Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 12 Number 3 **December 2005**

Teaching Psychohistory Special Issue — Part I

Postgraduate Psychohistorical Education

Paul H. Elovitz
The Psychohistory Forum/Ramapo College

Psychohistory offers unique insights into the human condition, yet despite the fine program at UCLA it is seldom taught in graduate schools. Furthermore, in my experience, most scholars and clinicians become interested in psychohistory after they have earned their terminal degrees, rather than before. For close to three decades, mostly through my role as founder and convener of the Psychohistory Forum, I have sought to help fill the gap created by this situation by providing postgraduate education in this field.

Some of the subject matter presented at our intellectual forums are: psychobiography; political psychobiography; death, dying, and mourning; child

(continued on page 121)

A Correspondence on Teaching Emotion and Politics

Peter Loewenberg
UCLA

Mark Fisher
UC Irvine

Introduction

Recently Mark Fisher, a neurologist and political scientist at the University of California at Irvine, initiated a correspondence with Peter Loewenberg, a historian and psychoanalyst at UCLA, on how most effectively to teach a graduate seminar on "Emotion and Politics: Neuroscience and Psychoanalytic Contributions" in the spring of 2006. We decided to bring this correspondence to you fresh and unaltered because it communicates the immediacy of colleagues who respect each other consulting on psychological social science teaching substance and

(continued on the next page)

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl and the Vita Psychoanalytica

Judith Harris
George Washington University

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl was born on March 3, 1946 in Elkton, Maryland where she grew up as the middle of three children and the eldest of two daughters in an Episcopalian family. Her maternal English ancestry dates back to the Mayflower and her paternal family traces its origins to the Jamestown settlement in Virginia. Her mother was a homemaker with a junior college degree while her father, a college graduate, was a teaching golf professional who became a real estate broker. After beginning college at Sarah Lawrence, she com-

(continued on page 139)

The Glory and Shadow of Fame

Danielle Knafo
Long Island University

The impact of fame on a person, as well as on others, is a very timely topic deserving of our attention. Around last Fathers' Day, one of Saul Bellow's sons wrote an Op-Ed in the *New York Times* titled "Missing: My Father," about his longing for the father he never had rather than the one he lost from recent death. Later that evening, a special television program on Hollywood fathers and sons aired, highlighting the perks and hardships of growing up with a

(continued on page 149)

Turn to the next page for
IN THIS ISSUE

IN THIS ISSUE

Postgraduate Psychohistorical Education........113
Paul H. Elovitz

Correspondence: Emotion and Politics.............113
Peter Loewenberg
Mark Fisher

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl…………………..........113
Judith Harris

The Glory and Shadow of Fame.....................113
Danielle Knafo

Teaching is Reaching………………………...118
Marshall S. Harth

Teaching Psychohistory in London......……...123
Ruth Dale Meyer

Using Disappointments………..…..…...……126
Robert A. Pois with Paul H. Elovitz

Integrating Psychohistory……….…………...128
Dick Booth

A Dialogue on Online Education…………….130
Kenneth Fuchsman and Paul H. Elovitz

Remembering Paul Roazen.............................134
Daniel Burston

Down Then Up: A Poem………………….......126
Kari Vander Weit

An Argentine Politician and Psychobiography.152
Ted Goertzel

Patton: The Dyslexic General………………..154
Glen Jeansonne
Frank Haney
David Luhrssen

The Era of Watergate......................................156
Paul H. Elovitz

The Arab-Israeli Conflict……….…………….159
Book Review by Leah Slivko

Pathologizing Women's Pain..........................161
Book Review by Evelyn Sommers

Woman's Story...163
Book Review by Ellen Toronto

Paul Roazen: In Memoriam……..…………..165
Daniel Burston

Paul Roazen: A Memoir.................................166
Donald Carveth

Bulletin Board………………………………..167

Call for Papers: Psychology of Sports……....160

Call for Papers: Love and Marriage ………....168
At-A-Distance

technique. Only abbreviations and syntactic irregularities have been changed. The times, dates, and formatting are as in the original; personal references to colleagues have been included. We can see the collaborative creative process at work—how one thought or idea leads to others in a creative dialogue about psychoanalysis and teaching. We consider this a model of what we all do, or should do—recognize that knowledge is relative and that we may all benefit from the experience and special expertise of colleagues in allied and interdisciplinary fields. Here Fisher's international authority in the field of stroke plays a role in the recommendation of the case of President Woodrow Wilson where stroke is a major research issue and his experience as a medical clinician is invoked in the end of life issues.

On 10/18/2005, 05:06 PM, Mark wrote:
Peter,

I have a question regarding my planned graduate student seminar, Emotion and Politics: Neuroscience and Psychoanalytic Contributions, in Political Science in the Spring: What do you think is the best single source introduction to psychoanalysis suitable for a one quarter seminar primarily for political science grad students who may know nothing about psychoanalysis? I want to get this intro out of the way pretty quickly, not more than one or two weeks. I'm currently considering the Brenner book (which I looked at a long time ago, pretty good as I recall), and also *Psychohistory* by Szaluta which is a book that you know. I prefer using one book for the introduction. This is designed to be a lead-in to works applying psychoanalysis to politics, e.g.: Harold Lasswell. Your thoughts?
Mark

Date: Wed, 19 Oct 2005 12:43:54 -0700
To: Mark Fisher

From: peter loewenberg <peterl@ucla.edu>
Subject: Your Pol Sci grad seminar

Dear Mark—
Brenner is an intro to only clinical psychoanalysis. Szaluta is the best psychohistory "handbook" we have. But you have to limit required readings. Add those to your suggested references. For a grad seminar of skeptical social scientists, a few hands-on case studies of how the use of psychoanalysis can deepen and enrich their understanding of a complex problem is the method I use. Start with facts and theories they know—begin with a political knowledge base familiar to them, such as:

1. President Woodrow Wilson: He repeated patterns of inflexible stubborn confrontation with other strong men to the point where he had to leave or lose, with Dean West as President of Princeton University, the Democratic bosses as Governor of New Jersey, and tragically with the United States Senate (Senator Henry Cabot Lodge) on the League of Nations. George and George document the family origins in humiliation by his stern Calvinist Presbyterian minister father in their 1956 study which has stood up well for half a century. Cocks and Crosby use this case in secs. 10-13, pp. 132-222, of their *Psychohistory*: #10 is the case of Wilson laid out by Alex George; #11 is an essay on the book by Robert Tucker (You could also use Tucker on Stalin which relates his sadism to his Georgian childhood). #12 Then an attack by neuropsychiatrist Ed Weinstien (it is about stroke—you should love this!) and the Wilson biographer Arthur Link; #13. The Georges respond and counter-attack, bringing in their medical expert—ophthalmologist Michael Marmor of Stanford Medical School (see his contribution on pp. 208-11). You could assign and discuss the Marmor piece: "Wilson, Strokes, and Zebras," *NEJM*, 307 (Aug 26, 1982), 528-35. Mark, as a stroke expert—this is your meat!!!

2. On a broader psycho-social scale, your students all know Max Weber's classic thesis *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904-05) which lifts out Radical Reformation Calvinist Puritan non-rational economic motives. He uses our own Benjamin Franklin (pp. 48-50) as his case example of secular inner worldly asceticism. You can juxtapose Weber's phenomenological description: save, work hard, do not spend, do not waste time nor money, anxiety and guilt at pleasure or opulence, against psychodynamic obsessive-compulsive categories, including Fenichel's brilliant and explicit (pp. 268-310) loaded with case vignettes, or even Wilhelm Reich's compulsive character (pp. 193-200), since he deals with unconscious surface character behaviors observable by social scientists.
You should have a ball!
Peter

At 06:49 PM 10/19/2005, Mark wrote:

Thanks, Peter,
I'm ordering the *Psychohistory: Readings* book, and, will check out the *NEJM* article. This will be an evening seminar. I'm hoping you can visit UCI this spring, maybe have dinner with Shawn Rosenberg and me, and meet with my class.
Mark

Date: Wed, 19 Oct 2005 22:57:29 -0700
To: "Mark Fisher" <mybya@cox.net>
From: peter loewenberg <peterl@ucla.edu>
Subject: more ideas for your seminar

Mark—

Depending on day and time I'll try to make it. Michael Marmor is the son of our late Judd Mar-

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 12 No. 3 **December 2005**

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
www.cliospsyche.org

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
$48 two year subscription to non-members
$40 yearly to institutions
(Add $10 per year outside U.S.A. & Canada)
Single Issue Price: $15

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

Copyright © 2005 The Psychohistory Forum

mor. See further by Michael Marmor, "The Eyes of Woodrow Wilson," and George, Marmor, and George, "Issues in Wilson Scholarship: References to 'Early Strokes'...." Some other rich psychodynamic case study ideas for social scientists:
3. "Charisma" which is a spongy Weberian concept in social science systematized by the psychodynamics of transference in Freud's "Group Psychology.... (1921)
4. The self-defeating *denouement* of the careers of Nixon and Clinton illuminated by Freud's "Those Wrecked by Success." (1916)
5. Hitler leads Wilson in the number of psychological studies. There is a great deal of psychodynamic scholarship on Nazism and Hitler, including my pieces on Heinrich Himmler, the Nazi Youth Cohort, and "Psychohistorical Perspectives on Modern German History."
Peter

At 06:22 AM 10/20/2005, Mark wrote:

Peter,
I am unfamiliar with the journal abbreviations, ie, *JAH*, *AHR*, *JMH*. The items in #5 would be particularly interesting if you visit UCI. Thanks again...
Mark

Date: Fri, 21 Oct 2005 18:01:14 -0700
To: "Mark Fisher" <mybya@cox.net>
From: peter loewenberg <peterl@ucla.edu>
Subject: ideas #6 and 7

Mark—
AHR: *American Historical Review*, flagship journal of the profession which comes with membership in the American Historical Association. Every historian receives it by being a member.
JMH: *Journal of Modern History*, a leading journal of modern European history.

JAH: *Journal of American History*, the journal of the Organization of American Historians, the prime journal for U.S. historians. I today mailed you a reprint of my "The Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort." It is my choice for discussions on method because it combines psychodynamics with broad demographic political traumas like war, national shame, disease, and hunger.

6: One of the hot button topics that always primes good discussion is race in America. I recommend Joel Williamson's 1997 piece of introspective personal counter-transferential work in *JAH*. Williamson, a distinguished white historian at University of North Carolina, reveals his self-reflections on why he was able to see and research slavery and segregation, but had a blind spot, could not see, the phenomenon of lynching as the central issue that he now recognizes. This leading American historian did not hesitate to refer to the psychodynamics of gender and sexuality in striving for an explanation: "Lynching was done by all classes of whites; it was done as a public ritual; and it was a tool to control not only blacks but whites as well, and especially white women and, most especially, white women in relation to sexual matters" (p. 1247). He is honest and modest in discussing his blind spots in relating race to rape and sexuality: "This nexus of sex and gender is the thing in southern culture that I feel I understand least.... Is it outrageous to say that the real war, the essence of the conflict, concerned gender, not race, and that lynching and even disenfranchisement, segregation, and proscription had more to do with relations between white men and white women than with relations between blacks and whites (p. 1253, *passim*)? Mark, if you do nothing else, assign the self-reflective four page "Introduction" (pp. 1217-1220) by *JAH* Editor, David Thelen, in which he writes:

> We live in an age when historians are as interested in the doing of history as in the products of that doing. We want to find out why authors say what they say and why they shun what they shun.... In the best autobiographical accounts personal experience becomes a threshold, not a destination, as authors transcend themselves and speak to us.... Joel Williamson wrote about how he came to see some things while failing to see others, and his essay invited referees to respond in equally intimate and candid ways, comparing what they see as they go about their work with what Williamson saw and revealing why history matters to them (p.1217).... Williamson challenges us to think about what we see and do not see, to reflect on what in our experience we avoid, erase, or deny, as well as what we focus on.... He insists that the subjects of history live inside us and that we as a culture can talk ourselves into not

> recognizing and confronting dark emotional sides of our past, preferring to leave them silent in the shadows.... What looks like specialization may be avoidance and erasure.... The challenge for history is to face squarely the things that are so horrible that we try not to see or remember them, not to rest until we have reached the heart of darkness, especially when that heart beats within us.... Beside psychological and cultural issues of avoidance and denial lie fragmenting and isolating rhythms in the contemporary craft of historical scholarship that make it hard for us to find and converse with what we each do (pp. 1219-20, *passim*).

Thelen eloquently makes the case for the intersubjective countertransference that is always present between the researcher and his subject. What is unique about this article, which your students will never see elsewhere, is that *JAH* published the original and unaltered referee's reports from all six referees of this paper, four White scholars who praised it, and two Black scholars who favored rejection, and a seventh feminist scholar who was brought in later. Notwithstanding the honored policy of anonymous and confidential review, waiver of secrecy was granted by all seven reviewers. This offers your graduate students an unprecedented opportunity to view the workings of review and publication bared like an MRI exposes internal physiology and pathology.

7: Assisted dying is a hot political issue in America currently before the Supreme Court. It is a theme that speaks to everyone and makes for passion in discussion because we all, on many conscious and unconscious levels must deal with death—our own and our loved ones. I just published an essay on "Assisted Dying in Contemporary America" (Oct. '05). We had a session at the American Psychoanalytic Association meetings in San Diego where Esther Dreifuss-Kattan, who opposes aid in dying, and Bill Winslade, a lawyer/philosopher medical ethicist now in Texas whom we trained in psychoanalysis; Melissa Nelken, a law professor/psychoanalyst; and I, joined issues on this loaded topic before a very engaged audience. Esther and I are very good friends. Needless to say, colleagues can disagree on issues and still like each other a lot. It is not necessary to be "right."

Peter

Conclusion

We have in the Fisher-Loewenberg correspondence a genuine interdisciplinary enterprise, an undertaking much lauded in academic culture and institutions, but most often honored in the breach. Our colleges and universities are organized in departments and the relevant teaching and efforts to cross disciplinary boundaries will take a back seat as long as teaching assignments and promotions are determined in the power forums of academic departments. Psychoanalysis is the *nexus* that makes it possible for a medical neurologist and a social scientist historian to relate over the project of organizing a course. "The psychoanalytic mode of thought," said Freud, "acts like a new instrument of research" (p.185). Today we have researchers and of a new kind, modern interdisciplinary scholars and teachers who combine dual training in both humanistic self-reflection and biological and psychological science, to utilize multiple processes of inquiry integrating both the natural and the cultural sciences to benefit new insights for themselves, their individual fields, and for their students.

Bibliography:

Brenner, Charles, *An Elementary Textbook of Psychoanalysis* (New York: International Universities Press, 1955).

Cocks, Geoffrey, and Crosby, Travis, *Psychohistory: Readings in the Method of Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

Fenichel, Otto, *Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis* (New York: Norton, 1945).

Freud, S., "The Claims of Psycho-Analysis to Scientific Interest" (1913), *Standard Edition*, XIII, 165-90.

Freud, S., "Those Wrecked by Success" in "Some Character-Types Met with in Psychoanalytic Work" (1916), *Standard Edition*, XIV, 309-333.

Freud, S., "Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego," (1921), *Standard Edition*, XVIII, 67-143.

George, Alexander L. and George, Juliette L., *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study* (New York: J. Day Co., 1956).

George, Marmor, and George, "Issues in Wilson Scholarship: References to Early 'Strokes'...," *Journal of American History,* 70 (March 1984), 845-53.

Lasswell, Harold, *Psychopathology and Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

Loewenberg, Peter, "The Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort," in *Decoding the Past* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1996), pp. 240-283).

Loewenberg, Peter, "Psychohistorical Perspectives on Modern German History," *JMH*, 47 (1975), 229-79.

Loewenberg, Peter, "Unsuccessful Adolescence of Heinrich Himmler," in *Decoding the Past,* pp. 209-239.

Loewenberg, Peter, "Assisted Dying in Contemporary America," in Andreas Bähr and Hans Medick, eds., *Sterben von eigener Hand: Selbsttötung als kulturelle Praxis* (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2005), pp. 219-38.

Marmor, Michael, "Wilson, Strokes, and Zebras," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 307 (Aug 26, 1982), 528-35.

Marmor, Michael, "The Eyes of Woodrow Wilson," *Ophthalmology*, 92 (March 1985), 454-65.

Reich, Wilhelm, *Character Analysis*, trans. Theodore P. Wolfe, 3rd, enl. ed. (New York: Noonday Press, Farrar Straus, 1949).

Szaluta, Jacques, *Psychohistory* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999).

David Thelen, "What We See and Can't See in the Past: An Introduction," *JAH*, 83:4 (March 1997), pp. 1217-1220.

Tucker, Robert C., *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929: A Study in History and Personality* (New York: Norton, 1973).

Weber, Max, *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons; introd. by Anthony Giddens (New York: Scribner's, 1958).

Williamson, Joel, "Wounds Not Scars: Lynching, the National Conscience, and the American Historian", in *JAH*, 83:4 (March 1997), 1221-1272.

Mark Fisher, MD*, is Professor of Neurology, Anatomy & Neurobiology and Political Science, and Chair of the Department of Neurology, at the University of California, Irvine. He is a third year Clinical Associate at the New Center of Psychoanalysis, Los Angeles. Dr. Fisher can be contacted at <mybya@cox.net>.* ***Peter Loewenberg, PhD****, is Professor of History, and Political Psychology at UCLA. He is co-dean and chairman of the Education Committee and director of the Training School of the New Center for Psychoanalysis in Los Angeles. Prof. Loewenberg can be reached at <peterL@ucla.edu>.*❑

Teaching Is Reaching

Marshall S. Harth
Ramapo College

An opportunity to reflect on my pedagogy is truly an invigorating experience. Where have I been? Where am I now? Where am I going? This series of questions can be quite provocative. As I reviewed my experiences and the record of my activities and achievements, I had to step back and say, "Well Marshall, it looks like you really enjoy what you do!" I think that captures the essence of what energizes my success: namely, my enthusiasm. I have now completed thirty-three years of teaching at Ramapo College and it has been an amazing and satisfying experience. I detect no inkling of a depreciation of the level of my enthusiasm for my profession. The connection between me the person and me the pedagogue is fused.

In fact, I consider myself to be a "connected teacher." As Mary Belenky suggests in *Women's Ways of Knowing*, we attempt, "...to enter into each student's perspective" (Belenky, *et al*, 1986). Above all, teaching is reaching. Reaching within myself. Reaching outside myself. Teaching is about making connections across many boundaries. Within these connections, resonance occurs between the subject matter, the student, and me. Such resonance is fundamental for pedagogy to succeed. Without it there is disarticulated isolation.

In my classroom there is always a desire to encourage an arrival at consensus, at a sense of shared experience. It is essential to what I do for it

allows for the development of "trust." With trust the discussion can begin in earnest. The process of engagement in the dance of learning responds to the rhythm of a diversity of opinions melodiously, and sometimes cacophonously, reverberating in the room. The encouragement of voicing difference enables the real to be present and in the moment. This is how learning takes place in my domain.

My mission is an epistemic one. I see myself as affording students the opportunity to ask, "how do we know?" In fact, I think I probably encourage students to challenge their assumptions of how they know to the limits of their capabilities and even beyond those limits. To me, this is an incredibly exhilarating experience, and it has been since the very first time I began teaching at the college level in 1966. I am still thrilled by the chance to explore the limits of knowledge with students and I view this as part of a liberatory educational experience.

I can also identify a second mission, one which I will call reciprocal outreach. I have been able to finesse a bi-directional interface between what I do in the classroom and what I do in the outside world, melding theory with practice in two venues. I have brought my thirty years of professional experience as a psychotherapist into the classroom. This occurs in the fieldwork component in the Substance Abuse course. I share directly with students the benefits of my clinical experience. Secondly, I have been able to take my theoretical/scholarly knowledge of human sexuality and bring it to the community at large by virtue of becoming associated with the Human Sexuality Program at UMDNJ, Robert Wood Johnson School of Medicine. Here I infuse my knowledge into the practical training of medical students. The reciprocity I refer to involves the counter balance between practice and theory in both venues. It is very exciting, meaningful, relevant, and satisfying.

I have recently discovered a third mission which has begun to unfold itself and make its presence known to me. It involves the use of a new pedagogical device that deals with the concept of "*voice*." In my course in Feminist Epistemology I invite the students to explore the voices not heard in traditional psychological theory. The best examples of this are the voices of the marginalized in society, especially the voices of women and people of color. We specifically explore such works as Carol Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* which offers an overview of the issue of inclusion/exclusion of "voice" in the dominant paradigm of psychological theory (Gilligan, 1982). As part of this exploration I introduce into the classroom experience the use of music, especially contemporary popular music, as examples of the mixed messages of "voice" that are presented in our culture. This has been well received by the students. However, I have recently discovered an additional "voice" in this regard. It is my own voice, in the form of my own music as presented in poetry. For the past five years I have employed the use of poetry that I have created to stimulate and facilitate the discussions in the course.

As implied above, I love teaching. I have said this many times to many people over the years. The remarkable thing is my conviction gets stronger as the years accumulate. I often tell my students that I wish they would have careers that would give them such a feeling of contentment. My exuberance for interacting with students still amazes me. My dream of an ideal experience with my students would be called "Pedagogic Ecstasy":

A critically thinking learning community
Affords us the ecstasy of opportunity
Beyond convention
Lies all invention
The spirit liberated
Expression tolerated
Pushed beyond the portal of the cave
To learn, to think, to no longer be a slave
The pedagogy of engagement
Moves beyond fears of estrangement
Cross the boundaries, time to transgress
The practice of freedom should create a mess
Political activism
Counters student atavism
Make the class a location of possibility
For the exchange of ideas and vulnerability

Teaching is being authentic. When I am in the classroom it is the real me. In this way, I am able to present as Parker Palmer would say in *The Courage to Teach,* an authentic me with integrity and identity (Palmer, 1998). I can engage the teaching experience with authority rather than power. I avail myself of the "exquisite vulnerability" that Carol Gilligan has written so well about in

The Birth of Pleasure (Gilligan, 2002), that is of placing myself in the position to be able to share the love of inquiry with my students. Here too, I attempt to establish an atmosphere of trust that allows us all to explore together.

There is another side of trust and this is responsibility to the standards of my profession. When a student told me last summer that I had given her the lowest grade she had ever received, that she was disappointed in the grade, but that, in the end she felt I was fair and, moreover, was as fine a teacher as she had ever had, I became aware of a particular personal ethic of responsibility that I cannot imagine myself ever violating. I never pander to a student in an effort to be popular. Like a true friend my love and respect for them would not allow that. I know that it serves no one to be given false praise or unearned reward. It misleads them and dulls their academic edge if they are rewarded beyond their accomplishments. This is the other context of trust I have in honoring my responsibility to being pure and true to my personal philosophy that will benefit students forever even if, in the short run, they may not see or feel it. I know that I make classes lively and, often, fun but not to be "popular" as a cool guy, but in an effort to use that fun as a gambit to make learning as stimulating as possible. This I feel is a genuine gift of love; the unwavering conviction that my students deserve to be challenged "relentlessly" and only then will they be able to reach their highest potential.

Teaching is being transparent. In allowing the student to see the actual person I am; a mirror of themselves. I am there in the classroom with knowledge and experience, and with critical insight and evaluation. I am there with wit and humor, insecurities and questions, hopes and dreams, and with heart and soul. Teaching is being enthusiastic. Paul Elovitz and other colleagues have noted my infectious enthusiasm about my teaching. I take the class on a ride of their lives. Sometimes I even warn them to strap themselves in. Sometimes, I don't. I tell a story.

For example, I tell the story of how Otto Loewi won the Nobel prize in Physiology and Medicine in 1936 for his demonstration that communication between nerve cells is chemical and not electrical. The story relates to dreams as the basis for creative problem solving and the significance of practicality in science, such as writing down the contents of the dream in a legible handwriting. Otherwise the dreamer has to wait for the dream to return in order to be able to actually perform the experiment portrayed in the dream. Of course I act out the entire story including the depression of Loewi when he could not decipher his own handwriting the next morning and his ultimate exhilaration upon the reoccurrence of the dream and his leaping out of bed and dashing directly off to the laboratory in the middle of the night to finally begin the experiment.

These stories are usually an adventure that goes down unexplored passageways. Often times I spin webs of interlacing connections between seemingly disparate insular items of information, only to eventually bring it all back together into a Gestalt of comprehension. Then invariably I begin the process of deconstruction. How does this story make, or not make sense? What assumptions, what blind spots, what errors of logic, what exclusions have been committed? This often involves improvisation reminiscent of riffing in a jazz mode. The music is wonderful.

So we come to the shore of the distant wide sea
A body of water seems to separate you from me
But that depends on your point of view
The water touches you and me too
We can splash and we can swim
We can give in to our inner whim
To follow our heart and not social dictates
We've paid the price of discriminating hates
Our horizon is inclusive of all we see
Whatever color, orientation or gender we be
So come with me and be my friend
We will swim together till the end.

This is my philosophy of teaching, my guiding principle. I am an individual who tries to value each and every human being I meet and treat each one as a person and *never* as a category. It truly has allowed me to function as a role model for my students and as a maker of ripples in the ocean of our increasingly interdependent world.

***Marshall Harth, PhD**, is Professor of Psychology at Ramapo College of New Jersey where he has taught for over thirty-three years. He convenes the Substance Abuse Minor and formerly convened the College Seminar Program. Dr.*

Harth has a private practice of psychotherapy and can be contacted at <mharth@ramapo.edu>. ❑

Postgraduate Psychohistorical Education

(continued from page 113)

hood and its history; war and peace; the history of psychohistory; the fathers and mothers of psychohistorians; right wing violence; 9/11 and the psychohistory of terrorism; millennialism; dreams; the role of the countertransference; the uses and misuses of empathy; genocide, the Holocaust; post traumatic stress disorder; men's envy of and attempt to subjugate women; film; sports psychology; guilt evasion and narcissism in the 1970's; and group process.

My goal here is to first describe the mission of the Psychohistory Forum, which supports Clio's Psyche—its publication. It is also to enlarge and disseminate the related paradigms of applied psychoanalysis, political psychology, psychobiography, and psychological history. We seek to do this in non-technical language. Our charge is always to stimulate psychohistorical thought, publications, research, and teaching. Specific objectives include communication with Forum members, networking of like-minded colleagues regardless of their geographical distance, expanding the psychohistorical community, helping clinicians focus on history and current events, assisting academics in all disciplines—history, literature, political science, psychology, sociology, and so forth—to utilize the insights and tools of psychoanalysis, and psychology. Additional objectives of the Forum consist of fostering psychohistorical debate and discussion, transmitting the knowledge of an older generation of psychohistorians to those just entering the field, and researching and publishing the history of our field, thus memorializing the work of those who have built it. After describing its membership, I will describe the organization and methodology of the Saturday Work-In-Progress Workshops, the core of our postgraduate education.

The Psychohistory Forum is comprised of colleagues from a large number of fields. For example, at our September 17, 2005 Work-In-Progress Saturday seminar, two colleagues and I gave a presentation on the 1970's as the age of guilt-evasion, narcissistic-permissiveness, and Watergate. Among the twenty-one colleagues exchanging ideas (allowing for multiple professional identifications) were thirteen therapists (eight psychoanalysts), seven professors, six psychologists, five historians, three social workers, two sociologists, and two MDs. The interdisciplinary cross-fertilization generated many ideas, encouraging additional research projects.

The Forum primarily meets on Saturdays in New York City five or six times a year. Since not everyone is free on Saturday, and about a third of our members are at-a-distance from Manhattan, we try to sometimes meet during the week and at other locations. This year additional weekday meetings were held at international conferences, one in Toronto and the other at Fordham Law School in New York City. Our presenters usually have terminal degrees or certifications (practicing psychoanalysts are usually certified) in their fields. One exception is a talented anthropologist who presented two years ago on the French Revolution and will share his materials on Islamic fundamentalism next year. Though he has only a bachelor 's degree—from Harvard—he has taught at Brandeis, New School University, UC-Berkeley, and elsewhere because of his brilliant scholarship. Some members join together on issues such as teaching or psychobiography and work in separate research groups. Because the main focus of our group is the development and exchange of ideas, impressive degrees are secondary to the work we do.

Our typical session focuses on only one presenter. Its outstanding aspect is that the colleague determines the subject matter. The director (convener is a better term) and the other participants of the Psychohistory Forum are there to help the presenter deepen his/her understanding of the subject. This is more akin to midwifery than to a senior faculty member helping a more junior colleague jump over the hurdles to complete a doctoral dissertation. The metaphor of midwifery is appropriate because as "midwife" and associates, we do not come up with the scholarly conception (the idea) for the research project presented, we do not do the research, we do not write the paper, and we do not do the difficult work of editing and revising. It is not our responsibility to do any of

these things, though there are instances when we may help with them. Rather it is the conception of the presenter, which we are helping to birth into a healthy baby, in the hope it can grow to full adult form very quickly. In the process of doing this, we deepen our knowledge of the subject and usually have a most interesting intellectual experience.

Throughout this process the presenter is always in control. Because of this sense of control, s/he is willing to probe the subject more deeply. (Of course, the main issue is the presenter's personal motivation for examining the subject that makes it important enough to devote considerable time and energy to it.) That this in-depth examination can only occur in a safe environment goes without saying. This "safety factor" is absolutely essential: without it the pangs of birth are so intense that an intellectual miscarriage may occur. An idea or book project needs support; it will whither and die in the face of criticism. The tenets of psychohistorical work include probing the materials in depth, following the emotion, and probing the author's transference to the subject matter and the group's countertransference feelings (the feelings induced in us by the materials and/or the presentation), therefore the presenter can feel and be quite vulnerable during the process, thus making safety all the more important.

Presenting at a Work-In-Progress Seminar can be valuable. The fact that the idea seems worthy of presentation gives validity to it and moves the researcher to work and write on it, or develop and polish it if it has been languishing. There is confirmation in developing and presenting it. To a psychohistorical group, the presenter will normally start thinking and developing the idea along more psychological, or historical, principles. We encourage work on a specific rather than a general subject. A supportive group can validate many of the presenter's formulations. It can also offer possible solutions to problems encountered by the researcher. Ideas and relationships the researcher had not previously thought of come to the fore. Group members may identify emotions induced by the materials or stemming from the presenter's feelings to the subject. Interdisciplinary researchers and clinicians view the same subject content from many different and valuable angles. Even their off-the-mark suggestions can have value. In explaining why suggestions put forth in a nurturing way do not work, why these approaches are wrong, the presenter is normally able to formulate a better understanding of his or her own brain child. (Innovative ideas do not spring full-grown as from the head of Zeus but are rather developed in stages.) Any signs of criticism of the presenter, as opposed to analysis of the materials, are nipped early on. In this process of nurturing a project, it is rewarding to watch it grow from a thought to an article and often ultimately to a book. This process of development is crucial to many presenters. Of course, there are also presenters who want only a supportive group to speak before and are fairly limited in their goals.

The reader may wonder if I am bored after almost three decades of doing this work. The answer is that this is a very seldom occurrence because I'm focused on aiding the struggle for greater insight rather than only on content. If members of the group are bored by the presentations selected by the program committee and me, they express their concerns to me or simply do not return. Since the membership of our group is fairly stable, this does not appear to happen very often.

It might be helpful if I next identify some of the principles that govern the organization and running of the Forum.

- Our goal is to never state "the truth," rather it is to assist in probing how to strive to find "truths" useful for the presenter.
- The presenter determines the subject matter.
- Presenters approach their subject matter in different, quite individualistic, ways and these variations are to always be respected.
- Case studies are preferred to more generalized studies.
- The presenter decides how much to bring to and take from the in-depth discussion.
- The presenter is in control at all times and may stop the process at any time if so desired.
- Insight into the structure of the presentation is encouraged and criticism is discouraged.
- The group notes or analyzes the emotion in the room.

- If there are signs of the group becoming disputatious or critical, a member, or the convener, makes an interpretation, reminding the group of its standards.
- People work in quite different ways, and such variations are to always be respected.
- Rigidity must be avoided.
- Ideas are to be nurtured, not stifled.

Non-psychological explanations are never the main focus of our discussions. A major goal is to enlarge the psychological paradigm.

The relationship of Clio's Psyche to the Psychohistory Forum's Work-In-Progress seminars is complex. Our publication was created in 1994 in part to leave a record of our proceedings. Nevertheless, most publications growing out of Forum seminars appear in books or in lengthy articles much longer than those fitting into our format. Indeed, even this editor regularly publishes his longer articles elsewhere. Still the special features, special issues, and symposia of our scholarly quarterly have served to focus attention on enlarging the psychological paradigm on issues such as apocalypticism, conspiracy theories, crime, cross disciplinary training, cyberspace, dreamwork, Elian Gonzalez group process, home, humor, immigration, impeachment, imperialism, law, publishing, psychogeography, religion, and serfdom. Scholar/therapists have explored these subjects from extremely different viewpoints. The differences of opinion and even debates within our pages have helped enormously in building a sense of community.

Technology is offering us new opportunities to achieve our goals. Increasingly, our members meet electronically. Our partially completed new website (cliospsyche.org) enables us to provide information to each other more efficiently and to introduce our work and aims to a much larger group of academics, clinicians, scholars, and students who otherwise might not know about it. A major goal of the website is to provide information on teaching psychological history as components of courses and in separate political psychology and psychohistory courses. Though the long-term consequences of this technological transformation remain to be seen, there is no question that it empowers more colleagues to participate and hone our craft.

As advocates of postgraduate interdisciplinary education, we at the Psychohistory Forum are interested in assisting in the building of the psychohistorical paradigm. Psychoanalysis, in its many varieties, is a vital tool, but it is only one among many. The psychohistorical work is what brings us and holds us together.

***Paul H. Elovitz, PhD**, began organizing psychohistorical groups when, with Alice Eichholz, in 1976 he proposed and co-chaired the Saturday Workshops of the Institute for Psychohistory. In 1982 he founded the Psychohistory Forum, with Henry Lawton as co-director for several years. Prof. Elovitz, who is the author of about 170 publications, may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>.* ❑

Teaching Psychohistory in London

Ruth Dale Meyer
Pacifica Graduate Institute

In April 1998 I embarked on my first experience of teaching psychohistory with my class of freshmen high school history students in London, England. Together we embarked on a two-month period of intensive investigation into the Holocaust. This article will examine my motivation, teaching methodology, and the outcome of one of the most exciting periods of my twenty-year career teaching high school history. Anyone wishing to obtain more detailed outline of these experiences should contact the Department of Educational Studies at the University of London in England, where you will find my published masters' dissertation on history in education entitled, *Is There a Place for Psychohistory in the Classroom?*

Looking back at my decision to bring psychohistory into the classroom, it was my own awakening to the power of the unconscious through recording my dreams and visiting a Jungian analyst every week made me want to examine the unconscious motivational forces in history. I also think that when we teach we set up a type of psychic field between ourselves and our students and sometimes our students seem to be able to tap into that field. Privately, I had been reading a combination of psychohistory books and

accounts of the Holocaust. I was trying to understand what made ordinary German soldiers kill innocent Jewish families. In class, I was teaching the Holocaust from the textbook when students began asking the questions I was trying so hard to figure out myself.

The average high school history textbook offers no clue as to why Adolf Hitler hated the Jews, or why so many Germans followed him with such zeal in his genocidal plans. Most textbooks aimed at the high school history student in both Great Britain and the United States leave us totally clueless regarding these crucial questions. The typical approach is to say that Hitler wanted to create a master race of tall, blonde haired blue-eyed Aryans and that he blamed the Jews for all of Germany's problems. But I am sure that I am not the only high school history teacher who has had students asking …"But why?"… "How could he?"… "It doesn't make sense, when he was so dark haired and short himself."

When we got beyond Hitler's rise to power and onto the Holocaust and the *einzatzgruppen*, the questions began again. "I would have just refused to do it!" said one of my students. "Yes, why didn't they all just refuse to carry out Hitler's orders?" they asked, once more echoing questions that I had been privately asking myself.

In the summer of 1997 I attended a workshop in England for educators teaching the Holocaust. It was run by the nonprofit organization, Facing History and Ourselves, based in Brookline, Massachusetts. What I liked about the approach of this organization was firstly that it did not attempt to side step any of the difficult questions my students were asking and secondly that it invited introspection, self-examination and reflection. Students are invited to look into the historical mirror in search of reflections of themselves.

After taking this course and reading more about psychohistory, I designed a coursework assignment for my students on the Holocaust which contributed about ten percent of their total points towards their General Certificate in Secondary Education examination in Modern European History. This examination, taken at age sixteen, is roughly equivalent to a slightly simplified version of Advanced Placement in European history, here in the United States. Students are expected to demonstrate skill in analyzing, evaluating, and interpreting primary source material, and teachers can, if they wish, design their own coursework assignments for students based on the examination standards outlined by the examination boards. The feedback that I received from the examination board was good, and they accepted my teacher-designed assignment. So even though the British education system is very government regulated, there is a place where teachers can bring psychohistorical approaches into their teaching.

The single most influential piece that I read in terms of helping me design my teaching unit on the Holocaust was written by Professor Paul Elovitz. Within the context of the Holocaust, Elovitz says that the psychological concepts he finds most useful are the mechanisms of defense. Elovitz suggests that concepts such as denial, projection, rationalization and repression are fairly easy concepts for our students to understand and examples can be used from every day life to illustrate them ("The Holocaust in the Classroom," *Historical and Psychological Inquiry* [NY: International Psychohistorical Association, 1990]). This gave me a confidence to proceed in designing a course work assignment based on Nazi perpetrator testimony which would reveal the defense mechanisms at work.

I set about selecting documents from the Nazi period revealing different defense mechanisms in action. The *Facing History and Ourselves Resource Book* contains a wealth of sources for the Holocaust educator. The journalist Gitta Sereney's *Into the Darkness* (London: Pimlico, 1974), based on her interview of a former commandant of Treblinka, was incredibly useful in providing examples of all of the defense mechanisms at work. Another valuable source, still available from Amazon.com, is Ernst Klee, Willi Dressen, & Volker Riess *The Good Old Days: Those Were the Days of the Holocaust As Seen by the Perpetrators and Bystanders* (London: Hamish, Hamilton, 1988).

My teaching strategy was as follows. First I encouraged my students to look at their textbooks and see what explanations they offered as to why the Holocaust happened. They identified causes such as anti-Semitism and Hitler's scapegoating of

the Jews for Germany's problems. I then asked them to consider how far these surface reasons really answered their questions concerning Hitler's motivation and carrying out Hitler's orders. We were able to observe that there was a gap in our knowledge. Finally I drew a diagram on the board in the shape of an island floating on the ocean. On the surface of the island were all of our "surface explanations" for the Holocaust. Underneath the island were the things that we were not yet aware of: the unconscious motivations. I explained that like them psychohistory is always asking the question why: underneath the surface explanations we offer ourselves to explain difficult history, there lay other factors such as defense mechanisms.

I found in the course of my teaching that my intuition in following Elovitz' (1990) advice concerning defense mechanisms was right. They were easy to explain. To explain denial for example, I surprised myself by talking to my students about the death of my father. I told them how I'd rushed back to England from Spain, upon hearing of his death and how I was overcome with grief when he wasn't there to meet me at the station. How my relatives all tried to quiet me down when I wanted to scream and rage because I was so angry at his death, and how they succeeded because I only cried for about half an hour and then threw myself into funeral preparations. "Burying yourself in details like the order of the funeral service, and the food for the wake," I told them, "Is denial at work. Do you do that when you would rather forget something unpleasant?" I asked them. "Throw yourselves into something else? Or perhaps you project your anger onto someone else and pick a fight?" Was Hitler in denial of his possible Jewish ancestors? Was he projecting his self-hatred onto the Jews?

Perhaps in the course of discussing the defense mechanisms at work I revealed more of myself to my students than I'd intended, but surprisingly I discovered that a lot of them had encountered similar reactions around denial and death. Opening myself up a little with them brought us closer as a group that year.

Finally students worked through documents of perpetrator testimony in small discussion groups, asking each other which explanations seemed to fit best. After they had written their answers up, I asked them to give me some feedback on what they felt they had learned from studying history in this way.

One student wrote about how studying psychohistory helped her to understand the human motivations of the Nazi perpetrators. She wrote, "Before I studied the Holocaust this way, I just thought the Nazi perpetrators were pure evil; like a sort of race apart; not human. But now I realize that these were just normal people, confronted with extreme circumstances. This," she continues, "leads me to believe the study of the Holocaust in depth is very important so we can root out its causes and prevent anything like it from happening again. This study also changed my whole perception of history. I now realize that history is about people, not facts and figures."

A second student wrote in a similar vein about how the exercise helped her to view the Nazi perpetrators as ordinary humans, not as a race apart. She stated that "I've learned an awful lot from studying the Holocaust and the reasons how and why behind it. Not only have I learned how this massive 'crime' could happen, I have also learned how an ordinary man could commit such terrible 'crimes,' how he could have been my father who went to mass rallies and my mother who loved Hitler, and that I could have been involved with the mass genocide of Jews." She goes on to say "that it has taught me as a person that to feel superior is very dangerous and to constantly question 'Why do I believe this,' 'What do I gain?' and 'How does it hurt others?' [and that] on a more academic level, I feel I've learned a bit about defense mechanisms such a projection, repression and rationalization and even though I've only touched on these subjects, it's made me very interested in this subject, and I would like to study it further."

A third student commented on her increased understanding not just of history, but also of herself when she wrote, "I feel that this topic has not only widened my understanding of the Holocaust and human nature, but it has widened my understanding of myself and what I would do when in a similar situation. This has been a very valuable learning curve. I feel that this is something I would like to continue, studying this way of history into university."

The conclusion to my MA dissertation should not come as a surprise. After asking the question, "*Is There a Place for Psychohistory in the Classroom?*" I concluded with a resounding "Yes!" Even though the British education system is very tightly controlled by the government, I demonstrated that it is perfectly possible to have a teaching assignment inspired by psychohistory approved by the government appointed examination boards. Furthermore, the whole experience of delving deeper into history through combining class discussion with carefully selected primary source materials and some basic teaching about defense mechanisms provided the students and their teacher alike with a much deeper experience of historical enquiry than is usually the case.

__Ruth Dale Meyer, PhD__, earned her doctoral degree in 2005 from Pacifica Graduate Institute. She teaches world history in a college preparatory school in San Jose, California and she can be contacted at <rutdal@yahoo.com>. ❑

Down Then Up

Kari Vander Weit
Ramapo College

Hiking up the rubble path
moonlight bathing my face.
Learning is like a midnight walk;
the pressure of trying to be
an individual
in an intellectual world
making my breath shaky.
The fears of failure in the
smoky shadows
are engulfing me in their
dark illusions.
These dark shadows are
temptations
trying to make me leave this
rubble path;
this late night excursion.
But at the end of it all
a warm blanket of past achievements
diminishes the chill.

__Kari Vander Weit__ is a nineteen year-old sophomore at Ramapo College of New Jersey majoring in communications with a concentration in writing. Her aspirations are to become a professional magazine writer and to publish a book of poetry. Her other interests include photography, piano playing, card making, and music appreciation. She can be contacted at<kvanderw@ramapo.edu>. ❑

Using Disappointments in Teaching the Holocaust

Robert A. Pois
University of Colorado
With Paul H. Elovitz

As a teacher of modern European history, I have learned from my students and found discussion ideas to help them understand major events, movements, and individuals such as Hitler. Below I discuss the use of feelings of disappointment in ourselves and disappointments experienced by our historical subjects as examples of this process.

It is one of the enduring maxims of the teaching profession that an instructor can learn from his students. Since anyone who teaches has to respond to the needs of students, it's expressed in how one goes about selecting books, writing, and rewriting lectures, how one presents crucial issues to students—who sometimes compel an instructor to consider new issues—and, in seminar situations, how one frames issues for purposes of discussion. There is something almost commonsensical about this. So, it is plain that just about every teaching situation is replete with possibilities for a teacher being taught by students, and this is particularly the case if such a person is sensitive to crucial aspects of what is going on in classroom situations. My thirty-eight years of college teaching experience has shown me that I can sometimes learn a lot from my students.

Whether or not one chooses to admit it, studying Nazi Germany, and particularly the Holocaust, no matter how much analytical acuity is involved in the process, has to result in an instructor drawing upon those "affective" aspects of his/her personality. Thus, to a degree, the instructor and students get to know one another in class and office situations.

Obviously, those personal concerns coming under scrutiny are those which in the study of Nazi Germany, are inextricably intertwined with analyti-

cal ones. In co-teaching a course on Nazi Germany and the Holocaust in 1992, I discovered that students related to issues of Nazism and the Holocaust in ways more substantively and more deeply than they could to those issues of the Great War (WWI) I found so absorbing. Hitler, his movement, and the genocide against Europe's Jews captured their imagination and emotions to a far greater degree than anything else in European history.

At a crucial junction in my teaching, the issue of "disappointment" loomed. It was there when I taught about the losses and frustrations influencing Hitler's life: failure at school and as an artist, the death of his beloved mother, and the loss of WWI and the *lebensraum* Germany had gained during the war. (I was also aware of my own disappointment in the students being more interested in Hitler than WWI.) To start the discussion, I told the class that everyone has experienced disappointments, though of varying severity. About a third of the class was participating in discussion at the time—they offered a variety of disappointments and responses to them.

Certainly, these disappointed people had shown some interesting reactions. For one, disappointment had been transmogrified into a kind of hatred of the "other" who was deemed responsible for the hurt. For another student, disappointment, originally turned inward in the form of a kind of self-loathing, was then projected outward, at least for a while, in the form of misanthropy, with a particular hatred of those by whom she originally had wished to be accepted. Finally, the hurt endured by a young man abandoned in a love which, to a great extent, was fantasy, became transformed into a loathing, perhaps fear, of real women—period—and a withdrawal into a kind of spiritual fortress.

When we talked about these issues in relationship to Hitler, the feelings of empathy, even sympathy, were uncomfortable. (Later, we would need to discuss why empathy, sympathy, and understanding do not provide justification for Hitler's crimes.) Suddenly, at least at an early stage in Hitler's life, he was simply a tormented human being, animated by self-doubts, which he outwardly assiduously strove to deny. Some students, particularly the Jewish ones, who had been brought up to believe that the man was a monster, were appalled at their own responses. Someone declared that this young Hitler could have been anybody. He was "a kind of 'every-man,'" another student remarked. Finally, and most interestingly, someone broke in with the strongly expressed view that, if one bore in mind all of his disappointments and frustrations, young Hitler could not be blamed for deciding to "hate the whole world." In due course, several students brought up the question of why young Hitler felt *entitled* to what had been denied him. With this, the class gradually began to explore more theoretical issues attached to his upbringing, and how such concepts could have more general application.

Nobody in the class could say that they had experienced anything like the Germans and Austrians did in the face of very rapid industrialization, political revolution, and then the Great Depression. What a few students did talk about, though, was what it was like to experience a loss or change which left them bewildered and, over time, embittered. One student, who had sustained a severe personal loss brought about by a changed family situation, described how she had found it necessary to become "more spiritual." As a result of this, she had created a kind of mystical world for herself. At times, she believed in it, at times she did not; but it was necessary that such a world be there for her nonetheless. Another student declared that a sense of loss revolving around a denial of choice about her future, plus the knowledge of what had been done in the name of religion throughout history (I suspected that the first motive had been of greater importance), had driven her to atheism, not only as a personal statement concerning the existence of a God, but as an entire attitude toward the notion of divinity. Later, in an office conversation, she said that she had succeeded in creating an "ideology of disbelief."

The lesson was obvious. Even if students could not entirely grasp the Nazi ideology, or any other ideology for that matter, the need to grab

Forthcoming in March 2006
The Beisel
Teaching Group Psychohistory
Symposium
21 authors and 41 pages

onto some form of system was crucial, either as a source of comfort, or as a kind of rationalization for bitterness engendered by a sense of loss. As time went on, the very term "ideology" became much less a source of bafflement or confusion. Rather, students came to see it as a kind of "logical," though not necessarily "rational" response to anger or frustration. Moreover, and this was very important, the existence of a melded-together confluence of ideas allowed for participation in what could be conceived as broader student and social concern. It was in this context that the class addressed the problem posed by the interaction of "individual" and "general" in history for the first time.

For the moment, the question of linkage between motivation and ideology was set aside. At the same time, it was plain that this was a troubling issue for many, including me. There was one issue upon which all in the class—at least all of those who had spoken up—agreed (by now, somewhat over half the class was participating in discussions). It was the necessity of an ideology's being able to "touch base" with people in order for it to succeed. Here, the ability to provide idealistic rationalizations for the crudest of commonly held beliefs and prejudices was important. All ideologies, but particularly this one (the emerging radical right-wing ideology which would animate Hitler), could probably be reduced to a few basics, someone remarked. Another member of the class asked the rhetorical question whether all who were living in Vienna at that time were angry individuals. Probably not, he replied, but the radical right certainly must have lent itself to expression of and identification with that rage.

***Robert Pois, PhD**, died January 18, 2004 after teaching modern European history at the University of Colorado for thirty-eight years. He won awards for teaching and published six books on modern German and European history. He also left behind hundreds of pages of draft materials on teaching from which this article was culled. Paul Elovitz, who co-authored an article with Pois in 2002, wants to thank Pois' widow, Professor Anne Marie Pois, for making these materials available to the scholarly community. An obituary of Robert A. Pois was published in the March, 2004 issue of this journal.* ❑

My Journey to Integrating Psychohistory into My Courses

Richard Booth
Black Hawk College

During my developmental period as a neophyte psychotherapist and psychology professor, I was reluctant to deviate from the fundamental, empirical principles and findings of either clinical practice or teaching. My fear stemmed from a sense that I did not possess the proficiency to extrapolate from principle to subtle application, let alone hypothetical possibility. In those days, I would not have thought it safe to generalize the findings of the courses I was teaching to content I then considered more appropriate to other psychology courses and even other disciplines. In other words, I did not feel secure applying course material from Personality Theories, Abnormal Psychology, Introduction to Psychology, and even Social Psychology far beyond direct and obvious applications to extra-classroom life experiences.

As the years went by, I continued to improve my practice skills and acquire more information about my discipline, as well as other disciplines, including history, anthropology, and political science, among others. I began to see interactive threads rather than discrete discipline entities. Naturally, every discipline has its primary focus and function, but I began to understand, on a deeper level, that social institutions could not exist without interacting with economic and political institutions; that psychology, being, in my view, the study of the entire lived experience with the primary focus on the individual person, interacted with everything else, since human behavior and experience are part and parcel of the matter and spirit that comprise all that happens. Then, some years ago, I came across an article written by Paul Elovitz (Editor, Clio's Psyche) that immediately sparked both my interest and my scientific skepticism. While I was taken with the nature of psychohistory, I could not help but wonder whether this approach to knowledge was too speculative to be given credence. I researched further and discovered Clio's Psyche itself, which went so far as to examine people's lives, including contemporar-

ies, from psychological and psychoanalytic perspectives.

Putting aside my empirical orientation and training for the moment, I read Clio within the context of my existing understanding of Freud, Fromm, Horney, Object Relations theorists, and Erikson. I learned, by further reading in the areas of metaphor and by studying the differences between scientific verification and different types and levels of validation, that much of what was being written in Clio and a few other places could be understood as theoretically valid if (1) sufficient, consistent, and believable support constituted the foundation of the authors' work, and (2) the evidence/ truth could be seen without the use of scientific quantification. I was reminded of having read Erikson's *Luther* and Freud's biography of Leonardo da Vinci, finding their "evidence" well-founded, well-integrated and compelling with, in the first instance, many biographical understandings of Luther and, in the second, the powerful use of Leonardo's actual works in the construction of da Vinci's psychoanalysis. Moreover, with the help of Spence, Bettelheim, Ernest Becker, and others, I began to comprehend that "evidence" can be understood as *that which appears evident to the parties involved after all other possible explanations have been carefully discarded.* This notion appeared to me to be a variation of the "reasonable man" theory, which grounds a significant amount of ethnopsychology and ethnosociology. I had finally arrived at a conclusion: while quantification is vital in scientific verification, evidence, which also leads to validation, may be attained through thoroughly reasoned argument and sufficient logical analysis. I also made an internal discovery during my evolution: somewhere in my mind, I had known this all along.

So, here I am today, having taught college for about thirty years. Now, and for some years past, I have engaged students not only in applications of psychology to everyday living, but also in delving into the more abstract *implications* of what psychological principles can tell us about historical figures, politics and political figures. This methodology has become a natural dimension of my teaching.

An opportunity to exercise this type of extrapolation occurred when feelings were running strong about the Bush administration's not expecting the chaos Iraq demonstrated after the "liberation." At the time, I was teaching the chapter on social psychology in my Introduction to Psychology course, and the concepts of crowding and group behavior in my Social Psychology course. Fundamental psychological research has repeatedly demonstrated that, after a period of close confinement, animals begin to attack each other. Then, when released from confinement, chaos ensues. Analogously, in humans, with a sheer increase in numbers within a group or geographical area, people have been shown to commit atrocities and ignore normative expectations, such as laws. Why, then, with a history of Sadam Hussein's "thumb" on his multitudes of people living very closely together (e.g., imprisonments, murders, rapes), would the Bush administration expect order when the thumb was released, particulary given the scientific maxim that the normal outcome of behavior is chaos unless there is an overriding force that keeps order? I put this question to my students, and the single most frequent response was that Bush and his aides were ignorant of the basic principles of human behavior. That discussion led to others. For example: politicians who have an agenda and will do almost anything to achieve its outcomes; the issue of whether politicians care about people, power, both, or neither; the degree to which politicians, in general, can be believed; and, very importantly, what kind of leader the American people want and why.

When the course arrived at the section addressing the self-actualized person and the authoritarian personality, I gave students some of the primary dimensions of both and then asked them to discuss what kinds of people in public life appear to conform to the two types. Not surprisingly, students were not as sure about whom they perceived as self-actualized, but they noted a number of political figures who, to them, appeared to reflect some major features of the authoritarian personality. I then raised the issue of the "Patriot Act" and whether its controls might fit within the discussion we were having. During these discussions, it was rarely necessary for me to intercede; students tended to feel strongly about these issues and most were willing to discuss them. I tended to be the arbiter rather than the lecturer.

There are numerous other issues that can be transferred from psychology courses into the public policy, judicial, social, and political arenas. The following two examples derive from the research and theory on decision-making and the psychology of persuasion.

Multiple studies have attempted to determine if there is a particular number of people who tend to make the best "correct" decisions when confronted with a problem. For example, does an individual confronted with a problem tend to be more accurate in solving it than three or four people? Is the best solution derived from the greatest number of people one can garner to attack the problem? When research findings are examined, we see that, on average, the number of persons most likely to make accurate decisions about problematic situations is three. Knowing this, I invite my students to evaluate our jury system in light of the data. This leads them into the study of group influence, face-saving, anonymity in groups, groupthink, and all manner of problems that might emerge during a jury's deliberation process. Then, I ask them to tell me how soon the system is likely to change to a jury of three if we were all to write a letter to the appropriate officials. Needless to say, laughter ensues.

The second issue goes to the question of what kind of leader is most influential with what kinds of audiences under what sets of conditions? In other words, what kinds of people are likely to be persuaded by President Bush and what kinds are not? Is there anything the President can do change the minds of those who disbelieve him? Other questions follow naturally: What role does inducing fear play in influencing a change of mind or behavior? What kinds of people conform when an emotional appeal is used and what kinds conform when a rational, intellectual appeal is used? Under what conditions, if any, are people, in general, good judges of truth-telling? The questions go on and on.

Finally, those who teach realize that only a certain amount of time can be allotted for discussions and debates like those described above. One adjunctive tool I use is the analytic essay, in which students are asked to describe a public figure in terms of psychological principles and findings. But, I always use a *caveat*, which I believe to be true: both in psychotherapy and in psychohistory, while evidence may be powerful, we must remember that we are talking "about" a person from what we observe; we must refrain from considering our conclusions definitive or absolute.

***Richard Booth, PhD**, is Professor of Psychology at Black Hawk College, Moline, IL. He is a licensed psychotherapist and Adjunct Professor of Behavioral and Social Sciences at University of Maryland University College, Adelphi, MD. Professor Booth expresses some of his scholarship in the form of editorial work on a variety of publications. He can be contacted at <boothr@bhc.edu>.*

[*Editor's Note: We had hoped to publish Booth's paper along side of that of one of his sophomore students who was inspired by him to write an excellent undergraduate paper on President Bush and the Iraq War. Unfortunately, because the paper was about the war rather than learning about it, it was in the end not suitable for this special issue.*]❑

A Dialogue on Online Education

Kenneth A. Fuchsman
University of Connecticut

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College

***Kenneth Fuchsman, EdD**, is Executive Program Director of the Bachelor of General Studies program at the University of Connecticut, where he has taught history for fourteen years. He teaches an online interdisciplinary course entitled "Integrating General Studies." His research specialties are the Freudian Oedipus Complex, and the nature of interdisciplinary studies. Dr. Fuchsman can be reached at ken.fuchsman@uconn.edu.*

*Below he is identified as **KAF** and our editor is identified as **PHE**. This interview was conducted in November.*

PHE: What is online education?

KAF: Online education occurs when college courses are offered over the Internet. Course materials are loaded on an online system, such as WebCT. Access to the course is restricted. The students gain access to the course by registering for

it and getting an identification number and password. Online classes can be either synchronous or asynchronous. If the class is synchronous, the instructor and students are present online simultaneously. In an asynchronous class, the students and professor do not need to be online at the same time. At the University of Connecticut where I teach, online classes are asynchronous and this is what we will discuss.

PHE: How can you teach students without their being present? Without necessarily ever seeing them?

KAF: There are many areas of overlap between online and face-to-face instruction. In face-to-face coursework the lecture material is spoken rather than written out as in online lectures. Both systems have reading assignments and examinations. There is ample time for interaction between students and professors in the online experience. Actually, online classes often generate more interaction and discussions than many face-to-face classes. Discussion is mandatory for each student in each section or module in the class. Students post answers to the questions or problems the instructor poses. In the online classes, the students have to read everything their classmates write, and respond to their classmates' postings. The instructor guides the discussion through his or her postings. If a student or instructor wants to discuss matters privately with the other, they can post a concern on the "reply privately" section of the website. Because online classes are heavily into class discussion, the number of students in a class is usually restricted to about twenty-five. It is probably more personal teaching students in the online environment than in a lecture class of a hundred or more students.

PHE: What do you gain by online education?

KAF: In a traditional face-to-face class where the professor's lecturing is the center of the class, the focus can be more on the teacher than the students. In an online class, the reading of the lecture is off to the side of the class, front and center is the postings everyone writes and sees. The focus in the online class switches from the professor to the interaction of professor and students. The "class" time is more on the student's postings than the professor's lecture. The students in online classes generate intense class discussion. The gain in online education is that students must be active. Class discussion is mandatory; there are deadlines for the postings. Online students cannot be passive learners, as are many students in college lecture classes. Students may be more open in an online class than in a face-to-face discussion. One of my students last summer wrote that we might be more open with each other in the online class because we do not see or know each other.

PHE: What do you lose?

KAF: You lose sensing what the whole person is like in an online environment. You obviously do not see body language, facial expressions. In a face-to-face class, a spontaneous group interaction can develop that can be magical. That kind of instant interaction is not likely in the online setting.

PHE: What do you say to those who see this online education as fraudulent?

KAF: Quality control is important. At UConn, we have a distance education office, which establishes a template for the courses. The written class material is handed in months before the class begins. If an instructor turns in skimpy lectures, the distance education office will work with the professor to turn in more substantial material and assignments. This is done in a manner that respects the academic freedom of the faculty member. As with any other teacher, the academic department has to approve the qualifications of the instructor to teach the particular class. As a rule, online classes require more work for both professor and student.

PHE: How do you know the student signed up for the course is really doing the work?

KAF: You don't know if the student who signed up is doing the work. Similar problems appear in traditional classes, i.e. the recent case of one of the heirs to the Wal Mart fortune who paid a classmate to do all her college course work for over three years. The same question as to who is doing the work can apply to papers written at home by the student. Can the teacher really know who wrote the paper, especially if there are only a few written assignments? At least in online classes, there are weekly writing assignments. Also, in face-to-face and online classes, plagiarism is an increasing problem with all the resources available on the net.

Asynchronous online classes require frequent student writing that depends on timely reading of the assignments. Therefore, anyone relying on someone else to do the work is asking for a big commitment of time and effort.

PHE: How can a student identify with a teacher s/he has never seen?

KAF: The same way a reader identifies with an author he or she has never met. This kind of identification and/or transference with an unseen person is a common human phenomenon. In past times, look at all the close relationships that were carried on exclusively in correspondence. E-mails and online postings are the successors to letters sent by mail. A student identifies with an unseen professor the same way a biographer can identify with a long deceased subject. Humans are prone to attach to, form bonds with and project onto others.

PHE: In terms of age, life goals, and personality, what kinds of students sign up for online courses at UConn?

KAF: Traditional age students flock to online classes. They have grown up with this technology, and many spend a great deal of time online. However, working degree-seeking adults make up the bulk of the online students. For many adults with careers and families, attending face-to-face classes is not easy. I find that a lot of the postings from my working adult students are done either first thing in the morning or later in the evening. I think age and life situation are more of a factor than life goals and personality.

PHE: Tell me about the course you teach on the family, focusing on the interaction with the students.

KAF: Well, the course I teach is on the interdisciplinary study of the family. Students read books on the family from the disciplines of history, psychology, biology, anthropology, and literature. They also learn about interdisciplinarity. A good deal of the course is critically examining the findings and concepts used from the books in the various disciplines, comparing the disciplines and seeing where the material on the family can be integrated across the disciplines. At the beginning of the class, I ask the students to define what a family is. Many have an idealized notion of the family as being primarily supportive and accepting, a place of refuge, or a haven in a heartless world. After they read biological and anthropological works that show conflict in the family, I ask how has the reading impacted on their conception of the family. Some can incorporate the new discoveries and revise their previous conceptions, others recognize the conflict, but do not alter their initial definition. Most of the students are quick to pick up that questions about the family cannot be answered from the perspectives of only one academic discipline.

PHE: What is an example of a book you assign and its impact?

KAF: For the history section, we have read Jessica Weiss's *To Have and To Hold*, which is about the post-World War II American family. It is based on a longitudinal study of married couples in the Berkeley-Oakland region of California. The students critically examine this work, and find that Weiss is not warranted in making conclusions about the American family as a whole from her narrow sample of white middle-class Northern Californians. They also find that there is too much group portraiture and not enough discussion of what the marriages of individual couples are like. They learn to think like historians in judging evidence and how it is used. What occurs in all the online classes I have taught is strong engagement by most of the students with the material. The students get involved, enthused, and enhance their critical capacities.

PHE: Are there any ways, beyond convenience, in which online education has advantages over traditional, in-class college education?

KAF: Yes, there are at least three such advantages. First, the frequency, intensity, and length of the online class discussions. These become a focus of the online experience. In the traditional classroom, when the bell rings, the discussion usually ends. In an online class, there may be a week in which the discussion on a topic can continue. This makes for the possibility of further and more extensive explorations of a topic. Second, the student writes from the privacy of his or her computer. The student can reflect more before writing than in a face-to-face class, and can also revise their work for the class discussions before submitting them. There may be more extensive inner dialogue in an

online discussion than in a face-to-face interaction. Third, not all in person classes require extensive student participation. Online classes do, and this means the student has to be more active and responsible, more of an agent, than in many traditional lecture classes. In online classes, everyone has to participate because class discussions can be about thirty percent of the grade.

PHE: Are there any well-done measurements of learning face-to-face and online in the course, with the same teacher?

KAF: At the University of California–Berkeley Extension, Mary Ann Koury reports in the *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* that in comparing an online and on campus course in "An Introduction to Shakespeare" where the instructor and content of the course are the same that the online course consistently showed better learning outcomes than the face-to-face version.

PHE: What is the role of the peer group in online courses and is it more positive than negative or vice versa? I asked because of the studies showing that in America the peer group presence has tended to work against the educational goals.

KAF: Students enter an online class knowing that class participation is mandatory and that a high proportion of their grade is based on their class postings. I find though that most of the students get involved in the exchanges with their classmates. They often play off each other and generate their own issues and discussions that take on a life of their own. Most of these students are adults in their thirties and older, and are in their last year of college. This may account for some of the more active participation compared to your traditional age freshman and sophomores.

PHE: You mentioned the transference. Tell me more about how this works out in online education.

KAF: I find, by and large, that online students are very deferential to me as instructor, more so than in face-to-face-classes. Even though I sign all my postings with my first name, most of the mid-life students in the class always address me as Professor. Many get very worried if they are going to hand in an assignment late. With many online students I find that they assign me the role of a judging authority or super ego figure. These students transfer to me their own image of a parental figure.

PHE: What is the grade distribution in online classes and how does it compare with face-to-face classes?

KAF: Using the format I now employ, I taught this class once face-to-face before teaching it online. In the online class, the students are more prepared. In the face-to-face class, some students would come to class not having read the assignment. As a result of the better preparation among the online students, I found the grades higher for my online students. Most surveys show that it is believed that more discipline is required for a student to take an online than an on campus class. At Kansas State University's Pharmacy D. program, the average test scores of asynchronous distanced based students was equal to or higher than the in person students. These findings were reported in the *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* Volume 8, Number 4 in December, 2004.

PHE: In working with students online, how are your own transference and counter transference feelings different than in face-to-face classes?

KAF: My own transference and counter transference issues are much less active in online than face-to-face-classes. In the online classes I respond more to the intellectual level of the postings. When I am touched by what an online student writes I let them know but find that the impact is more fleeting on me than in the in person classes. Part of this is due to volume. This semester I average 120 postings a week from a class of twenty-eight. In the face-to-face classes there is more of a combination of the intellectual and the visceral emotional reaction. In the synchronous in-person-classes, more senses are activated.

PHE: Therefore, would you say that your online classes are more intellectualized?

KAF: More that my responses are more intellectualized. I think there is much emotion laden material posted by the students

PHE: In writing research papers, are your online students more inclined to use Internet sources than your traditional ones? Is there therefore more plagiarism?

KAF: I would think that traditional age students may be more adept at using all the resources of the Internet than many adult students, including plagia-

rism. I don't think there is much plagiarism in my class, as the papers and research are all connected to the readings and the class discussions. As they are all interdisciplinary and oriented towards integrating findings from diverse disciplines, it would be more difficult to find Internet sources in these areas. I think this makes plagiarism less likely. It should also be noted that while the Internet provides materials which can be plagiarized, it also is a valuable tool for identifying plagiarism, even without special programs designed to readily do this.

PHE: How have you integrated psychoanalysis and psychohistory into your online courses?

KAF: Psychohistory and psychoanalysis come more in the back door than the front door of the course. In the lecture notes there is citing of psychoanalytically derived research, and my focus is on conflict within and the dynamics of the family, what psychoanalytically would be called the family complex. The critiques of the Weiss book emphasizes what is missing from the work because psychohistorical analysis is absent, even though her sources in interviews with married couples cries out for psychohistory.

PHE: Will you offer a course on psychohistory? If so, what aspect of it?

KAF: Given that I teach in a general studies program, the courses I offer must fit within that framework. In the history department I taught a course in "Personality and Power in the Twentieth Century," which centered on biographies of political leaders. Psychohistory as psychobiography was the center of that class. In that class, I connected the childhood and character of the figure with the development of their personal identity, political ideology and career of the individual subjects. Hitler, Stalin and FDR were always included in that course, and at various times, we studied Nixon, Mao, Gandhi, John Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., Churchill, and Woodrow Wilson. The students got involved in the connection between the subjects personal psychology and their political career.

PHE: Do you plan to continue with this teaching, or return to traditional teaching?

KAF: I really love the online learning environment. I think it is rich and offers many learning opportunities. In the future, I will teach both in person and online.

PHE: As a psychobiographer of Freud, do you have any thoughts as to what parts of the Freudian psychic topography of the id, ego, and superego is strengthened and weakened by the Internet?

KAF: As the research shows that more discipline is required to do well in Internet classes, those students who function well in the online learning environment rely on their ego strength. For those students who project their authority images on to me as Professor, their super-ego comes into play. I'm not sure where the id side comes into play in the online setting.

PHE: It is good to know more about an educational opportunity in which millions of students are enrolled. A verification of your points as to the benefits and increased work occasioned by online education just came from the nursing student who is proofing our dialogue. She calls it "fantastic!" Thank you for an interesting interview.❑

Remembering Paul Roazen: Role Model, Mentor, Teacher, and Critic

Daniel Burston
Duquesne University

Thirty years ago, when I was but twenty, I read a book that—quite literally—changed my life. It was Paul Roazen's *Brother Animal* (1986). During the previous two years, I had struggled with a series of books by and about Freud, C.G. Jung, the Glover brothers, Erich Fromm, and Erik Erikson. The impressions I had gleaned of Freud's personality from these disparate sources did not create a clear or consistent impression. Freud doubtlessly was a major thinker of the twentieth century, but Freud the man was a mystery to me, rendered all the more elusive by the dense controversies that swirled around him.

By a fortunate coincidence, before reading *Brother Animal*, I had read Erich Fromm, *Sigmund Freud's Mission: An Analysis of His Personality and Influence* (NY: Harper & Row, 1959). Fromm had argued that there was a strong authoritarian streak in Freud, a trait that manifested itself in a

certain emotional coldness in his dealings with others. I was still mulling this argument over when *Brother Animal* came to my attention. Fromm had used fragments of Freud's dreams and a few tidbits of correspondence to make his case. Initially, I found this approach quite original. When I read Roazen's gloss on the correspondence between Lou Salome and Sigmund Freud with respect to Tausk's analysis and suicide, I was completely blown away. Even now, I remember being struck by the convergence between Fromm and Roazen's perspectives, though Roazen's reflections were more powerfully persuasive. Thirteen years later, while researching *The Legacy of Erich Fromm* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), I discovered that, like myself, Fromm had initially greeted Roazen's revelations with considerable shock, but in due course, had only praise for Paul's clarity and courage. I soon discovered Fromm warmly recommended *Brother Animal* to all his students in Mexico and the United States, most of whom read the book with considerable appreciation.

Meanwhile, having read *Brother Animal*, I quickly acquired a copy of Roazen's first book, entitled *Freud: Political and Social Thought* (1968), which was stimulating but dense. *Freud and his Followers*, which I read next, was thoroughly engrossing—an absolutely riveting read (1971). I finished it in two days, and wanted more. Together with Henri Ellenberger's book, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (NY: Basic Books, 1970), another monumental eye-opener, these glorious discoveries prompted me to devote myself to studying the politics and history of psychoanalysis, and the applications of psychoanalysis to the study of politics, history, and religion. Since Roazen taught at York University in my hometown of Toronto, I resolved to study with him, and during my undergraduate career, I majored in Political Science, which was Paul's primary discipline.

In retrospect, I suppose my exposure to Paul's ideas and personality was fairly intensive. Much of my second and third years centered around my course work with him. I was dazzled and occasionally confused by his richly stimulating, but poorly organized, lectures on Freud and his followers. These were leavened with lengthy reflections on Norman O. Brown, Phillip Rieff, John Stuart Mill, Isaiah Berlin, Dostoyevsky, Nietzsche, Thoreau, T.E. Lawrence, Rilke, Frost, Alexis de Tocqueville, William Bullitt, Harold Laswell, Walter Lippmann, and Herbert Marcuse. It was quite an education! Though I already entertained some strong suspicions on this score, Paul made it crystal clear to me that Freud's overall sensibility was profoundly undemocratic, anti-American and utterly disdainful of the experimental method. I also remember an illuminating exchange when Paul noted my stubborn misconception of Freud as some kind of blunt, Germanic truth teller. He pointed out that Freud was Viennese, after all, and furnished me and my classmates with several vignettes of sugar-coated and strategic insincerity on Freud's part that left some of us in stitches.

Thus far, it may seem as if Paul only dwelt on Freud's less admirable qualities, but that is not the case. While perfectly candid about these features of Freud's personality, Paul also had boundless admiration for Freud's courage and originality, his willingness to transgress normal disciplinary boundaries to reach profound or illuminating insights into human nature and society, and his stubborn unwillingness to compromise when fundamentals were at stake. He was also quite tolerant of Freud's contradictions and made the point that notable inconsistencies between theory and practice are not always evidence of base hypocrisy, but sometimes operate for the better, rather than the worse.

While doing my master's degree, I switched from political science to an interdisciplinary program in social and political thought, but was still Paul's teaching assistant for one year. That, too, was an education, albeit of a different sort. In person, Paul was warm and accessible. He was a good listener, and generous with his time. But in the classroom, Paul often overwhelmed undergraduates with the breadth and diversity of his historical allusions and references, expecting a depth and sophistication (and a familiarity with things American) that many graduate students did not yet possess. Watching Paul lecture in an angry or vulnerable state of mind, teetering on the brink of rage or incoherence, as he did occasionally, taught me some valuable lessons about not idealizing one's teachers and role models excessively.

Paul's occasional lapses in the classroom were compounded by his recent divorce from Deborah Heller Roazen, which had left him reeling for several years afterwards. He seldom spoke about these matters without becoming visibly distressed and offending some of his female listeners.

Hoping to follow in my teacher's footsteps, I still cherished the illusion that someone who had written such lucid and engaging portraits of others must be completely "together." I eventually discovered that there is often a significant gap between the eloquent and composed authorial persona and the actual flesh and blood human being who is frail and fallible, and sometimes deeply disappointing. Of course, this discovery was a gradual process, rather than a singular event, and Paul was neither the first nor the last role model to provoke reflections like these. But the impression was deep and, initially, a little disconcerting.

It was around this time that our friendship was established, and I started to speak with Paul at length about my own research interests. Among other things, I was interested in Fromm's analysis of left-wing, as well as right-wing, authoritarianism. In view of its Weimar origins, Fromm's reflections on left-wing authoritarianism were quite relevant to the bourgeoning notion of "political correctness" sweeping North American campuses, a notion that was both silly and sinister and which did so much to provoke the powerful—and equally mindless—right-wing backlash that has engulfed our world today. Though I leaned farther left than Paul, we both abhorred the conformist attitudes. We also had some lively conversations about the Fromm-Marcuse debate that preoccupied left-wing Freudians of that era. While Marcuse and his followers eclipsed Fromm and his followers in sheer numbers, and sometimes trounced them in spirited debates, I frequently defended Fromm's ideas and reputation against Marcuse's onslaught, both publicly, on the podium, and in print. Paul listened sympathetically as I spelled out my complaints with Marcuse, and I flatter myself that some of my remarks may have colored Paul's later reflections.

We did not agree on everything. Being very proud of his American heritage, Paul spoke somewhat disparagingly about Canadian education, politics, and culture. Being a proud Canadian, I resented this, and told him so—tactfully. He would nod quietly and smile, but nothing would change, so I did not press the issue. Our exchanges on other subjects were a little more spirited. I found his biography of Helene Deutsch (1985) a little too sympathetic, and reproached her for taking some theoretical and political positions based on expediency, rather than genuine principle—for "playing along" with the Freudian establishment, and allowing Freud to appropriate her ideas without sufficient acknowledgement. Though I never said so in so many words, I think Paul was a little infatuated with Deutsch, who granted him unusually generous access for a woman in her position, and that in exchange, he glossed over her husband, Felix Deutsch's more egregious character flaws—at least in print. (In person, he was more candid on this score.) Conversely, I thought his study of Erikson (1976) was a little too harsh, and that he exaggerated the intensity of Erikson's (ostensible) conservative agenda by a considerable margin. In retrospect, I am relieved to say that, though he did not budge an inch, Paul was able to listen to my comments about Deutsch (and his book about her) with equanimity. But his attitude toward Erikson was adamant, though it softened appreciably in the many articles and chapters he devoted to him.

The biggest disagreement I had with Paul took place in 1992, shortly before I left Toronto to take a job at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh. Paul sometimes hosted monthly dinners where the assembled guests discussed selected topics in the history of psychiatry and psychoanalysis. While featured speakers were mostly visiting luminaries, local guests could also present there, so I offered to discuss R.D. Laing. I knew that Paul disliked Laing, but I was not prepared for just how deep and *personal* his dislike was. His attitude towards me at dinner and afterwards, as I haltingly attempted to outline my work in progress in the face of his angry interruption, was simply scathing.

Paul's visceral antipathy toward R.D. Laing is still a mystery to me. Paul was always tolerably sympathetic toward the "bad boys" of psychoanalysis—Groddeck, Reich, Rado, and Szasz. I never heard him trash or dismiss any of them out of hand for their personal or professional imperfections. In fact, some of his remarks about Rado were positively glowing, and he always had a

healthy respect for Szasz—a warmly reciprocated respect. So why pick on Laing? I guess that Laing made a very poor impression on some of Paul's friends in Boston. Perhaps, without actually saying so, these were people whose opinion he valued over mine. It is also remotely possible that Paul's antipathy was influenced or reinforced by the equally scalding appraisal of Thomas Szasz, who dismisses Laing as a posturing phony.

By contrast, I have always maintained that despite his many vivid shortcomings, both as a theorist and a simple human being, there is nonetheless a lucid, intelligible core to Laing's work that is not trivial, and warrants continued study and reflection. In composing my book, I worked very hard to eschew the twin evils of idealization and denigration, to present a balanced picture of Laing as a gifted but tormented human being. While the book was in progress, I drew great solace from Rycroft, who repeatedly reassured me that I had got Laing's character "just right." It was not until well after the book was published in 1996 that Paul moderated his opinion somewhat. After the book was reviewed in *The New York Times* and his beloved *New York Review of Books*, Paul allowed that the book was reasonably good, but cautioned me against writing another book about Laing and committing "career suicide." I took this as an acknowledgment on his part that his behavior that evening several years ago had been completely over the top, but that his opinion of Laing was nevertheless unchanged.

Paul was an incredibly prolific writer, and as the years passed, I tried to follow the steady stream of publications that continued to flow from his pen. All I know is that, despite our differences over the years, I remember Paul with affection and respect. I remember his temper, but I also remember his impish, slightly goofy smile, his refreshing and unrestrained laughter, and his boundless enthusiasm for people and ideas. I also remember his sense of mission and his palpable sense of relief when I decided, finally, *not* to train as an analyst. Paul felt, as I do, that the history of psychoanalysis cannot be left entirely to the psychoanalysts themselves, who tend to divide and distort the record along sectarian lines. Being a member of a psychoanalytic institute or referral network usually imposes invisible constraints or blinkers, and unless the historical writings of analysts are scrutinized and balanced by the efforts of professionally trained historians who have nothing to lose by being perfectly candid, all kinds of mythology and misconceptions will flourish freely.

Having said that, it is also the case that the history of psychoanalysis has changed a great deal since Paul began writing in the 1960s. Problems persist on all sides, but for the most part, it has changed for the better, thanks to Paul's effort and example. Nevertheless, though he tried valiantly, Paul himself did not always get the "big picture," and sometimes missed or glossed over important issues. When it came to psychoanalysis and religion, or the epistemological dimension of analytic theory and therapy—realism versus relativism, positivism versus hermeneutics, etc.—Paul was often trite or simply lost. Though it was usually evident to others who were versed in theology, comparative religion and the history and philosophy of science, he was too proud to admit when he was out of his depth in these controversial arenas.

When all is said and done, Paul's limitations pale in comparison to his positive contributions. More than any single author in the field, Paul transformed our understanding of Freud and his disciples repeatedly in the last four decades. Like Fromm, Paul never wavered from his goal of celebrating Freud's genius without succumbing to pitfalls of excessive or misplaced Freud piety. In addition to reviving Tausk's memory and contributions, he was the first to draw attention to Freud's analysis of his daughter Anna, and to his curious and distasteful flirtation with Mussolini (via Eduardo Weismann). He was among the first to give Adler, Jung, and Rank their due, and carefully refrained from the orthodox habit of dismissing every cogent objection to Freud's theory as the derivative manifestation of unresolved Oedipal *angst*, thereby changing the climate of discussion, and raising the bar for scholarly objectivity.

Taken together, Paul Roazen's work on the history of psychoanalysis constitutes an important contribution to twentieth century thought and letters. Whether they know it or not, everyone working in this field nowadays is directly or indirectly in his debt. Thank you, Paul. You will be missed.

***Daniel Burston, PhD**, Chair Elect of the Psychology Department at Duquesne University, holds doctorates in psychology (1989) and in social and political thought (1985) from York University in Toronto. He is also an Associate of the Center for Philosophy of Science at the University of Pittsburgh, and on the Advisory Board of the C. G. Jung Analyst Training Program of Pittsburgh, the Advisory Board of Janus Head, and the Editorial Board of the Journal of the Society for Existential Analysis. His books are The Legacy of Erich Fromm (1991), The Wing of Madness: The Life and Work of R. D. Laing (1996), and The Crucible of Experience: R. D. Laing and the Crisis of Psychotherapy (2000). He was Erik Erikson Scholar at the Austin Riggs Center in 1999-2000. Professor Burston can be contacted at <burston@ duq.edu>.*❑

A Bibliography of the Books of Paul Roazen

Daniel Burston and Paul Elovitz

Freud: Political and Social Thought. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1968.

Brother Animal: The Story of Freud and Tausk. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1969.

Freud and His Followers. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1975.

Erik H. Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Helene Deutsch: A Psychoanalyst's Life. New York: Anchor Press, 1985.

Comment Freud Analysait. Paris: Navarin, 1989.

Encountering Freud: The Politics and Histories of Psychoanalysis. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990.

Meeting Freud's Family. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1993.

Heresy: Sandor Rado and the Psychoanalytic Movement, with Bluma Swerdloff. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1995.

How Freud Worked: First-Hand Accounts of Patients. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, 1995.

Canada's King: An Essay in Political Psychology. Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press, 1998.

Oedipus in Britain: Edward Glover and the Struggle Over Klein. New York: Other Press, 2000.

Political Theory and the Psychology of the Unconscious: Mill, Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, Freud, Fromm, Bettelheim, and Erikson. London: Open Gate Press, 2000.

The Historiography of Psychoanalysis. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001.

The Trauma of Freud: Controversies in Psychoanalysis. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

On the Freud Watch: Public Memoirs. London: Free Association Books, 2003.

The Cultural Foundations of Political Psychology. London: Hogarth Press, 2003.

Eduardo Weiss: The House That Freud Built. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2005.

Les secrets de la psychoanalyse et de son historie, with Andre Haynal & Ernst Falzeder. Paris, Presses Universities de France, 2005.

The Doctor and the Diplomat: The Mysterious Collaboration Between Freud and Bullitt on Woodrow Wilson. New York: Rowland & Littlefield, in press.

Escaping from the Mind of Man: The Continuing Story of Freud and Tausk, forthcoming.

An Informal History of Psychoanalysis. New York: Rowland & Littlefield, forthcoming.

Edited books have *not* been included above. It should be noted that a large number of Roazen's books have been republished, often by more prestigious presses. Many have been translated into various languages. We wish to thank Professor Daniel Heller Roazen of Princeton for providing his late father's resume.

We welcome photos of members of our Editorial Board and of deceased colleagues to be put on our website.

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl and the Vita Psychoanalytica

(continued from page 113)

pleted her BA at the New School for Social Research in New York. There she went on to complete her MA and PhD in philosophy under Hannah Arendt's supervision (1975). Dr. Young-Bruehl then taught at Wesleyan University and later at Haverford College. She did postgraduate coursework in psychoanalytic theory at the Western New England Institute for Psychoanalysis in New Haven, graduated in 1999 from the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis, and has been certified by the American Psychoanalytic Association. Her seminars on the history of psychoanalysis have been offered at the Graduate Faculty's Program in Psychoanalytic Studies, the Institute of Pennsylvania Hospital, the Chicago Center for Psychoanalysis, and the Psychoanalytic Institute of Northern California. Currently, Dr. Young-Bruehl is on the faculty at the Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research. She is or has been on the editorial boards of The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, American Imago, Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, and the new journals Studies in Gender and Sexuality and Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society.

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl is the author of two award-winning biographies, Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World (1982) and Anna Freud: A Biography (1988). In addition to these psychobiographies, she has published a monograph entitled Freedom and Karl Jaspers's Philosophy (1981), a novel, Vigil (1983), a collection of her essays, Mind and the Body Politic (1989), an anthology of Freud's writings on female psychology, Freud on Women (1990), a study of types of creativity, Creative Characters (1991), and an anthology of short fiction from around the world, Global Cultures (1994). The Anatomy of Prejudices, published by Harvard University Press, was named the "Best Book in Psychology for 1996" by the American Association of Publishers. A second collection of Dr. Young-Bruehl's essays, Subject to Biography, was published by Harvard in 1999, and a book co-authored with Faith Bethelard entitled Cherishment: A Psychology of the Heart appeared in 2000 from Free Press. In 2003 Other Press published a third essay collection, Where Do We Fall When We Fall In Love?

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl has been awarded various grants and honors too numerous to list here, including a National Endowment for the Humanities grant and a Guggenheim Prize. She is a most sought-out speaker on the subjects of psychoanalysis, psychohistory, philosophy, and feminism, as well as child psychology and psychosocial interventions in the local and global communities. In the fall of 2005, Young-Bruehl (EYB) was interviewed by Judith Harris and Paul Elovitz.

Clio's Psyche: What brought you to psychoanalysis and psychobiography?

Elisabeth Young-Bruehl: When I was finishing my biography of Hannah Arendt in 1981, I was invited to join the Gardiner Seminar in Psychiatry and the Humanities at Yale, where I met many of the clinicians who have been most influential on me, many of them associates of Anna Freud's. My colleague at Wesleyan, Paul Schwaber, also a member of the Seminar, was doing analytic training, and sent me an example. Just as I was starting an analysis with Hans Loewald and deciding to train, the executor of Anna Freud's estate invited me to write Anna Freud's biography and made her papers available to me. So my training and my learning about Anna Freud's work were interwoven, as were my first experience as an analysand and my first experience with psychobiography.

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

EYB: I have written a dozen books of many different sorts and genres, in many fields, so my feelings about them are quite different, not really comparable. I am most proud of my novel as a literary work; of *Cherishment* for its central idea about an ego instinctual drive for cherishment and as an experiment in clinical writing; of the biographies as biographies and as contributions to the history of their fields, political theory and psychoanalysis. But the book that I feel represents most clearly the range of my intellect and my interests and is the most original and synthetic contribution to social science is *The Anatomy of Prejudices*. In this

book, I elaborated on a theory of character types (first advanced in *Creative Characters*), and I think this is my most valuable contribution to applied psychoanalysis. I use my own typology of hysterical, obsessional, and narcissistic characters everyday in my clinical work, but I also think I read evidence for it every day in my newspaper.

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

EYB: Because I now make my living full time as a clinician, I cannot write as I used to, turning out a book every few years. I work in smaller pieces. Out of lots of pieces and lectures, I am slowly writing a history of psychoanalysis, but not one that involves interviews or archival research, which I cannot do now. This is an intellectual-clinical history. I am also working on a history of the discovery of child abuse, which starts by considering the 1962 article "The Battered Child Syndrome." But, again, this is built on published sources, although it involves some clinical writing based on my own work. What all my current projects have in common is that I use my knowledge of the history of psychoanalysis to identify areas and topics that have not been written about or have been written about only very incompletely. For reasons of my own history, I need to be a pioneer with a topic, as I needed to be the first biographer of my two subjects. I do not like to have to follow or to rebel against what others have done; I do not want to get to the head of the Nile and have to say "Dr. Livingston, I presume?"

CP: What is your primary affiliation? Is it psychoanalysis, psychobiography, psychology, psychohistory, women's studies, or something else?

EYB: I don't have a primary affiliation, although I do *think* psychoanalytically now, no matter what field I am working in. I walk down the street psychoanalytically now. In my experience, psychoanalysis is not so much a field or a technique, a science or an art, as it is a way of life, like yoga, a *Lebensform*, the *vita psychoanalytica*.

CP: What special training was most helpful in your scholarly work; and what special training was most helpful in your doing your clinical work?

EYB: As I noted, doing clinical writing as part of my training was very helpful to me. In my clinical work, spending time in the Institute of Pennsylvania Hospital with special very disturbed populations—borderlines, multiple personality disorders, schizophrenics, addicts—was enormously helpful to me, particularly for making diagnoses and working collaboratively with psychopharmacologists. But, more generally, what I came away from my training with, and use daily as I work clinically and as I write, is an increased ability to observe myself as I work, to be sensitive to my countertransference and to make self-analysis continuously a feature of my life.

CP: Have you published, or do you plan to publish, an autobiography or any autobiographical writings—that is—beyond *Cherishment*'s autobiographical nuances?

EYB: My novel *Vigil* is an autobiography, but very intricately disguised and not written with the conscious intention of writing an autobiography. It is autobiographical as a dream is: all the characters are facets of myself, the whole is the plurality of my selves insofar as I knew them at the time (that is, when I was thirty, and before my analysis). I have considered writing an autobiography on the basis of my journal, which I have kept off and mostly on for my whole adult life, and which is full of my dreams. But I hesitate for two different types of reasons. One is that I cannot solve the problem of protecting the confidentiality of my loved ones or of myself (because I do not want patients and prospective patients to know too much). The second reason is that I think I inhibited my own psychoanalysis at times by trying to be the analyst myself, not letting my analyst be my analyst, and I would not like to repeat that problem of narcissism and inability to surrender control, which would, in an autobiography, manifest as a problem of perspective. This problem might yield as I grow older and hopefully wiser, but the first one is intrinsically recalcitrant. After 9/11, I wrote a long autobiographical piece focused on the dream I had the night of the attack and on the dream one of my patients had the night before the attack. But the piece, which is very interesting (to me, at least) on the topic of traumatic day residues and prophetic dreams, reveals too much about the end of a love affair that was coming about at that time.

CP: As a practicing psychoanalyst, distinguished theorist, and a widely praised biographer of Anna Freud and Hannah Arendt, you wrote the essay collection *Subject to Biography*, which reflects on the relations among self-knowledge, autobiography, biography and cultural history. How does the biographer's task become a mirror of one's own self—and did you find yourself *changed* or *altered* as a woman and a feminist as you wrote through that empathetic stance?

EYB: Analysts who write about the experience of immigrants or people who move from one culture to another sometimes speak of a "third individuation," contrasting that to the second individuation of adolescence and the first of childhood. My biographies were my third individuation. In and through them, I individuated from my second family, my "family romance" family, which I had created with Hannah Arendt, who was my teacher, and with the circle around Anna Freud, whom I never met. This was an ideal and idealized family of intellectual nurture and mentorship, German Jewish, philosophical and psychoanalytical, and I grew, expanded, enormously in that family, a predominantly female family, a matriarchy. But I also had to individuate, to come into my own, moving back into my own originary culture, as well as forward into a global culture that is evolving around me, and that all of us are immigrating into. It interests me that I resist speaking German or French now, and I have enjoyed in recent years reading ancient Greek again, as I first did in my undergraduate student years, while I have also enjoyed writing a more colloquial, non-technical English. These languages mean different things to me psychically and culturally.

CP: What training should a person entering applied psychoanalysis/psychobiography/ psychohistory today pursue?

EYB: That depends on the level a person desires. You can do good work with bookish learning of psychoanalysis, but if you want to go as far as you can go in applied analysis, you need a full analytic training, or at least a personal analysis.

CP: You came from a literary background, became involved in psychoanalysis, and made a decision at a point in your career (as you describe in *Cherishment*) to become a practitioner. Please reflect on that chain of events?

EYB: I noted before the external circumstances of my shift from being an academic to training, but, I am sure you can appreciate, the shift was densely over determined—like a conversion experience. And it took a long time, as I started training in New Haven in the mid-80's, interrupted it for nearly a decade, and finished in Philadelphia in the late 90's. Both I and the world changed a great deal in those fifteen years. I can describe the transition in many ways, but it is perhaps simplest to say that I wanted more out of life than scholarship and teaching represented to me; I felt that I was not using all my talents or developing all my interests as an academic, I felt that my emotions, my character were constricted in the academy. At the same time, I realized that the teaching I was doing verged on the psychotherapeutic and if that is what I felt good about, I should be trained for it and assume the appropriate role, therapist. (In my practice, I work predominantly with young adults.) Across my life, I wanted more freedom: from academic discourse, from unempathic intellectual conventionality, from any particular sexual scene or definition. At a moment when so many intellectuals, particularly feminists, found psychoanalysis a constriction, I found its theory and practice (not its organizations) a liberation.

CP: How do you see psychobiography and psychoanalysis developing in the next decade? Do you think by necessity it will develop into a political analysis of groups rather than individuals? (Clio's Psyche is subtitled Understanding the 'Why' of Culture, Current Events, History, and Society) How do you interpret that "Why", and which of the analysts or philosophers you have written about or associated with would best answer that "Why?"

EYB: Historically, psychobiography has followed psychoanalysis, so in the era of "the Oedipus complex is the nucleus of the neuroses," psychobiography was applied Oedipus complex. Later, when the pre-Oedipal mother-child dyad became the nucleus of the neuroses, psychobiographers became frantic to find out if their subjects had been nursed. As countertransference moved more into the fore clinically, psychobiographers took to walking into the pages of their books in the first person singular, telling how they loved or hated or wrestled

with their subjects. (In my estimation, this trend has been as unhappy for psychobiography as it has for psychoanalysis, where it seems to me have resulted in a lot of posturing, preciousness, and what one of my patients calls "look at me, me, me!" behavior.) Group psychology, too, has tended to follow clinically-focused theory rather than leading it, with the exception that clinicians have become more sensitive to their patients' cultural backgrounds, particularly if analyst and analysand are of different cultures. We are all what used to be called "Cultural Freudians" to a degree that would have surprised Karen Horney, although this does not mean that important works by early psychoanalytic students of cultural diversity, like Georges Devereux, inventor of the sub-field "ethno-psychoanalysis," have become well known (even though you can visit his French devotees on the web). Psychoanalysis will certainly become more connected to fields that are more empirical, more reality-based, body-oriented, and political—and this is a matter of do or die. But it will be interesting to see whether this necessary connecting, which will hopefully bring psychoanalysis out of its long isolation and defensiveness—often arrogant defensiveness—will happen without psychoanalysis losing its own unique way of thinking and experiencing and its commitment to not reducing the psyche to a function of something else, whether neurons or socio-political realities. Clinically, I expect that the most interesting psychoanalytic work will be done in areas of the world where national health care systems support psychoanalysis, so that there are some patients, particularly child patients (with whom the really pioneering work has always been done)—and that is certainly not likely to be the case in our country.

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

EYB: I'm going to take up your previous "why?" question here, by saying that to me it really seems time for psychohistory and psychoanalysis to give up asking "why?" "Why?" presumes that there is an answer, one answer. You put a question like "why does someone become a terrorist?" and you are already weighing against the complexity of the real world. There are as many routes to terrorism as there are terrorists. I am always struck by the over generalizing endemic to psychoanalysis, its applied branches—psychohistory, psychobiography, psychoanalytic literary criticism, etc.—and its mergers like psychoanalytic feminism or feminist psychoanalysis. So much searching after a single key to a question that has been construed as a single lock. "Why does someone become homosexual?" (To which I suppose the only reasonable answer is another question, "why not?") The most impressively ambitious mid-20th century work of applied analysis, *The Authoritarian Personality*, is a good example of distorting overgeneralization: it presumes that prejudice is a single phenomenon (no difference between anti-Semitism and racism, both are "ethnocentrism") and that there is a single answer to the question "why are people prejudiced?" which is "because they are authoritarian personalities." I tend to appreciate good use of *Idealtypen* in the tradition of Max Weber's work because it stresses plurals—there are prejudiced personalities of different types, as there are prejudices of different types, so we need careful, phenomenological study. In my experience, the best clinicians are the ones who linger long and lovingly over details—the intricate texture of a dream, the nuances of secondary revisions, etc., etc.—and work their way cautiously toward theory.

CP: One of the points you make in *Cherishment* is that we need to rethink general theory in order to find the missing links (even when they exist in the language itself) that will tell us more about culture and the individual's development. Do you sometimes see yourself as breaking new ground in orthodox psychoanalytic thinking?

EYB: As I implied before, I always travel back into our history while I am traveling critically in our present. Before I set out to think about how the concept "character" might be useful to us now, and to question its absence from most fields of applied analysis, I read the whole history of the concept in psychoanalysis, lingering over moments—like the "Culture and Personality" school based at Columbia after the Second World War—where it was central, and then I consulted other traditions (Aristotle's characterology, the Hippocratic characterology, etc.) and only then was I at all ready to judge my own ideas, and refine them, reference them. This is the way I was taught to philosophize by Hannah Arendt (who learned it from Heidegger): if you want to think deeply about a phenome-

non or a concept or the way a phenomenon has been conceptualized, you go back to the *arche*, the beginning, and follow the whole development, making use of philological tools, keeping what is helpful, freeing yourself of what is blinding, noting silences. *Between Past and Future* is a collection of Arendt's "exercises in political thinking," each one of which comes to a strikingly original use of a concept by means of a critical philological-historical tour. You might think I am just describing "deconstruction," but I don't think so; "reconstruction" would be more apt. *Cherishment* is an exercise over the question "is there a concept in the European tradition that is like the Japanese concept *amae*?" (and I continued the exercise into an essay coauthored with the classicist Joseph Russo in *Where Do We Fall When We Fall In Love?*). When I break new ground in psychoanalytic theory, it usually turns out that I have dug up a lost treasure.

CP: What is the importance of childhood to psychohistory?

EYB: It is devoutly to be desired that some hugely erudite but also clinically astute person will come along some day and produce a merger of the relatively new subfield of history that is history of childhood with the subfield of psychoanalysis that is child (and adolescent) analysis. This would make it obvious how important childhood (or perhaps it would be more accurate to say child-rearing practice) is to psychohistory. And it would have the further good effect of showing that there has been in all of recorded history a range of forms of prejudice against children —childism, I call this— that is perhaps the most fundamental form of prejudice in history and for the study of history.

CP: Do you care to comment on what your own childhood was like?

EYB: This would require the autobiography that, as I said before, I cannot write. But let me say just superficially that my childhood had a key "Before" and "After" in it. My first five years were a kind of idyll—the effects are visible in an album of family photographs in which I always appear so wide-eyed, open, radiantly smiling. Things got complicated when my mother had her third child and was quite overwhelmed with the responsibilities of three small children, the last one quite frail and then prone to illnesses. At that point, when I was not being mother's little helper, I turned to my older brother and my father for company and the three of us got all organized around sports and recreation and the out of doors. School became the arena where I had no competition. To cut a long story short, I came out of this move from the world of my mother and sister to the world of my father and brother with a mother identification and a father identification of almost perfectly equal strengths, and I have continued to be a character blend of a quiet, caretaking, artistic sensibility with one that is activist, athletic, achievement-oriented. My parents, so extremely different, had an explosive divorce, while I, although I tip one way or the other now and again, have been a strong marriage of opposites intrapsychically for nearly sixty years.

CP: Some Forum researchers have been struggling with the relationship between identification with a particular parent and achievement. If you would like to comment on this, it would be helpful to them and interesting for our readers.

EYB: I have been commenting on this, and will say further of myself that I think I have a particular proclivity toward identification as a mode of being. All through school, I developed identifications with teachers in the way some people develop crushes. The objects of my identifications were always quite androgynous, and their achievements were enormous. The women—the poet Muriel Rukeyser, Hannah Arendt—were women who succeeded in men's worlds without benefit of feminism. Characteristically, I blend those identifications in my ego ideal. But I am a feminist.

CP: In your experience and life, do you find that high achieving women are/were more identified with their fathers?

EYB: As I noted, in my personal experience, this is not so, or half so. And both clinically and as a biographer, I find mixtures of identifications to be the norm in high achieving women –but, of course, the mixtures vary considerably, including in terms of gender. Similarly, I observe great variation in mothers' and fathers' abilities to promote or support their daughters. Anna Freud was certainly promoted in her adulthood by her father, but Hannah Arendt's father died when she was a child, and she had to find father figures who promoted her

and with whom she could identify (particularly Karl Jaspers and her husband Heinrich Bluecher).

CP: Are psychohistorians more father-identified than other people?

EYB: Are you presuming psychohistorians are a type and looking for the "why?" I would not think of them as a group or a type. I think there are mediums of creativity (verbal, visual, auditory, etc.) and types of thinking (empirical, philosophical, psychoanalytical, etc.), and creative character types, but I don't think attraction to a genre defines a type.

CP: Father issues brings the father of our field, Freud, to mind. You edited and wrote an introduction to *Freud on Women: A Reader* (1990). What are some of your thoughts on Freud and women?

EYB: I think it is now clear to most people in our field that Freud's understanding of women was much less accurate or complete than his understanding of men, and it is one of the great developments in psychoanalysis that his limitation has been addressed and is continuing to be addressed. But psychoanalysis had to be prompted and helped by feminists and then by psychoanalytically trained feminists in this project. Work on female psychology, however, is still work in progress, for many reasons, one of which is that the distinction between sex and gender, which was so helpful and liberating, eventually brought psychoanalysts to too great a reliance on gender study, while sex study got rather neglected, as did the relations between sex and gender. Anatomy is not destiny, but anatomy repressed will return. Sexology and biology and medicine (particularly neurology and endocrinology) are no longer such male dominated fields, thank goodness, and much information is coming to us from them. In this period of 'correcting the pendulum swing' or 'avoiding binary thinking,' study of intersexuals, transsexuals, and bisexuals has become, for example, very important.

CP: There is an exciting amount of recently acquired knowledge regarding the psychology of women. Please share some of this with us.

EYB: To my mind, the most important advance going on now is a move away from thinking in terms of a psychology of one Woman or one Female, in the singular or the abstract, toward an appreciation of the huge diversity of lines of development that different women follow and follow differently. Again, this is an overcoming of a tendency in the field toward over generalization. Also, developmental stages that have been relatively neglected are being studied (menopause and post-menopause, for examples, partly because so many women analysts of my age are now around to contribute, using their own experience for motivation and observation).

CP: Anna Freud carried the psychoanalytic torch that her father lit and appeared to idealize him. What other feelings lay beneath idealization is an important question. Do you have any thoughts in this regard?

EYB: Anna Freud certainly idealized her father, but if you read her work—all eight volumes of it—carefully, you see that she was a sophisticated historian of psychoanalysis and very able to assess the limitations of his historical perspective on many (although not all) topics. For just one example, she says clearly that he was wrong to think in 1909, when he published the Little Hans case, that there could be no special technique for child analysis. There is no such thing as unambivalent idealization, but Anna Freud's idealization was remarkably unmixed; and this points us to a different matter, it seems to me, which is that her idealization involved such an inhibition in her erotic life, so that she became rather like a nun loving a divinity.

CP: Following up on an issue raised by Freud, what is the impact of parental loss on your level of achievement and those of subjects you have studied?

EYB: You can, of course, lose a parent in many ways, not just to death: to separation, to neglect, to betrayal or abuse, to changes brought about by illness and mental illness, to changes brought about by external traumas. And it matters so much to what degree a child or an adult suffering loss holds himself or herself responsible and struggles—often in the medium of achievements—to make reparations (and Melanie Klein's study of reparative creativity is crucial here) or to find a way to be special or to find a way to be in control of unruly

love or hate emotions and guilt toward the lost one or other people.

CP: How can psychoanalytically-oriented scholars have more impact in academia and on society and international conflict in general?

EYB: By not thinking that they have answers that other people, not psychoanalytically informed, do not have. The people who have most impact are always the ones who listen and learn most, avoiding any form of ideology—although this does not usually appear to be the case, and it is not always the case in the short run or immediately. One of the most moving experiences of my life was to be present three summers ago when His Holiness the Dalai Lama addressed a soccer stadium full of people from all over the former Yugoslavia in Zagreb, Croatia—people who had been at war with each other only a few years before. He delivered his characteristic message, which was then translated into half a dozen languages, one after the other, including into those of the former enemies, Croatian and Serbian, about how he knew from traveling the earth and listening carefully that all human beings desire happiness and all human beings are fundamentally compassionate. And I was just as astonished to find myself surrounded by people, young and old—and believe me, these were not Buddhists—weeping, at once mourning and soaking up his serenely joyful presence. I was sitting with a psychoanalytically trained therapist from the Zagreb Center for Traumatized Children who told me that she felt that she would go back to her little war survivors the next morning, as she said, "completely in peace." I was witnessing what might be called a collective therapeutic action. Much could be said about what was involved. But let me just observe what a difference it makes for the healer, one who has suffered so from war and exile, to be a person of peace, inner peace, who does not believe—or live his life on the belief—that all human beings are innately aggressive or driven by a death drive!

CP: Please reflect on your collaborative work with Mark Bracher in the Association of Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society and how that group evolved in the early 1990's.

EYB: APCS is an important organization for developing applied psychoanalysis, bringing *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society* together as well as academicians and clinicians, and for sponsoring a fine journal, (a journal that is refreshingly open to younger writers). The organization has had a complicated history of splitting and searching for community, and Mark Bracher, the journal's superb founding editor, brought me in to chair its Board through the wake of a big split, which was a kind of squabble among types of large ego Lacanians. I played the role of the peacemaker by being the one who didn't represent any of the particular warring ideologies and had no power stake. The organization is in crisis again now, but this time because of financial woes and several large egos, while the ideological differences are not salient, so a single peacemaker is not needed—the whole Board needs to understand the situation and act collectively. Different kinds of group crises and different kinds of group progress require different interventions. In my experience, psychoanalytic organizations are no different than other types of intellectual or academic societies in their proneness to splits and conflicts, except that psychoanalytically oriented people often think that they have been analyzed beyond such problems—a funny sort of egoism. Robert Waelder, an associate of Anna Freud's and the founder of my training institute in Philadelphia, used to say, quite rightly, "a mob of analysts is still a mob!"

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

EYB: In my recent essay collection *Where Do We Fall When We Fall in Love?* I published an essay on "Characters of Violence" that argues for not over-generalizing about "the root of violence" and for appreciating the variety of motives for violence and forms of violence. May I refer you to that? It's not summarizable in a few words.

CP: How do you understand the psychology of terrorism and modes of intervention?

EYB: After 9/11, many people rushed forth to describe "the terrorist" with clichés about young people growing up in poverty and lashing out at the over-privileged and decadent West. By now, fortunately, that stereotype and that stereotyping mode of analysis are receding and the complexity of our situation—the global situation—is being

better appreciated, as is the fact that no single mode of intervention will fit every particular type of terrorism. But in our country, it will be hard for this sophistication to advance very far as long as we are being governed by a group of characterologically obsessional, crony-corporate capitalist, anti-democratic, Christian fundamentalist terrorists—a very specific type.

CP: What books were important to your development? Your mother describes you as a particularly "serious" child who was a different kind of jewel amongst the rest of her children. Did you read serious subjects even as a young girl? If so, under whose apprenticeship, actual or imaginary, were you guided?

EYB: I'll tell you a funny story, to continue on the theme of my proclivity toward identification. When I was about thirteen, I read Daniel Defoe's *The Journal of the Plague Year*, having been so delighted by his *Robinson Crusoe* and thinking I would find another such wonderful book (at the time, I did not know much about the master-slave dialectic…). After suffering through all Defoe's horrific descriptions of people dying of the plague, I broke out in hives and my mother had to soak me in a baking soda bath! I was a rather over-serious reader. But it wasn't books themselves that so affected me, it was what they meant for me in terms of a persistent feeling I had that I did not understand the world or people, that I was either provincially naive or kept in ignorance. (I don't need to explain to psychoanalysts the characteristic childhood origins of this feeling of being little and excluded from the adult doings.) Also as a thirteen year old, I read Leon Uris's *Exodus* and then had a terrific quarrel with my father. How, I angrily begged him to answer, could he have fought in the Second World War to defeat this Nazi regime that I had just learned about but not ever told me, in any of his many stories about his soldiering, what had happened to the European Jews? How could I have gotten to be thirteen in ignorance of this? I have been reading ever since compelled by the same sense that unbelievable things have happened about which one must know to be a grown-up, or as I would now say, a citizen of the world. But I am happy to report that I have gotten over the idea that I would eventually come across a book—not even one by Freud—that would enlighten me or relieve me of my anxiety.

CP: Who else was important to your development as a quiet thinker, and then as a writer and activist sensitive to psychosocial conditions that effect our daily lives? Lacan? Foucault, Jaspers, Hans Loewald?

EYB: Ultimately, it has been people I have known personally who were most important to my development (to my ego ideal), more than books, although some of the people—like Hannah Arendt—wrote books. I am deeply grateful to Hans Loewald, but more as my first analyst than as a writer. The people who have influenced me share certain qualities: integrity (which I think of as healthy narcissism), modesty and respect for traditions combined with deep critical abilities, lack of moralism, eloquence, passion combined with discipline, wry and dry wit, friendliness, compassion (I call this cherishment).

CP: You seem to find some optimism in forgiveness at the end of your last paper. Do you think Arendt believed that love was by its nature, unworldly and unpolitical, but in a philosopher's purview?

EYB: I don't really understand your question. But let me say something about forgiveness, which I wrote about recently when I was asked to lecture on Hannah Arendt's "The Power to Forgive" in *The Human Condition*. It seems to me that we have witnessed in the last decade a phenomenon—the emergence of national Truth and Reconciliation commissions, following on the example of South Africa—that is unprecedented in the history of the world and certainly of nation states. The Commissions that have sprung up in various parts of the world are very different in type and in success (or unsuccess, as in the case of Chile), but they all to some degree recognize that Arendt was right in underscoring that forgiveness is *necessary* for there to be political life. They are as significant for the present moment as the emergence of the environmental movement after *Silent Spring* and the emergence of the women's liberation movement after *Le Deuxieme Sexe*. (You will note how three women triggered these movements with their writings, although the great recent politician practitioners of forgiveness are non-European men: Martin Luther King, Desmond Tutu, the

Dalai Lama).

CP: Are there any mentors besides Arendt who come to mind? Perhaps even your own mother. How did she, or did she not come into your writing about *amae*—and the infant's expectation for love?

EYB: I have been mentioning mentors throughout this interview, and I would certainly put my mother at the head of the list. She is an emotional mentor, a cherisher, and she had a great capacity to fulfill my infant expectation of love. I remember being so touched when she sent me a letter on my birthday—I was somewhere in my mid-twenties, living in New York, in the midst of the Vietnam War protests—in which she told me that each March 3rd she reminded herself that spring had come early to Maryland in 1946, and I was born on such a beautiful day, sunny and warm, "as fine a day as ever I saw in my life." This is the kind of thing that gives a person store enough of what Erikson called "basic trust" to go through quite a lot of adversity!

CP: In reviewing some of Arendt's writings I was struck by a quote in relation to *Cherishment*. She writes: "Love, by reason of its passion, destroys the in-between which relates us to and separates us from others. As long as its spell lasts, the only in-between which can insert itself between two lovers is the child, loves own product… Through the child, it is as though the lovers return to the world from which their love had expelled them." For you, the infant holds a special position in our awareness, could you elaborate on this point?

EYB: I think that it is widely understood now in most cultures—not just the psychoanalytic subculture—that the period "zero to three" (to use the title of an important journal) is absolutely crucial, foundational, for a person's physical and emotional development and well-being, as it is understood that children of this age are much more complex and related to their environments than had been thought. This understanding represents a kind of revolution in human thinking, a revolution as profound as the feminist revolution that spread the understanding that women and men are equals. Eventually, one can hope, child-rearing practices and social protections will reflect the new shift in consciousness. So far, the result is decidedly mixed (for the reason, as I implied before, that the prejudice I call childism is so deep).

CP: Something Arendt said about Heidegger—that with such a teacher it is possible to be taught how to think—did she help you to do that? Do you think thinking how to think is part of the curative process in analysis? Or, if the "cure" is love, how does this happen?

EYB: A lot of the literature on therapeutic action assumes that there is a single type of action that cures or a single process (perhaps one with beginning, middle and end stages) that is curative. All kinds of debates arise: does insight cure, or must there be re-experiencing involving regression and new progression? Does love cure? Instructions are issued: don't settle for a mere transference cure; don't read Franz Alexander's paper on "corrective emotional experience" or be seduced by that phrase, etc. Please excuse me if I once again ride out on my hobbyhorse to say that this literature, too, is full of over-generalizations. In my experience, psychoanalytic cures involve many ingredients—in fact, all the ingredients that have been packaged separately belong in the cupboard. I work very differently with different patients—using or making up different recipes, to continue my metaphor. What helps a survivor of childhood sexual abuse who feels she was an unwanted child would not help a person who was the extension of a parent's narcissism and feels entitled to be ruthless. What works in a once a week therapy doesn't necessarily work in a four day a week therapy, and vice versa. Freud set a great deal of bootless debate in train with his pronouncements about the "pure gold" of analysis and all the efforts to substitute alloys, as he did in his efforts to find a single key to the mystery of cure (of making the unconscious conscious, getting ego to be where id was, etc.).

CP: Lawrence Friedman's essay on "Is There a Special Kind of Psychoanalytic Love?" (*Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*) highlights Loewald as a positive model of someone who understood analytic love—as something unique to psychoanalysis—and not applicable to other therapies. Although the transference tends to "immunize" the analyst from being the direct target of a patient's love, the analyst also has a unique "inside" feeling that has been described as love.

Could you comment as an analyst?

EYB: Friedman's essay is a good and helpful survey of what has been said by some analysts (he is very selective, leaving out such important contributors as Ian Suttie) on the topic of analytic love. Evolving discussions need such summaries. But I wish we also had more reflection on what other traditions of healing, non-psychoanalytic, have to teach us, as it is very difficult to conceptualize what is specific to your own tradition, or your own experience, without comparison. Recently, guided by one of my patients, I've been reading about Native American healing traditions, particularly of dream interpretation, and this is helping me understand my own feelings as I interpret dreams.

CP: Your last collection *Where Do We Fall When We Fall in Love?* is a marvelous set of essays about the complexities of love and relationships, and the complexities of loving within the clinical practice. In a forthcoming special issue of this publication and at the Psychohistory Forum we are doing a Work-In-Progress session on Love, Marriage, and Relationship At-A-Distance. Would you care to comment on this phenomenon?

EYB: Thank you. But what is "relationship at a distance?" I cannot comment, as I don't know what you mean.

CP: I would like to ask you about your feelings about the natural landscape you grew up in (the Chesapeake) and the one where you now have a country home (in Connecticut). You came up with the metaphor of a "green shoot" as the fundamental rebirth of the mind when cherishment is extended. Do you find in nature such solace?

EYB: "Green shoot" was not my metaphor, my co-author of *Cherishment* and I borrowed it from ancient Greek, where there is a complex lexicon about scions (children as green shoots or saplings) and the same verbs are used for cherishing children, raising animals, and cultivating gardens (in Latin, the metaphor goes on to link cultivating plants—*colere*—to making *cultura*). The idea that nature and culture grow similarly appeals to me, even though we live in a time when so much of our culture is anti-nature or nature-destructive that "nature" hardly means anything to us except when we explicitly go looking for it, to try to save it or simply to vacation in it. My happiest memories from childhood are set on my maternal grandparents' dairy farm at the head of the Chesapeake Bay, where their hay barn was my playground with my brother and my cousins. When I was about six, I saw one of my favorite of the cows give birth, and I got to give the calf my name, which is also my grandmother's name (she was the eighth Elisabeth Bulkley to live in America, and the family geneologist). I now have a 1740 colonial house and farmland in Connecticut, only a few miles from the burying ground where one of our line, Elisabeth Bulkley Hooker, has rested in peace since 1732. It's a great pleasure to me that my family on both sides has been situated on beautiful farmlands for centuries, and that pleasure does influence my interests in both nature and culture.

CP: How can we recruit new people to the field of psychohistory?

EYB: Be the most interesting and exciting subfield in history and throughout the social sciences. The best students go to the best teachers. I know that sounds simple, but…

CP: Did Erik Erikson have any impact on your development as a student of psychosocial development?

EYB: Both *Childhood and Society* and *Identity* made big impressions on me, but, as a biographer, so did *Gandhi's Truth* and *Young Man Luther*.

CP: How do you define psychohistory?

EYB: It is the subfield of history that interests the readers of your journal, who, I imagine, come from all kinds of backgrounds and trainings.

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

EYB: May I do this in generations? 1. Freud 2. Among Freud's first followers: Jones, Sachs, and Rank 3. In the next generation: Kris, Waelder (*Progress and Revolution*), Fenichel, and Erikson
4. Then the "Culture and Personality" school, especially Devereux, Linton, Cora Du Bois, Fromm, Horney (*The Neurotic Personality in Our Time*)
5. After them, the list becomes very long and diversified and the contributors more academicians, not clinicians. (For me, some of the most important work has been done in classical studies, like,

for example, Philip Slater's *The Glory of Hera*; and Norman O. Brown's training was in classics).

CP: Thank you for a most interesting interview.❑

The Glory and Shadow of Fame

(continued from page 113)

celebrity parent. The same week there were two articles in the *New York Times* about Michael Jackson's acquittal from child abuse charges. One argued that the judgment had nothing to do with his fame and the other that it had everything to do with it.

Although I haven't written about the children of famous parents in many years, my interest in the topic has never waned. The "Featured Scholar" and "Featured Author" interviews of two accomplished individuals—Sue Erikson Bloland and Thomas A. Kohut—the children of famous psychoanalysts appearing in Clio's Psyche, provide some interesting data for a discussion of the subject. My article is based upon my years of interviewing and analyzing children who have grown up with famous parents, my contacts with spouses of someone famous, biographies and autobiographies of the famous and their offspring, and my study of creative individuals and the creative process.

Does the study of well-known psychoanalysts differ from other spheres of fame? I am sure the readers instantly noticed the disparate nature of the two interviews. Sue Erikson Bloland evidently feels very comfortable speaking about her famous father and the effects of being his child—something she says took her years of analysis to accomplish. Thomas Kohut, on the other hand, appears averse to answering questions about his father and seems only to want to speak of his career achievements and to have them appraised on their own merit. Although he acknowledges that his father was very influential to his development, he is reluctant to elaborate. These are two very typical responses in children who grow up with a famous parent. There are others. Some remain connected to the famous parent, often pursuing a career in the same field, or choosing a mate that resembles the parent in age, career, or both. Others attempt to conceal their connection to the parent, sometimes purposely changing their name for fear of receiving special treatment (either positive or negative) that is unrelated to who they are. In all cases, there is a powerful, ambivalent bond to be dealt with.

After reading the excellent biographies of Erik Erikson by Lawrence Friedman (*Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* [NY: Scribner Friedman, 1999]) and Heinz Kohut by Charles Strozier (*Heinz Kohut: The Making of a Psychoanalyst* [NY: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 2001]), and the lovely memoir by Sue Erikson Bloland (*In the Shadow of Fame* [NY: Viking, 2005]), it is possible to speculate that the reactions of Bloland and Kohut could be explained as having little to do with their parents' fame. Although Erikson was a renowned child analyst, he was not a hands-on father. Child rearing was left completely to his wife, Joan. Sue felt her father's absence and his preoccupation with his work above all else. She was also sent to a boarding school at a young age at a time when she had no desire to leave her home and school. Sue confesses that she harbored a secret longing to become a patient in order to receive the attention she imagined her father's patients received. Becoming a psychoanalyst in her own right, as well as her writing and speaking about her father, his fame, and fame in general, can be interpreted, at least on some level, as a way she has found to maintain a strong connection to the remote father of her childhood.

Heinz Kohut, on the other hand, seemed to have been intensely involved in his son Thomas's life. For example, he read everything he wrote to his son (except his autobiographical "Two Analyses of Mr. Z"). Thomas, an only child like his father, was so close to his father that he was entrusted with the task of burning all of his father's process notes on patients upon his death and of arranging his father's memorial service exactly as he wished it to be. This involvement appeared to be geared to satisfy the father more than the son. In Strozier's biography of Kohut, he mentions several occasions during which Thomas complained of his father's inordinate need for attention in social situations, a behavior that embarrassed and angered him. Should it come as a surprise, then, that Thomas, in his adult life, seeks to distance himself from a father whose needs of him were so great?

The different reactions in Bloland and Kohut, one could easily argue, have more to do with parenting style than fame. I bring them forward to highlight the many variables involved in parenting that get wrongly attributed to the fame factor. When approaching the famous, or those involved with them, let us try not to get caught up in the whirlwind of celebrity mystique and fervently attribute everything to it. Indeed, both Erikson-Bloland and Kohut, as well as Helene Rank, daughter of Otto Rank (whom I interviewed on August 31, 1987), all emphasize that their relationships with their mothers were as influential as the ones they had with their famous fathers.

Bloland's evocative memoir and discussion of fame raises several points that I would like to address. Although her book is subtitled, *A Memoir of the Daughter of Erik H. Erikson*, the book is a family portrait that focuses primarily on fame and its underbelly. She writes beautifully about the discrepancy between the public and private father she grew up with and her difficulties reconciling the two. The focus in her book is more on fame than on the children of fame and she emphasizes the idolization of famous persons as a detrimental factor in those who seek fame as well as those who are indirectly affected by it.

Although some people do seek fame for fame's sake, I am not convinced that this was the case with either Erikson or Kohut, or many other creative persons who end up famous. Research has found that the only factor creative people have in common is their unrelenting drive to do what they do, even in the absence of external reinforcement or recognition (Arnold Rothstein, *Creativity and Madness*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990). Therefore, to reduce these person's needs to narcissistic ones is too simplistic in my view. Many creative thinkers, like Erikson and Kohut, have no idea that they will become famous, but they are intent in putting their ideas across to the world. Erikson, and especially Kohut, experienced strong opposition to their views that ran counter to mainstream psychoanalysis, and they paid the price of alienating prior mentors, like Anna Freud, in pursuit of their visions. I agree with Bloland that having a grandiose vision is, in part, narcissistic; yet, being able to withstand the injury related to the rupture of significant relationships in the course of pursuing one's vision comes at the expense of narcissistic gratification. Rather than viewing creative persons as pursuing fame as a way to meet their narcissistic needs, the more relevant question might be how these people handle fame once they attain it.

We live in a culture of celebrity, it is true, and there are many negative consequences that result from it. Sue Erikson Bloland delineates these beautifully. What is important to add to her account in order to balance the picture is the natural need people have for heroes and idols, stars and the famous. Kohut's theories of the self nicely illustrate the human need for idealization that famous people, as well as parents, can serve. Otto Rank (*The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* [NY: Knopf, 1932]) and Ernest Becker (*The Denial of Death* [NY: Free Press, 1973]) similarly wrote about the human need for heroes, explaining that the world is too terrible without them. This is not a pathological need but a very human one. As is the envy experienced toward those who succeed and the need to debunk them, an aspect Bloland does not devote enough attention to in her book. Melanie Klein's theory is useful here. Group formation and the choice of leaders, as Freud (Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego [*Standard Edition*, 18: 67-143]) noticed in 1921 and Bion (*Experiences in Groups* [New York: Basic Books]) in 1959, also consist in the gratification of such needs. Indeed, since Biblical times, the need for idolization was recognized. After Moses failed to appear on Mount Sinai on the appointed day, his people felt their god had abandoned them and instinctively created a golden calf to idolize. Therefore, as Kohut suggests, we should not be too quick to dismantle people's needs to idealize.

Bloland's writing seems to imply that the famous are essentially narcissistic characters in need of a reader/audience's adulation in order to function and feel sure of themselves and their self-worth. While this may be true for some, I believe that a degree of narcissism and grandiosity are necessarily part of being creative. The creative individual, like the child at play, invents new worlds (Danielle Knafo, "Revisiting Ernst Kris' Concept 'Regression in the Service of the Ego.'" *Psychoanalytic Psychology*. [2002] 19 (1): 24-49). How can one accomplish such a feat without feeling grandiose and believing that one can contribute

substantially to the world? Furthermore, the emotional and time investment in one's creativity necessarily involves a certain degree of self-involvement, which often comes at the expense of social and family engagement. Once again, Kohut helps us to distinguish healthy (creative) narcissism, that includes ideals and grandiosity, from the unhealthy narcissism Bloland speaks of, whose aim is to compensate for damage, depression, trauma, and loss.

It is not easy being famous. Can anyone truly survive the scrutiny of public life and emerge unblemished? The biographies of these two men, and those of others who live in the limelight, imply that they were great thinkers but far from great men due to their personal flaws. Erikson, "architect of identity," had his own identity problems because of his unknown paternity, rejection of his Jewish heritage, and his need to hide his Down Syndrome child. Kohut, creator of self psychology, was ambivalent about his sexuality, denied his Jewish roots, and was himself a narcissist. These revelations do not make these men less great in my view because their ability to take individual psychopathology and transform it into theories that have universal applicability and appeal is the essence of greatness and creativity, not fame.

Having said that, I wish also to stress that it is not easy growing up with a famous parent or an extremely creative one, or even a workaholic parent. Interestingly, the theories of both Kohut and Erikson help us understand some of the challenges such children face in their development. A child who grows up knowing he or she does not come first in the parent's preoccupations develops narcissistic wounds and feelings of neglect and abandonment, as in Bellow's "missing father." The daughter of a very famous actor/director whom I interviewed poignantly described her father's abandonment and lack of involvement in her life: "I always felt when I went to see him—the few times that I did—that it was as though I were being granted an audience and I was just another member of the public who was coming to see the public man. And I never really knew the private man… That's one of the hardest things for me to deal with emotionally…When I was a young person, it was very traumatic and very painful…I experienced it as rejection and…I simply couldn't understand… how a parent could be that indifferent to a child. It was very painful and also, I felt that if he had not been a public figure, then this would've been my private dilemma. But because he was a public figure, I was constantly reminded of what I experienced as this rejection. Because people would say to me, "Oh, what is he doing there? Is he…?" And I wouldn't know. And I would find it as a child very humiliating that I couldn't tell them more than they could read in the papers because he wasn't in touch with me. I took it very personally (Danielle Knafo, "What's in a name? Psychoanalytic Considerations on Children of Famous Parents," *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, [1991] 8 (3), p. 273).

Many feel unloved or, even worse, attended to merely as "the son of" or "the daughter of"—narcissistic extensions of their famous parent—rather than for who they really are. Bloland says in her interview, "The more excited people are to meet 'Erik Erikson's daughter,' the less I feel I exist for them as a person. It is actually humiliating to be so objectified." In addition, essential mirroring and caretaking of the child are often reversed in these families so that it is the child who is called on to mirror the parent and his or her accomplishments rather than the other way around. This may have been the case with Kohut. Erikson Bloland, too, admits that she provided "emotional caretaking" for her father, a tendency she later developed in her career as a psychoanalytic social worker.

In addition to issues concerning the development of a healthy narcissism and sense of self are issues of identity formation and consolidation in the offspring of the famous. Erikson contributed a lot to our understanding of identity. Growing up in the shadow of a celebrity parent often results in difficulties individuating and establishing an identity separate from the parent. Martin Freud, Sigmund's son, resignedly confesses his plight: "I have never had any ambition to rise to eminence….I have been quite happy and content to bask in reflected glory…. The son of a genius remains the son of a genius, and his chances of winning human approval of anything he may do hardly exist if he attempts to make any claim to fame detached from that of his father (*Sigmund Freud: Man and Father* [New York: Jason Aronson, 1983, p. 9]).

Identity problems derive in part from the strong ambivalence felt toward the famous parent. They also result from the ways others treat the child, often encouraging in them the sense that they are imposters who receive favors having nothing to do with who they are. Even Anna Freud, after establishing her own fame, interpreted a dream she once had as "The people are nice to me, because of him, his name (In Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Anna Freud*. [New York: Summit, 1988], p. 344)." Thus, identifications in the offspring of the famous are often mixed. On the one hand, they may perceive themselves as special and privileged, even entitled—"basking in reflected glory"—and, on the other hand, insecure, inadequate, and confused about who they are, destined to—living "in the shadow of fame."

One also encounters magical identifications in these children because many of them never witness the parent's climb to fame. As a result, they believe that they can *be* the parent without having to *become* the parent, thereby confusing imitation with true identification (Reich, 1973). Charlie Chaplin Jr. illustrates this point in a conversation he reports having with his brother, Syd, "'I'm going to be an actor when I grow up,' Syd said. I understood what he meant. He was going to take that whole fairy tale world for himself one day, so he wouldn't have to wait to be invited to it. I thought over the idea a minute. It looked good. 'Me too,' I agreed…I am going to be a great actor,' I told them solemnly…. I was thinking about a man who was the greatest comedian in the world. I was his son with his name so I had to be good'" (Charlie Chaplin, Jr. *My Father, Charlie Chaplin*. [New York: Popular Library, 1960]).

What exactly is in a name? When they marry, female offspring of famous fathers have the choice of changing their family name. This choice is often fraught with conflict. Wishing, on the one hand, to be free of the pressures built around one's identity and tie to the famous father, they nonetheless desire to maintain whatever bond they can to the elusive parent and even benefit from the doors it might open. Helene Rank and Sue Erikson Bloland, both women who became psychoanalysts in their own right, long deliberated about when, how much, and to whom to use their father's name to get ahead in the profession. Moving out of a famous parent's shadow is clearly accomplished with much pain and hard work aimed at coming to terms with the reality of their childhoods—what they did and did not get—and their adulthoods—who they are and who they are not.

Danielle Knafo, PhD, *is an associate professor in the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program at Long Island University's C.W. Post Campus. She is faculty and supervisor at Derner's Postdoctoral Program in Psychoanalysis. Dr. Knafo is the author of A Self in Creation, A Psychoanalytic Study of the Self-portraits of Artist Egon Schiele (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994), editor of Living with Terror, Working with Trauma: A Clinician's Handbook (Aronson, 2004), and co-author with Kenneth Feiner of Unconscious Fantasy and the Relational World (Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, 2005). Dr. Knafo maintains a private practice in Great Neck, NY. She may be contacted at <Dknafo@liu.edu>.* ❑

Mariano Grondona on the Psychobiography of Argentine Politicians

Ted Goertzel
Rutgers University

Mariano Grondona is one of Argentina's best known intellectuals and newspaper columnists, and one of very few who incorporates a psychohistorical worldview in his work. His book *La Realidad: El Despertar del Sueño Argentino* (Buenos Aires: Planeta, 2002) is a psychologically sensitive account of Argentine political culture. Now he is turning to psychobiography for insights into the behavior of the Argentine leadership. In a column called "The Psychobiography of Our Politicians" in a leading Buenos Aires newspaper (*La Nación,* September 2005), he observes that "it is common to evaluate our politicians by the goals they propose and the methods they use to achieve them. This means paying attention only to their *rational* side, as if they were chess players. A new vision of politicians has developed in the last few

Go to <**cliospsyche.org**> to see our partially constructed website

years, one which views them not as chess players but as beings of flesh and bone, with their passions and complexes, with their irrational side."

Grondona describes psychobiography as a growing discipline that examines the unconscious minds of political leaders, paying more attention to their childhoods than to their political programs. He uses Jerrold Post's edited book *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders* as a starting point, but develops his own simplified analytical framework. Grondona classifies Argentine politicians as *integrators, conciliators or personalists*. *Integrators* are politicians who devote themselves to defending the integrity of their own political party in difficult times. As an example, he cites Ricardo Balbín, a leader of the Argentina's leading middle-class party, the Unión Cívica Radical, who defended his party during a period of dominance by the *Partido Justicialista* of Juan Domingo Perón. Later in his career, Balbín became a *conciliator* when he reached out beyond his party to help build a national accord. Perón had dominated the country as a *personalist* leader for thirty years when the country and its institutions revolved around him personally.

In Grondona's view, *integrators* and *conciliators* are consistent with a democratic political system, but *personalist* politicians have psychological traits that must be constrained for a democratic system to function well. In his view, two of Perón's successors in his political party have caused problems by prolonging the personalist style: former president Carlos Menem and current president Néstor Carlos Kirchner. Former president Eduardo Duhalde, however, was an integrator when he cut short his own presidency to resolve a crisis by allowing Kirchner to take power.

In Grondona's view, "the personalist politician cannot prosper without the adulation and even the obsequiousness of those who surround him. At times, one does not know which is more shocking, the personalist leaders who continue to flourish in contradiction to our democratic system, or the wide reserves of obsequiousness displayed in our political life." Grondona explains that personalist politicians have an inflated ego rooted in narcissism caused by low self-esteem which causes them to surround themselves with people who give them fawning adulation. This is often accompanied by a quasi-paranoid tendency to see everyone who fails to give unconditional adulation as a conspiring enemy.

Grondona says that three pathological personality types are common among Argentine politicians:

- the narcissistic personality who compensates for low self-esteem by surrounding himself with people who give him unlimited admiration.
- the quasi-paranoid personality who believes that all who disagree with him are part of a dark conspiracy.
- the obsessive-compulsive personality who is so single-mindedly committed to his own work that he rejects all compromise.

Domingo Cavallo, a brilliant and charismatic economist who had remarkable success as Economy Minister in the 1990s, is characterized as exhibiting obsessive-compulsive with narcissistic personality traits. Cavallo tenaciously tried to maintain his economic program in 2002 when there was little hope of it succeeding. Cavallo had accepted a second appointment as Economy Minister at a time when the convertibility plan he had established in the 1990s was in a profound crisis and many experts thought that a devaluation was inevitable. When his plans failed, despite a valiant effort, Cavallo was scapegoated and demonized by the public he worked to hard to serve. He and then President Fernando de la Rúa were forced out of office, with de la Rúa forced by crowds to escape from the Presidential Palace's roof in a helicopter.

After a period of voluntary exile at American universities, Cavallo has recently returned to run for Congress despite polls that show his chances of success to be negligible. He believes that his economic ideas were right and is using the Congressional campaign to defend them. He now realizes, however, that it may be some time before the Argentine leadership and public are ready to accept the kind of economic policies the country really needs.

Grondona cites several Argentine politicians as examples of quasi-paranoid thinking, including presidential candidates Carlos Menem and Elisa Carrió who thought they detected a "sickness" in Néstor Kirchner's aspirations to the

presidency. Quasi-paranoid thinking is common in Argentine politics, perhaps because there actually are many political conspiracies. Grondona observes that "all politicians exhibit some form of psychological excess, without which they would lack the powerful ambition required to jump into the arena with the lions." Democracy can be saved, in Grondona's view, if politicians are able to put aside their animosities after the heat of the campaigns and listen to each other.

Psychoanalysis is well established as a therapeutic practice in Buenos Aires which probably has as many analysts per capita as New York. Only recently, however, have psychoanalysts been asked to comment on political events, and they have not been particularly well prepared to respond. In a BBC World Service broadcast on January 24, 2002, one analyst opined that "it is an essential aspect of Argentine political character to oscillate between periods of supporting illusions and periods when reality becomes plain and conscious." Another stated that "the unconscious feeling of guilt in our society is very deeply tied in with the still unprocessed aspects of the military government, the repression, the murders." Another stated that "we are a sado-masochistic country that can only feel joy in suffering." (Quotes from Mariano Plotkin, *Argentina on the Couch: Psychiatry, State and Society, 1880 to the Present,* University of New Mexico Press, 2003, pp. 224-227).

In commenting on the BBC program, Mariano Plotkin observes that "the analysts's contributions were mostly limited to reductionist explanations of the origins of the crisis based on psychological generalizations heavily loaded with psychoanalytic jargon." They do, however, show an interest which might be enriched by study of psychohistorical literature. The fact that this literature is being read and discussed by a scholar of Mariano Grondona's reputation is encouraging.

Ted Goertzel, PhD*, is Professor of Sociology at Rutgers in Camden, a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum, and a prolific author. Among his books are Fernando Henrique Cardoso: Reinventing Democracy in Brazil (1999), Linus Pauling: A Life in Science and Politics (1995), and Turncoats and True Believers: The Dynamics of Political Belief and Disillusionment (1992). In 2004 he updated and co-edited his parents' 1962 book, Cradles of Eminence: Childhoods of More Than 700 Famous Men and Women. Prof. Goertzel may be contacted at <goertzel@camden.rutgers.edu>.*❑

Patton: The Dyslexic General

Glen Jeansonne, David Luhrssen, and Frank Haney
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

The career of General George S. Patton, Jr. (1885-1945) is one of the most thoroughly documented of the major commanders of World War II. Patton kept diaries and saved virtually every scrap of paper he ever handled. Even with such voluminous, detailed, and often personal material available on this flamboyant military leader, it is only recently that we began to understand the hitherto unknown elements that shaped his career.

Historians read the past through the lens of their own time. Patton, greatly concerned about shaping an acceptable public image, did not call attention to his dyslexia. Moreover, neither did those who wrote about his swashbuckling exploits in the aftermath of World War II care to investigate it, despite such red flags as the frequent symptomatic idiosyncrasies in his spelling and punctuation and his early difficulties in learning.

Given the psychological knowledge of his time, neither Patton himself, nor historians could have been aware that he may also have suffered from an affliction known today as Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD), which afflicts many dyslexics, nor could historians have identified the condition until recently. That Patton had dyslexia is supported by his family which, early on, noticed that letters appeared reversed and upended by George. This family information has been supported by recent biographers (Martin Blumenson, *Patton: the Man Behind the Legend 1885-1945* [New York, 1985], pp. 16-17; Carlo D'Este, *Patton: A Genius for War* [New York, 1995], pp. 45-47). The details on his dyslexia will be discussed more explicitly in the context of his childhood and education.

It is also worth examining whether Patton also had Attention Deficit Disorder. Its major symptoms are poor impulse control, susceptibility

to accidents, extreme mood swings in response to events, and brief displays of excessive temper (Mark Selikowitz, *Dyslexia and Other Learning Difficulties* [Oxford, 1998], pp. 111-114). This syndrome is supported by the *Manual of Diagnostic and Statistical Disorders – IV*. Patton displayed all of these as a commanding officer, sometimes notoriously, as with the pair of infamous slapping incidents during World War II in which he was accused of abusing enlisted men (For a detailed account, see Ladislas Farago, *Patton: Ordeal and Triumph* [London, 1966], pp. 186-187).

The frustrations experienced by a person dealing with dyslexia or ADD can be overwhelming, and may lead to destructive self-doubt, feelings of inadequacy, bouts of uncontrollable anger, and emotional hypersensitivity. On the other hand, some of his strengths may also be related to his condition. For example, his flexibility and willingness to shift strategy, including the quick deal he cut in Casablanca which permitted the formerly Vichy forces to continue governing Morocco in November, 1942, may be connected to his short attention span. Another symptom was his boredom with mundane tasks, such as his 1916 garrison duty at the Mexican town of Dublan, where he wrote, "We are all rapidly going crazy from lack of occupation and there is no help in sight" (Letter from George S. Patton, Jr. to Beatrice Ayer Patton, July 29 1916, cited in D'Este, *Genius*, p. 178).

Dyslexia is a learning disorder that does not reflect a lack of intelligence. Quite the contrary, many dyslexics are extremely intelligent and are often characterized as gifted; however, their perceptual styles are different from the norm. (Selikowitz, *Dyslexia,* pp. 16-17).

Creative geniuses such as Leonardo da Vinci and Albert Einstein are thought by many to be dyslexic. The creative imagination Patton brought to the art of war was not fundamentally different from the vision of great artists and scientists. Along with the almost intangible, seemingly instinctive ability to grasp and visualize the complexities of battle, another element of Patton's successes that may have been spurred by his disability was his prodigious willingness to work hard to overcome all obstacles. "No soldier in the annals of the U.S. Army ever worked more diligently to prepare himself for high command than did Patton" (D'Este, *Genius*, p. 3).

The building blocks for Patton's career were laid at his comfortable family home in Lake Vineyard, California. He grew up in a close-knit family under the scrutiny of his father, George S. Patton II, a Southern aristocrat proud of his family's martial background, and his mother, Ruth, daughter of one of the founders of the state of California. His father relinquished a profitable law practice and his office as district attorney in 1885, dedicating himself to managing the troubled business interests of a relative, including real estate and a winery. George, who was left-handed, had one younger sibling, Anne. An expert horseman at an early age, Patton established himself as an accident-prone risk-taker in his riding and childhood war games. He remained a magnet for accidents through his military career, from a tent fire that singed his face during the 1916 Mexican Expedition to auto accidents in the waning months of World War II.

One of his family's more eccentric figures, Aunt Nannie, became the boy's second mother, and refused to permit his biological parents to punish him for childhood infractions. Along with his easy-going father, who encouraged young George's martial proclivities by giving him a rifle and a wooden sword, educated him by reading the Greek classics aloud, and filled him with stories of the gallant South during the Civil War, Aunt Nannie did more to shape his mentality than anyone in his childhood. Nannie also read to him, especially from the Bible and stories about Alexander the Great and Napoleon. His parents may have doted on him, but Nannie was obsessed with the boy.

Nannie was never certain if her efforts had any effect and even came to the conclusion that he was dim-witted. Until he started school at the age of eleven, he was unable to read or write. Patton's early education was not unusual at a time when privileged children often were tutored at home until a relatively advanced age. Early on, however, his parents discovered he had a learning disability that hampered his ability to read (D'Este, *Genius,* p. 45). Today, that disability is recognized as dyslexia, a malady first identified in 1896, one year before the eleven-year old Patton entered the Classical School for Boys in Pasadena, unable to read or write. Dyslexia did not become widely recog-

nized in the U.S. until the 1920s, well into Patton's tenure as a military officer.

Dyslexia is not simply a matter of reversing letters or numbers but is a complicated disorder whose symptoms include hyperactivity, obsessiveness, mood swings, difficulty in concentrating, impulsiveness and compulsiveness. These symptoms also fit the pattern for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHS). Because of their effort to overcome difficulty in reading and writing, dyslexics can be driven by a compulsion to succeed yet they often harbor feelings of inferiority. Virtually every symptom of dyslexia can be found in the adult Patton. "Pa, I am stupid there is no use talking I am stupid [sic]. It is truly unfortunate that such earnestness and tenacity and so much ambition should have been put into a body incapable of doing any thing but wish," he despaired while a cadet at West Point (Letter from George S. Patton, Jr. to George S. Patton II, June 3, 1905, cited in D'Este, *Genius*, p. 84). This was despite his prodigious intellectual powers and ability to recall lengthy Bible passages and entire volumes of poetry.

At the elite Classical School for Boys, where Patton spent six years getting his first formal schooling, he was a diligent student who struggled with algebra, geometry and arithmetic because of his dyslexia. Drawing from his family-tutored knowledge, his marks in ancient and modern history were consistently high. Given the many generations of Pattons who graduated from the Virginia Military Institute (VMI) since the academy's founding, his inconsistent school record was no obstacle to admission. He started classes in September, 1903, even as his father worked tirelessly to secure his admission to West Point. His parents accompanied him to VMI, along with Aunt Nannie, setting up housekeeping near the school for the entire school year.

At VMI, Patton applied himself with vengeance. His military work rose above that of his classmates and his academic marks were good, even if he was struggling. Knowing that his dream of West Point could slip away, he redoubled his efforts and his grades steadily improved. He was aided by the dyslexic's need to strive hard to overcome all impediments. By the time he finally entered West Point in 1904, Patton had taken a passable performance at the Classical School and forged it into an impressive one at VMI. The first real and significant challenge of Patton's life had been conquered by dint of hard work and perseverance.

At West Point, Patton's consciousness as an aristocrat of Southern provenance was exceeded only by his mood swings, self-doubting, and self-aggrandizement. Patton alternately berated, then praised himself. "I am a characterless, lazy, stupid, yet ambitious dreamer; who will degenerate into a third rate second lieutenant and never command anything more than a platoon," he wrote. (Letter from George S. Patton, Jr. to George S. Patton II, 1904, cited in D'Este, *Genius*, p. 79). It was a dizzying ride through the emotional roller coaster of dyslexia. All the while, "Papa" gave patient, judicious, and loving counsel to his son. Never judgmental, always analytical, he was the lens through which Patton saw his problems clearly. Patton was torn between a vision of future greatness and doubts about his competence prompted by his dyslexia.

There were setbacks at West Point. Failing math, a typical hurdle for dyslexics, Patton was forced to repeat his plebe year. This reinforced his feelings of inadequacy, but drove him to new heights of perseverance. In his final year, Patton was named Adjutant of Cadets, and would graduate with the rank of 46th in a class of 103 cadets. He had survived into adulthood and had learned to thrive in his dyslexic world.

In conclusion, Patton's supportive upbringing, encouraged by legends of ancestral martial prowess and the attention lavished on him by close relatives, proved a correct formula for bringing the best out in a dyslexic person. His formative environment helped him become a historic figure when it would have been likely, given the extent of his disability, that he would become anonymous and marginal. Patton's family played a vital role in his development, leaving him well equipped in a society that misunderstood his condition. They provided a learning environment tailored for his com-

John Hartman
The Evidential Basis of
Psychohistory Symposium
Commentaries Wanted by April 15, 2006
June 2006 Issue

bination of brilliance and disability. Understanding Patton's disability and the efforts he undertook to overcome it help us fathom the human dimensions of a figure often caricatured as a coarse, able but sometimes irresponsible swashbuckler.

***Glen Jeansonne, PhD**, is professor of 20th-century American history at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and is the author of Women of the Far Right: The Mothers Movement and World War II (1996), Gerald L.K. Smith: Minister of Hate (1988), and much else. **David Luhrssen** is a newspaper editor and historian who has lectured at Marquette University, Beloit College, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. **Frank C. Haney** is a graduate student in history at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. They may be reached at* <gsj@uwm.edu>, <dave@shepherd-express.com>, and <fhaney@wi.rr.com>.❑

Meeting Report

Guilt–Evasion, Narcissism, and Permissiveness in the Era of Watergate

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College/the Psychohistory Forum

There was lots of excitement and controversy at the September 17, 2005 Work-In-Progress Saturday seminar. Donald Carveth (York University and private practice), Kenneth Fuchsman (University of Connecticut), and this author presented on the 1970s as the age of guilt-evasion, narcissistic-permissiveness, and Watergate. Jacques Szaluta (Merchant Marine Academy) skillfully chaired the session in a manner that allowed every last person to have her or his say. Among the 21 colleagues exchanging ideas were (allowing for multiple professional identifications), 13 therapists, eight of whom are psychoanalysts, seven professors, six psychologists, five historians, three social workers, two sociologists, and two MD's.

The genesis of this session was two-fold. At the International Society of Political Psychology annual meetings on July 3rd in Toronto, Kenneth Fuchsman and I were quite impressed with Don Carveth's discussion of Harry Guntrip's guilt evasion, leading to our thinking of guilt-evasion as a metaphor for the 1970's. Back in Connecticut, Ken started reading Bob Woodward's newly released *The Secret Man: The Story of Watergate's Deep Throat.* Ken immediately acted on my suggestion that he write an essay for Clio's Psyche on Woodward and Deep Throat (W. Mark Felt) based upon the book and his extensive knowledge of the period. As we e-mailed back and forth, I soon realized that I was peppering Professor Fuchsman with so many ideas that I had better write an essay of my own. The results were our articles, "Filial Loyalty and Rebellion in Watergate: Woodward, Felt, and Nixon," and "Reflections on 'Deep Throat,'" in the September issue of our publication. Fuchsman, whose field is recent American history suggested that we read Tom Wolfe's "The Me Decade and the Third Great Awakening" in *Mauve Gloves & Madmen, Clutter & Vine* (1976) and reread Christopher Lasch, *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (1979).

Professor Fuchsman spoke about the polarizing periods in American history when generational issues came to the fore. The young Bob Woodward felt an obligation to his father, the respectable mid-western attorney, and his "extra father," the career FBI man, Mark Felt, but in the end he betrayed both of them. After a most successful career made possible by their contributions and as an act of contrition to Felt, he wrote *The Secret Man.* Clearly, he was accepting his own guilt in the process. Woodward had described Felt as being on deep background, which meant to Woodward that he was not even supposed to acknowledge that he had a source in the administration. During the writing of *All The President's Men*, Felt told Woodward not to acknowledge him as a source and that this was part of an inviolate agreement. After the book was published with "Deep Throat" prominently featured, Woodward called Felt, and the latter hung up on him. Later, Felt accused Woodward of exploiting their relationship. Woodward admitted he felt personal responsibility for Felt's plight. (I argued that Woodward, even when expressing his own guilt, acted in a most self-serving manner.) Subsequently, Fuchsman focused on the nationalization of the culture and the economy. The group appreciated Ken's quiet

humor.

This author focused on the issue of the process and mechanisms of change about which we really do not know enough. He used the example of how "*Deep Throat*" became the first "crossover movie," viewed by middle class, "respectable" audiences as well as those who regularly frequented pornographic films. A lot of formerly "shady" things became less unthinkable in that timeframe, from pornography to illegal activities designed to destroy a candidate's campaign for president. This post-1960's atmosphere increased ambiguity and discourse about what exactly is right and wrong—acceptable or beyond the pale. The embarrassment and self-consciousness felt by the academic couples traveling to a seedy part of town to view this suddenly acceptable pornographic film vividly conveys the ambiguity of the era: should they be feeling guilty about this activity or not? Given the excesses that were to follow, such self-consciousness seems almost quaint.

Donald Carveth's focus on the issue of guilt evasion in Guntrip, society in general, and psychoanalysis in particular riveted the audience. Whereas Freud equated the unconscious need for punishment with guilt, Professor Carveth argued that the former, self-sabotaging and self-tormenting behaviors of all types, function as *defenses against* guilt: people often seem to prefer self-flagellation to the pain of having to bear guilt. Don was not sure that bearing, rather than evading, guilt was any easier in the past when the Judeo-Christian concept of the fallen-ness of human nature—the idea that everyone is a sinner—was still in place. He thinks human beings have always been inclined to evade guilt. He does find it significant as an indicator of cultural change that psychoanalysis itself seems to have turned away, from the late 1960s through to the present, from its earlier focus upon the role of the superego, guilt, and self-punishment in psychopathology, in favor of newer psychoanalytic models viewing people more as victims of parental failure than as guilty agents. He cited various articles with titles such as "Whatever Became of Sin?" (Menninger), "Whatever Became of the Superego?" (Carveth), and "The Flight from Conscience" (Wurmser). He sees psychoanalysis as reflecting culture instead of challenging it.

Carveth thought it significant that Leo Rangell, author of *The Mind of Watergate: A Study of the Compromise of Integrity* (1980), was an exception to this trend as one of the few psychoanalysts who protested against this tendency. Rangell lived in California and followed the career of Richard Nixon from his earliest days in running against Helen Gahagen Douglas, through his Watergate years, and beyond. Don Carveth reported that his own initial reaction to the cultural change was to be a hippie who rejected religion. However, in his forties he came to see the value of a mature religious belief as opposed to one based upon a fundamentalist approach searching for black and white answers and scapegoats. The interaction of Don and his wife Jean Hantman, who is a modern psychoanalyst in Philadelphia, was interesting. She sometimes finished his sentences and vice versa, which reflects a closeness that one does not expect from a couple living in Toronto and Philadelphia. Note that they will be the presenters on the subject of love, marriage, and relationship at-a-distance at a future seminar as well as in the March 2006 special feature on the subject. Carveth pointed out that he considers himself a Kleinian rather than a Freudian. He described a struggle between the paranoid schizoid (black/white, fundamentalist thinking) and the depressive position with its sadness, guilt, remorse and desire for reparation.

The meeting, with its focus on the narcissistic permissiveness of the 1970's, provoked some intense individualistic reactions from the participants. One felt that she could no longer teach in a world threatened by catastrophes. The narcissistic permissive of the 1970's was connected by Ken Fuchsman to the issues of the high divorce rate and the later advent of marriage. The Crazy Eddie electronics store commercial, "Get everything you want and get it now," was used as an example of the new mentality. Hanna Turken, a psychologist/psychoanalyst, pointed out that the system of checks and balances, the superego and ego checking the pleasure principle, broke down and still has not been restored. It was brought up that modern advertising got its beginning with Freud's nephew, Edward Bernays, in the 1920s. This author noted that the motto of modern society often appears to be, "where superego was, there id shall be." David Beisel argued that pleasure brings the guilt for which we then punish ourselves. There was also a

good deal of discussion of the issue of what Freud called "the narcissism of minor differences." Some networking that followed the session included psychologist George Victor calling this author to help find an exact Freud citation.

In a turn to economics and psychoeconomics, Lee Solomon, a retired businessman and friend of the late economist Robert Heilbroner, thinks of modern technological society as a giant eating machine, consuming resources. He argued that there is a tectonic change in the struggle for resources as the United States no longer dominates the world economy but must compete with so many other players. He cited Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950) regarding the need for fiscal restraint.

Though the meeting was quite successful, the impact of Hurricane Katrina and impending Hurricanes Ophelia and Rita was felt and perhaps helps to explain the tendency of some participants to jump to different subjects. As psychohistorians we were all aware that we were not isolated from the main currents of our society.

***Paul H. Elovitz, PhD**, is the convener/director of the Psychohistory Forum and editor of this publication. He would like to thank Professors Carveth and Fuchsman for their assistance in writing this report. He may be contacted at <pelovitz@aol.com>.* ❑

BOOK REVIEWS

Psychoanalytic Explorations of the Arab-Israeli Conflict

Leah Slivko
Private Practice and NYU

Review of Avner Falk, Fratricide in the Holy Land, A Psychoanalytic View of the Arab-Israeli Conflict. Madison: Terrace Books of the University of Wisconsin Press, 2204. ISBN 0-29920250-X, i-vii, 271 pages, cloth, $35.00.

Fratricide in the Holy Land is an articulate and intense analytic study of the Arab-Israeli conflict that exists in the land Israelis call Israel and Palestinians claim is Palestine. Though both people have a love for their Middle Eastern land, their intense mistrust, betrayal, and oppressive history override the use of their energy in a constructive conjoint effort. Instead, the cycle of violence, war, death, and constantly challenging geographical boundaries dominates the relationship between these two small nations.

Dr. Falk presents a profound picture of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the variety of forces in play. Though he provides insight from history, value systems, Ariel Sharon, Yasser Arafat, terrorists—including suicide bombers—and traumatized victims on both sides of the conflict, there is a furor that goes beyond rational examination. From a historical point of view, Falk examines the various dynamics of why the conflict between Arab and Jew exists and how so many opportunities to end the conflict have failed. The title of the book is poignant as it rightfully suggests how closely related the Arab and Jew are and how based on biblical history; they are indeed half-brothers who have fought for thousands of years. This fight would be very difficult to let go of as in and of itself, but also it gives both parties a sense of dignity and identity. Israelis and Palestinians long for power over a land they share and in which they have both been oppressed for centuries under the rule of Babylonians, Persians, Macedonians, Ottoman Turks, the British, and so forth. Both peoples have experienced severe trauma, the disdain of others, and attempts at establishing a place of safety and security that are now showing some promise.

The tragic conflict between Jewish Israelis and Palestinian Arabs is described as "two traumatized groups of people on a tiny piece of real estate that keep on traumatizing one another and themselves." They share "a small sliver of land along the eastern Mediterranean coast known as the Holy Land [and are] locked in a tragic and endless war that neither can win and which causes further deaths, trauma, and misery to both." Though by any measure it is certainly irrational, it "has been going on for over a century at such [a] terrible cost to the two antagonists" (p. 5).

This Israeli psychohistorian and psychologist is correct in calling the conflict irrational. There are several dimensions to it. Both peoples have a religious basis to their connection to the land and in having such a claim to the land, neither

can let go of their struggle to hold onto the land as a strong symbol of duty and loyalty. Both have been reinforced by biblical texts and through education to hold onto the land at all costs.

When religious beliefs are held intact, there are prohibitions on examining them in a psychoanalytic framework as they are sacred to the people and are literally experienced as truth and reality. Both nations hold deeply to their biblical and historical right to the land. Each perspective has truth to it and what is difficult to let go of, is the belief that giving up any of their right to the terra firma would mean defeat rather than peace.

In deepening the understanding of the conflict, Dr. Falk summarizes the scholarly literature written on the Arab-Israeli conflict from historical, political, psychoanalytic, and other perspectives. He highlights the impact of perceived reality, national identities, leadership qualities and their impact in perpetuating the conflict rather than resolving it. He is a pioneer in developing psychogeography, using its concepts to beautifully illustrates unconscious projections onto borders, cities, deserts, lakes, and mountains. Space is used by both nations to give a sense of national self, though without clearly defined borders that can be agreed upon by these two nations or even by external forces. This leaves both with unresolved longing for what is perceived as their own motherland, which must be fought for as they would for their own mother. Each continues to feel betrayed, misunderstood, and abused by the other in their efforts to hold onto what is rightfully theirs.

As a psychoanalyst, I am struck by the psychodynamics explored though I am also left with questions. For example, why were the dynamics of primitive innate aggression not included? What suggestions does the author have regarding how to intervene in the process of healing, bringing the unconscious to consciousness and engaging both nations in a healing process? What policies might the author suggest to help both nations contain their aggression so they can openly reflect upon themselves and each other in order to change their ongoing underlying psychodynamics which contribute to the conflict? How can the cycle of anger be broken and worked through rather than acted upon as has happened interminably? Why has the leadership of both people been unable to control acts of disrespect and violence? How can the threat of political instability, war, and poverty be ended?

The book reminded me of a conflict I recently witnessed at the Children's Museum in New York City between two four-year-old playmates. The girls had been playing happily until they simultaneously sought to be in the small driving seat of a vehicle on exhibit they had watched an older child drive. They started to shove each other off the chair, each wanting it to herself. They both shouted, "Mine!" Within a few seconds, the shouting turned into pushing, punching, hair pulling, crying, and hysterics. No parent took charge, but a young adult stepped in with a voice of firm reason. "Girls, stop fighting over that chair! Either you share it or one of you sit on the chair right beside this one over here," she declared. Upon hearing an external voice and solution to the situation, the girls stopped their fighting, gained some awareness of themselves, and then they negotiated taking turns.

Call for Papers

Psychology of Sports

Special Issue, June 2006

Some possible approaches to this topic include:

- The expression of emotion in sports
- Idealization & denigration of sports/athletes
- Baseball as the national pastime—an historical viewpoint
- Personal and national identity through sports
- The psychological functions of different sports
- The development and psychology of professional sports
- Girls and women in sports
- Steroid & alcohol abuse among athletes
- Sports as the "moral equivalent to war"
- The team and the superstar

Articles of 500-1500 words are due on April 15, 2006. One long article may be accepted.

Please Send an Abstract or Outline ASAP.
All Articles will be Refereed.

Contact Paul H. Elovitz, Editor
pelovitz@aol.com

The girls' behavior was spontaneous, passionate, and explosive until someone intervened. In the Middle East, the constant rage between the two nations continues to be ignited by those whose destructive use of it is reinforced by education, belief systems, and self-righteousness. When lives are constantly threatened by suicide bombers whose cause is more valuable than their lives and by soldiers whose purpose is to defend their country and people by retaliation, there is little room to stop, reflect and resolve. The primitive rage has yet to be contained by outside powers.

Dr. Falk's book captures the intensity felt by Palestinians and Israelis. His work invites not only scholars, but all who are invested in changing the forces of war and peace to examine more closely how to use intense energy in a positive creative manner rather than continue to focus the energy in the destructive cycle on ongoing power struggles in controlling the land.

The pessimistic conclusion Dr. Falk offers in *Fratricide* disappointed me: he declares that "all attempts to end war during the past century have largely failed" (p. 189). If scholars and people in power let go of their hope for resolution, how then will the people of the two conflicting nations who do not have the ability to contain their intense feelings of anger, fear, despair, anguish, and daily tension, be able to reinforce their positive life forces? If a belief system given ultimate authority in identifying the land is more important than life itself, how then does individual life maintain its value?

Perhaps, as a clinician, I am too optimistic to hope that the passion of both nations can be rechannelled into positive action. I have always been struck as to how protective and loving both nations are of their own families and of whom they invite into their homes. They are able to be extremely generous and warm to visitors from foreign lands, openly discussing their strife and joys of keeping their land—their love. Why is it then, that the aggression cannot be used in a positive way?

Although Dr. Falk gives many insights into the forces at play in maintaining the Arab-Israeli conflict, the insights do not provide resolutions. They do, however, provide an opening for ongoing discussion in how to make a powerful positive impact when destructive dynamics are repeated over and over again. As psychoanalytic literature suggests, we continue to repeat until we resolve; it is repeated differently each time until we finally do master the conflict. I commend Avner Falk for his clarity, conviction, and honesty in providing the reader with a thorough and intense look at the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Leah Slivko, LICSW, Psych.D*, is a psychoanalyst in private practice in Amherst, MA and New York City who lived in Israel for a while in the late 1990's. She is an adjunct associate professor at the NYU School of Social Work, a control analyst at the New Jersey Institute for Training in Psychoanalysis, a Faculty Member at the Eastern Group Psychotherapy Society's Group Training Program, and a member of both the International Psychoanalytic and Israeli Psychoanalytic associations. She can be reached at <lslivko@hotmail.com>.* ❑

Pathologizing Women's Pain: The Tyranny of the Experts

Evelyn Sommers
Private Practice—Toronto

Review of Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of the Experts' Advice to Women. New York: Second Anchor Books Edition, 2005. Paperback ISBN 1400078008, 410 pages, $ 14.00.

If ever I held doubt that the medical profession holds power over its patients, a client I call Terry dispelled it. She had been taking antidepressant medication for years despite her ambivalence about doctors and its benefits. She was also in psychotherapy, making progress with significant issues in her life. Even though she felt much better, the prescribing physician advised her to continue with medication. Three days before Christmas Terry ran out of the pills and did not renew the prescription. By Christmas Eve, she was experiencing symptoms—heart palpitations and anxiety—and on Christmas Day she sought out a pharmacy hoping to get even one pill to carry her through to the next day when her usual pharmacy was open. A pharmacist cooperated and gave her a supply. Terry left the store, got into her car, and

swallowed a pill. It was only halfway down her throat when her symptoms disappeared.

As she related the story to me, Terry expressed amazement. She realized that it was impossible for the pill to have such an immediate effect and was stunned at the impact of taking it. She concluded that her doctor's words—his cautions about staying on the antidepressants over winter and weaning off them very gradually—had the greatest impact on her. She believed she should not have disobeyed and that her recovery was a direct result of re-compliance with his instructions.

Terry's story is a modern one, filled with hope for she went on to make choices that felt right to her, including becoming medication-free. In *For Her Own Good* Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English present a history that lurks behind Terry's experiences. They write about women's experiences with the advice they have received from experts, most of whom were male medical doctors and scientists.

The authors trace the evolution of medical practice to the present from a period they call the "old order" when women were the producers of food, clothing and household goods, and the healers, administering herbal remedies to their families. The Industrial Revolution changed women's lives dramatically. With husbands who became the monied middle class, the women's traditional contributions were outsourced. Stripped of their roles as producers and healers the women fell under the long shadow of another product of the era, the newly minted male physician-scientists who began to treat the women's increasing ennui and sense of purposelessness as pathology. Clamoring for relief the women sought out those who offered the promise of help even though it meant normal functions such as menstruation and childbirth were reclassified as illnesses. Doctors who armed themselves with so-called scientific findings offered the latest "cures" and acquired a celebrity status while women embraced them as a way to enhance their own status and demonstrate their up-to-the minute knowledge. Unwittingly contributing to their own oppression, the women complied with such bizarre "cures" as leeches in their uteruses, clitoridectomies, and the "rest cure" that kept them immobile in darkened bedrooms eating bland diets for months on end.

Physicians took every opportunity to treat the social problem of what to do with women as a commodity, by offering various cures at fees that were within the reach only of women of the middle and upper classes. Intent on wiping out all competition for fee-paying patients they even usurped the jobs of midwives for the lower classes who were no competition for them in the medical marketplace. With the rise of the profession of obstetrics-gynecology, lower class women were needed in the charity hospitals since no women of a higher class could be expected to serve as raw material for the student physicians, and the midwives' work became redundant. Some black female slaves were kept exclusively for surgical experimentation. A particularly zealous surgeon operated on one of them thirty times in four years. Lower class women might have been spared any exposure to these machinations had it not been for the scientists' need for human subjects to test out their theories and practice their skills as surgeons.

The experts' rise to power over women is startling. It involved destroying or discrediting the networks through which women had learned from each other. They did this through the promotion of science, fortified by wealth and women—especially educated women—who went along with the notion that to ignore science was to live in the Dark Ages. The ironies abound. Women were infantilized but bought into the system in order to appear knowledgeable by siding with the experts. Doctors were revered while practicing in ways that must surely have raised some eyebrows. Women who challenged the all-male education system and won places in it became educated in men's science and consequently, were no help liberating women from the grip of the experts.

Women were unfulfilled, unhappy and vulnerable. An unexpected result of the women's discontent was a declining birthrate among the privileged classes. Women were either too sick to have sex, or they used illness as a reason to avoid it. This was viewed as an alarming trend by the likes of psychologist G. Stanley Hall and Theodore Roosevelt: the President said it meant disaster for the nation because poorer specimens were still propagating. Hysteria, a new trend, emerged in women's illness and was to be the straw that fi-

nally broke the hold of the gynecologist over women. It seems that women began to use the notion of illness for their own purposes to the frustration of a medical profession that was losing control of them. There was speculation in medical journals that women were utilizing illness to avoid work and responsibility as well as to gain power over their husbands, children, and doctors. Hysteria was a logical outcome of the "cult of female invalidism." The medical answer was psychoanalysis. Malingering was reassigned illness status and women were encouraged to confess their resentment in psychoanalysis and accept their role as women.

As a new spirit of activism gripped America in the early 20th century, women loosened their garments and became more mobile. A new era was ushered in, one in which housekeeping, conceptualized as a full-time profession, was described by a new set of experts, domestic scientists, many of whom were women. In time, motherhood was pathologized and child-raising was subjected to scientific scrutiny. Dr. Spock emerged as the expert on children, overriding mothers' and grandmothers' inclinations based on knowledge of their offspring.

In their valuable book, Ehrenreich and English present a powerful argument against compliance with experts. A new "Foreword" and some additions to the "Afterward" bring this edition up to 2004 while the analysis remains as clear and compelling as in the first edition (Anchor Books, 1979). They advise women to think for themselves and dig deeper than the degrees and studies that modern experts present to them.

There are, however, a number of omissions. They do not address the creation of the depression phenomenon of which women are the primary—acknowledged—sufferers. They do not address the fact that pharmaceutical companies educate the first line of contact with patients, the family doctor, and so have become the experts behind the experts. Neither do they probe the emotional and sometimes physical disfigurement of women in the name of beauty through plastic surgery. Aging has become the new women's problem to be exploited by the battery of medical experts and yet it rates not a mention in this volume.

The authors seem inimical to psychology, and I am uncomfortable with their discussion of it. Ehrenreich and English cast practitioners in the same damning role of experts. Early psychologists worked within the range of interpretation available to them, which also happened to be the language of women's oppression so it may deserve bad press. The current trend towards sound-bite answers to complex problems is disturbing. But theory and practice have been evolving and we therapists are not all slick-tongued shamans as they imply. Psychology, used in the service of liberation can help women, men, and children to develop the strengths they require to face intense pressures to comply and conform.

It is important to be cautious with interpretations of events not lived through and impossible to reproduce. The authors write a history of female oppression bordering on the sensational. Yet there were strengths and movements that carried women through. The experts may have destroyed networks, but women formed others, as they continued to make their ways in the world. Ehrenreich and English reserve most of their comments on women's activism to the feminist movement of the past half-century. They note that it was feminism that exposed the problems but state that feminists are now holding back in uncertainty. They recognize that the woman question has yielded to a much larger one, how women and men together can manage civilization.

This history book is a valuable resource for laywomen and experts alike. If we all dig deeper, remember the past, and reflect on the present, we may avoid a repetition of the suffering documented within it.

***Evelyn Sommers, PhD**, is a psychologist in private practice in Toronto, Canada. Among her publications are Voices From Within: Women Who Have Broken the Law (University of Toronto Press, 1995) and The Tyranny of Niceness: Unmasking the Need for Approval (Dundurn Group, 2005). The case of Terry is adapted from her most recent book. For more information visit her website at <www.ekslibris.ca>.* ❑

Our non-profit welcomes volunteers
to help with our publication and website

Woman's Story—A Disruptive Act

Ellen Toronto
Private Practice

Review essay of Jerome A. Winer, James Anderson, and Christine C. Kieffer, eds., Psychoanalysis and Women The Annual of Psychoanalysis Vol. XXXII (Hilsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press, 2004) ISBN 0-88163-421-2, pages 253, $37.50.

Carol Gilligan wrote "…I came to a sudden and…startling realization that to bring women's lives into history was a disruptive act. It would change the account of both life-history and history by illuminating a reality of connectedness where separateness had been assumed" (p.132). The impact of women's history is everywhere, in every field of endeavor and human thought. Changes in human practice come more slowly. Errors and abuses based on an assumption of male subjectivity and male supremacy abound. But women's voices grow louder and more determined—speaking in behalf of the mutuality of relationships and the inter-connectedness of all humanity.

Women have spoken with particular cogency from the heart of psychoanalysis, despite its patriarchal origins and early leanings. As a method of listening and gathering data from the depths of the human mind it has provided a fertile ground from which women's story can be told. *Psychoanalysis and Women* has assembled a striking collections of articles that document the history and evolution of its "founding mothers"—the likes of Edith Jacobson, Marion Milner, Therese Benedek, Dorothy Burlingham, and Anna Freud—as well as later contributors to its theory and practice.

I have often wondered how Freud himself might react, not only to the disruptive acts but also to the seismic shifts that have occurred in psychoanalysis, due in large part to the influx of women and their perspective. Would he welcome and incorporate a relational perspective? Would he consider the reality of seduction in the lives of many women and children or would he ignore it as have other monolithic institutions? Allow me to pursue this line of thinking as I reflect on the articles collected here.

The first section of *Psychoanalysis and Women* presents clinical material including an in-depth study of a cancer patient and an examination of "defensive autonomy" in white heterosexual middle class women. Joyce McDougal writes with her customary clarity and compassion of a woman whose self-hatred had taken residence in her body as a deadly form of breast cancer. An unloved child, the patient felt that she could survive but could not live. In short, she had become her cancer. The article describes the poignant interplay of patient and therapist as the patient was able to let go of death and fully embrace her cancer treatment. Freud himself struggled with cancer and I would conjecture that he would have welcomed the opportunity to speak of his illness, even to analyze its psychological roots in his own history with a compassionate analyst such as Dr. McDougall.

The theoretical section takes up, among other issues, the topic of passivity from a number of vantage points as delineated by Jessica Benjamin, Julia Kristeva and Ethel Spector Person. Benjamin deconstructs the equation of femininity with passivity, contending that "passivity is not a preexisting 'thing' that is repudiated by the male psyche; rather it is constructed by it" (p. 45). Rather than viewing the female as a "container", designed to hold male tension and discharge, she presents an intersubjective economy between two subjects who can both contain and discharge in mutual regulation. Her concept depends upon a mother as subject, not the invisible mother of Freud's poor Dora or the 'holding environment' of later theorists. We know that "Mother" was a particular blind spot for Freud and for early psychoanalysis in general as was the daughter in the father-daughter relationship. Christine Kieffer points out the paucity of literature about the latter relationship except when it is focused on father-daughter incest. She then goes on to provide a unique perspective on the Pyrrhic victory suffered by the favored daughter, the so-called Oedipal victor, who becomes a mere extension of her father's projections and wishes. Again I wonder whether Freud would have recognized in this description the shadow of his own daughter Anna.

Personal narratives of women in the forefront of psychoanalysis and feminism comprise the fourth section of this volume. We learn of the

meeting and subsequent communication of Nancy Chodorow and Jessica Benjamin. Brenda Solomon describes her supervision with Therese Benedek and Marian Tolpin in the Chicago Institute. Malkah Notman recounts her participation in a ten-year psychoanalytic workshop which included Carol Gilligan and other noted women theorists.

The authors recount the history of their consciousness-raising and the evolution of their thinking. Chodorow describes her early dismissal of biological determinism and her subsequent reappraisal, forged by clinical experience and her own experience with motherhood, of the importance of puberty, menarche, the potential for pregnancy, pregnancy and childbirth in female development and psychic representation. Her training and experience finally led her to the notion of the clinical individual who cognizes experience with body, family, culture and dominant relationships to give unique meaning to gender and self. It is Chodorow's contention that "beginning with Freud, there is no single femininity, masculinity, or sexuality; we have misread him if there is" (p.118). We have focused on the well-known and tortuous path to normative femininity. But this approach ignores the many women he studied, treated and worked with who had their own ideas about femininity and could, in no way, be reduced to a singular "woman."

In the last section of the book Marian Tolpin presents a provocative article on the case of Dora as a timely opportunity for Freud to revise his 'mistaken' seduction theory. She also reviews his lengthy search for a "normal female castration complex" and the corroboration he sought from aspiring female analysts. We learn of the contribution of early female pioneers such as Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham who translated Freud's beginning recognition of the importance of the mother into the origins of parent-infant observation in psychoanalysis. Therese Benedek, another pioneer, further elaborated the significance of empathic communication between mother and child. While remaining committed to Freud's theory, she focused on the transactional nature of parent-child interaction and translated her findings into the therapeutic relationship which author, Erika Schmidt, argues became a prototype for two-person relational psychology.

Schmidt points out that Benedek understood Freud's ideas about women in historical context. In light of his sensitive work with patients and colleagues she did not believe him to be a misogynist. Following that line of thinking, I believe that Papa Freud would be quite proud of *Psychoanalysis and Women*. He would be excited to know that his theoretical daughters have minds of their own such that they can modify, enlarge, deepen and even disrupt his theory to explain phenomena that he could only begin to understand.

As a 'first wave' psychoanalytic feminist I am thrilled with the volume. In the last several weeks it has become my bedtime reading, a position usually accorded only to top-rated page-turning fiction. The poignant clinical descriptions, the clear explanations of theoretical shifts, the personal narratives of consciousness-raising, and the biographies of courageous women pioneers have grabbed me at my core. It places in perspective the changes initiated by women in the field and, as such; I believe it is a "must-read" for serious students of the history of psychoanalysis. It confirms yet again the message at the heart of psychoanalysis, that, given sufficient exploration of the human mind and its intricacies, all of us, including Freud, can change.

***Ellen Toronto, PhD**, a therapist and psychoanalyst in private practice in Ann Arbor, is a founding member and past president of the Michigan Psychoanalytic Council. She has presented and published in the areas of women, gender studies, mothering, and nonverbal communication in the therapeutic setting. Dr. Toronto is co-editor of Psychoanalytic Reflections of a Gender-free Case: Into the Void (NY: Routledge, 2005) and may be reached at <etoronto@umich.edu>.* ❑

Paul Roazen (1936-2005): In Memoriam

Daniel Burston
Duquesne University

Paul Roazen, a political scientist and historian of psychoanalysis, died at age sixty-nine in Boston on November 3rd from complications of Crohn's disease. His life began in Boston on August 14, 1936 as the second of three children of a

Jewish family making its living in the auto parts business. In 1954, he graduated from Brookline High School, and in 1958, from Harvard College, where he studied American Government with Robert McCloskey. He went on to do graduate work in political science and psychoanalysis at the University of Chicago, Oxford, and finally, at Harvard, where he was mentored by Louis Hartz and Erik Erikson.

With the help of Helene Deutsch, Roazen embarked on a massive research project, between 1964 and 1967, interviewing seventy people who had known Freud personally, (twenty-five of whom were also patients), and forty others who were involved in the early history of the psychoanalytic movement. This voluminous body of data furnished the basis for many of his books in years to come. He was also the first non-psychoanalyst to be granted access to the library at the British Psychoanalytical Institute. Anna Freud, who allowed him access, heartily regretted her decision when Roazen published *Brother Animal* (1969), an instructive but extremely controversial gloss on the correspondence between Sigmund Freud and Lou Andreas Salome concerning an all but forgotten analyst named Victor Tausk who had once shown considerable promise, but committed suicide while under Salome's care. As it happens, Freud was analyzing Salome while she was analyzing Tausk, and in retrospect, Freud's attitude toward Tausk was profoundly disconcerting. Roazen antagonized Anna Freud and her circle even further when he revealed in *Freud and His Followers* (1975) that she had been analyzed by her own father. Kurt Eissler, a Freudian stalwart, wrote a scathing critique of Roazen in 1985 entitled *Victor Tausk's Suicide*. While seriously flawed, Eissler's book embodied the attitude of many analytic practitioners who felt that Roazen's work was little more than "gossip."

While Professor Roazen did not flinch from igniting controversies like these during his colorful career, he also devoted considerable effort to spelling out the political and philosophical roots and ramifications of psychoanalytic theories at the social, cultural and historical level. Indeed, his first book *Freud: Political and Social Thought* (1968), was an adaptation of his doctoral thesis: it paved the way for his appointments in the Political Science Department and the Social Science Division at York University in Toronto, where he taught from 1971 to 1995, prior to taking early retirement to become Professor Emeritus. Always a prolific writer, Roazen continued to publish widely until his death, including a study of Canada's most popular (and eccentric) Prime Minister, William Lyon Mackenzie King, entitled *Canada's King: As Essay in Political Psychology* (1998). "The Political Psychology of Paul Roazen," was published in Clio's Psyche (Vol. 2, 4: 73, 75-80) as a featured scholar interview and his article, "The Enigma of Canada's MacKenzie King," was published prior to the release of the above mentioned book (Vol. 4, 4: 122-126). At the time of his death he was researching the papers of Ambassador William Bullitt who, together with Freud, wrote a psychological study of Woodrow Wilson. A book on Bullitt is one of three forthcoming books listed in Paul Roazen's CV. Roazen is survived by two sons, Jules and Daniel, whom he fathered with his former wife, Deborah Heller.

Daniel Burston's *biography may be found on page* 138.❑

Paul Roazen: A Memoir

Donald Carveth
Glendon College of York University

I was very sorry to learn of the death of my old colleague and friend, Paul Roazen. We taught together at York University here in Toronto and participated in the activities of the psychoanalytic community here for many years before Paul retired and moved back to Cambridge. Early in his career, Paul devoted himself to the history of psychoanalysis, seeking to interview everyone he could find who had played a part in the movement in its earlier days. The result is a fascinating and important body of work on Freud, Helene Deutsch, Victor Tausk, Erik Erikson, Eduardo Weiss, and many other key players in the history of psychoanalysis.

Unfortunately, members of the movement Freud created have not always been able to overcome the very human inclination to idealize the master and defend his reputation against critics—real and imagined. As a result, Paul was not always beloved of the Freudians because, while in my opinion never devaluing Freud, he also refused

to idealize him, insisting on seeing him whole, warts and all, as is the proper task of any decent scholar. Paul was a witty man who usually had a smile on his face and an engaging twinkle in his eye. He was a scholar through and through. I think it can be said he was in love with scholarship.

On a few occasions in more recent years, Paul and I discussed the thinly disguised Roman Catholicism that is Lacanian theory. I think it was Paul who drew my attention to the fact that Lacan's brother was a Benedictine monk. A central Lacanian concept is the *name-of-the-father* (hear "in the name of the father, the son, and the Holy Spirit"). Another is the concept of the cure as "acceptance of castration" (hear crucifixion: "lack" as holes in the hands, the feet, the side). So many Lacanians seem to be ex-Catholics, ex-priests, ex-nuns, though some, like William Richardson, are still active in the priesthood. Often these folks don't seem to like it pointed out that Lacanism is Roman Catholicism filtered through Hegel, Heidegger, de Saussure, Sartre and Freud. Who can blame them? They want to be psychoanalysts and psychoanalysis has not always been very friendly to Christians. Meissner seems to have survived by splitting his identity as analyst from his identity as Jesuit priest, keeping them in airtight separate compartments. Leavy only announced his life-long Anglo-Catholicism after he retired as an analyst.

My generation seems to have it a little easier. Though not an analyst himself, I'm sure Paul would have been amused had I had a chance to tell him of a relevant experience of my own that took place not so long ago. In the process of my becoming a supervising and training analyst, I received a bizarre telephone call from the Chair of the Institute Membership Committee occasioned by the fact that during a cocktail party at my home, at which the doors were opened to my home office, someone spotted a King James Bible in my consulting room. Naturally my secular humanist colleagues were concerned that I might be using the clinical setting, not to bring people to secular humanist ideology as they do, but to Jesus. Finally, embarrassed to have been forced to ask these questions (which I can't imagine anyone asking a Muslim, a Buddhist, or an orthodox Jew, for fear of human rights violations), my colleague admitted he too had a Bible in his consulting room, a Jewish one, and we discussed matters of translation.

As a social scientist, Paul Roazen was a man who understood the ideological nature even of our own ideologies. I wish more colleagues got this point.

***Donald Carveth, PhD**, is a sociologist and psychoanalyst teaching at Glendon College of York University for over thirty-five years. He is a training and supervising psychoanalyst in the Canadian Institute of Psychoanalysis and past Editor-in-Chief of the* Canadian Journal of Psychoanalysis/ Revue Canadienne de Psychanalyse. *Professor Carveth has published extensively and of late has focused on guilt evasion in Harry Guntrip and others. Many of his papers are on his website http://www.yorku.ca/dcarveth.* ❑

Bulletin Board

The next **Psychohistory Forum Work-In-Progress Saturday Seminar** will be on **February 4, 2006** when **Jean Hantman** (private practice-Philadelphia) and **Donald Carveth** (York University and private practice) will present on **"Marriage At-A-Distance."** Subsequent 2006 presentations will include **David Lotto** on "**Vengeance," Eli Sagan** on **"The Need for a Secular Sacred Response to Fundamentalism,"** and **Peter Petschauer** *et al*, **"The Search for the Father and Other Explorations in Autobiography"** on **September 30, 2006.** We also hope to finalize plans for a session on suicide and on suicidal terrorism. **CONFERENCES:** There is still an open call for papers from the IPA and ISPP: the **June 7-9, 2005 International Psychohistory Association** meetings will be at Fordham Law School and the **International Society for Political Society** meetings will be on **July 12-16, 2006** in **Barcelona**. **NOTES ON COLLEAGUES: Maria Miliora** retired earlier this year from her professorship at Suffolk University and her private practice of psychoanalysis to recuperate from brain surgery and devote full time to her research and writing. We wish her well and congratulate her on the 2004 publication of *The Scorsese Psyche on Screen: Roots of Themes and Characters in the Film* (McFarland). Her next book, *America's Old West in Fact and in the Movies*, is half completed. **Ruth Dale Meyer** presented "Clio's Circle: Historians

Who Dare to Embrace the Unconscious" in the October 15, 2005 Santa Barbara conference, "When History Wakes: Cultural and Ecological Memory. **Montague Ullman** gave a November 10, 2005 seminar, "Dreaming as a Natural Healing System," in Manhattan. On October 10th, **Joseph Held** was honored by the Hungarian Academy of Science. **Glen Jeansonne** is completing the 600-page manuscript for *A Time of Paradox: America Since 1890*, to be published by Rowman and Littlefield early in 2006. He is also writing *Herbert Hoover: Fighting Quaker*. To devote himself to creating art**, Joe Illick** retired from San Francisco State University. **Margo Kren** spent five months in China earlier this year. **Jerry Piven** has taken a position in the Philosophy Department at Case Western Reserve University. **DEATHS:** The sad news has come to our attention that **Elizabeth Wirth Marvick** died of natural causes on the night of April 18th. **Betty Glad** is writing an obituary and reminiscences are welcome. **WELCOME:** to new member **Lee Solomen. OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Benefactors Herbert Barry and Ralph Colp; Patrons David Beisel, Andrew Brink, Mary Lambert, Peter Loewenberg, David Lotto, and Shirley Stewart; Sustaining Member Jacques Szaluta; Supporting Members Rudolph Binion, Paul Elovitz, David Felix, Jacqueline Paulson, Edryce Reynolds, and the Shneidmans; and Members Michael Britton, Charles Gouaux, Michael Isaacs, Maria Miliora, Margery Quackenbush, and Roberta Rubin. Our appreciation to Forum hosts Mary Lambert and Connie and Lee Schniedman. Our thanks for thought provoking materials to Dick Booth, Daniel Burston, Don Carveth, Mark Fisher, Ken Fuchsman, Ted Goertzel, Frank Haney, Judith Harris, Marshall Harth, Glen Jeansonne, Danielle Knafo, Peter Loewenberg, David Luhrssen, Ruth Dale Meyer, Robert Pois, Leah Slivko, Evelyn Sommers, Jacques Szaluta, Ellen Toronto, Kari Vander Weit, and Elisabeth Young-Bruehl. Our thanks to David Beisel and Dick Booth for selective editing, Nancy Dobosiewicz for proofing/ Publisher 2003 software application, Tom Ossa for proofing/web design/computer instruction, and to Theresa Graziano, Laura Greene, and Kari Vander Weit for proofing. We wish to thank our numerous referees, who must remain anonymous.❑

Call for Papers

Love, Marriage, and Relationship At-A-Distance

Special Issue, March 2006

Some possible approaches to this topic include:

- The fantasies and realities of love
- Proximity and attachment
- Case studies
- Is this a second marriage phenomenon?
- Changing expectations in second marriages
- The impact of the Internet and cell phones
- Fantasies and realities of Internet dating
- Other people's children
- Internet relations in the movies: i.e. "*Must Love Dogs*"
- Negotiating intimacy at-a-distance
- The statistics behind the relationships and a case study
- How to nurture love and marriage at-a-distance
- Facing personal and family crises at-a-distance
- Marital strife at a distance
- The need for personal space when together
- Correlations between childhood, personality, and long distance marriage
- Immigrant marriage at-a-distance
- Intercontinental arranged marriages
- Love and marriage in war
- Marriage, relationships, and love in different historical periods and cultures
- Interviews with distant marriage partners
- Reviews of relevant books

Articles of 500-1500 words are due on January 15, 2006. One long article is welcome.

Please Send an Abstract or Outline ASAP.
All Articles will be Refereed.

Contact Paul H. Elovitz, Editor
pelovitz@aol.com