifman** (Boston University) will present "**Profile of the Modern Terrorist**," from her forthcoming book, *Death will be Their God*.

**CONFERENCES:** At the **International Psychohistorical Association (IPA)** at Fordham University on June 8-10, 2005, the Forum's Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidential Candidates and Presidents will sponsor a session on the first 100 days of the Bush administration and the prospects for the next four years. The presenters include **Herbert Barry, Dan Dervin, Paul Elovitz,** and **Jennefer Mazza.** (**Rudy Binion, John Hartman, David Lotto,** and **H. John Rogers** are some additional Forum members noted on the program.) **Jacques Szaluta** (E-mail: szalutaJ@usmma.edu) has taken the lead in arranging for psychohistorical panels at the **International Society for Political Psychology (ISPP)** in Toronto, Canada, on July 3-6, 2005 and he has asked Paul Elovitz to set up a second panel and perhaps a roundtable. Contact either for details. **AWARDS:** The Psychohistory Forum has available the Young Scholars Membership Award, the *Clio's Psyche* Subscription Award, and the Sidney Halpern Award for the Best Psychohistorical Idea or Accomplishment. The last may be granted at the graduate, undergraduate, or postgraduate level. **DEATHS:** **Lucy Freeman**, a pioneer in reporting on mental health/psychoanalysis, author of 78 books, and a friend to psychohistory died at age 88 in December from complications of Alzheimer's Disease. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry, Ralph Colp, and Mary Lambert; Patrons David Beisel, Peter Loewenberg, Peter Petschauer, H. John Rogers, and Jacques Szaluta; Sustaining Members C. Frederick (Fred) Alford and David Lotto; Supporting Member Hanna Turken; and Members Sander Breiner, Paul Elovitz, Alberto Fergusson, Richard Harrison, Flora Hogman, Glen Jeansonne, Margery Quackenbush, Robert Quackenbush, and Roberta Rubin. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to David Beisel, Kelly

Bulkeley, Dereck Daschke, Lloyd deMause, Dan Dervin, David Felix, Eva Fogelman, John Hartman, Henry Lawton, Peter Petschauer, Paula Straile-Costa, Jacques Szaluta, and Montague Ullman. Our appreciation to Dick Booth and Bob Lentz for selected editing and to Lauren Gargani for proofing, and laying out the issue in Publisher 2003 software.



### In the March Issue of *Clio's Psyche*: The Voice/Personal Experience and Psychology of Women at Work and in Modern Life

"My Journey from Oxford to Psychohistory"  
 "Physics and Pantyhose Days"  
 "My Personal Experience in National Defence"  
 "Finding My Own Path"  
 "Women's Freedom to Choose"  
 "Being a Feminist in Israel"  
 "The 'Jewish Mother' in Myth and Society"  
 "Remembering My Mother"  
 "Overcoming Pain through Writing"  
 "The Gender Gap in Voting"  
 "Martha Stewart and Her Gender Role"  
 "Sexism at the Hardware Store"  
 "The Beauty Myth: The Culture of Appearance"  
 Distinguished Scholar: Nancy J. Chodorow  
 (*Reproduction of Mothering*)

Psychohistory Forum  
 Saturday Work-in-Progress Seminar  
 Proposals Are Encouraged  
 Electronically Send an Abstract or a  
 Draft Paper  
 to Paul Elovitz Who Will Share Your  
 Ideas With the Program Committee  
 A Biography is Requested