
Clio's Psyche

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

Volume 10 Number 1

June 2003

Classics and Psychohistorians Special Feature

The Editor's Classics

Paul H. Elovitz
Clio's *Psyche* and
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, is to my mind one of the great classics of our field because it deals with the essential issues that we face as civilized human beings. Peter Loewenberg, *Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach*, is a work that I find to be invaluable as both a teacher and a scholar. Lloyd deManse, "The Evolution of Childhood," is pathbreaking scholarship and a wonderful intro-

(Continued on page 12)

The Child Psychology of Mr. Rogers Special Feature

The Trolley and The Tunnel

Dereck Daschke
Truman State University

While a regular watcher of "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood" when growing up in the early to mid-1970s, I cannot say that I remember it particularly well today -- it is not as wedded to my psyche as "Sesame Street," "The Electric Company," and, dare I say, "The Brady Bunch" or "The Monkees." Hence it is all the more interesting that one of the single most memorable dreams from my childhood was a disturbing visit to Mr. Rogers' "Neighborhood"

(Continued on page 22)

War with Iraq

Special Feature

Bush's America Goes To War

Rudolph Binion
Brandeis University

The ghastly aerial attack of 9/11 on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, the financial and military nerve centers of our nation, was traumatic in the strictest sense of the word. A trauma is a deep wound to the mind, heart, and nerves that will not heal. Not just individuals, but large groups, even whole peoples, can be traumatized. 9/11 traumatized Americans collectively.

Three kinds of reaction follow on a trauma either singly or in combination. One is incessant, painful recall. Another is too-late defense against the traumatic blow. The third, and most drastic, is to relive the trauma in disguise unawares.

Traumatized America is reacting in all three ways at once. The haunting remembrance of 9/11, the memorialization and mourning, have hardly diminished since the event, which has meanwhile crept into the subsoil of our fantasies and nightmares. We have defended against its recurrence in its original form by focusing vital counterterrorist controls inordinately on airports and immigrants, as if bin Laden would simple-mindedly try the very same stunt a second time. And we are conjuring up 9/11 in thin disguise through a war on Iraq which, billed as a war on terrorism, is as if calculated to promote more terror-ism -- a textbook case of traumatic reliving.

That war was launched by an aerial attack on the nerve centers of Iraq's capital and main city: shades of 9/11. It bore the distinctly traumatic code name "Shock and Awe." Ostensibly designed to

Turn to the next page for

IN THIS ISSUE

IN THIS ISSUE

<p style="text-align: center;">War with Iraq</p> <p>Bush's America Goes to War1 Rudolph Binion</p> <p>The Second Bush Persian Gulf War3 <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i></p> <p>Dreaming of War in Iraq8 <i>Kelly Bulkeley</i></p> <p>War as Spectacle Makes the Human Tragedy Banal...9 <i>Junta Vilhena and Sergio Medeiros</i></p> <p>War Casualties Include Empathy11 <i>Herbert Barry III</i></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Classics and Psychohistorians</p> <p>The Editor's Classics1 <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i></p> <p>What Psychohistory Means to Me12 <i>David Lotto</i></p> <p>My Life as Historian with Freud13 <i>David Felix</i></p> <p>Erik H. Erikson as a Pioneer of Psychohistory15 <i>Juhami Ihanus</i></p> <p>Rocking the Cradle16 <i>Victor Wei/Temkin ein</i></p> <p>Adventures in Psychobiography with Fighting Bob <i>La Follette</i>17 <i>Nancy C Unger</i></p>	<p>On Being a Psychohistorian 19 <i>Sander) Breiner</i></p> <p>Neglected Works in Psychohistory 20 <i>Leon Rappoport</i></p> <p>My Psychohistorical Classics 21 <i>Robert Pots</i></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">The Child Psychology of Mr. Rogers</p> <p>The Trolley and The Tunnel 1 <i>Dereck Daschke</i></p> <p>"Won't You Be My Neighbor?": Mr. Rogers as an Ethical Model23 <i>Thomas G. Plante</i></p> <p>Mr. Rogers: The Nature of the Man24 <i>Laura E Levine</i></p> <p>"Mr. Rogers Preaching"24 <i>H. John Rogers</i></p> <hr/> <p>J. Lee Shneidman26 <i>Paul H. Elovitz</i></p> <p>Fame: Erikson Family Materials31 <i>Meeting Report by Hanna Turken</i></p> <p>Call for Papers, December 2003: "Psychology of America as an Imperial Power". 32</p> <p>Bulletin Board32</p>
--	---

shatter morale, it predictably only aroused hatred for the assailants instead, just like 9/11.

Historically, traumatized groups often do their reliving through leaders who relive traumas of their own in the process. In this historic mode, Bush has hijacked the American national trauma of 9/11 for his own innermost purposes -- his "hidden agenda," hidden even from himself. To uncover these purposes, I must first back up a little.

The dominant theme of Bush's early inner life was a failing rivalry with his father marked by adulation and emulation. Somewhere beneath every such failing filial rivalry lurks -- even with-out the benefit of a Freudian father complex -- secret anger inwardly denied. The anger and the idolatry feed each other.

Sent to the same schools as his namesake, the younger George came of age in the shadow of the elder one's shining academic, athletic, military, and business record. He trailed his father humiliat-

ingly on all four scores and took refuge in alcohol and -- as he pointedly did not deny when asked -- drugs. At age 40 he shook his addiction only to go the opposite extreme as a crusading born-again Christian. From this "dry-drunk" vantage point, he watched his father as president triumphantly form and lead a United Nations coalition that undid Sad-dam Hussein's aggression against Kuwait short of destroying Saddam himself

In April 1993 came a car-bomb attempt on the elder Bush's life in Kuwait that local officials promptly blamed on Saddam. That misfired blast boomeranged as the younger Bush projected onto Saddam with a bang the repressed filial rage within him for an idolized father he could not measure up to. With this new target he had found a purpose. He put it guilelessly last September at a fund-raiser in Houston when he called Saddam "the guy who tried to kill my dad."

After 9/11, invested with personal power to

conduct a war on terrorism for America, the younger Bush twisted this congressional mandate into a God-given mission to kill Saddam. Thus would he prove himself a loving and worthy son who, into the bargain, can go one better than his father, never mind our blood and our civil liberties drained, the United Nations and international law flouted, and our moral stock plummeting world-wide, let alone the Iraqis caught in the crossfire. Just as the Kuwaiti claim that Saddam was behind that attempt on Bush senior's life was unproven, Bush junior's claim that Saddam was harboring terrorists and weapons of mass destruction was unproven. The preliminary blow of "Shock and Awe" targeted Saddam personally: this re-edition of a flubbed assassination attempt duly missed its mark Everything meshed.

This tight fit between the course of escalating traumatic disaster engaged by Bush's America and a pattern of pathology documented in numerous historical case studies is no mere academic cu-

riosity. It is a highest worldwide alarm signal: blinding red. Is our nation too far gone to heed it?

Rudolph Binion, PhD, is Leff Professor of History at Brandeis University. Of his numerous scholarly publications, the most relevant to this article are Hitler Among the Germans (1975) and "Traumatic Reliving in History," forthcoming this year in The Annual of Psychoanalysis. □

The Second Bush Persian Gulf War

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College of New Jersey and the
Psychohistory Forum

The long-awaited and feared second Bush Persian Gulf War has come and gone. Below, I de-scribe the war and free-associate about it. Else-where, in the *Journal of Psychohistory*, my December 2002 *Clio's Psyche* (Vol. 9 No. 3) article, "Perspectives on Teaching About War-Making in 2002 America," is being reprinted with the comments of eight colleagues and my response to their thoughts on it. These are different, but complementary, articles.

War brings both great fears and hopes, though often from different sectors of the population. Students, who as young people incline to favor action over inaction, tend to be more positive about war. Women and older citizens tend to be more aware of the downside of war. During the war, there were numerous fears expressed, sup-pressed, and repressed. Fears of biological or chemical weapons used against the invading armies or on the home front ebbed and flowed throughout the conflict. As a psychohistorian I wonder if the enormous fears of SARS (Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome) was partly a displacement of worldwide fears of terrorist biological and chemical weapons. After all, there was and is a tremendous focus on this health issue despite the facts that as of today's news (May 12) there is not one confirmed U.S. death from it and that the flu kills 20,000-30,000 Americans every year. It has long been my conjecture that we humans in-cline to project our own individual health fears onto the nation, and that we feel more or less healthy depending upon how healthy the nation seems to be. Epidemiological studies showed a de-cline in the rate of death by some diseases and suicide in World War II when people were so focused

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 10 No. 1

June 2003

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum
627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417
Telephone: (201) 891-7486
e-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD Associate
Editor: Bob Lena

Editorial Board

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

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum
\$25 yearly to non-members
\$40 yearly to institutions
(Both add \$10 outside U.S.A. & Canada)

Single Issue Price: \$12; Institutions, \$20

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

Copyright © 2003 The Psychohistory Forum

on the health of the country itself.

Twentieth-century warfare and its after-math were devastating to ordinary people. Civilians died by the millions in World War II: the causes were "friendly" and unfriendly fire, bombing, starvation, thirst, disease, slave labor, incarceration under inhumane conditions, and genocide. Many deaths can be attributed to the policies of the governments of the civilians rather than their avowed enemies. Civilians died in large numbers in the Iraq-Iran Gulf War of the 1980s and of course they were not spared in the first Bush Gulf War of 1991. However, in that case, Peter Arnett's CNN cameras showing civilian death and destruction reminded Americans that civilian death and destruction are a typical part of warfare. The images of Iraqi women holding their dead loved ones amidst piles of rubble, or angrily waving their fists at the cameras while denouncing America shattered the myth that we were only hurting him ("him" variously referred to Saddam Hussein, the Republican Guard, Hussein's army and forces of repression, and the enemy in general). Despite our best efforts to dehumanize the Iraqis in the service of attempting to limit our compassion only to U.S. and allied sons and daughters in the war zone, these vivid images forced many to face some of the realities of war. There was much humor at the time aimed at dehumanizin^g the moral force of these Iraqi women. I remember a colleague at the college, who was also a state senator, asking as a "joke," "How many Iraqi women does it take to get a full set of teeth?" His answer of "32" reflected contempt for the poverty of these poor displaced women who often appeared to have only a few teeth.

The recent propaganda war harkens back to the "War on Terrorism" which started out being called a "crusade," but "crusade" had to be dropped because of its negative connotations in the Islamic world. The next proposed title, "Infinite Justice," was an affront to devout Muslims because only Allah can dispense "infinite justice." It also made too many Arab monarchs and dictators nervous, so the equally vague "Enduring Freedom" was used in the war with Afghanistan. "Operation Iraqi Freedom" is the official U.S. label for the war, though it is not supported by the pictures of the bodies of Iraqi children and civilians killed as "collateral damage" and the spontaneous calls for Americans to leave almost immediately after Sad-dam Hussein lost power. The Arab media never depicted the war as the "War for Iraqi Freedom" Different U.S. networks presented the news over

banners at the bottom of the television screen such as "Attack on Iraq" and "War in Iraq." At the end of the first week of fighting, a properly descriptive subtitle might have been, "Operation Dangerously Long Supply Lines," but this was not apparent on any channel I viewed, since it did not fit the daily script.

When a president, who got elected denouncing "nation building," uses terms like "crusade," "Infinite Justice," and "Enduring Freedom," I worry that they reveal apocalyptic fantasies or a cynical willingness to simply sell the wars to the American public using rhetoric which will broadcast well. After all, if such goals are taken seriously, it could mean never-ending meddling in the affairs of others and endless wars with large casualties on all sides under the pretense of democracy. On the other hand, if the terms are mostly meant as propaganda, then American efforts will have been squandered. The situation in Afghanistan suggests the latter interpretation. The current administration won the war inexpensively through an alliance with the warlords, and, despite the slogan, "Enduring Freedom," there is little sign of freedom for most people throughout the country. The government the U.S. installed in the capital city is sustained by our forces and its president is thought of as the mayor of Kabul since his control and influence is almost nonexistent beyond its out-skirts. Regarding Iraq, we do not know how the American public will react to the costs of the occupation, resentment over a Western presence, and struggles by different individuals and groups for dominance.

The language of war is of great concern to me as a psychohistorian. My ears always perk up when I hear words like "kill" and parental language. So I took notice when I heard about "kill boxes" -- areas where U.S. firepower killed with-out restraint in Iraq. The words "father" and "mother" also draw my attention, as when Saddam Hussein in 1991 promised "the mother of all battles." For this Gulf war, the United States has developed the gigantic bunker-buster "mother of all bombs" (MOAB) which had been considered for use should Saddam Hussein or the Republican Guard assemble for a desperate last stand.

In a war in which the Defense Department partly chose targets after consulting with lawyers and with an eye as to how the results of the action would look on television, the idea of "kill boxes" clearly is worth probing. For the period of the war, in those special places ("kill boxes"), our repressed

murderous desires are given free reign. I suspect that the opposition of the French, Germans, and Russians to this war was based in part upon the fear that Bush and Company are a bunch of Texas cowboy-types spoiling for a fight. They were re-pulsed by the President wanting bin Laden "dead or alive" and the Vice President's referring to wanting the Saudi terrorist's "head on a plate." The Germans, at the behest of the West, have especially suppressed and repressed most of their murderous desires and are offended by the administration's more open aggression. American pollsters (we are always taking our political temperature) perhaps should have some questions relating to re-action formations against violence, because I suspect these are some of the great divides in our society.

War is always a gamble and bored military personnel are well known for gambling despite the meagerness of their salaries, but this is the first war in which I recollect playing cards becoming a major interest of the media. As the Baath Party disintegrated and Saddam's forces retreated, the Defense Department issued 55 playing cards to the military and media with the pictures, positions, vital statistics, and other information on this most wanted list. The U.S and its allies have won the first hand in this conflict, but it remains to be seen if our government understands the Middle East and its games well enough, and has the staying power to win its peacetime objectives.

In the first two weeks of this war, when "shock and awe" were emphasized, American civilian and military leadership had to do some quick public relations adjusting to the failed fantasies of an instantly successful war as a result of "taking out" (killing) Saddam Hussein Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and the military had to work over-time trying to convince the public that the war was going according to plan, and that they never expected it to be over almost instantly. The problem was in sending their message simultaneously to Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi military, the Iraqi people, the American public, and the world. They would have much preferred being able to particularize the message to each audience, but that option diminishes in the era of global, 24-four-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week (24/7) coverage by competing news outlets. The longer the war endured, the less saleable was the idea of conflict without casualties and the danger of disillusionment increased. The logic of warfare, especially asymmetrical warfare (where one side has a preponderance

of power), is at odds with the logic of winning over the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. For ex-ample, a suicide-bomb killing of American GIs resulted in field commanders giving "shoot-to-kill" orders to their troops at checkpoints, with some civilians being killed for not responding fast enough. Increasingly, the Iraqi people were caught between "a rock and a hard place." The "rock" was allied bombing and firepower, the Hussein administration's hiding its military equipment among civilians, using irregular troops and tactics of deception, and firing without regard into civilian areas (if we are to believe the reports allowed by American military sources). The "hard place" was the thirst, hunger, terror, bombing, desperation, looting, and hysteria of war.

Early on in this violent conflict, the war was being defined by government spokesmen and retired generals and colonels in primarily military terms. There was *great* interest in the technology in the early stages of the war, though not to the same extent as in the 1991 war when our country was fascinated by "smart bombs." The hope (the fantasy) of the first few days was that the war would be over almost instantly as a result of our marvelous military technology "taking out" (killing) Saddam Hussein. The wish was that in the face of our amazingly precise technology, the Iraqi people would quickly throw off their oppressors and loudly hail us as liberators, thereby silencing much of the world's criticism of President Bush's choice of war rather than of continued UN inspection. The fantasy was of an instant war in which only the "bad guys" were the casualties. This fantasy did not become the reality. In fact, the rest of the world was more in tune with the reality of it being a bloody war than was and is the United States.

In war, there is no neutral terminology, despite the major effort the U.S. made to appear objective. What the Bush Administration calls the "War for Iraqi Freedom," *Al-Jazeera* is calling an American war of aggression and occupation, rather like the Israeli occupation of the West Bank of Palestine. Arab media portrays dead Iraqis as Arab martyrs. The propaganda war was fought by all sides in cyberspace, and in many respects still is being fought. The *Al-Jazeera* television station in Qatar had its English language version delayed by Americans who disliked its bias and its eagerness to show American casualties even before the families were notified.

As a psychohistorical scholar, my transfer-

ence and countertransference to the war must be monitored and its impact assessed. Let me give an example of my awareness of this. Although there appears to be an excitement for most people that comes with war, I usually experience the outbreak of war as a defeat and am slightly depressed when it happens. Simultaneously, I notice that while Americans of all ages appear to feel more connected by the common fear and hope for victory, I feel less connected. In 1991 when I faced this problem I created the Emotions of the 1991 Persian Gulf War Research Project of the Psychohistory Forum. I worked closely with colleagues and students studying reactions to the war, doing surveys of the emotions of over 1000 Americans, Russians, French, Israelis, Australians, and others. This activity energized me when my country was sending men abroad to kill others and be killed. The study also confirmed the well-known phenomenon of a sense of greater American cohesiveness during wartime.

The influence of my own experiences as a soldier in the United States Army during the Cold War should not go unmentioned. It taught me an enormous amount about the differences between the theory of war and the practice, especially because American wars are carried out mostly by very young, scared, and often careless males. I am saddened, but not surprised, by the number of personnel killed in accidents and by friendly fire, in fact, close to 40 percent in Iraq in 2003. (Amy Goldstein *et al.*, "U.S. Casualties Came From More Than Enemy Fire," *Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, Vol. 20 No. 26, April 21-27, p. 10)

It is instructive to examine many of the elements of the war with which my students are more familiar. From the onset of the conflict, in search of more information and baffled by different cover-age perspectives, students were open to discussions of the propaganda war. With some help from me, the misuses of journalism were apparent. The Department of Defense (as a historian I remember when it was called, with greater honesty, the Department of War) realized that its 1991 Gulf War strategy of keeping reporters far from the action was not likely to be successful in the 21st century due to the proliferation of Arabic news outlets and the hostility of much of the world to this war. It decided to "embed" reporters within different military units before and during the war. The advantage to reporters was the immediacy of participation in the conflict. The military benefited from

the mostly temporary censorship regarding what was released to the news outlets and the reporters' identification with the military personnel among whom they served. This arrangement, of course, meant that most American reporters were not covering the greatest victims of warfare: civilians. Regrettably, during wartime civilians are almost never covered by the media except to portray the inhumanity of the enemy.

Our administration's stated goal was the liberation of the Iraqi people. Consequently, it began the 2003 Persian Gulf War by attempting to destroy the enemy, while leaving the Iraqi infra-structure and people unscathed. The policy of liberation meant some concern to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people, the partial humanization of the Iraqi people (unusual during wartime), and the desire to disprove much of the world's current view that Americans, or at least the Bush administration, is bloodthirsty. Many of the leaders of our government remember how little stomach the American people had for the televised images of the 1991 mass slaughter of retreating Iraqi soldiers on the "Highway of Death." Rumsfeld had hoped that a policy of "shock and awe" would crush the will of the Iraqi administration, while saving the U. S. from having to rebuild the Iraqi infrastructure or look bloodthirsty on television.

On the American "home front," the cover-age of the war news was pervasive. It involved "reality war" with "real-time" journalism, which, in the earliest stages, sounded like a commercial for whatever military unit in which the journalist was embedded. Television retired generals and colonels replaced the usual news experts. This de-fining of the war in almost purely military terms inclined to miss many of the central issues of asymmetrical warfare. When one power has overwhelming force, as did our military in Iraq, the weaker side normally uses whatever means possible to achieve its goals. This includes assuming the mantle of victim (difficult for Saddam Hussein, but not the long-suffering Iraqi people), attempting to win the propaganda war, and increasing the cost and brutality of the conflict. The great fear was that ultimately, if all else failed, Hussein would use whatever weapons of mass destruction were at his disposal. Fortunately, this never happened.

In thinking about war, I think it is helpful if I mention my usual levels of classroom discourse: What do you know about it? How does it feel? What are your thoughts about it? What are the underlying causes, the "why," of it? What body(ies)

of knowledge might be applied to gain greater in-sight? Sometimes I will use David Beisel's five levels of classroom discussion. These are: the descriptive level (what facts are agreed upon), the causal level, the consequences, the judgmental level (the rights and wrongs), and the prescriptive level for improving the situation. (David Beisel, "Columbine: The Search for Causes," *Clio's iPsycho*, Vol. 6 No. 1, June 1999, p. 14) Both of these systems work quite well.

War in itself is a comparatively simple process in which each force seeks to kill and disable the other before its own will to fight is broken. The transition to peace can be quite difficult. When the existing government has collapsed or been destroyed, it is difficult to re-establish peace through control of food and other necessities, fear, and force of arms. Uncertainty and even chaos can follow as in Iraq today where weapons are every-where and there is widespread looting as well as different individuals and groups seeking retribution and future advantage. Stability is re-established in these situations when people see enough examples of others being shot for looting, violating curfew, or even holding arms. The aftermath of war and the establishment of a workable, peaceful government through the force of arms is especially complicated when it is in a county without a representational and democratic tradition, that is fragmented by different ethnic and religious groups. When this is carried out under the scrutiny of 24/7 news coverage, in an area of the world hostile to the occupying county, the problems are multiplied, as Americans are presenting learning in Iraq.

Comparisons are being made in the media regarding the establishment of a civil society and democracy in post-WWII Germany and Japan, and the current situation in Iraq. There are very major differences. First and foremost, both the Germans and the Japanese had considerable experience with representational government. The Germans had a viable democracy preceding and longer than the 12 years of Nazi rule. Both countries for years suffered from the deprivations and realities of war, preparing them to be submissive in peace. Both saw Western occupation as far superior to occupation by the Communists, a fact of life in East Germany and a realistic fear elsewhere. In Japan, the Emperor lent his prestige to an orderly transition to peace. In neither county was open opposition to the occupiers allowed.

Iraq has no tradition of effective representation in government, to say nothing of democracy.

It is also surrounded by neighbors who are hostile to Western influences and American dreams of establishing a secular, democratic state. It is not even certain that Saddam Hussein is dead or that many of his forces have not resolved to dissolve into the populace to wage guerilla warfare, as partisans did against the Nazis in World War II Yugoslavia. Probably the only thing that Iraqi Shiite and Sunni Muslims can agree upon is that they want the victors to both rebuild their country and depart almost immediately. Well-organized Shiite groups are calling for a Islamic Republic along the lines of Iran. The smallest of the major groups, the Kurds in the north, who really don't want to be a part of Iraq, may very well want Americans to stay as a protection against both Baghdad and Ankara (Turkey).

What are the prospects for a democracy in Iraq? My answer is: not very good for democracy. However, there are some positive indicators for a viable state: Iraq has oil, water, a significant middle class, and a tradition of secularism, even if the latter has been weakened by the spread of fundamentalism in the region and through Saddam Hussein's recent attempts to garner support among the people by building mosques. It is unclear whether the United States (which so many Iraqis see as hating its religion and greedy for its oil) has the will-power to pay for rebuilding Iraq and to stay long enough for the firm establishment of a government which could become democratic. Whether an international body could do this better is also in question, though handing responsibility over to one may be a good exit strategy for an administration tired of bad publicity and a high price tag.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, studied history and political science in graduate school before training for 10 years in psychoanalysis. He is co-director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on War, Peace, and Conflict Resolution. Among the many courses he has taught at Ramapo College, as well as at Temple, Rutgers, and Fairleigh Dickinson universities, are War, Peace, and Conflict Resolution; War Through Film, Western Civilization; Psychohistory of Assassination; Psychology of War and Peace; Manhood; Hitler, the Holocaust, and Genocide; Gender Roles in Society, and 9/11 and the Psychology of Terrorism. Professor Elovitz may be reached at <pelovitz@aolcom>. □

CFP: "Psychology of America as an Imperial Power," Dec. 2003, see page 32

Dreaming of War in Iraq

Kelly Bulkeley
Graduate Theological Union

In earlier writings I have explored the political dimensions of dreams in relation to U.S. presidential elections, the terrorist attack of September 11, and people's self-reports of political ideology. My basic argument is that certain dreams have directly meaningful connections and offer new insights to the most urgent questions of public and political affairs in the dreamer's waking life. I am seeking to refute the idea (associated most directly with Sigmund Freud and Calvin Hall) that dreaming is exclusively concerned with the private concerns of the individual and does not have anything meaningful to say about the broader social world. To be sure, by far the majority of people's dreams do not include any overt reference to political themes. Looking at the phenomenon from a broader theoretical perspective, dreams with explicit political references are worthy of study because they reflect an unusually dynamic interplay of physiological, psychological, cultural, and even religious forces, all swirling together with creative, recombinatory tension in the private visionary arena of the nocturnal imagination.

My present study is an extension of these ideas in the context of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, which began on March 19 and ended approximately a month later. When the war initially broke out I posted a research request in several liberal/ progressive publications and electronic forums, and I contacted dozens of colleagues, teachers, re-searchers, and students *who* in turn distributed my request to other people. To date, 25 people have shared detailed accounts of their war-related dreams with me. Six of these people are male, nineteen female. Only three of the respondents supported the U.S. decision to go to war, or at least were untroubled by it; all the other respondents were strongly opposed to the war.

Three initial observations can be made about this response to the research request. First, the number of responses was fairly small, particularly when compared to the much *larger* number of dream reports I gathered using the same basic method in the immediate aftermath of September 11. This may partly reflect the relatively minimal degree of personal fear Americans feel when contemplating the war in Iraq, in contrast to the sudden shock and alarming personal vulnerability that were generated by the events of September 11.

Second, the gender imbalance is striking, though perhaps not surprising given that American women tend to take a much greater interest in dreams than do American men. Third, the respondents were almost entirely from the "anti-war" side of the political spectrum. This may be partly due to the rather obvious fact that "pro-war" people are not as emotionally frustrated by the Iraq invasion as those who opposed the war, and thus are not feeling psychologically compelled to dream about it as much.

So, before turning to a consideration of one of the dreams, the following qualifications need to be noted: The dreams I gathered may not be representative of what Americans in general are dreaming. Rather, I am more interested in highlighting the creative details and meaning-rich images, feelings, and sensations that distinguish each individual dream. As someone who is strongly opposed to the war and *who* has struggled to make sense of the fast-moving transformations of the past several weeks, I confess to the personal interest of seeking in these dreams some insight into my own confused thoughts, turbulent feelings, and flashes of spiritual despair during this violent moment in our national history.

In a future writing I will provide a fuller documentation and comparative analysis of the dreams I have gathered. For this brief preliminary report, I will present and discuss a single dream.

David, a 55-year-old health care technician in North Carolina, had this dream on February 28, about three weeks before the start of the war, which he bitterly opposed ("Quite frankly, I think the invasion of Iraq is a cynical ploy to inflate Mr. Bush's approval ratings, discredit the United Nations, and protect the interests of an avaricious economic minority").

House Bearing Elephants and Birds Caged in the Attic

I notice a movement in the corner of my eye and turn to see something large and dark coming toward me. After a moment it resolves into an elephant with a white, one-storied house on its back. The elephant proceeds to a far corner of the parking lot on which I am standing. I study the house as I walk across the lot. It is sided with rough-textured pressboard and looks like the kind of temporary building one often sees serving as offices on used car lots. I look down to find there are now four elephants. Looking back up, I see the little building is now

buried in one corner of a much larger, multi-storied version of itself on the backs of the four elephants. From within the original building I hear a man's voice say, "Look! I got a campaign to run here!" I see a digital clock face which reads "6:15" and realize it is time for me to go home. As I am about to leave, I remember several cockatiels are caged in the attic of the white building and I must see they are fed before I can go. I climb a ladder made of two-by-fours to the attic. The birdcages are made of wire mesh and have been built between the rafters and struts of the roof. It is difficult to see into one cage, which contains a normal grey, male cockatiel. I cannot see any seed dish at all in this cage and become very anxious, wondering how long the bird has gone unfed. I stand on tiptoe to look into the bottom of the cage hoping to see a dish there but, instead, I find a goldfinch in summer plumage, lying on its side, dead. I worry that if I move it I will create a bad smell and a big mess which may be unhealthy for the cockatiel. Then I wonder, with honor, if the cockatiel has been *feeding* on the dead bird in lieu of seed. I am torn between the need to deal with the dead bird and my desire to get home.

The first thing to note is that this dream does *not* contain any explicit reference to the imminent war. It would be extremely difficult to devise a keyword search that could reliably identify this as a "war-related" dream. Yet for David, the dream is absolutely an explicit expression of his thoughts and feelings about the *current* political situation. This was his initial reaction to the dream: "The elephant, of course, is a symbol of the Republican Party which is further emphasized by the White House on its back." The elephant moves to a position opposite (ideologically) to where David is standing, and then the house swells in size and there are four elephants instead of one -- "much as the Republicans and Bush have increased in power lately." The man's voice shouting about the "campaign" is for David a transparent political reference to his scornful waking-life attitude toward the President.

The final section of the dream, with the cockatiels and the dead goldfinch, carries the political reference to a new allegorical height. The ladder of two-by-fours is a peculiar symbol that David has noticed in his dreams for years, and he

has come to see the rough-hewn, handmade nature of the ladders as a reflection of his underlying belief that he has to "make my own way up" in life. The "normal grey, male cockatiel" David could not help but associate with himself, while the "goldfinch with summer plumage" struck him as symbolizing the "sweet bird of youth." In that context, his intense reaction ("I wonder, with horror") to the possibility that the cockatiel has been eating the goldfinch led him to this humbling personal and political realization: "To paraphrase the adage, young people fight wars that old people start. It is also true that 'normal grey' people live in and benefit from economies bolstered by wars, so my ambivalent feelings about dealing with the dead goldfinch could be a reflection of a desire not to acknowledge the ways in which I, myself, feed on the young sacrificed in war and the responsibility I bear because I have tolerated the actions of Bush's government"

Of course, a single brief dream report like this can tell us very little about broader patterns in psychological functioning or the cultural imagination. But I suggest a larger set of similar dreams *can* be useful in that regard. David's dream, with its exquisite interweaving of personal and political themes, and its palpable effect on him both in giving vivid imagistic expression to his waking life political attitudes and provoking deeper critical reflection on those attitudes, offers a glimpse of what future explorations in that direction may provide.

Kelly Bulkeley, PhD, is Adjunct Faculty in Psychology and Religion at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. He is the author of Visions of the Night Dreams, Religion, and Psychology (1999) and Dreams of Healing: Transforming Nightmares into Visions of Hope (2003) and editor of Among All These Dreamers: Essays on Dreaming and Modern Society (1999). Dr. Bulkeley may be contacted at <kellybulkeley@earthlink.net>. □

War as Spectacle Makes the Human Tragedy Banal

**Junia Vilhena and Sergio Medeiros
Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil**

Sigmund Freud wrote *Civilization and Its Discontents* in 1930 when the world was on the verge of the Second World War and the Holocaust. While Europe was being swept by a wave of intolerance, segregation, and violence, Freud wrote that

there were three main sources of human suffering: nature, with its untamable power; the body's vicissitudes in their inexorable march towards self-dissolution; and the relationship among men, which condemned them to social demands and instinctive renunciations which were much beyond the possibilities of their narrow spirit.

More than 70 years have gone by and a new world has been built. The conquests of science and the advances of technology have been so many that we sometimes fail to recognize ourselves in the biographies of those who lived the violence and the passions of those days. However, it is in the relationship with the other -- the third cause of human suffering pointed out by Freud -- that our advance has been most timid. It seems that we have not worked with the other, but rather have frequently worked against him.

While there is much that could be said about the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington and the war against Iraq from political, economic, military, and ethical perspectives, we would like to focus on the *reporting* of these cases -- the way the facts are described and shown. Those scenes, to a certain point, are self-explanatory. In fact, if anyone wished to affirm the power of his act, he couldn't do much better than to offer *death as a spectacle* before an infinitely bigger audience than that of the Coliseum -- particularly when this involves the death of so many. Until now, no human power has subdued death. This is the measure of our helplessness, the primordial cause of our anguish. Death dissolves our thoughts, values, pleasures, and even our fears and pains. It is the desire to deny death by taking control of it that seduces suicides; it is the delirium to master it that attracts homicides.

Two phenomena seem to come together in the explosive fusion of suicides-homicides since 9/11: the decreeing of *jihad*, or "holy war," and the sensationalist media coverage. *Jihad* involves the fantasy of the negation of death. Immediate paradise is offered to whoever believes in it. Without a judgment according to the criteria of his own religion, his place in eternal life is pre-approved. To the religious extremist, incapable of doubt (as a matter of fact, an incapability common to every extremist), the holy war presents itself as an invitation to suicide.

The narrative that testifies to the acts of suicide and homicide guarantees a glorious place in the Pantheon of the Heroes, built by the popular imagination. We have known this since the Greek

epics: it was not Ulysses but Homer who made the Odyssey immortal.

The aesthetics of the tragic in traditional works of art make an interesting comparison with modern broadcast war scenes. From Aristotle to Hegel, the representation of the tragic has always been associated with the idea of perfecting the human spirit. To the Greek thinker, the staging of tragedy, whether in its imitation in sculpture or in its narration by poetry, made possible a "cleansing of emotions" to the person who was participating in the aesthetic relationship. This phenomenon, which Aristotle called *katharsis*, was possible since the representation of the tragic offered a reflective distancing. Art allowed mediation between the unbearable, real tragedy and its presentation, about which one could talk, reflect, and think on the greatness of the passions in conflict.

On the other hand, the narrative of today's media, particularly television news, acts oppositely. The screen shows the real tragedy as if it were a staging. In September 2001, after the re-reporting scoop, the images of the Twin Towers hit by the attack are transformed into a vignette under the logo, "America under Attack." Other scenes of destruction illustrate the leads of the following day's coverage of "America's New War." Eighteen months later, the world's television channels again form a net with live images from Baghdad: the death show must go on. The endlessly repeated scenes show *things*: aircraft, missiles, buildings, explosions, smoke, and wreckage. The *human* dimension of the tragedy is ruined by the aesthetics of the spectacle.

In *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Freud talks about a death instinct, which may be understood as the extension of the universal entropy process (disorganization and dispersion of energy) to the inner parts of human psyche. Thus, faced with a strong tendency toward psychic disintegration, we need to act assertively to sustain our ego organization. It is because we are fragile beings, self-destructive and possessing such a subtle equilibrium, that we need to resist the daily desire to be against life. Freud knew about this as well when he pointed out the need for a higher ethics based on right, laws, and reciprocity.

We know that man can experience pleasure when inflicting pain on his fellow man. Man is the only primate that plans and carries out the killing (and possible extinction) of his own species. Animals *must* fight but do not make war. Men are capable of causing suffering for intolerance, convenience,

and pleasure. Humans easily dehumanize the "other" for his difference as revealed in history by apathy toward the less fortunate, sexual prejudice, racism, and religious intolerance. Inhumanity is committed on behalf of security or the greater good, believing the "other" to be inferior, crazy, or fanatic, and not rational and moral like "us."

Psychoanalytically, we have the return of the primeval horde as described by Freud: the forsaking of the paternal law without any fraternal order: siblings killing siblings -- everything live -- on our television screens. If religious fanaticism over New York and Washington dehumanizes the terrorists and their victims, making them instruments of faith, then war in Iraq as spectacle dehumanizes soldiers and civilians, negating their existence in the tragedy. As if one might exist without the other. It is our firm belief that to report facts is the press' ethical duty. However, to reify human suffering is to make death banal and to act against life.

Junior Vilhena, PhD, is Professor in the Psychology Department of the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Director of the University's Psychology Clinic, and a psychoanalyst. She may be contacted at <vilhenaj@iis.com.br>. Sergio Medeiros is a psychoanalyst and a doctoral candidate in psychology at the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. He may be contacted at <sa.medeiros@ig.com.br>. □

War Casualties Include Empathy

Herbert Barry III
University of Pittsburgh

The individual behavior of empathy is one of the casualties of lethal conflict between groups. War is "a state of usually open and declared armed hostile conflict between political units (as states or nations)." Empathy is "the capacity for participating in or a vicarious experiencing of another's feelings, volitions, or ideas." (Both definitions are from *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged, 1986.*)

The definition of war does not refer to the individual soldier who tries to kill and is vulnerable to being killed. "Political units" distinguish war from individual conflict and murder. Empathy pertains to emotional behavior of the empathic individual. Empathy shares or perceives the other person's feelings, such as joy or sorrow.

Human beings are born with the capacity

for empathy and develop empathic behavior in early childhood. The great cognitive capabilities of our species and the network of social relationships contribute to our awareness of the thoughts and feelings of parents, other adults, siblings, and other people. When empathic behavior is not apparent in a social situation, the reason is usually not deficient capability. It is because the empathy has been suppressed.

War requires another group to be regarded as the enemy. The individual soldier's obligation to kill and to be a target for killing is tolerable only by suppressing empathy. A less drastic suppression of empathy occurs in competition with other people, especially in team sports. A person with fragile ego or low self-esteem may attempt to bolster the sense of self by suppressing empathy.

A popular euphemism in war is "collateral damage." A more accurate term would be "killing or destroying people or objects that are not combatants." The term "damage" is appropriate for the effect of war on empathy. War suppresses but does not destroy the capability for empathic behavior. The suppressed empathy is an urge that expresses itself in distorted ways, in accordance with Freud's description of emotional feelings that are repressed from conscious awareness. Symptoms of suppressed empathy include exaggerated affiliation with the person's group or nation, and the reaction formation of exaggerated hatred of the enemy.

I believe that the 1991 Gulf War suppressed lessened empathic feeling and subsequent empathic behaviors of individuals in all of the participant nations. The prolonged suppression of empathy contributed to the 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States and its "coalition," defying the United Nations and the sentiments of many individuals in the United States and elsewhere. Collateral damage to empathy following the 2003 war may include American aggression against other countries, heightened Muslim antagonism against the "Great Satan," and more frequent attacks by individual terrorists against Israel and the United States.

Herbert Barry III, PhD, is Emeritus Professor at the University of Pittsburgh. He is Co-Director of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on the Childhood Personality and Psychology of Presidents and Presidential Candidates. Professor Barry has constructed and tested several versions of a questionnaire to measure choices of an empathic, rational, or emotional response in hypothetical situations. He

may be contacted at <barryh@pitt.edu>. □

The Editor's Classics

(Continued from front page)

duction to the subject of childhood, one of the central issues for our *field*. His six modes of childrearing provide valuable insights even though they *are* subject to misuse if used rigidly. My students, except for the most psychologically inclined, *are* unable to grasp the psychogenic theory, though I suspect that those who have been through a thorough *analysis* do not have this *problem*. Rudolph Bin-ion, *Hitler Among the Germans*, is fine psychohistorical scholarship combining individual *and* group psychodynamics. Last night I was *distressed* to see that a History Channel program on Hitler and Stalin did not *call* upon Rudy as one of its *authorities*.

As a psychohistorian, teacher, *and* psycho-historical organizer/mentor, I am *incredibly aware* of how varied *and* even mundane some of the sources are from which people take *inspiration*. My own experience made it easy for me to *under-stand* this. Edmund Bergler was a *psychoanalyst and popularizer* of the field who wrote a variety of books including *Basic Neurosis and Divorce Won't Help*. Though his work was rather simplistic and reductionistic, it helped open me to ideas of the working of the unconscious in the 1960s when I was *still* being introduced to the field. In 2003, I certainly would not recommend this author but I do feel it is so *important* that we keep in mind the *large* variety of ways in which people come to *an awareness and* understanding of the unconscious.

My introduction to the field did not come *from* books so much as *unanswered questions* about myself *and* the people *around* me. For example: Why had a fellow graduate student recreated the life *pattern* of a father he detested. Why was I so blocked in *writing* my doctoral dissertation when I desperately wanted to write it, at least at a conscious level? Professor Sydney Halpern, my colleague at Temple University's Amblar Campus, opened the worlds of psychoanalysis *and* psycho-history to me in the late 1960s *and* the beginning of the 1970s, without publishing more than a few articles which I was unable to find *and* know about until some *years* later. Like Socrates, *also* a great troubler of the sleep of mankind, Sid Halpern preferred to talk instead of write. Where I a less busy individual, I would be inclined to publish his thoughts, just as Plato did for Socrates.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is Editor of this publication
He may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.>. □

What Psychohistory Means to Me

David Lotto
University of Massachusetts and
Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

I was born in 1946, one year *after* the ex-tent of the Holocaust became fully known *and* nuclear weapons were first used. I am Jewish, American, male, *and* white. I was *an* only child for my first 10 years, a good student, *and* curious about how the world worked. My favorite subjects, in school *and* out, were history, science, *and* math. I went to the Bronx High School of Science and graduated Brandeis University as a physics major. Sometime during my undergraduate years at Brandeis, partly in response to my father's severe depressive episode during my freshman year, my *curiosity* about understanding how things work shifted to understanding why people act as they do.

I had some wonderful teachers at Brandeis. I most remember Richard Jones, a student of Erik Erikson, whose major *area* of interest was dreams. He introduced me to Freud and psychoanalysis. Herbert Marcuse was on the faculty at Brandeis, *although* he left before I could take a course with him. His book *Eros and Civilization* along with Norman O. Brown's *Life Against Death* were important in inspiring my passion for psychoanalytic thought. My interest in psychoanalysis was not primarily *clinical*, but more as a way of *under-stand*ing contemporary political realities *and* historical trends *and* events -- in other words, psycho-history. This was in the mid-1960s at the start of the *anti-war* movement *and* the emergence of the radical politics of the New Left. I felt that psycho-analytic concepts were the most powerful, sophisticated, *and* satisfying tools for understanding entities larger than the individual -- groups, governments, nations, *and* institutions -- in order to *better understand* what was going on in the world. *This* is when I started seriously reading Freud for the first time, particularly his books dealing with history *and* 'civilization': *Totem and Taboo*, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, *The Future of an Illusion*, *and* the motherlode, *Civilization and Its Discontents*. In clinical psychology in graduate school at the University of Chicago *and* later at York University

in Toronto, where I transferred after Nixon ended graduate school draft deferments in 1968, I was a student of David Bakan, author of *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* (1958).

I have always strongly identified with Freud's claim that he was more interested in understanding than in therapeutic change. In particular, I have always wanted to be able to understand what motivates people to do things like drop atomic bombs on cities full of people and to commit the atrocities of the Holocaust. I have also been drawn to those thinkers who have emphasized the importance of the outer world, the stage of history, politics, and current events, in determining who we are and what we do. This steam of what is usually called "applied" psychoanalysis has its roots in pre-World War I Freud, with his papers on da Vinci and Michelangelo, and was expanded later in the books I mentioned earlier. The tradition was continued by Jung, Rank, Ferenczi, Geza Roheim, Wilhelm Reich, Erikson, and Fromm, to name just a few of the many analysts who have dabbled or devoted themselves to "applied" psychoanalysis. To me, all of this work falls within the realm of psychohistory, although none of the authors above, with the exception of Erikson, used the term *psychohistory* or considered *themselves* to be psycho-historians.

If we consider psychohistory the *enterprise* of *seeking* to understand any and all aspects of historical or contemporary realities with the help of psychoanalytic or psychological modes of thought, then the domain of psychohistory is vast. Anything from biography to literary, film, or art criticism, to history of ideas, to analysis of current or past political and cultural events that uses any psychoanalytic or psychological concept properly falls within the realm of psychohistory.

The potential topics or areas open to psychohistorical exploration have expanded greatly in recent years as the number of psychological and psychoanalytic schools of thought has proliferated since Freud's death in 1939. To name just some of the more influential newer perspectives in psycho-analysis, there are object relations, interpersonal, self-psychological, and attachment theories; Lacan; relational psychoanalysis; and trauma theory. In addition there has been an explosion of developmental observation and theory, particularly with regard to early development, that has occurred within psychoanalysis over the last 50 years, which has also opened new territory for psychohistorical investigation.

Given this broad expanse, choosing a small number of books that could be considered classics is a daunting task. So I'll limit myself to mentioning three of my favorite authors who are perhaps not as well known as some other psychohistorians. The first is Richard Koenigsberg who wrote two short but insightful books: *Hitler's Ideology* (1975) and *The Psychoanalysis of Racism, Revolution, & Nationalism* (1977). The second is the classical scholar Eli Sagan whose books, particularly his *Cannibalism* (1974), *At the Dawn of Tyranny* (1985), *Freud, Women, & Morality* (1988), and *The Honey and the Hemlock* (1991) are all gems: thoroughly researched and well documented studies written from a sophisticated psychoanalytic perspective. Finally, Dan Dervin's *Enactments* (1996) is an excellent and erudite systematic analysis of the field of psychohistory.

David Lotto, PhD, is a psychologist and psychoanalyst in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, who has a strong sense of social justice and commitment to averting war. He is both an adjunct professor at the University of Massachusetts and a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum. Dr. Lotto may be reached at <dlotto@berkshire.rrcom>. □

My Life as Historian with Freud

David Felix

Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

Freud slowly, easily, inexorably and, of course, unconsciously, became the major influence on my thinking as it moved into historiography. While other thinkers have had their various and considerable impact on me, none has occupied so central a position. Others have affected me to the extent that they supported or filled out the Freudian structure.

If I remember correctly (despite Freud suggesting that I don't), I got my first sense of him as social scientist when, by chance, I read his *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, given from 1915 to 1917 at the University of Vienna. Reading the book was a purely intellectual experience of Freud. A great scientist constructed a great new science before my eyes. His particularly convincing method consisted of building vast conclusions about the human condition on the most ordinary facts: slips, misunderstandings, functional mistakes, and dreams. To his audience he disclaimed any attempt "to give you dogmatic lectures and to

insist on your unqualified belief... I do not wish to arouse conviction; I wish to stimulate thought and upset prejudices." He insisted, "You should neither believe nor reject," simply "allow what I tell you to work on you" In a world of gurus and pied pipers singing thought to sleep, he seduced me with the mundane and the modest, the completely comprehensible (as far as my comprehension went). I have found myself trying to write and tell history in the same way.

Since then I have read more Freud at odd moments when he fell into my hands or when I found an immediate use for him. I read *Civilization and Its Discontents* while attempting to enter intellectual history. I found it one of the supreme works of all thought. Freud asked the most important questions about human existence -- and answered them mercilessly. One essential aspect, although others have their importance, was its bleakness. He had been offering one of the best cures for humanity's ills in psychoanalysis, and now, while he continued to practice it as committed healer, he honestly traced its limits. Freud was a great anti-utopian. He began with his title, *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur*, which can be more accurately translated as The Queasiness in Civilization or Civilization's Sick Stomach

It was breathtaking to face up to the sense that civilization made humans sick by its inhibitions as laid upon the id. Freud had to articulate the "contention that ... what we call our civilization is largely responsible for our misery that we should be much happier if we gave it up and re-turned to primitive conditions." With this he summed up his knowledge of a wide range of private discontents deriving from conflicts between the individual's need for self-assertion and the community's need for social peace, or between freedom and order. His conclusions condensed out much of the essence of the classic Greek plays, Shakespeare's work, and other great statements on the human condition.

I moved directly, if unchronologically, from Freud to Nietzsche, reading in Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*: "Conscience is the instinctive cruelty which reverses itself after it cannot discharge itself outward" and "Morality as end-product, as a symptom, as disguise, as religious hypocrisy, as sickness, as a misunderstanding, but also as cause, cure, stimulus, inhibition, as poison." Social scientist and philosopher, I thought, were telling the (same) truth, as were the great playwrights, poets, and novelists.

Such a truth is unbearable to many persons. I can see why huge efforts have been made to deny or soften Freud's scientific statement as too cruel and blacken Nietzsche's artful one as protofascistic. Both, I think, were addressing the irreducible contradictions in all life. If that view is unqualifiedly bleak, it is also an efficient instrument to cut through society's fictions. Without their denying the value of the progress of the human spirit through time and history, both thinkers suggested its limits to me: the need to be modest in our individual and collective ambitions.

Another characteristic of Freud and Nietzsche's thought was the distance both spanned -- from the individual to the civilization and back. If their cosmos remains humane, their magnitude of view does not trivialize the individual. There is a density of meaning in this doubled vision.

These *are* the parameters of my efforts to understand history. Freud has helped me grasp the suicidal complicity of the Weimar Foreign Minister Walther Rathenau in his assassination *and also* his heroic phoniness; the constructive *and* destructive utopianism of Marx, Lenin, *and* Wilson; the nexus between familial *and* public politics of Marx *and* Lenin; the politics in Marxian *and* Keynesian economics; the idealism in American pragmatism; *and*, with the assistance of Erik Erikson's *Young Man Luther*, the father-son dynamics in John Neville *and* John Maynard Keynes. Others have questioned my understanding. Critics, for example, have found my interpretation of Rathenau unappreciative, of Keynes uncomprehending, *and* of Marx expressing anger. They have labeled my interpretations "charlatanry of the worst stripe" and self-deluding Machiavellianism. I found such comments exhilarating, although they did not necessarily confirm the validity of my evaluation.

David Felix, PhD, is Professor of History Emeritus of the City University of New York. An intellectual and economic historian, he has published biographical studies of Walther Rathenau, Karl Marx, and John Maynard Keynes. Felix is a long-time Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum and an active participant in its Autobiography Research Group. He may be reached at <DFlix@msn.com>. □

Forthcoming in the September issue:
Symposium on
The Emotional Life of Nations

Erik H. Erikson as a Pioneer of Psychohistory

Juhani Ihanus
University of Helsinki, Finland

By the end of the 1930s and the *early* 1940s, Erik H. Erikson had begun to study the childrearing practices of two Amerindian tribes, the buffalo-hunting Sioux of South Dakota and the fishing and acorn-gathering Yurok on the Pacific coast. Although Erikson had close connections to "national character" and "personality and culture" research, he did not posit a causal link between certain native childrearing practices and certain adult traits or a certain tribal character. While de-scribing goals and values of the Sioux and the Yurok, Erikson was not trying to establish their character structures. Still, he anchored some behavioral "configurations" to certain childrearing practices, for example, the generosity of the Sioux to the "oral paradise" of long breast-feeding and the retentiveness of the Yurok to over-controlling "anal" training.

These tribal groups and their economic and cultural "synthesis" were not delineated by Erikson as pathological. Rather, Erikson saw that what in Western clinical parlance were called "orality" and "anality" were evaluated and emphasized by the Indians according to whether these would help develop individuals whom the culture considered "good." He insisted that there were no proper terms to clinically characterize group-scale irrationality, which is now studied by psychohistorical group fantasy analysis.

In 1942, Erikson for the first time psycho-logically sketched Hitler in "Hitler's Imagery and German Youth" (further expanded in a chapter in *Childhood and Society* in 1950 and 1963). Erikson believed that Hitler's adolescence stored up rage because of unfulfilled potentialities, which in turn blocked positive actions. Hitler brought the Aryan adolescent imagery of Germans to political dominance. He planned, and to a large extent managed, to "prevent" developmental conflicts in German children through trance-like action and obedience. Organized ideological education for sacrifice and purity (without individual explorative learning) reinforced crushing the enemy without any respect for God, parents, ethics, love of neighbor, or friendship.

This fragmentary profile of Hitler opened the way to Erikson's later psychohistorical investi-

gations, which related the particular identity needs of a leader to large groups. Although at unequal levels, the leader and the led had reciprocal needs. On a national scale the masses made demands on their leader, who acted out conflicts of national consciousness and conscience, and also global conflicts of human evolution. Kings were thus seen by Erikson as "toys" of the people.

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, Erikson formed his concepts of identity, adolescent development, and the life cycle. He laid more emphasis than most Freudian psychoanalysts on the psycho-social, cultural, historical, and ego-developmental aspects. Erikson claimed that his eight develop-mental stages are universal, escaping the specific effects of historical time, society, and culture. His version of the psychoanalytic method insisted that the psychoanalyst was to become a participant historian, influencing what he or she observed. For Erikson, the historical process was a kind of huge "metabolism" of individual life cycles. Erikson's method was at first linked to clinical case histories but gradually was molded into the life history approach.

Through Erikson's lens of "disciplined subjectivity," psychoanalysts and psychohistorians are both observers of and participants in the history of humanity. Their means of understanding history are based on history. They make multiple tentative and flexible interpretations of single phenomena and events, getting emotionally involved and immersed into a life history. "Hard" scientists, on the other hand, lay stress on a unitary explanation of multiple phenomena and events, shunning emotional investments and favoring logical-intellectual mastery of knowledge.

Erikson's works invite his readers to ponder moral and other personal values in connection with social, historical, and global processes. There is also a streak of psychopedagogical utopian reformism attached to Erikson's views of the beneficial societal effects of the improvement of child-rearing practices. Erikson opposed with fervor child mistreatment and childbeating adults who really remained children themselves. Erikson's tone is enlightening yet sermon-like: "Some day, maybe, there will exist a well-informed, well-considered, and yet fervent public conviction that the most deadly of all possible sins is the mutilation of a child's spirit." (*Young Man Luther A Study in Psychoanalysis and History*, 1958, p. 70) For Erikson, both Luther and Freud reached out through introspective means to acknowledge, "the

child is in the midst"

Erikson's psychobiographies of young Gorky, young Luther, and Gandhi became for him examples of transformative identity crises. Their "psychosocial identity" consisted of "somatic," "personal," and "social" categories. Erikson was concerned with analyzing not only conflicts but also creative tensions among these three groups. He wanted to expand the Freudian clinical perspective from conflicts and debilitating disorders to potentials and restorative means of action.

Before Erikson, Preserved Smith had introduced the morbid Oedipus complex into Luther studies, and Fromm had taken a much more sinister view while pointing out Luther's hostility and demands for submission and self-sacrifice. Erikson turned resolutely away from such formulations, towards more imaginative and life-affirming aspects in Luther's life. Luther, Gandhi, and Freud were for Erikson reformers of inner worldviews, creative transformers of established institutions.

Psychohistorians should be, according to Erikson, more conscious of their "re-transference" of the "unlived portions" and "unrealized selves" of their own lives, which are projected (with a personal bias) onto psychohistorical research: the choice of subject, remembering, reviewing, and interpreting historical motivations. Different interpretations of historical motivations have to be related with each other and co-constructed. By revealing compulsory repetitions in themselves and others, psychohistorians bequeath historical processes to future reappraisals.

The polylogue among psychohistorians even calls for changing old definitions of basic, long-cherished concepts such as "Mom." In *Child-hood and Society*, Erikson figured "Mom" as a stereotype and a caricature containing all kinds of victimization and blamings. He anticipated the interdisciplinary study of such stereotypes, a new kind of history, which would remove impression-ism and sensationalism.

Lawrence J. Friedman has called Erikson "identity's architect." Erikson's challenging psychohistorical enterprise and its constructed identity are worthy of further study.

Juhani Ihanus, PhD, is Adjunct Professor of Cultural Psychology at the University of Helsinki and Adjunct Professor of the History of Science and Ideas at the University of Oulu. He has published scientific and essay books in Finnish and two books in English, Multiple Origins (1999)

and Swaddling, Shame, and Society (2001). His many scientific articles deal with psychohistory (especially connected with Russian studies), the history of the humanities, and clinical and cultural psychology. Professor Ihanus can be reached at <juhani.ihanus@helsinki.fi>. □

Rocking the Cradle

Victor Wolfenstein
UCLA

Classics in psychohistory: I start rummaging through the attics of my intellectual life and come upon the texts that have most influenced my own perspective. The first, and in some ways most enduring, is Freud's *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. I've come a long way in my own work from anything like an orthodox Freudianism, but the problem of collective forms of emotional life has never been far from my mind --pressingly near these days, when the voices of political reason cannot be heard above the shrill clamor of Us (the U.S.) and Them (all those who dare to criticize Us/the U.S.).

Next I'd mention Harold D. Lasswell's *Psychopathology and Politics* and Erik H. Erikson's *Young Man Luther*, the two books that most helped to shake me free from political science. Then, a leftward and philosophical step further down the road, the writings of Norman O. Brown, Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse, Wilhelm Reich -- and, closer to the political bone, Frantz Fanon's *Black Skins, White Masks*, and *The Wretched of the Earth*. But -- with the exception of *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* -- no book contributed as much to reorienting my thinking as Dorothy Dinnerstein's *The Mermaid and the Minotaur* (first published in 1976, now available from Other Press with a moving afterward by Adrienne Harris).

Mermaid is complex and multi-dimensional. Dinnerstein wove anthropological, historical, political, philosophical, and psychoanalytic threads into a tapestry of (as she put it) our "sexual arrangements and human malaise." I say a tapestry because the book is as unusual and nonlinear in its organization as it is in its argument. The chapters are arranged with intervening notes and asides; discussion boxes point forward and backward within and between chapters; and the reader is given a choice of which chapters to read in which order. At the same time, the exposition is driven by a powerful and precisely focused analysis: what we

now would term our "gender identities" are set very early, in the practices of early childhood care, and in complicitous fashion by men and women. Men and women agree to granting or imposing upon women a monopoly of infant care. The consequence is the emergence, splitting off, and repression of a realm in which the hands that rock the cradle rule the world. These competent (seemingly even magical) maternal hands are not to rule the "larger" world, however, the one in which masculine industry and power are to be displayed and deployed. She rules in her place, he in his, but the two domains do not exist on the same plane. Mother, earth mother, Mother Nature -- she will always find herself beneath and supporting him, also resented by him, devalued by him, and despoiled by him

Dinnerstein believed that the phantasmal quality of our sexual arrangements permitted the enactment of massively destructive tendencies, ecological ones most obviously. She called for and hoped that a change in parenting practices might have far-reaching consequences: if men and women shared the burdens and rewards of child-care and if children had the experience of being nurtured by both men and women, we all might be forced to see more clearly and take responsibility for our destructiveness. She also hoped that breaking down the defenses against what is now the mother-world would open up deeper and more genuine possibilities for animal-erotic gratification. In this latter regard she stands as counterpart and critic of Brown and Marcuse, who share with her the aim of enriching our sensuality and sensuousness, but without her keen understanding of what inhibits and distorts them.

E. Victor Wolfenstein, PhD, is Professor of Political Science, UCLA, and a former member of the faculty, Southern California Psychoanalytic Institute. His books include The Revolutionary Personality (1967), The Victims of Democracy: Malcolm X and the Black Revolution (1981), Psychoanalytic Marxism: Groundwork (1993), and Inside/Outside Nietzsche: Psychoanalytic Explorations (2000). Professor Wolfenstein may be contacted at <evw@ucla.edu>. □

Next Psychohistory Forum Meeting

Saturday, September 20, 2003

Lawrence Friedman

"Erik Erikson and Erich Fromm"

Adventures in Psychobiography with

Fighting Bob La Follette

Nancy C. Unger
Santa Clara University

In 1981 I began my doctoral dissertation, a psychobiography of Wisconsin Progressive Robert M. La Follette (1855-1925). Surveying the corrupt politicians, powerful trusts, and many other abuses in the new industrial, urban "gilded" age, La Follette put his finger on the problem: "The supreme issue, involving all the others, is the encroachment of the powerful few upon the rights of the many." As congressman, governor, and senator, he set about reversing that encroachment, creating a variety of reforms to more equitably redistribute the nation's power and wealth. Having myself come of age during the quagmires of Vietnam and Watergate, La Follette seemed to me, with his righteous ideals and his willingness to fight for his convictions, the perfect antidote to all the political confusion and deceit with which I'd grown up.

However, despite his many successes, La Follette also encountered many failures. At times he seemed his own worst enemy, alienating even those who supported his political goals by throwing away the possible in his insistence upon the impossible. His uncompromising personality remained unexplored despite several biographies. Even the best known of these, for example, devoted only a single sentence to the fact that, at the age of 39, La Follette had supervised the exhumation of the grave of his father, who had died in La Follette's infancy. Thoughts of his father, La Follette told his wife, were always part of his consciousness, even in his early childhood, and his devotion to his memory was, in her words, "almost morbid." In order to emulate his father in life and to try to discover what behavior would have been pleasing to him, La Follette went to extreme measures to satisfy his relentless desire for information about this idolized figure who his mother insisted that he worship. I discovered that La Follette personally gathered up his father's remains and brought them to his family physician to help lay them out for careful study. According to the doctor, La Follette "seemed to be very intent on ... re-producing in imagination the form of his father as he must have looked in life." The startling exhumation scene alone, it seemed to me, demanded further inquiry into the forces that shaped La Fol.-

lette, including his elderly stepfather, a failing shopkeeper who whipped his stepsons and made a daily ritual of preaching about the agonies of eternal hellfire and damnation for those who, like their father, died unbaptized and unrepentant. Four years and 532 pages later, I had not only a PhD, but much greater insight into this remarkable politician, husband (to Belle Case La Follette, first female graduate of the University of Wisconsin Law School, suffrage speaker, and activist for peace and civil rights), and father (of four, two of whom followed him into politics).

I sent the manuscript to Harvard University Press. Reader A termed the monograph "a well re-searched, effectively written psychobiography" and "a most effective analysis of La Follette's personality and driving force," which was "well worth publishing." Reader B criticized the "scanty re-search" but called the chapter on La Follette's relationship with his oldest son and namesake "excellent." Reader C's response was exactly the opposite, praising me for having a "done marvelous job of research" which was "solid and original" but referring to the chapter on the relationship with the son as "a disaster" and "simply irresponsible." Reader C also claimed to be "quite willing to take seriously a psychobiographical evaluation," yet, tellingly, asserted that such an approach "always almost makes the subject look 'bad,' if only because the author attempts to show that the subject's stated reasons for doing things aren't the 'real' reasons."

When Harvard ultimately rejected the manuscript, I was disappointed but not devastated. I naively concluded that I simply needed to find the right press, a decision that ultimately had environmental implications, as an entire forest must have been leveled to produce the resultant rejection letters. Those letters first surprised me and then, as their numbers increased, left me shocked and de-pressed. But even the harsh ones singled out the material on La Follette's public breakdown in 1912 as especially compelling. I revised that material and began submitting it to journals as an article. As with the larger manuscript, there was much interest, but great unease with the psychological approach. I was elated when the readers for *The Psychohistory Review* responded with helpful advice on how to make it better psychohistory, rather than denounce me for making it psychoanalytic in the first place. The article appeared in that journal ("The 'Political Suicide' of Robert M La Follette: Public Disaster, Private Catharsis," *The Psychohis-*

tory Review, Volume 21, Number 2 (Winter 1993), pp. 187-220) and was followed two years later by another article drawn from the larger manuscript, on the emotional development, senatorial career, and ultimate suicide of La Follette's son ("The Burden of a Great Name: Robert M La Follette, Jr.," *The Psychohistory Review*, Volume 23, Number 2 (Winter 1995), pp. 167-91).

Rejection letters for the book-length manuscript continued to mount. The emphatic disdain for openly psychoanalytic remarks and interpretations became overwhelming. Although the concepts and analysis remained intact, the psychoanalytic language and references to specific theorists were first relegated to the footnotes, and then removed entirely. In their place I discussed complex issues of emotional development and behavior in easily accessible terms and in ways that seemed to me to need no real leap of theoretical faith, but were logically based in common sense. As I toned down the psychology, I geared up the politics and struggled mightily to find the right balance between the two. The manuscript finally found a home at the University of North Carolina Press and was published as *Fighting Bob La Follette: Righteous Reformer* in 2000.

During the presidential campaign of 2000, an op-ed feature I wrote, comparing Ralph Nader's independent bid for the presidency to La Follette's in 1912, was carried by newspapers in a number of states. Most versions noted that the biography was forthcoming. I immediately received a flattering e-mail from the associate director of the press that had sent me the most hostile rejection letter of all, one that had caused me great distress. The editor didn't recall my submission, but wondered if my manuscript had been submitted and "short-sightedly" rejected. That same day my press was contacted by Ralph Nader's office, seeking an advance copy of the book. After so many years of self-doubt and frustration, I began to feel, if not vindication, at least relief.

The emphasis placed by pre-publication critics on the psychological aspects varied widely, giving a taste of things to come. Howard Zinn focused exclusively on La Follette's unique political courage, while Don Ritchie of the U.S. Senate Historical Office called the book "a convincing portrait of 'Fighting Bob' that does justice to both the man and his political movement." Historian John Milton Cooper, Jr., wrote, "Unger has produced a fascinating, insightful and persuasive portrait of Wisconsin's 'Little Giant.' She has a good feel for

him and penetrates into his mind and character. Especially impressive is the way she shows the repetitive patterns in his life of intense involvement and overwork followed by withdrawals and often accompanied by physical breakdowns."

In September 2000, *Fighting Bob La Follette* was featured on Amazon.com as one of the best new books in the field of history. This generated interest, compounded by a favorable notice in *The New York Times Book Review* that concluded, "Unger's voice remains subdued and objective throughout the book, but La Follette manages to leap from its pages." In subsequent reviews, 24 to date, the range of response to the psychology was dramatic. Some ignored it entirely. One called the book "a model of lively political history" even as it praised my history of La Follette's psychological distress. Others responded as if the book were a dedicated psychobiography. One newspaper re-view, for example, featured a seven by eight-and-a-half inch portrait of La Follette. It had been split lengthwise, with the left half placed two inches higher than the right, to emphasize La Follette's divided self. The review was entitled, "The Fight Within: Book Chronicles Inner Struggles of 'Fighting Bob' La Follette." Another noted that "the book focuses heavily -- perhaps too heavily -- on La Follette's private family life," and yet concluded, "Unger goes deeper into what made 'Fighting Bob' tick than any of the dozens of others who have written about him," and placed *Fighting Bob* on their 'must read' list for the year. *The Progressive*, on the other hand, dedicated a three-page review entitled "Feet of Clay" to denouncing my blasphemy in "simplistically psychoanalyzing La Follette." I was accused by the magazine's editor of becoming "contemptuous of old Fighting Bob"; of treating him without sympathy, compassion, or generosity; and of "sneering" at him and speaking disapprovingly.

According to one reviewer, "Unger deftly explores the psychological issues," while another complained, "Her dutiful march through her subject's writings and letters leaves one with a wealth of detail about illnesses, diet, vacations, moments of self-doubt, and other personal matters at the expense of more fully examining the elements and contradictions of La Follette's evolving politics." Conversely, one journal that praised the political material also noted, "Unger's account documents a history of psychological distress that has been underestimated in the existing La Follette scholarship," while still another asserted, "the character of

La Follette, Sr., and his history of accomplishments were and are dramatic enough to make *these* [psychological] suppositions, in the final analysis, not all that important."

When I was notified that *Fighting Bob* had won the Wisconsin Historical Society's 2001 Book of Merit Award, several people asked if I intended to travel all the way from California to Wisconsin to receive it. I did. I took great satisfaction in that award, just as I did in the several reviews and many letters from the public praising the book's balance of the personal and the political. I am still struck by the range of responses to the psychological aspects of my book, and the intensity of both the hostility and the praise. In the end, however, the latter far outweighed the former, and I believe that my approach brought new understanding to the life of an important politician and a great and complex man.

Nancy C. Unger, PhD, is Assistant Professor of History, Women and Gender Studies, and Environmental Studies at Santa Clara University. Her work on the La Follettes subsequent to *Fighting Bob* includes "'I Went to Learn': Meanings of the European Tour of Senator Robert M La Follette," *Mid-America* (Winter/summer/fall 2002), and "'When Women Condemn the Whole Race': Belle Case La Follette Attacks the Color Line" to appear in *Women in Print* (2003). Her current book project is *Beyond "Nature's Housekeepers": American Women and Gender in Environmental History*. Professor Unger may be reached at <nunger@scu.edu>. □

On Being a Psychohistorian

Sander J. Breiner, MD, F.A.P.A.
Michigan State University and
Wayne State University

I'm a physician, psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and psychohistorian. I'm a professor at *three* medical schools (Medicine and Osteopathy at Michigan State, Medicine at Wayne State) and have published over 100 scientific articles. However, this tells little of who I am personally, how I became a psychohistorian, and what I read that I consider important in my transformation to a psychohistorian.

The following are personal factors I consider important in my development in this special vocation. My mother was of Hungarian Jewish extraction. I was always interested in the complicated

and fascinating history and background of both sides of my family. Though my family was not religious, they practiced a moderate form of Judaism. My father was an atheist and so was I from age 12. However, at age 16 I taught the history of the ancient Fertile Crescent in a Jewish Sunday school.

My father, Alfred Breiner, was an Austrian Jew, who was a linguist and fluent in all the major European languages, including classical Latin and Greek. As a young man he left home and wandered about Europe and North Africa, eventually coming to the U.S. When the U.S. entered WWI he enlisted in the Rainbow Division (NY) and soon became an interpreter and translator for General Pershing. Prior to WWII he was an active anti-Nazi and helped many people (both Jew and Christian) to escape from the Nazis. He was senior interpreter/translator (with the rank of General) at the first Nuremberg Trial. When I saw him there, he would not show me or even tell me about the pictures and documents about the German-run concentration camps that he was studying and translating, as it would be "too upsetting" for his son (even though I had been a combat infantryman in France, Belgium, and Germany).

After the war I returned to college as a premed student -- and to my first awakening to the distorted history that I had been taught. Purely by accident I took an "easy course" on Latin American history and learned the truth of some of the unfair and dishonest things my country had done in this geographic area. Though I continued on to medical school, I took an additional study at a separate university in Henry George economics. Not only in medical school but also in my personal pleasure reading, was the history of medicine, psychology, and, most importantly, psychoanalysis. When I began my formal training in psychoanalysis, my extensive reading and study of Freud included a fascination with *Moses* and Monotheism and his study of the sculpture of Moses holding the Ten Commandments. These were my first psycho-historical studies, and have since been a major influence on my studies of history.

The other books that I have read along the way that have been an influence are: *Penguin Is-land*, *Candide*, *Gargantua*, *Decameron*, *History of the Jews*, *Arab Mind*, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, and, of course, the material on child-hood by Lloyd deMause and Philip Aries. Edward Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, is the most insightful historical writer I have read. You can open at random any of the books of the set

and find wonderful quotable comments with in-sight. I should not leave out my studies of Rene Descartes, John Locke, David Hume, and Immanuel Kant.

However, the most important training to be a psychohistorian is personal psychoanalytic therapy and training, and an inquiring mind that doubts the non-psychological understanding of historical events.

Sander Breiner, MD, is part-time Associate Professor of Psychiatry at Michigan State University and part-time Assistant Professor of Psychiatry at Wayne State University. He is author of *Slaughter of the Innocents: Child Abuse Through the Ages and Today* (1990) and numerous articles on childrearing, diseases, masochism, and the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. Dr. Breiner may be contacted at <sjbreiner@comcasinet>. □

Neglected Works in Psychohistory

Leon Rappoport
Kansas State University

The opening line in Gore Vidal's little memoir called *Screening History* goes something like this: "All I know about history I learned at the movies." The line came back to me while looking through my collection of books and papers on psychohistory. I rediscovered some favorites that I've enjoyed and used in the past in relevant courses, but which concern the topic of movies, which doesn't seem to get much attention lately in main-stream psychohistory (if there is such a thing).

The first item is Paul Monaco's 1976 book, *Cinema and Society*. It was based on a dissertation he completed at Brandeis under Rudy Binion, who will come up again in this article. (I had forgotten that Monaco had published an article about his dissertation in *the History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory* in 1974.) Briefly, two things from Monaco's book still impress me and perhaps deserve emphasis as "pathbreaking." First, he carefully specifies the psychological and physiological similarities between dreaming and viewing a film -- a point that carries obvious implications for the study of group fantasies. Second, all movies are the result of a complex, collective effort involving a mix of people representing technical, financial, and artistic skills. In other words, it is necessary for a variety of people to share and

invest themselves in a group fantasy before they can produce one for public consumption. One need only read Peter Bogdanovich's biography of Orson Welles to see how profoundly addictive the shared group experience of filmmaking can be-come.

Also on my shelf is Henry Lawton's re-view essay, "Towards a Psychohistorical Theory of Film" in a 1992 issue of the Journal of Psychohistory. It is a more eclectic effort that suggests a tentative paradigm for psychohistorical analysis of movies. Based on his study of 17 diverse works about the art and meaning of film, it is densely packed with useful insights and interesting personal comments, not the least of which is his narrative of how important movies were to him as he was growing up. This was true for many of us, including me and, on the testimony in his book, also Gore Vidal. But just how all of us were influenced by our frequent moviegoing (and/or television viewing) remains an open and challenging question.

The vast literature on the Holocaust, psychohistorical and otherwise, was for many years a major focus of study for me and my recently de-ceased friend and colleague, George Kren. Among the many excellent works we learned from, two stand out as relatively neglected or unfairly criticized. The first of the was Tom Segev's 1977 dissertation, *The Commanders of the Nazi Concentration Camps*, later published in 1987 as *Soldiers of Evil*. Based on interviews with these former SS officers, a remarkable achievement in itself, it showed very clearly that their behavior was not due to any certifiable form of psychopathology. Indeed, as we now have seen confirmed in more recent work by Christopher Browning (see *Ordinary Men*, 1992), Segev's finding that normal, regular guys are capable of just about anything was correct, but at the time, few people wanted to hear it. (Just as few people today want to hear the same truth about terrorists and suicide bombers.)

It may not be accurate to call Rudy Bin-ion's 1975 psychobiography *Hitler Among the Germans* "neglected," because its publication did receive a good deal of attention. Unfortunately, much of it was in our (George and my) view overly critical and somewhat dismissive. Yet it seems to me now that despite the subsequent and more de-tailed studies of Hitler that have appeared, there is

little or no evidence to suggest that Binion's discussions of Hitler's relationship with his mother, the Jewish physician who *treated her for cancer*,

and his gassing in WWI as critically significant for his later career were flawed. Nor is there anything to contradict Binion's description of Hitler's charisma "among the Germans"

Leon Rappoport, PhD, is Professor of Psychology and Director of the Personality-Social Graduate Program at Kansas State University. He has published work in the areas of personality development, decision-making, Holocaust studies, and food cognition. His book on the psychosocial meanings of food, *How We Eat: Appetite, Culture, and the Psychology of Food*, has recently been published Professor Rappoport may be contacted at <rappo@ksu.edu>. □

My Psychohistorical Classics

Robert Pois

University of Denver at Boulder

When I think of classics of psychohistory, Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontent*, is the first book that comes to mind. It is quite valuable though perhaps it represents a touch of arrogance to make such a sweeping statement about civilization. Although it is not a psychohistorical classic, I also recommend "Analysis Terminal and Interminable" as an example of Freud's intellectual honesty. There are two fine Peter Loewenberg articles which are included in Loewenberg, *Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach*: "The Unsuccessful Adolescence of Heinrich Himmler" and "The Psychohistorical Origins of the Nazi Youth Cohort" The psychohistorical approach is incredibly valuable also to military historians. On my list I include the expanded version of Paul Elovitz, "Perspectives on Teaching About War-Making in 2002 America," which is the centerpiece to a Journal of Psychohistory Summer 2003 symposium.

Robert Pois, PhD, is Professor of History at the University of Colorado at Boulder. His special interests are in Weimar Germany, Nazism, the Great War, and German Expressionism. His latest book, *Failures in Military Decision Making: Some Psychological Observations*, is co-authored with Philip Langer and is forthcoming in the spring of 2004. Dr. Pois may be reached at <poisr@colarado.edu>. □

Nominate someone for a Young Scholar/ Analyst Award. Contact Paul H. Elovitz.

The Trolley and the Tunnel

(Continued from front page)

of Make Believe" via the trolley that ran between his world and the fantasy world of Lady Elaine, King Friday XBI, and the other marionettes. Yet, as an adult, I have trouble placing this dream exactly in the context of my life. From my vantage point today, it seems to me that I had more or less stopped watching the show or, at least, was watching it with less frequency and interest; thus, I believe I was around seven years old, give or take a year -- in any case, solidly into the latency stage. The power of this nightmare -- which it was -- was such that I am even uncertain whether I dreamed it once or if it was recurring.

In any case, in the dream I travel to the Neighborhood of Make-Believe (henceforth, NMB) on the red trolley, through the long, twisting, dark tunnel. (Viewers will remember this is not just dream imagery; the camera actually depicts this in the show.) In the NMB, I interact with the characters as Fred did (he himself is not in my dream). I have no memory of what anyone did or said there; however I clearly remember what happened next. I am in the tunnel again, apparently waiting for the trolley to take me back to the "real" world, when suddenly it is right in front of me, speeding towards me. I am very frightened, but before I can react, it runs me right down. The dream ends, but there is a lingering feeling of shock and fear when I wake up and recall it, a feeling I can still evoke clearly today.

In analyzing this dream, two, possibly complementary, psychoanalytic options come to mind. First, one must acknowledge the uncannily Freudian imagery here. The powerful trolley initially transports me through a tunnel to a "Neighborhood of Make Believe," where I am the biggest, most powerful figure in the society, commanding the attention of royalty; then, seemingly without notice, in the tunnel that same trolley destroys me. From the Freudian perspective, this dream is an Oedipal echo, where my fantasy of power, even over adults, kings, and queens, is unceremoniously cut short by the truth about power --that it does not belong to me, but to the one whose "trolley" is in the "tunnel," and thus I must end my Oedipal fantasy, lest I be destroyed. It is a clear triumph of the reality principle over the pleasure principle at the hands (wheels?) of my father, and a premonition of the emotionally perilous journey into adulthood that lays ahead.

Yet, another perspective might serve to draw this dream out of the realm of the personal into that of the cultural. The trolley on the show nearly literally signifies the NMB as an example of Donald Winnicott's "transitional space," whereby a kind of televisual mass transit takes Fred, the viewer, and the rest of the audience to a place de-fined by new rules of play and creativity. As in any child's story or game, the characters in the NMB are both real and not real; the marionettes' reality is not doubted any more than Fred's is. In fact, the power of play is that the fantasy is experienced as, in some ways, more real and compelling than ordinary reality; certainly, the colorful personas of the inhabitants of the NMB made for more ideal companions in play for children than the soft-spoken, earnest, cardigan-wearing adult who came to visit them.

So, too, does the NMB in the dream represent exactly this kind of liberating escape from social or external reality; the dream, then, is about the conflict between these two spaces taking place in the third, the subjective space of my inner world. It is about the anxiety felt when the reality of which one is not the master begins to dominate and dispel the fantasy. Especially fascinating about this interpretation is the layering and reduplication of fantasy or transitional spaces: It is a dream about a puppet world on a TV show. But it is not the playful elements that I remember clearly (memory being another symbolic psychological space) but the confrontation with reality that destroys me once I am done playing. Understood this way, the dream does more than express disillusionment over the impending end of childhood -- it warns me not to give up play and fantasy entirely, or I truly will find myself on the tracks unable to move, with life barreling down on me. Nightmare or not, Mr. Rogers surely would have approved if his show impressed that message upon my psyche.

Dereck Daschke, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Truman State University in Kirksville, Missouri. He has written on Christian mysticism and Jungian psychology in the *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* and the role of melancholia in Old Testament Exilic prophecy in *American Imago*. He has also taught courses on religion and healing, psychology and religion, apocalypticism, and the search for spirituality. Professor Daschke may be contacted at <ddaschke@truman.edu>.

□

"Won't You Be My Neighbor?":

Mr. Rogers as an Ethical Model

Thomas G. Plante
 Santa Clara University and
 Stanford University School of Medicine

Like so many people influenced by "Mr. Rogers Neighborhood," I was surprised and saddened to hear the news of Fred Rogers' death in late February from stomach cancer at the age of 74. I remember watching "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood" on a regular basis after school while growing up. His show first appeared on public television in 1968 when I was eight-years-old. I watched it regularly until I was 11 or 12, and then occasion-ally into my teens with my sister who was seven years younger.

Mr. Rogers appeared so different from most of the men I knew in my working-class town in northern Rhode Island. My father was a high school dropout who worked in construction, and wasn't very interested in education or discussing feelings. Mr. Rogers expressed care and concerns for others, was soft-spoken and thoughtful, found it easy to discuss his feelings with both children and adults, and seemed attentive to both ethical and spiritual matters. He intrigued me. I felt drawn to his lessons and insights into human behavior. When I learned over the years that he was an ordained Presbyterian minister as well as a person who had academic training in child development, I was not at all surprised. I was also not surprised to learn that *many* people reported that he was the same kind of person in private as he was in public: He apparently was very much himself on his television show.

I do believe that Mr. Rogers and his show influenced me to become a clinical psychologist. I knew of no psychologists or other mental health professionals while growing up. My mother, how-ever, was an elementary school teacher and thought highly of public television in general and Mr. Rogers in particular. I believe that Mr. Rogers taught me that men can be thoughtful, sensitive, and open in discussing their feelings, and can see all of life as special. On reflection, I now see him as both an ethical and spiritual model.

In my most recent book, *Do the Right Thing. Living Ethically in an Unethical World* (in press), I introduce a five-point model of value ethics. The approach comes from what we have learned over the years from moral philosophy as

well as the influence of the American Psychological Association's Ethics Code. The model reflects the following values that can be applied to all behavior: respect, responsibility, integrity, competence, and concern. As I think of what Mr. Rogers modeled and promoted on his long-running public television show, I believe that he well embodied these important ethical principles. He clearly emphasized that all life should be treated respectfully and that we must be responsible for our thoughts and behavior. He also clearly embodied and modeled integrity, highlighting the importance of being honest, fair, and just in all that we do and say. He also emphasized the importance of competence and appeared to highly appreciate and delight in the skills of his guests and show characters. Finally, he often highlighted and well patterned the need to experience and express concern for others. Perhaps his ability to express concern and appreciation for others was what impressed me above all. In doing so, he well modeled good ethical behavior, thinking, and decision-making.

When I think of other television personalities and celebrities, they all fall short in comparison to Mr. Rogers as examples for children and families. Mr. Rogers well modeled what it means to be a good neighbor. If more people were like Mr. Rogers, we would indeed all be better neighbors and likely not experience so many of the devastating societal and international problems that we have today. I with more people were watching and learning from his excellent example.

My sadness at Mr. Rogers' death is tempered by the knowledge that he was a positive influence in the lives of so many, and that in subtle (and perhaps not so subtle ways) he lives on in the hearts and minds of those influenced by him. I am pleased and proud that his influence touched me and contributed to the person I am and the person I hope to be. I do not regret watching his show even when I was perhaps "too old" to watch "children's programming." Thank you. Mr. Rogers. Rest in peace, my good neighbor.

Thomas G. Plante, PhD, ABPP, is Professor of Psychology at Santa Clara University and a Clinical Associate Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University School of Medicine. He may be reached at <tplante@scu.edu>. □

Introduce a friend to the Psychohistory Forum/Clio's Psyche. Contact Paul H. Elovitz.

Mr. Rogers: The Nature of the Man

Laura E. Levine
Central Connecticut State University

Eighteen years ago, when my son was three years old, we sat together comfortably watching Mr. Rogers on TV. At the end of the show, my son turned to me and said, "Mom, I think he knows my name." I was so moved by his sense that his "friend" on TV knew him personally that I told my family (and anyone else who would listen) about what he'd said.

This event would have been enough to make me love Mr. Rogers forever, but there was more. My sister, Beth Levine, a freelance writer, was assigned to interview Fred Rogers about a book he had written. She called and asked for an interview. He agreed, but only on the condition that she allow him to find out about her as well. So they talked. He told about himself and she talked about an interesting article she was writing about adoption. He had a special interest in the topic because he had an adopted sister. They wrote several letters to each other. Beth eventually wrote to Mr. Rogers about what my son had said about him. She received a wonderful letter back from him in which he said, "How perceptive your 3-year-old nephew is! When he said, 'I think he knows my name,' little did he know that *name* and *nature* are the exact same word in Old Testament Hebrew. I've spent much of my professional life trying to know the nature of children like your nephew. Please give him a hug for me when you see him."

Several years later, as a clinical psychologist, I was involved in therapy with a woman suffering from depression. During the time that we worked together, she gave birth to a child. When he was about 18 months old she came to her therapy session and told me about her experience watching Mr. Rogers with her son. Struggling with her own self-esteem, she told me that she felt so much better after watching Mr. Rogers on TV. He would look out from the TV and seem as if he was talking just to her, and he would tell her (and everyone who was watching) how special, unique, and important each individual was. With a laugh she said that she really did feel special then, and that the feeling stayed with her throughout her day.

Now that I teach a course entitled "The Psychology of Early Childhood," my students and

I discuss the impact of educational TV on pre-schoolers. They all know "Sesame Street" and "Blues Clues" Some groan when I bring up "Mr. Rogers and His Neighborhood," but they stop moaning when I bring them back to how they actually felt as small children watching the show. When I bring up the slower pace and the personal attention, those students who had been quiet begin piping up about how much they always loved the show. It may not be cool to like Mr. Rogers, but they loved him anyway.

There was magic to the man and that magic was personal connection and appreciation of every individual. From my three-year-old son, to a 30-year-old depressed woman, to 19-year-old college students, to me myself, we were all touched by Mr. Rogers' nature and we all felt in some way that he knew our name.

Laura E. Levine, PhD, is Associate Professor of Psychology at Central Connecticut State University, where she specializes in the development of infants and young children. She is the author (with Bradley M Waite) of "Television and the Life of the American Child" in Clio's Psyche, Vol. 9 No. 1, June 2002, pp 24-26 Dr Levine may be contacted at devinel@ccsu.edu>.

"Mr. Rogers Preaching"

H. John Rogers
Psychohistory Forum Research Associate

Some 20 years ago as a student at Pitts-burgh Theological Seminary, I did my year of student ministry at the Emory United Methodist Church, a couple blocks from the Seminary. Like most metropolitan Protestant churches, Emory operated at about 30 percent capacity, with the congregation consisting of a growing contingent of African-Americans from the "hood." In addition to my other duties, I was to deliver the main sermon once a month. At my first preaching, I was pleasantly surprised to gaze out at 25-50 additional congregants. More amazingly, I counted 15 or more Seminary students, nearly all of whom I knew to be "Presbys," or Presbyterians.

In a conversation with a conservative female classmate at the coffee hour after church, I said, "It's nice that so many Presbyterians Caine to hear my first sermon."

"Did you notice the marquee sign out

front?" she asked softly.

I had. It read, "Mr. Rogers Preaching."

Fred Rogers was a graduate of the Pitts-burgh Theological Seminary and an ordained Presbyterian minister. Despite his "day job" on television, he remained active in the local Presbytery and eventually served on the board of the Seminary. By all local accounts, though, he viewed "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood" as his ministry.

The original format of the show would appear to have been borrowed from a post-WWII addition to the service in Protestant churches to accommodate the "baby boom," namely, the "Children's Sermon." This innovation -- perhaps an indirect product of Dr. Spock's book -- was the *via media* between the total exclusion of young children from the service and the earlier practice of forcing them to sit in uncomfortable seats listening to that steady pastoral drone which has cured many parishioners of insomnia. One of the higher compliments that churchgoers pay to the parents is "How well behaved they are!" I wince when I hear this because my observation has been that the dumber the child, the less the fidgeting.

My exposure to "Mr. Rogers' Neighbor-hood" over the decades has been somewhat limited, but from the programs that I did view it seems fairly clear that the text comes largely from the amorphous theology of Middle American. By this I mean the preachments of the mainline Protestant churches (for example, Presbyterians, Methodists, the United Church of Christ, Northern Baptists), Reform Judaism, and "cafeteria" Catholicism. These are the people who the Religious Right has accused of "secular humanism." With the exception of anti-war protesters (past and present) and "pro-choice" people, the religious left in this country has never been much of a socio-political factor, at least nothing close to the force of labor-Catholic coalition in Poland that caused the Soviets to blink or the liberation theologians in South America. Numerous women applied the term "non-threatening" to Mr. Rogers when I asked them what children saw in the entertainer.

The theology can without too great an oversimplification be reduced to a general admonition to "Be nice." This surface pleasantness meshes with what has been the predominant psychological type for the clergy for the past three or four generations. Since WWII numerous studies about the clergy have indicated that the mother has been the one person who most frequently influenced the

child's vocational choice. In the century before, it was the father whom a majority of seminarians said influenced their decision. Whether the "feminization" of the clergy (not necessarily a bad thing) was the cause or effect of this "Be nice" theology is a "the chicken or the egg" question. However, traditional "feminine" values such as absence of conflict, sharing, and soft voices do complement a "Be kind" theology. This is a way of describing "Mr. Rogers' Neighbourhood" -- a get-together with no one getting angry or raising their voices, and the end product being a bland consensus. It also describes many church board meetings. No one ever gets sent to the principal's office.

Part of Mr. Rogers' mystique is the hagiography of public television by the socioeconomic classes just below the idle rich. Commercial television is market-driven, of course, but public television must toady to the affluent, as well as to the foundations and the Fortune 500. It would require a considerable naivete to believe that the people who donate large sums to public television do not to some degree influence the programming. At the very least, those who operate the stations act as volunteer censors.

This was brought home to me in the early 1970s when I went to WQED in Pittsburgh (Mr. Rogers' home base) in the company of Dr. I.E. Buff, a physician who had long been active in the fight to gain adequate compensation for those afflicted with coal miner's pneumoconiosis, or "black lung." The coal companies had attempted to control (with some success) the media coverage of the matter in West Virginia.

The interviewer began "Well, Dr. Buff, you're not in West Virginia now, so you can say anything here you want to say."

"Fine," the doctor replied, "I want to talk about the Mellon family."

The remark was later excised from the tape, just as I suspect Fred Rogers would have been redacted if he had ever asked his child audience, "Why do you think some people in Pitts-burgh are so rich and why some are so poor?" For those who might argue this question would have been inappropriate for these little tots, I would suggest that many inner-city youth have already made this observation, perhaps at show-and-tell after Christmas at a very tender age. But then, in Mr. Rogers' defense, I didn't preach on this subject at my church either, not with trustees from the Mellon Foundation in the congregation.

H. John Rogers, JD, MDiv, MA (Sacred Theology), is a Harvard-trained West Virginia attorney and a minister with some psychoanalytic training. □

J. Lee Shneidman

Paul H. Elovitz

Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

Jerome Lee Shneidman was born June 20, 1929, in New York City. He did his undergraduate and master's work at New York University, studied at Columbia University's Russian Institute for a year, and then received his doctoral degree in 1957 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Jews and the Constitutional Crisis in Aragon, 1265-1283 was his dissertation topic. After teaching at Brooklyn College, City College, the University of Maryland in Europe, and Fairleigh Dickinson University for seven years, he joined Adelphi University in 1963, where he was Professor of History, specializing in historical methodology and Spanish history, until becoming emeritus in 2001. From 1974-1978 he was Special Research Student at the Psychoanalytic Clinic for Training and Re-search, Department of Psychiatry, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University. Among the many organizations he has been a member of are the Group for the Use of Psychology in History, the International Psychohistorical Association, and the Psychohistory Forum. Professor Shneidman was elected in 1965 to the Columbia University Seminar in the History of Legal and Political Thought and Institutions, where he served as chair from 1985-2002.

Dr Shneidman is author of The Rise of the Aragonese-Catalan Empire: 1200-1350 (two vols., 1970), Spain and Franco: The Quest for International Acceptance, 1949-1959 (1973), John F Kennedy (with Peter Schwab, 1974), and numerous articles. Since the 1960s he has been a member of the Board of Collaborators of Indice Historico Espanol in Barcelona. He and his wife, the psychologist/psychoanalyst Connalee (Connie) Levine-Shneidman, have worked together on scholarly research and for over a decade have hosted the Psychohistory Forum Research Group, Communism: The Dream That Failed, that has been transformed into the Autobiography and Biography Research Group. Paul Elovitz conducted the interview in the Shneidman's home in March.

Paul H. Elovitz (PHE): Please tell us

about your family background.

J. Lee Shneidman (JLS): Both my parents were Jewish immigrants from the Russian Empire. My father was a watchmaker; my mother was a housewife and a semi-professional singer with her own Yiddish radio program. The family was middle class. I have a brother, two-and-a-half years younger, who became a lawyer. My father died when I was 54 and my mother when I was 50.

PHE: What brought you to psychohistory?

JLS: The short answer is the realization that I needed formal training to deal with historical individuals because accepted views countered my gut feelings. Let me explain. There were certain problems I faced when writing my book, The Rise of the Aragonese-Catalan Empire: 1200-1350. King James (Jaime) used primarily Jewish administrators, as did his son. The standard interpretation of James' policy was that the Jews bought the office. In the king's autobiography, he states, "When I came to the throne at the age of eight, I came to find that my kingdom was in pawn to the Jews and the Muslims." I accepted that. As I began working on the documents, however, I found that it was not true. I discovered that the Jews did not have money and the king's father, who died at the Battle of Muret, had pawned the castles to the nobles. When I wrote that in the book, I was roundly attacked. Father Robert Burns, working from the Arabic sources, was the only one who supported me, because when looking at the Muslim accounts he found that the Muslims did not have money either. In his book on the Crusaders in Valencia, Burns spends two pages not only defending me but showing how the king's words had been altered.

So, at two o'clock in the morning, I went to my wife, Connie, saying, "Look, I've got a problem. I've looked at the economics and the politics. It makes no sense. Why does the king select either Jews or his bastard children as his administrators?" Her response was to begin to ask me questions about the king's childhood. I had all the information, I didn't have to look up anything. I just had never put it all together. What came out was that the king would appoint only people of whom he had legal control.

By law, Jews (and Muslims) were royal slaves, which meant that they owned nothing. When the Jew died, everything reverted to the king, but the king usually gave it to the heirs after keeping a portion for himself. (Which is why, when a Jew died; the king insisted that all debts be paid.) What the king was doing -- and again, it had

made no sense -- was giving the Jews great privileges. Jews in the Kingdom of Aragon did not have to wear the yellow badge. When one of the local bishops began to badger the Jews, the king wrote a letter to the Pope asking the Pope to inform the bishop not to bother the Jews. People talk about the ghetto as a place the Jews were forced into, yet the ghetto was actually a privilege for the Jews. Within its walls, only Jewish law held sway. You had a local Jewish council. At night the Jews locked the gates of the ghetto so nobody could get in -- this was a privilege. The Jews had an armed military force in case they had to defend the walls. Occasionally a rich Jew would seek privilege to break part of the wall to extend his property because his property was against the wall, and the king would grant this privilege. So the king was giving all sorts of privileges to the Jews and the question was "Why?" What Connie said was that, given the king's early childhood when his uncles tried to kill him; he could only trust people who were completely dependent on him. At that point I decided that I needed my own psychoanalytic training, so I went to Columbia. That's how I got into psychoanalytic history.

The program is at the Center for Psycho-analytic Training and Research, Department of Psychiatry, College of Physicians and Surgeons. Bob Michaels was in charge of it. He was worried that I would want to see patients at a time when psychiatrists wanted to maintain a monopoly on practicing psychoanalysis. I said, "No, I prefer all my patients to be dead." After four years there, a problem developed. Because I wasn't an MD, they didn't want me to sit in on case studies. Otto Kern-berg was giving a class on the British school with case examples from his own practice and they didn't want me to take it. I spoke with Kernberg, who let me in the course. After that it was becoming increasingly difficult, so I went to the Ruben Fine Psychoanalytic Institute. After a year they said that I had to see patients. I said that I didn't want to see patients, it wasn't my interest. I would make a terrible analyst! I left shortly thereafter. My own analysis helps me deal with my years in the hospital and with physicians and authority figures.

It was helpful to take the theoretical courses at Columbia and being exposed -- not only to Freud, because Columbia is not Freudian -- but also to Kernberg, the British school (Balint and Winnicott), and the various other theorists. I could pick and choose what theory part fit what facts. For example, Ferenczi talks about the psychological importance of the eyes. Esther Burr, Aaron

Burr's mother, always complained about her eyes. That could be useful. I don't believe in having a theoretical frame of reference and then making the facts fit

PHE: It's interesting that it's the psycho-analytic theory that has great influence on you, and that for me, it's the psychoanalytic training that I had as a historian: the cases, the working with patients, and the working with the transference. I found I tended to use the theoretical materials when I was anxious. I would jump to conclusions, whether about patients living or historical. I am very cautious about theoretical models.

JLS: Right, one can't put the cart before the horse. I don't start out with a theory; I start out with a set of historical facts and then look to some theories to help explain them. It's Balint who comes up with the theory that you can have the best possible child and the best possible mother, but if they don't fit, the result is a neurotic mother and a psychotic child. You have to deal with the facts and then explain. Bun said, "I leave my actions to speak for themselves." That's an attitudinal value, but where did he get it? I can find a theory that can explain it, but then I have to see how his actions fit into the theoretical framework

PHE: How was your view of historical figures and events transformed by getting this analytical experience?

JLS: It wasn't transformed at all. I always had the feeling that people make decisions based on their personality. For instance, the first article that I wrote was on the so-called "Russian Invasion," the Russian plans to invade India in 1801 in alliance with Napoleon. The "documents" describing the plan were a series of letters that Emperor Paul I supposedly wrote to Napoleon. I have the letters. I said that Paul could not have written one of the letters because it says that the Russian Army would go through Kazakhstan, but they would have to stop at a monastery (which did exist), but that the head of the monastery was in Bavaria and Paul would have to write to him to seek permission. There was no way Paul would ever write that. Paul was the absolute master in Russia, he was an autocrat, his entire reign was devoted to bringing back the position of the czar (the emperor) to what it had been under Peter the Great, who was an absolute autocrat. I concluded that the document was a forgery.

PHE: For the record, how do you define *psychohistory*? How can we strengthen it?

JLS: Psychohistory is using the psycho-

analytic sciences, or the psychological sciences, as one of the tools in understanding and writing history, specifically in explaining motivation and choice among options. Luther, Loyola, and Erasmus all faced the same external problems, yet each opted for a different external solution. It's not the end-all-be-all -- there is nothing like that in history. We can strengthen our field by learning how to use verifiable data and by using logic in acceptable language.

PHE: Would you list, preferably in order of importance, the greatest contributors to psycho-history?

JLS: Foremost, Erikson, but after him, I don't know. Franz Fanon used psychohistory, except I was turned off. He wrote as though he knew something about psychoanalysis, but he didn't believe in psychoanalysis and he published against it in France. He didn't know Arabic, so how could he write all those big meanings of what Berber peas-ants told him about how they felt about being emasculated by the French?

PHE: What is the importance of the study of childhood to psychohistory?

JLS: It helps explain why certain individuals make certain choices. It helps us understand that children do identify, either by following or re-belling. It shows how influential parental loss can be. For example, on Burr and Hamilton it was tremendous. With Burr, within a period of 18 months, by the time he was three and a half, he had lost his mother, father, grandmother, and two grandfathers. He's forced to live with his 18-year-old maternal uncle, a minister who had just married. One consequence of parental loss for Bun, who was quite competent and hard working, was that he was never sure of himself and he was reluctant to show himself to the world. He hated the society of his maternal grandfather, Jonathan Edwards, the leading philosopher-theologian of his era, who had deserted him through death, which is why he didn't go into the ministry, and preferred the company of lower-class people to those of his own group. Hamilton suffered from parental loss, his own illegitimacy, and the psychoses of his parents. He married up and defended the upper class with whom he identified, despite his underlying anger at them.

PHE: Of which of your works are you most proud? What are you working on now?

JLS: My first book, *The Rise of the Aragonese-Catalan Empire, 1200-1350*. I've recently completed *Leading from Weakness: Jefferson's*

Overt and Coven Relations with Spain and the Barbary Sates: 1801-1807. Its importance is to understand that coven operations have always been a part of American foreign policy, to realize that presidents deny or cover up their actions so they can be seen as having "clean hands," and to question who has the power to declare war.

PHE: What theoretical framework have you ended up with to explain Thomas Jefferson's covert actions and his dissembling because of his need to maintain an image?

JLS: The latest book on Jefferson, Joseph J. Ellis, *American Sphinx*, talks about how Jefferson compartmentalized. I have not put it into a framework, but I have the facts. For instance, when Jefferson was a child, his father remarried to the widow of a Randolph and he kept his children by the different marriages in separate parts of the house which he had built in the shape of an "H." The Randolph family was on one leg and the Jefferson on the other, and they met in the middle. So, Jefferson had to compartmentalize his relation-ships with the Randolphs, setting a lifelong pattern of keeping things separate. So he could honestly believe in the universal Lockean principle of the equality of all men and, at the same time, in the inferiority of African-Americans, thus never acknowledging his own children by Sally Hemmings.

PHE: So there you used ideas from Balint?

JLS: I would use Balint, anything that would help explain Jefferson. For example, I gave a paper in San Francisco about Hamilton. I think that Hamilton was psychotic, as his parents had been, and the psychosis was completely encapsulated so he could function perfectly normally. His merchantilistic economics of governmental protection and encouragement were perfectly normal. The psychological reason behind these policies was his identification with the commercial class rather than the plantation class. When it came to his relationship with Burr, I used the concept of projective identification whereby Hamilton turned Bun into his evil self. It seemed to fit. For in-stance, Hamilton wrote a letter to John Jay, who was governor of New York at the time, suggesting that Jay overturn the election results of 1800 for the New York State Legislature because the Jeffersonians won control of the legislature and it was the senators and the assembly that elected the presidential electors. Jay responded that he didn't think it would be proper action. Hamilton then wrote a letter attacking Burr, who engineered the Jeffersonian victory, saying that Burr wanted to violate the *Constitution of New York State*. Thus

Hamilton had projected his own vile faults onto 'Burr. Hamilton was exceedingly jealous of Burr because Burr had everything that Hamilton wanted: Bun would be vice president of the U.S., Burr's father had been president of Princeton College, and his grandfather was Edwards. John Adams wrote to Jefferson in 1813 that if Burr ever wanted to run for President, just the name "Bun" would guarantee him 100,000 votes.

PHE: You are one of a very few historians who has written about countertransference issues of historians.

JLS: There's no such thing as impartial history. Someone once said that all histories of England are either pro-Tory or pro-Whig. Every-body comes to history with his/her own baggage. Sometimes you're aware of it. When *The Rise of the Aragonese-Catalan Empire* came out, one of the reviewers said that I don't like the feudal aristocracy. He was right but I did not realize that it showed. That's my own upbringing; I found they were useless. They had all the privilege when they originally did service for that privilege but now they had the privilege without doing the service. My own attitudes and values I bring to what I write. I don't like Hamilton; I don't like what he stands for. I don't believe in government of the rich and wellborn. I don't like Jefferson personally because he's kind of sneaky, but I like what he stands for. So we look at things through our prism and the bias comes through.

I tell my students that history is art. Every historian has a palette full of facts with which he paints. He can use a thick brush for this and high-light it with a thin brush or he can use a thin brush for this and use a thick brush to highlight it. So what a historian does is take the facts, determines their relevance, and either highlights them or downplays them. The historian looks at the data and refines it through his own prism, his own attitudes and values.

PHE: Many years ago in one of our sessions on the fathers of psychohistorians, you spoke about the impact of your personal history and predilections on your scholarship, relating them to your childhood cancer and hospitalization. Would you elaborate?

JLS: I had cancer, melanoma on the groin. Twice I heard the doctors say to get the parents be-cause I wasn't supposed to live until morning. If I lived, I wasn't supposed to walk. I was never al-owed to do any athletics; after all, I had been told I was not supposed to live. Being constantly con-

finied to the hospital ward with no privacy, I read a lot and became involved in history to keep my mind active. I fantasized I was *with the historical people I read about*. I read the newspapers and *National Geographic*, and eventually studied history through my stamp collecting, especially of Russia. This enabled me to move beyond a hospital bed in the Bronx. I was always drawn toward adventure novels, of the Raphael Sabatini variety. Anything to get my thoughts away from the hospital with its grey-green walls, the smell of ether, and the curtain they would wrap around my bed so they could then ignore me.

I had a tremendous authority problem. A vivid memory I had was of being rushed to the hospital. The doctors had removed a tumor, but the tumor came back. It then exploded and the puss was coming out. My father rushed me to the emergency ward of the hospital. The doctor wouldn't even touch me until my father came up with \$25, which he didn't have. So he had to go around to all our relatives and pick up \$5 here and \$6 there, until he had the \$25. To me, "MD" stands for "medically deranged." Connie insisted that the reason that I selected Columbia Psychoanalytic was because it was part of a medical school and I was working out my animosity towards physicians. I don't know if that succeeded. The late Chaim Shatan correctly pointed out 30 years ago that I write only about growth, not decline, a subject that is still uncomfortable for me to research and write about.

PHE: What has the impact been on you of being married to a psychologist /psychoanalyst?

JLS: It's been great. Connie was analytically trained at NYU Psychoanalytic. Working with my wife has been most helpful in my psycho-historical work. If I were having a problem with a certain person, Connie would ask the questions and I would role-play the person, answering as if I were the historical personage. I had all the answers, I just never thought of asking the questions until I decided to get my own training.

PHE: What has the Research Group on Communism: The Dream That Failed, which has now become mostly a biography and autobiography research group, meant to you?

JLS: We're a great group of friends -- very close-knit. That's also why we prefer to keep it a closed, by invitation only, group: there's no competition, no one-upmanship, and no leader -- just expertise. Listening to the approaches of the other members allows me to grow and constantly look

for multiple possible answers.

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

JLS: People need security. If it is not inner, then they look outside of themselves. Absolute truth is external. Terrorism is an overstated temper tantrum of a frustrated adult.

PHE: You've written about Franco. What are your thoughts on him?

JLS: He was a good manipulator and a good conciliator. He could jump when the iron got too hot. The only reason he survived is that no-body could replace him. Hitler wanted to try to have him removed, but the German ambassador wrote back saying that there was no way they could replace him because Franco was great at maintaining the support of often opposing groups such as the Fascists, conservatives, the Church, the monarchists, and the Jose Antonioists who were anti-capitalist, anti-monarchist, and anti-clerical. He played one off against the other.

PHE: In what year did Hitler want him re-moved?

JLS: In 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939. It was on a regular basis. In fact, twice he ordered the German General Staff to invade Spain. The first time he rescinded the order so he could invade Yugoslavia, and the second time he rescinded the Spanish order to invade Russia. He met Franco outside of Biarritz, afterwards he said he'd rather have two teeth pulled than meet the Spanish leader again. Franco knew he couldn't afford to go to war. He didn't want German troops in Spain, attacking British-held Gibraltar.

PHE: You've also written about Kennedy. What do you think of him and his family?

JLS: I identified with Kennedy because of his constant hospitalizations. He was quite crude personally, with the "Kennedy polish" coming from Jackie. Kennedy realized that World War II could have been avoided had England and France been both armed and willing to use their armaments. France and England had more U-boats than Germany at the beginning of the war but they didn't use them. In the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy wasn't bluffing. He would have gone to war, but he didn't want to. The generals wanted to go to war, but I can't find any evidence that they public wanted war.

I don't know much about Kennedy's sex life. Physically, Kennedy had such back pain that during sex he could only be on his back or stand-

ing. I have a letter he wrote to his father when he was 18 years old. I don't think he had yet had sexual intercourse. He was driving in the South with one of his friends and wrote, "The girls would date me, I guess they heard you were the head of the SEC." He went to then all-male Harvard, so how was he going to meet girls? The normal dates were Radcliffe girls, who *were* WASPs. He was a Catholic, an outsider. He couldn't even get into an eating club until two of his WASP friends, who were jocks, said they wouldn't join unless Jack Kennedy could join with them.

You get the sense he was this big man and big things would come to him in the future. He never had any money on him, but he never needed any because everybody knew who he was and all his friends would pick up the tab. Jack had been a sick kid. Joseph, Sr., would insist that everybody come to the table and they would read *The New York Times* and discuss world events, but Jack wasn't there. He would be sitting on the dunes out-side and mom would bring him a hot plate or sandwiches. He was a loner. He was in constant competition with Joe, Jr., because daddy only recognized number one because only number one was important. As long as Jack was number two, he didn't know what he wanted to do. People would say he wanted to be a lawyer, but I have no evidence he wanted to apply to law school. Daddy got him a job with a newspaper, so Kennedy wrote a couple of articles. It was only after Joe, Jr., died that daddy noticed Jack.

I personally didn't like Bobby, who was to me, in the generic sense, an authoritarian, a fascist. As a New York County Democratic Party committeeman (1963-present), I worked with Bobby to break Tammany Hall in New York City. But having destroyed it, he didn't replace it with anything. So the Democratic Party in New York never again had a focus: there is such a thing as good corruption. What I mean is, the poor people in New York had no power, but they did have the right to vote, so the old Tammany Hall would take care of these people. For example, Mrs. Jones' husband had just been laid off, so Mrs. Jones would be made a poll watcher so she could make some money for Christmas. Or, she might be helped to get a temporary postal job at Christmas. Or, a Christmas package would be given to her family. If Father Smith had a problem, he would be helped and at voting time Father Smith would ask the nuns to babysit for Mrs. Jones and other women while they voted. Bobby destroyed the system helping poor people without replacing it. I just didn't like the man.

PHE: It is time for our research group to start meeting. Thanks for an interesting interview.

Fame: Erikson Family Materials

Hanna Turken

Psychohistory Forum Research Associate and
Private Practice, New York City

At the April 5, 2003, Work-in-Progress meeting of the Psychohistory Forum, Sue Erikson Bloland presented on her personal experience growing up as the daughter of her famous psycho-analyst father, Erik Erikson, and her research into the life experiences of other famous people, including Sir Laurence Olivier. Bloland, a psychotherapist and a psychoanalytic teacher, is in the latter stages of writing *Fame: The Power and Cost of a Fantasy*. She has formulated theories on what lies behind the drive to be famous. Some of her preliminary conclusions appeared in a November 1999 *The Atlantic Monthly* article (Vol. 284 No. 5, pp. 51-62) under the same title.

Sue Bloland was prompted to write this article by the enthusiastic response she received when she spoke on the subject to the Manhattan Institute for Psychotherapy where she teaches. Her colleagues felt that her findings could be important to the therapeutic community. Her book reflects her own family experiences, as well as clarifies some of the materials included in Lawrence J. Friedman, *Identity's Architect A Biography of Erik H. Erikson* (1999).

In Bloland's findings, the public image of a famous person is the opposite of the private person. It reflects what the private person longs to be, it is an ideal self. The narcissism (grandiosity) invested in the ideal self is essentially a defense against shame. It is the early experience of shame so overwhelming to the self that it is being de-fended against in becoming someone extraordinary. The narcissistic solution is: if I am not lovable for who I am, I will have to make people admire me for what I can do. This interactional pattern is the result of a parent-child relationship in which fulfilling parental expectations comes at the expense of the real self. Striving to become some special being that is caring, talented, and charismatic, is the vehicle in desperately pursuing emotional nourishment. These individuals are "driven to be famous." Their extraordinary talent seems characteristically fueled by a desperate longing for human connection. For the famous, the public be-

comes the connecting parent, and although the deeper needs are not being met, the fame gives the illusion of their being met. Fame helps the individuals ignore the reality of not being really loved or cared for. The acceptance of the idealization is at the expense of the person's human qualities. Not all trauma leads a person to want to be famous, but Bloland has not yet found a famous person that has not experienced trauma.

Fame came to Erikson after publishing *Childhood and Society*. Fame suited him. During the writing of the book he was teaching at Berkeley and working in a hut outside the house among the trees. Lecturing and writing were his life. His imposing figure, striking looks with a shock of white hair, penetrating blue eyes, and total engagement when talking about his work made the experience seem very intimate for the individual he was en-gaging at the moment.

To live in "the shadow of fame" of a famous parent is not easy for the children, especially for Sue. Her attempt to get close to her father met with disillusionment. It was not easy to accept that a father who was so perceptive about human development was unable to emotionally connect with his children or meet their individual needs.

It was Bloland's mother, Joan Serson Erikson, a very charismatic figure in her own right, who reared the children and brought structure to the household. She set very clear rules that were followed by the children and their father. She could do anything that was needed, including translating and editing Erikson's work. She hosted colleagues, friends, and others interested in his work. The birth of the fourth child with Down's syndrome and his immediate placement after birth in a long-term institution without her consent, caused her a great deal of grief. The children were told that the child had died, but there would be no rites or mourning. For Sue, who was promised that she would share in the care of the baby, the loss was very significant. Her father never understood the effect this had on her mother. For her father, *Childhood and Society* became the child. Sue's psyche was most affected by the contradiction between her father the man and her father the gifted theoretician, and the family's need to protect the idealized image.

Bloland's perceptive and candid sharing of her extensive knowledge of the subject, and her personal working-through of her inner experiences, generated a most enthusiastic group discussion which included our acknowledgment of Erikson's extensive contribution to the fields of psychohis-

tory, psychology, and sociology. She has agreed to join us in further discussing this subject and we are looking forward to her return.

Present at the meeting were Sue Erikson

Bloland, Sharon Brennan, Mike Britton, Molly Cas-
telloe, Ralph and Charlotte Colp, Paul Elovitz,

David Felix, Eva Fogelman, Renee Haynon, Flora
Hogman, David Lotto, Geraldine Pauling, H. John
Rogers, Vivian Rosenberg, Shirley Stewart,

Jacques Szaluta, Hanna Turken, and Isaac Ziem-
an.

On September 20, Lawrence J. Friedman

will speak to the Forum on Erikson and on Erich
Fromm, about whom he is currently writing a psychobiography.

Hanna Turken, ACSW, BCD, NCPsyA, is a
psychoanalyst in private practice in Manhattan.
Bulletin Board

The next Psychohistory Forum WORK

IN-PROGRESS SATURDAY SEMINAR will be

on September 20, 2003, when Lawrence Fried-
man (Indiana University) will speak on "Erik

Erikson and Erich Fromm." For the fall and

winter seminars we are working to schedule

Vamik Volkan (Center for Mind and Human In-
teraction at the University of Virginia) and Omer

Bartov (Brown University). CONFERENCE: On

April 12, 2003, in Manhattan, the National Asso-
ciation for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis

(NAAP) held its 31st annual conference on the

topic of "Analytic Positions in the Exploration of

Emotional Memory." The keynote speaker was

Lawrence Friedman, who spoke on "Addressing

the Common Denominator of Thought, Action, and Emotion." Names

especially familiar to our read-

ers among the many people making it a successful

conference were Ellen Mendel, Margery Quack

enbush, and Alan Roland. MEMBERS CITED AS AUTHORITIES:

When George Victor and David Beisel were recently shown on television

as authorities for a History Channel program on Hitler and Stalin, they

joined a growing list of members who have been called upon for their

expertise. AWARDS: Congratulations to Paul Elovitz on receipt of a

lifetime achievement award as the founder and advisor to the Ramapo

College History Club which was hailed as an outstanding student

organization. MOVED: Rita Ransohoff has moved to a retirement

community in Connecticut. To contact her, call 203-315-1406 or write her

at Evergreen Woods, North Branford, CT. DEATHS: In March, of two

who contributed to psychohistory: Elliott Jaques (age 88), psychoana-

lyst and management theorist, and Frank Manuel (age 92),

historian and psychobiographer. *Clio's Psyche* welcomes

obituaries on these individuals for our next issue.

CORRECTION: In the March 2003 *Clio's Psyche* (Vol. 9

No. 4, pp. 163-164) article by Flora Hogman, "The Effects

of Strong Emotions on Memory and the Re-creation of His-
tory," it was the French school teacher rather than the

Germans who asked the first grade students who was

Jewish. OUR THANKS: To our members and subscribers

for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To

Benefactors Herbert Barry, Andrew Brink, and Ralph Colp;

Patrons Pe-ter Petschauer, H. John Rogers, and Jacques

Szaluta; Sustaining Members David Beisel, Mary Coleman,

Jay Gonen, Robert Pois, and Connalee and Lee Shneidman;

Supporting Members C. Fred Alford, Rudolph Binion,

Peter Loewenberg, and Jacqueline Paulson; and Members

Richard Harrison, Nancy Kobrin, Maria Miliora, Dom and

Mena Potts, Vivian Rosenberg, Hanna Turken, and George

Victor. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to

Herbert Barry, Rudolph Binion, Sander Breiner, Kelly

Bulkeley, Dereck Daschke, Geri Kirschner Elovitz, David

Felix, Juhani Ihanus, Laura Levine, David Lotto, Sergio

Medeiros, Thomas Plante, Bob Pois, Leon Rappoport, H.

John Rogers, J. Lee Shneidman, Hanna Turken, Nancy

Unger, Junia Vilhena, and Victor Wolfenstein

lyst and management theorist, and Frank Manuel (age 92),
historian and psychobiographer. *Clio's Psyche* welcomes
obituaries on these individuals for our next issue.
CORRECTION: In the March 2003 *Clio's Psyche* (Vol. 9
No. 4, pp. 163-164) article by Flora Hogman, "The Effects
of Strong Emotions on Memory and the Re-creation of His-
tory," it was the French school teacher rather than the
Germans who asked the first grade students who was
Jewish. OUR THANKS: To our members and subscribers
for the support that makes *Clio's Psyche* possible. To
Benefactors Herbert Barry, Andrew Brink, and Ralph Colp;
Patrons Pe-ter Petschauer, H. John Rogers, and Jacques
Szaluta; Sustaining Members David Beisel, Mary Coleman,
Jay Gonen, Robert Pois, and Connalee and Lee Shneidman;
Supporting Members C. Fred Alford, Rudolph Binion,
Peter Loewenberg, and Jacqueline Paulson; and Members
Richard Harrison, Nancy Kobrin, Maria Miliora, Dom and
Mena Potts, Vivian Rosenberg, Hanna Turken, and George
Victor. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to
Herbert Barry, Rudolph Binion, Sander Breiner, Kelly
Bulkeley, Dereck Daschke, Geri Kirschner Elovitz, David
Felix, Juhani Ihanus, Laura Levine, David Lotto, Sergio
Medeiros, Thomas Plante, Bob Pois, Leon Rappoport, H.
John Rogers, J. Lee Shneidman, Hanna Turken, Nancy
Unger, Junia Vilhena, and Victor Wolfenstein

Call for Papers

The Psychology of America

as an Imperial Power

Special Theme Issue, Dec. 2003

Some possible approaches to this topic include:

- The "Why" of imperialism
- Why other countries and peoples see America as imperialistic
- Emotions aroused by words such as "occupation," "world's policeman," and "empire"
- The "imperial personality"
- George W. Bush as imperial president
- Psychodynamics of the neo-conservatives who advocate imperialism
- Comparing modern America with Roman and British empires

Articles of 500-1500 words, due Oct. 15

Contact Bob Lentz, Associate Editor

<lentz@teludplanet.net>