
Clio's Psyche

Volume 10 Number 4

March 2004

Erik Erikson: A Biographer's Reflections on a Decade-Long Process

Lawrence J. Friedman
Indiana University

Early in 1990 I went to New York to review final details for the spring publication of Menninger: The Family and the Clinic. Nine years in the making, it explored the interrelationship between the founding Menninger family and its historically renowned psychiatric clinic. A psychologically dysfunctional family made for a dysfunctional clinic, the argument ran. Although the study was not intended to be a biography, Karl Menninger's presence, brilliance, and erratic temperament were at the heart of the study. "It's darned near a biography," my editor insisted.

That evening I had dinner with two New York friends, writers, and fellow political activists – Robert Jay Lifton and Charles Strozier. Both suggested that after Karl Menninger, I "do" their friend
(continued on page 131)

Carol Gilligan: The Voice of a Woman Psychohistorian

Paul H. Elovitz
Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

Carol Gilligan was born as Carol Friedman on November 28, 1936 in Manhattan and she grew up in a professional New York City family as an only child. She received a bachelors degree in English literature from Swarthmore College (1958), a masters in clinical psychology from Radcliffe College (1961), a PhD in social psychology from Harvard University (1964), and eight honorary degrees. For over three decades she was a member of the Harvard faculty, becoming the first Patricia Albjerg Graham Professor of Gender Studies at Harvard in 1997.

She has held various visiting professorships, including the Pitt Professor of American History and Institutions at the University of Cambridge (1992-93) where she is presently affiliated with the Centre for Gender Studies and Jesus College.

IN THIS ISSUE

Did Soviet Citizens Love Stalin? 141
Anna Geifman

Studying the Democratic Candidates..... 144
Paul H. Elovitz

E-mail Identities..... 153
Paul H. Elovitz

Holding onto September 11..... 154
Jaclyn Dilling

Understanding Emotions..... 156
Book Review by Donna Crawley

Aggression, Sex Roles, and Adaptation..... 158
Review by Peter Petschauer

The Denial of American Imperialism..... 160
A Letter to the Editor by David Lotto

In Memoriam: Robert Pois (1940-2004)..... 161
Paul H. Elovitz

Call for Papers: Psychology of 2004 Election..... 154

Bulletin Board..... 163

Call for Papers: Psychology of Women..... 164

Since 2002, she has been a University Professor at New York University.

Harvard University Press stated that *In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (1982 & 1993 and translated into 17 different languages) is "the little book that started a revolution" and *The Times Literary Supplement* noted that *The Birth of Pleasure* (2002) created "a thrilling new paradigm." After her first volume, she initiated the Harvard Project on Women's Psychology and Girls' Development, co-authoring or editing five books with her students: *Mapping the Moral Domain* (1988), *Making Connections* (1990), *Women, Girls, and Psychotherapy: Reframing Resistance* (1991), *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development* (1992 & 1993), and *Between Voice and Silence: Women and Girls, Race and Relationships*

(1995). In 2002 Shakespeare and Company produced her play, "The Scarlet Letter." She made a contribution to *110 Stories: New York Writes After September 11* (2002). Among her forthcoming publications are "Recovering Psyche: Reflections on Life History," and "Knowing and Not Knowing: Reflections on Manhood."

Our interviewee is not only a world-renown scholar but also a thoughtful and committed teacher devoted to carefully listening to her students as well as to her research subjects. Early in her career she was a teaching assistant to Erik Erikson in his famed Life Cycle course. Among the 20 seminars and courses she has taught are Adolescent Psychology, Freud on Women, Gender Issues in Psychology and Culture, The Listening Guide, Moral Development, The Psychology of Nurture, Intimacy and Love, A Radical Geography of the Psyche, and Relational Psychology. Included in her NYU courses are a gender seminar in the Law School on the culture and psychology of democratic societies, and a freshman honors seminar, From the Birth of Tragedy to the Birth of Pleasure.

Amidst the two dozen academic awards and honors won by Dr. Gilligan are a Spencer Foundation senior research scholarship, a Grawemeyer Award for her contributions to education, and a Heinz Award for her contributions to understanding the human condition. In 1996 *Time Magazine* named her as one of the 25 most influential Americans. She is a member of many organizations and seminars and co-leads a study group of the American Psychoanalytic Association. Dr. Gilligan was interviewed in January and February over the Internet and on the telephone. She may be reached at <Carol.gilligan@nyu.edu>.

Paul H. Elovitz (PHE): What brought you to the psychological study of society?

Carol Gilligan (CG): I remember the moment: I was sitting at my kitchen table reading through the transcripts of interviews that Mary Belenky and I had conducted with women who were pregnant and considering abortion. The interviews were part of a study of identity and moral development, and we were interested in how the sense of self and concep-

Clio's Psyche

Vol. 10 No. 4

March 2004

ISSN 1080-2622

Published Quarterly by The Psychohistory Forum

627 Dakota Trail, Franklin Lakes, NJ 07417

Telephone: (201) 891-7486

e-mail: pelovitz@aol.com

Editor: Paul H. Elovitz, PhD

Editorial Board

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

Subscription Rate:

Free to members of the Psychohistory Forum

\$25 yearly to non-members

\$40 yearly to institutions

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

Single Issue Price: \$15

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

Copyright © 2004 The Psychohistory Forum

tions of morality came into play in the face of actual situations of conflict and choice. It was the middle of the day, and the house was quiet; the kids were in school. I remember the light in the room and the sudden realization of a disparity between the terms of the public abortion debate (right to life vs. right to choice) and the way in which many women were framing the dilemma. It was not a question of whether or not the fetus had rights or if so, whose rights took precedence (whether to be “selfless” or “selfish”). Instead, they saw it as a dilemma of relationship – how to act responsively and responsibly within a web of connections. The very parameters of the problem shifted – like the Gestalt experiments in figure-ground reversal: you could frame it as a problem of rights, starting from a premise of separateness, or you could frame it as a problem of relationship, starting from a premise of connectedness. You could see the dilemma in two ways but you couldn't see both at once because each represented a different way of perceiving and organizing the problem.

In that moment, I saw how bringing women's voices into psychology and history would change both psychology and history; it would change the societal conversation and also the experience of women who felt that if they were to say what they were really seeing and thinking and feeling they would not be heard or understood.

I remember my friend Dora Ullian came in and I said to her – she was a graduate student in psychology at the time – that I suddenly saw why women didn't fit the categories of psychological theory, because they were starting from a different set of assumptions about the human world. She said, “Why don't you write about that?”

So I did. It was the winter of 1975; we had just moved from Newton to Brookline Massachusetts and I had stayed home for the year to help my children settle into a new house, neighborhood, and schools. I wrote “In a Different Voice: Women's Conceptions of Self and of Morality” to explore how the inclusion of women's voices would change what was commonly spoken of at that time as the “human conversation” and also how this inclusion could free women from an insoluble dilemma of relationship where including themselves sounded

“selfish” and excluding themselves or becoming “selfless” seemed good. It was what Erikson would call “a historical moment,” meaning a moment of heightened intersection between life-history and history. But connecting women's lives with history was a radical act in that it implied a change in the conception of both life-history and history – a change that affected both women and men.

PHE: As one of Erikson's teaching assistants, what was his influence on you and your work?

CG: Erik's way of seeing inspired me, especially his insight into the connections between childhood and society, life-history and history. I carried his phrase with me, “You cannot take a life out of history” – in retrospect I see it at the core of my work, as giving me language for exploring the tensions between the psyche and the society or cultures in which it is embedded. I was also inspired by Erik's teaching – his integration of the arts, of film and literature into his teaching of psychology. Once I saw this possibility, I became much more interested in teaching psychology, because I had come to psychology from a background in literature and the arts and I saw writers as among the best psychologists.

PHE: What are your thoughts on Erikson's failure to significantly integrate the voices of women into his stage theory and work?

CG: I saw it as a huge roadblock in his work – where the issue was right in front of him and he couldn't see how to move forward with it, in part because the implications were so radical. Erik had made an exception of women in charting his stages of the life cycle: women, he observed, integrated issues of identity and of intimacy. In Gandhi's Truth, he experienced a writing block because he saw the contradictions between Gandhi's philosophy of *satyagraha* and nonviolent resistance and his behavior in relation to women. Specifically, in Gandhi's overriding his wife's truth with his own and in his cutting the hair of an adolescent girl whose beauty sexually aroused the boys, Erik saw untruth where truth was the issue, violence where nonviolence was professed. What I think he didn't see was how to integrate these observations and insights into his theory, and in this, he was a man of his time. But he also was a very astute observer and he couldn't turn away from what he saw. To move

forward would have meant to reconstruct his life cycle theory, and it may be that by that time he was too identified with his theory, that too much was at stake in changing it. Joan had done a beautiful weaving of the eight stages, and it would have meant unraveling that.

PHE: What did you find Erikson to be like as an individual?

CG: He was a *chiaroscuro* – a mix of light and shadow, closeness and distance, presence and absence. He was an artist, and he lived deeply within himself. He was also a psychoanalyst with a keen sense of the importance of meeting people face to face. He was charismatic, with his shock of white hair and his blue eyes and his sense of physical presence. He also had a light touch which was very engaging, a sense of perspective, and a vulnerability that I found endearing. We would sit around in his study in Widener Library and he would ask us, his teaching assistants, what we thought he should do in response to this or that invitation. The students wanted him to be their Gandhi, and he didn't know what to do about that.

PHE: Dissociation is a vital concept to your work. When did you first come to understand and use this concept?

CG: Dissociation came into my work with the girls – with the shock of hearing a voice that sounded at once familiar and surprising. I started the girls research after *In a Different Voice* – in response to a puzzle at the heart of that book: I couldn't discern the line of development connecting the one preadolescent girl, 11-year old Amy, with the voices of the women, and then the 1980 *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* reiterated an observation that Bettelheim had made in the 1960s – that the psychology of adolescence was “the psychology of the male youngster writ large.” I started with adolescent girls, but when my colleagues and I extended the research backward into girls' childhood, we heard a voice that we knew but had not remembered: startling in its clarity and the honesty with which it spoke about the human emotional world. It was a Proustian moment: for myself and other women, girls' voices opened “a vast storehouse of recollection,” taking us into what had been a lost time in our own development. At the edge of adolescence,

we observed girls beginning to dissociate themselves from an honest voice and covering what they knew, often with the disclaimer, “I don't know.” Some girls took a knowing voice underground and developed strategies of political resistance but we also saw some girls begin literally not to know what in another sense they knew.

I began to reread Freud's *Studies on Hysteria* (1895). The girls who arrested my attention resembled the women Breuer and Freud described in their case studies: they were gifted, intelligent, with a strong moral sensibility, and with “an independence of nature that went beyond the feminine ideal and showed itself in a considerable amount of obstinacy, pugnacity, and reserve” (*Standard Edition*, Vol. 2, p. 161). But the girls in my studies weren't hysterical; they were resisting dissociation, insisting on knowing and saying what they knew, at least in the presence of someone who would listen. What I saw in following girls' development from childhood through adolescence was a paradoxical sacrifice of relationship in order to “have relationships”; it was part of an initiation into societies and cultures that historically had been built by men and that reflected men's experiences, including their experience of sacrificing relationship at a much earlier time in development. Girls at adolescence were narrating this initiation and also resisting this sacrifice – which for many years was seen as a problem in girls' development. I saw it not only as a sign of psychological health but also as a resistance that quickly became embattled as a struggle for voice came into conflict with the desire to have relationships. I would subsequently see signs of a similar resistance in boys around the age of five, expressed more through action than in words. Girls were calling attention to a conflict between psychological development and a cultural initiation, a conflict that affected both women and men although in somewhat different ways since manhood implied privileging voice over relationships and femininity meant choosing relationships over voice. The insight of my research lay in the realization that voice and relationship are interdependent.

PHE: As a mother of sons, what did you learn about children that surprised you and how did it impact upon your research?

CG: My first son was born while I was still in graduate school, my second son right after I finished my dissertation, and I was the mother of three sons when I began teaching psychology. I remember divorcing myself from my own experience in order to teach theories of psychological development because the representation of mothers and of children was so different from what I knew through experience. But the question of men and what men know through experience was present at the beginning of my research on people's responses to real rather than hypothetical dilemmas. I was teaching with Larry Kohlberg in his undergraduate course on moral and political choice, and the men in my section didn't want to talk about their personal dilemmas over the Vietnam draft, knowing that their concerns about how their actions would affect their relationships would be considered low stage within the framework of Kohlberg's theory. So I knew at this point that these theories did not accurately reflect men's experiences. My original plan was to follow these coffee last month with Wendy Steiner whose degree is in literature and whose work also ranges widely across academic fields and the arts. We thought of making a film called "Academic Freedom" about women mostly of our generation who have been tenured at major universities and who have taken advantage of academic freedom to cross disciplinary boundaries.

PHE: That is a wonderful idea. Within the parts of academia that are more resistant to psychoanalysis and psychohistory, such as in history departments, I find that psychohistorical work is overwhelmingly done by scholars (both male and female) with the protection of tenure. What are your thoughts and feelings about the academic world and academic psychology?

CG: As an undergraduate at Swarthmore College, I fell in love with the academic world – a love affair that ended when I entered graduate school in psychology. But it's not psychology per se that changed my feelings but the nature of the training which my friend Bernie Kaplan, who taught psychology at Clark for many years, compared to *dressage*. I had been an English major at Swarthmore, and part of the shock of graduate school in psychology had to do with the language, the way of speaking about people which seemed to me rather crude

and simplistic. But it also had to do with methods of doing research that in the name of science or objectivity trivialized human experience and made it seemingly impossible to capture the nuances and subtleties of the human psyche.

PHE: In a similar note, last December Lawrence Friedman declared that graduate school in history is now a "terrible...disheartening rite of passage" which takes the fun out of studying history (Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 105). What special training was most helpful in your doing your research?

CG: I had different types of preparation. My training as an undergraduate in new criticism was invaluable to me because it taught me how to work directly from a text without relying on secondary sources. It was a way of freeing interpretation from tradition, of working empirically (through experience) rather than relying on the voice of authority. My listening for voice also draws on my background in music. I sang in choruses and madrigal groups, which meant listening for the interplay of different voices. I play Bach on the piano – which tuned my ear to the patterns of fugue and counterpoint. In writing *In a Different Voice* and increasingly in my subsequent work, I have built on these foundations, and with my students, I developed a "listening guide" to render this way of working systematic (see Gilligan et al, "On the Listening Guide: A Voice-Centered Relational Method," in Paul Marc Camic et al, eds., *Qualitative Research in Psychology* [2003], pp. 157-72). My analysis was also invaluable to me in listening for voice and tracking psychological processes. I think it was critical in leading me to conceptualize all psychological inquiry as an intrinsically relational undertaking.

PHE: Have you published, or do you plan to publish, an autobiography or any autobiographical writings – beyond your use of personal materials in some of your books?

CG: Two friends have recently suggested this to me – I really hadn't thought about it. At the moment, I'm too involved in other writing to consider it seriously.

PHE: I have always encouraged my students and colleagues to view themselves as participant observers in the pursuit of knowledge. I have noted

this approach in your work and would appreciate your discussing how you developed and use it.

CG: I say to my students that all research in psychology is relational and the question is what kind of relationship will facilitate the process of discovery. Like the temperature and humidity of a chemistry or physics laboratory; the nature of the relationship will affect the activity and the reactivity of the psyche. Most psychological research is conducted in the context of non-responsive relationship. I saw how the difference between non-responsive and responsive relationships affects not only what you can learn from other people but also what they know or have access to within themselves. I came to think what is commonly taken for objectivity or neutrality on the part of the researcher tacitly leaves cultural resonances in place, aligning the research with prevailing cultural norms and values. A striking illustration comes from my study of couples in crisis. In couples therapy, Phil, a man whose marriage was in crisis, said that his ultimate nightmare was his "wife in the arms of another man." I could have left it at that – I knew the culture, it goes back to the Trojan War. Instead, I asked him, "Why is this the ultimate nightmare," and in response he gave an answer I would not have anticipated; he said, "I guess my ultimate nightmare really for me was to never have the opportunity to show her how I really feel and to be a family man, to open my heart and to love her." At the end of a five-year longitudinal study of girls' development, 13-year-old Tracy, one of the participants, observed, "When we were nine, we were stupid." I said it would never have occurred to me to use the word "stupid" to describe them when they were nine, because what struck me most about them at that time was how much they knew. "I mean," Tracy said, "When we were nine, we were honest." I came to think that objectivity or neutrality does not mean saying nothing or being noncommittal; instead it means being aware of the culture or cultures surrounding the research and taking that into account in listening and responding to what people say.

PHE: Careful listening is an important tool of your research. Careful listening is something I learned to do in psychoanalytic training where I noticed that my female colleagues were generally better listen-

ers than my male colleagues and less inclined to try to fit what they heard into theoretical straightjackets. Does this match your own experience?

CG: Careful listening is important in life – it's key to living in the human world. To the extent that women listen more attentively it is partly because we are encouraged to do so. Much of what women traditionally have done, including raising children and supporting men, requires careful listening. But I also think that women living in cultures that have historically been shaped by men are more aware of the disparity between what is said to be true and what actually happens. Women are less inclined to fit their experience into theoretical straightjackets that have not been tailored for them.

PHE: Our members of the Psychohistory Forum and readers of *Clio's Psyche* come from many backgrounds. Many identify themselves as psychohistorians and or psychoanalysts. What are your thoughts about these fields?

CG: Psychohistory, like psychoanalysis, is a powerful lens for looking at the human world. But insofar as these lenses have been ground to the specifications of patriarchal societies and cultures, they distort human experience, and they need the corrective lenses of women's history and women's psychology. Having used the word "patriarchy," I need to specify its meaning because it has become such a code word for men's oppression of women. Patriarchy is an anthropological term, denoting families and societies that are headed by fathers. It is a hierarchy, a priesthood, in which a father or some fathers control access to truth and power and God and knowledge – to salvation in whatever form it takes. In elevating some men above others and subordinating women, patriarchy is an order of domination. But in separating some men from other men and all men from women, in dividing fathers from mothers and daughters and sons, patriarchy creates a rift within the psyche, dividing everyone from parts of themselves. In *The Birth of Pleasure*, I contrast patriarchy with democracy and explore the psychological implications of this contrast.

PHE: Sometimes people come to psychohistory from the arts and find it to be of value. Do you have any thoughts on this phenomenon?

CG: In a freshman honors seminar I taught last fall, I asked my students: why are artists such good psychologists? We were reading Heart of Darkness and Toni Morrison's The Bluest Eye, both of which rely on an associative method. It is the associative method of artists that provides a ready entry into the associative logic of the psyche, freeing their work from the constraints of the either/or categories of a binary logic. We had a very heated discussion in class about the implications of understanding, as Morrison insists we do, why or how Chollie Breedlove in The Bluest Eye comes to rape his young daughter. One of the women in the class was concerned that understanding how he came to do this would absolve him from responsibility.

PHE: In teaching about the Holocaust, I sometimes encounter the same resistance to understanding. While discussing the Nazis, some students confuse the use of empathy and understanding with absolution from responsibility. I have to be quite explicit that this is not the case. Turning to another subject, do you have any recommendations as to what training a person seeking to do good work in psychohistory should pursue today?

CG: I think it's obvious – they need good training in history and historical methods, and also experiences that will lead them to grasp the logic and the nature of psychological processes. A good psychoanalysis or good psychotherapy seems invaluable to me.

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

CG: Psychohistory as it's commonly understood has been for the most part devoted to the psychological study of a history largely enacted by men – I'm thinking of Erikson's studies of Luther and Gandhi, or Robert Jay Lifton's work on Hiroshima or the Nazi doctors or his recent study of Aum Shinrikyo. But as the field of history has expanded to include women's history, this is a logical development for psychohistory as well. A new direction would also incorporate the insights that have come from studies of women's psychology and have changed the understanding of psychology.

PHE: How can we get more women involved in psychohistory and to take leadership positions in

this field? By the way, the political psychologists have done a better job than psychohistorians in this regard.

CG: I think women's greater involvement will follow a broadening of the scope of psychohistory and a genuine curiosity as to what has been lost by focusing so exclusively on men. Following this line of thinking, women are in a position to make creative contributions to psychohistory and to lead in the development of the field. But there are real political issues involved in this expansion or transformation of scholarship, and this may explain why women have been drawn more to political psychology.

PHE: Please discuss the importance of childhood?

CG: Childhood is a magical time, as Selma Fraiberg observed in The Magic Years (1968), a time of imagination and creativity. It's also the beginning, and everything that happens afterward comes next, so it sets the stage. It's necessary to understand childhood if you want to understand adulthood – as Freud pointed out and also Erikson in Childhood and Society.

PHE: Some Forum researchers have been struggling with the issue of identification with a particular parent and achievement. If you would like to comment on this, especially on gender differences, it would be helpful to them.

CG: I sense that you're talking about Sue Bloland and her struggle to make sense of her experience as the daughter of Erik Erikson. Virginia Woolf said that as women we think back through our mothers; yet we live in a culture where "achievement" has been aligned with fathers. How to be a woman and pursue one's own aspirations is a question that many women artists and scientists have grappled with. Sue Quinn writes about this in A Mind of Her Own: The Life of Karen Horney and Marie Curie: A Life. Also, Evelyn Keller in A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock. There are also studies of women whose achievements have not been recognized, in part because they were incorporated by their male lovers or mentors or competitors. I'm thinking about the biography of Rosalind Franklin, or Rodin's mistress – it's a long list.

PHE: In your experience and life, are high achievers more identified with their fathers than mothers as one of our members has suggested?

CG: One question is how you define achievement – by whose standards is achievement measured? But there's another point raised by my colleague David Richards in his recently completed manuscript for a book called, Disarming Manhood. Moral voice is associated in psychoanalytic theory with fathers, but Richards finds in his study of William Lloyd Garrison, Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Churchill that all of these men who notably challenged the linkages between violence and appeals to manhood had identified with and were guided by a strong maternal voice that they carried inside them.

PHE: Following up on an issue raised by Freud, what is the impact of parental loss on your level of achievement and those of subjects you have studied? In The Birth of Pleasure (pp. 228-31) you made reference to Freud becoming more rigid and less open to listening to others after the death of his father Jacob; is this reaction a common experience, or peculiar to Freud?

CG: I think you are asking about how the deaths of my parents affected my writing The Birth of Pleasure. I don't think I could have written that book until after their deaths. But after writing it, I wished they were alive because I felt that it would have opened a conversation between us that I very much desired. As to Freud, Madelon Sprengnether wrote a brilliant essay, "Mourning Freud" (In Peter Rudnytsky et al, eds., Psychoanalyses/Feminisms (1998), where she discusses Freud's failure to mourn his father's death. Rather than grieving the loss of his father, he identified with his father, and then incorporated this identification into his theory, leading to the changes in his theory and method, which I discuss in The Birth of Pleasure.

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

CG: I see it in part as a reaction to the growth of feminism in that feminism exposes and challenges the contradictions between democracy and patriarchy. Fundamentalisms are all fundamentally patriarchal and reassert the hierarchy of man over woman or what the Elizabethans called the great

chain of being, with "God the Father" at the top. In "Knowing and Not Knowing: Reflections on Manhood," I suggest that totalitarianism or fascism in the twentieth century and fundamentalism now are in part a reaction to feminism which threatened to dismantle the last bastion of an endangered patriarchal manhood: the assurance of being on top of women.

PHE: What are your thoughts on women's expression of individuality in fundamentalist families and societies?

CG: Two of my graduate students explored this question in their dissertation research which they have now expanded into remarkable books. Tova Hartman-Halbertal interviewed modern mothers raising daughters in traditional religions (orthodox Judaism and Catholicism) – her book is called Appropriately Subversive: Modern Mothers in Traditional Religions (Harvard University Press, 2002). Stephanie Levine interviewed adolescent girls in the Lubavitch community in Crown Heights Brooklyn asking whether they have what could be called an independent voice. The title of her book, Mystics, Mavericks and Merrymakers: An Intimate Journey Among Hasidic Jews (New York University Press, 2003), answers the question.

PHE: This fits my sense that the voice of women is so strong and their power so great that they come through even among the most traditional. Of course, the psychic cost can be considerable, as in the case of one of my orthodox Jewish students who graduated with high honors right after her twentieth birthday, an age at which her girl friends already had their second child. When I last spoke with her she was continuing her struggle to postpone marriage so that she could graduate law school first. The pressure from her family and religious community was enormous. What is your opinion regarding the psychic costs of this type of struggle?

CG: To have to choose between having a voice and having relationships is agonizing, in part because either way, you lose both voice and relationship. This is why it's such a struggle. The question then becomes why is this choice necessary? It means rethinking both voice and relationship, how to include oneself and also others, how to live with others without silencing oneself, but it also means re-

thinking societal arrangements as well as cultural norms and values.

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

CG: This is the subject of my husband, Jim Gilligan's brilliant work. He has identified shame as the proximal cause of violence and showed how seemingly senseless acts of violence have a psychological logic that needs to be interpreted like the logic of dreams.

PHE: I just became aware that your husband is on the University of Pennsylvania faculty and is Director of the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Which of his various books on violence would you recommend reading first and what is the impact of his work on yours?

CG: I would start with Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic (Vintage, 1997) and then go on to Preventing Violence (Thames and Hudson, 2002). I would also recommend his essay on shame in the recent volume of Social Issues devoted to that subject. Jim's work has given me great insight into the psychodynamics of violence and also into the male honor codes of patriarchy that play such a large role in shaping both men's and women's psychology.

PHE: From my own study of manhood and violence, I would certainly concur that shame is a central issue for those who resort to violence. Along similar lines, how do you understand the psychology of terrorism?

CG: Very much in terms of Jim's work on shame as the proximal cause of violence, as a response to humiliation and an attempt to establish manhood. Both Jessica Stern who interviewed terrorists for Terror in the Name of God (2003) and Mark Jurgensmeyer in Terror in the Mind of God (2002) see terrorism as a response to shame.

PHE: I couldn't agree more. Men are so often insecure in their manhood. For over three decades I have felt that the sense of shame and the need to subordinate and shame women, which often leads to violence against them, is related to man's counter-dependency needs. Underneath the demeaning of

women is the desire to be cared for as a child, when mother took care of everything. The suicide bomber Mohamed Atta infuriated his father by sitting on his mother's lap until he went to college. In Atta's mind he proved he was a man when he blow up large numbers of people, leaving behind precise instructions that no woman should touch his dead body. As if they could, since it was in charred fragments, if not vaporized? What is your opinion of the role of counter-dependency in male violence and terrorism?

CG: When a man's desire for relationship leads him to be seen as unmanly or exposes him to shame, relationships become associated with women and with infancy and are repudiated or dissociated from the self. This dynamic sets the stage for violence toward women who come to represent the repudiated or dissociated aspects of the self and also for Mohammed Atta who goes from wanting to sit on his mother's lap to not wanting to be touched by women. But then there are those 100 or 1000 virgins waiting for him in heaven, which I guess becomes an illustration of how the repressed returns. When I asked girls, "What is the opposite of dependence?" many of them said, "isolation," but manhood is often organized around the opposition of dependence to independence.

PHE: How can psychologically oriented scholars have more impact in academia and on society in general?

CG: It seems to me that they have had enormous impact – I'm thinking of Freud and also Erikson who anticipated cultural studies. But there is a resistance in academia, much more than in the arts, to seeing the human world as a psychological world. But then academics are obsessive and tend to separate thought from emotion, thus making what the neuroscientist Antonio Damasio has called "Descartes' Error."

PHE: I have been analyzing this resistance for years and stressing the need to integrate emotion with thought. However, the resistance is quite ingrained and therefore difficult to overcome, especially among historians. What is the impact of psychohistory on your area(s) of expertise?

CG: It has given me a framework for thinking

about the interplay of psychology and politics and has encouraged me in exploring its historical dimensions.

PHE: How can we recruit new people to the field?

CG: By my inviting them to participate, by valuing and incorporating their contributions.

PHE: This sounds very good. Who do you have in mind to invite and to which psychohistorical forums? Also, what suggestions do you have as to how to overcome the common resistances to participation?

CG: I would invite Juliet Mitchell, now at the University of Cambridge, and Jean Baker Miller and/or Judith Jordan from the Stone Center at Wellesley College. I would certainly invite Arundhati Roy to discuss her recent book, War Talk (2004). Also, Judith Herman (on the faculty of Cambridge Hospital and Harvard Medical School) whose book Trauma and Recovery (1993) describes the history of discovering and then burying knowledge of trauma. Additionally, Jessica Stern to talk about terrorism, and Samantha Power to discuss her award-winning book on genocide, A Problem From Hell (2003), and Margot Strom who developed a curriculum on holocaust and human behavior described in Facing History and Ourselves (1994) that is now taught all over the world, and Martha Minow from Harvard Law School to talk about her book Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence (1999).

PHE: What books were important to your development?

CG: At any given time, certain books become essential to me, but if I had to single out a few that have been enduring in their inspiration, I would say the plays of Shakespeare, and Virginia Woolf's Three Guineas. In writing The Birth of Pleasure my constant companions were Michael Ondaatje's The English Patient and Jorie Graham's The Dream of a Unified Field.

PHE: Who were the most important mentors in your development as a student of psychosocial phenomena? Why?

CG: Erik Erikson and Jean Baker Miller. Also,

Robert Coles, through his first book, Children of Crisis. Coles' analysis of the way in which the desegregation of schools following Brown v. Board of Education affected the children who were involved in integrating the schools inspired my thinking about the effects on Roe v. Wade on women's psychological and moral development. I used to teach Coles' study of Ruby and of John Washington from Children of Crisis, and what struck me so forcefully was the importance of the people who accompanied them through crisis – Ruby's grandmother, and in the case of John Washington, Robert Coles. Also how with the adolescent John Washington the crisis brought everything out into the open in his relationship with his parents, leading his parents to reveal their own history with the racism their son wanted to contest. In exploring the association of crisis with growth rather than with pathology, Coles demonstrated an approach which I found very fruitful in my research.

PHE: What is your psychoanalytic/psychotherapeutic experience and what is its influence on you as a scholar? How has it changed your vision of the world?

CG: I had a long and life changing analysis that coincided with my research on girls' development. This was immensely helpful to me – in tracing girls' development, I was also retracing my own life-history and this led to a much deeper understanding of the processes of resistance and dissociation, as well as of the power of association to free a voice that has been held in silence. I also began writing fiction in the middle of my analysis and came to see myself as a writer. My analysis freed me to bring myself more fully into my scholarship, to draw on different parts of myself, to write about my own experience in exploring psychological questions, and to pay attention to my dreams. Especially in the girls' research and in writing Birth of Pleasure, insights often came to me first in dreams.

PHE: How do you define psychohistory?

CG: As Erikson defined it – as a study of the intersections between life history and history.

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

CG: I'm going to give you two lists, two lines of descent. One starting from Freud and one from Virginia Woolf. What's striking to me is how little they have intersected, and this may explain some of the puzzles you raise as to why more women haven't been involved in psychohistory, because, until now the field has followed a patrilineal descent. The first list then is familiar; it begins with Sigmund Freud and includes Erik Erikson, Erich Fromm, Robert Jay Lifton, and Robert Coles. The second list begins with Virginia Woolf (*A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*) and includes Karen Horney (*The Flight from Womanhood* and *The Neurotic Personality of our Time*), Juliet Mitchell (*Psychoanalysis and Feminism*), Jean Baker Miller (*Toward A New Psychology of Women*), and Arundhati Roy (*The God of Small Things*).

PHE: Thank you for an interesting interview. It highlights your contributions as well as the need for the psychohistorical contributions of more women to be recognized and enlarged.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is editor of this publication. □

Erik Erikson: A Biographer's

(continued from front page)

Erik Erikson (1902-1994). After all, I knew Erikson modestly and had been teaching his books for decades. Erikson's *Young Man Luther* (1958) had shown those of us who had helped to launch the "psychohistory" movement the magnificent insights that could accrue by fusing a flexible psychoanalytic psychology with daring, imaginative historical questions. I told Lifton and Strozier that I liked the ideal of "doing Erik." However, I needed to check with him and his wife, Joan, and to determine the state of the newly deposited Erikson papers at Harvard's Houghton Library.

By spring, just after Menninger came out, I spent a week in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Erik and Joan Erikson lived there, roughly four blocks from the Houghton Library, where the papers had recently been deposited by theologian Dorothy Austin, their housemate/caretaker. (During "spring cleaning," Joan had placed the papers in plastic

Call for Papers

The Voice/Personal Experience and

Psychology of Women at Work and in Modern Life

Special Theme Issue

December 2004

See page 164 for details

trash bags, which Austin rescued at curbside as a garbage truck approached.) I spent five or six days surveying these papers – a fairly substantial collection – and realized that they were the basis for a full-scale biography. After periodic teas that week with the Eriksons, who had been reading Menninger, the two signed consent forms that allowed me to study all Erikson material anywhere – personal, public, and clinical – without restrictions. Erik fretted to Joan that a biography would "ruin us," but Joan reassured him. The project had been launched. Now the task was to gain perspective on Erik's life and thought – a much greater difficulty than I had anticipated.

Within the first year of becoming Erikson's biographer, I met with David Wilcox, a child development psychologist and the last clinician that the aging Erik had supervised under special arrangements with Cambridge Hospital. One day in the late 1980s, Wilcox had brought materials to Erikson's house from a four-year-old boy with whom he had been working. He arranged various toys on the floor as the boy had arranged them and presented the child's tic-tac-toe grids. Erikson spent much time studying and asking questions about the items, wondering about several particulars that Wilcox had not considered significant. He told Wilcox, that play, like a dream, opened the child's inner life—the

unconscious. But play also told much about the child's specific social and family circumstances, and these were no less important in their minutest detail. Nothing could ever be left out of the clinician's consideration. "Remember," Erikson emphasized, "*everything* is our business." He proceeded to point out items in the child's play activities that were easy to ignore but showed the intersection of inner emotional life and outer social circumstances. The old man was still a brilliant clinician.

When I attended graduate school in history in the mid-1960s, "everything is our business" was basic dogma. Historians were supposed to look at every conceivable bit of evidence on their topics. But it became all too obvious that historians and other professionals honored this requirement in the breach; there was simply too much data in too many locations and too many time constraints to look at "everything." Nonetheless, old man Erikson meant what he said. Because deep insights could be derived from the most obscure part of a toy construction or a tic-tac-toe grid, literally everything had to be looked at. Not long after launching the biography, I realized that I literally had to approximate this goal – to try to look at Erikson with a clinician's fine eye – if I was to capture his life in much of its complexity. During all of his existence, the man constantly – sometimes hourly – shifted about in his moods, his thoughts, and his actions, and I needed to try to follow these changes through nine decades. To reduce the life and thought to set generalizations and regular patterns was to blunder badly.

Very early on, I conferred with Erikson's two prior biographers – Robert Coles, Erik H. Erikson: The Growth of His Work (1970), and Paul Roazen, Erik H. Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision (1976). Both published before the Houghton Library collection had existed, but they had rapport with a younger and more vibrant Erikson at the peak of his influence. Coles and Roazen shared materials with me and I then read the massive Erikson secondary literature – dissertations, articles, and short books in German and English. Though some of these works were deeper than others, I realized that they focused on select aspects of the man's published thought and wholly missed the ever-changing complexities of the life from which those thoughts

emerged.

To capture Erikson in his full, always changing complexity, and to avoid rendering another work of reductionist scholarship, my first response was to find every existent shred of evidence about the man. The Houghton collection was heaviest after 1970, and I needed to travel to archives throughout the world that had other pieces of the Erikson story – Karlsruhe, Vienna, Copenhagen, London, San Francisco, and other locations. I also interviewed and re-interviewed prodigiously all living members of the Erikson family and most of his friends, colleagues, and enemies – well over a hundred people. I studied all available clinical case conference reports where he had participated, large numbers of his clinical records, FBI files, and even confidential faculty files at Berkeley and Harvard. After all, since "everything" was "my business," I struggled over the years to see it all. In the course of a decade, I probably saw considerably more than earlier investigators. However, in the years since 1999, when Identity's Architect: A Biography of Erik H. Erikson was published, important new information from family and friends – memories, documents, photographs, and much more – has continued to surface. It was naive to think I could know *everything*.

Erikson probably deserved to be called the "father" of exemplary psychobiography through Young Man Luther, which focused on the Protestant Reformation leader's late adolescent "identity crisis," and Gandhi's Truth (1969), which concerned the Mahatma in mid-life preoccupied with personal and political "generativity." These were, of course, stops on Erikson's eight-stage model of the human life cycle, beginning with the infant's issues of trust and mistrust and ending with the elderly person's conflict between a sense that his life had integrity and a feeling of despair. The temptation, of course, was to structure my biography of Erikson along the lines he had laid out for humanity, stage by stage. An Eriksonian biography of Erikson seemed eminently sensible. After all, did not his model of a universal life cycle have to be congruent with his own life?

Apparently not. Between 1968 and 1975 Erikson published his three versions of an autobio-

graphical essay, and the developmental stages he described for himself in each differed significantly from his life cycle model. For one, he plotted six and not eight stages to his life, and they focused not so much on the emotions of inner life but upon the social, occupational, and ethical concerns of his adulthood. The first five stages of his model (from the trust vs. mistrust dichotomy of infancy to the identity vs. role confusion clash at adolescence) were collapsed into the first 25 years of his life. He characterized the second stage of his life to be his six years in Vienna (1927-1933) where he acquired "training" and stability – his Freudian idea system, a psychoanalytic vocation, a wife who grounded him firmly in day-to-day realities, and two children. Nor did Erikson's third autobiographical stage correspond to his developmental model. It represented the years from his arrival in America in 1933 to the publication in 1950 of his first book, Childhood and Society. He characterized the 1950s as the fourth stage in his life – a period which began with his failure to find his own voice in the crisis over the McCarthyite faculty loyalty oath at the University of California, witnessed his efforts to help adolescent patients discover their voices at the Austen Riggs Center, and culminated with his second book in which he described how Luther discovered his full voice and identity. Erikson considered the 1950-1975 interval as his fifth stage – his period as a beloved Harvard professor and ethical philosopher. Old age stood for the sixth and last stage – the last years of his life and his entry into "the shadow of nonbeing."

Because these six autobiographical stages drew upon and interpreted what Erikson saw to be the broad directions of his own existence, I gave them more credence as biographer than his formal model of the life cycle. Indeed, they were easier to document with written contemporary evidence than fragments and speculations on his early years. However, I was mindful that three years before he published the first essay on his own life, Erikson had written about Gandhi's autobiography: "Autobiographies are written at certain stages of life for the purpose of re-creating oneself in the image of one's own method; and they are written so as to make that image convincing." Five single pages of notes on the major and minor variations in Erikson's three published versions of his autobiography sug-

gested the importance with which he regarded his effort to present himself to the world as he entered late life. Moreover, although his autobiography emphasized his outer social and intellectual life, I was unwilling to belittle Erikson's inner emotions, especially during his early years and adolescence. In the end, my biography was Eriksonian in the sense that, like his studies of others, I was deeply attentive to the intersection of inner emotions and outer social circumstances.

I found Erikson's universal eight-stage life cycle largely inapplicable to the data I uncovered concerning his own existence and his six-stage autobiography only a somewhat more helpful guide. I decided to treat the eight-stage life cycle as part of his own effort with Joan to understand their crisis in the mid-1940s – to understand what the "normal" stages of human life were in comparison to their Down's syndrome son, Neil, who seemed to them to be a developmental "freak." I regarded Erikson's published autobiography largely as the effort of an old man to assure himself and others that his life had more moments of "integrity" than "despair." Succinctly, I decided that Erikson's abstract life stages approach was a problematic guide to his own life and simply allowed the fundamental issues in the course of his life to unravel – to analyze the continuities and breaks of a life in process. "Context is everything," he frequently emphasized, and I allowed the twists and turns of his emotions, thought, actions, and contexts to shape the Erikson story.

My preliminary title for the biography was Border Crossings: A Life of Erik H. Erikson. The more I learned about the man, the more uncomfortable I became with standard descriptive labels. Yes, he was a psychoanalyst but also an ethicist and an artist. He thought with an acute and logical mind, but he also thought visually in pictures and diagrams. At times he rambled and was nearly incoherent. He considered himself a Dane, but sometimes also a German and increasingly after 1933 an American. Asked whether he was a Jew or a Christian, he characteristically replied, "Why both, of course." Even on that matter, his emphasis regularly shifted. Sometimes he regarded himself as a mentor, at times a student, periodically a guru, sometimes a teacher and writer, and sometimes sim-

ply a loner. In his clinical and scholarly work, he sometimes followed Freud and focused vertically into the inner life of the self. But at other times he focused horizontally at the society and milieu around the inner self. Most often, as in his analysis of Freud's work on the famous Irma dream, he saw the manifest or outer form of the dream as coequal in importance with the deep inner or latent dream content.

The perspective of Erikson as a constant border crosser who was always in process and very difficult to pin down surfaced again and again in the course of my investigations. In 1965 he spoke at Harvard at the memorial service for theologian Paul Tillich, his friend and colleague. The theme was that Tillich, too, had been a border crosser – constantly walking over traditional lines of demarcation. Like himself, Tillich had been a German but also an American and liked to live on the edges of the United States (west and east coasts). He, like Tillich, shifted constantly in his vocational identities. Both had ties to an amorphous sort of Protestantism, the tenets of which modified constantly. After the memorial service, Erikson walked through Cambridge for hours with his graduate student, Richard Hunt, and recounted that, like Tillich, he had joyed in crossing borders and avoiding fixed positions or identifying characteristics. Life consisted of shifts back and forth across multiple edges.

Even in old age, Erikson preferred the borders. When I visited Erikson in May 1992, for example, I brought Hetty Zock's closely textured book, A Psychology of Ultimate Concern: Erik H. Erikson's Contribution to the Psychology of Religion (1990), which traced the interplay between his deepening existentialist and spiritualist orientations. Erikson objected to "ultimate concern" as too rigid and deterministic a characterization. A lot more had been on his mind, and matters of "ultimate concern" represented but one of the threads or trajectories. In mid-January of 1994, a few months before his death and during an interval when he could mumble but not speak, I visited Erikson in his room at a nursing home in Harwich. Even as the end approached, his eyes shifted about constantly (a sort of cognitive crossing) from the Danish flag on his chest of drawers to a box of chocolates on a ledge

to his name on the door to the scenery outside his window. He smiled and frowned and laughed and pondered and dozed. Never before had I seen a very elderly, disabled person in such variable states.

If, even in his last months, Erikson was so variable and changing, it was difficult to summarize the essence of most of his written texts. Childhood and Society, for example, represented at least a dozen years of formulating and reformulating his thoughts about Hitler's appeal to German youth, the nature of dreams, the culture of the Sioux and the Yurok, his most compelling clinical experiences, Gorky's childhood within central Russia, and the centrality of identity to the eight-stage life cycle. Even after the book came out, he penciled in thematic and literary modifications. The second edition of Childhood and Society in 1963 was a very different book, in many respects, from the first, but even that underwent extensive post-publication penciled modifications. Erikson's last significant publication, "The Galilean Sayings and the Sense of 'I'" (Yale Review, April 1981), was eight years in the making. It was sparked by his sense that there was something deeper than his concept of human identity – that humankind was connected by the sense of "I." To understand the nature of this "I," Erikson had initially turned to Jefferson's compilation of Jesus' "authentic" sayings. In 1973 he had given a lecture sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities on the protean third president and what Jesus' sayings revealed to Jefferson about the essential nature of the conscious self. Next Erikson considered writing a biography of Kierkegaard to understand the "I" – the full conscious self at its most profound level – but found that his Danish was insufficient. Finally, he settled on pondering the nature of Jesus' Galilean ministry. In Galilee, Erikson concluded, Jesus discovered a sense of "I" at its deepest level. It was something like the Quaker Inner Light where God permeated all of humanity, connecting the individual self to all selves. Finally, as his son Kai worked with him to make the Yale Review essay coherent, Erikson felt *compelled* to explore how the "I" that one experienced in late life recreated the numinous "I" of the newborn – whether the life cycle folded back into itself. Whether it was the "Galilean Sayings" article, Childhood and Society, or anything else that Erikson wrote, I found that his thought and feeling

underwent constant shifts as he drafted and re-drafted his texts. As biographer, I felt that I could not simply summarize the final publication but had to trace the constantly shifting contemplations and life experiences as he wrote and rewrote.

Because it was so difficult to write a biography of an avid border crosser who, until death, was in constant motion, especially in his thoughts and feelings, I needed somehow to ground his life – to reach a concrete human dimension. Friends and colleagues who looked at my first draft of the manuscript warned about the obvious – that they needed the particulars of Erikson's day to day life – what he liked to eat, his hobbies, his music preferences, even his attire. Readers needed to know a good deal more about the living human being. Initially, I simply jotted down specific details from visiting with Erik and Joan Erikson as I researched the biography. I remembered Erik's extreme dependence on Joan for day-to-day life necessities – what to wear, what he could and could not eat, when to be cheerful, and so forth. I observed him doze off in his chair and his genuine childlike glee when I "smuggled" a candy bar past Joan's eyes for him to devour. I recalled that one day when my wife and I took over vegetarian lasagna for dinner with the Eriksons, Erik consumed three sizeable helpings and then, in European style, kissed my wife's hand. Generally, however, I had been so pre-occupied by Erik's brilliant mind and evolving thoughts during the dozens of times I met with him that I was only able to come up with a short list of specifics on the rest of the person.

Fortunately, Erikson's youngest son, Jon, had been more attentive to the particulars. Jon provided a vast array of specifics – how his father's idea of good food was a frozen Swanson TV dinner and chocolate-covered coffee beans (despite Joan's attentiveness to healthful living). There were also the late-night raids on the ice cream in the freezer as Joan slept. Jon recalled that Erikson had played the piano during the 1930s with considerable joy, and that he swam with a breaststroke to avoid wetting his hair. Jon also described how Erik was quite style conscious about his clothing. During the 1960s and early 1970s he cut quite a figure, for example, with his sweeping white hair, aviator glasses, white shoes, Southwest bow tie, and blue

blazer.

A wonderful photographer, Jon Erikson also urged me to be attentive to photographs of his father, supplied me a good many, and sent me to other family members for more. For the first time I noticed Erikson's stark blue eyes as well as the situations where he had been stiff and uncomfortable, and where he had been more relaxed and joyous. I could see his unhappiness as a young child and especially as an adolescent in Karlsruhe, and how he manifested a more grounded and contented existence when, at 25, he moved to Vienna, found a vocation as a psychoanalyst, and married a very understanding lifelong partner – Joan. Soon it became apparent that the hundreds of photographs I was looking at revealed a vast amount of important detail on the man. The exercise prompted me to go farther – to review the woodcuts Erik made as a young man, his doodles, his sketches of patients and acquaintances, and the multi-colored lines, circles, and arrows amidst words and phrases that represented "notes" for his public presentations. After a few years of reviewing all the visual materials I could find, it struck me that Erik had never really put behind the preoccupation of his adolescent trying to succeed as an artist who made woodcuts. Erikson often referred to himself as a "visual observer." He thought visually – in shapes, shades, and colors. As a clinician and writer, he always needed to "see" others and their circumstances, and he was exceedingly attentive to visual artifacts that patients and others constructed or kept. In all of his writings, there are very strong visual dimensions – he usually saw before he wrote and most of his writings need to be seen while they are read. As I turned back to his written texts, I found that I could now see images in phrases, sentences, and paragraphs that I had not been able to access earlier – a Sioux medicine woman, Luther during his "fit in the choir," Gorky as a child, and even Gandhi in 1918 as he discovered the essence of nonviolent resistance.

If I had learned to see considerably more through Erikson's eyes, I now decided to pursue the auditory more than I had. As I met with him, I tried to hear the variety of his tones and exclamations and even his silences, played back my tape recordings of our conversations, and made notes on

the feelings that the vocal tones seemed to convey. I also listened to other recordings of Erikson's voice as early as I could find them and worked on matching photographs and other visual materials with the voice at particular times. Especially through the frequent indistinctiveness and blurring of his voice, I realized that this was a man who saw before he heard (though I wish I could have heard a recording of him at the piano in the 1930s). In brief, by the end of my second draft of the biography, Erikson was becoming a fuller, more earthbound person – one who ate, slept, walked, saw, and spoke.

Failures in the biographical endeavor must be recounted as well as the successes. Chapter organization often tends to "freeze" or reduce a man in constant mental and even physical motion. I wrote a chapter on Erikson's migration from Europe to America during the dangerous 1930s too much along the lines of the traditional saga of the intellectual émigrés of the period. This obscured the fact that Erikson was always shifting his residence – seven times, for example, during his six years in Vienna. I devoted two chapters to Childhood and Society – one to his treatment of a vast array of cultures (German, American, Russian, Sioux, Yurok, etc.) and a second to his clinical presentations and his creation of his eight-stage life cycle model. In fact, he was thinking and writing about all of these topics at the same time and in terms of each other. For purposes of apparent clarity, I had "invented" two books rather than the one that he prepared. I repeated this pattern for his life and thought during the peak of his influence – the 1960s. To avoid what I feared would be an unwieldy mass, I devoted one chapter to his teaching and writing during that decade and a second chapter to his travels to India as he prepared Gandhi's Truth. He brought the India project to the classroom and to his other writings, and they in turn decidedly impacted the Gandhi study. For the sake of seemingly greater clarity, I was simplifying the man.

Kathleen Jones wrote a very penetrating review of Identity's Architect for the December 2000 American Historical Review. She noted that although I treated both Erikson's life and his times, the overwhelming focus was on the life. Jones was absolutely right. I found the complexity of the life so overwhelming that I did far too little on the

wider context and how he impacted it – the Karlsruhe of his youth, Freud's Vienna when Erikson was trained during the last years of the "red decade" of Social Democrat programmatic innovation, New Deal America when he became a U.S. citizen in the late 1930s, and the Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam War movements of the 1960s and early 1970s as he became an icon for protest culture. My public justification for focusing on the life over the wider context was that I had vast primary documentation on the life and needed to draw largely on the works of others for the wider world around that life (which meant it was best to play to my strength). Retrospectively, I wonder whether that justification was actually a rationalization. For the purposes of completing the book and meeting my deadline, had I slighted Erikson's admonition that "context is everything"?

Another reservation is that I may have taken too much literary license. For the past several decades, I have come increasingly to feel that good biography is a literary art and that a measure of one's success is whether one's manuscript reaches out beyond academia to the many who like a flowing, felicitous, exciting read. At least four rewrites of every chapter were required to take me to the point where I felt I had reached that goal. Was I taking too much literary license in the process, making sure that the narrative line was strong and forceful and animating, but sometimes coasting over rather dull, flat, and mundane descriptive material in the process?

This links to another issue that I still question – whether I balanced close personal empathy and sympathetic understanding of Erikson with the need for hard-nosed critical distance. I had no desire to exalt him and had no compunctions about revealing how he and Joan had hidden a deep family secret – the birth and two-decade concealment of their fourth child, Neil, who had been badly deformed and mentally retarded by Down's syndrome. Neil's birth represented a family crisis from which Erik and Joan worked out the concept of an eight-stage human life cycle that pivoted around the fifth stage of identity. The event simply had to be brought to light even as I recognized that it would "feed" the scandalmongers. In a similar vein, I felt the need to emphasize that if Erikson did not sign

the McCarthy era loyalty oath as a faculty member at the University of California, he almost certainly signed a "new form of contract" that contained the language of the oath. His courage during this event was limited. Throughout the biography, as well, I had no compunctions about underscoring his frequent vagaries and even his contradictions as a writer and theorist. Nor did I hold back on his decided shortcomings as a husband and a father.

On the other hand, I felt a very close bond with the man, identifying with his reclusive life as a writer and his mixed feelings about being a public intellectual. When I jogged every morning, I thought about him. At parties and dinners, I usually made him a topic of conversation. I probably bored my students to death with Erikson stories. If I found religious experience less compelling than Erikson but political activism in progressive causes more satisfying, I regarded these as comparatively minor points of difference. We both loved the life of the mind and the writing process, and whenever I read or reread angry attacks on him by social critics I respected, I sometimes felt that I was being chastised. In *Writing Lives* (1959), the brilliant Henry James biographer, Leon Edel, warned that "The problem of identification is in reality at the core of modern biography, and it explains some of its most serious failures." Edel warned, "An empathetic feeling need not involve identification" (p. 29). Had I gone beyond strong empathy and strongly identified with the architect of identity, thereby reducing my capacity for hard-nosed criticism? Edel had given me cause to wonder.

I finished my biography in the late 1990s so exhausted that I was determined never to write another. Indeed, I launched a study of those intellectual émigrés from the Holocaust who wrote psychologically penetrating studies of the rise of European fascism and authoritarianism. Within a few years, however, I found myself focusing on Erich Fromm, one of the most interesting of the lot, and now have embarked on another full-scale biography. Moreover, I have created a senior seminar on individual lives in history and seem to have evolved into a life-long biographer. To get at the sources of this phenomenon, I have come to the conclusion that while all proficient biographers have to be historians of social, cultural, and economic processes, the biogra-

pher's task is further distinguishable in important ways.

For one, after comparing my own experience with that of quite a few other historian-biographers, I have concluded that the conscientious biography can often take a good deal longer and may, in many respects, be more frustrating. The historian can skip the seemingly small details of her/his cast of characters – favorite foods, musical and sports tastes, fondness for alcohol, and mundane daily routines, for example. The biographer needs to be attentive to all of these, for all are obviously parts of the fabric of a total human life and can be quite revealing. But a biographer can hardly emulate the 17th-century New England Puritan minister who tries to tell all – every detail about a person or event – because all are pertinent in detecting the will of God. Consequently, after years of research on one's subject, what particulars does the biographer delete in her/his narrative? It is almost always those details that seem extraneous to her/his interpretive framework. But what if the framework is somehow flawed or reductionist or otherwise problematic as the biographer increasingly finds a stake in it through years of arduous writing and living with his subject? Can a human life, with all of its variables, coexist with even the most nuanced interpretive framework? My own sense is that this elementary dilemma becomes a conscious or semi-conscious apprehension of no few biographers. It helps to explain the discomfort many of us feel when it comes time to turn our "final drafts" over to our publishing houses.

The biographer often realizes that if she/he has a lively, artfully constructed story line, all sorts of readers outside one's historic specialty area will be interested. Bookstores will stock the biography and some will ask for author presentations and book signings. National newspapers like *The New York Times* may review it and reporters may call for stories. There may be radio and television talk show appearances, formal book tours, and a piece in the *New York Review of Books* and the *Times Literary Supplement*. Additionally, all sorts of people will write letters to the author, especially those who had contacts with the subject. Of course, academic historians are not trained for this sort of exposure. We blunder about with our scholarly qualifications and

hesitancies. We wonder whether we should repeat what we already said in hard covers. We become impatient with interviewers or news people or radio call-in listeners who want clear "yes" and "no" answers. In time, though, we become more relaxed and even pleased by the sense that literate and curious Borders or Barnes & Noble readers and book show listeners are sharing and enjoying our pursuit of our elusive subjects. Indeed, I became a lot more respectful of people who enjoy an animating story line and find themselves connecting their lives and experiences with Erikson's. A number of people in this general audience offered more penetrating observations than reviewers in academic specialty journals. As I became more open and respectful of this general audience, I found that my rapport with my own undergraduate students became more respectful and enjoyable. They had much to say that was cogent if only I would really listen to them.

Certainly, the historian of broad social or cultural processes can gain a good deal of self-understanding. Through the flow of emotions and empathies that years with one's subject inevitably provoke, the self-awareness acquired by the biographer has to be a good deal more intense. It certainly was in my case. As I learned of Joan and Erik Erikson's tragic experience of giving birth to a Down's syndrome child in an era when such children were regarded as "Mongoloid Idiots" and hidden in distant institutions, I thought about several of the tragedies in my own life. Indeed, while I investigated the birth of Neil Erikson, a person very close to me was on the border between life and death. As I learned how the Eriksons blundered and even sometimes turned on one another, yet, in the end, summoned the wherewithal to move on in their lives, I gained hope and resilience and perhaps a survivor instinct. They moved on by developing the eight-stage model of the life cycle and I moved on by finishing *Identity's Architect* and intensifying my then flagging commitments to political activism.

Most of my firsthand experience with Erikson was in his final years. I saw him experience his own late life (eighth developmental stage) tension between thinking back on his life with a sense of integrity and pride, and reviewing his life course with gloom and despair. I devoted an entire chapter

to his last years, to the wonderment of several of my reviewers. Retrospectively, I realize that this was because I myself was crossing the divide between the generative productivities of middle age and the questions and doubts of old age. Through preoccupation with Erikson, I was drawing insight into the inevitable frailties and limitations that would occupy my own life in the years ahead and into ways of dealing with them. More than ever before, I asked myself quite a few questions about how I wanted to spend my emerging old age. In sum, I cannot help but thinking that the biographer's experience is often eminently introspective, indeed therapeutic.

Perhaps because biography has such a decided personal impact upon both the biographer and the reader, the very process of publication seems to provoke new evidence. After readers peruse a biography, some will come up with new memories and seek out additional documents. Indeed, all three of Erikson's living children flooded me with recollections that they had not offered during years of interviews, and continue to do so. His daughter, Sue Bloland, launched and is about to complete a full-scale memoir and meditation on her parents. Erikson spent many anguished years trying to discover who had fathered him. Although I may have narrowed his paternity down to some Copenhagen photographers, I was far from certain. Married into the Copenhagen Abrahamsen family on his mother Karla's side, Martha Abrahamsen wrote to me a few months after publication concerning her recent conversation in Israel with one of Karla's grandchildren. Apparently, she had told the grandchild that she had many lovers during her long life but had never asked for payment from any of them. In other words, she herself may not have known who had fathered Erik.

In *Childhood and Society*, Erikson wrote that he had "nothing to offer but a way of looking at things." Steven Schlein took the phrase "a way of looking at things" and made it into the title of his rich collection of many of Erikson's writings. Yet after reading *Identity's Architect*, a London psychoanalyst showed me how the phrase originated in a letter that Erikson's analyst, Anna Freud, had written in 1934 to Ernest Jones about Wulf Sachs, a member of the British Psychoanalytic Society. I

could go on at length with other information – sometimes exceedingly important – that came my way subsequent to publication. I had gotten post-publication feedback with most of the books on broader historical topics that I had written, but nowhere as extensive and as crucial as the Erikson biography provoked – and continues to yield. Thus, the process of being the biographer has, in important ways, continued several years after completing the biography. Had I not become immersed in another life story, Erich Fromm's, I would probably use the abundance of new data to prepare a revised edition of Identity's Architect.

When Erikson died in 1994, no few obituaries, memorial conferences, and essays evaluated his legacy. I attended the funeral and several of the memorial conferences, and read the obituaries. But I did not yet have a full measure of the man and found myself unwilling or incapable of speaking about the legacy. Four years later, realizing that Identity's Architect would soon be sent to my publishing house, I knew that I would have to address the legacy in the text. Perhaps because I was still so deeply immersed in Erikson's day-to-day life and thought, I wrote too vaguely and awkwardly about the legacy. But let me make a stab at it now, a hundred years after Karla Abrahamsen brought Erik into the world.

The formulator of the "identity crisis" and other issues concerning identity had no fixed professional identity. He was not a psychologist, flunking his one academic psychology course and always feeling very distant from that profession. He favored what he called "disciplined subjectivity," and the positivism and scientific claims of professional psychology troubled him. Never in his life did he even contemplate conducting empirical research. When required to state his formal discipline, Erikson tended to invoke the label "psychoanalyst." He had been trained by Freud's daughter and colleagues in Vienna to master a relatively orthodox set of doctrines and techniques, and had been admitted to full membership in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Moreover, most of his life, he had belonged to professional psychoanalytic organizations and held the highest office in one of them. But whereas Freud and his followers focused vertically, excavating the deepest inner layers of the

individual human psyche, Erikson saw the necessity of linking this vertical to the horizontal – to the society and culture that surrounded the individual. One dimension was hardly less important than the other. Unlike Erich Fromm or Karen Horney, he never broke explicitly with Freud's structural theory or the centrality of instinctual drives, but he had no patience with shoring up the structure of psychoanalytic orthodoxy.

Was Erikson a psychohistorian? Young Man Luther is usually conceived of as the book that started the psychohistory movement as a subspecialty among academic historians – merging psychoanalytic understanding with historical context. But Erikson shunned the role of "founder" and was distressed when several professed "psychohistorians" treated public statements of prominent historic figures like Woodrow Wilson and Georges Clemenceau as if they had originated in private therapeutic encounters. Indeed, his Luther book began as a study of his adolescent patients at the Austen Riggs Center, with an essay on adolescent Luther as the epilogue, but it evolved into a clinician's reflections on Luther's younger years. By the mid-1970s, after avoiding most psychohistorical journals and practically all gatherings held in his honor, he privately wished the term would fall into disuse.

Clearly, Erikson had no firm sense of identification with any profession as such. His legacy is not a professional one. As I searched for a title for my biography, my longtime friend and colleague, Ronald Takaki, recommended Erikson's Extravagance. What Takaki meant was that Erikson was no austere Ahab who repressed joy and the senses in compulsive and austere pursuit of Moby Dick. Instead, Erikson felt that learning and thinking and doing ought to be play-like, pleasure-packed, delightful, and zestful. Seeing, hearing, walking, touching, tasting, and doing – in work, lovemaking, and all else – needed to have a certain pleasurable flare. Adults needed to discover the children in themselves – to become extravagantly playful – if they were to sustain or recover life's joys.

This is not to suggest that Erikson believed in the American ethic of self-help individualism – the "American Adam" or the Horatio Alger hero

who, by self-exertion and a bit of luck, crowns his life with material success. Notions of free, unfettered individuality always troubled him, particularly when they were coupled with aggrandizing materialism. Perhaps exhibiting more a European than an American sense of "identity," Erikson felt that connectedness to others and to one's community was essential. The self could hardly flourish without the "Other." Like other ego psychologists of his generation, he maintained that optimal selfhood required some adjustment to society's customs and expectations. For this reason, several critics of the 1960s and 1970s castigated him as an "architect of adjustment" who was uneasy with social rebellion against injustice. Yet in the years when that accusation gained currency, Erikson had become increasingly taken by the revolutionary leader who worked to disrupt encrusted patterns of elite domination and social conformity – to promote radical new opportunities for the society around him and for humankind. Beginning with his portrayal of young Luther launching the Reformation, then middle-aged Gandhi cultivating *satyagraha* to garner Indian independence, next Jefferson as leader of a revolutionary new nation, and finally Jesus in Galilee discovering the "I" in human consciousness, Erikson's examples of firm ego identity were rebels who connected constructively with the "Other" in themselves and the others in their societies to promote radical new opportunities for humankind.

Part of Erikson's legacy belongs among mid-century Western interdisciplinary public intellectuals who had been conditioned by the tragedies of Nazism, Stalinism, and McCarthyism, and embraced a universalist and cosmopolitan "Family of Man" perspective. Despite the contrived differences of race and ethnicity ("pseudospeciation," Erikson called it), all human beings were made of the same essential qualities and needed to be accorded the same basic dignities ("universal specieshood"). Unlike many of the cosmopolitan public intellectuals of his generation, Erikson insisted that people had to recognize the "Other" in themselves through a multicultural perspective. Erikson embraced the rich distinctiveness of Native Americans, Germans, Russians, Nigerians, and others. He also insisted that women were gendered creatures whose unique "inner space" fostered linkage or connectedness among humankind. In this sense, he was a

forerunner of the focus since the 1960s in intellectual circles on the primacy of race, ethnicity, and gender.

As I pursued Erikson's intellectual legacy, I learned that quite a few of his friendships among public intellectuals came not through the exchange of ideas but through his successful efforts as a therapist. He treated other intellectuals or members of their families, and this fostered lifelong friendships. David Riesman and Reinhold Niebuhr were prime examples. I reviewed the preponderance of Erikson's case files and found that most of his patients improved. He had a remarkable capacity to understand the crisis and confusion of those he treated. In case conferences, training sessions, and public presentations, Erikson explained to clinicians that the therapist had to be attentive not only to the patient's pathologies and deficiencies, but also to the patient's strengths. Often it was more efficacious to build on what a patient did right than to search for underlying pathologies. He also preached against what he called the "originology fallacy" – that early experience determined subsequent psychological development. Not infrequently, it was more important to understand and reform the patient's current social and emotional world. Most important, Erikson built his clinical legacy on the premise that the therapist-patient connection was essentially a relationship through which both parties gained by giving to the other. Successful therapy rested heavily upon practicing the Golden Rule – possibly no more and certainly no less.

Erikson spoke to and lived the possibilities of border crossing – the excitement and freedom of shifting ideas, moods, vocations, religious proclivities, and geographic settings. He was a Freudian in one moment or paragraph, a cultural anthropologist in another, and an existentialist in another. As such, his life and work may have anticipated current discussions of the decentered sense of being that we have come to equate with postmodernism. Writing in the 1990s, his friend Robert Lifton described the phenomenon optimistically as "proteanism" – a fluid and many-sided buoyancy responsive to the restless flux of the late 20th century. Less positively, psychologist Kenneth Gergen has referred to "the vertigo of unlimited multiplicity" while psychologist Philip Cushman has described an un-

bounded and undifferentiated emotional hunger. However we assess the postmodern condition, Erikson's life and writings offer material for an instructive prologue.

Five years after Erikson died, two adolescents went on a killing rampage at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. They belonged to a group called the "Trenchcoat Mafia" and thrived on Nazi weaponry and uniforms, the German language, Mein Kampf, and the celebration of Hitler's birthday. Although from prosperous suburban households and with outwardly concerned parents, the two killers felt deep inner senses of emptiness and inadequacy in their lives. In the wake of the national shock over Columbine, Gordon Harper and several other clinicians Erikson had trained were called upon by The New York Times and other media to offer expert commentary. They had no difficulty doing so. They simply cited Erikson's essay in Childhood and Society on Hitler's appeal to unsteady German youth. Promoting himself as the head of a juvenile delinquent gang, Hitler told German youngsters (who were not unlike the Columbine killers) to bypass their parents and local community standards of respectability and to gain identity negatively – by assaulting Jews, homosexuals, gypsies, the handicapped, Communists, and other "undesirables." One learned what one was and gained a sense of place and destiny by turning with Hitler against these enemies of the *volk*. The clinicians trained by Erikson had no difficulty pointing to resemblances between Littleton's Trenchcoat Mafia and Nazi youth gangs. Resisting the national call for greater security devices and policing of public schools, they underscored how there were no quick fixes to distraught, violence-prone adolescents. Parents and others in local communities needed to encourage inner trust, groundedness, and playfulness in children of all ages. They had to cultivate traditions of what Erikson called "intergenerational reciprocity" where youth and adults gave and received from one another in secure and trusting environments, guided by the Golden Rule. There were no shortcuts to effective but time-consuming parenting and mentoring unless one wanted to run the risks of more Columbines. Clearly, an important part of Erikson's legacy is that it is eminently usable to us as parents, grandparents, and public citizens.

Lawrence J. Friedman, PhD, was the Featured Scholar in the December 2003 issue (Vol. 10 # 3:75,101-110) of this journal. He may be reached at <ljfriedm@indiana.edu>. □

Did Soviet Citizens Love Stalin?

**Anna Geifman
Boston University**

During his years as Soviet leader, Stalin was hailed as the "genius of all times;" "best friend of humanity;" "the greatest living human being;" "the creator of the people's happiness;" and "the shining sun." Although the avalanche of laudatory epithets has been invented by a legion of image-makers, there is hardly a doubt that during the 1930s, 1940s, and early 1950s a multitude of Soviet citizens from every social milieu accepted the official representation that conferred upon Stalin the status of semi-deity. Even if some were eager to flaunt their loyalty out of fear that otherwise they would have been labeled "enemies of the people," large numbers of Soviets revered Stalin and were religiously devoted to him. Was it not a paradox that the exploited, humiliated, and persecuted felt what appeared to be idolatrous love toward the man whose policies caused their suffering and death?

With such a paradox a symbolic representation may illustrate the situation's inner, psycho-historical complexity most vividly. Whereas the West sometimes wishfully saw Stalin as a would-be uncle figure (the war-era "Uncle Joe"), Soviet citizens were particularly conditioned to Stalin's image as their protector as the "Father of the people." This tendency fits in with the centuries-long Russian tradition of deification of the leader, which the communists rejected in theory but not in practice. Russian rulers were powerful super-ego surrogates, and the Soviets indeed related to Stalin as traumatized children would to an abusive parent—exhibiting disorientation, ambivalence, and inner turmoil. As Bruno Bettelheim notes, "being subject to such a strong external controlling force reactivates childish attitudes and feelings" ("Remarks on the Psychological Appeals of Totalitarianism," Survival and Other Es-

says [Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1979], pp. 328-329).

In the Soviet Union terrorized adults [repressed to childhood emotional states, finding](#) it psychologically unacceptable to admit any misgivings about their symbolic father. [Aided by his potent](#) propaganda machine, [Stalin](#) presented himself as their sole source of security in the dark and dangerous world perpetually threatened by foreign aggressors and undermined by terrorists, wreckers, bandits, and other secret domestic enemies. Child-like individuals [therefore tended to repress](#) any negative feelings toward [their protector](#) as bad, indeed criminal, [such that triggered guilt concomitant with legitimate fear of persecution](#). In fact, even momentary doubts about Stalin's rule would render the thought-offenders accomplices to his crimes, if only because they did nothing to prevent them. [People's](#) compliance with officially required applause for the regime's brutality [thus](#) sustained and reinforced [terror, and their ethical impasse](#) offered two alternatives: to retain integrity and self-respect by protesting and perishing or to be "bad"—hypocrites, liars, cowards, and collaborators with evil.

A way out of this conflict between dignity and personal safety was to identify with the values of the paranoid world Stalin created. [Daniel Rancour-Laferriere referred to this situation as a "mass Stockholm syndrome," where identification with the aggressor served to cancel fear](#) (Personal communication from the author on February 14, 2004). Indeed, [identifying with Stalin's omnipotent state might have strengthened the Soviet citizens while simultaneously reinforced the masochistic cult of power](#) (For in-depth analysis see [Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, The Slave Soul of Russia: Moral Masochism and the Cult of Suffering](#) [New York University Press: New York, 1996]).

[This process also rendered people](#) psychologically dependent on their belief that the "father's" wrath was directed only against those who "misbehaved." To retain faith, they desperately held on to any and all officially supplied proof of the lawfulness and validity of state-instigated terror. Having learned about the arrest

of a relative, friend, or colleague, they reasoned that a seemingly innocent citizen could in fact turn out to be a secret enemy and therefore deserved to be purged. Still, all rationalizations notwithstanding, there remained an emotional inconsistency in their responses to terror. If "Father" were invariably kind and just, and if "children" were obedient and adoring, surely they could count on his love? Why then did thousands of loyal and allegedly trusting Soviet citizens keep pre-packed bundles with soap, warm socks, and other essentials; why did they sleep with their clothes on, and during the designated "arrest hours" of the night stay wide awake—ready for the "black marusia" car of the NKVD to take them away? Individuals who did not suffer from psychotic delusions of being spies or saboteurs expected punishment, and, like children exposed to random abuse, were perpetually afraid. Their lives were thus torn apart by relentless confusion and a deep conflict between what they wished to feel and what they in fact experienced. Their decades-long predicament required a singular psychological adaptation, which could end the agonizing inner discord, a consequence of ambivalent reactions to violence.

A survivor of Stalin's Great Terror has the following vivid memory. Strolling down a busy street, she noticed a NKVD car following her. In panic, she turned the corner, walked faster, almost running. The car pursued her. Finally, worn-out by fear and knowing she could not escape arrest, she stopped. The car pulled near and several NKVD officers came out, demanding, "Aren't you so-and-so, the actress?" "Yes" she responded with trepidation. "We saw you perform last week; we loved it! Could you possibly give us your autograph?" She signed a piece of paper; the uniformed men thanked her and left. She started off, benumbed, barely able to walk. On a wall of a public building, she saw a huge poster of Stalin. Suddenly elated, she knelt down on the pavement before Stalin's image and prayed feverishly, thanking "the savior" for her miraculous escape (Author interview with Dr. S. Antonenko, International University, Moscow, June, 2001).

Having destroyed practically everyone who

had known him as a human being, rather than as power incarnate and the personification of tyranny's terrible magnificence, Stalin remained only a grand abstraction for the masses. A popular children's song went, "I am a little girl. I play, and I sing. I have never seen Stalin, but I love him anyway." Yet, since love pertains to closeness and personal emotional bonds, people's alleged affection for the Soviet icon must be questioned. We can only be certain of their all-consuming fear, for years paralyzing them mentally and physically.

Yet, along with fear, any attempt to understand people's emotions must emphasize another essential aspect of Stalin's epoch—the regime's demand that all of its subjects, proletarians and intellectuals alike, function on an extremely high level of intensity, performing and producing almost beyond human capacity. Stalin insisted on **both**: unmitigated terror and spectacular accomplishment. **Such achievement, however**, is seemingly incompatible with the creative paralysis intrinsic to fear. It could not be eliminated, but terrorized people did find a way out of their predicament by unconsciously cloaking their fear with positive feelings surrounding an idealized Stalin, saving them from debilitating numbness. As part of this **emotional** conversion, most terrifying features in the tyrant's image metamorphosed into qualities that guaranteed security. Quintessential strength, potentially destructive and murderous, turned into a protective shield of an epic hero, invested with nearly supernatural genius to defend the weak. Stalin the abstraction transformed into an idol to be worshipped and appeased, rendering the faithful less afraid.

The public reaction to Stalin's death in 1953 was shock and mass hysteria. People took to the streets, and whole towns wept (**F. D. Volkov, [Vzlet i padenie Stalina {The Rise and Fall of Stalin}](#) [Spektr: Moscow, 1992], p. 300**). My mother, then eighteen, remembers being trapped in an enormous crowd, gripping the hand of her eleven-year-old brother, who thought her to be a heartless monster for not crying like all the others. Stalin's death undermined the implied immortality of a demigod, and people were hysterical because suddenly they found themselves unprotected by "Father's" omnipotence, alone and lost like frightened children in a dark and dangerous forest. Helpless authorities

issued countless admonitions against panic, but to no avail.

Yet, by 1956 the ones who had mourned the death of their godlike leader supported Khrushchev in denouncing the "Cult of Personality" and welcomed de-Stalinization. We may label the nation as immature—a "toddler nation-state," in the terminology of the Israeli scholar Sam Vaknin, which had undergone the process of transforming a tyrant into a benevolent deity and then, posthumously, rejected the "Father" ("**Object Relations: The Psychology of Serial and Mass Killers**," <http://www.toddler.com/sam/matrix/killers.htm>). It appears more useful, however, to bear in mind that as fear gradually loosened its paralyzing grip of Stalin's victims, and as they began to emerge from their emotionally impaired state, many seized the opportunity to get in touch with their true feelings. With adoration no longer officially and psychologically obligatory, they acknowledged their underlying fear previously camouflaged as love. Sometimes it took only a few moments of inner liberation for the hidden feelings to explode with astonishing emotion, that which for a quarter of a century was kept hidden, sometimes even from oneself as well as from all others. Upon hearing the news of the leader's death, one presumably loyal citizen blurted out to his horrified family, "The bloody dog is dead." (Uttered by the grandfather of Dr. Vladimir **Akulin, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France**, interviewed by the author in July, 2002).

Who **may** be lonelier, more anxious, and further detached from reality than a tyrant surrounded by his small, frightened, and false entourage? Stalin had numerous statues erected of himself and **ocean liners** named after him. He knew of countless songs and poems written to glorify his **name**, and he could observe colossal skyscrapers built all over Moscow to commemorate the triumph of his reign. Nonetheless, his boundless **narcissistic** need to be reassured of mass adoration always had to remain insatiable since all he could draw out of his subjects was a pseudo-emotion, directed not toward him but rather *away from themselves*. It was fear in disguise. The "beloved comrade Stalin" was caught in a vicious circle. He both craved for affection and tyrannized, only to find himself forever

deprived—despite manifest conformity to his regime—of genuine admiration and love.

Anna Geifman, PhD, is Professor of History at Boston University, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate classes on the history of imperial Russia, the USSR, and psychohistory. Included in her publications are Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1894-1917 (Princeton University Press, 1993), Entangled in Terror: The Azef Affair and the Russian Revolution (Scholarly Resources, 2000), the edited Russia under the Last Tsar: Opposition and Subversion, 1894-1917 (Blackwell, 1999), and numerous journal articles and book chapters on Russian political and cultural history. Professor Geifman is currently working on a volume of essays on the psychology of political violence, aggression, and self-destructiveness of Russian political extremists. She may be reached at <geifman@bu.edu>.

[Postscript: The author would like to thank Rudolph Binion, Leff Families Professor of Modern European History at Brandeis University, and Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, Professor of Russian at the University of California-Davis, for their helpful comments.] □

Psychohistory Forum Meeting

April 24, 2004: 12:30-3:30

Anna Geifman (Boston Univ.)

“Lenin’s Personality Profile”

Philip Pomper (Wesleyan Univ.)

**“Trotsky’s Self-Destructive
Ambivalence”**

Free Associations

Election 2004: Studying the Democratic Candidates

Paul H. Elovitz

Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

A Psychobiographer’s Tasks and Ambivalence:

In a weak moment back in 2002, I asked the editor of the Journal of Psychohistory if he would like me to write my customary presidential psychobiographical article in the form of a comparison of the Democratic and Republican candidates. As usual, he said yes, giving me a June 1st deadline. I must confess to enormous pride, as well as ambivalence, regarding my role as a presidential candidate psychobiographer. Let me start with the pride.

It is extraordinarily important to know as much as possible about the childhood, personality, life traumas, political pattern, policies, and values of the individual who will be president. This is so because this person will have power over life and death, as well as the ability to start or stop wars, to say nothing of lesser responsibilities. I am quite proud of the work I have done in this regard since 1976.

The sources of my ambivalence are not hard to find. First and foremost, the research is enormously time-consuming, especially during a period of almost weekly candidate debates and forums starting after Labor Day and extending into at least late February or early March when a clear victory emerges. For two years now, I have been watching the potential and declared candidates on C-SPAN television and other news networks when I could have been watching a nice old movie or reading a good book. My office and life have become cluttered with clippings from magazines and newspapers, though I do not yet fear, thanks to electronic storage, that I will be literally buried in paper as were the Collyer brothers in 1947. The New York Times may claim to have “All the News That’s Fit to Print,” but since the business of Washington is politics, I find The Washington Post (I settle for the weekly National Edition until the campaign becomes quite heated) to be an indispensable source

of information regarding our next President. Online sources are also quite helpful. My ambivalence goes beyond the enormous amount of work required to do this job properly. There is the issue of how to find materials suitable for psychohistorical analysis amidst the masses of information available. There is the problem of trying to predict who will emerge as the winner when there is a large field of candidates – particularly since there are often latecomers, like Senator John McCain in 2003 and third party candidates like Ross Perot in 1992 and Ralph Nader in 2000 and 2004.

My hesitation also involves the growing frustration with the polarized politics of Washington. Nevertheless, here I am again; collecting data and hoping that this work will not cut too deeply into my time in writing about the history of psychohistory during my sabbatical semester.

The Permanent Presidential Campaign in Its Invisible Phase: In this era of the *permanent presidential campaign*, a major question arises: When do the invisible campaigns become visible? This varies, partly as a function of the electorate's discontent with the sitting president. The extraordinary proliferation of news outlets also makes a difference as they search for grist for their mills. The peculiarities of the present system are heightened by candidates who actively run for six months or a year and then, when they think the time is right, formally announce their campaigns so they can receive additional news coverage. During the invisible part of their campaigns, they have been raising funds, hiring campaign managers, pollsters, and other staff, and organizing focus groups to determine what ideas and words are most appealing to different groups of voters in the primaries.

King-of-the-Mountain and Everybody Wants to be Your Friend: A more important question than when the presidential campaign becomes visible to a mass public, is who will emerge as the frontrunner of the party. Leading the field has powerful advantages and disadvantages, depending partly on the timing. The rewards for facing the plaudits and abuse of being declared the leading candidate *can* be enormous. Some of the best (and most expensive) political operatives want to work in your campaign, while people you never met donate money

because they want to influence your positions, have access to you should you be elected, or just find a champion to displace the person/party in power. There is a bandwagon effect if the frontrunner survives the abuse and scrutiny of rivals and maintains this position. Supporters want to jump on the frontrunner's bandwagon early, hoping they will be remembered after Election Day when the victorious candidate distributes the "goodies". Thus, Al Gore, Tom Harkin, Carol Braun, some important white-collar unions, and others jumped on former Governor Howard Dean's bandwagon early on. To their disappointment, Dean's seemingly unstoppable parade began to slow to a crawl in the weeks before the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary. The current rush is to join the Kerry parade that is heading for the Democratic National Convention in Boston without a great deal of opposition after his major rivals conceded to him after his March 2 Super Tuesday victories. What happens in cases like that of Howard Dean?

Early on, the frontrunner becomes the target of criticism by all the other candidates, and investigative journalists, who are out to make a name for themselves by bringing down the mighty, or the would-be mighty. This reminds me of a childhood game called "King-of-the-Mountain," in which all the boys combine to knock down the child on top of the mound, who has declared himself "King-of-the-Mountain." Given the odds of one boy against many, usually, the "king's" reign is brief. In politics, the "King-of-Mountain" is called the frontrunner. Journalists and public opinion polls apply this designation at a stage in the process when not enough of the electorate is involved for the label to mean much on election days. Experienced politicians, like John Kerry, try to avoid this designation until the nomination is assured. If successful, this strategy helps the candidate evade the higher expectations, intense journalistic investigative scrutiny, and the criticism of rivals, facing the favorite as the "one to beat." (See below for more discussion for the reason Dean's campaign collapsed so abruptly.)

Senators and Governors in the Presidential Sweepstakes: There is something about being a senator that makes individuals subject to the contagion of presidential fever. Senators Biden, Daschle, and Dodd, almost came down with it, while Bob

Graham of Florida caught it but was cured within several months by the cool temperature of the voters he approached. On the campaign trail, Senator Graham, also a former governor, often put aside his courtly manner, and excoriated President Bush for the secrecy of his administration, inept policies, and failure to pursue "Osama bin Forgotten." John Edwards of North Carolina caught the fever in his very first term in the Senate, even though he had no prior political experience. His autobiography, Four Trials (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004 [really 2003]) was written with a Professor of English, and recounts aspects of his trials and life (the trials of life might be more helpful for my purposes), including the essay he wrote as an 11 year old, preserved by his "Mamma," on "why I want to be a lawyer." His desire to "protect innocent people from blind justice the best I can" (p.7) is in keeping with his presidential primary campaign rhetoric. He proved himself to be a most effective campaigner, with a consistent message, and spoke in sound bytes, which is a most valuable asset.

Carol Mosley Braun, a former one-term senator from Illinois, carried the mantle for women in the 2004 election; however, she was not a very impressive candidate, despite being well-spoken and getting considerable exposure in the weekly Democratic debates in the Fall of 2003. C-SPAN's coverage of her candidacy announcement showed only media at the event, and she received only a few drops of the mother's milk of political success—campaign contributions. The earliest book on the campaign reports that Braun "appears to be doing virtually nothing beyond gracing the dais at multi-candidate forums" (Walter Shapiro, One-Car Caravan: On the Road with the 2004 Democrats Before America Tunes In [NY: Public Affairs, 2003], p.145).

Joseph Lieberman, a three-term Senator, and John Forbes Kerry, with four terms, had more time than Edwards and Braun to build up their credentials and think about changing their address to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. The Senator from Connecticut wrote In Praise of Public Life (NY: Simon and Schuster, 2000) and, together with his wife and Sarah Crichton, An Amazing Adventure: Joe and Hadassah's Personal Notes on the 2000 Campaign (NY: Simon and Schuster, 2003). In the

latter, they alternate their responses to the 2000 run for the vice-presidency. Hadassah provides a vivid account of the pressure of incessant media scrutiny: for example, she describes reporters falling out of her forsythia bushes where they laid in waiting for her husband as she put out her garbage in her bathrobe and bare feet. John Kerry, A Call to Service: My Vision for a Better America (NY: Viking of Penguin, 2003), in contrast to the Liebermans' folksiness, presents a somewhat more formal statement of his vision of America, which is in keeping with his oft-described presidential look. The book of this junior senator from Massachusetts is clearly in the tradition of John Kennedy's call to service which influenced the young Kerry.

In recent years, governors, or former governors, have been more readily elected to the presidency than senators. After all, JFK, in 1960, was the last senator elected to the presidency directly, while George W. Bush (2000), Carter (1976), Clinton (1992), and Reagan (1980) were the governors elected president. (I am excluding those who became president through the vice-presidency, which is a more frequent route for senators.) Four governors elected, compared to one senator since 1960, is *prima facie* evidence that voters tend to believe that governors have the executive experience necessary for the presidency, while senators do not. An additional explanatory factor for the victory of governors may be that senators are so well known in Washington that their competitors can quickly marshal arguments and advertisements against them at decisive moments in the campaign. (If John Forbes Kerry is elected president in 2004, future historians may no longer use the initials JFK to refer to John Fitzgerald Kennedy to avoid confusion. Kerry wore a JFK tie clasp when he rooted for his fellow Massachusetts native in the 1960s.)

It is worth noting that three of the Democratic contenders (the New Englanders Dean [class of 1971], Lieberman [1964], and Kerry [1966]) were at Yale in the 1960s. (Clinton and Cheney also attended Yale: Clinton in the Law School from 1970-73 and Cheney as an undergraduate in 1959, before dropping out and later taking his degrees elsewhere.) I will not forget to include our New England born and educated (Andover, Yale [class of 1968], and Harvard) current president, even

though he views himself as a West Texan, and has cultivated that image throughout his life. John Kerry, like three generations of Bushes (Senator Prescott, G. H. W. and W. Bush), was even selected to the exclusive, secretive Skull and Bones Society at Yale, which admits only 15 seniors in each class.

These days, the media mostly gather together like geese on migration or police to crime scenes. Fortunately, there are a few who risk loneliness, starting early in the game rather than following the crowd. Walter Shapiro is a political columnist who went on the campaign trail so early (the late summer of 2002) that he was sitting in the back of a van or car with the candidate for extended periods. The only declared candidate at the time was a five-term governor of Vermont, whose one traveling aide drove the car and did almost everything else. The long-time political reporter found the doctor-politician to have a wonderful memory as they chatted about the 1961 New York Yankees, the political philosophy Dean learned in his political science courses at Yale, and much else.

Howard Dean's Internet Campaign: It was only in 2001 that Governor Dean learned how to do e-mail and probe the Internet but his candidacy for president was galvanized by its use. Joe Trippi, at a time when he was being hailed as the most innovative and successful of the campaign managers, rather than as an idiosyncratic loser as he was when the Dean presidential drive collapsed, thought it a "great myth" that he was running the campaign. In Trippi's five or six previous excursions into presidential primaries, he declared that it "has always been command and control from the top down," while the challenge in the Dean campaign "has been to let people create their own energy." After awhile, they proudly called themselves "Deaniacs." A month like last September saw over 1,200 local events listed on the Dean Web site. Through "Meet-up.com," a free and independent Internet site, people with similar interests have met together to support Dean. They provided their own money, organizational talents, and energy, while the official campaign concentrated on key early states like New Hampshire and Iowa. To keep novice volunteers in compliance with Federal Election Commission rules on monetary and time contributions, the organized campaign communicated to the volunteers

throughout the country on Dean's official Web site, www.deanforamerica.com (Lois Romano, "Bottom's Up: Dean's Grass-roots Support is Turning Presidential Politics Upside Down," Washington Post National Edition 9/11-10/5/03:11).

The psychology of the grass roots Internet campaign is what interests me most. There has been a rapid online establishment of individuals and groups supporting candidates. Capability and commitment, rather than age and experience, determined who played what role. The 17-year-old, who ran Dean's Alaska campaign, is an example of this phenomenon. The anonymity of the Internet enabled diverse populations to play significant roles. The political establishment and press were enormously impressed with the Dean campaign's use of the Internet in raising money (\$41 million was the figure bandied about) and bringing young people into the political process. In the end, the "Deaniacs'" ability to bring voters to the primaries was much less impressive than anticipated. It is hard to say how much of this failure may be attributed to the mistakes of their inexperienced candidate in the face of the intense scrutiny of the front-runner and to the co-opting of his message by his major rivals.

Books by and on the "Internet Candidate" that I was reading in 2003 and January of this year are Howard Dean's Winning Back America (NY: Simon and Schuster, 2003); Lisa Rogak's (ed.) Howard Dean: In His Own Words (NY: Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Griffin, 2003); and Dirk Van Susteren's (ed.) Howard Dean: A Citizen's Guide to the Man Who Would Be President (South Royalton, VT: Steerforth Press, 2003). Dean's books provide significant biographical information but do not emphasize his life story because growing up on Park Avenue and in Sag Harbor did not differentiate him enough from Senator Kerry or the Republican blue-blood he hoped to defeat in November, as the advocate of ordinary people. Born in 1948, the eldest of four sons, he rebelled against his father's (Big Howard's) conservative Republican affiliations and values. Shortly after graduation, he turned away from his father's life of money making through finance, to helping people as a doctor. He also reached out beyond his white Anglo-Saxon, Protestant upper crust social group to others,

requesting minority roommates at Yale, attending a medical school founded by Jews, marrying a Jew, and allowing his wife to raise their children primarily as Jews.

Dean's amazing rise from being a little known governor of a small state to the apparently unstoppable frontrunner was based upon his catching the mood of anger, especially of young voters, over the Iraq war, the Patriot Act, and self-serving Washington politicians. His main competitors were initially slow to criticize him, partly because they underestimated him. Later, the more successful among them adjusted their own message to mirror his intense attack on Bush and the 2003 Iraq War.

Howard Dean's ultimate failure has a variety of causes most of which say more about his competitors and the electorate than his weaknesses. The negative, mutually-attacking advertisements of Gephardt and Dean in Iowa, hurt both, and knocked Gephardt out of the race since his neighboring state was a "have-to" win for him. Jon Haber, Chief of Staff for the Dean Campaign, called it a Dean-Gephardt mutual "murder-suicide" (C-SPAN on March 11, 2004). In the end, many of Dean's young supporters turned out to not be Dean voters in the primaries. A significant number of Democratic voters decided that they needed a candidate who could challenge Bush as a leader in wartime; something Clark or Kerry could do far better than Dean. The rush of endorsements for Dean had a sobering effect on voters at a time when he faced the full scrutiny of the press in December and January. The former governor did not handle this examination like a major league politician. Edwards was proving himself to be an excellent campaigner. John Kerry's campaign had become energized in the late Fall and most especially in the final phase before the crucial early decisions in Iowa and New Hampshire. The media's handling of Dean's "I've Got a Scream Speech," on the evening of his surprising disappointing third place showing in Iowa, led to his quick marginalization as not having the temperament for the presidency, and was the source of endless jokes by television comedians. (In retrospect, many observers insist that he had to scream to be heard over the noise of his boisterous young adherents and a poor public address system.) Though much of his support came from his verbal-

izing anger against Bush, in his speech, Dean was portrayed as crossing the line by what appeared to be the out of control anger of a fanatical hockey dad. This fits one of my theories that we want our politicians to express our anger, but we also are quick to disown the anger because of our ambivalence and shared reaction formations.

Another General Running for President and the Issue of Military Experience: Generals run for president, although less frequently than senators and governors. Sometimes running is as a result of overarching ambition although it may be at the urging of more politically astute types who are looking for a viable candidate. Thus, retired general Dwight D. Eisenhower had both the Democratic and Republican parties knocking at his door after WWII. Twelve American presidents have been generals (Washington, Jackson, Harrison, Taylor, Pierce, Johnson, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Harrison, and Eisenhower) and most have had military experience. Indeed, only 12 to 15 of the 42 presidents have not had military experience (the 12-15 range is because my sources are contradictory). Only lawyers have been more successful than generals in acquiring the presidency. However, Eisenhower (1952-60) was the only general to become president since Benjamin Harrison's election in 1888. Teddy Roosevelt may have temporarily assuaged America's desire for a warrior-president because the six presidents following him had not served in the military, though FDR did serve as Assistant Secretary of the Navy (1913-20).

I was hoping that Clinton's election would break the focus on military experience present in post WWII presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush the Elder. However, because Clinton took so much FLAK for his handling of the issue of homosexuals in the military, after having avoided the draft while protesting the Vietnam War, it became likely that the next president would have some military credentials and, perhaps, use the military more. Our current President, a national guardsman who, like so many others of his generation, evaded service in Vietnam, has certainly focused on his role as commander-in-chief and has been quick to use the military in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Many Democratic voters have shown a preference for men with military experience during this series of primaries. Wesley Clark's emergence in mid-September, as both a Democrat and presidential contender is a prime example of this. First he declared his candidacy for president, and then, during the following week, amidst fanfare and dubious polls that showed he could beat Bush, he joined the party. Though Clark was not successful in his presidential bid, many felt that he was also in the race to be noticed as a potential vice-presidential choice to strengthen the national defense credentials of the 2004 Democratic contender. Senator Kerry, whose campaign had been pronounced dead by many pundits, came out fighting in the fall and, in October, I noticed him surrounded by veterans he had fought with in Vietnam. His first wife wrote, as quoted in Douglas Brinkley's Tour of Duty: John Kerry and the Vietnam War (NY: Harper Collins, 2004, p. 443), "He's always at his best when he's with those [veterans] guys, they make him capable. He really loves them all in a profound way." Watching Kerry's face and body language when surrounded by former Senator Max Cleland, a triple amputee, and veterans from the Swift Boat he commanded in Vietnam, verifies her judgment. According to Brinkley, in previous elections, his ex-wife has been successful in keeping his opponents from using her to hurt his political career.

Wesley K. Clark (Kanne is his birth name and his natural father was Jewish), a West Point educated Rhodes scholar and highly political general, did not get along well with his peers in the military. This was primarily because he was brighter than most, did not focus on their "macho" rules, and was openly political. He was making a name for himself as head of NATO and as a peace-keeping general in Bosnia and Kosovo when he was fired by Clinton's Secretary of Defense for his lack of respect for the chain of command and his political mistakes. By comparison, Collin Powell was so diplomatic that his military career thrived under Democrats and Republicans, and it is no accident that he is serving as America's chief diplomat rather than as the head of the Department of Defense. After several years of making money and pontificating as a defense analyst, Clark jumped into the scramble for the Democratic nomination at the urging of

former President Clinton. He had the added advantage of being from the Sunbelt, whence all presidents since Ford (who only needed Nixon's vote) have come to the presidency. The two books Clark wrote after his discharge from the Army, mainly to bolster his finances and credentials as a military analyst, shed some light on his thinking. They are Winning Modern Wars: Iraq, Terrorism, and the American Empire (NY: Public Affairs, 2003) and Waging Modern War: Bosnia, Kosovo, and the Future of Combat (NY: Public Affairs, 2001). Clark was not alone in having his eyes on the number two spot, John Edwards was extremely careful to avoid criticizing his leading competitors until he found himself in an essentially two-man race before Super Tuesday (March 2). Even then, he held back, and upon conceding he stressed his friendship with the victorious Kerry.

One might argue that men with military experience are either more or less warlike than those without it. Wilson was as close to being a pacifist as we have had in the White House until he got involved in "the war to end all wars." Eisenhower, a career military man, was not very warlike, though he certainly had hawkish types in his administration. Both Bushes have been equally willing to take us into war despite the father's serious involvement in WWII (his plane was shot down over the Pacific and both of his crew members died) as a naval aviator and his son's avoidance of service in Vietnam (a war he supported but did not think much about) by flying planes in the Texas National Guard.

September 11th frightened many Americans into a collective fantasy focusing on a strong, commander-in-chief type of president. Regrettably, this is a reality we will have to deal with for sometime.

Other Candidates: These included two congressmen and one minister. The early demise of the candidacy of former Democratic congressional leader Richard Gephardt of Missouri was related to his negative campaign message in Iowa. Democratic primary voters punished both Dean and Gephardt for being quite critical of each other, rather than saving their negativity for President Bush. Had Gephardt been more successful, those following the campaign would have been reading his 1999 book, with Michael Wessel, An Even Better Place: Amer-

ica in the 21st Century. Though Congressman Dennis Kucinich never had a chance of getting elected, to advance his candidacy he wrote A Prayer for America (2003), together with Studs Terkel.

Running for president can be a narcissistic high for all candidates and for some a stepping stone to professional advancement having nothing to do with the presidency. This is clearly the case for a child preacher who has often been in the news. The Reverend [the title appears on the book cover] Al Sharpton, Al on America (NY: Kensington Publishing Co, 2002), provides a lively read and, in public appearances, led the candidates in humor. On at least one occasion he even broke out into song and dance on the campaign trail, a reminder that he had been road manager for the singer James Brown from 1973-80. He worked to get people to try to forget his past as a demagogue, to win enough support to get to speak at the Democratic Convention in the footsteps of Jesse Jackson, and to begin a new career as a cable television and radio host. By late February he hired the William Morris talent agency to help achieve the latter goal.

Identification With and Countertransference to the Candidates: Analysts of the candidates and the political process come to identify with candidates for a variety of reasons that extend beyond the specific policies advocated. There is the practical issue of the candidate you have spent the most time researching and whose books you have read. After buying and starting to read various book last fall, I wondered how reporters who give up the niceties of home to follow candidates come to root for the candidate they invested their time and energy reporting on. The social psychological principle of self-justification influences humans to justify what we have done after we have done it, simply because we did it. So, committing months to a candidate and his ideas and works, may require justification merely for having made the commitment. Personally, I pay close attention to my own "gut" reactions to each candidate, recording Freudian slips and dreams about them. Countertransference feelings are as important to monitor with candidates as with patients.

The Costs of Running for President: The dream of becoming president is one that relatively few

Americans pursue. This is not surprising given the unlikelihood of success and the extraordinary costs of the journey. Candidates with any serious chance of nomination (this excluded Braun, Kucinich, and Sharpton in the 2004 sweepstakes) lose almost all privacy and must pursue a manic pace that is utterly exhausting, and somewhat dehumanizing. They are surrounded by people from morning until night, seven days a week, until Election Day, yet they have almost no real relationship with these people. Handlers whisper what to say as they rush their candidate into yet another hall where people applaud him or her for arriving and cheer him for repeating clichés. Seemingly endless hands are shaken, photographs taken of smiling faces, and yet there is no real conversation. There is no time to listen to and exchange ideas with each other in the way thoughtful people do. Consequently, confusions are not clarified and errors are not acknowledged. If a candidate alters an idea, he is immediately charged with flip-flopping, opportunism, and weakness. He then gets blasted in the media and learns not to do it again if he wants to be the winning candidate. From supporters, and those close to him, he receives endless flattery. An enormous number of people want a piece of him, because he could be our next president. People project their own hopes and wishes onto him, seeing him as their secular savior.

Some candidates made valiant efforts to protect their families from the engulfing nature of the electoral process. Howard Dean pledged to not miss any of his 17-year-old son's hockey games but, in early January, he was violating this promise as he cancelled his trip back to Burlington. Similarly, the Dean family's effort to allow Dr. Judith Steinberg to attend to her patients in Vermont rather than her husband's campaign also fell by the wayside after his disappointing showings in Iowa and New Hampshire. Teresa Heinz Kerry's initial ambivalence about her husband's running and her campaigning with him was a casualty of the campaign. As a psychobiographer, I find it interesting to watch the wives and children on the campaign trail because it informs me about them and their family dynamics. While being moved around and managed like a young child, the primary candidate hears a grandiose image of himself. The whole process is depersonalizing, dehumanizing, and falsely inflating, yet it prepares the winning candi-

date for the intensity of the fall campaign and the incredibly more demanding process of being president.

Life's Surprises: The challenge of facing the realities and surprises of life on the campaign trail are enormous. Both Kerry and Gephardt faced the illnesses and deaths of their mothers during the campaign. Kerry, who sometimes seemed like a "sad sack" to journalist Walter Shapiro, faced not only this blow, but prostate cancer and the revelation that his paternal grandfather (Fred Kerry) was born Jewish (as Kritz Kohn in the Austrian Empire) and had committed suicide in 1921 by gun shot in a Boston hotel's men's room (Shapiro, p. 186). Death certainly has impacts on human beings. Shapiro noted that, when his brother died in 1974 in Southeast Asia, Howard Dean switched careers from Wall Street finance to medicine, and when his father and namesake died in 2001, within the month, he declared for "the big prize" of the presidency. The candidate's response, in the back of a van headed for an Iowa political meeting, was that "it's an interesting coincidence, worthy of discussion, but no light is likely to be shed on it in five minutes or an hour" (Shapiro, p.189). He recognized that focus is essential to victory, which certainly contributed to his not pursuing Shapiro's thoughtful observations. While campaigning, Wesley Clark discovered he had a half-brother, but did not want to meet him until after the election. This reminds me that, as a result of his running for office, his fellow Arkansan, Bill Clinton, discovered that the father he never knew not only had several wives prior to his mother, but also had at least one other son and, therefore, that he had another half-brother. Regarding brothers, the eldest have been more inclined to become president than their younger siblings. Both the current President Bush and John Kerry are first born sons.

The Prospect of a First Lady with an Unusual Background: If Joe Lieberman had won the nomination and been elected, his wife would have been an atypical First Lady. Hadassah was born in Europe as the child of Holocaust survivors, coming to these shores speaking only Yiddish. If Kerry should be elected president, his second wife (Teresa Heinz Kerry, who was born as Maria Teresa Thierstein Simoes-Ferreira), would be an unusual First

Lady in a number of respects. She is a linguist who speaks five languages and was born in Africa as the daughter of Portuguese immigrants to Mozambique 65 years ago. This outspoken woman is five years older than her husband and much richer than him. She was widowed and he was divorced. Philanthropy and the environment are two of her major concerns.

The Democratic Primary Winner and the Outcome of This Research: John Forbes Kerry, the tallest (the taller candidates usually have a significant advantage) at six foot three inches and the most Lincolnesque looking of the candidates, struck me as the most introspective and thoughtful of the Democratic field. He sometimes muses in public, unusual for a politician at his level, and has published several books including The New Soldier (1971 and today on sale used on Abebooks.com for \$600-1500!). Julia Thorne, his ex-wife, has even written a self-help book, You Are Not Alone: Words of Experience and Hope for the Journey Through Depression (1993), based upon her own struggle. Kerry is a man who does not easily speak, except in the heat of political battle, in sound bytes – a distinct disadvantage in a campaign for the presidency. We will know more about him as a politician in April with the publication of John F. Kerry: The Complete Biography: By the Boston Globe Reporters Who Know Him Best, by Michael Kranish, Brian C. Mooney, and Nina J. Easton (Boston: Public Affairs, 432 pp., ISBN no. 15864827). (This information was obtained from Amazon.com.)

For information on Kerry as a soldier and man, we are fortunate to have a fine, partial biography on him by the distinguished historian, Douglas Brinkley, whose 546-page book focuses on Kerry's service in Vietnam but covers the Senator's entire life. Brinkley interviewed the Senator nine times in addition to more than 100 other people for the volume. He also used Kerry's letters and journals from his college and Vietnam years as sources. The resulting book is being mined these days by journalists, as well as his political friends and enemies, for their own purposes. I recommend that you consider reading it as well.

Kerry will be tested on the campaign trail,

just as he was in Vietnam on a noisy Swift Boat going down narrow rivers with the Vietcong firing on him from both shores. At the moment President Bush has already raised 158 million dollars for his reelection campaign. The Republican plan is to negatively define, specifically within the next three months, Kerry as a flip flopping, soft on defense, big spending Massachusetts liberal. Bush has been carefully making speeches and raising money in the states the Democrats have held their most heated primaries and on March 20 he formally declared his candidacy. It is unusual for a president to not maintain a "Rose Garden" strategy by which they act above the fray of politics until after the nominating conventions. The *president as the national leader and commander-in-chief* is less subject to criticism than the *president as candidate* who is fair game for censure. Bush may discover, as Dean did and before him the Vietcong, that Kerry is an extremely tough counter puncher who inclines to take the struggle to the opponent. His situation is improved by the unity of the Democratic Party.

My psychobiographical explorations will result in the aforementioned comparison of the 2004 Democratic and Republican standard-bearers. Some will also be shared at the International Psychohistorical Association's June 2, 2004 panel of the Psychohistory Forum's Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidential Candidates and Presidents, with presenters Herbert Barry and Dan Dervin. I may present additional findings at the International Society for Political Society in Lund, Sweden, this coming July. As usual, in the month or two prior to the decisive vote, the Forum will have a Saturday Work-In-Progress Seminar on the candidates and the psychology of the electoral process. Throughout the campaign season, the interplay of the candidates with the changing emotions of the electorate will be explored. All of what I learn will be shared with my students. Most importantly, the result of my studies will determine whom I vote for come the first Tuesday in November.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, studied political science in graduate school at Rutgers before taking his doctoral degrees in history and becoming a psychoanalyst. Since 1976 he has been exploring the psychobiographies of U.S. presidential candidates and

presidents, often publishing his results. He may be reached at <pelovitz@aol.com>.

Call for Papers

The Political Psychology and Psychobiography of the 2004 Candidates and Election

Special Theme Issue
September 2004

Some possible approaches include:

- Comparing and contrasting the Bush/Kerry decision making, political styles, psychology and values
- Comparing and contrasting Kerry/Bush childhoods and personalities
- Interviewing Bush/Kerry significant others
- A comparison of the defense (coping) mechanisms of Kerry/Bush
- Fathers and sons: Richard and John Kerry and G. H. W. and W. Bush
- Sibling relations in the Bush and Kerry families
- Emotional expression in the lives of Kerry/Bush
- Religion in the life and politics of W. Bush
- Comparing and contrasting John Forbes Kerry ("JFK") with his youthful ego ideal – JFK
- Flying, military service, and risk taking in the lives of Bush/Kerry
- The impact of death: Bush's sister and Kerry's parents and "brothers" in Vietnam
- The impact of 9/11 and Vietnam on the election
- The impact of war and culture wars on the election
- Psychohistorical book review essays

Articles of 500-1500 words, due June 15
(Early submissions are welcome)
Contact Paul Elovitz, Editor
<pelovitz@aol.com>

E-mail Identities

Paul H. Elovitz
The Psychohistory Forum

Normally, people do not get to name themselves. Parents choose our names and I have known individuals who have rued the parental choices they carried throughout their lives. To their minds, their names (and often their body sizes, features, etc., etc.) are too common, uncommon, interesting, or dull. Few among us have not had a friend or relative who has not spent endless hours complaining of the misfortune of having a name or face that was not masculine or feminine enough, handsome or pretty enough. In my experience, such discontents are sometimes a part of our way of establishing a separate identity from that of our family which named us and passed on their body sizes and looks. When Erik Erikson wrote so insightfully about issues of identity, I doubt that he imagined that there would be such a fruitful way of trying on different identities as there are on e-mail.

On e-mail, we have the choice of totally reinventing ourselves as whatever we would like and in being perceived by people who have never met us in person as whoever our new name implies. This process can make for all sorts of transformations that would be either difficult or impossible in reality. The media focuses on cases of pedophiles or scam artists who create false identities used for immoral/unscrupulous purposes. My interest is in how young people, mostly 18-25, make statements about their identity in choosing e-mail addresses. In this article I write about some of the e-mail identities taken by people in this age group with whom I have had some contact in the last year or two. It is amazing to me that all of these examples come from a fairly small number of individuals. To protect the identity of those involved, I have disguised the addresses of the server and sometimes made changes without disrupting the essence of the address. For example, "@aol.com" may be changed to "@comcast.net" or "@juno.com" and "psyhhstfm3@juno" would be altered to something like "Psychohistory Forum27@aol.com." Numbers may be changed or added to further disguise an address and often vowels are added. Note that e-mail addresses had been limited to eight spaces before the "@" until fairly

recently, and they now appear to be limited to 13 characters. However, for the sake of clarity I have lengthened them and added vowels which are often eliminated for the purposes of space. I have also added capitalization to make it easier for the reader who is unfamiliar with e-mail to read the component parts. Thus awywithwrds22@nyu.edu becomes AwayWithWords22@netmail.com.

I find that e-mail addresses ("handles") can be organized under many different categories such as: **a n t i - i n t e l l e c t u a l** (AwayWithWords22@netmail.com), **ethnic identity** (ItalianStallion7@hotmail.com and FightenIrish253@ru.edu), **food** (Cookies736@netmail.com), **gender** (BabyGurl03579@hotmail.com), **mood** (Ennui425@msn.com and ImAlmostHappy33@aol.com), **nature** (RedSands834@aol.com), **nicknames** ([Honey B289@hotmail.com](mailto:HoneyB289@hotmail.com) and Wags9356@aol.com for an individual with a name like Wagnert), **personal characteristic** (PeachyChicOne@aol.com), **self-image** (FadedSilhouette3@earthlink.net and Vanity97@telusplanet.net), **profession** (NurseNumber1@juno.com), **prophecy** (shaman535@hotmail.com), and **worth** (BillDaBest721@rr.com). Togetherness with a loved one (TomAndMary33@yahoo.com and GeorgeAndAnna@yahoo.com) is not uncommon and in my limited sample it has been women who have these e-mail addresses. Could such an address be an e-mail equivalent of an engagement or wedding ring?

Hobbies are important and sometimes even lead to professions: AquaAngel628391@aol.com loves to swim, Breakwave7@hotmail.com is a swimming instructor, and PonyGirlRacing651@hotmail.com likes horses and is training to be a nurse. Animal names also serve as ways of establishing identity: PrissyKittyKate56@aol.com and MonkeyFreak23995@hotmail.com are straight forward examples, while WernDog88@yahoo.com is based on half of the individual's last name and man's best friend.

My first hypothesis about the meaning of an Internet handle is often not what the creator of the e-mail address had in mind. For example, IrisInBalance@comcast.net had a hard time concentrat-

ing on her schoolwork because of disruptions in her personal life, so I wondered if her e-mail was a reflection of a psychic balance she was trying to achieve. When I inquired about why she chose this address, she gave me her business card while stating that she was a physical therapist who helped balance the bodies of her clients. When I read the address TwistedKisses15@yahoo.com I assumed that some sort of a kiss was the main thing on her mind in devising it. However, she reports that in creating it as a fifteen year old she was not thinking so much of kissing in the sexual sense, as of something that would both convey "strange/weird" ("twisted") and "sweet/cute" ("a kiss"). Gender neutrality is common in e-mail handles: Chris348@aol.com could be Christina, but it is for Christopher, Mel94597@hotmail.com is the address of Melissa rather than Melvin, Pat31638@yahoo.com is Patrick's rather than Patricia's address, and Rob89@aol.com comes from Robyn rather than Robert.

There are also issues of multiple and changing identities. AwayWithWords22@netmail.com also wrote me from the e-mail CitizenSoldierX@netmail.com. I wondered if he was thinking of joining the army, the National Guard, or a militia group, but he told me that the address was inspired by a book on WWII soldiers and that he wanted to convey something about personal struggle, in the sense of "soldiering through life."

Sometimes more than an e-mail address changes in the search for a comfortable identity. Several years ago my sense of gender identity was confused by a young person with a gender neutral name who worked in the college cafeteria. The first day I saw him he looked male and the next day, and mostly thereafter, he appeared at work dressed as a female who was slightly in need of a shave. S/he was singularly uncommunicative and when I asked a question about the food it felt like s/he was going to bite. Before too long, the public presentation of this quite visible person settled in a female persona. The school scuttlebutt is that electrolysis and estrogen treatments helped to clarify the identity. A few months ago when chatting with her in a lounge area, I received an approving nod of agreement when I commented that she seemed to be much more relaxed than she had been the year before. When I

asked her for an e-mail address, it included a totally different, quite feminine name within it.

It was through my work in psychohistory that I first used e-mail and I wanted an e-mail address that reflected my several decades of psychohistorical research and writing. To my astonishment America Online (AOL) e-mail handles conveying the word psychohistory were already taken and yet I did not know or know of the people involved. Before long I discovered that the e-mailer's using them were mostly inspired by Isaac Asimov's fantasy psychohistory. This stimulated the *Clio's Psyche* special issue, "Freud and Asimov: Two Very Different 'Psychohistories,'" (Vol. 5, no. 1: pp. 1, 15-38) to better understand the imaginary psychohistory of a most prolific author. I will conclude with my own e-mail address of pelovitz@aol.com. It reflects a lifelong identity, but little of the imagination of so many of the young people who have come of age in an era of Internet identity.

Paul H. Elovitz, PhD, is editor of this publication. □

Holding onto September 11th

Jaclyn Anne Dilling
Ramapo College of New Jersey

On September 11, 2001 I commuted to class enjoying the comfort of my morning schedule. It was a beautiful day with the sky a lovely shade of blue with puffy white clouds. In fact, I was completely ignorant as to what was going on less than 30 miles from my campus. While I sat in class busily taking notes on Machiavelli, terrorist hijackers were crashing planes into the World Trade Center. My peace of mind was shattered when a professor came running into our classroom and told us, "The United States is under attack - two planes have crashed into the World Trade Center." My thoughts left the lecture subject, fearfully jumping to my father, who worked in Tower 2 of the Center. I rushed out of the classroom while trying on my cell phone to contact him, my mother, and my sister. I got into my car as quickly as possible, hitting redial on my cell phone, I dis-

covered I could not get in touch with anyone in my family. Busy signal was followed by infuriating busy signal. Though I did not realize it at the time, the telephone lines were overloaded with people like me desperately trying to establish that their loved ones were not hurt in the terrorist attack.

While trying to reach family, I prayed that someone would pick up. I sped down Route 17 South toward home. Directly in front of me, instead of the usual beautiful view of the Manhattan skyline, was an enormous, dark cloud of smoke.

Eventually, after what seemed like a lifetime, I heard a ring on the other end of the phone. My mother, hysterically crying into the phone, managed to tell me that she had heard from my father who had called from a payphone after escaping from the burning building. Only then did I begin to cry.

About a year later, I developed a phobia of classrooms. Sitting in a classroom would within seconds throw me into a state of panic. I began to feel trapped, had a rapid heartbeat, and difficulty breathing. Such an acute state of fear possessed me that I felt I *had* to leave the room immediately. To stop the panic attacks I would flee from class. Everyday for the next week I drove to campus, parked my car, walked into the building and sat down in class. But before my professor would even arrive, I would walk right back out the door and back to my car. The following week, once I arrived on campus I could not even bring myself to step out of my car. In my own solitary capsule I would sit, crying uncontrollably. After a while, even the thought of classrooms, would instantly trigger a panic attack. I became phobic of them, because that is where I had been during the attacks that could have taken my father's life.

These attacks were endangering my education. I am an extremely serious student who values the opportunity to attend college. Nevertheless, in October, 2002 I had dropped all of my classes. I had been a psychology major with a 3.5 GPA, and had hopes of attending New York University. Instead, I turned into a nervous wreck; sitting alone all day in my room loathing myself. My life felt worthless. I blamed myself for not being able to attend class and became incredibly

depressed. My doctor advised me to begin seeing a therapist.

After seeing three different therapists, I was diagnosed with panic attacks, social anxiety disorder, and depression. The therapists diagnosed my anxiety disorders as stemming from my experience as a college student during the September 11th terrorist attacks.

After much intensive therapy and several medications to control my disorders, I was finally able to get myself back to college. Now, I must sit next to the door in each of my classes to help me feel less trapped. To help cope, I learned breathing exercises which are useful in soothing my otherwise uncontrollable nerves. I have registered with Special Services so that I have a college counselor I can talk to when I feel anxious. In a psychohistory class I wrote a paper on emotional reactions to 9/11. Nevertheless, classrooms still produce great anxiety for me and at times panic attacks. Thankfully, I have learned not to let them control me, but to instead control them.

Why am I "panicking" over September 11th? Could it be related to the panic attacks that plagued my father as long as I remember? Though I love my mother, I feel for my father especially when he is put down. I know I identify with my father; could it be that I identify with his panic? After all, it was fear for his safety that first came to mind when I heard of the terrorist attacks of September 11th. Though at the present time I have more questions than answers, I am thankful that I am once again a successful student who is on the road to greater understanding of my problems and control over my life.

Jaclyn Dilling is a psychology major at Ramapo College, maintaining her high average

The Best of Clio's Psyche
is Available for Assignment in Classes
Currently, it is \$15 for the 175 page
volume

Understanding Emotions Through Rogers, Ellis, and Perls

Donna Crawley
Ramapo College

Review of Carol Magai and Jeannette Haviland-Jones, The Hidden Genius of Emotion: Lifespan Transformations of Personality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Hardcover ISBN 0-521-64094-6, xv, 527 pages, \$70. This book is part of the Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction (Second Series), edited by Keith Oatley (University of Toronto) and Antony S. R. Manstead (University of Cambridge).

The thesis of *The Hidden Genius of Emotion* is that "... affect is the central organizing force in individual personality and the integrative link between domains of psychological functioning" (p. xi). Emotion is presented as the key element drawing other disparate areas of psychological development and personality together. Carol Magai and Jeannette Haviland-Jones draw on newer epistemological systems as well as standard psychological theories in order to present the argument that affect is as important, or perhaps even more central, than cognition in understanding human personality and developmental change.

The authors utilize a fascinating approach – combining theoretical analysis with psychohistorical case study. Specifically, they use the lives of three psychologists as case applications. The lives of Carl Rogers, Fritz Perls, and Albert Ellis are examined using biographical, autobiographical, academic, and video materials. The choice of these three theorists/analysts is interesting, given their historical importance within psychology. Indeed, the selection of these three makes the book of particular interest to any students of psychology who have seen the video of the three clinicians each in session with the same client (Gloria) and have compared and contrasted the therapeutic approaches of these three men. This video, Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (1966), was a standard in psychology classes at one time.

Carol Magai and Jeannette Haviland-Jones

have taken a lifespan approach to personality development, using affect, attachment, and cognition as the fundamental forces. They examine the personal lives of Roger, Perls, and Ellis to trace their patterns of affect and attachment and link those patterns to their later work in psychology. Positioning Rogers, Perls, and Ellis within their personal and historical frameworks in order to examine their theoretical standpoints fits well with a postmodern mode of analysis. Interestingly, the authors have used classic theoreticians as their subjects, and often rely on other classic psychological theories for their core content, yet they have used very current epistemological techniques to construct their argument. Along the same lines, they critique the absence of a focus on the *individual* within psychology, and expose the myth of depersonalized objectivity as an attainable and desirable goal within the field. This too is consistent with more current feminist and postmodern critiques of traditional epistemological systems within the field of psychology.

In academic psychology as a whole, emotion has not been at the center of theories of personality and development; cognition has more often been the focus. Further, traditional assumptions about empirical methodology take emotion out of the equation, so to speak. The affective reactions of the psychologist are traditionally kept out of the processes most often used to search for information, for "truth," in psychology. In addition, the waves within psychology that focus on cognition and neuroscience have flooded the field in recent years. Therefore, it is a radical approach in academic psychology to put emotion at the center of development and to acknowledge the emotional behavior of the psychologist as an important factor in a therapist/client interaction, as these authors have done.

Professors Magai and Haviland-Jones interrogate the affective aspects of the therapeutic context through an examination of the behavioral, verbal, and nonverbal posturing of both the therapist and the client in a dynamic reciprocal "dance." The analysis of the interaction between the therapist and client is key insight here – extending the authors' theoretical arguments about affect into the practice arena. For example, they focus in the later part of the book on the video of Rogers, Perls, and Ellis with Gloria, and they look at the affective pattern

that Gloria brings into the sessions along with the power dynamics inherent in the situation. The authors describe how Gloria's affective pattern interacts uniquely with each of the individual affective patterns of the therapists. This interaction shapes the sessions. Although there is some consistency in how Gloria presents herself with each therapist, ultimately each session is shaped by the therapist's prior goals, interests, and interactional pattern.

The primary audiences for The Hidden Genius of Emotion would be clinical psychologists and other practitioners of psychotherapy, personality psychologists, developmental psychologists, and psychohistorians. One of the interesting aspects of this book is the triangulation of methods and materials used by the authors. Their study of individual lives (cases) may not fit with notions of strict traditional, empirical research in psychology – and thus will be unconvincing to some psychologists; however, they have used multiple types of materials and qualitative methods. Magai and Haviland-Jones present the pros and cons of qualitative research in an interesting discussion of narrative analysis as a form of research. This section of the book would be valuable to use in teaching research methodology. In fact, the book would be appropriate for classroom use in a variety of ways, as described below.

There is a good deal of material on the history of psychology in The Hidden Genius of Emotion. Although some interpretations by the authors may be open to debate, there is considerable reference to the historical development of the discipline. In addition, the biographical materials on Rogers, Ellis, and Perls – and the authors' interpretations of that material – are interesting in and of themselves. An example of one such section is the descriptions of Rogers' upbringing and his resultant discomfort with hostility, which profoundly impacted not only the content of this therapeutic approach (e.g., unconditional positive regard) but also his reaction to hostility by his clients. The text would be quite useful in teaching the history of psychology by providing material that illustrates the relationship between the personal history of individual psychologists and the academic theories and practice techniques that each uses.

In addition, the authors are instructive in the text – explaining the various theoretical systems and concepts they use as if to a naïve (albeit educated) audience. They are also redundant as the book proceeds, including introductory sections and summaries in the chapters that restate the core concepts. This writing pattern also makes the book appropriate for classroom use. For example, students in an advanced undergraduate or graduate course studying Client-Centered Therapy by Rogers, Rational Emotive Therapy by Ellis, or Perls' Gestalt methods would find the book illuminating and provocative. In this book the face and human history of the systems of therapy are personalized.

One downside to the authors' analyses in a few places is that they are highly speculative at times, analyzing events for which there is no real evidence. Indeed, the authors themselves refer to some of these events as possibly apocryphal. While the existence of the "lore" of these events may be telling, it is dangerous to analyze what may not even have happened.

The most interesting – and maybe most valid – parts of the book lie in the contrasts made between the three therapists. I found the individual stories and analyses fascinating, but the book came alive for me in the comparisons. I felt that I could see the individual pictures and lives best when presented in contrast to the others. I could see the authors' argument that emotions and emotional patterns organize experience and thought, thus altering the value and the processing of lived events, as the three famous therapists were contrasted. The emotions that are presented as key to understanding each therapist differ, and include hostility, fear, and shame. These emotions are presented as having not only shaped the therapists' personalities, but as having provided the foundations for each person's mental and physical life. By the authors' interpretations, such emotions and affective patterns can be identified in how each individual reacts, thinks, writes, theorizes, and practices. The confluence of biography, affective pattern, and cognitive processes – as presented in The Hidden Genius of Emotion – is most thought-provoking.

Donna Crawley, PhD, received her doctor-

ate in social psychology and personality from Cornell University, and is Professor of Psychology at Ramapo College of New Jersey where for 19 years she has taught and held major administrative positions, such as Academic Vice President. Her most recent scholarly work has focused on diversity and curriculum revision in higher education. For four years she was Co-editor of the national journal *Transformations*. Dr. Crawley may be contacted at <dcrawley@ramapo.edu>. □

Aggression, Sex Roles, and Adaptation in Early Societies

Peter Petschauer
Appalachian State University

Review of Peter Jüngst and Oskar Meder, Psychodynamik, Machtverhältnisse und Territorialität in "einfachen" und frühen staatlichen Gesellschaften. Überlegungen und Thesen (Psychodynamics, Power Relationships and Territoriality in "Simple" and Early Societies: Considerations and Theses). It is part of the series: Urbs et Regio, 74/2002: Psychodynamik und Territorium. (Psychodynamics and Territory.) [Kasseler Schriften zur Geographie und Planung] (Kassel: Universitätsbibliothek, 2002) ISBN 3-89792-085-1, pp. 541.

The authors discuss aspects of hunting/gathering and early agricultural societies, high cultures, and state systems. For each of these societies, they elaborate on production and reproduction; territorial arrangements in dispersed small groups and large settlements in concentrated areas; development of leadership patterns in response to the increasing complexity of agricultural activities and defensive needs; and the standing of men and women, young and old, as ancient societies responded to changing needs.

My first reaction to this volume was negative because I could not immediately visualize studying modern tribes, their territorialities, and other ways of being as a means to theorize about ancient hunting and hunting societies. I quickly changed my mind as it became apparent that modern examples of small groups, like the San of the

Kalahari can assist in approaching similar groupings in a preliterate world.

Jüngst and Meder are particularly interested in forms of production and reproduction, thus in the ways in which members of communities operated to solve them internally and in response to outside realities. Their astonishing proposition is that members of small groups created for each other a considerable amount of "autonomy"; thus the need was not for the young to subordinate themselves without question to their seniors' norms and behaviors. Such submissiveness would not have served the groups well because they required individuals who could "act individually and to make decisions independently" in the context of hunting and gathering. The authors also agree with the better-known assumption that men and women acted in more egalitarian fashion in these societies than in later agricultural societies. Having theorized for years in World Civilization courses about this difference, I am delighted to have confirmed the spatial arrangements of early tropical and subtropical societies, namely the presence of fathers, or men, in the midst of the compound or village—in contrast to later societies. As a whole, individuals in societies like these had to have the ability to react quickly in response to unforeseen circumstances. This capacity was all the more important because, unlike in later societies, they did not gather and hunt for the long term, but for the immediate needs of the group; therefore success was immediately important due to the lack of long-term reserves to make up for individual or group failures.

Additionally I found it fascinating that groups like these did not develop the sort of leadership structure familiar from later societies and that women were an integral part of the processes of production and reproduction. The partnership relationship of parents and adult support for the self-expression of children made it unnecessary to find ways to compensate for suppressed needs and wishes. The ability to realize themselves in the context of the group made it possible for each member to "shine" at appropriate occasions; thus

the lesser need for one or two to do so in a leadership role.

Another proposition for these early hunting and gathering societies is equally intriguing, namely that their thin settlement pattern made it unnecessary to protect by force a specific location. After all, the group, or groups, could simply remove themselves from one area and resettle in another that was less immediately exposed to attack. Not having to defend a specific territory in turn meant that warlike individuals did not need to be produced through a modified socialization process; a process that would have lessened or destroyed the egalitarianism of young and old, men and women. Obviously, once societies engaged in large hunts, or developed a higher degree of territoriality in fertile and otherwise rich areas, leadership structures gradually emerged that resemble the "Big Man" or chieftain patterns.

Having laid out their thesis in the first part of the volume, and reiterating it in the conclusion, the authors continued showing how various agricultural societies solved many of their productive and reproductive needs. For example, the more efficient agriculture became in a particularly fertile area, the more it permitted the increase of population and the creation of surpluses; both situations making them open to attack by others who sought access to production and surplus. Implicit in success with agricultural production was the development of greater internal organizational abilities and external defenses. Internally the societies had to adjust themselves to creating men who could organize production and defense against aggressors. This in turn meant that the childrearing patterns and the patterns of living had to be adjusted over time.

Male children had to be trained in such a way that at least some of them felt compelled to lead and to defend. Early latent aggressiveness in boys had to be captured through various rites and channeled for the benefit of the group. This process required that societies allow for the emergence of elders and various male leaders who could arrange agricultural activities, lead rituals, and organize the defense of the community. Spatial rearrangements quickly followed suit. As the men took more dominant roles, they moved to the center of their socie-

ties into expansive compounds, and women were pushed from their "traditional" center, including their positions as leading goddesses, to the periphery. One quick read of Gilgamesh demonstrates many of the patterns that had existed since he had ruled. One sees him at the center of his society, with another man as his companion, abusing women, questioning a goddess, killing off the lush forests to the west, and leading men into war. He was portrayed as being arrogant enough to think of himself as godlike.

For psychohistorians this work is particularly interesting because it summarizes the vast literature on everything from hunting and gathering to the societal workings of ancient city-states. It introduces and informs those in the field who do not regularly engage in these topics and links them with discussions and insights on childrearing, leadership, and a number of other issues to concern to those involved in the field of psychohistory. It is quite important that the exclusive emphasis of some psychohistorians on infanticide and other negative practices of the ancient world is moderated by other considerations such as children needing to be socialized in order to attain specific outcomes for a society, for example, lesser or greater aggressiveness. Also, instead of emphasizing the role of mothers to the exclusion of fathers, we are treated to an understanding of the role of both in hunting and gathering and ancient agricultural societies. Finally, instead of an emphasis on negative practices, like abandoning children to wild animals and other abuses, we are given reasons for societies' need to have children survive into adulthood so that they could serve in specific roles for the benefit of the whole. Fortunately, this volume offers a more textured view of the history of childhood than one often finds in more linear approaches.

I highly recommend this volume not only to those with considerable ability in German, but also to those who want to have the ancient world interpreted differently than the usual historical and psychohistorical perspective.

Peter Petschauer, PhD, is a Professor of History and Director of the Hubbard Center for Faculty and Staff Support at Appalachian State University. He is a prolific author and a Contribut-

Letter to the Editor

The American Empire: Denial and Self-Deception

To the Editor:

The articles in the special issue: "America as an Imperial Power? Psychological Implications" (Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 75-101) provoked strong feelings in me, especially about the issue of denial of imperialism. Before speaking of denial it is important to demonstrate the existence of that which is being denied. The topic here is the American Empire so I would like to suggest the following definition of imperial activity: when one nation state becomes involved militarily, economically, or politically in matters affecting people beyond the boundaries of the state in a way that is of significantly greater benefit to the imperial nation than to the other nations or people. I take this definition to be substantially the same as Michael Parenti's definition of imperialism from his book Against Empire (1995) which is "the process whereby the dominant politico-economic interests of one nation expropriate for their own enrichment the land, labor, raw materials, and markets of another people" (p. 1). Thus, outright military conquest, economic exploitation, or political manipulation of the affairs of another nation would all qualify as imperial behavior while trade and commerce in a fair market situation, freely negotiated treaties, or agreements between countries would not.

The question of the historical record is a crucial one. In the limited space available here the best I can do is to give some references to the body of work that demonstrates the enormous number of instances in which this nation has acted as an empire. The best overview, from the days of Columbus until 1980 when the book was written, is Howard Zinn's A People's History of the United States. In particular, chapter 12 "The Empire and the People," which starts off documenting the 103 interventions in the affairs of other countries between 1798 and 1895, is an excellent source. For the historical record of America's imperial adventures in the modern era, see former State Department employee William Blum's Rogue State: A Guide to the

World's Only Superpower, (2000). Chapter 17, "A Concise History of US Global Interventions, 1945-Present" documents 77 separate interventions, most of which lasted years or decades. Blum's 1995 book, Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions Since WWII, is also rich in information on our military and quasi-military actions.

Michael Parenti's Against Empire details the non-military aspects of the contemporary American Empire. Specifically, the second chapter "Imperial Domination Updated" along with several other sections of the book, provides an analysis of some of the extremely sophisticated and innovative developments in the technology of control which have been put to effective use by those operating the machinery of the empire; methods far from the overt violence of military conquest but which can achieve the same results. Then there is the prolific Noam Chomsky, probably the most knowledgeable and politically sophisticated observer of American imperial behavior. I would recommend his 1994 book, World Orders Old and New, which documents and analyzes the post Cold War shifts in American imperial strategies and tactics. There is also his brilliant tribute to Orwell, Manufacturing Consent, written in 1984, which illuminates how those who run the empire are able to create the situation in which there is virtually no opposition to their policies and decisions. Part four of The Chomsky Reader, published in 1987, "The United States and the World," contains a number of articles documenting American imperial activities during the Cold War era. Chomsky is an excellent source on the domestic activities necessary to keep the empire running.

A major rationalization for the uniquely American form of imperialism is the concept or philosophy of "manifest destiny." It is a sort of a combination of the British Empire's racist concept of the white man's burden and the later Nazi doctrine of "Lebensraum;" concepts which Americans have no difficulty seeing as highly problematic when held by others but are presented by mainstream U.S. history as an essentially benign development of the American nation; an organic unfolding that simply grew naturally from the need to absorb all those European immigrants along with our high birth rate.

In psychoanalysis we have many pejorative words that describe people who behave as imperial nations do. They get called malignant narcissists with tendencies toward grandiosity, psychic primitives dwelling in the paranoid-schizoid position who split the world into good and bad, who both love themselves and hate their designated enemies too much. In ordinary language, they are not seeing something which might make them feel uncomfortable – in particular that uncomfortable guilty feeling that comes with the realization that one has done something harmful to another. The American Empire is hardly unique when it comes to rationalization. The Romans saw themselves as bringing civilization to the barbarians, the church brought God to the heathens, the British shouldered the white man's burden, and the Americans are bringing the world the benefits of that unique blend of consumerism and libertarianism that constitute the American Way.

Denial runs through our leaders' justification of imperialism; from the earliest days when the Monroe Doctrine was said to be in the service of protecting the weak nations of the Western Hemisphere, from European imperial designs, to the present when deposing Saddam Hussein is said to be for the purpose of bringing democracy to Iraq. The justification changes but the imperial ambition remains the same.

David Lotto

Pittsfield, Massachusetts

David Lotto, PhD, is a psychoanalyst/psychologist in private practice, a Research Associate of the Psychohistory Forum, and an adjunct faculty member at the University of Massachusetts. He often writes for this publication and he may be reached at <dlotto@ny.cap.rr.com>. □

Call for Papers

The 9/11 Commission Hearings and Report

The Next Assignment of Psychohistory

"The Passion of the Christ"

Television, Celebrity, and Reality

In Memoriam: Robert Pois (1940-2004)

Paul H. Elovitz

Ramapo College and the Psychohistory Forum

Robert A. Pois, Professor of History at the University of Colorado in Boulder where he taught for 38 years, died on January 18, 2004. His special interests and areas of expertise were in Weimar Germany, Nazism, the "Great War," German Expressionism, and psychohistory. Among his many publications were the books Alfred Rosenberg: Selected Writings (as editor in 1970, and published in the U.S. under the title of Race and Race History), Frederick Meinecke and German Politics in the Twentieth Century (1972), The Bourgeois Democrats of Weimar Germany (1976), Emil Nolde (1982), National Socialism and the Religion of Nature (1986), and The Great War (1994). His latest book, Command Failure: Psychology and Leadership, is co-authored with Philip Langer and is forthcoming this spring from the University of Indiana Press. Professor Pois wrote articles for various journals and gave numerous professional presentations. Partly because most of his colleagues in Colorado were not very accepting of his interest in psychohistory, he reached out to those on the coasts. In late-April 1989, he organized an excellent psychohistorical conference, "The Rise of Adolf Hitler and Other Genocidal Leaders." It was held at St. Mary's Medical Center in San Francisco and it involved many leading colleagues in the field. For many years he was a member of the Psychohistory Forum and he occasionally wrote articles for this publication on a variety of different subjects, most recently last September. We co-authored "Mourning, Melancholia, and the Palestinians" (March 2002 Vol. 8, no. 4: pp. 165-168) and I had looked forward to further collaboration with him.

Bob Pois died of pneumonia after a period of poor health that included a failed back operation, pancreatitis, a general physical collapse, and a week in hospice. His family was with him at the time of his death. Peter Loewenberg of UCLA, whom Bob had considered a mentor, responded to hearing of this loss with the words,

"Pois had a big heart, was a true friend; suffered for himself and his family; loved all kinds of history, particularly military history. He died too young." Despite his geographical distance from the major centers of psychohistory, he is remembered fondly by a variety of other psychohistorical colleagues, including David Beisel and Jacques Szaluta.

The life of Robert August Pois started with his birth in Washington DC on April 24, 1940. He grew up mostly in Chicago with his parents and his younger brother. His childhood was often a lonely one, punctuated by moments of joy when he and his brother would walk to the railroad tracks and observe steam and diesel trains. He retained this passion for steam locomotives throughout his entire life. His interests ran the gamut from music, art, history, philosophy, psychology, and animals (frequently of the reptile family), to the more esoteric. He explained his fascination with the Loch Ness Monster in the following manner: "Well, God is dead and socialism doesn't work, why not believe in Nessie?" While his parents bemoaned Bob's off-beat sense of humor it was part of his coping strategy. His funny stories kept his wife, children, friends, and countless students laughing over the years and anticipating the next great tale or joke.

Pois took his B.A. from Grinnell College and his masters and doctoral degrees at the University of Wisconsin, where he was a Woodrow Wilson fellow, under the distinguished intellectual historian, George Mosse (1918-1999).

Professor Pois loved to teach and the students responded quite positively to him. He put enormous energy into his lectures even when he was in great pain, as in recent years. He was an institution at the University of Colorado at Boulder where he was well known for his lectures on World War I, Nazi Germany, and the Holocaust. Bronson Hilliard, a former student, declared that "his classes were symphonies that would take you from one of these great moments of elation and wonder, then to tears, and then uproarious laugh-

ter - all in the same lecture." From year to year word spread of this professor's fascinating and informative classes. ROTC (Reserve Officer Training Corp) and engineering students fulfilling liberal arts requirements were among the students eagerly signing up to learn more about war, military history, the Holocaust, the folly of humankind, and much else. There are reports that Bob's sense of humor led him to tell "outrageous stories" that the students loved. One former student, who taped many of his lectures, spoke about creating a compact disc of the classes he attended so they could be shared with others. Professor Pois won numerous teaching awards and was named a University of Colorado Presidential Teaching Scholar in 1990.

He is survived by Anne Marie Messerschmitt Pois, his wife of 31 years, his daughters Rebecca, Erica, and Emily, and his brother Marc. His widow teaches in the Women's Studies Program at the University of Colorado in Boulder. Condolences may be sent to her by e-mail at <Pois@colorado.edu>. □

The Next Psychohistory

Forum Meeting

April 3, 2004

Barry Shapiro

"Conspiracy Thinking

in the

French Revolution"

Bulletin Board

The next **Psychohistory Forum WORK-IN-PROGRESS SATURDAY SEMINAR** will be on **April 3, 2004** when **Barry Shapiro**, PhD (Allegheny College) will speak on "**Conspiracy Thinking in the French Revolution.**" It will be followed on **April 24** when **Anna Geifman**, PhD (Boston University) will present "**Lenin's Personality Profile**" and **Philip Pomper**, PhD (Wesleyan University) on "**Trotsky's Self-Destructive Ambivalence.**" (The April 24 meeting is an **afternoon seminar from 12:30-3:30.**) **Herbert Barry** and **Paul Elovitz** will be presenting the Fall 2004 reports of the Forum's **Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidential Candidates and Presidents.** Additional psychobiographical presenters will be considered for this panel. Recent Forum seminars have been on March 6, 2004 when **David Beisel** spoke on "**Unfinished Mourning and the Origins of WWII: Chamberlain as Exemplar**" with 16 colleagues in attendance. (Note that Professor Beisel's book, The Suicidal Embrace: Hitler, The Allies, and the Origins of the Second World War, has finally been published by Circumstantial Productions/ 6 South Broadway/ Nyack, NY 10960/ Tel. 845-358-3603.) On December 16 **Ralph Colp**, **Paul Elovitz**, **Henry Lawton**, **Jerry Piven**, and **Robert Quackenbush** presented on "**The History, Present State, and Next Assignment of Psychohistory.**" **Jacques Szaluta** presented in absentia through the chair, after the snowed-out seminar was rescheduled to a time when he had a previous engagement. **CONFERENCES:** The **National Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis (NAAP)** is calling for papers on The Many Aspects of Fantasy for its 32nd Annual Conference to be held on Saturday, October 9, 2004 at the Marriott Financial Center Hotel. By May 1, 2004, abstracts should be sent to **Margery Quackenbush**, PhD, NAAP Administrator at naap72@aol.com. At the **International Psychohistorical Association's** 27th annual conference at New York University (June 2-4, 2004) **Herbert Barry**, **Dan Dervin** and **Paul Elovitz** will present under the sponsorship of the Research Group on the Childhood, Personality, and Psychology of Presidential Candidates and Presidents. IPA president **Henry Lawton** welcomes additional presenta-

tion proposals. He may be reached at <hwlipa@aol.com>. **CONGRATULATIONS:** To **Ted Goertzel** on the Publication of the second edition of the revised Cradles of Eminence: Childhoods of More Than 700 Famous Men and Women (Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press, 2004), originally published by his parents in 1962. Also, to **George Victor**, who has completed his second book, The Myth of Pearl Harbor, on WWII, which is now under review by a press, and to **Mary Coleman**, who has completed her long awaited book, Blood of the Beloved, which is in press. **NOTES ON PSYCHOHISTORIANS:** In February the City of Vienna, in collaboration with the World Council of Psychotherapy, granted **Vamik Volkan** the **Sigmund Freud Award** for "outstanding contributions to psychotherapy worldwide." **Peter J. Loewenberg** of UCLA spent part of December teaching psychodynamic psychotherapy supervision in the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Hong Kong. Two New York Jewish psychoanalyst members of the Forum have been doing considerable speaking in Germany and the U.S. on the issue of reconciliation of Germans and Jews after the Holocaust. **Isaac Zieman**, who lost his entire family in Latvia, has been speaking about reconciliation in Germany for the last 30 years. In this country he is associated with the One by One Dialogue Group. **Ellen Mendel**, who escaped Germany as a child, for the last five years has been going back to the land of her birth speaking under the auspices of the program: Rescuing History; A Project of Dialogue, Reconciliation and Healing. **Margo Kren**, widow of **George Kren**, has retired from teaching at the University of Kansas. The sad news of the death of **Rita Ransohoff**, has just reached us. We hope to have an obituary in the next issue. The **International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP)** is pleased to announce the establishment of the **Alexander L. George Book Award** for the best political psychology book in the previous year, to be given at the July 2004 Annual Scientific meeting in Lund, Sweden. **OUR THANKS:** To our members and subscribers for the support that makes Clio's Psyche possible. To Benefactors **Herbert Barry**, **Ralph Colp**, and **Mary Lambert**; Patrons **David Beisel**, **Andrew Brink**, **David Lotto**, **Peter Pet-schauer**, and **H. John Rogers**; Sustaining Members **Connee/Lee Shneidman**, **Shirley Stewart**, and **Jacques Szaluta**; Supporting Members **Rudolph**

Binion, David Felix, Peter Loewenberg, and Jacqueline Paulson; and Members anonymous, Ted Goertzel, Nancy Kobrin, Richard Morrock, and Hanna Turken. Our thanks for thought-provoking materials to Donna Crawley, Jaclyn Dilling, Lawrence J. Friedman, Anna Geifman, Carol Gilligan, David Lotto, and Peter W. Petschauer. Our appreciation to Dick Booth and Bob Lentz for editing select articles and to Jaclyn Dilling and Eric Nelson for proof reading. A number of individuals are deserving of credit for technical support for training this editor in Publisher 2000: Jun Chen, Bob Lentz, and, in the Ramapo College Technical Laboratory, Ray Fallon and Tibor Csokasi. □

Young Scholar Membership Award Recipient

Mark Baxter

In late 2003 Professor Robert Pois nominated Mark Baxter, one of his graduate students, for this honor. For his doctoral dissertation, Mr. Baxter has been grappling with the psychology and economics of inflation and the associated theories of value – Friedman, Keynes, Marx. His special interest is the enormous inflation under the Weimar Republic. Upon completing his graduate work, his goal is to devote his life to helping ordinary people while working as an independent scholar. These goals reflect his background: he did volunteer work with the United Steel Workers during their fight against the Wells Fargo Bank and in 1997 he was an associate editor for the Encyclopedia of American Indian Civil Rights. We welcome him to the Forum and wish him well in achieving his goals. You may contact him at <mbaxter999@yahoo.com>.

Forthcoming Articles

The Autobiography of Hitler's Family Doctor
Civilians in Wartime
Freud's Medical Ego Ideals
General Joseph Hooker
"The Passion of the Christ"
A Psychohistorian's Dream
Sports Psychology – and much more

Call for Papers

The Voice/Personal Experience and Psychology of Women at Work and in Modern Life

Special Theme Issue
December 2004

Some possible approaches, all of which must be psychological, include:

- Your personal experience as a woman in a position previously reserved for men
- Must you surrender your voice as a woman to succeed in the world of men?
- The psychology of the superwoman: juggling work, children, and husband
- Parenting styles and birth order in female success in the world outside of the home
- Female sports and business success
- The psychology of female entrepreneurs
- Martha Stewart as icon and target
- The psychobiography of historical female personages
- Women in different cultures
- Women's voices in fundamentalist families
- Why do some high achieving women decide to stay home?
- House husbanding
- How the presence of women changes the attitudes and behavior of men
- Women and politics
- Attitudes to the wives and mothers of male leaders
- Case studies of women in political psychology and psychohistory
- The different situation of pioneering women compared to subsequent women
- The current fascination with homosexuality
- Review essays of important books

500-1500 words, due October 1
(Early submissions welcomed)
Contact Paul Elovitz, Editor
<pelovitz@aol.com>